The World Political Forum
General Assembly, 2003
(Turin, October 23-24)

The World of the XXI Century: New Unity or New Fractures?

REPORT

Report prepared for the client by

Civitatis International

https://www.civitatisinternational.com

INDICE

The World of the XXI Century: New Unity or New Fractures?

INTRODUCTION

The current international order has become unhinged and unstable. Supranational political and economic institutions are ridden with conflict and disagreement between their members. The hoped-for co-operation between states and the new world order at the end of the Cold War has failed to transpire. Rather, international affairs are now characterised by a world disorder as recent events exacerbate fundamental differences of opinion across the globe.

The World Political Forum seeks to examine how to arrange the best possible co-ordination of international institutions and what models for future order are desirable and achievable to reduce these imbalances and differences, in the search for a new political space where civilisations can meet and come to an agreement to manage the international disorder. This world disorder affects every civilisation, and can be solved by none alone. Only with a determined and concerted multi-lateral and trans-societal combined effort by international actors can this spiral of disorder be averted.

The World Political Forum, inspired by its founder and President, Mikhail Gorbachev, seeks to become a meeting point and crossroads for cultures, religions, and leaders, an open forum for the whole world that, through analysis and discussion, will give guidance and provide new solutions to global problems and strive toward a New World Civilisation and framework for a democratic international order.

At its founding conference in May 2003 and inaugural working session in October 2003, in the symbolic cities of Alessandria and Turin, in the Italian region of Piedmont, the World Political Forum defined the path for a new culture of global peace. Many world leaders, past and present, responded to the invitation of President Gorbachev and the Italian sponsoring committee, and assembled at the World Political Forum to seek out new solutions for the problems of the world, and to begin to construct the foundations for their resolution by examining what the causes of world disorder are and how best they can be managed or solved.

The debate examined the need for a new international architecture to avert a clash of civilisations, and the need to rejuvenate the United Nations. The state of the world was also examined and causes of concern were expressed over the Middle East, Africa, and for the future prospects of world disorder. It was resolved at the founding conference to continue the work of the World Political Forum in annual assemblies and regional sessions to seek to examine how the Forum could be of most assistance to world leaders in helping them seek a new path to a culture of peace.

Mr. Jan Mortier
Rapporteur for the World Political Forum

Dr. Andrei Grachev
Chairman of the WPF's Scientific Committee

STRUCTURE

The sessions of the annual assembly of the World Political Forum were held on October 23-24, 2003, at the Meridian Lingotto in Turin and the historic Palazzo Ghilini at Alessandria. The annual assembly spanned two days and sought to examine the state of the world in the 21st century in light of the recent imbalances. The conference sought to examine means to reconcile imbalances in the international order, and forecast new imbalances along with the means for the international community to address them.

The morning session of the annual general assembly of the World Political Forum was titled, "Redefining Peace". This session was divided into two working sessions: "New World Disorder" and "New Means for New Goals". The overall theme "Redefining Peace", sought to scientifically analyse the state of world disorder using theory and structural models.

The participants examined new definitions of security and it was noted that security has varying degrees and definitions in varying cultures, and the emergence of the new world players, both in classical state powers, non-governmental organisations and asymmetric non-state groups, were acknowledged as all having an influence on the state of international affairs, and that new modes of governance would be needed to adequately compensate for the new players, and to manage the new threats to security.

The afternoon session addressed "New Limits to Sovereignty", and it was noted that the end of the Westphalian order had been instigated by the American war on Iraq, as the war was in violation of the binding Charter of the United Nations. Sovereignty was also addressed in that it had changed as a concept, as states no longer have absolute dominion within their realms of sovereignty.

"Crisis Management and Crisis Prevention" were addressed as a way to learn from the best practices of that past and see what new methods could be sought to reduce crises in regions around the world, particularly between civilisations, where local conflicts could inflame wider tensions. "International Justice", was examined, and an analysis of the International Criminal Tribunals and the rise of the new International Criminal Court were welcomed. International law and methods to improve the International Court of Justice were also touched upon by the participants in this session.

Finally, the United Nations was examined for its strengths and weaknesses in light of the Iraq war, and new means were sought to suggest ways to improve the organisation. The reform of the United Nations and international order was discussed in detail throughout the conference and this overriding prominence that the speakers devoted to the subject is reflected here in this report.

I.

GLOBAL DISEQUILIBRIUM - THE NEW WORLD DISORDER

The opening working session of the World Political Forum in Turin on October 23, 2003, addressed the pressing issue of the new world disorder. The session was inaugurated with the call for a need of a retrospective analysis of historical events to understand reasons for the present situation. It was noted that the old world found its place **i**n the historic rationale of a system of sovereign states based on the treaties of Westphalia that had emerged in Europe in the 17th century. The analysis of the session traversed the historical aspect of the balance of power up to the 20th century, and then the international order resulting from World War II and the precarious strategic equilibrium of the Cold War.

The chairman pointed out that Mikhail Gorbachev, the President of the World Political Forum, was the first world leader to call for the building of a new global order at his speech to the United Nations in 1988, where he said, "that further global progress is only possible through a quest for a universal political consensus". The discussion centred on the fact that the world had drastically changed from the era of optimism and hope at the end of the Cold War and that today, international affairs are characterised by an era of insecurity presided over by a mega power in a unipolar world.

There is a new global division and inter-civilisational tension that has arisen. It is characterised by a new political East and a new political West. The advance of Western civilisation with all its successes and faults is evoking a backlash in the political East and particularly within the global South. The factors causing this world disorder are numerous and varying in degrees of severity, but all need to be addressed resolutely if we are to avert the seemingly inevitable spiral of world disorder and the disastrous implications that this entails.

Themes addressed by the participants as causes of inter-civilizational tensions, were the division of the world into classifications of degrees of order, economic disorder, new security threats, and religious and cultural tensions between civilisations. It was noted by some participants that the general long-term trend is towards a post-modern, globalising world, and that the present world consists of three distinct worlds: the pre-modern, the modern, and the post-modern societies. The post-modern world is networked by globalisation and interdependence. This world is pluralistic and enjoys ever closer union, as barriers to trade and exchange are lowered as International Sovereignty develops. In this world there is a premium placed on transparency, information sharing, and communication. The post-modern world promises conflict resolution and diplomacy based on confidence building.

Despite the emergence of the post-modern world, international society is still characterised by the modern world, which adheres to Westphalian principles of sovereignty and realpolitik.. Here, balance of power, secrecy, and the use of force or its threat, remain

important to preserve the national interest and to deter conflict among powers that retain a different strategic outlook or political position.

For all its faults, the multilateral world order has kept the world free from major war over the past half century, and has fulfilled its primary objective of saving generations from the scourge of war. The democratic basis on which interstate affairs have been run so far has contributed to the willing participation of all nations, irrespective of power projection or ideology, in the management of global affairs and ushered in a new sense of global community this last century.

It was noted that disorder and chaos have always been the starting point for new self-organisation, and this was compared to a recognition that the collapse of the old bi-polar world order has led to the emergence of a new global disequilibrium, in which, the US has seized the predominant role, without adequately formulating the rules of the new order, thus fostering further world disorder. The UN Secretary General's comments were reiterated; 'that America cannot arrogate itself the right of unilateral action which it denies to others'.

Yet, the discussion outlined that the origins of the global disequilibrium do not lie solely in the foreign policy of the United States, but rather also lie in the disintegration of the Westphalian order, and the inability of the international community to establish new modes of global governance and security to manage the decline of the old order.

As a progenitor for an international structure of peace, the North Atlantic Treaty Organisation (NATO) was addressed in the discussion and its new expansion and role were examined in the discussion. It was suggested that NATO, even in its quasi-reformed role could not guarantee the peace of all Europe without fully, and openly, engaging in military and political co-operation with all key neighbouring states. It was also noted that although the NATO-Russia Council was a step in the right direction, it would not be sufficient without a credible process of arms reduction.

The participants from the European members of NATO have expressed concerns that Europe could be drawn into an unforeseen conflict as the USA embarks on a series of increasingly diverse and distant conflicts. It is therefore in the interest of both the Europeans and the United States, to re-examine the transatlantic relationship and seek ways to find a new common ground before relations deteriorate any further. A principal means to do this would be the construction of new systems of European and global security in tandem with the United States, in whose interest it would be, to foster the preconditions for this development in a multilateral manner with the foresight that not all security threats can be managed single-handedly.

One participant at the World Political Forum pointed out that the post-modern method of diplomacy through non-military means and the promotion of confidence building and transparency could be a promising approach. For instance, Europe's success in the Helsinki process could be a model to emulate in other areas.

The pre-modern world remains in existence in outposts of the globe and is a realm of existence furthest from the light of civilisation. In such areas, sources of political

legitimacy are vastly different from the post-modern and modern dimensions of politics. The most basic political and human rights are denied to the inhabitants of this world by feudal structures, fundamentalist currents and warlords. It is here that terrorism has its roots and breeding ground.

FROM THE OLD TO THE NEW INTERNATIONAL ORDER

Maintaining order in the modern world while dealing with the challenges of the vestiges of the pre-modern world, has become the strategic challenge of this era of international order. It has become particularly complex as pre-modern groups lash out at the modern world using globalised post-modern technology, communication and finance. However, the discussion concluded positively and agreed that out of this chaos and division it is possible to distinguish a new multilayered international order emerging and that the conceptualisation of the pre-modern, modern, and post-modern worlds will have some relevance in formulating everyday policy.

Since the end of the Cold War; there are new types of conflicts with new actors. It was raised at the session of "New Means for New Goals" that the differing agendas are often linked to the New World's divides and the frustration provoked by globalisation, nationalism and fanaticism, organised crime and interest networks rather than ideology. Such conflicts in the twenty-first century have a global reach and possibly civilisational consequences. Civilians are often the major victims of the new conflicts. The international media have now sanitised conflicts to the point of a clinical and desensitised representational display to the public that seeks to mask the eternal horror that is war. New conflicts are also characterised by the attempt to manipulate world opinion by all sides.

The defence of basic human rights remains a concept at the very heart of the United Nations, yet they are still denied to many people around the world. At the same time there have been examples of instrumentalisation of the conception of human rights for issues not related to cases of their mass violation to the point of bringing the term human rights into disrepute. It was noted by a participant that no country can regard itself as civilised if it does not grant its citizens the unfettered rights of free expression and free assembly, and at the same time realise the legitimate social expectations of decent housing, healthcare, and education. It was noted that the United Nations should become better equipped to employ sanctions that are effective against tyrannical regimes, perhaps in the form of withdrawal of voting rights or even membership of the organisation. A suggestion from an earlier working session proposing a United Nations embargo on the sale of arms to regimes abusing human rights was commended by the discussants.

It was additionally suggested that new security and political structures would be needed as the water tables in key regions of the world begin to fall to critical levels, and

that water and energy wars will characterise the major conflicts of the twenty-first century unless systems of management are implemented soon.

NEW MEANS FOR NEW GOALS

The session of "New Means for New Goals" raised the point that supranational political and economic institutions, most of which have been created after the Second World War, are ridden with inefficiency and internal conflicts. The World Political Forum has set as its goal to examine how to arrange the best possible co-ordination of international institutions and what models for future order are desirable and achievable. The purpose proclaimed by the World Political Forum is to reduce imbalances and formulate different approaches in the search for a new political mould in which different civilisations can meet and come to an agreement to manage the evolution of the international situation in the interests of all nations.

The United Nations is the only international institution to which all the world's states subscribe. Despite its deficiencies, the United Nations does have a positive role to play in maintaining international order and all states have an interest in seeing it succeed. The organisation's mandate ranges from securing international peace to the fight against poverty, environmental degradation and the protection of human rights.

The United Nations system includes some twenty-five plus agencies and has had notable and recognised important achievements like the World Health Organisation's containment of the SARS virus; the World Food Programme feeds more than seventy million people annually and the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees continues to help millions of displaced people the world over. The organisation's ongoing successes include peacekeeping operations, disarmament, landmine clearance, electoral assistance, and post-conflict reconstruction around the world. The UN also recently created the International Criminal Tribunals for Rwanda, Sierra Leone and for the former Yugoslavia. These tribunals have introduced international investigation on behalf of the international community, for war crimes committed in these countries and have made commendable progress. Therefore, an evaluation of the United Nations in fulfilling its mandate should be appreciated in this full spectrum of its global activity.

For all its shortcomings, real or perceived, the UN remains the only source of international legitimacy of collective peacekeeping actions and the foremost forum, with the experience and personnel to deal with a wide range of challenges. Its responses to these challenges, such as humanitarian relief, promoting human rights, the rule of law, conflict management, and post-conflict peace building, have been and remain absolutely essential to reducing world disorder. The United Nations may not be the perfect institution but it does embody certain fundamental values basic to any democratic community.

Firstly, the United Nations embodies rules and norms for acceptable international conduct, establishing thereby an international rule of law between states. Likewise, the principle of sovereign equality enshrined in the UN Charter recognises that while states are not equal in terms of state power, they are nevertheless entitled to equal treatment within the community of nations. This emulates the equality before the law principle that is central to every democratic structure. The United Nations also seeks to de-legitimise the unilateral use of force in settling international disputes, which also emulates civic law, where punishment can only follow due process. It is, by its nature and statute, a multilateral organisation.

The Iraqi crisis gripped the world's attention as the most recent issue challenging the United Nations in its mandate to secure international peace and security. The members of the Security Council failed to reach consensus on a workable multilateral response to Iraq's defiance of its resolutions. The Iraq war called into question the role of the UN, the system of multilateral co-operation and norms for international conduct that are embodied in the UN Charter. The greatest threat to multilateralism and thus the fabric of the United Nations is the thesis of preventative wars carried out unilaterally or in ad hoc coalitions without any mandate from the Security Council.

It was noted by participants at the World Political Forum that the United Nations should be reformed to reflect the significant evolution of the international situation since the end of the Cold War. If the United Nations is to remain a viable institution in the world of the twenty-first century, then member states are going to have to consider significant alterations to its structure, particularly to the Security Council, which clearly and urgently needs reform in its structure, size and composition. The Security Council should be enlarged to include more permanent members and the new centres of political and economic power should be represented. It was also noted that the rules of decision making within the Security Council have to be modified. The power of a single member's veto impedes the work of the Council and, at worst, portrays it as ineffective.

However, there is a chasm between this acknowledgement and putting it into practice. Significant change in the international governance architecture has previously only taken place following major catastrophes such as the two World Wars. The World Political Forum advocates that international society has reached a point of sophistication where such destructive catalysts are no longer necessary to change the status quo.

A participant noted that if the United Nations ignored perceived security threats and continued to operate on the abstract theoretical basis of attempting to alter the reality of the unipolar world into a multipolar one, then it will fail, and this in turn will lead to tension and conflicts endangering world peace. The European Union was also praised as an unprecedented historical success, where states volunteered to peacefully merge their sovereignties to facilitate good governance and supra-national management, with the goal of establishing a realm of peace.

The United Nations is well placed to tackle the future challenges of new threats to international security, international conflicts, violation of human and civil rights, oppression of national and social minorities, poverty, demographic challenges, inequality in access to education and information, food, water, and community services**,** environmental degradation, and the management of scarce resources. The co-operation and unity of all nations will be required as never before in order to work collectively to redress these imbalances and limit the significant effects of international disorder that challenge the well-being of mankind and undermine the prospect of a better future for all humanity.

INTERNATIONAL LAW AND THE NEW SOVEREIGNTY

One of the greatest challenges to the efficiency of United Nations today, is the issue of the international use of force infringing upon national sovereignty. The discussion that took place at the two sessions of the World Political Forum held in 2003, was divided into two principal opinions. The first, that state sovereignty is an inviolable concept and that sovereign equality among nations is fundamental to peace and stability in the current international order. A participant noted that at the Millennium Summit the world leaders reaffirmed their commitment to the purposes and principles of the Charter of the United Nations as timeless and universal, and that this included the doctrine of national sovereignty. The second opinion held that there is a new sovereignty, a sovereignty that is qualified by the treatment of citizens at the hands of their governments.

The last Iraq War can be understood in terms of the announced end of the Westphalian order. This order was most visibly questioned with the 1999 NATO intervention in Kosovo, that was launched without the mandate of the United Nations, where the traditional conception of sovereignty clashed with the new approach, implying the state's responsibility for the observation and respect of the human rights of its citizens. It was agreed that this new approach is not yet legalised by international conventions and is far from being shared by the majority of state leaders across the world. This is an era of unpredictable flux and potential crises that are beyond the management of states and the current system of international order. This era as a changing paradigm of order is at a point of instability furthest from its known equilibrium, posing the greatest danger while simultaneously providing a window of opportunity for the greatest change.

The doctrine of absolute national sovereignty is challenged by those who believe that military intervention is permissible to remove or replace the leadership of rogue or failed states. The right of self-defence formulated in Article 51 of the UN Charter is being replaced by the potentially unlimited doctrine of pre-emptive action, which implies that the most powerful member state of the United Nations might ignore the binding status of the United Nations Charter. The theory of pre-emptive self-defence is a conception that could destabilise the corpus of international law and international security. If this doctrine were

to be emulated by other states, the world would soon experience disintegration into lawlessness and endemic unilateralism.

There is a dangerous permissiveness to war as a means of settling issues between states. States around the world are now increasing their military budgets in an era of insecurity at the expense of their populations, and the danger of a new international arms race is present.

The world must re-examine and redefine the role of national sovereignty and self-defence in the twenty-first century. Large scale abuses of fundamental human rights that 'shock the moral conscience of mankind' need to be codified as threats to international peace and security.

It is necessary to review the UN Charter, both in its theoretical founding principles and in its practical aspects. It is necessary to establish principles that clearly define when the civil population or human and civil rights of individuals or national minorities are in danger. Unless these considerations are included in a review of the Charter, the use of illegal force in international affairs will increase.

THE MOVEMENT TOWARD THE MULTILATERAL WORLD

Concerted action to manage world disorder need not wait until the United Nations is reformed; it should proceed as and when the need transpires. It is quite possible to work in this way with the current structure of the organisation. The situation in international affairs has greatly altered since the great hopes expressed in the meetings held at the United Nations in the 1990s. To improve this situation, a logical solution would be to attempt to re-launch a multilateral system. A participant observed that the world is faced either with a choice between a multilateral international order, or an order that will continue to disintegrate into disorder, as the neo-conservatives antagonise the rest of the world's capitals. The issue at hand is to find equilibrium between states, a common ground and congenial political space in which to legislate and enforce law. This task must primarily be borne by democratic states, as democracy is the source of legitimacy in twenty-first century international affairs.

The shape of things to come articulated at the World Political Forum, with regard to the world economic order over the next half century, forecast that the United States of America will continue to exercise its unchallenged power projection in technological, economic, and military spheres. Europe will emerge as a quasi-state and work towards a continental union; there will be a continuous expansion of the market economy system around the world, accompanied by the extension of democracy and political freedoms worldwide. State borders will increasingly become porous in the realm of economics and culture.

Globalisation will need conscious management to steer its course onto an ethical path and to reduce the imbalances causing disorder. Globalisation has become a negative phenomenon, condemned by many people. The world needs another kind of globalisation, a globalisation that has a sense of responsibility, ethics, and common destiny for our world. The world needs an 'ethicalisation' of world economics.

The World Bank recently polled 2600 decision makers and seventy percent agreed that the extreme poverty of a thousand million people is a serious threat to world peace. Poverty alleviation is one of the basic goals of world economic development and with the continuous development of the economy; the amount of wealth in the world has risen sharply. Globalisation has benefited many countries namely China, India, and the region of East Asia. For the rest of the world it has left a wealthy West presiding over failed and falling states, and the gap between the rich and poor is widening to unprecedented and potentially cataclysmic proportions.

The unbalanced development of the world economy, the serious polarisation between the rich and the poor, and the aggravation of poverty, have become problems of such magnitude to the international community that if left unaddressed will invite catastrophe within this century. There is no credible way of keeping peace in this global village of such vast inequality. The total property of the 225 wealthiest persons in the world is $1.3 trillion, which is comparable to the total income of over half of the world's population. On an individual level, this means that the wealth of one of these persons included in this list of 225 is equal to the annual wages of 30 million people.

Such disparity of incredible wealth compared to the incredible human suffering of those in absolute poverty is unconscionable to the universal aspirations of civilisation and the right to human dignity. The world cannot accept that an accident of latitude or longitude determines whether a child will live or die. Poverty on a global scale is reaching critical levels, if populations continue to increase at their current rate, and their poverty remains the same, state structures may see a backlash of their populations, and likewise states against the international financial architecture. It is a priority to avert this backlash by reforming the international financial architecture and ensuring that absolute poverty on the global scale is reduced, and in time, eradicated.

The challenges of globalisation require open dialogue and democratic participation of all varieties of humanity existent in the world today. The human family must address above all the great inequalities that exist in the current order to establish its common home. The Forum continues to address work on the reduction of global poverty in its annual general assembly on October 2004.

REGIONAL PERSPECTIVES ON DEVELOPMENT

In considering the situation of the world in continental regions, the World Political Forum found that it is apparent that those regions where the state invests sufficiently in education and training have the ability to overcome the situation of poverty. For those in countries where their daily choices are about survival, globalisation is at best a dream and at worst a lie.

It is apparent that Africa as a continent does not have states that invest in adequate levels of education and training, barring a few exceptions. In Africa 7,000 lives are lost each day because people cannot get access to medicines for HIV/AIDS that those in the West can. Global research into health is aimed at the diseases of the rich nations rather than those of the poor and this has caused a great imbalance.

Many civilisational tensions, particularly in Muslim and Christian communities, are merely the result of economic disparity. The solution lies in poverty alleviation, in empowering vulnerable groups - including women - by promoting education, that leads to understanding and tolerance of a globalisation that opens doors rather than closes them to young people.

The debate on development went on to suggest that the debt of the poor states is unjust and that the world cannot hold the grandchildren responsible for the debts of the grandparents. It was proposed that the world needs an international insolvency procedure for nations. The West cannot continue the protectionism of its industries by denying poor countries access to its markets, and dumping its surplus on the struggling economies. If the world continues to exclude and exploit people from models of development, eventually they will choose another system or worse, seek to undermine it. It was noted that the fires of extremism are stoked by poverty and despair.

Despite its promise of benefits for all, globalisation contains no inherent principles of order and justice. It is a facet of the new world disorder, different from the old world disorder of the Cold War. It is a disorder that is the result of disputes over trade and environmental rules, and it is these disputes that have caused the promise of sustainable development to be broken. It was noted in the working sessions addressing the growth of the world economy that, together with the growth of positive globalisation, there will be the inflammation of the negative aspect of globalisation; principally the poverty of the majority of the world's population, which if left unaddressed has the potential to become critical world disorder.

There is also the forecasted scarcity of oil and water reserves, set to decline over the next fifty years to critical levels, and which may result in large-scale military conflict between states. The international community needs to act now to prepare for the

management of these impending crises and create the structures to alleviate their impact on the international system.

The global community has become so interdependent for trade and investment that to solve problems related to climate change, eradicating poverty and fighting terrorism, every state and institution will have to work together to transform global insecurity into global responsibility. Multilateralism can be undermined when states are selective in choosing which policy suits their needs best at any particular given moment. On the other hand, multilateralism does share burdens, promotes trust and provides legitimacy for actions taken, particularly with regard to threats to international peace and security.

The world needs a two-tier solution, which simultaneously has a global and regional approach. This applies as much to the economic sector as to the political. The world needs international organisations managing its global evolution, but it also needs institutions at the regional level, able to accelerate integration and steer the regions toward parity. Integration as a 'top-down' approach, is very difficult to implement and inherently unstable. It was demonstrated by a participant at the World Political Forum that such an approach would be essential in the development of regional economies to synchronise with other regions in advance of a global system. In addition to the regional free trade agreements, the World Trade Organisation is essential in allowing the rules of free trade to operate on a global level.

As model for integration, the European Union was praised as an unprecedented voluntary association of states that have relinquished a portion of their sovereignty in the knowledge that integration through economics and politics fosters peace and security. The European Union, in its long process of economic and political integration is becoming a new sovereignty that has the potential - over time - to expand eastward to the Russian borders and to the south, to find ways of association with the Mediterranean region. The model and experience of the European Union can serve as an example of how to promote economic growth and political freedoms, while managing imbalances of disorder within the zone of sovereignty and influence. Emulating this integration process throughout the economic and political regions of the world would clearly reduce the imbalances that cause regional and world disorder.

WORLD ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT AND DEMOCRATIC CONTROL

There is a new political terrain caused by globalisation that operates without democratic regulation. If trade liberalisation is to continue, then the international community must address the non-trade agenda of globalisation, encompassing political rights. It was suggested by a participant at the World Political Forum, that this could be done by nurturing democratic processes and increasing the relative strength of the non-

trade international agreements on issues such as human rights, poverty, the environment, demographics, and democracy.

The principle of democracy requires that reforms suggested to state governance and state power obtain public approval. It follows, then, that as state power is altered by international trade agreements, states and institutions will have to integrate legitimate civil society in the ongoing reform dynamic brought about by trade liberalisation. This will require more transparency, more accountability and political involvement in what was previously a bureaucratic affair.

The success of the international trade agenda will depend on the ability of countries to address the non-trade agenda that is affected by trade policy decisions. These issues are now becoming part of the agenda, in so far as they impact on the future of the economic development of the world. These are climate change, depletion of commercial resources, stratospheric ozone depletion, the desertification of agricultural lands, and the shrinkage of the economic base of the world economy as natural resources are destroyed at an exponential rate.

The inclusion of legitimate civil society in multilayered processes of involvement in the consideration and implementation of international trade agreements is essential to ensuring the balanced development of the world's economy. There is a democratic gap that could be filled by participation of civil society in the governance processes, through solutions such as parliamentary commissions and executive branch consultations. Securing the participation of civil society at the supranational level will not only confer added legitimacy on the supranational processes, it will find new potential allies, who would be willing to assist in the implementation and funding for the non-trade agenda.

II.

PILOT MODELS, PILOT FAILURES

The World Political Forum sessions held at Alessandria on October 24, 2003, sought to build on the exchange of knowledge and solutions proposed to reduce inter-civilizational tensions. Iraq, the Balkans and Afghanistan were the pilot models that drew the most analysis and debate.

The discussion on pilot models and pilot failures featured a comparison between the contemporary state of order in Iraq and Afghanistan. Hopes and concerns were expressed for both models. Not only is the situation within Iraq and the Middle East of great importance, but it is significantly revelatory of international tensions on the world stage. The divisions in the international system that have arisen out of, or been revealed by, the Iraq issue are deeper than the abstentions on the Security Council.

It was noted in the discussion on Iraq that if the international community were to remain divided on Iraq then this would have terrible consequences for the Iraqis themselves. The twenty-five million citizens of Iraq are suffering; they have suffered under the brutalisation of Saddam Hussein, from decades of authoritarian regimes before that, from wars initiated by Hussein and the neighbouring states, and they are now suffering under the mismanagement of the coalition in Iraq.

Another aspect of the division of the political world order over Iraq is the agenda of remaking the world, or building nations through the use of military force. While the democratisation of the Middle East is an admirable aim of self-initiated development in the long term and indeed a right of the people, it was noted that the means to go about this should not involve the use of illegitimate force, but rather through constructive engagement, capacity building, and peace building. It was further noted that if Iraq was intended to become a base from which to fight terrorism, then the prospects so far are not that positive, as the US presence in Iraq has drawn terrorists hateful of democracy from all over the world, flooding into the country and causing as much havoc as possible in fighting the coalition forces.

It was suggested that a provisional representative and sovereign government should be installed in Iraq, which can then enter into contractual relations with foreign troops, who, through a new UN Security Council resolution, would have been transformed from an occupying force into a multinational peacekeeping force. Secondly, that a constitution and elections need not take priority in the early stages of administration of Iraq, as, in a premature atmosphere, more damage can be done to long-term democracy if implemented too early. It was suggested that a better approach would be to enact such measures after order has been restored and when the country has had a period to normalise for some years.

It was observed that democracy is a long process and that the Middle East is in a stage of political development akin to Europe many centuries ago, and that the difficulties there now should be viewed in light of this historical process. The discussion at the World Political Forum working session on Pilot Models called for the international community to send a new message to the Iraqis: a message that Iraq will no longer be the tool of various agendas, but that the international community will act in a united manner and in the best interests of the Iraqi people.

Afghanistan was brought up as having a significant relevance to the New World Civilisation, in so far as it had been the definition of disorder in the pre-modern world under the misrule of the Taliban. As a pilot model for a world in change, Afghanistan was noted in the discussion as being particularly relevant, since the removal of the Taliban from power and the appointment of the Karzai administration, society has taken steps in the direction of pluralism, tolerance, and democracy. The discussion was concluded on an optimistic note that foreign and UN sanctioned intervention in this case had benefited Afghanistan. This was the view of an Afghan participant, who also stated that Afghanistan is today a society with hope for its future and one that is now offered the prospect of participation in the international community, and that, as an encouraging pilot model, it

needs continued support from the international community to enable it to participate in the New World Civilisation.

The central element to a clash of civilisations seems not only to focus on the epicentres of conflict but on the broader theme of religion. The debate focused on the desire for tolerance between cultures and religions, and the pre-modern tendency to wish for reciprocity. It was noted that the fusion of religion and politics throughout history has only ever served to divide civilisations and increase intolerance.

The World Political Forum rejects the perspective of the inevitability of the clash of civilisations and seeks to bring together cultures and religions to resolve their differences. It was noted that the Muslim world is not monolithic and nor is the Christian world. Both civilisations are multifaceted and have had an intimate common history in the preservation and development of knowledge, language, and science.

A moving appeal from the Islamic world was made at the close of the working session on Global Challenges that, barring the majority of the insane, those moderate and tolerant groups can co-exist peacefully and that war need not be inevitable. The solution lies in the empowerment of local groups, the reduction of poverty and in promoting education. Religions can and do promote tolerance and peaceful coexistence, and there can be a universal *Pacem in Terris*.

Pilot models and pilot failures for human rights were also analysed. It was noted that large international or civilisational conflicts and tensions have their roots in smaller localities. A tension between Islam and the West for instance, is fermented by the local conflicts between the Serbs and the Kosovars, the Taliban and the West, the Israelis and Palestinians and the troubles of the Caucasus region. The ethnicity and religious or cultural identity becomes an increasingly important factor in these conflicts as the conflict is prolonged. In many cases, this leads to the destabilisation of entire regions, the justification of political oppression, radicalisation on all sides and, at times, the expulsion or execution of people and minorities.

The persecution of minority human rights must irreversibly become an increasing focus of attention for the international community. In addition, it is foreseeable that the world will have to find different methods of conflict resolution from the ones that are employed now. The world needs to examine what can be done to avert the transition from a local underlying tension into a humanitarian catastrophe, and seek methods of unarmed intervention before the situation becomes a crisis.

Germany was commended for its commencement of dialogue with China, known to be sensitive about criticism of its human rights record and occupation of Tibet. The dialogue focuses on what functional institutions and structures a state requires to function to develop its society and economy. China's engagement in the dialogue was welcomed by the participants of the World Political Forum. Hopes were expressed for further similar processes around the world, and it was suggested that such efforts could become an important agenda of the United Nations.

THE FOUNDATIONS OF A NEW WORLD ARCHITECTURE

If humanity is to promote democracy and development sustainably, the world must confront the monstrous irresponsibility of military spending. War and preparation for war is one of the greatest obstacles to human progress, fostering a vicious cycle of arms races and poverty. The world's total combined military spending is fourteen times the amount governments spend on foreign aid and development. Five members of the United Nations Security Council are responsible for eighty percent of arms exports throughout the world. Many participants at the World Political Forum expressed great disappointment that these five members have not taken stronger steps to ensure humanitarian controls on these arms transfers. True security is linked to the fight for economic justice; true security is linked to the fight against famine and disease.

Globalisation in its current form is unjust and on an unsustainable course that is already leading to world disorder. This is a world we cannot accept in silence. The participants appealed for a new ethic for the new millennium. The World Political Forum has convened under an ethical imperative, the participants were impelled to meet to steer human society towards a new morality that acknowledges the plight of those who are hungry, sick, or socially marginalized. Globalisation is an objective process; it is part of our world irrespective of opinion on its merits. The question is how states and civil societies can minimise the negative aspects of globalisation. Integration and legislation are the most effective instruments for this aim.

Culture is basic to mankind's development. We need to break down our wall of indifference. We must adapt our institutions to an ethical model fit for a World Civilisation, so that they become tools of development. We have a choice of either working to create a global village, where everyone benefits from the progress of others, or a world with islands of prosperity that will be forever insecure against a sea of destitution.

Poverty and insecurity cannot be eradicated overnight; only by building a new political and economic order in the world can we solve the global problems from the root. This new order requires great effort, a true leadership, and a rejection of some old ways and assumptions. The course of the twenty-first century has yet to be determined; the World Political Forum rejects pessimism and a pre ordained history. The participants of the World Political Forum urge the world to take this opportunity to choose a new path, a path that will lead to a new culture of understanding, economic justice, and sustainable peace.

The spirit of the New World Civilisation would be best suited to managing international affairs if it were to encompass the reform and improvement of the current international order by the democratisation of the varying structures of governance, and encourage their interconnection in an interdependent and co-operative architecture. The involvement of civil society, populations, and industry should be encouraged to reflect the

new actors on the international stage. A framework for multilateral and multifaceted co-operation mechanisms between all the centres of power is essential to international affairs.

The nature of tomorrow's challenges are beyond the power of human reason to forecast; only the means with which the world addresses and overcomes these challenges lies within our grasp. The participants at the World Political Forum entreat the world to rededicate itself to peaceful means in international affairs; Goethe once said that 'freedom must be reinvented in every generation' The international community as a whole must reinvent freedom in this new age. It must be a freedom of relations and a freedom from fear between states at the supranational level in the multilateral effort of managing the world's political and economic affairs.

We need a reference point, a keystone for a new civilisation that can serve as a minimum acceptable ethic of world order. Pragmatism as a doctrine in trade and politics affects the human condition, so therefore must be anchored to a universally endorsed foundation. It is important to lay this cornerstone to build the new world, as its composition now will affect the course of its evolution and the destiny of mankind. This foundation stone is the universal right to human dignity itself.

The New World Civilisation seeks, in the knowledge of this foresight, to avert these impending crises by bridging the divide between civilisations and cultures, and promoting co-existence with all civilisations by assisting in resolving the causes for inter-civilizational tensions. The New World Civilisation will be characterised by a changing world. It will be a world of new political actors on the international scene, a world of incredible technological advances that offer the prospect for new paths of development and societal change.

The dawn of the twenty-first century has been characterised by the last century's development of technology and communication which has broken down barriers in time and space. The development of the globalised world has overtaken the development of politics and the obligation to protect humanity in the process. The World Political Forum heralds a new age and seeks to lay the foundations for the realignment of development and technology to restore politics to oversight, so that the protection of people can once more become the central dynamo of progress.

In its proclamation of the dawn of a new age and the establishment of a path to a culture of peace, the World Political Forum seeks to avert a clash of civilisations, traverses the lost horizons of the future and heralds the genesis of an enlightened New World Civilisation as the shape of things to come.

The challenges of globalisation require open dialogue and democratic participation of all the varieties of humanity in the world today. The human family must address above all the great inequalities that exist in the current order to establish its common home.

The World Political Forum calls upon the leaders of the world to establish a new system of institutional politics, fit for a new world culture in its progress toward the New World Civilisation. Victor Hugo once wrote, 'the future has many names; for the weak, it is unreachable; for the timid, it is unknowable; for the brave, it is an opportunity.'

Verso una nuova civiltà.

The World Political Forum
General Assembly, 2003
(Turin, October 23-24)

The World of the XXI Century:
New Unity or New Fractures?

SPEECHES

Speeches transcribed and edited for the client by

Civitatis International

https://www.civitatisinternational.com

INDICE

The World of the XXI Century:New Unity or New Fractures?

Redefining Peace

One World, Plural Civilizations

The World of Global Challenges

Pilot Models, Pilot Failures?

Redefinig Peace

Rolando Picchioni, *Executive Director of The World Political Forum*
Welcome greetings

Mr President Mikhail Gorbachev, Mr President Oscar Luigi Scalfaro, authorities, ladies and gentlemen, less than five months after the inaugural session in May, above all an event of symbolic and media value, eminent statesmen, authoritative representatives of politics, culture and religions of twenty four different countries are meeting today, again in Turin and Alessandria, to share their thoughts on the current international situation, on the global challenges that the young world of the XXI century has to face, on the role of the United Nations in the new world disorder, on the increasingly complex relations between culture and society, culture and politics, between culture and the different processes of globalisation.

In these brief introductory notes, I don't want to go back over the goals of the World Political Forum, founded as you all know on the deep insight of President Gorbachev, on his great civil ardour in seeking out a new road for a culture of peace. The general theme of this session is "New unity or new fractures?" starting from a new definition of peace, of how exemplary, of how high the ideals of Gorbachev's project are and how the open discussion by everyone raises its profile and dignity.

The World Political Forum has worked hard since May till today with my staff. The Scientific Committee did its work, excellently led by Professor Andrei Grachev, meeting in a number of sessions to prepare the agenda and to make this first seminar possible.

But the day after tomorrow, our agenda will engage us not only for the difficult medium-term plan of work that awaits us, but also for how to develop it. This must have the support of basic facilities in Turin and Alessandria, without depriving the Forum of its characteristic of "informal meeting point for the world's political élite", as our friend Andrei Grachev has defined it, for which we hope that the interest of civil society will grow in its many, and not only institutional, relations.

Today there are so many changes in world order that political reflection is often without the right tools, but even without the spaces for reformulating, debating and exchanging points of view. In addition, after the fall of the Berlin Wall, a new phenomenon is growing: cultural issues, pose questions for politics and at times tend to weaken political change and evolution. Religions, codes of identity, and language often act as destabilising factors for questions concerning governance on the world and local scales.

To conclude my brief comments, I must thank all the institutions and local authorities, first and foremost Piedmont Region, the City of Turin, the Province of Turin, with which we will sign a Declaration of Intent tomorrow for the restructuring of Santa Croce; President Ghigo, President Palenzona, the bank foundations, and the Cultural Heritage bodies that have taken on the responsibility of refurbishing the extraordinary Renaissance complex of Bosco Marengo, the future home of the World Political Forum.

The decision on its use strengthens our hopes: in fact, it overturns into a logical sequence what unfortunately, as often happens in our country, is the dynamic of a reverse process, the restructuring of historic buildings whatever their improbable and uncertain final use.

I mentioned the Foundation of Turin Saving Bank, and would like to thank its President Mr. Comba. I would also like to thank the President of Unicredit Private Bank Mr. Cavalchini and the President of the Foundation of Alessandria Saving Bank, Mr. Pittatore: without their strong and generous contribution we would not have been able to hold this session.

We trust that others will join us and thus continue and ensure that Gorbachev's idea can effectively develop all of its great potential.

Mikhail Gorbachev, *President of the World Political Forum*
Opening Speech

I am glad to greet all participants here in Turin. We will use a concept that has come from America, where a group of people were called the "Founders of America". So today, as I can see, at this meeting besides the founders of the Forum, there are new faces, as well. Our project gets broader and richer thanks to new political representatives, experts and representatives of international civil society. I am sure that what brought them here is a feeling reflecting their position sharing our concern about the present situation of global politics. And I have to say that this concern brought us to the start of this unique project last May.

I see in this action the confirmation that there is another kind of globalization, not only a negative one which consequences are condemned by many people, but also another one that we have to applaud and support. I mean globalization in the sense of responsibility for the destiny of our common world. It is very important to emphasize this right from the beginning.

And so we have thought of this Forum as an instrument of help for politicians and politics in general, complementing their role of leadership that nobody can fill in their place. We are well aware of what our position is. We have never had and we will never have any political ambitions. No! We will reflect, discuss and make proposals and as there is a great concentration of experience here, I think that proposals of interest to politicians can emerge. We have decided to start our work with a discussion on general matters as though we were returning, once again, to some important starting point. By the way, some hours ago I was on a plane and it was very difficult to make out Turin and the airport through the thick layers of fog that almost reached the ground. I thought how much this was like the world situation today, a very confusing situation, even dangerous. But thanks to the modern equipment of the plane we were able to land without any problem. Today too we have a number of modern instruments, great intellectual powers, through which, along with our efforts, we can show the political world the way to the airport for landing, where we expect to meet our goals. But this is a metaphor, a digression.

I think that through today's and tomorrow's debate we have to try to make clear why the possibilities that arose after the cold war to change the world in a better one, have not been exploited. If we do not answer this question, it will be difficult to go on with our project. In my opinion it is important to remember what the starting point of our thoughts and hopes for a better world were, that is to say, coming out of the Cold War we wanted to move towards a safer and better world. As a matter of fact, at that time, we began reducing nuclear weapons and we decided to put an end to chemical and bacteriological weapons. It seemed that we would never reach this goal, but this process began at that time with the Agreements of Vienna on the reduction of military fronts and armaments in Europe signed in Paris in November 1990 at the highest levels, the Paris Charter for Europe, the project for creating a new security structure for Europe.

The Soviet Union was developing its relationships with China. Thirty years of hostility came to an end with the complete understanding that we had to reject all what had happened

in the past and to go further as comrade Den Xiao Ping (I call him comrade because at that time we called each other comrade) said during a talk with me. He said: "Let us turn the page; the wind has already swept away all this dust". He even added: "Maybe it is not necessary for you to take the floor – he had already spoken – There is no need because everything is clear". "No!" I replied, "I have to speak, as well". As a matter of fact the solution to the problem of relationships between the Soviet Union and China had great importance on the international scene. The Soviet Union began diplomatic relations with South Korea and Israel. Also in this case these were problems tackled in every debate. Immediately after the starting of the Madrid Conference for the Solution to the Conflict in the Middle East, the policy for sustainable development was boosted in Rio de Janeiro. And then unexpected democratization processes involving over eighty countries began, according to data from the United Nations; dictatorships, authoritarian and totalitarian regimes were removed from the political scene highlighting their inefficiency. On the agenda we had the question of the creation of a new world order. Even this does not indicate everything that happened, but it points out clearly the premises developing at that time which enabled us to think about our future and to work out plans, serious political, economic and social plans.

So we developed visions that were suitable for that time and we showed our political will. Here, in my opinion, is the answer to the question about how we managed to overcome the difficult situation of a political contrast that, through possible conflict, was pushing us to the abyss and maybe to a Third World War. We overcame this situation because at that time we found a convergence. There was a vision of things and facts and there was political will in all the fiery debates. Most of the participants of these debates are here today and the majority of them were direct protagonists.

However, at that time we were able to avoid that situation and to begin an important process. But later this thrust lost most of its impetus. I think this happened because of the collapse of the Soviet Union, a country that in the middle of the Eighties was on the way to deep reforms, and that was able to take important initiatives for the country itself and for the whole world.

The collapse of the Soviet Union had an important influence on international relations. The political class changed. This substitution probably did not take place in the best of ways: it was not akin to a relay racer grabbing the baton to take it further. On the contrary, a review of what had happened began. I would even say that after the disappearance of the Soviet Union there were new attempts to play at geopolitics. This was the beginning of the fight for markets and for spheres of influence. It was in this way that the political will that had brought about the premises for the end of the Cold War and had created the premises towards progress, seemed to loose its vitality and to be questioned.

I think it is important to stress this because what was the result? The international situation, with all its changes, is complex and brings many worries. In many aspects our hopes did not realize. As a matter of fact, if we have to define – let us say – the process starting at the beginning of the Nineties, we must say it was characterized by many contradictions and negative aspects. After the wave of democratic transformations that took place everywhere in

the world during the Eighties and the Nineties, there was a contrary movement. In many countries people had to face new difficulties due to the spontaneous influence of globalization and because of the wishes, attempts and plans to provide resources for the fight against poverty, backwardness and ecological problems. All this did not take place! Rio – the road leading towards a sustainable world – and all its policies, were interrupted. People began to worry and in many countries they did not realize that with the end of the Cold War they had been promised a better world. Due to this situation the political leaders who wedded the results of economic growth and social progress with an authoritarian government got more and more support. This is a fact. Similar processes took place in the post-Soviet regions, as well. With the end of the Cold War these processes started there too. But today it is an area where many regimes may only be defined as authoritarian or on the way to a new authoritarianism. This is a very serious problem.

We had to face new conflicts, although many of the previous ones had been solved. These conflicts exist first of all in Europe, Africa and in other countries; up to now we have not been able to find a solution to the situation in the Middle East. Throughout the world there has been a deep financial disorder from which we have not yet recovered. We tried again to act through the International Monetary Fund according to the old spirit of imposing models in new countries without considering their history, their phase of development and mentality. It seems that only with hindsight are we able to understand that this was a real mistake. The hope to harmonize our efforts against poverty has not met with success either, because globalization, due to its spontaneous influence and its ungovernability, has widened the gap between rich and poor countries.

Finally, the conflict between man and nature has reached global dimensions. Furthermore, the ecological situation is so bad that on this matter we should show our political leadership, whereas, on the contrary, it is completely lacking. This leadership is missing where it is necessary! We prepared the Johannesburg summit facing many difficulties – we and in general all those who participated in its preparation. This summit was uncertain because there was nothing to propose. And the conclusions after Johannesburg were just that Johannesburg was not Rio plus ten, but rather Rio plus zero. In the developed countries there have been rumours that we should substitute sustainable development with open market. All this has been reviewed. This is the effect of the change of political elite and of reference points. Therefore, I think we have to consider this.

I refer to this in detail because as we celebrated the Millennium in the year 2000, we reached very important positions and declarations in the UN that had been signed together by the Heads of State. But what we have seen after that date in the years 2001, 2002 and 2003 confirms once again that there are declarations, but there is no political will to implement them.

We have come back many times to the topic of the reform of the international institutions, the UN, the Security Council and the international organizations. Many of them still act according to the old rules. I think that the point is not to reject them but rather to use them after their possible reform or to create new institutions. In other cases it is necessary that

organizations, such as WTO, do not work according to the rules of the Cold War, but consider the changes of the world and the fact that we are living in a global, interconnected world. Therefore it seems that it is here that we should look for the answer to the question as to why things are going as they are. It is a serious and difficult task that worries and frightens us. Here in this analysis of the situation we have to seek answers which we can propose to the political world and public opinion.

I hope that our debate will be fruitful, considering the participants or, I would say, something more than a group of participants, because the expert is often an expert in the scientific sense, while here we have politicians, people of experience, persons that have acquired this experience and can therefore speak about what politics needs nowadays.

New World Disorder

Luigi Guidobono Cavalchini, *President of Unicredit Private Banking, former Ambassador of Italy*
<u>Chairman</u>

Mikhail Gorbachev was the first world leader to come out publicly with talk of a new world order in his address to the General Assembly of the United Nations in 1988. He made this very important, and I should say even prophetic statement: "further global progress is now possible only through a quest for universal consensus in the movement toward a new world order."

I think that it is very important to stress the causes and the basic components of the present world disorder. I think that today the old world is not completely behind us and the new one is still waiting to be invented. The old order found its place in the rationale system of sovereign States that emerged in Europe after the treaties of Westphalia, and the question, therefore that immediately arises is: what are the characteristics of this present situation?

Lord Skidelsky, *Member of the House of Lords*

This session is called '*the new world disorder*.' This makes a change from the early 1990's when everyone talked about '*the new world order*.' At that time it was widely thought that one order would be succeeded by another – a better one. I agree completely with President Gorbachev, we need to understand how we got from there to here and particularly why we got from that position to the one we are in now.

During the Cold War there was a bi-polar world. The Cold War was misnamed: it should have been called the Cold Peace because peace was in fact preserved for 50 years by a bipolar balance of power. It may have been peace without justice, but a Third World War was avoided. But then in 1991 one of the poles collapsed.

The first reaction arrived by academics, among whom a very important one was Francis Fukuyama, who proclaimed the end of history, by which he meant 'the triumph of the West, of the Western idea" in the form of markets and democracy. Fukuyama meant the American idea. But he managed to divorce it from American power, and that was the main attraction of his thesis. His article promised peace and prosperity without empire; a kind of velvet revolution for the world.

Precisely in the early nineties, somewhat in parallel, grew up the idea that globalization, economic interdependence plus internet was making the world a single and necessarily a peaceful community. All countries tried to jump onto the globalization bandwagon. Economics too promised a wonderful future, without power.

Those who saw a single world emerging naturally turned their attention to global rules and global institution building. The UN would start to function at last as a kind of world government upholding an agreed system of international law. The new World Trade Organisation would join the IMF and World Bank in building rules for a global economy and the Rio process would start tackling the problem of global environmental degradation. None of these institutions had any power, but that wasn't supposed to matter. Soft power not hard power would do the job, hard power was to be residual in an inherently orderly world rather like police work, such was the new world order envisaged by many scholars and hoped for by many politicians.

Today these rosy visions have receded. Fukuyama, in his original article, acknowledged that history would continue on the fringes of post-history. There would be a big area of post-history but a little area of history going on. On 11th September 2001 history struck back with a vengeance. In fact, history had never vanished. The collapse of one pole of the Cold War world had left the other pole standing. The United States with its world wide military and economic tentacles was unmistakably part of history. That's why it got attacked.

The hope that a new world order would emerge based on the UN charter and other institutions has also faded. The 1993 Gulf War could just about be called a UN war, but in 1999 the United States attacked Kosovo and this year Iraq, without reference to the United

Nations. Not only is the UN not at the centre of the world order maintenance, but there are too many police actions going on for comfort.

The boom in globalization also collapsed in Seattle in 1999. What is emerging is not a new world economic order but continuous bitter disputes about what the rules of such an order should be. Meanwhile, it is pretty much free for all. Globalization has undoubtedly benefited many countries, particularly China, India and East Asia. Elsewhere it has left a wealthy but insecure West sitting on top of a large heap of failed and failing states.

US power is overwhelming but there is no general agreement on how, when and according to what rules it should be used. Globalization, despite its promise of benefits for all, contains no inherent principles of order or justice. The promise of sustainable development has been lost in bickering over trade and environmental rules. That is why we talk of a new world disorder.

I emphasize the word 'new' in this idea of world disorder, because world disorder today is not anything like as threatening as the disorder which led to two World Wars. In short we shouldn't be too gloomy. We don't have an unstable global balance of power. Today there are no "rogue" great powers such as Germany and Japan were earlier in the last century. Today's actual and potential rogue states are insignificant in terms of their potential impact on international relations. That much was decided in 1945, and it hasn't been reversed.

Why then the pervasive sense of disorder? Because I think there is a gap between our historical perceptions between how peace and order are maintained and the reality of today's global situation. Historically, the two order maintaining mechanisms were empire and the balance of power. In practice, the Cold War combined elements of both. Universal empire has never been achieved although often dreamt of. The post-1945 world was extremely hierarchical but it wasn't a bipolar world. There wasn't just one pole. Careful management of the United States and the Soviet Union of their nuclear competition prevented the recurrence of devastating conflict while allowing a considerable degree of economic integration to proceed between the two blocs.

But there's an obvious contradiction that has become more and more apparent between the concept of an international order maintained by hierarchical arrangements and the emergence by the early 1990's of a world system of nearly 200 independent sates, each claiming the privilege of state sovereignty and non-interference in domestic affairs.

In such a world the claim of a few powers, even in the end actually one power, to a monopoly of global means of coercion is ipso facto a curtailment of everyone else's sovereignty, it is a claim to a universal empire and to a Westphalian world which the process of decolonization has produced.

Why the US (and Western) demand for non-proliferation of WMD reached such a crescendo of urgency at the start of the new millennium is a big subject which I cannot explore in the time available. It is not directly connected with the terrorist attack on the World Trade Centre and Pentagon, which was carried out by conventional terrorist means, raised to a new height of efficiency and callousness. But it is connected to terrorism through the rise of Islamic fundamentalism.

At the heart of it, I think, is the breakdown of the classical theory of deterrence, which underpinned the bipolar peace. Deterrence theory is based on stable state structures – states which exercise a monopoly of coercion means within their borders. If state structures disintegrate, so does deterrence. One cannot deter people with no fixed address. Deterrence has been replaced by the doctrine of pre-emptive intervention – to stop the development within states of WMD which may be distributed to non-state groups. The United States has been explicit in claiming this right. But as Kofi Annan pointed out last month: 'America cannot arrogate itself the right of unilateral action which it denies others'. At the same time, he recognised that the threat of proliferation had to be dealt with.

What new conceptual map best fits the world we inhabit? One that has been gaining support among students of international relations is the tripartite division of the world into post-modern, modern and pre-modern.

The post-modern one is a world in which the states that it includes have decided they will never fight each other again. This decision enables interdependence to be carried much further than if security remained a big issue. The chief example of the post-modern development is the European Union. "The EU", writes Robert Cooper, "is a highly developed system for mutual interference in each others affairs right down to beer and sausages". But there are elements of post-modernity also in institutions like the WTO and the IMF, and rather stronger elements of post-modernity in institutions like NATO. One might even talk about a universal striving for post-modernity.

The pre-modern world is also fairly easy to characterize: it encompasses the world of failing states. Pre-modernity represents a regress from membership of European empires to nation-states, tribalism and criminality. This part of the world is a "zone of chaos". Most of sub-Saharan Africa is relapsing into pre-modernity.

And then there is the modern world of the classic state system. "States retain a monopoly of force in this world and may be prepared to use it against it", says Cooper. State sovereignty is the ruling doctrine.

In this kind of typology USA is firmly tethered to the modern not the post-modern world because it's too powerful and therefore too vulnerable not to be in it. It's not willing to sacrifice any of its sovereignty. Russia, China, and India are the main actors in the modern world.

I'm not wholly persuaded by this classification, though it does mark an improvement on the traditional conceptualisation and I think it's worth exploring. It begins to suggest that a new principal, or order, may be emerging out of the present chaos, because to conceptualize is the beginning of the process of trying to order, and without a conceptualization of what the world is today we will never solve a problem of how to create a new order out of the present disorder.

It suggests that Fukuyama's 'end of history' was not entirely an illusion. The post-modern world is Fukuyama's post-historical one. But its domain is much more limited than Fukuyama supposed. That is why it needs an external guarantor from the modern world like the United States. This point was graphically made by Robert Kagan in his *Paradise and*

Power. The United States is in fact the pivot of all three worlds: as guarantor of the post-modern, balancer of the modern, and nation-builder of the pre-modern – though it can share this latter role with other post-modern and modern states.

Does this help us better to see the world as it is and the shape of things to come? I see it as an interesting road map, no more. Those who wish to pursue it, will need to full up the many blank spaces for themselves.

Oscar Arias Sanchez, *former President of Costa Rica, Nobel Peace Laureate*

What kind of world are we living in today? If this is a world of disorder, also because it is a world of injustice, in which each of the 500 richest individuals hold more than one billion dollars in assets while more than 1.2 billion people survive on less than one dollar a day. It is a world of war and conflict in which total military spending equals 14 times the amount our governments spend on foreign aid for development. It is a world of unthinking consumption and destruction in which 12 percent of known species are threatened with extinction and world-wide reserves of oil and natural gas could run out in the next 50 years. It is a world of prejudice, of fear and intolerance where many children are taught to hate their peers of another race or ethnicity. It is a world that we cannot accept in silence.

In human history our societies have always known poverty and suffering, but what makes today's poverty so sinister is that this poverty exists alongside such tremendous wealth. When poverty and inequality remain at such terrible levels armed conflict will be inevitable. Terrorism, the defining malady of our time, thrives in a global system which exacerbates extreme poverty. That disparity of income between and within societies, spread of infectious diseases, climate change and environmental degradation: it is now chillingly clear that a world where millions endure extreme misery will never be fully secure, even for its most privileged inhabitants. There are no easy answers to the challenges the international community currently faces, but it is clear that global citizens must demand a new ethic for the new millennium.

I believe we all have a mission for the world that motivates us to act in our different capacities to achieve peace. In a hundred years I would like my great-grandchildren to see a world in which each government is democratically elected, is able to fulfil its people's basic needs, remains at peace both with its neighbours and internal opposition, and uses the tools of economics and science to the benefit of all its people. This is my idea of ethical government, humble yet painfully out of reach.

I want to stress three crucial areas that must be addressed if we are to make this vision a reality: we must strengthen democracy throughout the world; we must battle corruption at all levels of government; we must alter the worldwide focus on military spending.

Today as a Costa Rican, I am deeply troubled by the state of democracy in the developing world. A sense of desperate frustration emanates from its rural towns and the popular neighbourhoods of its vast cities. Frustration with its inadequate schools, its goals, between what the working poor earn and how much they need to live, obscure laws that prevent them from owning their own houses and legally starting small businesses. So called democratic societies, it seems, are structured to exclude them. How much poverty can democracy endure? The question, my dear friends, is not rhetorical – the heavy enthusiasm which swept democratic regimes into power in the eighties has receded, pushed back by popular apathy and violence. The breathtaking resurgence of social unrest in various global hotspots suggests that if a democratic government cannot provide its people with the most

basis necessities, it will be held in no greater esteem than the totalitarian regimes it has replaced.

Currently one of the greatest dangers to democracy in the world is corruption. Transparency and accountability continue to elude us, as does honesty in public discourse. It is very easy to craft speeches around opinion polls and to offer up rosy visions of general prosperity about the hard facts surrounding the cost of social justice. In the end, no one is fooled and the result is more cynicism and less participation. Governments' leaders must embrace the difficult task of leadership: telling people what they need to know and not what they want to hear. Truly to govern is to educate, not to please, not to convince and not to conquer.

Finally, if we are to promote democracy and development we must confront the monstrous irresponsibility of military spending. War and the preparation for war is one of the greatest obstacles to human progress, fostering a vicious cycle of arms races violence and poverty. It is a great disappointment to me that the five permanent members of the UN Security Council who are responsible for over 80% of arms exports throughout the world have not taken any stronger steps to ensure humanitarian controls on these transfers.

In pursuing true solutions to contemporary defense concerns, and in creating policies that will allow us to focus on human development, we urgently need to work together as an international community to limit the availability and spread of deadly weaponry. For this reason, I have called together my fellow Nobel Peace Laureates to advocate an international code of conduct on arms transfers, now known as the Arms Trade Treaty. The Treaty calls for a ban on weapons transfers to governments that repress fundamental democratic and human rights, or that commit acts of armed international aggression. I am happy to say that this month, we are marking the launch of an international campaign to ratify this treaty into a binding piece of international law.

We must steer human society towards a new morality that acknowledges the plight of those who are hungry, sick or socially marginalized. The course of the XXI century has yet to be determined, and as Victor Hugo once wrote, the future has many names: "for the weak, it is the unreachable; for the timid, it is the unknowable; for the brave, it is an opportunity." For all of the turmoil we see in today's world, we must remember that there is always the possibility of a better future. It will require conviction, courage and perseverance to arrive there. But we have an opportunity: let's make use of it.

Riccardo Petrella, *Professor at the University of Lovanio*

I believe the fact that the right to life is denied to 2.7 billion human beings is the primary cause of world disorder.

Among the main causes that threaten the right to life and that therefore give rise to disorder, there is access to the water supply. We often speak of water crisis, water struggle. We all know that in the next thirty years China, India and the United States will face severe problems with their agricultural production, that will cause a food crisis, due to the dangerous and rapid lowering of the water tables which are being excessively exploited.

In thirty years, two billion people will be living in slums, without sanitation and in totally unhealthy conditions.

In the heavily industrialized countries of the world, pollution of both surface and underground waters is increasing rapidly and our politicians do not seem inclined to change the present agricultural, industrial and energy production systems. This will contribute to the worsening of water pollution and to set off the fight for access to water, both for human consumption and for agriculture and energy production.

Canada, Russia and Brazil might be tempted to sell their water and become the "oil magnates" of the XXI century.

Water is becoming one of the main sources of conflicts and wars, so that we can speak of water in the same terms as crude oil. Water is now considered and marketed just like oil, thus becoming the target of geomilitary and geopolitical strategies. Just as oil has set off a number of wars, the last one in Iraq, so water will turn into the main cause for wars in the XXI century.

Is the World Political Forum ready to take up this question or will it do as many other forum have done, that is discuss the question at a merely rhetorical level? In this case, we will continue to talk about peace, friendship and justice but it will be just mere words. Words have changed the world, but sometimes words are not enough. So I would propose something: I believe that, with the idea of the right to life as a point of departure, our Forum could become an instrument to create new alliances aiming at ensuring life throughout the world. The World Political Forum could become the point of reference not only of new civilizations but of the spirit of life itself that in twenty years should animate the existence of eight billion human beings.

The World Political Forum should become a sort of champion of the right to life, a global advocacy, and we must be its promoters. So, my proposal is this: starting with the right to water supply, let us turn the right to life into the instrument through which proposals can be put forward to build a new political, social and economic world system and into the main function of the new world political architecture as proposed by President Gorbachev.

Hall Gardner*, Chair of theDepartment of International Affairs, American University of Paris*

It is possible that had the United States heeded the warnings and counsel of Mikhail Gorbachev (in regard to American support for the Afghan *mujahadin*, who once upon a time were depicted as "freedom fighters"), the horrors of the September 11 attacks might never have taken place. Had the US shaken hands with Mikhail Gorbachev in the late 1980s over Afghanistan, it is dubious that the heinous, pseudo-Islamic, Taliban would have come to power.

The specter of terrorist actions, that are still present, would probably not have reached quite the same magnitude. Had the US shaken hands with Gorbachev, the threats posed by proliferation of Weapons of Mass Destruction, would probably be not so acute as they are today. There is, evidently, no way to know for certain what could have happened had a different path been taken. And there should be absolutely no nostalgia for that grotesque, ideologically charged era dubbed the "Cold War" with its superpower cravings. At the same time, there *should be* a clear-headed and realistic recognition and assessment that the collapse of the old bipolar world order has led to the emergence of a new global *disequilibrium* – in which the US has *seized* the predominant role.

The question of Afghanistan in the late 1980s was evidently not the first, nor the last time, that the US would fail to heed friendly advice. In just the past year, Washington has refused to heed the friendly counsel and warnings its own allies, France and Germany, in regard to the potentially destabilizing consequences of military intervention in Iraq. Relations between the US and Europe have subsequently become more fractious as US has tended to play the UK, Spain, Italy, and states such as Poland, against France and Germany, a policy that could divide Europe with the risk of alienation of Russia as well. At the same time, much as the two Cassandras of the "old Europe" forewarned, the US is now suffering from the consequences of its preclusive, military intervention. The US and its coalition partners now appear bogged down in both the Iraqi and Afghan quagmires and sinking further into quicksand.

The provocative nature of US foreign policy rhetoric and discourse has itself contributed to the new world disorder. The catch phrase, for example, "war on terrorism" represents the perfect formula for perpetual conflict. The concept provides no direction; it provides no way out, no exit. There will be absolutely no end to this conflict as long as key actor and states continue to counter-accuse each other of engaging in acts of "terrorism" and "state terrorism". The term "terrorism" itself has more than a 100 definitions. It seems we cannot even define what we are fighting against. The American tendency to *demonize* the leaderships of various countries – a position that violates the elementary principles of classical realism (taught at the sophomore level) – boxes the US into a corner that makes conflicts almost inevitable.

It is nearly impossible to engage in *real diplomacy* and reach compromises, or gain some concessions, once a particular country's leadership has been labeled the "devil

incarnate". The *demonization* of Saddam Hussein, for example, made alternatives to war (such as the more muscular weapons inspections proposed by France and Germany) almost impossible. "Regime change" became the only available option…. Even more profoundly, the *demonization* of the Iraqi leadership (and not just those individuals accused of war crimes) through the "de-Ba'athification" of Iraqi society has made the prospects for peace and reconstruction even more remote.

The inconsistent pattern of US diplomacy tends to repeat itself under both Democrats and Republicans: deadlock or war is the result. The US has, in the past, engaged in multilateral diplomacy, but then dumped multilateral efforts, openly opting for war, in the case of Kosovo, when other options may have been feasible if the situation had been given prompt and concerted attention. The US did, of course, obtain multilateral UNSC support for the war against the Taliban and Al-Qaida in Afghanistan, but then quickly forgot that it was the French who led charge in support of military intervention with their support for UNSC Resolution 1368. In each of these interventions, Washington opted for war, but without considering the long-term consequences and, one might add, the much needed financing for post-war reconstruction and state and society building and the need to fully include these elements. Moreover, prior to almost all of its post-Cold War military interventions, the US appeared to promise a "Marshall Plan," yet international funding has thus far only trickled in.

One is reminded of George Kennan's statements in 1951, in his book "American diplomacy", in which he compared the US with a "prehistoric monster". Kennan essentially argued that the US could have at least "taken a little more interest in what was going on at earlier date" and "prevented some of these situations from arising instead of proceeding from an undiscriminating indifference to a holy wrath equally undiscriminating".

The roots of the new global disequilibrium do not, of course, rest in the US intervention in Iraq alone. They also reside in the inability to establish new modes of global governance and security. US reluctance to reach out to both an expanding EU and a retrenching Russia, and to implement new systems of security in Europe, is most fundamentally at the root of this crisis. One simply cannot expect to achieve peace and security in much of the developing world if one cannot absolutely guarantee peace within Europe itself. History has revealed that unfortunate and horrendous fact far too often.

The American belief that NATO enlargement represents a panacea for European security is disquieting. NATO – even as a quasi-reformed organization – simply cannot guarantee the security for *all* of Europe, that is, without fully and openly engaging in political-military coordination with each of the key states in the region in such a way as to permit both power *and* burden sharing.

The fact that the US appears to be stretching itself out to confront crisis after crisis in Central Asia, the Persian Gulf etc., raises fears that the US might not necessarily come to the defense of Europe if needed, or that it might drag Europe into unwanted conflicts.

It is consequently in the interest of the Europeans (and I might add the UK as well) to construct new systems of security in Europe, while it is concurrently in the *enlightened* American interest to help foster the development of those new European systems of security.

Finally, let me conclude with some words about how to establish new systems of global governance and European security and to suggest a way to hopefully transcend the new global disequilibrium.

First, it is absolutely crucial for American foreign policy to move away from the rhetoric of "rogue states" and "war on terrorism" and toward a *multilateral strategy* of "engaged reconciliation" between conflicting parties. For the most part, without concerted motivated efforts to bring conflicting sides together, there will be absolutely no end to the "war on terrorism" as long as key groups and states continue to accuse each other of engaging in acts of "terrorism" and "state terrorism."

Second, a new system of Euro-Atlantic security can be achieved through the formation of "security communities" that involve greater regional interstate political-military and economic cooperation. The deployment of multinational "war-prevention" or peace-keeping forces throughout central and eastern Europe, where deemed necessary, could help reinforce stability and assist regional development. These measures need to be combined with *overlapping* NATO, EU and Russian security guarantees to the states concerned.

To re-define the adage attributed to the first NATO Secretary General, Lord Ismay, the implementation of a new system of European security would, in effect, necessitate the building of the European Union "up," the drawing of the US "down" (but *not* "out") – at that same time that Russia is brought "in" – while, it should be added, keeping the Ukraine "happy" (i.e. "neutral" through overlapping security guarantees).

In regard to the disputes raging in the Middle East, Persian Gulf, Africa, and Asia, the formation of multilateral "contact groups" much like that formed to deal with ex-Yugoslavia, or like the Quartet grouping of the EU, US, Russia and the UN should be considered, but made much more effective. Such contact groups need to engage in "behind the scenes" diplomacy, but they must be prepared for multinational peacekeeping, in a number of *post-conflict* situations, backed by a multinational Rapid Deployment forces, based on UN mandates.

As recent experience proved, peacekeeping *by itself* does not necessarily keep the peace. Peacekeeping must be preceded by viable political accords. Finding ways that truly engage popular political participation without permitting destabilizing demagoguery will be a major challenge. The "liberal-democratic" model so trumpeted by post-1989 "end of history" theosophy may not necessarily prove to be the best model.

On the question of "rogue states" it is important to emphasize that the issues of massive human rights abuses, support for "terrorism," as well as proliferation of WMD can only be dealt with effectively by engaging in a *real dialogue*. The concept of joint US, Chinese, Russian, Japanese and South Korean guarantees for North Korea, in exchange for a pledge not to develop nuclear weapons, seems to be moving in the right direction, so far.

My last point is, rather than denigrating the UN, as the US has tended to do, it is crucial that every effort be made to *re-legitimize* the UN, by making the UN Security Council more representative of the post-Cold War political, military and economic relations.

Finally, and most fundamentally, the formation of a new system of global governance and security must be supported by an *open* and *pragmatic* approach intended to look for diplomatic and economic means to *prevent* disputes and crises before they break out. Such an approach must also work toward the reconciliation and reconstruction of war-torn societies upon the basis of greater fairness and justice, and to assist their basic development goals.

Gianni De Michelis, *former Italian Minister of Foreign Affairs*

When between '89, '91, '92, the old order stemmed out from the Second World War ascended, it was clear to everybody that only trying to build a new world order, it would have been possible to avoid an increasing world disorder and so it was. Obviously it was very difficult to foresee how to build a new world order. And in this decade of the 90's we have had different and general and theoretical considerations about the framework in which it would have been necessary to try to build this new world order. I only want to remember two of them which more or less are the two sides of the possibilities spectrum ahead of us. On one side, Fukuyama's work about the end of history, more or less the idea that with the end of the Cold War a sort of stable situation was there based on liberal democracy and market economy. So it would have been very easy to organize this new world order. On the other side, Huntington's book on the thesis of the clash of civilisations which instead was saying that the end of the old equilibrium based on the opposition of the two political blocks would have brought a much more disordered phase, based on the conflict of the most important ideologies which exist in the history of mankind, which are religions. And the clash of civilisations is based especially on religious identities.

I do not think that these simplifications are very useful to bring us in the right direction, which obviously in reality has to be a pragmatic approach to what we could call not the establishing of the new order, but the reduction of the reasons of disorder. From this point of view the most important aspect to consider, in my opinion, is that disorder is coming out from different origins. One obvious reason is the end of a political order. We had always had in history, in the face of stability, the situation of political order – different in shape but similar in nature. But on the other side the main reason of disorder is coming out from the social, the economic, the ecological situation of our world. And these imbalances, which are the reasons why we are in disorder, are in our historical phase, bigger than ever. Never had we had such demographic, economic, social, such ecological imbalances and so the problem to try to put together a new political order and the reduction of imbalances, is much more difficult than it was in the past. Probably the old solutions – from roman times to the Peace of Westphalia, to the congress of Vienna, until the Society of Nations, United Nations – are no longer sufficient. It was more or less possible to envisage institutional solutions to this problem. Now it's much more difficult because we have not only to reach a political compromise, that is a sort of order between political institutions, but we also have to give real solutions to problems of this society and world, solutions really able at least to reduce these imbalances if not to solve them completely, and this is much more difficult and is the big challenge which is in front of us today. After ten years of disengagement with respect to these problems, now we are obliged to face it, simply because with September 11 Al-Qaeda demonstrated that owing to the combination of political disorder, civilian society is becoming an unbearable tangent for many of us and now we have to face this problem. We would make a mistake not understanding that

we have to find a solution that could address at the same time the political aspect and all the other problems which cause imbalances, that create disorder.

I will try to be very schematic about the possible direction of a solution, which is based in my view on two concepts. First of all the solution can exist only in the direction of what I like to call integration. So the first choice is between integration and disintegration. Here in Europe we had the biggest experience of integration, with all the liabilities of this experienc, in the last decades and we have to have clear in our mind that the opposite of integration is disintegration. That integration is a step toward the order and disintegration is obviously the basis of disorder. I would like to give only one example to try to explain this idea of mine. I was Foreign Minister ten years ago, when the Yugoslavian crises exploded and this is a perfect explanation between the choice of integration and disintegration. Also many European and western governments, made the mistake of thinking that to approve the tendency toward disintegration would have been a good idea. European countries had a big discussion about this issue, and in the end governments, forces and public opinion in favour of disintegration prevailed, saying that it is good because disintegration means democracy and the result was one of the worst crises of this period of world disorder. On the contrary interaction would have been, though all its difficulties, even with the popular resistance towards it, the right way to let Yugoslavia pass from its previous communist experience to the democratic one without paying the price of thousands lives, without the terrible economic costs of refugees, people displaced and so on. We could apply the same idea to many other situations in the world. In my view when a member of a government thinks what to do to work for the order and against the disorder, he should evaluate any choice on the basis of whether this choice carries more integration or more disintegration.

The second very broad idea, but also very specific one, which we should take in mind to work toward order reducing disorder, is to understand that what we need in our situation is a double track approach, able to be both global and regional. We need United Nations but we need also regional institutions, able to make integration real faster and further with respect to a global institution because, obviously, to evolve the integration process at the global level is very difficult, very complex and probably impossible. The same is true at the economic level, it is necessary to have the WTO but we have learnt that regional agreements for free trade and so on a smaller basis are absolutely necessary to give the global system of rules for free trade a real possibility to function. We have to understand that the solution to the problem of disorder is only a reduction of disorder. We could utilize the same approach with respect to the problem of peace: if you speak of 'peace' in political terms and not in moral terms, the only way to work for peace is working to reduce the conflict. Absolute peace doesn't exist and in many cases force is necessary to reduce the causes of conflict. So in political terms there is no contradiction between the use of force and the real action in favour of peace. In ethical and moral terms the concept is totally different. It is necessary to understand that perfect order, right order, doesn't exist. I also do not think that the concept of international legitimacy itself exists. I've learnt the difference between what we read in books and what happens in practice. International rules are not consequences of rules and conventions, they are agreements that

change over time. It doesn't exist, this theoretical, just international legitimacy. Also the world order by definition is only an approximation to the best possible solution. You have to consider the differences in power and the differences with respect to the different subject. It is better to have an imperfect order with respect to the absence of order. The only way to go in this direction is to take into account this broad concept, to work for integration – for one side to work on a double track of global and regional. I understand it is not enough to solve all the problems which are in front of us, but I do think it is because of my personal experience as Foreign Minister in confronting the problems of international imbalances and disorder. If you try to utilize these two concepts seriously, a good aid is given us to make the right choices and not to make many of the mistakes which have been done following the more general and theoretical principles, speaking in my view of very vague concepts of international legitimacy and global governance and so on.

Emilio Colombo, *former Prime Minister of Italy*

The start of world disorder was the Cold War. I am identifying it as order and disorder at the same time, because it was founded on force. I identify the new world disorder with the most recent events that have characterized international affairs.

The terrorist attacks on the United States caused the reaction of the United States to this threat. Firstly, the reaction was in Afghanistan with the so-called '*à la carte*' alliances (e.g. beyond international organizations). Later something more worrying raised its head, which has already been mentioned: the unilateralism of the United States, which is two things at the same time. Firstly, it is a theorization – a cultural elaboration – that reaches up to the highest levels of the American establishment and, therefore, more worryingly because it does not have the contingency like for example, the contingent nature of a political act. Unilateralism was then transformed into preventative war – in Iraq. This means weakening the UN, but this also means the division of Europe. The division of Europe is not in solidarity towards the United States, but in the way to give solidarity to the United States. My impression is that the old ghosts are re-appearing in Europe, such as the special relationship between Britain and the United States, the tendency of France, also strengthened by the right of veto at the UN, to exercise this right and, therefore, to block UN decisions. And then, behind all this in Europe, even as it moves towards the European Constitution, a background of weaknesses and divisions remains and continues.

Iraq has demonstrated the insufficiency of military victory to achieve much higher aspirations that go beyond violence and reach as far as the establishment of democracy. I like very much this kind of globalization of discussion. Everything is globalized, now even discussion, and our eyes look to distant horizons. I wonder if it is not right that we be careful not to dismember old certainties when we have no new ones. Or, when the maintenance of these old certainties is needed to create new ones. This means re-creating the Euro-Atlantic relationship, naturally giving fewer justifications for the unilateralism of the United States, for which we Europeans are also a little responsible because we lagged considerably in building our unity. A common commitment to foreign policy and defence, and to maintain this inter-Atlantic relationship on the political level, of political collaboration and, naturally, ensuring or being certain that European unity, not constituted by a set of pillars but true unity, is the first fundamental bond with the United States from which we can then look out onto the world.

The first area of the world to which we should cast our eyes is the Middle East, but not only Iraq, remembering that the relationship between Palestinians and Israel is even more shameful for the world. Europe had the strength, in 1980, to make a declaration for the Middle East, but we are still there, from 1980 to today, in the same situation and this disorder also throws its shadow onto the relationship between Muslims and Israel, and also between Muslims and the West. The conclusion is therefore to be careful, at this time when some certainties are at risk, and do not let them run that risk again, but rather reconstitute them as the nucleus through which have a terrace to view the rest of the world.

Hubert Vedrine, *former French Minister of Foreign Affairs*

I would like to briefly share with you my view on the current world situation. First of all, I think that through the Nineties we cherished the illusion that we were a part of an international community – the words were often repeated in many debates – thinking that the world would soon be unified thanks to the generalized dissemination of the western type of democracy and of the market economy, and that we would be living fully under the rule of law. Based on this belief we founded the Society of Nations, and then the United Nations at a time when nations were certainly not united. So we went through a period of optimism, so unreal an optimism that it rendered us blind. The document which, I think, best shows this blindness, this unrealism, this sort of *"Unrealpolitik"* is the Millenium Declaration adopted by the United Nations in September 2000, a fascinating document but unfortunately very disconnected from the world reality.

In the past three years a number of tragedies took place that made us come back to reality quite painfully. We have seen the failure of the peace process in the Near East, the continuing incomprehension and antagonism between Islam and the West (I am not speaking of 'clash', since from antagonism to clash the passage is not automatic), the metamorphosis of the United States. I have been speaking of '*hyperpower*' since 1998 and not as a criticism but rather as a description of the fact that this country has grown too great to accept to follow the rules established for everyone else. I believe all this was already true for some time, then there was the election of George W. Bush with his administration that is completely different from the previous ones, and terrorism, and September 11 – which was not the starting point of change since most of the disquieting phenomena were already there – and the Iraq war waged without UN support, and the resurfacing of the North-South gap.

So the situation of the world in 2003 differs markedly from the hopes expressed in the big UN meetings in the Nineties and from all the discussions of the type of simposium and forum mainly attended by people who share humanitarian purposes, much good will, strong idealism, but who do not actually represent the world we live in.

The term 'Third Millenium' has been much abused, but, in fact, it does not mean anything. You could even say that Third Millenium means 'crashing to the ground at take-off'. I am saying this because I think that all this is not exclusively due to the Bush administration. It would be over-simplistic to think so. Many people in the world are concerned about American policies and politics, they protest, they hope it is something transient and that already in 2004 American voters will appoint a Democrat, whose name is not yet known, who will pursue a multilateral policy. I think that this is once again an illusion. I believe the American metamorphosis is deep and long lasting. The Bush administration is its exaggerated expression, with its adventurism, its militarism, with a reactionary dimension in its religious grounding. Nonetheless there are some basic elements which I think will continue to exist. Perhaps I will be proven wrong, but I think the United States will be unilateralist for a long time and they will be able to do so in a kinder and more gentle manner. I have followed

closely the Clinton-Albright administration. At that time, France and the United States cooperated very effectively, as never before, but even under that administration it was thought that the world should accept the benevolent leadership of the United States, which was good for all and had to be accepted graciously as it was proposed kindly, in spite of being a general leadership. This is why I don't think that the questions we are debating today will disappear even in case of a change in the next elections.

What can be done, then?

A logical solution would be to try and see how a multilateral system can be relaunched. It is a tragic choice, the one between today's United Nations, quite impotent from many points of view, and Rumsfeld's policy. So we have to find an alternative, to reform the United Nations so that they can regain full legitimacy. Just as it was done after World War Two, it is necessary to review the UN Charter, both in its theoretical founding principles and in its practical aspects. These issues are widely known: first of all a way must be found to expand the Security Council, to identify its new permanent members and the non-permanent members; then the veto question must be solved. I think that neither the United States nor any other country will ever relinquish their veto power, so new rules are required. Then there is the question of Art. 7: it is no longer possible to have a Charter that provides for intervention only in case international peace and security are endangered. It is necessary to establish principles that clearly define who must decide when a population is in danger, and in this case the right of veto should not apply. These are all issues that must be analyzed when undertaking the reform of the UN. I also think that some forms of protection should be envisaged, such as protectorates, since among the 200 members of the United Nations dozens are incompetent, they do not function, their politicians can scarcely keep their own capital cities under control.

I think these considerations must be introduced in the Charter; if not, the risk is resorting to force and Rumsfeld will be justified in saying that he conducted a preventive and necessary war, and Western countries might be led to think that they are forced to intervene. If the Charter is not reformed we might find ourselves in the same negative situation we experienced in the colonial era.

The necessary reform of the United Nations is extremely complex and can be pursued only with the agreement of the Security Council Permanent Members. But the present US administration will never accept such a reform because it is not in its interest to re-legitimize the UN. The United States, in fact, prefer to appeal to the UN only in some cases, but they do not want the UN to play a central role. And what will Russia and China do about this?

I believe that countries that participate in forum such as this should in any case think about the reform of the UN because, even if it may seem unrealistic, when it is finally proposed it will have greater political strength and will be perceived as a viable alternative that the various countries involved will have difficulty rejecting.

I am sure that there are in the world a number of wise political leaders, whether still active politically or not, that are capable to draft the new future UN Charter.

Before closing I would like to touch upon two other issues. Still with reference to the reform of the United Nations, there are two conflicting ideas. In Europe we often hear people say it is intolerable that the UN include non democratic countries among their members. Just remember the turmoil caused by Libya taking the chair of the Human Rights Commission. We must make a clear distinction between two concepts: we either create an organization of democracies or we create the organization of the countries of the world. So, to all those who are in favor of an organization of democracies I say that is a nice and positive idea, but democracies must first of all pursue an intelligent policy towards non democratic countries. I do not think that democracy is equivalent to a sudden conversion. I often say that democracy is not like instant coffee, it is a political and social process. On the other hand you cannot shoot at democracy. So there must be a logic behind the process and a community of democracies can be accepted if its policy towards others is intelligent.

Secondly, we need an organization of all countries in the world, whether democratic or not, otherwise we risk regression. We need a forum to discuss any issue, regardless of the regimes in power. So it would perhaps be better to suppress the UN Human Rights Commission rather than inventing criteria for membership.

The last issue I will address is Europe. It is here, in fact, that we can find a variable adaptation. In pursuing our common policy need to build a true international community, we constantly refer to Europe. But Europeans for a long time have pursued a 'wishful thinking' policy, that is they have confused their wishes with reality. In truth, Europeans living in the European Union to this day still do not agree about what the role of Europe in the world should be. They can't reach an agreement on this simply because the question has never been addressed before: as it was a thorny question, they chose to postpone it and now it came back quite strongly. And what is the disagreement about? Some Europeans – I mean governments and people – simply want to enjoy a space for wealth, peace, security and freedom. All this is undoubtedly a huge improvement over the past. But there is no mention of power. And there are other Europeans, the French in particular, who want a Europe of powers. This is a contradiction, as they want a Europe of powers because they believe that is nothing more than an enlarged France. Of course the situation is very different and a compromise will be needed.

There are differences in the idea of Europe itself. Many Europeans do not like the idea of a Europe of powers and prefer a "wait-and-see" policy. The British, for example, refuse the idea because they think that it divides the Western world and is therefore dangerous. To them there is only one leader, the United States. Many in Europe also do not like the idea of powers since they feel that, after 1945, the very idea of power was abandoned in Europe and we should not step back, power being dangerous, negative and even obscene. These Europeans want to hear justifications for the theories of the Bush administration, for what Robert Kagan says about the Europeans coming from Venus and the Americans from Mars. So they foster the current American vision that in Europe you have to be extremely kind, have an idealistic view of the world and believe you live in a post-tragic world. But the world *is* tragic, so a serious country must be concerned with world safety, and it's America that is playing the game. Therefore those European that reject the idea of power run the risk of living in a

powerless and dependent Europe and of being unable, in the long run, to maintain the European way of life which is our common asset.

I think we should face the fact that Europeans have not yet reached an agreement about the different ideas of Europe. In order to make a decision it would be useful to discuss the question among us Europeans, even if the discussion could develop into a heated argument. I hope the disputes may be followed by the birth of a specific Europe of powers, exemplary, respectful of the international law, and obviously an ally of the United States. It would be useless and absurd to create a Europe of powers at war with the US.

To conclude, I am very confident about the future partnership between Europe and the United States. This alliance is possible as the United States want allies and Europeans are hesitant to become such. It would be desirable that on the one hand the United States were able to control their own power and, on the other, that Europeans could achieve more power. These two aspects are not currently present, but I believe this is not a definitive situation.

Marshall Goldman, *Political Scientist*

To understand the world disorder, it seems to me that what we must do is treat it like a disease, and to solve problems of the disease – to attack the disease – we have to understand the causes, and try to develop and discover antidotes, and that's what I would like to try to do. I would say the world is more complicated than it was ten or twenty years ago. When the Cold War ended, Fukuyama called it the end of history. My wife continually tells me that she misses the Cold War because we knew where everybody stood: I disagree with her. So what was so good about the Cold War? Well the sides were divided up. Communism versus capitalism – those two ideologies that overrode less compelling ideologies, and there was relatively little feuding within the ranks. There was some but for the most part Moscow and Washington were the centres of power and enforced or generated discipline within their ranks. Equally important were boundaries, and they were more or less set and certain, we knew where the opponents were, divided by states we knew the address of, and if there was a complaint or threat to be made we knew where to send it.

The notion of Mutually Assured Destruction tended to keep the sides disciplined and balanced. That's not to deny there were scary moments: when for example it looked like either side might push its luck too far: the Cuban missile crises; the 1973 Yom Kippur war; Ronald Reagan threatening, in some ways, the Soviet position in Europe. As I thought about this, one of the things that occurred to me was the book by George Orwell, *1984*. He had notion of states and coalitions feuding with one another. As he pointed out in *1984*, there would be periodic shifting of partners and alliances. But the idea was again of disputing among states and alternating coalitions. In his concept, there was Oceania, there was Eurasia and there was East Asia. And if you think about it, by going back to World War I or World War II, in WWII there was the Axis – Germany, Italy and Japan, the Allies – amongst them the UK, USSR, China and the US. Then the Cold War came, and we changed partners. Then there was the Soviet Union and China, and our former enemies Germany and Japan joined up with the United States, UK, and of course Italy. With the end of the Cold War it appeared as if we had reached the end of these Orwellian type of conflicts. Indeed it looked like there might no longer be confrontation between states or among states because we were all partners in this together. And in that sense it did seem like this was the end of history. So how did we get to the current situation?

With the end of the Cold War, instead of forming one giant coalition it turned out that the different members within the ranks began to break ranks. There was no compelling reason why everybody had to be disciplined and so you could call them mavericks, people began to break out. More than that, the technologies that were created during the Cold War opened the doors to non-geographically bound or limited forces. In other words you did not have to be a state, to have a tax system, or to have a military to become a threat to other countries or other regions. More than that, instead of having one idea binding one side against another, such as communism versus another side capitalism, we had a multitude of ideas and ideologies, and

the weapons that were made available to you could impose a threat to the other side. So you could be a world terrorist because there were more powerful explosives available, more powerful weapons: the Stinger missiles, for example, could be used by individuals, not just small groups but individuals, in addition, of course, to the small groups. As somebody else here has pointed out, ironically the Islamic militant fundamentalists in Afghanistan were helped by the United States in our effort to fight the Soviet power.

And with growing materialism in the world and a break down of morals, pornography, materialism, this began to create a backlash and led to the growth of fundamentalism not only in the Islamic world but in the United States in form of evangelicalism, or in parts of Europe as well, and on top of that, these ideologies became powerful enough to lead individuals to commit suicide. That's not the first time that's happened historically, we've often had people committing suicide, and in some cases in the Cold War or in World War II you committed suicide but it was in the name of patriotism, fighting for the army.

How should one cope with this situation? We could try to recapture weapons, ensure non-proliferation of nuclear weapons, but, that won't stop the movements. In addition because of growing advances in technology there are other weapons that could take their place.

Another way to address the problem would presumably be to address the breakdown in morals, the clash of civilisations of Samuel Huntington which you've heard before. But it seems to me that it's not going to be easy to repair these differences. Another approach would be trying to build up civilisations to try to clean up the morals and finally maybe just hold out until the other side is exhausted. After all we have had hundred year wars, fighting over different ideologies. In some cases we'll just have to live with unresolved terrorism for centuries to come.

The danger in all this is that in mobilising to fight these diseases, or these movements, we can end up like them. And I should say right now that my own concern in the United States is that we have introduced controls on civil rights that in some sense leave us doing exactly what we used criticize the totalitarian regimes for doing. We are not there yet by any manner of means, but we're certainly heading in the wrong direction. More and more I see the Department of Homeland Security introducing techniques that are very reminiscent of the Cold War. So as we look to address these concerns it seems to me that it's important to prevent the abolition of civil freedoms all over the world. Those of you, who have had to travel through international airports, certainly are aware of the problems. The approach in some sense reminds me very much of what used to happen in the Soviet Union. Ben Franklin, one of our often quoted philosophers, put it this way: "They that can give up essential liberty to obtain a better temporary safety deserve neither liberty nor safety." And it seems to me that we should heed that.

So let me conclude. Unfortunately I cannot come up with any far reaching simple solutions and it seems to me that given what has happened this is unlikely to be a short term affair. The trick is how to preserve our liberties and still lead a normal life. Otherwise we risk turning into what we are fighting against.

Jiang Mingjun, *President of UN Development Programme*

Poverty is an ancient and bitter topic that is simple on one hand and complicated on the other. Poverty alleviation is one of the basic goals of world economic development as well as an arduous task confronted by many countries. Human beings have made ceaseless efforts over thousands of years to eradicate poverty, but poverty still extensively exists in many countries. The impoverished people are especially concentrated in the developing countries. In various media we can often see such scenes, famine victims with insufficient food and clothes sleep on the street, withered and bare boned poor children stagger here and there looking for food. Poverty stricken people with ragged garments, dishevelled hair and dirty faces are crowded in disordered slums with stinking smell. All these scenes are realities in modern life; environmental deterioration, pollution explosion, social turbulence, and war are all closely related to poverty.

With the continuous development of the world economy the amount of wealth in the world has risen sharply, but the gap between the rich and the poor is becoming wider and wider. In May 2001 the UN held a meeting of the least developed countries from the Third World in Brussels. In total 49 countries were included in the shameful list of least developed countries. The data disclosed at the meeting were shocking to people. The population of the 49 impoverished countries is 630 million, accounting to 10 percent of the world's total population but the total income of these countries is less than 1 percent of the world's total. The per capita of GDP of these countries is only 235 USD, while the same figure of the developed countries is already up to 25,000 USD, which is more than 100 times above that of the poor countries. The total property of the 225 wealthiest persons in the world is up to 1.3 billion USD. Which is equal to the total income of over half of the world's population and it means that a wealthy person's property is equal to the annual wages of 30 millions people.

In the XXI century when economic globalisation is developing at a higher speed, should we allow the continuous gap between the rich and the poor or strive for coordinated economic development among all countries to reduce that gap? This has become a major concern of the international community. This is a world featured by mutual dependence and the world's prosperity and stability can't be achieved and maintained before the problem of poverty is solved. Therefore poverty has become a barrier for human progress and its eradication is a urgent task for us.

Firstly, poverty is a comprehensive historical and regional concept, generally divided into absolute poverty and relative poverty. Absolute poverty is also known as poverty for survival. The poverty confronted by the developing countries is absolute poverty while that confronted by the developed countries is relative; this is actually a division of poverty at different levels, and from the angles of different classes. With the development of society absolute poverty will be gradually reduced and finally eliminated while relative poverty will exist for the long term and even grow. With the advancement of time the definition of poverty has also witnessed ceaseless changes as redefined by the World Bank in its 2001–2002 annual

report. Poverty means not only low income and low consumption, but also the lack of chance to receive education, malnutrition, poor health conditions, as well as no right to speak and terror.

In the current world poverty mainly has the following characteristics.

Drastic expansion of the gap between the poor and the rich.

More obvious globalization of poverty.

Uneven distribution of income.

Low level of consumption.

Low educational level and poor culture quality.

Terrible conditions that cannot guarantee health.

Harsh natural environment for existence of backward social infrastructures.

It should be noted that women suffer the most from poverty. At present there are more than 1 billion impoverished people that are mostly women according to the International Labour Organization's statistics. Women take two-thirds of the world's total labour hours while the percentage of payment for labour obtained by women is only 10 %. In most countries women haven't got the right for equal pay and equal work yet and are more easily threatened by unemployment. Now that human beings have entered the XXI century the women of many countries still have no right to elect or be elected, as indicated by data provided by the Federation of Parliaments. In the parliaments of all countries the average proportion of women is 13 %. The average proportion of women in the parliaments of Arabic countries is only 3% and there are still fewer female state leaders. From the angle of the society, women's interests are still seriously threatened. Such phenomena as the maltreatment of women, sexual harassment, and kidnapping and trafficking of women are still ubiquitous.

Secondly, with the continuous development of economic globalisation and the increase of the degree of mutual dependence no country can pay attention to its own matters without thought of others. Therefore it's rather an obligation than a freedom for the rich countries to increase their income and reduce the debt payable by the poor countries. The imbalanced development of world economy, the serious polarisation between the rich and the poor, and the aggravation of poverty has become of great concern to the international community.

Eradicating poverty was one of the themes of the state leaders Millennium Summit held by the UN in 2000. The conference appealed to the international community to jointly undertake the responsibility of eradicating poverty and require that the developed countries must take concrete actions jointly with the developing ones. The Millennium Summit made a pronouncement, saying that more than one billion people were living in poverty and that the UN would save no efforts to help them get rid of poverty. Everybody has the right of development. The UN has decided to create domestic and international environments beneficial to eradicate poverty. The UN has pledged to satisfy the least developed countries special needs and court the industrialised countries to implement polices of no tax and no quota against the least developed countries, the impoverished island countries and the inland developing countries, reducing their debts and providing more material financial and technical aids to them.

The UN has decided to reduce the percentage of people with less than one US dollar daily income and the percentage of starving people by half. Reduce the percentage of people that can not get safe drinking water by half. Enable children in all parts of the world to receive primary school education, make men and women have equal opportunity to receive education at all levels. Reduce the mortality of women by three fourths on the current basis. Reduce the mortality rate of children under five years old by two-thirds on the current basis. Provide special aid for the children orphaned from HIV/Aids and stop the spreading of AIDS, malaria and other major diseases by 2015. By 2020 the UN will hopefully improve the lives of one hundred million slum residents, promote equality between men and women, safeguard the rights of men and women; actively fight against poverty, starvation and disease; find a way of really sustainable development and establish appropriate models to promote development to eradicate poverty.

Thirdly, there is still a long way to go to eradicate poverty. In October 2001, President Wolfson of the World Bank published an article in the World News of France holding that the most serious problem encountered by the international community is the fight against poverty. He proposed to establish a world anti-poverty alliance saying that our alliance will cover the whole world, not only in the struggle against terrorism but also for the fight against poverty. I think that poverty cannot be eradicated overnight. Only by building a new political and economic order in the world can we solve the global problem of poverty from the root. So let us make great efforts to realise this common goal of human beings.

Giulio Andreotti, *former Prime Minister of Italy*

I believe that we, as Europeans and not only Europeans, must make an act of repentance for a sin committed against President Gorbachev. When, in the important G7 meeting, President Gorbachev was invited at an extremely delicate moment, he made a passionate speech and said to us: 'We certainly need financial aid, because we are in great difficulty, but this is neither the only nor the most important problem'. He said: 'You must give us the time to develop, within what is the Union of Republics, a gradual policy, because different models need to be given to each of these Republics. If you push, for example, to give – or rather better give back – sovereignty immediately to the Baltic Republics, this leads to great confusion in my gradual design. We must create models suited to the different nature of these Republics. At this moment, we must ask for this understanding.'

And I must say that, on the level of heads of state and of government, only President Mitterrand and myself understood this design. The President of the Commission, Jacques Delors also understood it well when he said: 'Note that the economic system of the Soviet Union is very complex, there is even integrated production, where parts are made in Czechoslovakia and parts are made in Hungary. If we demand that everything becomes overnight a market economy in the Soviet Union, we will really create such disorder, such practical impossibility that we will be responsible for the failure of a design that, I repeat, certainly needs financial support, but it needs political confidence, belief in this gigantic operation that has to be done.'

Not to be polemical with anyone, but if you read an official book, the diary of Mrs. Thatcher, you will find it criticizes Delors saying that on that occasion he showed nostalgia for the Soviet Union and for the system of the Soviet Union. This is a passing comment as everyone is responsible for his own words. Naturally, things then developed completely differently, not only because of this, but certainly President Gorbachev was the first to pay a high personal price.

On the occasion of that G7 meeting there should have been greater understanding, because making Gorbachev return to Moscow simply with the recommendation to the Monetary Fund to take a look at the problems was certainly rather too little. Because of this, the system that was then created slipped out of the hands and the governing ability of President Gorbachev; it was a totally new system. In the name of privatization, for instance, mega-millionaires were created and I do not know if anyone really, when you did not have freedom and aspired to it, also aspired to a system in which Mr. Abramovic could buy the Chelsea team, competing with American or Australian millionaires.

I say this because I am a chronicler, not a scholar, I experienced these events. The world is unjust, there are too many poor people and too many rich people, a road to understanding, peace, will not be found until there is justice, linked to very fragile foundations. So I believe we must attempt to see how a real step forward can be made in this existing social disorder. We often have to tackle emergency situations. There is no night when we ourselves, in Italy,

do not have to face the situations of dozens or hundreds of poor people from Africa or even further away, believing in the illusion to be able to settle here.

In my conclusion, I would like to say, I hope by the time of our next meeting we could give a concrete contribution on one essential point which was mentioned this morning. We all hope that the organization of the United Nations can be changed and updated. Today it has, fortunately, become universal in terms of participation. There is – and the reason behind this is too far away – the domination of five countries with the right of veto and many other things that do not work. So, we must dedicate our future study to an effective model of change for the United Nations. There are some positive things on the move: the European Union, with its enlargement, is becoming almost a continental union. MERCUSOR is a force of a certain importance. Perhaps a little visionary, but the African plan of an African Union is also moving towards the creation or the study of integration. I have no recipe, but studying all together we would be able to do something that is more suited to a class of former combatants like us, because as we have no immediate necessity, not needing to suggest resolutions to be approved by parliaments, we have this freedom to be able to study, examine in depth and make a contribution to create, within the United Nations, a different organization. Improving what is in part on the table is desirable – because when we talk about the United Nations we must talk not only about the Assembly or the Security Council, but also of all the Agencies and of their work performed around the world.

So we could help by giving some ideas. There will be no meeting in which we will not hear someone say, 'It is not right that one fifth of the people in the world enjoy 80% of the resources'. I am a bit tired of hearing this and so I hope those of you who are younger people could hear more optimistic statements.

Yuri Ryžov, *former Ambassador of the RussianFederation to France*

Disorder and chaos have always been the starting point for a new self-organization of energies, as we like saying today. Physicists have known this for a long time and I think politicians are now likely to understand it as well.

First of all I have to say that I agree with who says that Fukuyama and Huntington, who have been mentioned so often in the last ten years, did not know the laws of synergy and self-organization – I mean self-organization within the process and not as a 'jump'.

I would like to deal with the problem of 'collateral damage' in armed conflicts that – no matter if they are small or large – burst out because of the different causes that took place in the last one hundred years. I will focus my speech on the point that this may now have on the typology of armed conflicts which are changing very rapidly. The main purpose of a normal policy basically consists in the protection of life, health and civil rights and not in the preservation of any system of power or in keeping people in power, as it was and, in many aspects still is, in my own country, Russia.

During the XX century the percentage of victims among the civilian population caused by armed conflicts – compared with the total number of victims of these conflicts – amounted to 5% during the First World War and it reached over 90% during the last conflict in the last century, where no weapons of mass-destruction were used. There are two causes for this and both of them are due to technological causes. The first one concerns the increase of power of war devices, e.g. kilotons, megatons and so on. But the main reason, the "technological reason", for the increase of the victims number among the civilian population is the improvement in the ability to project firepower. At the beginning of the Second World War strategic bombers were used but now missiles with an increasing range are spreading throughout the world. It is hence understandable that the UN's and, in general, all of the International Community's aim is, in particular, to fight against the spread of weapons of mass-destruction. They must also oppose missiles as a means to project firepower to the core of the infrastructure of the conflicting parties, in a situation where, first of all, those not staying at the front are exposed to the attack but instead those staying within the infrastructure are at risk, far away from the conflict.

The conflicts and wars of the XX century were localized in every single moment in terms of time and space. Today we are facing a different situation. The recent conflicts differ completely from the previous ones because they are not localized in terms of time and space, while the collateral damage during these conflicts is almost as high as the one at the end of the last century. Nevertheless, there are new, perilous means of transport which are more dangerous for civilians. These are suicide bombers and car bombs of any kind, for example.

I think the world has proved to be totally unprepared for this kind of change: first of all because anti-aircraft artillery and anti-missile systems are completely powerless in the fight against international terrorism. It has to be remarked that the world has proved to be unprepared yet, not because this is something totally new. We have known terrorism for a

long time, including state, religious and territorial terrorism. The history of Russia and the history in the XX century has shown us state terrorism. Take for instance the Third Reich of Hitler or the Soviet Union that condemned – with no limits – both terrorism outside the country and global terrorism against its own population inside the country.

Until now, the search for new methods with which to fight international terrorism has only led to the undermining of civil freedom. International terrorism has caused its first victim, that is to say: freedom of speech, of the press, of gathering and so on. As soon as the mass-media freedom is established, it is usually attacked and, unfortunately, this situation is remarkable in my own country as well. Therefore, besides looking for ways and instruments with which to fight against terrorism – but applying other means too – the democratic international community has to act in order to preserve civil freedom, human rights and to prevent a new explosion of xenophobia, which has already occurred in some long-established democracies. This danger is no less than the challenge of international terrorism. I do not agree with those who believe that Orwell's prediction is not applicable to today's situation.

Oscar Luigi Scalfaro, *former President of the Italian Republic*

The theme of disorder has been faced in some sense and we will be looking at this new order and its principles. This is an effort we must always bear in mind also because it would be a bit strange that after we have had responsibility when all this disorder was determined, we now have pretensions to give advice for future order. Let's leave each generation free to make its own mistakes and regret them. We perhaps do not exactly have the right to teach those who come after how one must not make mistakes. I always remember a phrase of Adenauer in a meeting of the Christian Democrat world, who, talking about his successor said, with a particularly ferocious humour: 'You always learn something in this world even in old age. I for example have learnt how to make mistakes from my successor'. Evidently, he had never learnt it in the whole of his life.

I cannot forget that President Gorbachev stressed two points at the beginning of this meeting that seem vital to me for the meeting itself, and that I'd translate in my simple words, if I understood well. We have no intention to impose or to give particular advice to those who have front-line political and other responsibilities today. We want to present experience, and there is evidently vast experience. Drawing on a speech that I personally enjoyed, the speech by Mr. Gardner, who at a certain moment spoke of the need for 'real dialogue', I think that this terminology invites us to seek out a human common denominator. When one thinks of the same capacity, in the most diverse forms, of people to turn their eyes, their thoughts, their own feelings to a religious vision – a transcendental vision therefore – which should inevitably help the common denominators for our common miseries, one see it does not help here. So if we come down to a purely human common denominator, we are all human beings, brought together by the splendid opening of Article 1 of the Declaration of Human Rights of 1948, in the Assembly of the United Nations, the denominator of the individual rights. And I believe the respect for truth is the foundation of freedom and justice, which are the conditions for peace.

We live in a time when peace is sadly absent but we must acknowledge this. Some time ago, a on our television, someone made a list of the wars in progress at the moment; I know there were more than thirty, and I believe it reached forty. This is why I must say that, while very much appreciating what emerged from the European Convention as the Declaration of Rights, I was astonished that there was not, I do not say courage, but perhaps the initiative to want to say that 'every human being has the right to peace'. It is a right linked to human nature and which, underlining it, also underlines that any aggression, from violence to war, is an extremely serious attack of the fundamental rights of human beings and of the individual.

And here it can be added that it would not have been bad, and still would be if it were possible. Thinking about that phrase in our Italian Constitution's Article 11, which says 'Italy repudiates war', I hold little hope in a Europe that also repudiates, that rejects, which says no to war. We do not have peace, we have an absence of peace, and this hurts people in their primary right, because when there is uncertainty about peace, when there is fear of war, the

individual is mutilated and is undoubtedly in a position of lesser capacity to fulfill his possibilities, in all fields, from culture to the economy and research, in all sectors.

Talking of truth: how many countries are there in the world where democracy formally exists, but, because the reality is far from that, in international relations we rightly pretend to take note that form is substance, knowing that this is not so? How many cases of injustice? I underline and totally agree with the appeal made by former Prime Minister Andreotti, I totally agree that the constant repetition of injustices is never positive. The United States, which has a direct responsibility in the most recent wars, even inventing a new right – preventative war – which is the total negation of international law, moves a serious attack on the international organizations being that a war of aggression, and so against the essential principles of human ethics.

I am in total agreement also with the approach of the French President: we cannot leave the United States alone in this situation. We must constrain it. If not, the passing of time will make the illegal legal and the unjust just. Taking as valid what has happened merely because it has happened, is beyond any logic, any right and any fundamental human value.

And is there today a common agreement to say a real 'no' to war. Is there? Or does the thought still remain that, all things considered, war can solve something in some cases. War never solved anything. It is true that in certain cases, if we talk about certain historical moments, it seems that only war removed a dictatorship or demolished some situation, but we would need to look at when those dictatorships were born, when the crimes against human values began. How many people risked something to defend those values, how many risked something to denounce the beginning of these distortions that would lead either to dictatorships or wars, but to both evils!

I want to say just one more thing, as the appeal of President Gorbachev is so clear, of what the limits are to our thoughts, to the manifestations of our thoughts. I think and believe that as long as persons remembers they have an intellect, as long as they are rational and are willing to use both, hope does not die.

I thank and will be forever grateful if this Assembly, this Forum, discussing the various themes, manages to help, to give a hand to those who hold primary responsibilities, never to give in to anything that is negative for the rights of the human individual: help hope not to die.

Mikhail Gorbachev, *President of the World Political Forum*

I would like to reply on two topics. The fact that we do not have to build the new world order on abstraction has been dealt with in different ways, even if in front of scientists, researchers and politicians. Here today we cannot attack abstraction, because through abstraction we may find answers to important questions and discover and understand better phenomena.

However the topic that emerged is the following: we have to create a new world order on the basis of the new events. This is a very serious matter. I think this is also been said against me, Gorbachev would cherish illusions while he is tackling the problem of a new world order. I admit I agree on the fact that we have to create a new world order starting from the new events, because if we have a different approach we will not be able to propose anything to the political world. The political world has an influence on precise events and contexts and it expects from us enlightened opinions, advice and warning according to this context and these events. But my question is: should we change the new context for better (because it represents a world that does not satisfy a half or more of the humanity) or maintain the *status quo* of the new context itself? This is the key point of the question.

In Mr. Petrella's thesis, in his first thought he stated that the present world is not acceptable. I have to say that this thesis may be objected to as we are actually living in this world. However, he wants us to debate on the possibility and necessity to have a new world in a new perspective, towards a different world. But then, is it necessary to change this existing context? Yes! But how can you go towards a new world order without changing anything about poverty? How can we go towards a new world order if the current processes in Africa continue in this way and if because of them in the present decade the number of victims of AIDS will be higher or at least as high as the number of victims during the Second World War? Are we then going to keep this new context and to applaud it because somehow we have found our place? This position is too pragmatic and, after all, it has no morals. Anyway, we cannot put the political world and morals together, they belong to two completely different areas, but we cannot forget moral references.

Firstly, In our Forum we have to work out the reference points and, in a certain sense, we have to draw an intellectual line in order not to get lost in this complicated world. I think that, of course, we have to build our future starting from the new contexts but we will do this in order to change the world for better. Therefore, it is necessary to change these contexts too.

Secondly, during the debate some arguments have emerged to justify in some way, carefully and subtly, the possibility to use them to jeopardize democracy and international law. And so, urged by the context we are living in, we try, but we do not have any range of action. It is evident that we need a strong policy, we need a strong power. But democracy is the strongest power! As far as international law is concerned, we may say that we can do without it.

We should instead apply the concept of pre-emptive intervention. We like it apparently. Besides in the USA there are other states that declared: "Yes! We will follow the rule of pre-emptive attacks or measures in the places characterized by disorder". I think there may soon be a queue, of those who will follow this example disregarding international law and the democratic procedures. In general, there are so many factors that may jeopardize the international political world! Therefore, I think this is very important. Our next meeting and the activity of our Forum will take place starting from these fundamental points, on which we have somehow to agree today. How are we going to build this new world? I believe we can think of a democratic world order, a world order that will contribute, even the creation of this new order will be based upon our approach to the solution to concrete questions and we will have to continue solving our problems and worries while eliminating disorder.

New Means for New Goals

Professor Andrea Comba, *President of the Foundation CRT (Turin Saving Bank)*
<u>Chairman</u>

This morning we discussed the negative side of international order and the new world disorder. This afternoon we will discuss new means for new goals. In the past, Secretary General Boutros Boutros Ghali reminded us of the new order that should exist between states now. The scientific committee has suggested new limits to sovereignty, crises management, international justice, and I would modify after hearing from Prime Minister Andreotti, what kind of new functions we need for the United Nations. This is a problem for the whole of international society and the United Nations should be designed to reorder the international system. I give the floor now to President Jan Kavan.

Jan Kavan, *Member of the Czech Republic's Parliament, former President of the UN General Assembly*

I will concentrate on the United Nations, as up until a few weeks ago I was President of the United Nations General Assembly. I think the subject is more relevant than ever as the United Nations is confronted more than ever. Let me start by expressing very clearly that I do believe the UN does have a role in maintaining international order, and it is the only legitimate institution or forum in the world to which all nations subscribe and in which we all have a stake.

The Iraqi crisis has seized, and rightly so, our attention as the most outstanding issue before the United Nations. The Security Council failed to produce a workable multilateral solution to Iraq's defiance of its resolutions. And now, in the post-war situation the Security Council I would say is struggling to designate the role which the United Nations should play in the reconstruction efforts in Iraq. The earlier Resolution, 1483, I would describe as a classic case of diplomatic double speak. Without legitimising the invasion, it regularised the result and opened up the possibility for deeper UN involvement. However, the problem was clearly not solved. The very latest resolution 1511 is another compromise. Those who want to think still in terms of contest between those who opposed the war and those who supported the war can describe the Resolution as a victory for United States diplomacy. But I think it can resemble a victory of a bald man who won a hairbrush in a lottery. It may not result in any countries supplying more troops and more money and it will not change the situation on the ground. What is offered is a kind of timetable for constitution and elections. And there are many acknowledgements for the need of the UN to play a vital role in Iraq, and these are clearly steps in the right direction. I would suggest, or I would express my belief that sooner rather than later it will lead to demands for new and more concrete UN resolutions. The deadlock in the Security Council before the war clearly led some people to make, what I would say, hasty comparisons with the fate of the League of Nations and there were premature obituaries to the UN. Equally premature was clearly the epitaph announced by Richard Perle last March, when he said that when Saddam Hussein went down he would take the United Nations with him, and that did clearly not happen.

The Organization's broad mandate and day-to-day activities range from the fight against poverty and environmental degradation to protection of human rights, covering such diverse issues as education, water scarcity or cultural heritage. The UN system includes some 25 or so agencies. Only this year, for example, the World Health Organisation led the global battle against SARS. The UN's established criminal tribunals tried a number of individuals for war crimes committed on the territories of former Yugoslavia or Rwanda or Sierra Leone. The World Food Programme feeds more than 70 million people annually, the UN refugee agency continues to help more than 20 million persons to restart their lives. But I would say that even in the area of peace and security the UN agenda goes well beyond Iraq, including

peacekeeping operations most notably now in Africa; disarmament, clearing landmines, electoral assistance and other post conflict reconstruction activities.

So I would argue that it would be greatly biased to engage in a discussion on the UN without seeing the whole picture of the multitude of agendas, and without having an appreciation of its daily work to fulfill its mandate. The role of the organisation be it in peacekeeping organisations or in disarmament, the fight against poverty or creation of international law has been and should remain absolutely essential.

The global community needs to work together intensively and courageously, in order to build what I would call a more secure and rule based world in which human freedom and life and dignity as well as private enterprise can flourish. And nowhere is this more relevant than in Iraq. Iraq's post-conflict society is confronted with various problems of instability. Recent United Nations experiences elsewhere, for example in Kosovo or in East Timor, demonstrated clearly that a comprehensive strategy to tackle the issues in a post conflict phase is critical, and furthermore it is evident now that a strategy for political and economic reforms should be crafted in conjunction within an overall vision of democratization for Iraqi society. And I do believe the United Nations is capable to carry out such a task.

For all its shortcomings, real or perceived, the UN is still the foremost forum which has grassroots experience and personnel to deal with a wide range of crises, whether in the field of humanitarian relief, or helping people or countries to rebuild their lives, promoting human rights, and the rule of law in conflict management or post-conflict peacebuilding.

The Iraqi situation clearly turned our attention once again to the relations between United Nations and United States. The United Nations has always enjoyed a kind of special relationship with the United States. The US is its largest contributor covering 22% of the UN's regular budget and 27% of its peacekeeping operations budget. The US and UN are at odds on several issues; the Kyoto Protocol, the Biological Weapons Convention, the Convention on the Elimination of Discrimination Against Women, and in particular on the International Criminal Court. Given the US approach to these and other topics it resulted in the growing perception among many UN member states that the United States is turning away from pursuing multilateralism in favour of pursuing unilateralism in international relations, and this perception became even more acute during the Iraq crisis.

The uneasy relationship between the US and the United Nations reflects a new international system where one single nation, in this case the United States, possesses an unprecedented military and economic power. A nation, which is so powerful that it can almost afford to ignore the entire international order. I purposely said 'almost' because I believe not entirely. The United States still needs the legitimacy and existence of a world order that only the United Nations can provide. The Security Council remains the most widely accepted source of international legitimacy and US dependency on UN legitimacy is still relevant. On the other hand, I agree it is clear that a United Nations without the United States would be far less effective and may begin to resemble the weakness of the League of Nations.

The UN in order to be effective has to reflect the real world, and in the real world the United States is almost as indispensable as the US thinks it is. If the United Nations did not reflect reality it would be out of touch with it and thus unable to influence it.

The question before us, is therefore how to accommodate a member state, which is economically and militarily so powerful, and make the relationship between the United Nations and United States beneficial to both. The UN clearly is in need of constant reforms relating to the strengthening of the UN system. Continued process of consecutive steps to render it more flexible, much more focused in its work and more result orientated. But, if the UN is to remain a relevant international player in the XXI century then member states have to seriously consider a reform of the Security Council. Reform of the Security Council in its composition, in its size and in its veto powers. I will share with you a fact that many know, that for every General Assembly President over the last ten years, this was one of the most frustrating tasks, because there was always a widespread agreement of the need to reform and the need to increase non-permanent and permanent members, and set a restriction of veto power. However, I myself experienced that there is a huge gap between this acknowledgement and projecting it into practice. I have concluded that reform of the Security Council can only take place after a major political breakthrough in the capitals of some crucial states. It cannot be done by diplomats in the UN building. I am of course aware that the history of last centuries suggests that such breakthroughs are achieved following major catastrophes such as the two World Wars which led to the foundation of the League of Nations and United Nations respectively. At the same time, I of course believe that the international community has reached a far higher degree of sanity and thus we will not need any more reminders of the need for change of the status quo. Other than those which we have already encountered.

It is acknowledged that the global community has become interdependent be it for trade or investment, or solving problems related to climate change, eradicating poverty or fighting terrorism, so I believe we all have to work together to transfer global insecurity into global responsibility. And the number of areas where multilateral action today is needed is larger than ever. Concerted multilateral action, I believe, is the only way we can protect ourselves from concerns affecting the environment, proliferation of illicit drugs, biological and nuclear weapons, trafficking in human beings, poverty and terrorism and others. At the same time, I have to acknowledge that multilateralism is not free of any weakness. Certainly it helps to share burdens, promote trust, provide legitimacy for actions taken, for example in response to threats to peace and security, but multilateral approaches can be ponderous, limiting actions to the speed of the slowest or the most reluctant, and it can be undermined when states pick and choose what suits them at any particular moment. This is a kind of *a la carte* approach rooted in political convenience rather in any principled commitment. But I would agree with Kofi Annan that the greatest danger to multilateralism and in fact the whole philosophy on which the United Nations rests, is today posed by the notion that preventive war can be carried out unilaterally or in ad hoc coalitions without any mandate from the United Nations Security Council, without this still universally acknowledged formal legitimation, as Kofi Annan formally warned. This can lead to unilateral use of force, outside international law and with

questionable justifications. Let me at the same time make clear that I strongly believe we should never entertain any ideas of accepting appeasement and I come from a country that experienced bitterly what consequences accepting appeasement can have.

We have to acknowledge that after the horrors of September 11, it is clear that a terrorist group can launch an attack without warning and even without the use of weapons of mass destruction. So we need to engage in a serious discussion on how to respond best to such threats or to threats of genocide, or use of massive violations of human rights. It's the same thing Kofi Annan made clear in the Millennium Summit in 1999, but we should consider the use of force only as the last resort, and I believe only within the multilateral context and onl if legitimized by the UN. I do believe that the international community acting in concert is vastly preferable to military action, which would be against the United Nations Charter and thus in violation of international law.

I would like to reiterate that the existence of the UN system is to serve as a forum or as a tool, or vehicle through which multilateral approaches can be initially developed and brought to fruition. During the last 10 years, more or less, the world has been learning how to better address these challenges. Wars in Bosnia or in Sierra Leone have been brought to an end. Timor East is now independent and I can testify from my own experiences as I visited the Island twice, that its future depends now on how successfully the United Nations would be able to complete its educational training and other programmes, which help to facilitate the transition to a functioning, sovereign and independent East Timor. United Nations, civil society groups and business are now working more closely together than ever, each recognising what we call the need for partnership. Without doubt, the UN is going through a very critical phase. At the same time, I think it is necessary to acknowledge that the UN is indeed collectively greater than the sum of its individual parts. It has no doubt achieved great successes, and it has no doubt its share of failures. Undoubtedly its greatest failures were in Africa, and I would still argue that Srebrenica, and Rwanda, will forever remain symbols of terrible human tragedy.

But I would suggest that they illustrate the consequences of a lack of political will on the part of some important member states. If I recall it correctly, it was the US Secretary of State, Madeline Albright, who threatened to veto any resolution to send additional peacekeeping troops to Rwanda. The best way to avoid dissolution I always argued is not to have any illusions about the UN. The United Nations is created to prevent us from going to hell, it is not created to take us to heaven. Some people clearly hope even today, that the UN can give the Lilliputians strings to restrain the global Gulliver. I think this is a bit of a simplification; however, I think that sits undoubtedly clear that the Lilliputians can some times negotiate collectively even with the global Gulliver with certain success, while on the other hand bilaterally they would be either ignored or defeated. Undoubtedly, the UN needs to be reformed and strengthened, but let us make clear the UN is not some super-state or super-organisation. The UN can only do what its members will allow it to do. And those members have now to acknowledge that the UN is still the most appropriate instrument to ensure peace and stability.

In the words of the UN Charter: the UN was created to "save succeeding generations from the scourge of war." I am convinced that the UN can help to create what I call an, 'optimal social and economic environment.' I think it is crucial to create conditions where people would be free of fear and hunger, as well as free from fear of oppression, where the rule of law and justice, (and I mean here to include social justice), will be able to nip in the bud sources of tensions, of conflicts and sources of wars, and be able to challenge feelings of powerlessness, and anger, because these feelings create fertile soil for radical extremism and sometimes even terrorist behaviour.

For example, the resolution that we passed through under my presidency on the prevention of armed conflict, and to fight to implement the Millennium Development Goals, including the reduction of poverty, are all clearly interlinked. And let me finish by recalling how the British film director Stanley Kubrik once observed that "great states behave like gangsters and small nations behave like prostitutes." I do believe that the multilateralist approach with its emphasis, on the need to respect the rules of international law on the one hand and the support for the basic principles of cooperation and solidarity on the other, can help to ensure that this realpolitik observation, can in time become obsolete, or at least one can still entertain this hope.

Emma Bonino, *Member of the European Parliament, former EU Commissioner*

I agree there is too much UN bashing all around. Nevertheless, even for people like me who still want to be multilateralist, it is evident that the UN, the EU and other multilateral institutions have to undergo quite radical reform simply to be updated with new challenges. Tomorrow, I think, Secretary-General Kofi Annan is going to announce the establishment of a high-level panel that he chose to consult around the world, be back in less that one year with some proposals for reform of the UN system on peace and security and some other agencies. In addition, I hope that so many of the highly experienced people that I see around this table will possibly be part of this high-level panel. Maybe this can be one of the tasks of the Forum. Let us try to help this high-level panel to come in a few months with proposals for a reform of the UN system to make them not the perfect organization – if we expect a perfect organisation, I think we really can go nowhere – but a better and more efficient organisation for the challenges of this century. So yes, I agree there is too much UN bashing and yes, there is a need to reform the UN system.

I do not want to dwell on what you said, mentioning the UN Security Council and others. It is clear the problem is located there, even if there has been a lot of proposals on how to reform the Security Council and other agencies. The problem is that there has been a lack of political will in sufficient quantity as to make any of these proposals come about. Maybe after the shock of this year some people will finally realize that something has to be done. Which is exactly why there are those who still believe that multilateral system, whatever its weaknesses, is anyhow better than a unilateral one.

On the second point, I would like to mention three things, and that is what has been said this morning that in my opinion can bring some understanding to the confusion. I will start from wording: for instance, I do not think peoples in the world share the same meaning of what 'peace' is. For my Palestinian friends 'peace' is peace plus land; for my Israeli friends it is peace plus security. For my Kosovar friends it is peace plus autonomy or independence; for my Chechen friends it is peace plus autonomy and independence. So I am not so sure when we simply say 'peace' we have the same meaning all over the world. Just recently, a few days ago in one of the Arab countries in which I live, as a European, I was confronted very angrily by a dissident of an Arab country who spent some years in jail. He said, "Look Mrs. Bonino, can you do me a favour when you march with millions for peace, can you just simply give it another name? Because your peace is our mass graves. So please, march for everything. By the way you are lucky enough to live in a country in which you can march, but just to avoid any kind of misunderstanding, give it another name. Your peace was my oppression, the mass graves in my country, the jails for 20 years for a lot of people, so call it another name. You have the perfect right to march for your beliefs, but do not call it peace – it is our oppression."

I think we have to understand them because in such a gathering as today's, we have been asked to give means and ideas. I do believe the complex world that has been described this morning has a lot of problems: poverty, water, land, etc. I think that the effort is to find a

thread to pull. You cannot solve every problem at once or at the same time. The challenge is to find a mean of pulling threads by which you can hope to find a better world, and for us the thread to pull is promoting freedom and democracy, which does not mean imposing: there are a lot of democrats all over the world, and it is plenty enough just to support them. There is no need to export democracy, to export it by arms or by force, it would be all really quite enough to support democratic groups that exist everywhere. Which, by the way, we do not do. Our credentials of supporting human rights and democracy in the world are, frankly speaking, very poor. In the Arab countries for instance, we treat them like a sort of oil pump. So long as the oil was at a reasonable price of 20-30 dollars, who cares about the people? Our credibility in this field is very poor. Moreover, in some fields we have to start from scratch.

However, I very much believe that the thread to pull is to promote democracy and freedom, which does not mean a Westminster style democracy in every detail. But as Kofi Annan rightly said in his last report, democracy must be considered as a human right *per se*, which is quite a clear-cut definition, even if it is not so clearly written in the UN Charter. You can read it in Article 21 of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights: Article 21 says that 'every citizen has the right to change their rulers by the force of the ballots and not the force of bullets.' Democracy is a much more complex issue than that, but at least it is there, as well as the right to peace, education and water. I strongly believe as Amartya Sen has clearly demonstrated, there is no sustainable economic development without freedom, and if we do not really make a consistent policy on that, then this can have other articulations. For instance, President Andreotti was saying: "You cannot think that the world of 193 member states can be managed from New York. It is also very important to have stronger regional organizations" – regional democratic organisations. Therefore, I think we are in a moment in which democracy and freedom cannot be overlooked any more and that they should be the essence of economic globalisation. I am not so visionary as to say that the only priority should be human rights, I am much more realist than that. I know that at least for economic relations to be fruitful and sustainable they have to go with the promotion of transparency, accountability and good governance – which means democracy.

I asked one of my Arab friends "why do you call it good governance and not democracy?," and he was the one who invented the term 'good governance', "because good governance scares us less, democracy is something western. We are meaning the same thing, but we prefer to call it good governance because that is less threatening, but we are talking of the same thing" I think it is important when we talk about peace to define what we mean by peace. Not everybody has the same meaning.

Secondly, I strongly disagree that terrorism stems from poverty. It is not true, terrorist organizations and their leaders have a clear-cut power political agenda, they never mention poverty alleviation. They can claim Palestinian suffering for their own public opinion but their clear agenda is a political power orientated agenda and nothing to do with poverty.

Thirdly, I disagree with a sort of conceptual model dividing states between post-modern, modern and pre-modern states. I think the real point is that the clash is between democratic, pre-democratic, and anti-democratic states.

Finally, I think that one idea I know our French friends do not like so much, is the notion of the Community of Democracies[1] promotion inside the UN system, or a democratic caucus. As there is the Islamic Organisation Conference and the Non-aligned Movement that has its own procedures and consistency in the UN system, I think that a democratic caucus can really foster a lot of good behaviour, with a balance of the stick and carrot, and I think that can be achieved.

I would not like to be in another conference in which we start discussing the clash of civilisations and the end of history, I am exhausted with this debate. A colleague of mine said that "maybe there is a writer here who could write a new bestseller that could be named the "*Clash of Huntington and the End of Fukuyama*." Maybe that would be the end of some rhetoric and stereotypes, not because they meant these stereotypes but because they have become *the* stereotypes. I think that we need a fresh critical vision of what we are and what the 'others' are. In promoting democracy West is not so credible, so we have a long way to go. However, we have to start, otherwise we will never reach our goal.

The third point is that we should not believe that democracy is the luxury of developed countries, and that no other countries are fit for it. That is not true, individual human beings have a universal aspiration for freedom, accountability and individualism. I think that is the thread to pull and I hope this Forum will really think about this. Without that, you do not solve the water issue, you do not solve development, you do not solve protectionism of agriculture and you do not solve anything else.

---

[1] For more information on the Community of Democracies see www.radicalparty.org and www.ccd21.org

Pierre Joxe, *Member of the French Constitutional Council, former French Minister for Internal Affairs*

We are here to put forward some proposals and suggestions for change. Certainly the UN system needs to be changed and it is possible to design a reform for an extensive system. The creation and the subsequent evolution of institutions such as the Society of Nations and, later on, of the United Nations took quite some time. I think we should focus on specific issues, such as the one mentioned this morning by Riccardo Petrella. I will refer to what he said about the water issue. His proposal implies juridical considerations, not only on the right to water supply, but also on the juridical status of water in the world. Mr. Petrella's proposal amounts to a complete juridical upset, as it questions the idea of property of water and considers water as a common asset of the whole of mankind. Water as such would not be subject to a private property regime but to that of a collective, global property. This is a very interesting view, not only geopolitically but juridically as well. And I would discuss the juridical aspect.

This morning Mr. Scalfaro defined preemptive war as an assault to international law. Mr. Colombo stated that unilateralism weakens both the UN and international law. I would point out to you a strange paradox: international justice has made great progress, while international law is going trough a phase of regression. From Roman law we learn that law progresses when justice is institutionalized. The same applies to the law of our countries: law without a judge is a denial of justice and a judge without law is abuse. Law and justice go hand in hand. This principle is clearly stated in domestic laws and is found also in European law. So why what is sound here is not applicable also on the international scale?

I may recall that international justice has made huge progress in the last century. Century that started with the genocide of Armenians and ended with the genocides committed in Rwanda and in a number of other countries, and during which there was the horrendous genocide of the *Shoah*. So why am I speaking of the progress of law? This took place in Rome in 1998 with the Statutes that led to the creation of the International Criminal Court and that were signed by a larger number of countries than it required for it to come into force. That was an incredible evolution, even if it took some time, since the creation of international justice is always a slow process.

The Geneva Convention of 1854 was the first to introduce the idea that war needed to be compatible with the laws of humanity. Then came the Hague Conventions of 1899 and 1907 on the protection of the population in time of war. During World War One the authorities of the Ottoman Empire were warned by France, Russia and Great Britain who established that the perpetrators of the massacres of Armenians would be prosecuted and punished. But, as you all know, the Treaty of Versailles, which included three clauses envisaging an international jurisdiction to try Wilhelm II, was never enforced and neither Wilhelm II nor those responsible for the massacres were ever tried. Then we had the Society of Nations experience, with results not always positive; World War Two; the painfully slow

attempts to set up a Penal Chamber within the International Court of Justice; and then, at the end of the war, the attempts to institutionalize the Nuremberg and Tokyo Tribunals. Against expectations, these two tribunals had a very brief duration and tried only about ten people. It was only at the end of the XX century, and after the chock of Yugoslavia and Rwanda, that it was possible to create at first two *ad hoc* criminal courts that were to judge the crimes committed in Yugoslavia and Rwanda, and then, in 1998, the International Criminal Court whose Statutes were signed in Rome.

Art. 5 of the Statutes of the ICC distinguishes four categories of crimes: genocide, crimes against humanity, war crimes and the crime of aggression. This last type of crime involves some difficulty in interpretation, as it is difficult to give a specific definition of the term aggression. Progress achieved by the international juridical system led to the creation of different penal jurisdictions, but no treaty ever gave a clear definition of the term aggression. The UN Charter, for example, alludes to this concept without defining it. Only in 1974 a definition of the term, albeit incomplete and insufficient, was given and this proves the difficulty of overcoming the fundamental problem of sovereignty and of the definition, in international law, of self-defense or, more correctly, of legitimate use of force.

The treaty establishing the International Criminal Court considers aggression a crime but, rather ironically, paragraph 2 states that "The Court will exercise its competence with regard to the crime of aggression when a provision is adopted in conformity with Articles 121 and 123 that define this crime and establish the conditions for the exercise of the Court's competence in this matter."

So we see that jurisdiction has made progress but it constantly runs into the conceptual obstacle of the difficulty on the part of the criminal law and the international law to define the term aggression.

A number of speakers this morning have already addressed these issues, so, for the sake of brevity, I will just mention two particularly thorny questions. International law justifies aggression in case of self-defense. But what is self-defense? Rather than giving generic examples, I will refer to two recent tragedies.

Israel authorities, for example, based on the principle of self-defense and of preemptive action, justified the destruction of buildings in Jenin, that of the headquarters of the Palestinian Authority and the homicide attacks to political leaders considered at the head of terrorists. The juridical category of self-defense is present in international law, working as an excuse and turning aggression into self-defense. Today violence has reassured the Israeli public opinion and has militarily intimidated Palestinian activists. However it has emblematically destroyed any peace perspective needed for the creation of a Palestinian State, and it did so by destroying the headquarters, humiliating the Palestinian Authority and physically eliminating individuals and leaders.

The same ambiguity can be seen in the recent conduct of the United States. It is increasingly clear that the principle of self-defense was applied to wage the war against Iraq. It is quite legitimate to conduct preemptive action against a country that has surely facilitated or organized the homicide attacks of September 2001, or that has or produces mass destruction

weapons, such as chemical, biological or nuclear weapons. But, in order to define such preemptive action as self-defense the accusations must have a foundation in international law. We all know that that was not the case and that international law was ignored from the beginning, since the United States did not even ask the opinion of the Security Council, or rather they acted as if they had obtained it and Resolution 1441 was enough.

So, how can the symmetrical concepts of aggression and self-defense be defined? I believe that in depth reflection is required, not of the juridical aspects alone, in order to analyze and expound the concept of aggression, which was defined by the United Nations too late and in an incomplete and ineffective way. This, in my opinion, is simpler and more useful than a far reaching reform on the UN organization. This reform does not involve intellectuals or schools of thought but the Member States.

To be realistic I do not think we should wait for an evolution of the law, but it is necessary to take a stand in favor of measures for peace and security, such as immediately sending a peace-keeping force to separate the parties in Palestine, to avoid the worsening of the tragedy experienced by the population in the region.

These, I believe, are the main measures we should think about.

Giovanni Conso, *Chairman of the Accademia dei Lincei, former President of the Constitutional Court*

Listening to Emma Bonino and Pierre Joxe I already found myself on the path I prefer, but it is a winding path. Preferences are usually comprised of enthusiasm and conviction. Sometimes however, as a series of difficulties and obstacles arise, the dream risks fading away. Instead it must be retained, because the battle against war crimes and against the crime of aggression has to be fought right to the end – right to the last hope.

Now, I believe that at this point one thing needs to be superimposed – on that which has already been said and what will be said – this includes looking towards the practicality of the road ahead. Here we are talking of new approaches and new goals. The routes, when they are already outlined, imply the need to respect reality; perhaps the end may not be reached, but a certain route must be followed. Perhaps one will retire at one stage, but from a stage, not from the program. Soon we have some dates that sooner or later will pose this problem, which I would like to spell out. I believe that this is the only chance we have to ensure that the permanent International Criminal Court is readjusted, faced with the many missing important ratifications that there are.

In September 2008, the General Assembly of States, which has met in that month for two years and has done good work those two years, is now a tradition and it will be even more so in 2008. In that year, one of the tasks of this Assembly will be the revision of the Court Statute. The revision of the Statute is planned, naturally on the basis of proposals that will have to be balanced and presented, but inevitably there will be some, whether many or few I do not know, but there will be some. It is absolutely necessary to grasp this deadline in order to accommodate certain needs whether we like them or not, so as to enable, let's say, a strengthening of the system, of the Court.

The revision will make it possible to take into account certain shortcomings, perhaps not foreseen immediately or any that have occurred, so as to attract those who are outside it to soften their position. 2008 must be the deadline. But in 2008 another deadline is in the air, in fact rather more than in the air, which is part of the more complicated road that regards the Tribunal for the former Yugoslavia. It has already been decided that the so-called preliminary investigations and the enquiries must stop in 2004. After 2004, the prosecution will no longer be able to conduct investigations. In 2008, and this is where the dates coincide, it will no longer be able to pass first sentences and in 2012 the curtain will also fall on appeal judgments. This means that it has been planned at The Hague court, not the new court – let's call it the 'old court' – both co-existing, to stop the work of that court.

This is an inescapable problem, because those who wanted the 'old court' for the former Yugoslavia – the Tribunal in The Hague, which was set-up and supported through the Act of the Security Council, supported by countries, including the United States – almost seem to prefer the method of the ad hoc tribunal to the one of a pre-constituted court. It is clear that, at a certain moment, those who approved and wanted that Tribunal will have to come to terms

with those who, instead, are deciding the three-stage halting of its activities. It will not be possible to ignore this; it will not be possible to say 'No, let's not talk about it'. No! This time it will have to be talked about at the end of 2004, so fairly soon. In any case, in 2008, the new courts jurisdiction comes into force. This will mean an end to judgments, even those already prepared will not be able to continue if the first-level trial is not finished. This is a sort of invalidity by prescription of a global nature.

It is clear that those who wanted that Tribunal, faced with the attitude of those who maybe preferred the new court in The Hague, hope that the other one finishes, because it is not possible to go on with two courts and also because of the enormous expense, as economic problems condition the operations of both courts.

I think that, on this terrain, setting 2008 for the end of the judgments of the Tribunal for Yugoslavia and the revision, for the first time, of the new Court in The Hague, discussion will be needed as this problem cannot be avoided.

So on the agenda there will be, on the one hand, the aspect concerning crime of aggression. This was postponed, right at the beginning, to the first revision session, which will be that of 2008 where the problem will be tackled. It will be necessary to find a way for greater participation at that Assembly that today has 92 states and might become 100, but some fundamental ones are missing, starting with the United States. It is therefore absolutely imperative to find the way to broaden this discussion. And then, on the other hand, are war crimes, because Minister Joxe has rightly spoken of war crimes. Something paradoxical is happening. There is practically, no longer much talk about crimes against humanity because with the wars currently in progress, with the crimes that are being committed, the main objective becomes that of war crimes. Peace means war; it means avoiding and condemning war crimes. The rest moves a little into the background and there is no doubt that, with the wars in progress and with the wars not yet finished, as we certainly cannot consider that war in Iraq or Afghanistan really finished and others are on the horizon, even if there has been a peace agreement there. So the theme of war crimes becomes fundamental and is a question that should be tackled in the broadest scenario, with the widest participation. The opportunities are there, in effect. I hope that the search for mediation and not a continuation at loggerheads emerges between those who support one solution and those who support the other. One group saying: 'We do not accept this, you are bad because you do not accept it', does not lead to a result.

I think and hope that this chance is taken in time, because waiting until the last minute makes it difficult to reach an agreement that will bear discussion, shift from conflict to debate and looking each other directly in the face. These are two situations which cannot co-exist: one only must survive. I believe it cannot be anything but the permanent court, because it is a pre-constituted judge, of global dimensions and not only limited to the territory of the Balkans as the experiences, however significant, of the ad hoc Tribunal for the former Yugoslavia are.

Tom Gehrels, *Professor at the University of Arizona*

Our world has serious problems, but there is good news also. The first good news is that the number of children per family is coming down. In India in the 1970's it was 6 children per family. Today it is 2.3 per family. This is largely accomplished through educational television by cosmic ray physicist Vikram Sarabhai, with help from Prime Minister Indira Ghandi and industrialist and philanthropist J.R.D. Tata. There was no television in the 1970's in India, so Sarabhai erected a transmitter in Ahmedabad and distributed the TV sets to the villages and slums. There were hurdles and setbacks, but in the 1980's the number of children per family came down. However, the news on the future of the world is that the same is happening in large communities in other parts of the world.

The second good news that I would like to report on is that several organisations are uniting to diminish poverty in the slums. A new integration is on the way also in India, which concentrates on the lowest level of poverty in the slums and in the streets, and it concentrates on the children. This is deliberately done to bring them to school and is called *Akanksha*, which is translated as 'aspirations' – that is the aspirations of these children to get out. This organization has a beautiful website, they are fairly new but they already have 30 centres of 60 children each, and the cost is very low. The teachers are being paid, and the way it works is that in the morning, the teacher goes into the slum to collect her children and the children come running and are eager to do this. Then she takes them to existing schools, or *Akanksha* schools in donated space that is usually provided by industry. So, the two teachers per 60 countries which in most countries is a large number but there is no discipline problem and the teachers are helped by volunteers, often retired people. Some food is bought, and clothing, and they are provided with some follow-up and personality building because these are children who have had a horrible past. The cost is a quarter of a USD per child, per day. So, that translates into 100 dollars per year. And they want to do it for five years. This is not a continuing philanthropic project, it is only for five years. So it is 500 dollars you need for the five years of education of these children. Now what we're trying to do is to help in this problem of globalisation. Globalisation has so far not affected, not looked for labour at the very lowest level. It is the higher levels that are being employed at this time. And now we are trying to talk the industry CEO's into taking an interest in these children, as they are very eager to learn.

It is remarkable what you can do with these children. They learn English at the same time as their local language. Therefore, with these industries we try to catch their attention to follow them a bit, and see if they can perhaps educate them after the 5 years and perhaps employ them. In a few years, this has reached so far in the city of Mumbai: 1,800 children and it is spreading rapidly. So the idea with these children is that they will find their own resources and that they will go very far.

Anyone of us can help with this. Starting today we can either give a donation or help, with people especially round this table and at the back of the world too. We want to spread it

as far as it will go. The goal is ultimately 200 million children all over the world, but adapting to local conditions. So the principles of this whole effort are local control, the fact that parents are involved. It depends on teachers' dedication – they have to work hard – but this is a job that teachers love to do, to work with material like this. And finally, it depends on our determination to see it through. But, we need help to find national or regional organizers who in turn find organizers in various cities in their country or region; who in turn hires teachers, finds space and finds donors. At this time, it is going quite well, spreading at least in India. But, we do find it difficult to gain access to CEO's – you need an introduction, and as with all fundraising the secretary will not let you in.

So as a scientist this is a fascinating experiment as to who will help and who will care, and will it work in countries like Indonesia? So far in India there are of course Muslim students also and there doesn't seem to be a problem. The girls are taken out somewhat earlier than the boys are. That is the only difference. Will it work in South America? We will learn and if this succeeds I will report in coming years to you about this. We may be raising the world economies from bottom up, because once you get these kids to do their own thing, make their own decisions and find their own resources, they will be needing the help and the interaction with the layers above them. So, to see if this will work: we must raise world economies from bottom up.

AN APPEAL TO THE READERS
by **Tom Gehrels**

Please help in the campaign to raise slum children described below. It is a large undertaking, mostly by volunteers, for which international participation is essential. If you can afford it, please help financially – any amount will work a miracle for a child. If you know potential contributors among individuals, organizations or corporations anywhere – or potential participants in countries and cities that have slums – please introduce the campaign to them, or forward their address to us. At the address of <tgehrels@u.arizona.edu> and at the website www.akanksha.org we can provide further information and support, also regarding tax deduction for donations.

Jack Matlock, *Former US Ambassador to the Soviet Union*

Our task today, I believe, is to look at the future and think about what we should do. Of course, we must consider the past, without a better understanding of the past we are apt to keep making the same mistakes. Nevertheless, it seems to me that what we have heard has at times been distorted by generalizations that are neither accurate nor helpful. US unilateralism, which does exist and which I deplore, is not the sole or, in my opinion, even the primary cause of the world's problems. If it disappears tomorrow, the world's problems will not be solved unless we have more realistic approaches to these problems.

The theories on which we operate need to be subjected to the facts of the real world. Our American administration, I believe, operated on some mistaken theories, particularly regarding the ease of reconstructing Iraq and establishing democratic government there. Now the United States is saddled with the problem of doing so, which will be a political liability for the president of the United States in the future. The United States is a democracy even though its legal system brought a president to office who received fewer votes than his opponent did. Nevertheless, he is held accountable. In the long run, no United States president can continue a route of unilateralism without paying a political price at home.

For that reason, I believe we need to focus in other aspects of the current world situation. Some phrases that we hear often, and have heard occasionally today, are concepts such as bipolarism, multipolarism, and unipolarism. It seems to me that these terms represent a distorted view of power in the world today. I understand the reasons people use the terms, but they are based almost entirely on military power. I can assure you that even during the Cold War, when supposedly we had a "bipolar" world, as an American diplomat I spent most of my time, not ordering people around, but trying to make compromises to keep our alliance together. Neither the United States nor the Soviet Union had the power to order people around. Nor today does the war on terrorism give anyone that power. Some rhetoric from certain American figures would seem to suggest otherwise, but they are wrong, if that is what they mean. Most of today's problems, including threats to security, cannot be solved by military means alone.

So where does that leave us? First of all we need to be practical not only in the way we look at the world but also in the way we look at solutions. Instead of simplifying a complex world by using terms like unipolarity, we should take account of the sort of factors Lord Skidelsky mentioned. Madame Bonino's proposed framework is also a preferable approach. We must look at the world in terms other than military power. You have to ask – "Power to do what?". Military power does not help us deal with our health problems; military power does not help us deal with our environmental problems. And obviously, effective power to deal with those problems can only be created by common action on the part of a number of countries, not by single countries alone, however powerful.

When we are looking at these issues, we need to avoid excessive generalization. It has been said that "all politics is local". We must always ask ourselves which of the proposals are

going to be acceptable to the countries that are going to have to implement them. If certain proposals are not acceptable to crucial countries, we should think about ways to make them acceptable. Often, this will require modification so that the best does not become the enemy of the good. If we begin to look at things that way, we will find that more progress has been made in dealing with concrete problems than we often realise.

New structures are being developed; they are developing organically, not the result of some overall scheme. Note how much more successful the World Health Organization (WHO) was in preventing a SARS epidemic than the world community was with AIDS, which got out of hand before we saw any action. Whether this will continue to be the case on the future we cannot be sure, but it is an example of the sort of progress that can be made in dealing with concrete problems.

The development of the new world order may well resemble more the development of the British constitution than the writing of the American constitution. And I think that international law may come to resemble some aspects of Anglo Saxon common law – that is the development of customs and habits – rather than adopting Roman-law types of legislation. We need both types of course but what is important is whether the international community is meeting the real needs that the people feel. There are encouraging signs, like *Akanksha*, and I think that there are many more.

Those who worry about American unilateralism should pay attention to the fact that though the United States is concerned about the potential of nuclear weapons in Iran, the administration is working through the International Atomic Energy Agency to deal with the problem. Moreover, when it comes to North Korea and the real threat nuclear weapons there would pose, the United States is working with other countries. It has, in fact, rejected a purely bilateral approach. If we begin to look for success stories or potential success stories, we can find them. We need to expand on that experience.

Is the UN as weak as some say? I agree with those that say some assertions of UN weakness are overdrawn. Of course, the United Nations and particularly the Security Council reflect the policies of their members. The organization is not so much at fault as are its members. To the degree the Security Council is able to respond to the perceived needs of its members, whether in the security area or otherwise, it will be relevant. If, however, it seems to ignore perceived security threats and operate on a simplistic theoretical basis, aiming to change a "unipolar world," to a "multipolar world," then it will fail. That sort of abstract reasoning will lead us to unnecessary fights and will weaken the organization. The fact is the United States needs the UN as much as the rest of the world does, but the organization can be crippled if some members try to use it against countries that are essential to its effectiveness.

The UN clearly could benefit from reform, but the United States has never stood in the way of UN reform. The rest of the world has great difficulty in deciding what the reform should be in practical terms. If more members of the Security Council are needed, fine, but who should they be? The bigger the Security Council gets the more difficult it will be to make decisions. There are tradeoffs here, and one can always think of countries that by rights should be permanent members, and yet other countries in their region do not necessarily agree on that

identity. There are great political problems involved in making fundamental changes in existing institutions, no matter how desirable these changes might be if viewed in the abstract.

We should continue to think about United Nations reform but not wait for it before we do other things to deal with the problems of the day. With the right attitude, we can better utilize the United Nations, even with its current, unreformed structure. That should be the direction of most of our efforts.

Pierre Marc Johnson, *former Prime Minister of Québec*

We are asked to consider adaptive behaviors to the changing world we live in. I will not address the fight against terrorism or its successful or unsuccessful outcome. I will address political behavior in the international Trade arena.

I make the following basic assumptions: the USA will exercise hegemony, of course militarily, but mostly in security, technological and economic terms; Europe will emerge as a quasi–state; China's economic progress will turn into increasing political and strategic might; there will be a continuous expansion of the market economy system across the world, accompanied by the consolidation of property rights and extension of democratic values to a dominant number of countries.

And all of this will take place in a context of increasingly porous borders in economic, scientific, cultural and social terms, in other words a globalization context, the subject here of my short intervention.

Increased economic growth and welfare for nations, enterprises and individual through the leveling of the economic field faces a major challenge: the necessity to accommodate in parallel to and within international trade rules, a huge corpus of social, environmental, human rights, cultural and developmental claims and demands stemming from an articulate, diverse, numerous and well heard constellation of Non Governmental Organizations.

Indeed, globalization is first about the circulation of goods, services and capital. Contractually entered into international agreements allow freer trade through decreased tariffs and disciplines. States thus commit to refrain from intervening legislatively and otherwise in a way that impedes free circulation of goods, services and capital.

Secondly, globalization is about a scientific revolution, that of information and communications technologies; this revolution is allowing massive circulation of data, information and knowledge. It has facilitated the establishment of sophisticated networks of interests, and mostly it has proven to be an accessible, cheap, and efficient means of political mobilization.

Thirdly, globalization is about a series of phenomena: some biophysical and some political and sociological that have created a new political terrain that is all inclusive of nations and interests yet still without a precise democratic rules book. This new unclearly defined terrain of broad international activities emerged as a result of many phenomena.

There are threats to the global commons (climate change, rarefaction of ocean commercial resources, stratospheric ozone depletion and desertification of agricultural lands). There are concerns about the depleting economic base of the world economy as natural resources are destroyed at a high rate. The Non-Security/non-Trade agenda has expanded beyond these concerns to such issues as women's and children's rights, human rights, social equity and the fight against world poverty and the fight against corruption. These operate in the context of a "vertical loss" of sovereignty of the traditional Nation State. Powers are being relinquished in favor of international Trade Regimes, and others, in the context of the fight

against deficits are delegated to sub national levels of government. This results in an apparent loss of legitimacy and relevancy of national governments.

If the rhythm of trade liberalization is to be maintained, the international community will need to address the non Trade agenda of globalization. This should take the form of nurturing democratic processes and increasing the relative strength of Non Trade International Agreements.

First, the process issue is a core one. In countries that have a strong democratic tradition, political authorities must demonstrate to their constituents that they can strike a balance between economic growth and social and environmental concerns. Indeed, it is not conceivable in most western democracies to overhaul – let us say health or educational systems – without a clear electoral mandate or an important public input. Yet the consequences of adhering to International Trade Regimes are of the same political nature as major domestic social reforms. Through the paramount application of their provisions over national legislation and regulation, International Trade Agreements have entered into a quasi-constitutional mode: indeed, like constitutions, their implementation imposes constraints and limitations on the capacities of governments to make policy. This has become a legitimate source of concerns for civil society, whose systematic claims to participation in international negotiations becomes understandable. Even though a process issue, this is a crucial one. Democratic systems demand the maintaining of a sense of legitimacy and its appearance. Going about reforming institutions such as the powers of the State requires public acceptance. Thus, just as if they entered into major domestic policy reforms, democratic public authorities must find ways to adequately integrate civil society in the ongoing fundamental reform dynamics brought about by international trade liberalization. This means more transparency, more accountability and strong political interventions in what has been traditionally the realm of specialized often opaque trade bureaucracies.

The second aspect of the globalization dynamics that must be addressed is the relative importance given to Non-Trade/Security international instruments. There is a myriad of such instruments. They have been negotiated under the pressures of various NGOs pushing for global and international approaches to human rights protection, environmental conservation and sustainable development, women's and children's rights, the fight against global poverty, the fight against corruption. Leadership emanating from some OECD countries has made place for the development of a dense corpus of international law addressing these and other issues. But these instruments are mostly non-sanctionable. They are also under funded, often poorly staffed and seen in isolation and segregated from the trade agenda. The issue of sanctionability of international instruments will not be solved in the short term. In spite of the diluting effects of trade agreements on the exercise of sovereignty, there is still enough around (except in part on Security and Trade issues) for states to oppose the sanctioning of those in breach of their commitments. Sufficient funding, adequate staffing. Better inter-convention coordination, can compensate partly for the absence of "clout" of these conventions. Also energetic interventions by Ministries of Finance, and of Foreign Affairs as central organs of states, can ensure better follow up of these international agreements that have often suffered

from very low grade political involvement. Actions by such international forum as the G-8 and the (original) G-20 at the heads of states and Ministers of Finance levels are also a way to ensure better priorization by major actors of these issues.

Acting on civil society's presence in international processes is also a promising avenue. There is a tendency to caricature civil society's concerns by contextualising them in the folkloric disruptions of international events brought about by the anarchist high jack of otherwise peaceful and legitimate demonstrations. This is not constructive or useful.

Reflection and systematic movement toward multi-level involvement of civil society organizations is essential to the successful progression, the deepening and the extension of international trade liberalization regimes. Addressing the international negotiations democratic gap can be insured by the presence of non commercial interests in the usual domestic institutional context (parliamentary commissions, executive branch consultations etc.) but it must also be transported in the international arena and forum. By securing a place for civil society's presence, the international processes will not only gain in legitimacy but will find potential allies, and sometimes funding for the implementation of various non trade conventions.

Not securing this place will impede the furthering of international trade liberalization as expressions of dissatisfaction emerge in democratic countries.

Many of these decisions will require from politicians original thinking and acting at the multilateral level. Considering their present policies on multilateral systems, one must not expect at this point any initiative from the United States. It is for other OECD countries, and major developing countries to act.

Hubert Vedrine, *former French Minister of Foreign Affairs*

I would like to briefly share with you my view on the current world situation. First of all, I think that through the Nineties we cherished the illusion that we were a part of an international community – the words were often repeated in many debates – thinking that the world would soon be unified thanks to the generalized dissemination of the western type of democracy and of the market economy, and that we would be living fully under the rule of law. Based on this belief we founded the Society of Nations, and then the United Nations at a time when nations were certainly not united. So we went through a period of optimism, so unreal an optimism that it rendered us blind. The document which, I think, best shows this blindness, this unrealism, this sort of *"Unrealpolitik"* is the Millenium Declaration adopted by the United Nations in September 2000, a fascinating document but unfortunately very disconnected from the world reality.

In the past three years a number of tragedies took place that made us come back to reality quite painfully. We have seen the failure of the peace process in the Near East, the continuing incomprehension and antagonism between Islam and the West (I am not speaking of 'clash', since from antagonism to clash the passage is not automatic), the metamorphosis of the United States. I have been speaking of '*hyperpower*' since 1998 and not as a criticism but rather as a description of the fact that this country has grown too great to accept to follow the rules established for everyone else. I believe all this was already true for some time, then there was the election of George W. Bush with his administration that is completely different from the previous ones, and terrorism, and September 11 – which was not the starting point of change since most of the disquieting phenomena were already there – and the Iraq war waged without UN support, and the resurfacing of the North-South gap.

So the situation of the world in 2003 differs markedly from the hopes expressed in the big UN meetings in the Nineties and from all the discussions of the type of simposium and forum mainly attended by people who share humanitarian purposes, much good will, strong idealism, but who do not actually represent the world we live in.

The term 'Third Millenium' has been much abused, but, in fact, it does not mean anything. You could even say that Third Millenium means 'crashing to the ground at take-off'. I am saying this because I think that all this is not exclusively due to the Bush administration. It would be over-simplistic to think so. Many people in the world are concerned about American policies and politics, they protest, they hope it is something transient and that already in 2004 American voters will appoint a Democrat, whose name is not yet known, who will pursue a multilateral policy. I think that this is once again an illusion. I believe the American metamorphosis is deep and long lasting. The Bush administration is its exaggerated expression, with its adventurism, its militarism, with a reactionary dimension in its religious grounding. Nonetheless there are some basic elements which I think will continue to exist. Perhaps I will be proven wrong, but I think the United States will be unilateralist for a long time and they will be able to do so in a kinder and more gentle manner. I have followed

closely the Clinton-Albright administration. At that time, France and the United States cooperated very effectively, as never before, but even under that administration it was thought that the world should accept the benevolent leadership of the United States, which was good for all and had to be accepted graciously as it was proposed kindly, in spite of being a general leadership. This is why I don't think that the questions we are debating today will disappear even in case of a change in the next elections.

What can be done, then?

A logical solution would be to try and see how a multilateral system can be relaunched. It is a tragic choice, the one between today's United Nations, quite impotent from many points of view, and Rumsfeld's policy. So we have to find an alternative, to reform the United Nations so that they can regain full legitimacy. Just as it was done after World War Two, it is necessary to review the UN Charter, both in its theoretical founding principles and in its practical aspects. These issues are widely known: first of all a way must be found to expand the Security Council, to identify its new permanent members and the non-permanent members; then the veto question must be solved. I think that neither the United States nor any other country will ever relinquish their veto power, so new rules are required. Then there is the question of Art. 7: it is no longer possible to have a Charter that provides for intervention only in case international peace and security are endangered. It is necessary to establish principles that clearly define who must decide when a population is in danger, and in this case the right of veto should not apply. These are all issues that must be analyzed when undertaking the reform of the UN. I also think that some forms of protection should be envisaged, such as protectorates, since among the 200 members of the United Nations dozens are incompetent, they do not function, their politicians can scarcely keep their own capital cities under control.

I think these considerations must be introduced in the Charter; if not, the risk is resorting to force and Rumsfeld will be justified in saying that he conducted a preventive and necessary war, and Western countries might be led to think that they are forced to intervene. If the Charter is not reformed we might find ourselves in the same negative situation we experienced in the colonial era.

The necessary reform of the United Nations is extremely complex and can be pursued only with the agreement of the Security Council Permanent Members. But the present US administration will never accept such a reform because it is not in its interest to re-legitimize the UN. The United States, in fact, prefer to appeal to the UN only in some cases, but they do not want the UN to play a central role. And what will Russia and China do about this?

I believe that countries that participate in forum such as this should in any case think about the reform of the UN because, even if it may seem unrealistic, when it is finally proposed it will have greater political strength and will be perceived as a viable alternative that the various countries involved will have difficulty rejecting.

I am sure that there are in the world a number of wise political leaders, whether still active politically or not, that are capable to draft the new future UN Charter.

Before closing I would like to touch upon two other issues. Still with reference to the reform of the United Nations, there are two conflicting ideas. In Europe we often hear people say it is intolerable that the UN include non democratic countries among their members. Just remember the turmoil caused by Libya taking the chair of the Human Rights Commission. We must make a clear distinction between two concepts: we either create an organization of democracies or we create the organization of the countries of the world. So, to all those who are in favor of an organization of democracies I say that is a nice and positive idea, but democracies must first of all pursue an intelligent policy towards non democratic countries. I do not think that democracy is equivalent to a sudden conversion. I often say that democracy is not like instant coffee, it is a political and social process. On the other hand you cannot shoot at democracy. So there must be a logic behind the process and a community of democracies can be accepted if its policy towards others is intelligent.

Secondly, we need an organization of all countries in the world, whether democratic or not, otherwise we risk regression. We need a forum to discuss any issue, regardless of the regimes in power. So it would perhaps be better to suppress the UN Human Rights Commission rather than inventing criteria for membership.

The last issue I will address is Europe. It is here, in fact, that we can find a variable adaptation. In pursuing our common policy need to build a true international community, we constantly refer to Europe. But Europeans for a long time have pursued a 'wishful thinking' policy, that is they have confused their wishes with reality. In truth, Europeans living in the European Union to this day still do not agree about what the role of Europe in the world should be. They can't reach an agreement on this simply because the question has never been addressed before: as it was a thorny question, they chose to postpone it and now it came back quite strongly. And what is the disagreement about? Some Europeans – I mean governments and people – simply want to enjoy a space for wealth, peace, security and freedom. All this is undoubtedly a huge improvement over the past. But there is no mention of power. And there are other Europeans, the French in particular, who want a Europe of powers. This is a contradiction, as they want a Europe of powers because they believe that is nothing more than an enlarged France. Of course the situation is very different and a compromise will be needed.

There are differences in the idea of Europe itself. Many Europeans do not like the idea of a Europe of powers and prefer a "wait-and-see" policy. The British, for example, refuse the idea because they think that it divides the Western world and is therefore dangerous. To them there is only one leader, the United States. Many in Europe also do not like the idea of powers since they feel that, after 1945, the very idea of power was abandoned in Europe and we should not step back, power being dangerous, negative and even obscene. These Europeans want to hear justifications for the theories of the Bush administration, for what Robert Kagan says about the Europeans coming from Venus and the Americans from Mars. So they foster the current American vision that in Europe you have to be extremely kind, have an idealistic view of the world and believe you live in a post-tragic world. But the world *is* tragic, so a serious country must be concerned with world safety, and it's America that is playing the game. Therefore those European that reject the idea of power run the risk of living in a

powerless and dependent Europe and of being unable, in the long run, to maintain the European way of life which is our common asset.

I think we should face the fact that Europeans have not yet reached an agreement about the different ideas of Europe. In order to make a decision it would be useful to discuss the question among us Europeans, even if the discussion could develop into a heated argument. I hope the disputes may be followed by the birth of a specific Europe of powers, exemplary, respectful of the international law, and obviously an ally of the United States. It would be useless and absurd to create a Europe of powers at war with the US.

To conclude, I am very confident about the future partnership between Europe and the United States. This alliance is possible as the United States want allies and Europeans are hesitant to become such. It would be desirable that on the one hand the United States were able to control their own power and, on the other, that Europeans could achieve more power. These two aspects are not currently present, but I believe this is not a definitive situation.

Francesco Cossiga, *former President of the Italian Republic*

Three excellent speakers have all raised points that particularly impressed me. One, my friend Mikhail Gorbachev, in the face of all the references to the use of international law to achieve peace, has, in a certain sense, made a claim for the primacy of politics. For some time, now, academics all over the world have been debating whether international law is or is not law. The changes in International law have been so many that we can hardly say what it is; unless we want to take as such, the confused and vague resolutions of the Security Council which state one thing and immediately afterwards deny what they stated; which sincerely, does not seem a viable solution.

The second thing. Ambassador Matlock rightly said that, unfortunately, international laws have been formed according to only European rationalistic criteria, while it would have been better if the Statute of the United Nations was like the British constitution, which does not exist and is nothing other than the result of precedents, and just like common law is not decided by others but established by real relations between people.

The last thing that struck me was certainly that of my friend Mr. Vedrine, who highlighted how the United Nations is not the organization of democratic states but the organization of democratic and non-democratic states. But dear Vedrine, if it is not the organization of democratic states, do we really want to give the last word to this organization on what is right and what is not right, on what is true and what is not? In politics, I try not to talk of truth but rather what is appropriate and what is not appropriate. Is it really the United Nations, whose Security Council is the peace maker? How about the United States, the home of freedom, which was excluded from the Human Rights Committee and instead the presidency was given to Libya, with all due respect to its representative? Let me note that viewing the United Nations as a source of international law and establish that what the United Nations allows is right and what the United Nations does not allow is not right. The UN is not a society of bandits and it is not a society of gentlemen. It is a society of bandits *and* gentlemen. It is the society of President Chirac and small African dictators, the one of President Putin and of those who have destroyed their countries and who used Western aid to achieve that destruction. The Tutsis who had killed the Hutus under the indifferent gaze of Kofi Anan have voting rights as much as everyone else.

I believe that the problem is to find a new equilibrium between states; first and foremost between the world's democratic states. The balance reached in reality with Yalta and the division of the world in two has been broken. The world was not divided arbitrarily in two. It was not divided arbitrarily at Yalta any more than Europe was designed arbitrarily after the Peace of Westphalia, *cuius regio eius religio*, in which a Catholic found himself a Protestant merely because his sovereign was. After the treaty of Vienna and Versailles, which destroyed a real force like the Austro-Hungarian Empire, we did manage to find balances. International rights were created, they manage to regulate, to stabilize those balances and to solve minor

conflicts within those balances. Outside those balances, conflicts have been resolved historically by war.

If one goes to look at the first people who wrote about international law, the first Scholars, but above all the great Scholars of the school of Salamanca: De Vitoria, Molina, Suarez, the Protestant Grotius, the founder of international law who cites the Dominican Catholic De Vitoria 702 times, one will see that international law has always been talked about, i.e. the international law of peace and the international law of war. Both peace and war are the normal state of the international community. Except that for war to be legitimate what is needed ethically, but not legally however, whether defensive or not defensive, is that it must be declared.

The system of international law is not only the international law of peace, there are broader agreements that concern the international law of war than those that concern the international law of peace, because, at the end of the day, peace does not need agreements.

The fall of the Berlin Wall, is what undercuts the equilibrium that had maintained peace. As long as the two superpowers existed, there were no tragedies such as the ones we have seen recently in Africa. Even the conflict between Palestinians and Israelis was a low-intensity conflict and it was not assumed because the two powers, each in their own frame exercised power, not only through military force, but through ideals. That ideological dream of peace and liberation on both sides helped to maintain peace and stability in so many parts of the world.

Today I must tell you that in my life I had to face the necessity to make choices. I've been in the situation to decide together with Helmut Schmidt whether to deploy missiles or not, in response to the Soviet rearmament imprudently launched by Brezhnev with the SS20s. The choice of peace would certainly have been not to react. Likewise, the choice of peace in 1939 would have been saying to Poland, 'cede Danzig'. Was it worth dying for Danzig? On the basis of today's principles of peace, absolutely not!

Stalin's initiative to make the famous Molotov-Ribbentrop agreement was a demonstration of great political understanding and wisdom, to which Europe owes the most part of its freedom. Without that agreement, in fact, the Soviet Union would not have been able to defend if Germany had not limited its attack to Poland and had gone beyond its bounds. I am not and have never been a Communist, but about this history will tell the truth, admitting that was an act of great insight and wisdom of Stalin's, then made real by Molotov. At that time it seemed a betrayal of the anti-fascism, of democracy, but in reality it was the condition of international and military politic for a future of freedom. Why? Because early after that France, Belgium, Netherlands were immediately overturned. And when we Europeans judge the behavior of the United States and also the behavior of the Soviet Union, I would like us to remember that if it had not been for the Soviet Union and the United States we, probably, would not be holding this forum here, or outside we would hear the jackboots of the German SS. In passing moral judgment on the Soviet Union and the United States, France and Italy etc would do well to remember their shameful deportation of Jews. Europe history and saviours, Russia, and the United States, should be remembered.

I remember that a boy wrote a letter to me when the first flames of the war for Iraq could already be seen, asking why I had voted no to the war. I had voted against my country's intervention for reasons of internal constitutional policy, because without a UN resolution we could not join military action. In order to try to answer this boy, which I did in public, as a Christian, indeed as a Catholic, I went to look, firstly at moral ethics and saw that the theory of peace and the legitimacy of war no longer has a certain point of reference because most Catholic Christian moralists have theorized humanitarian intervention.

According to traditional international law, humanitarian intervention is a war of aggression and interference in the internal affairs of another state. Intervention in Kosovo to protect the Albanians by bombing Belgrade was an act of aggression and interference. That is an international crime.

So the problem arises of the legitimacy of pre-emptive, preventative, defensive war. From a historical point of view, I think, if instead of going to Munich to sign the humiliating Treaty of Munich, the British government and the French government had ordered the French and British forces to invade Germany, we would not have had twenty million Soviet deaths and we would not have had six million Jews destroyed, so let us be mindful. Let us be careful.

I voted against the Iraq war, while part of the left voted in favor. Certainly the United States – and this is dangerous because they are raising to the status of theory – are using *pre-emptive war* at their discretion, because pre-emptive war is allowed by the Statute of the United Nations and the Security Council can wage it. Pre-emptive war has not been eliminated by the Statute of the United Nations. If the Security Council says that the disputes in Northern Ireland are a danger, it can give the order to invade Northern Ireland and also Britain. But unilaterally made, this act not only is not legal but it even is really dangerous!

Are we Europeans perhaps not responsible for certain initiatives of the United States? If the United States had pushed us or not pushed us, would we have gone into Bosnia-Herzegovina? If the United States had not given us a push, would we have gone into Kosovo? Are United States and Britain willing to put their nuclear arms at disposal of a future European army? Are they ready? I am very worried about the theorization that the Bush administration is making of all this. Europe once really believed that the age of peace had arrived. Yet there was war in Israel, and what was happening in Iraq? In Africa we have quietly let everyone be massacred. As the Pope says, "the thirty two wars in Africa do not count". Let the French parachutists deal with the French-speaking colonies, the British parachutists – without UN authorization, on the basis of bilateral agreements – but we let many in Africa get massacred. We did not notice or we turned our eyes on another side.

I am still very firm over the concept of agreements between states and national sovereignty, also because it is within the framework of the nation-states that the great principles of democracy and freedom have been established. Behind the French Republic there is a great monarchy and a great revolution. Behind Russia there is a great revolution. Behind the United States there is a great revolution. There must be a great revolution behind the United Nations, but it will not come from within. I believe, therefore, that the problem is, still and always, first and foremost a European problem.

We have to say that the fall of the Berlin Wall has also triggered a crisis in Europe, because Europe is more divided today than before. Because in Europe, rightly, American unilateralism is a thing that has disoriented all us Europeans, but it doesn't seem to me that the government of Paris and the government of Berlin – mark, not the Bonn government any more – consulted anyone before taking the positions that they took towards the United States of America. The other eight small states that took the position against Berlin and against Paris were also unilateral. So, I believe that we must first of all think about giving Europe a political function, which bears in mind that there are two actors in Europe, the European Union and Russia, because it must be remembered that Russia is one of the world powers and that the world's affairs cannot be run without taking into account the fact that Russia is still a major power and that as the Soviet Union, together with the United States, saved Europe from that absolute evil of Nazism. Peace cannot be governed in the world without the participation of Russia.

I believe that we must abandon dreams, we must abandon abstractions, we must look at concrete facts and I say this to my American friends and European friends, before throwing charges left and right, charges that may be entirely justified. I would like to remind you that the wars of the USA have always been started by the Democrats and finished by the Republicans. This is a general rule, this is history. Wars, in the name of the sacred principles of liberty, have been waged by Democrats. To establish democracy in Vietnam the Democrats waged war. I think that it would be good if the Europeans really thought about how Europe must be constructed. Equally they must think about assuming important responsibilities and must not believe that with the fall of the Berlin Wall, the golden age of peace has come, that the responsibility of bearing arms is only up to the United States and that our responsibility is only to produce and distribute the maximum amount to our European compatriots.

Jean Christophe Rufin, *Action Contre la Faim*

I would like to be practical and share with you the point of view of the people who are at the head of an international network of humanitarian emergency organizations.

In this sector we are the first partner of ECHO (EU) and we are active in many countries of the world through many hundreds volunteers. So, I can say we are "observers" of conflicts, but with different eyes, perhaps less political but not necessarily more objective.

I would like, here, to make a few comments about the recent evolution of this scenario of war and conflicts that we see all over the world. Recently conflicts have undergone a transformation and some believe that wars are a new phenomenon, mostly related to the fall of the Soviet Union and to the end of the bipolar order. I would recall that conflicts are undoubtedly very old, but in recent times there were other times characterized by an increase of the number of conflicts in the world, especially in 1975 after the Vietnam war. Then a time of great hopes came, thanks also to the Helsinki Agreements and, similarly to what happened in the Nineties, hopes were followed by the breaking out of a number of conflicts all over the world.

The conflicts of the Seventies and Eighties were not very active militarily, but had enormous consequences on the civilian population. They were low intensity conflicts in which we always had to intervene.

So, from this point of view, there is nothing new and the conflicts we currently observe are not more numerous than in the past. But they are different in quality, for a number of reasons that I will simply list without going into the details.

On the one hand there is an increase in the number of actors that take part in these conflicts. While at the time of the Cold War there were only two or three belligerent parties, now there are tens or even hundreds of armed groups with which it is very difficult to establish any contact and which generally do not respect any cease-fire signed on the basis of the Geneva Conventions or any other convention.

On the other hand, these conflicts often cause the collapse of state structures and develop into a situation of total anarchy, as we saw in Somalia, in Liberia, in Sierra Leone. The collapse of the state brings with it the growth of new armed groups, making the situation even worse.

There is another novel aspect: the involvement of cities in the wars, which was not so fifteen or twenty years ago. In the past fifteen years, more or less, cities have come into the war, as it happened for example with Sarajevo, and this gives a whole new, unprecedented dimension to the human problem. The populations involved do not have resources available, no food or crops and, once they are besieged, the nature of the rescue operations to ensure their survival is totally different from what it was in the past.

Lastly, human rights are questioned and are used as weapons in the war. Harm caused to the civilian population during conflicts is not a side effect but rather it is the direct effect of a strategy and in many recent conflicts, such as in the Balkans, the best armed groups

distinguished themselves for their ability to kill the utterly innocent and unarmed. These victims were in greater number than among the armed forces fighting other armed forces, that is to say that civilians are the main targets of the conflict technique.

These were, quite briefly, the main developments that we can observe in armed conflicts.

But I would like to say something about the evolution in the international scene in which these conflicts are set.

This morning we talked about UN operations, such as peace-keeping operations. Such operations have at times been cause for concern on our part, as they have not always been positive, but now we can say that, after a long absence of thirty years, the UN has once again found its role in conflict management. NGO's, which we represent, had become used to this not so perfect actor. Today the UN is being heavily criticized, but I feel that in a number of operations (Cambodia, El Salvador, Mozambique) the UN achieved good results.

Starting in 1995 though, with the events in Bosnia, in Kosovo, later on in Afghanistan and then especially in Iraq, we have witnessed an increasing marginalization of the UN, and this has posed serious difficulties to NGO's which can no longer operate as they cannot rely on partners with whom they can cooperate effectively. So we are forced to relate with belligerents, that is people engaged in a war, and even if these belligerents are democracies, relations with them are difficult since there are severe safety problems for us. In recent years the number of NGO victims has been much higher than in the past, as locally, humanitarian and non governmental organizations get confused with armed forces. This confusion is not accidental, but it is the fruit of a purposeful strategy deployed by the forces acting in these countries. Just think, for example, of aircraft dropping both bombs and food provisions on Afghanistan. This confusion of armed forces with autonomous and independent rescue operators is very serious.

The last thought I would like to mention, referring to the activity of civilians in conflicts, is the attitude of our governments and of our public opinions. Today, western governments increasingly try to control all the actors that intervene in conflicts, not only those involved in humanitarian operations but journalists as well. During the course of the Iraq war, for example, press reporters were controlled, they could travel only if authorized. The same happened and is still happening in Kosovo and Albania, where humanitarian staff members and journalists can only operate in areas strictly controlled by the belligerents. This represents a very serious problem.

In Europe, all of us are constantly concerned by the developments of the European Union. The new text of the convention, which is being widely discussed, envisages humanitarian activities becoming an integral part of the European foreign policy. And since the European foreign policy lacks all the necessary means, it is obvious that the easiest thing to do is make use of what is already available, that is those humanitarian activities that are in place, turning them into the essence of the European foreign policy.

If ECHO, the organization currently running the European policy on a humanitarian basis, will be subjected to strictly political interests in the future, we will witness the "politicization" of the humanitarian activity, thus increasing our difficulties in operation.

Then there is the question of public opinion. In my country, France, for example, humanitarian activity was fashionable up to some ten years ago. Now it is much less so and many people question its effectiveness since wars and famine are still going on, since periodically – roughly every ten years – campaigns are launched to collect funds, always to help the same countries. People think that all of this is useless and that it would be better to choose more radical solutions, such as organizations against globalization.

To conclude I wish to recall that ever since Toqueville landed in America at the beginning of the XIX century, humanitarian activities are an integral part of democracy. A democratic society is, by definition, a society of people enjoying the same conditions, that can share and feel compassion for other people's sufferings. When we are no longer able to act and feel this way, in my opinion the type of society has changed.

Today I see the humanitarian ideal as a dimension of various activities carried out by people who no longer accept ideologies. Their action is much more aggressive, I feel, as in the world there are increasing numbers of regimes and groups that brutally attack the population. These new humanitarians contribute to disseminate the idea of the rights of men "in action". They are ready to go and work in difficult areas, where there are conflicts and wars. These groups are the examples of what our countries should be, of what we should believe in, all together.

Sir Patrick Cormack, *Member of the House of Commons*

I would like to say to President Cossiga that I was very glad that he reminded people that the Second World War would have ended very differently had it not been for the Soviet Union and the United States. I would also add to that, that Britain played a small part. I think it is also well to remember that we would not be having this splendid conference, were it not for the fact that the United States behaved with incredible altruism and benevolence after the end of the Second World War. I deeply deplore some of the remarks of Mr. Vedrine. I thought Mr. Vedrine's attack on the United States was both unjustified and immoderate, and as a British Conservative Member of Parliament who is glad to give support to a Labour Prime Minister. I frankly applaud the way in which the United States has tried to give world leadership, often in the most selfless manner.

But I really would like to begin, if I may, with a brief personal anecdote. When I entered the House of Commons in 1970, I became, very shortly after, the first Chairman of the British Campaign for the Release of Soviet Jewry. For many years I was persona non grata in the Soviet Union. I was consistently refused a visa as I campaigned on human rights issues. When Mr. Gorbachev came to power I became a welcome guest. He was a man who did recognize human rights. He brought a breath of freedom to the Soviet Union that many thought it would never feel. When the history of the XX century come to be written objectively he will have a very honoured part in that history.

Human rights is a concept at the very heart of the United Nations, but I want to make a few brief remarks to set this in context. The human rights which came to the Soviet Union, Russia as it now is, after the Gorbachev era are still denied to many people throughout the world. And yet at the same time, in western sophisticated societies, there is an interpretation and assertion of human rights that penetrates almost every facet of life, and forms part of many civil complaints and grievances of a very trivial nature.

One thinks of a recent case in Great Britain, when a man not allowed to go to work in an open-neck shirt asserted that his human rights were being debased and another where a truant from school tried to take an educational authority to court on the basis of a violation of human rights. In America someone who had hot coffee spilled over her suggested that her human rights had been violated because McDonald's had not told her it was hot. It sometimes seems to me that western culture is being permeated by a rights mentality rather than an acceptance of individual responsibility. I do think that there is a danger of this bringing the whole term human rights into disrepute. We must not allow this self-indulgent interpretation to blind us to the international responsibility of the United Nations to make nations aware that signing the Universal Declaration of Human Rights means something. I believe that this is an issue which this forum could very properly address, not only now but in the future.

Of course we should constantly be urging nations around the world that no country can regard itself civilized if it does not grant its citizens the basic human rights of unfettered free expression and free assembly and also strive to realize their legitimate social expectations of

decent housing, healthcare and education. Some of these things have been touched on today. I was particularly taken by two speeches this morning, one by President Arias Sanchez and another by the professor who talked about the need for water and what a real undermining of people's human rights that issue could become.

The United Nations in the XXI century must become better equipped to employ sanctions which really work against tyrannical regimes, and I cite particularly Zimbabwe. Many of us in the United Kingdom, and I know people throughout the world, are deeply saddened and angered by the appalling treatment meted out to the subjects of President Mugabe. What a pity it was that he was received as an honored guest in Paris not so long ago.

I do think that we have got to be better able (as well as dealing with tyrants) to bring collective help to those governments which are genuinely seeking to fulfill the legitimate social expectations of decent housing and healthcare and education. Let me just briefly be a little bit provocative. I would suggest that when we're dealing with tyrannies, sanctions against them have got to bite. If we are going to have a United Nations fit for the XXI century we have got to have a mechanism where those who violate their own citizens are indeed subject to proper sanctions such as the withdrawal of voting rights, and, ultimately, full membership. We have also got to be prepared ultimately to contemplate the use of force to remove those who tyrannize, destroy and despoil fertile lands and industrious people. I was very glad this morning to hear about President Arias's initiative on the arms trade, because that is a specific thing that the United Nations can do. We have also got to make sure that there is proper help for those who are seeking to help their people and we have got to coordinate better the international help over debt and trade, to reorganize the United Nations into much more effective executive bodies.

This morning Mr. Andreotti talked about what this Forum might do in the future. Perhaps it could be a prime function of a body such as this to try to draw up a blue print for an effective United Nations? Perhaps a logical first step would be for a small working party to prepare a draft which could then be considered and debated at a future meeting, and it might well be sensible at a future meeting to break-up the Forum into separate sections, so that specific aspects of that can be debated and discussed. I believe that what Mr. Gorbachev has done in bringing us together, what our Italian hosts have made possible, is remarkable and can lead to great things. But we cannot just allow ourselves to give a succession of statements. We have got to try and work out policies that can be commended both to the international community and individual governments within it.

Gyula Horn, *former Prime Minister of Hungary*

Let me make some remarks about the speeches held here today in order to arrive at our purpose, to answer Mikhail Gorbachev's request, that is to say to indicate alternatives to today's governments, which is, in my opinion, a very useful thing.

Terrorism: first of all, it is not true that poor countries and poverty are the source of terrorism. According to the UN's statistics, none of the fifty five poorest countries represents a basis for terrorism. The foundations of terrorism are to be sought in rich countries, in the wealthiest social classes and in extremist political forces. Secondly, the problem is that terrorism is an international phenomenon, whereas up to now the defence against terrorism has not been fully carried out on an international scale. We have to understand this.

International Monetary Fund: we all know that this fund is not a charity institution. We too had to learn this to our cost. But I have to admit that without the intense cooperation with the International Monetary Fund we would not have been able to stabilize our country, even if all this has been very demanding. I would like to tell you that in last seventy years there has not been any financial or economic crisis with international dimensions. Seventy years! And the International Monetary Fund has played an important role in trying to reach this situation. We have to keep it in mind. It is true that the way it operates, its style and the content of its work have to be changed, but the Monetary Fund is necessary because it checks the financial situation of the single countries and this is very important.

The world is not so negative. I sometimes have had the feeling that someone has described a very negative picture in their speech. In the last century all forty three countries belonging to Europe adopted common political values rooted in the development of democracy. This democracy means the Rule of Law and the preservation of human rights. Such a situation had never happened before in European history. We must not forget that this is because the situation is very positive and may influence other countries or – let us say – other regions.

Globalization: we have to remember that the process of globalization did not begin after the Cold War, but about a decade earlier. Nevertheless, we have to think that globalization is an objective process and it does not matter whether you like the process or not, or whether you support it or not! It belongs to our present world and it is the most important part of our world. How can people react all over the world? In my opinion the role of the state on this subject is very important. How can states minimize the negative aspects of globalization? First of all, in many countries and in particular here in Europe decisions have already been made considering different factors (e.g. workers) and now new contents of work are going to be defined. Secondly, laws have been made for the protection of consumers and the preservation of the environment. This is an important aspect of the question. It is in our common interest to remove and reduce the negative influence of globalization. Thirdly, integration. In my opinion integration is the most efficient method or instrument against all that.

When it comes to globalization, I would like to add something else. If we consider the situation of the single regions of the earth, we have to admit that in the countries where the state helps sufficiently in education and training, than these countries have the possibility to overcome their catastrophic situation. Consider Africa. In Africa we cannot find this situation. They do not spend money on objectives such as education, with the exception of some countries, and it is evident that Africa is in a situation of backwardness.

I still have to say one thing. Who loves wars? We do not, I am sure of it. But I do not agree with those who state that in a certain sense we should never take any military action. Let us take Yugoslavia for example with the intervention of NATO in 1999. We supported this intervention – and not only us, but all neighbouring countries did it – not only because we wanted to reach particular positions or places. The matter was that over ten years negotiations had not brought any result. And do you know what Milosevič did in Yugoslavia? Within a short time there were half a million victims, three million refugees that left their country and unfortunately hundreds billions of dollars in debts due to an economic catastrophe. This was the result of Milosevič's regime. If this regime had not been eliminated, we would not have been able to make and create a new policy in the Balkan region. So, with these remarks I would like to emphasize that when it is unavoidable, when there is no other way out, whether we like it or not, we have to come to a military intervention.

And last, the general reform of the United Nations. In my opinion it is important to underline the change of Article 51 concerning not only preventative actions, but also including all elements linked to self-defence. These are out-of-date formulations; therefore we have to re-formulate all elements included in Article 51 of the fundamental Charter of the United Nations.

One World, Plural Civilization

Fabrizio Palenzona, *President of the Province of Alessandria (Italy)*
Welcome greetings

It is a great honour for me and for the Province of Alessandria and for all of our community to welcome President Gorbachev, as President of the World Political Forum .

I am a believer and believe in the signs of divine providence. Those who do not believe should be respected and perhaps believe in the signs of destiny. I believe there is a thread that links various events in our recent history that have occurred here in Alessandria, in this room.

I recall that, at a certain point, we decided all together to name this room after Yitzak Rabin, whose image you see on my right, and we held a very important conference with Mrs. Leah Rabin, and spoke of peace here. We spoke of peace and Mrs. Rabin said: "We, with my husband, with all men of good will, we have set a train in motion, the train of peace. This train will find many obstacles, there will be many bridges to be built, someone will move the tracks, but we will put them back, and this train will reach the station, it will reach peace".

So, I believe that there is this thread, we today are also laying our tracks, our carriage on this train, which Mrs. Rabin had indicated to us right here in this room. And I believe also that, some years ago, President Scalfaro honoured us greatly by coming here, in his lofty position, to award this standard with the golden medal for the values of Resistance. This thread binds this people, the people of our Province who worked, who suffered, who fought for those values that are in our Constitution and which are embodied in that small golden sign on that standard, which represents the sacrifice of a people towards freedom, democracy, peace and the co-existence of Italy and all peoples.

I believe that, in such a divided world, people of good will, the men of good will to which the Bible often appeals, have met in Alessandria, as they met in Turin, not because they have goals of ambition. These people have already had their just and legitimate ambitions, and have all already offered the highest service to their countries and communities. But today they feel that they can accept the Forum's proposal, the proposal of President Gorbachev, to give an important contribution neither of power nor of command, but a true contribution, support to those who must make decisions for the world to work in a direction that leads to peace and civil co-existence. These words could almost be taken for granted, they may verge on the rhetorical, but this is needed today, and I believe that this gathering can and will make a significant contribution.

The World of Global Challenges

Khaled Fouad Allam*, Professor at the University of Trieste (Italy)*
Chairman

We all hope that right here we will soon start a rewarding exchange of experiences which will allow us to outline the common ways to meet the big challenges we must face today.

The wonderful town of Alessandria lies at the core of such a relationship between past and future, which permeates our consciences, our human communities and from which one of the most important issues of the twenty-first century arises: the dialogue between cultures. The way in which diverse cultural and religious communities can work together to lay the foundations for a better world, where political, cultural and social dynamics can be built on the concepts of peace and pluralism, is especially important.

Yesterday, for example, we heard how the conceptual frameworks that should accompany our entry in the XXI century are still undefined. The relationships among countries and the end of bipolarity have been the big questions which, since the fall of the Berlin Wall, have been indirectly shaping the new political sphere. The existence of different ethnic groups, languages and cultures has helped to generate unrest and turbulence. This often leads to think that the politics of the new century will be characterized by the continuous *Clash of Civilizations*. Yesterday we argued against the conceptual groupings – and the history itself – of a Clash of Civilizations. But we are nonetheless forced to admit that the relationship between societies is the key factor for the political architecture of the XXI century.

Thus, several complex questions arise. Though it is not always possible to answer them, they force us to constantly reflect upon the link between history and memory. For instance, in order to understand the relationship between the Muslim world and Europe (or the Western world), it is imperative to explore the connection between history and memory and to investigate the relationship between Islam and the West, so that history does not become memory.

The dialogue and Clash of Civilizations exist in an imaginary dimension: it is legitimate to wonder what such a clash means to a businessman from Lebanon, Qatar or to a *sans papier* or to what the relationship between the efficacy of such a theory and the reality of the Clash of Civilizations actually is.

Still, I believe it is clear that the current political models are shaped by religion and identity. And, it is these very models which generate problems at both the international and geopolitical level, and at national level, as they undermine the very foundations of our societies, both Muslim and European.

The issues of Islam and immigration are complex ones. They define the present and will also define in the next thirty years and the political architecture that good-willed people will

give to the new, still undefined world order. But we can also observe the expectations, anxieties and big question marks which characterize current global geopolitics. Although they cannot be placed within a clear general conceptual framework, they can all be described on the basis of a *leitmotiv*, a common principle which allows us to assess the magnitude and value of problems from North to South, from East to West.

I am referring to democracy, especially to the idea of being able to 'export' it. This includes its ability for functionality and penetration, which will undoubtedly characterize our entry into the twenty-first century in much the same way as the idea of the 'nation-state' characterized Arab and Muslim countries at the beginning of the twentieth century.

Today, Muslim societies wonder how they can build a democratic environment, how they can give it historical value and how to exploit it in an attempt to build a dialogue between civilizations. These are some of the big issues on which experts and intellectuals will provide their opinions during this meeting.

Pascal Boniface, *IRIS Director*

The theory of Huntington, presented in 1993 in order to explain new future conflicts, has been widely criticized by politicians and experts alike. There are few instances when such a fiercely criticized idea has later been so widely commented upon. The more the fallacies of such a theory are highlighted, the more it becomes the object of comments and analysis. There is a clear contradiction between the omnipresence of Huntington's theory in strategic discussions and the numerous criticisms it receives.

I believe that when we talk about the Clash of Civilizations we must avoid two fundamental mistakes.

First, we can't agree with the idea that the most frequent clash of civilizations, as Huntington maintains, is that between the Western-Catholic world and the Muslim world which is somehow predetermined and predefined by history. Thus all we can do is prepare for it, as it cannot be escaped. The idea of inescapability is what characterizes Huntington's theory, as if history had already been written in advance and as if people were not able to alter the course of events through their actions and political will. It is untrue to state that the Western and the Muslim worlds are necessarily and automatically doomed to clash against each other, as European princes and kings did in ancient times or as ideologies have done so during this century. This kind of approach does not take into any account the role of people and politics.

The second dangerous mistake we need to avoid is rejecting Huntington's theory for reasons of mere political or diplomatic fairness and then maintaining that it is wrong for these reasons only. Simply rejecting war between civilizations as a despicable thing does not mean avoiding it. It is not enough to automatically condemn a theory such as Huntington's without having implemented all the measures needed to prevent it from becoming true.

I believe these ideas hide two dangers. On the one hand it is characterized by what I would describe as *wishful thinking* and on the other it outlines a *self-fulfilling prophecy*: it categorically states that wars between civilizations should not happen and therefore will not happen, but it also maintains that such wars will automatically break out, thus indirectly increasing the possibility that this will happen.

Clearly, one major problem is the difference between the good-willed people and all the others. We cannot let the elites reject the idea of war between civilizations for mere reasons of political fairness while people are slowly preparing for entering into such a war. We must look beyond this intellectual and political circle and see how things really stand.

I believe we were all struck by the words of the Prime Minister of Malaysia, Mohammad Mahathir, words which shocked Europe and the United States but which were deemed as inevitable by those who actually listened to them. We cannot simply say that Mahathir's words were unacceptable words for Europe and the United States and thus refuse to understand what he meant and why those who listened did not consider them to be despicable. What is curious in Huntington's theory is the fact that it never touches on the topic

of the Israeli-Palestinian conflict, although this is the core of the whole issue. This small land, with a surface area which could be compared to that of two French regions, has become the epicentre of the clash of civilizations. What started as a mere territorial claim on the West Bank and the Gaza Strip, while waiting for a solution of the Arab-Israeli conflict, is now a true clash between the civilizations living in these two small territories.

This clash can only be overcome if the Israelis and the Palestinians will quickly put an end to war, as their conflict is viewed in a completely different manner by the Western and the Muslim communities. For Westerners, it is a chronic and unsolvable conflict, whereas for Muslims it is a consequence of the inconsistency and hypocrisy of the Western world and of the fact that, when it comes to enforce laws, the West is very strict at times and very tolerant, almost complacent at others.

We must understand that it is not our values which are criticized outside the Western world but our inconsistent and selective way in which we adhere to them. It would be too easy to seek comfort in optimism and say that there are differences because other civilizations do not share our values.

We can certainly say that there are far more serious conflicts than the Israeli-Palestinian one, such as the wars in Sierra Leone, Somalia and Chechnya, which claim a much higher number of victims. But there is a major difference between these and the Israeli-Palestinian conflict, as not all agree that if the Western world did not let Israel continue with its occupation of the territories, the conflict would end. In particular, the United States is accused of acting as a sort of 'supporter' of a situation considered to be unacceptable. It is now time to find our lost consistency and establish peace.

We live in a globalized world where images circulate faster and faster. In many areas of the world, the images portraying everyday life in Palestine are shown every day and could generate turmoil and rage.

There is no doubt we must fight against terrorism and eradicate it completely, but first we need to identify the causes behind it. The room where we are gathered today is dedicated to Yitzhak Rabin, who wanted to fight against terrorism as if there was not a peace process, and pursue the peace process as if terrorism did not exist. This is exactly the path we should follow.

A war can have three types of solutions. Firstly, a military solution – although a conflict never really ends by military actions, as these are nothing but the prelude to the political solution. There will not be a military solution between the Israelis and the Palestinians. The extremist Palestinians who want to drive away the Jews from the Holy Land will not achieve their objective. The same goes for the extremist Israelis who want to drive away the Palestinians to Jordan. The conflict will be ended by a political agreement and not by a military solution. The search for a political agreement can have two outcomes: either the leading figures involved decide to reconcile themselves or they cannot find a peace agreement as they do not have time to assess the respective responsibilities. There is a third opportunity: the international solution, which is the only one possible when there is no military solution to the conflict and the involved parties are not able to find a political agreement.

The international community must stop being hesitant when it comes to the Israeli-Palestinian conflict. This shyness is perceived as hypocritical or as a sign of the complicity by most of the world population.

To conclude, I completely agree with Pierre Joxe's idea that the international community should be encouraged to act in order to avoid the rooting and development of this conflict. It not only impacts on the two directly involved populations and the Middle Eastern area, but it will have negative consequences for the whole world. It is therefore absolutely necessary that the international community prevents the situation from degenerating and finds an urgent solution.

Mercedes Bresso, *President of the Province of Turin (Italy)*

Yesterday we had a very important meeting between the world associations of local authorities and agencies of the United Nations to discuss the many questions that we are presently debating. These include: how to construct a permanent international presence of local authorities and how these will work together with the agencies of the United Nations on a whole series of issues.

This work is continuing today in Geneva. The discussion there is on the role of cities in the prevention and management of conflict, on human rights in local communities, on applying the Millennium Goals, on the fight by local communities against AIDS, of international co-operation to create governance of local authorities in the weakest countries, on the reconstruction of cities in situations of conflict, of essential services. Also yesterday, a theme talked about in Turin concerned the relationship between local authorities and new information technologies. In other words the digital divide, that we risk to create in the world, and cities and local authorities are the main bodies that experience it at their own expense.

I wanted to recall that today many conflicts, those which we are being discussed in this session, are rooted in local societies and are therefore one of the themes being debated today by local authorities. As you know, there is a question in our country on granting the right to vote to immigrant populations in local elections. The issue of integration of immigrant populations within, first of all, the local societies where they live and work and where the first bonds with the city and local reception structure is made, is a question that has always involved local authorities. Last year, you will remember, there was the World Social Forum in Florence. The day before there was a forum of local authorities that tackled the same themes then discussed at the Social Forum. At the final conclusion of that Forum, the appeal was launched to the Italian government to tackle the question of the vote for immigrants at local elections which I believe, is a powerful tool of integration into the local societies to which they belong.

This is one theme, but all the themes of religious co-existence and multi-ethnic co-existence live, are first of all, experienced, and often also provoke problems and rifts, within local communities. I therefore believe that today it is in the cities that we can work to construct co-existence between religions, religious faiths and also different ethnic and cultural groups. And it is in these cities that the first integration becomes possible. I believe if it happens in the city, questions come to a head and become easier to tackle.

Today, the local authorities asked to not be considered by states and the United Nations, as non governmental bodies – which they are often thought of as: we are all incorporated in the vast category of non governmental organizations – but as local governments, in other words with full rights to policies and diplomatic capacities at the international level. The diplomacy of local authorities is today, more than other forms of diplomacy, the one that can overcome situations of conflict. This has always been true in history: the Association of which I am President, the World Federation of United Cities, was founded in the post-war period,

primarily to rebuild dialogue between German and French cities after the lacerations of war that had created terrible tensions at the level of consciousness of the people. It then worked very much on dialogue between the cities of the East and cities of Western Europe, again with the intention to overcome barriers between our populations in the period of the Cold War. The Association has always worked on dialogue with the Muslim world, in particular between Israel and Palestine. Before the conflict intensified we had jointly decided to organize a conference for the reconstruction of the Palestinian towns that were to be divided between Israel and Palestine, as a symbol of the dialogue that cities have, whatever the borders, whatever the wars, whatever the barriers.

And no city is excluded from the world organization that we are building. The fact that in some countries there is no democracy and appointment of local authorities, is an extra reason for dialogue and co-operation, to try to build with citizens and their administrators the basic conditions of democracy that are founded first of all in local governments. I believe, therefore, that, in this sense, all the basic, diplomatic work that cities are doing to build a world of peace is an important element for our reflection, just as the first moments of construction of civil co-existence are within local societies. Thus as it is possible to provide the means to support local societies in their work, it is probably possible to examine many of the questions to which Khaled Fouad Allam and Pascal Boniface referred to before.

In a few weeks we will hold a meeting of local bodies in Saint Denis, again interacting with the movements that currently aim to keep the doors of dialogue open whatever tensions exist. This meeting will reason around these questions: peace between all borders, how to keep channels of dialogue open even in the most difficult situations like those that are being created in the world today. I believe that our Forum, at first conceived as a debate between great statesmen and representatives of what could, may I say, be considered as "high-level" politics. I think a session of discussion could be proposed instead between those who come from the realm of diplomacy between local authorities, with those who have instead, the experience of government. I believe that acknowledging local authorities as one of the parts of full governance, not just of local issues, but the great issues of the world, is also an important theme for our Forum. I would therefore like to pose the following question: how can we achieve results in the work we are beginning to set in motion and how can we stimulate this joint reflection between the politics of states and the politics of local authorities? Both are fundamental to me and both are necessary if one wants to face the practical management of the great conflicts that trouble our planet.

There are very many questions that can be used to see this duality of reasoning and analysis. I am thinking of the whole question of water. Again, here is a matter of relationship between the practical, political decisions that local authorities must take concerning the management of water reserves. Instead the major issues of the right to and exclusion from water are raised, where the local authorities are certainly key players, but in tandem with their own governments. This is a theme that I invite you to reflect on in the future of the Forum.

Predrag Matvejevic, *Professor at the University "La Sapienza" (Rome), writer*

For once, it is not the Mediterranean I wish to speak of, even if many problems are afflicting this area, which is our Sea. I would rather talk about the Balkans. If I may, I would like to open with a paradoxical statement: the Balkans do not exist. You may concede it is folly to say the Balkans do not exist. This is a thesis we developed together, Claudio Magris and I.

Those who speak from the standpoint of Germany may say the Balkans start in Vienna and in Munich. Metternich himself stated that the Balkans began outside the walls of Vienna. Well, this offends Vienna. So then, the Balkans start in Zagreb, Lubiana, former Yugoslavia. Well, Zagreb, Lubiana, Croatia and Slovenia are equally offended. It is rather in Belgrade, Tirana and Skopje that the Balkans begin, so on and so forth.

The wise, intelligent, educated people from those places state that the cradle of European culture is slightly more to the East and slightly more to the South of Europe. So, see this manner of moving the borders, this denial, this refusal to be present in the heart of Europe, yet that is where we are, that is where European culture was born and, therefore, where Europe was born. That is where the school of thought of democracy, the Forum and the Agorà originated; it is where philosophic thought was born. So, you see, I think it is quite important to underscore this relativism.

This is the first thesis. There is a second one I would simply like to say a few words about; or rather, I would like to list the contradictions there are in this area, afflicted by one of the bloodiest wars ever. In thinking about it, we must indeed keep in mind that this is the place of the Catholic Schism. It is here that Europe split apart. The Schism is not in the Holy Books, but it is rather an invention of the Powers, of Man; it is not in the Gospel. A Muslim component is wedged in the split between two Christianities. Alas, this Islam, which was one of the most secular in the world, was not perceived as such by Europe and was allowed to be destroyed by those whom I call Christian, Orthodox and Catholic Talibans. Massacres were perpetrated in Srebrenica, Sarajevo and Mostar for example. This area is still one of the most divided in our continent.

Just consider: the inheritance of Nicolae Ceausescu in Romania, of Todor Zivcov in Bulgaria, of Enver Hoxha in Albania; the contradictions inside countries such as Serbia and Montenegro; the conflicts between Kosovars, Albanians and Serbs, the separation of national identity in Bosnia-Herzegovina (Serbs, Croats, Muslims), of the tense relations between Greece and Turkey; ambiguous relations between Bulgaria and Macedonia, the Hungarian issue in Transylvania or the Romanian issue in Moldova (birthplace of the Hungarian Magyar language), the Greek-Turkish issue over Cyprus, the Greek issue over Macedonia, the Croatian issue over Serbia, the Bulgarian issue over Turkey, and the two million or so refugees and dispersed people who are trying to live in such a way as to assume a post-communist identity and are trying to solve the never-ending problem of minorities.

I am now closing, but I would just like to add a few details to the picture I have attempted to depict. How did the divisions in the Balkans originate? After every division there was always something left unsolved, something incomplete, producing an unstable balance hence leading to different 'truths'. Where does the Serb, Bulgarian, Greek, Croatian, Albanian, Muslim, Catholic, Orthodox 'truth' come from? Each and every one believes they retain the 'truth', hence relativising the actual truth on the Balkans.

Part of the objective (quite often the most important part) remains unachieved. Work towards their achievement is delayed, delayed to more favourable times, times that never come. Furthermore, in the Balkans, the past was not always allowed to turn into history. The past is not history: there is a big difference between the two. Despite this, national history opted for the most favourable scenario. In so doing, it shunned objectivity and neglected historical values. So, where the past invaded history, the various elements got distorted, if not totally out of control. Distorted by the prism of ideology, conscience, vis-à-vis the past, creating its own scenarios, urging followers to accept them and believe in them. These scenarios bear more on myth rather than reality and identify myth with victory over myth, (it is a common mistake to assimilate myth with victory over myth), to the point that events are imprisoned in narrative form which is powerfully historical and in fiction, which is narration, rather more than truth.

One last point: the peoples who only belatedly became a Nation (this includes peoples in Europe who, because of this lateness, have experienced fascism, Germany was late, Italy was late, Spain after an initial thrust, was late), these Peoples perceived themselves as a Nation and as a People at the same time. They did not quite know whether they were a People or a Nation; this makes it difficult to determine a feasible criterion of identification even when using the most possible critical language.

This is the situation in the Balkans where an implacable war has been waged. A war few people in Europe understood and which we ourselves did not understand, a war that has produced two, close to three million refugees. Just imagine these problems. I myself am one of these refugees. This is the reason why I decided to depict a rather pessimistic picture of the Balkans rather than talk about the Mediterranean for which I have responsibility in the European Commission as Councillor to Mr. Romano Prodi on Mediterranean affairs.

Abdessalam Cheddadi, *Historian*

I will face the problem of world unity and plurality of civilizations, beginning with an aspect I consider important, which is the double paradox existing in the level of development reached by the modern world. On one hand it carries out a complete and irreversible unification, while on the other hand it increases divisions. Therefore, the values essential to its own survival are highly praised, while the obstacles to their concrete realization raise.

The modern world has carried out a complete and irreversible unification in three sectors: science and technology, economy and communication. This unification is now real and complete since no society, no region of the world is capable to offer a technology, a science, an economy or means of communication that could be competitive with the ones today universally in use. It is also irreversible since humanity cannot physically survive without a unified science, technology, economy and communication.

Nevertheless we can see great differences between the various regions and nations of the world in matters of technology, science, economy and means of communication. Such disparity has taken, for the majority of human beings, the form of an insurmountable gap, not only in terms of quantity, but mostly in qualitative and conceptual terms.

Furthermore, disparities are bigger in the sector of human and social sciences, in literature and art, which represent all that gives today the necessary means to individuals, groups and societies to communicate and relate between themselves, to relate to their present and their past, to understand what happens in the world and to actively participate in the mental and spiritual evolution of humanity.

I will just give one example that involves myself. In the whole Arab world it isn't possible to find a library equal to the smallest library of any American or European university. Studies on Arab literature and history and, generally, studies on social sciences about the Arab world are much more advanced in the United States or Europe, than they are in the Arab countries. According to a recent report about studies on human development, the number of books translated into Arabic from the Abassid period (1200 years ago) up to our days, is smaller that the number of books translated annually in a country like Greece. It is then useless to say that in such conditions, it is impossible to find in the Arab world an important study on an aspect whatsoever of the other cultures of the world.

The Arab world is therefore deprived of all the means that would allow it to develop a modern knowledge not only of itself, but also of all the other cultures of the world.

Such disparity and, for the majority of human beings, such gap between countries on control over technology and science on the one hand and, on the other, over effective globalization of economy and communication, make the irreversible unification of the world dangerous and dramatic, instead of transforming it in the source of peace and harmony that it potentially represents.

There is then another disparity, just as dangerous and even more widely spread, which is the one existing between the enormous quantity of knowledge available to scientists and

specialists, and the minimum level of circulation of such knowledge among simple citizens, especially in the sector of human and social sciences. Such disparity intensifies as a consequence of the fast diffusion of information, it pours over the world, it increases the detachment between politicians and citizens, so aggravating the risks of manipulations and the necessity of control over society.

The modern world has been capable, though, to develop two values: freedom and individualism. On the political level such values form the concept of democracy and are fundamental in human rights. Ideally every individual should have available all the means that allow him/her to enjoy the more complete liberties and at the same time, he/she should have guaranteed the educational, political and economical conditions that make him/her a person with rights and capable of fulfilling one's civil and interpersonal duties. Only individuals of this kind can ideally form a truly democratic nation.

From the philosophical point of view, this double ideal, individual and political, is considered as the final result of the historical evolution of humanity.

The American theoretician Francis Fukuyama has even stated that the realization of this double ideal marks the end of history.

History will always remain an open concept, therefore Fukuyama's statement must be interpreted as an exaggeration or a joke, although it is not, in my opinion, completely false. This statement has been rightly criticized because of its pro-liberal inclination. It is clear that the values of individualism, freedom and democracy are universally shared, even though there can be exceptions in certain cases. These are the founding and undisputed values of the world in which we live. Furthermore, the quick progress of globalization enlightens more and more the fact that the end of something is coming.

On the basis of the analysis I just outlined about the existing unbalances between good intentions and the factual realizations of the modern world, it is possible to make two main objections to Fukuyama's thesis.

The modern world has developed sophisticated capabilities which, for the first time in history, have permitted humanity to be objectively and concretely united. But these capabilities instead of guaranteeing harmony, have produced material unbalances and have never been realized concretely from a moral and political point of view. As a consequence, if it is possible to speak of an end of history, it can only be of the history of modernity and not of the history of humanity. History of modernity, is not a real and proper history, but a simple prehistory, a preliminary phase during which the foundations of modernity have been laid.

Thanks to the extensive unification of the material and political conditions of individual and social life, we have today the necessary means to get a new unified history of humanity started.

The problem is not the confrontation between civilizations and ideologies, as predicted by Huntington, but it is instead the nostalgia for supremacy and domination, for the imperial grandeur that characterized the pre-modern era, during which the world was structurally and necessarily fragmented, but which isn't anymore justified in a world inevitably evolving towards a tangible and irreversible unification.

There will not be a civilization shock since all pre-modern civilizations, the European one included, belong to the past and cannot be brought back to life as such anymore.

Any region of the world, any nation has a specific sensibility towards the world, determined by its bond with the past and its own civilization, but such sensibility has its origin necessarily in a common modernity. No region, no nation develops or is capable of developing an autonomous civilization in contrast or opposition to a modern civilisation.

The clash among civilizations represents therefore, both today and in the immediate future, a pure mystification.

The conflicts and clashes among civilizations take place only if deliberately launched and wanted for world political strategy reasons, by stressing the unbalances I just mentioned. The unbalances between the good intentions and the concrete acts of the modern world are real and profound. It is possible to transform them in ideology or to manipulate them, but according to me they aren't essential. We can optimistically affirm that they belong to the period of 'gestation' or prehistory of the modern world, but the history ahead of us, the history we have to build, must find us involved in a constant fight to eliminate or reduce them.

Sir Roderick Braithwaite, *former Ambassador of the UK to the Soviet Union and the Russian Federation*

We have talked a great deal about the theories that have been batted around, mostly by American writers: the clash of civilisations, the end of history, the contrast between Venus Europe and Mars America. It is easy enough to dismiss these propositions as being simple minded. But if you actually read the books from which they emerge, you find that they are somewhat more sophisticated than they look and that they do make you think. And that of course is the main point of reading.

The subject today is the clash of civilisations. But in passing I would just like to emphasize how much I enjoyed and agreed with the very Cartesian analysis of Mr. Vedrine yesterday about the future of European unification. I do not believe that Europeans will be prepared to remain an effeminate Venus forever. They too are going to develop some kind of military structures.

In this morning's discussion about the clash of civilisations one very important point has been brought out, the question of double standards. Samuel Huntington says in his book "The Clash of Civilisations": "The West won the world not by the superiority of its ideas or values or religion (to which few members of other civilizations were converted) but rather by its superiority in applying organized violence. Westerners often forget this fact; non-Westerners never do."[2] It's something that as Europeans we need to remember when we talk about the rest of the world.

But I want to concentrate more on something which is more important in Europe than it is in North America, and that is the impact of immigration and demographic change on the way we manage our democracies. When they first come to London, my Russians friends are surprised when they see that London is now a very multiracial city. If you travel on the Underground in London, about 30 percent of the people in the carriage with you are not Anglo-Saxons. Russians find that rather shocking, but it's a fact. It is a fact that we are going to have to manage if we wish to retain a civilized society and a democratic society.

And this is a mutual requirement. There are double standards on both sides of the argument. On the one hand, for example, there is the proposition that Muslim girls in French state schools may not wear veils. Our French colleagues will argue that is entirely reasonable. It seems to me a foolish as well as unacceptable. But it is equally unacceptable for Muslim countries to impose similar restrictions on the expression of religious belief by non-Muslims. During the first Gulf War, there was a great row between Saudi Government and the British Government, over whether our soldiers – who were in Saudi Arabia to defend the country and invade Iraq – could wear crosses and celebrate Christmas.

Of course, if you live in a country whose primary religion and practices differ from your own, you must be sensible in the way you behave. If you are in Saudi Arabia you really mustn't drink alcohol too obviously and you really must recognize that if you do things that

---

[2] Huntingdon S, Clash of Civilisations (New York 1996), page 51.

are against Sharia law, you will be punished by Sharia law. If you don't like that, you had better not live in Saudi Arabia.

The same is true in our own countries. Most of the people now living in Britain, of whatever race, colour, or religion, were born there. They all have an equal right to practise their religions and observe their own customs and practices. But there are general laws and practices which all of us living in the country have to observe. Otherwise the system breaks down and that is bad for everybody. Of course these laws and practices have to be applied with tolerance and understanding. Managing multiracial and multiethnic societies is a very difficult and fragile business. There have been many attempts to do so in the past which have been successful for a time and have then broken down. Obvious examples from recent history are the Austro-Hungarian Empire, which was a multiracial, multiethnic, and reasonably peaceful political construction. There was the Soviet Union, where people did have a sense of common citizenship: they were Soviet citizens as well as being Russians or Georgians, or whatever. That broke down comparatively peacefully in 1991. And of course most spectacularly and tragically there is Yugoslavia, which for a while nevertheless did manage the problem of the various relationships between the various religions in that part of the world.

There are no perfect and permanent solutions, as Mr. De Michelis said yesterday. It is better to accept an imperfect solution rather than uselessly strive after the perfect solution. There is no black and white. The clash of civilizations is an overdramatic term evoking shock. One must also be clear about the facts. Huntington identifies a fault line between the Greek/Russian orthodox world and the Western Christian world. But with the obvious exception of Yugoslavia, most of the European wars of religion were not across this line, but within the Western Christian world, and very bloody they were too.

But tension between civilisations, religions, customs, is a permanent fact of history. I don't think history has changed. We are not living or about to live in a post-modern world. The factors which governed the way human beings lived together in the past are deeply rooted in human nature. They will continue to operate in the future.

This is not a reason for despair. One can deal with these things successfully and pragmatically, adapting to the concrete circumstances. There is no reason why there should be an inevitable clash between Islam and the Christian world if people of goodwill work sensibly together.

What one has to do is to exercise the kind of arguments, the kind of practices that solved within Western Europe the clash of Christianities in the XVIII century, thanks to Voltaire and others who brought the bloodshed to an end. You have to apply the principles of tolerance and democracy which go absolutely together: you can't have democracy without tolerance. This applies to the relationship between Islam and the West both between states and within our own societies.

This is not of course a simple matter. Let me quote two examples of the kind of things you have to manage with all the tolerance you can muster that have happened within Britain recently. Some years ago up in the north of the country where there are a lot of Muslims. The Muslims decided to set up an alternative parliament, their own parliament, a different political

structure. Well, that irritated a number of people, but it didn't cause a great fuss, and of course what happened was it faded away again. So it was very much worth not making a fuss about.

More shocking to people in Britain was something that happened quite recently. After the beginning of the Afghan war some young Muslims in Britain were going off to Afghanistan and fighting there with the Taliban, being trained there as terrorists. There was an interview on television with three young men who said that they supported the struggle in Afghanistan against the Anglo-Americans. The interviewer said, "As British Muslims surely you have some kind of loyalty to the country of which you are citizens, where you were actually born". And they said, "We're not British Muslims, we are Muslims living in Britain".

Well, that's a concept which makes the management of a state – whether pre-modern, modern or post-modern – very difficult. It is an attitude which I think one has to regard as unacceptable. If you're living in a country, born there and accept the privileges, you also have to accept the obligations. The corollary is that the other people living there have to tolerate your particular way of life and you are perfectly entitled to exercise that, provided that it doesn't clash, either with your fundamental responsibilities to the state your living in or with the rights of your neighbours.

H.E. Diarmuid Martin, *Archbishop Coadiutor of Dublin, Permanent Observer of the Holy See to the United Nations Office in Geneva and to the World Trade Organization*

All too often, we talk about the war against terrorism and wonder, is this war against something? A war against terrorism must be above all a war in favour of the rule of law and of different relations between peoples and cultures. A war in favour of the rule of law which takes up, and respects, the dignity of every individual – their rights and their capacities – a war, which doesn't just attempt to block the hand of a potential aggressor or enemy, but which more extends the hand in welcome and understanding between peoples and cultures. The war which looks at 'the other', not as a potential enemy but as a potential friend and as a fellow human being; and there is only one-way to pursue that type of war: first of all through the weapons of transparency and legality, and then by investing in people and human capacity, and in those infrastructures, which foster the participation that is needed for government. We have to equip people with the capacities they need, so that we can develop a new political culture of participation rather than a culture that leaves people on the margins of the areas which affect their lives.

Politics requires an ethical and legal framework – a market economy requires an ethical and legal framework – but above all, they need to be inspired by a correct vision which is able to make those structures work. This involves also very much a vibrant civil society alongside the structures of a free and responsible press. It is very difficult to do this, as it is hard to know what is the sequence in which these things come. But, we must invest in people so that we can have a long-term participative democracy. I see two current disunities in this which we might address at this Forum. One is the cost of politics: being elected costs a lot of money and this at times even distorts the political process. Political parties cost a lot of money and rather than being a mediation between politics and societies, they alienate this process. The second danger to participative democracy is what is called in English, "spin". Spin is the management of facts. Democracy needs the participation of citizens and the ownership of political fact by the citizens. Spin damages people's confidence in democracy just when democracy needs confidence.

A fifth prerequisite for the rule of law is that it must also lead to greater ownership of international political realities. Our international family is a very dysfunctional family. Its intuitions are inadequate and at times unbalanced or lop-sided. The human family must address, above all, the great inequalities that exist in order, to establish a common home. We talked today about the digital divide – I would add alongside that the health divide, the huge divide between those who have access to health and those who don't, where money for research in health goes out to the health problems of the wealthy trader rather than to those of the poor. There is an education divide in our world and there is a conflict divide. There are areas of today's world right across the heart of Africa where people have only known war and conflict for two to three generations, and the same in the Middle East: in the face of this we

are making almost no progress. In disarmament discussions, less than we did at the times of the Cold War.

President Gorbachev at a particularly difficult period appealed to us all to think of our common European home. Today we must think of our common global family and we have to fight the inequalities that exist within that. Strangely, at times, a successful fight against extreme poverty has brought with it a growth in extreme inequalities. We live in a world where we have seen enormous progress in science but we have not learned yet the science of sharing that wealth. One hopeful sign in this – and again it is an area where this forum could look – is the evolution of global public opinion. A very strong influence on decision-making, particularly in the international level, it is changing the global political culture; it is bringing a new dimension and new players in our international and political reflection. It will be interesting to see how this will affect political realities, and how when necessary politicians do not go with global public opinion and maybe even take positions against it.

In a world in which religious questions can be so easily exploited to reinforce division, what can the religious communities do to avoid that? I think that the first thing they must do is to draw out from their own traditions those references to the unity of the human family. That when God created humanity he created it as a family and he made us all brothers and sisters. There's a vast resource of this in the religious traditions which could become a focus of an inter-religious dialogue working towards peace. The success of Pope John Paul's II calls on religious leaders to assist are an indication of how much this desire is rooted in the heart of people. We have difficulty in talking about a dialogue between Islam and the West because, as has been pointed out, we have European Muslims, and we have Christians who are not western. If people are surprised to see London as a multicultural city, let them come to Dublin – a city which people are thought of as mono-cultural, that has a huge multicultural presence today. In addition, this will be the case in all our cities for the future.

If I were to be asked what is the principal contribution, at this moment, in which believers of all religions could bring to our debate, I would say it is that they should be people of hope and purpose, who never give in to those who believe that certain trends are inevitable, never believe in the fact that evil will triumph over good. We need people who are people of hope, and who spread hope in a world in which there are far too many prophets of doom.

Hisham Khatib, *Representative of HRH Prince El Hassan Bin Talal of Jordan*

I represent Prince Hassan of Jordan. He has a message to the meeting. It says through the theme of Christianity and Islam, how to prevent the war of the worlds. The question here as it is posed seems to assume that there will be wars, and that this will involve Christianity and Islam. I prefer to approach this question in a more conservative manner. How can Christianity and Islam work together to prevent future wars?

The Muslim world is not monolithic and nor is the Christian world, each is multifaceted, different cultures exist among Muslims as among Christians. In fact it's true in barring the majority of the sane, that moderate and tolerant groups can exist peacefully. Tension, which occasionally takes place between Muslim and Christian communities in some countries, is merely driven by economic reasons and social practices; it is not intrinsic in the teachings of religions. The solution lies in poverty alleviation in empowering vulnerable groups, including women, in promoting education that leads to understanding and tolerance in globalisation and that opens the door for aspiring young people. What promotes peaceful coexistence is in the teaching of a religion or common premises that transcend religious differences – or can it be both – religions solicit and promote peaceful coexistence? The holy Koran says in its teaching that *'You will find that the nearest in affection to Muslims are those who say we are preachers, that because there are priests and monks among them, and they are free from prejudice.'*

This particular phrase from the Koran defines the Christian–Muslim relationship. It promotes and enshrines peaceful coexistence in global societies between Muslims and Christians. Deviations from this will be contrary to Islamic religious teachings, leading to social tensions and compromising coexistence. It is against the sprit and teaching of Islam. Islamic teaching is transparent and the role in promoting religious coexistence is deeply enshrined in the following verse of the Koran.

'Be courteous when you are with people of the book, Christians and Jews, except those who among them who do evil, and say we believe in that what is revealed to us and what is revealed to you, our God and your God is one. And to him we surrender ourselves.'

Pilot Models, Pilot Failures?

Andrei Grachev, *Chairman of the WPF's Scientific Committee*
Chairman

We are passing now into the concluding part of our session. We have started to debate about the clash of civilisations and at the same time we brought concrete examples of failures, of successes, of hopes, of disillusions. Just to continue on the same line and to be conscious that we are just at the beginning of the debate – which at the same time looks promising – I am very glad to note that weare having an impressive panel here.

Another thing that maybe would be appropriate to remark – relating to Ms. Bresso's mentioning the objective interrelation that exists between the debate here and the ones going on in other places of Europe and of the world – is the presence here of the official representative of Porto Alegre Social Summmit, Mr Roberto Savio.

I would now like to pass the fllor to the President of the Region of Piedmont, Enzo Ghigo and I profit once again from this occasion to thank the Region for its hospitality and to hope the Forum will have the support of the Region even in the future.

Enzo Ghigo, *President of the Region of Piedmont (Italy)*

In his last annual report, the Secretary General of the UN, Kofi Annan, wrote: "Let's imagine for a moment that the world is a global village. Let's imagine that this village has one thousand inhabitants, with all the characteristics of the human race today. About 150 inhabitants live in the rich districts, 780 in the poor areas, 70 others in a transition zone. Just 200 possess 86% of all wealth, 220 inhabitants of the village are completely illiterate. Over half of the inhabitants of the village have never made or received a telephone call. Fewer than 60 people have a computer and 24 have access to Internet. There is no credible way of keeping peace in this village.'

Leaving the scale of the village, the figures unfortunately grow: four and a half billion people are deprived of fundamental rights, live on less than one dollar a day, many die of malnutrition and lack of health assistance and many lack the basic means of subsistence and other elements. To complete this unhappy picture of our era, we can add the events of September 11, the worsening of the Middle Eastern crisis, but also acts of terrorism in the Balkans. All civil society thus feels the increasing urgency of the need to intervene in order to re-establish the conditions for peaceful co-existence between peoples and the respect for human rights in many parts of the world.

Action to achieve these objectives cannot be considered the task exclusively of the states and the United Nations, but rather a goal to be reached with the contribution of all the institutions that have the possibility and the competency to intervene in situations of conflict. In Italy, for instance, the time has come to look to the Regions, to which Article 117 of the Constitution attributes greater room for manoeuvre in international matters and relations. Regions want to make a significant contribution to the peace process, fully exploiting their competence in matters of co-operation and development, their partnership activities, their relations with the Regions of the Mediterranean and the Balkans. Two of the four events held under the Italian Presidency of the European Union were on these themes, promoted by the Conference of the Presidents of the Italian Regions. We must attempt to reinvest in an open Mediterranean, in the countries and regions located along its coasts, which were for centuries, the cradle of the most ancient civilizations.

We need to break down the wall of indifference; we must adapt our institutions to our society so that they can become a tool for development. The dramatic recent landings of clandestine immigrants on the coasts of some Sicilian islands must make us reflect and they must represent the clearest signal of the need to change our way of feeling and of being Europeans. We cannot hide from the fact that human trafficking is going on, not far away, south of Europe, at the expense of men and women.

I am among the most convinced supporters of the validity of the model of Western democracies which, whatever their defects, have represented the launching pad for the spread of the prosperous society. We now have the duty to work on the marketing of freedom, the possibility of development, respecting cultural and religious diversity, a model that puts

people at the centre of the system, constructing a system of fundamental guarantees and rights for the individual.

When I said that it was necessary to enlist the support on the Regions and local authorities, I was referring to the need to grasp an opportunity for relations that start from the bottom up, systems of trade, cultural and industrial relations that can often represent the first step to restart interaction in areas that are today tormented by inter-ethnic conflicts or by the domination of forms of fundamentalism that exploit noble religious reasons for political ends. To give some practical examples, I would like to remind you of my Region's commitment along two lines. The first concerns the work of international co-operation, in particular decentralized co-operation projects, actions to strengthen the institutions. The second is represented by study, research and training initiatives, to offer indispensable, visible instruments to those working in the first field, the one of international co-operation and solidarity.

So what can a single Region do? Certainly, a single drop does not make an ocean, as we know, but there would be no ocean without drops. So we, in Piedmont, have made available € 1,150,000 for actions linked to food safety in the Sahel, continuing a project begun in 1997. In the same way, work backed by the region continued to provide support in Morocco, allocating about € 150,000, in addition to the € 600,000 already earmarked for the creation of an industrial park in the area of Rabat and the € 20,000 to set up training courses for Moroccan workers in the fields of wood working and pottery.

The Region of Piedmont intends to continue its commitment to the promotion and support of peace-keeping policies, perfectly aware that the real urgency, for those who hold liberty and democracy dear, is to act so that the poor and humiliated can finally acquire their fundamental rights. My wish is that all the inhabitants of the global village that the UN Secretary General talked about can live in peace.

But the world of change forces at least two other reflections on us. We live in an era in which the development of technology progresses at a fast speed and the conquests in the field of IT and telecommunications have broken down or are breaking down time barriers. But we cannot forget that everything pivots, or should pivot, around people and their needs. Thus, for example, whilst discussing the progress in biotechnology and genetic engineering, on the one hand we cannot but believe in the possibilities related to this progress: to be able to defeat diseases, to tackle famine, to manage to respond in some way to the damage that man has already done partly compromising the eco-system. On the other hand we must wonder about the scenario just over the horizon. And if we have doubts, we have the duty to try to govern this phase of transition towards the completion of the global village, because this responds to the use of making the most of the individual and never creating uniform social models and cultural universalism.

I recently had the opportunity to discover the benefits that the research into GM food is producing in various sectors. I have also understood the need to try, in my own small way, as a representative of the institutions, to govern the spread of GM products themselves before contamination reaches levels that would effectively stop the possibility of GM-free crops.

What will agriculture be like in the future? Some people might have expected a final mention of important industrial advances, and I will come back to this topic, but only in reference to the vital question of energy. I would instead like to start from where all modern civilizations have begun: agriculture. We must, as I have said before, defend the age-old right to seeds, which is not at present guaranteed by genetically modified seeds, which are sterile and which, in my opinion, are part of the untouchable heritage of humanity. But my concern is also of an economic and cultural nature. If we are not able to govern this transition towards GM products, we will all become dependent on them, no country excluded, starting from the poorest nations on the earth? We know that nature, climate and land give natural characteristics to the crop which is innate to each country. I, as a citizen of the world, do not want to give this diversity up. I cannot manage to accept the idea that agricultural production could be decided in the future by seed multinationals and I consider this battle a choice for freedom.

Finally, as mentioned, I would like to look at an issue which, in our country, has raised its head again dramatically: the one of energy needs. There are still too many countries today, including my own, which pay a high price for their energy dependency. But there are industries, researchers, opinion leaders engaged in trying to understand if it is possible to achieve the development of a *democratic energy*. I know that notable steps forward are being made in the field of exploiting hydrogen. I am convinced that, if we manage to achieve equal opportunities in energy, the global world of the third millennium will be able to develop a further phase of prosperity, better than that of the past century only after World War II and only for some countries.

The global village might turn out to be a sort of home for all people, in which everyone enjoys the progresses of the others, or could reveal itself to be a platform on the sea of inequalities. And, only a few monopolists will live in that platform. Events and actions of these years will tell us which of the two roads the world is starting down.

Ghassan Salame, *UN Senior Advisor on Iraq, former Libanese Minister of Culture*

I do believe there is hardly a situation since the end of the Cold War that has divided the international community the way the Iraqi question has. I should say that it is still dividing the international community. Why? First, because the stakes in Iraq are extremely high: this is the second largest depository of oil in the world; this is a very central country in a very volatile region, and this is also a volatile country where those who decide to wage war against the past regime have put the stakes very high; but also because on the Iraqi question a number of conflicts in the international system have somehow exploded. But Iraq is also important as it reveals deeper hatred – conflicts and rivalries in the international system – that have to do not so much with Iraq, but with unilateralism versus multilateralism. They have to do with the best way of fighting terrorism in the world. They have to do also with the basic attitude concerning the use and misuse of the military instrument in international relations, and other questions like that.

Here we are faced with a real problem. Do we accept the idea that the international community will remain divided on Iraq? This would be terrible for the Iraqis themselves first. Do we accept the idea that it is easy to produce a new consensus on Iraq? My feeling is that this would not be realistic these days. Let us face it, as Ambassador Kavan said properly, the latest Resolution 1511 of the UN Security Council is just a façade, and is just like giving a hairbrush to a bald man. Moreover, I believe that this is exactly the proper way of depicting that Resolution. Divisions are still very deep. In fact, those countries that did not abstain in the Security Council did abstain where it matters. They did abstain from sending troops to Iraq, and did abstain from funding the war machine in Iraq. So abstention where it counts is still the matter for, I would say, the majority of members in the Security Council. So here we are, in a situation which is extremely dramatic. One of the most interesting criticisms people had concerning Saddam Hussein was that he used his country for purposes that went beyond Iraq itself, like he wanted to make it the eastern flank of the world, or the jumping board for some regional leadership, or something like that. I accuse the international community of doing exactly the same thing with Iraq right now. The Coalition in Iraq wants to use it either as a jumping board for democratisation in the Middle East or as a pilot for countries – for other countries in the Middle East – or as some place from which to deter both Syria and Iran, or some place to fight terrorism. I mean to use Iraq again for something that has nothing to do necessarily with Iraq. And those who are opposed to the international coalition in the international system also want to use Iraq to prevent a re-election of George W. Bush next year in the United States, or to show that unilateralism is not the best way to deal with these kind of challenges. Or even more in order to show that those who go to war despite the majority of members in the Security Council being opposed will be punished where they have committed a violation of international law. For all these reasons, what the international community is doing in Iraq is exactly what Saddam Hussein was doing with it – using it for some other purpose than the welfare of its inhabitants. That is why in a very short sentence I

would call for liberation in Iraq. Let's liberate Iraq from these grand designs, let's look into the welfare and interests of its people – the 25 million of them – and then we will discover that what is done right now in Iraq, is a triple challenge to this population.

This population is suffering, before Saddam and under Saddam, from many decades of authoritarian regimes. It's is also suffering from a number of wars waged, either by Saddam Hussein or by wars waged against Saddam Hussein, and now it is also suffering from mismanagement and misrule by the Coalition in Iraq itself – a Coalition that made a number of mistakes like dissolving the regular army; dissolving the national police; go against the single political party and weaken the whole civil administration of well trained people. That left the population without protection; that made very numerous attacks against public institutions, as well as against the Coalition; and that transformed Iraq right now into a nest for terrorists coming from all over the world. Evidence has never been produced that Saddam Hussein had any kind of relations with Al Qaeda, and I promise you that after the war Al Qaeda has come to Iraq, when Saddam Hussein has been out of it and not when Saddam Hussein was the master of that country. For all these reasons, I do believe that the system is now untenable. The United States has already poured $ 160 billion into this quagmire, counting the $ 87 billion that has been given by Congress recently. The others that have criticised going to war are helping neither with troops, nor with money and will not help in the foreseeable future. So, we are in a quagmire and for that, what I propose is to be positive on the following.

On the one hand we should dissociate the question of sovereignty from the question of institution building. In a country like Afghanistan, two years after the war they still do not have a permanent constitution. So let us not ask, as Mr Powell did the Iraqis, to produce a constitution n the next six months, asking this in order to get sovereignty transferred, this means creating a new source of dissention and conflict in the country. Let us dissociate sovereignty from institution building; let us use the first temple by which we build a provisional government, more representative and sovereign government in Iraq. That would go into contractual relations with the foreign troops that we would have transformed through a new UN resolution from occupation force into a multinational force, and this could be done in a matter of three to four months in my view. On the other hand, let us time institution building. Because let me be frank with you, despite that everybody is calling for constitution and elections, this is the holy gospel of these days. To be realistic no constitution can be produced within six months, no elections can be held before a long time and meanwhile we are creating a new quagmire instead of solving the real problems. Let us disassociate the two temples. Let us send for the first time in years, a unified message to the Iraqis from the international countries that the Coalition has ceased to use this country for its own strategic purposes; and to those who criticise the Coalition that they have ceased to use Iraq in order to prevent the Coalition from achieving its own strategic interests. That would be for the first time a signal to the Iraqis that the international community is serious about Iraq, and I would say that the international community exists in the first place.

Benon V. Sevan, *United Nations Under-Secretary General and Executive Director of the Office of Iraq Programme*

I share fully the views expressed by my friend Mr. Salame. I should like to inform Mr. Salame, however, that we should not worry about the twelve or six months period which may be required for the formulation of the constitution. We should bear in mind that the Security Council itself after fifty years has not adopted its rules of procedures and is still conducting its work under its provisional rules of procedure.

I am glad President Cossiga made his statement before me. If there are differences among those who are sitting at this podium with regard to their approach to politics, religion, economic and social affairs, despite their common economic, cultural, religious, political and social background, you can well imagine the differences of approach from the West of those who live in the Middle East, Asia or elsewhere. This is the reason why I believe everybody should refrain from coming out with this "spin", as my friend the Archbishop stated earlier, of using these sound bytes about democracy when we don't really know what we're talking about when we say "democracy". "Democracy" means so many things to so many different people. Accordingly, those who sit down in their computerised rooms with no reference to the economic and social background of the individuals or peoples in other regions about whom they are trying to make policies should come down to earth to look at the culture, look at the background of these people and start thinking in human terms rather than in computerised terms of models to try to impose on other people, when in fact it has taken so many decades, if not centuries, to develop democracies. It doesn't work. We talk about democracy, but how long has it taken Europeans – Italy, the United Kingdom, France and the United States – to develop democracy? They've gone through all the difficulties, which the Middle Eastern people are currently going through. And president Cossiga was right saying "How do you define a terrorist?"

Having served in Afghanistan from 1988 to 1992, I should like to recall the shortsightedness of the major powers in their involvement in Afghanistan, which still continues to suffer and bleed. I am glad to see the former Prime Minister Benazir Bhutto of Pakistan present at this meeting. I think the Americans and the Pakistanis are still suffering now from the success they thought they had achieved in Afghanistan, because the very people they used as mercenaries to bleed the Soviet Union then – and I give here credit to President Gorbachev for his vision, for announcing the withdrawal of Soviet troops from Afghanistan with or without an agreement – are the very people they now are trying hard to locate and eliminate as leaders of terrorism. I recall vividly how many times I warned all concerned that those who were being supported would one day come and haunt their supporters in their own countries. My prediction has unfortunately come to be true. The whole world is suffering because of the shortsighted policies of the 80s and 90s. In fact, some quarters were not happy with President Gorbachev's decision to leave Afghanistan, because they wanted to bleed the Soviet Union. Now those who thought they succeeded in Afghanistan for beating the Soviet

Union are bleeding from the very people they supported. They are trying to kill the very people they supported. They gave the highest amount of money, the highest amount of weapons, and now they are trying to locate the individuals, including Hekmatyar, in order to eliminate them. I used to warn the governments concerned "these Frankensteins you are creating will come home and haunt you in your own countries." I am sorry it all came true. Now it's starting all over again. I agree with my friend Ghassan Salame, that they try to use models for the purpose of modern democracy, it just doesn't fit.

In summing up I should like to say: no single country, no matter how powerful, whether powerful militarily, politically or economically, no single organization as big as the UN with its universal membership can solve the Iraqi problem alone. At the same time I should like to appeal to all Member States of the United Nations – whether they agreed to the war or not, the war took place. Let's try to put the war behind us. Let's try to work together for the sake of the Iraqi people, in full partnership. They deserve better, because until such time as there is a collaborative cooperative and full partnership approach to the Iraqi problem, the Iraqi people will suffer, the rest of the region will suffer, and the whole world will suffer. Iraq is too big a problem for anybody to gloss over the failure of other governments. We have to put our heads together both in terms of organizations and governments to work together to solve this problem, once and for all, because what's going on in Iraq is not destroying or rooting out terrorism. Every single day there are new recruits because they believe in what they are doing – and I disagree with what Madame Bonino said yesterday that "these terrorists have different agendas". Those who send suicide bombers may have different agendas, but the suicide bombers are the disgruntled ones. They are the poorest people who live on the margins of society. They are suffering; and in their desperation they join terrorist causes and are manipulated by others.

What we must try to understand is the frame of mind of an individual, including young women, who are prepared to blow themselves up and make the ultimate sacrifice for a cause they are fully committed to. We need to address the root causes for their actions. These are the things we have to start looking at, and look at most urgently, instead of the ideological approach to solve the problems of the Third World. We simply cannot impose our own culture, political and economic systems on other people. Just as we expect others to respect our own culture, religion and political systems, we must respect the culture, religion and political preferences of others. Unless we do so, I am afraid we will continue to face one conflict after another. However, with full respect for each other, with full cooperation and support for each other, we can and must resolve our differences peacefully for the benefit of all the peoples of the world.

Serge Boidevaix, *Ambassador of France and President of the French-Arabian Chamber of Commerce*

This morning's debate confirms the conclusions we reached yesterday, that after the 1990s, a time fuelled by the great hopes in which President Gorbachev has played a key role, we have now entered a time marked by constant disappointments. Such disappointments are of particular interest to the region discussed, the Arab countries, the region of my personal care as President of the French-Arab Chamber of Commerce.

The big international institutions have recently met in Dubai, where they have drawn a very severe and pessimistic outline of the situation of the Arab world. Doctor Cheddadi has already recalled some of its aspects, such as, for instance, the diminishing industrial productivity, life expectancy and levels of literacy etc. To this we must add the conflict between Islam and the Western world, and the *Clash of Civilizations*.

My country is particularly sensitive to this situation. As President Cossiga emphasized, a lively debate is currently going on in France given that in France, one in ten is Muslim, and that it is also home to one of the biggest Jewish communities in Western Europe.

As President Cossiga underlined, there exists serious problems concerning most of the educational system. Although attributing the due importance to your observations, I nevertheless wish to reassure you by telling you that, for instance, in France all Muslim girls can wear a veil and attend a private school. As for public schools, there isn't yet a law on the matter, so that all schools are free to decide autonomously and appeal to the State Council. The Council uses liberal legislation which means that the decision to remove a certain person can be cancelled in case there is not any provocation. Many French people though believe that a law on the matter is necessary. Therefore, we will surely keep President Cossiga's observations in consideration when we decide to discuss it.

It is my opinion that the situation relative to the Arab world is not correctly interpreted. I believe that in the Islamic and Arab world a myth is being built, dangerous and scary to Europe.

I would like most of all to underline that in the first fifteen years starting from the 1970s, the Arab world rapidly grew economically. It was the one region of the world, besides Eastern Asia, in which the growth was strongest not only in the petroleum sector but in all production sectors. Then, starting from 1998, a crisis developed due to both the reduction of petrol prices, financial resources and also because of the wars launched by some Arab countries against others. From this came the upsetting situation which we all must face today.

How are we to react then? We can go on living in anxiety, but this is certainly not the right solution. It is undeniable that chronic problems exist.

We have spoken at length about the improvement of governance. It is my advice that firstly, the solidity of the state must be guaranteed, as the state is an absolutely necessary organism. It is clear that the state must adapt to the democratization process, but we must keep into consideration the basic principle of international law, which is the importance of state

sovereignty. In view of this principle and of what was said by Ghassan Salame and Benon Sevan regarding Iraq, it is undeniable that there exist problems regarding the reconstruction of a state and such reconstruction is indispensable as it is not possible to put an end to conflict without it.

Also, an economic and social movement must be put into action to allow these societies to regain their lost confidence. When we faced the subject regarding the criticism about possible religious clashes, we realized we were dealing with countries which were deprived of confidence in themselves. It is essential to get this confidence back, by developing an economy capable to face the greatest demographic growth in the world, even though it is necessary to differentiate between the various situations, considering that, for instance, the Magreb situation is different from the one of Macherek.

I believe the main task is to pursue the right politics. Since I am French, I refer mainly to the role of the European Union, although I do not deny that there have been other countries, such as the United States or the Asian countries, which have made significant economic proposals on this matter. I nevertheless acknowledge that the work done by the European Union, although extremely positive, has not so far reached the desired effects. The international institutions gathered in Dubai and sketched a negative outline, on the basis of the situation that followed, starting in 1998 with the fall of petroleum prices and, indirectly, of financial resources. Today the situation is definitely better, since for about eighteen years, petrol guarantees these countries excellent financial resources. We must now take advantage of this positive moment and support investments in such countries, investments that have until now been too feeble.

I think that if Europe will continue to follow its ambitious policy of aid and development, through the mediation of the European Bank for investments, we will without any doubt fulfil such a goal.

I also believe that we can take further steps ahead. I refer particularly to the formula proposed by the President of the European Commission – Romano Prodi – according to whom it is necessary to set up a system which does not imply adhesion but would, at the same time, overcome the principle of plain association largely in use today. It is necessary to implement an integration formula that would allow such countries to have access to European structural policies.

On a political level we have furthermore to accept the fact that a consultative Arab-European assembly can exist. Currently, this is not a priority, since Europe is getting prepared for the enlargement towards the East, which will allow it to recreate its historical dimension. I think that the phase now beginning is and must necessarily be, oriented towards the South, since it is vital to make progress in this direction.

It would in fact, be unthinkable to enlarge towards the East, without the necessary opening towards the South, guaranteed only by integrating the European economical policies with the ones of the countries tied to European history throughout history, meaning the countries of the South, the Macherek and the Eastern countries.

The Mediterranean Sea has always had a key role in European history and this role must today be necessarily rediscovered and intensified. On this subject I would like to specify that besides the numerous problems tied to Islam, in the Arab Countries there exists a great expectation towards all that Europe has represented. In the relations with the Arab countries, Europe is, according to me, an indispensable partner for the good of all humanity.

Anwar-ul-Haq Ahady, *Governor of the Bank of Afghanistan*

I would like to begin with two observations before I discuss the situation in Afghanistan. First, I think there is the emergence of a 'new civilization'. I think, in literature different aspects of this civilization have been described in different terms, such as globalization, new world order, liberal era, post-modern rise of the trading states, etc. However, these are all different, but overlapping aspects of the same phenomena, the 'new world civilization'. The dominant feature of this new civilization, in contrast to the old one, is limited sovereignty; interdependence, economic power and the liberal socio-political institutions and values of democracy, freedom, pluralism and tolerance.

This is in sharp contrast to the old international system that is still in some ways relevant, but the dominant feature of the old system was emphasis on sovereignty, territoriality, self-sufficiency, military power, and non-interference in domestic affairs of each nation-state. I think there is a rather uncomfortable coexistence between these two models of managing world affairs. In some areas the relevance of the old model is prevalent and other areas the relevance of the new model is salient. But I think the relevance of the new civilization in terms of values and institutions is increasing and this actually started some time in the 1960's. It is becoming much more prominent now than it has been a few decades ago.

I don't think this new civilization can be characterized as Christian civilization, Islamic, Judaic civilization or by any other religious term. I think it can accommodate all of these civilizations as long as they do not insist on exclusivity and as long as they accept pluralism. I mention this because our experiences in Afghanistan are very relevant to the ideas of the new world civilization. The situation under the Taliban was very much contrary to the recommended values and institutions of the new world civilization. There was the violation of women's rights, the violation of human rights, the protection of terrorists and disrespect for international norms, etc.

Even though there was no violent reaction from the international community before September 11, 2001 however, because of the Taliban's disregard for the new world civilization there was a lot of pressure on the Taliban to change their policy and behavior. I should also say that since the collapse of the Taliban and the rise of the Karzai administration in the past 22 months or so, reconstruction in Afghanistan has been very much inspired by the values and institutions of the new world civilization. For instance, if we look at the politics of the country, the draft constitution was just finished a few days ago and it is expected to be ratified in December by the *Loya Jirga*. This draft constitution is probably one of the most progressive constitutions in this region and the Middle East. It is truly democratic and it allows for some of the practices that are prevalent in some of the most advanced democratic countries. In terms of social norms, once again there is a great deal of emphasis on women's rights. There is also a great deal of emphasis on human rights. I would say that the emphasis on women's rights is unprecedented in this region. Under the new constitution female participation in political and social matters in Afghanistan will probably be even greater than

participation by women in some western societies. According to the draft constitution almost 25 % of seats in the parliament are to be allocated to women. There might be some problem with that in the *Loya Jirga* as it might not pass, but the insistence is that women's rights have been neglected for so long in Afghanistan that there should be an affirmative action approach to women's rights to force society to make up for the neglect of women's rights in the past few decades.

The same is applicable in regards to the economy. Our economy used to be a very closed one; now it is becoming very much aligned with the prescriptions of the World Bank and IMF models in the sense that the emphasis is on free trade and Afghanistan currently has one of the most free trade orientated polices in the region. Last year the government passed an investment law which is very much friendly and allows foreign investors to own 100% of enterprises. The central bank was just given its autonomy and we have passed a very liberal commercial banking law. In short, our political social and economic institutions and polices are in line with the latest thinking and models of the new world civilization.

I do not think these developments would have occurred had we allowed the internal dynamics of Afghan society to follow its natural course. These developments are the result of foreign intervention. Without foreign influence I don't think that we would have been in the situation that we are now. When internal developments are helped by foreign intervention there is also resistance to them. This resistance is not so much in the form of a public rebellion but there are certain political groups who are exploiting some of the discomfort that come with the changes that are conditioned by external forces. However, I am still quite hopeful and I think that the current experiment will succeed as long as there is adequate international attention to Afghanistan, both in terms of foreign assistance – which Afghanistan has received very little for the purposes of reconstruction – and in terms of supporting the political and social institutions that are being built in Afghanistan.

I should just add a more normative note in the sense that for the past few minutes I was talking more in objective terms. My personal preference is that I very much welcome this sort of international influence to advance socio-economic developments in Afghanistan, and I hope that we will continue to get this sort of attention from the international community in Afghanistan.

Antje Vollmer, *Vice-President of the Bundestag*

Not exactly as a political representative of the Greens, I would like to focus the topic of this panel – 'Debate on exemplary failure and solutions' – on a troublesome question which is related to failure. That is to say, why our greatest 'sanctuary' – the theme of human rights – becomes more and more of a reason for military intervention and why at the same time it is not a solution to the problem of stability, which the Ambassador dealt with during his speech. I would hereby like to make a proposal for a possible solution starting from our concrete policy.

We all know that today, big conflicts all have similar foundations. No matter if it is a conflict between the Serbs and Kosovo-Albanians or between the Taliban and the West or between the Chinese and Tibetans, in any case, a conflict between states and their interests plays a smaller and smaller role. On the other hand, the ethnic, religious or cultural belonging of the groups involved frequently becomes more and more an important factor. In many cases this leads first to the destabilization of entire regions, justification of oppression, radicalization and expulsion of people and minorities. When, therefore, these groups are successful in their fight, this also leads to the fragmentation of big states so that they are then smaller and ethnically purer, but not necessary more stable.

Conflicts that have been solved still continue and may erupt again. We all know the worrying situation in Iraq, Israel, Palestine, Afghanistan and the Caucasus region. According to my first thesis, minorities and human rights violations must irreversibly become more and more the focus of international attention, but for instance maybe we will have to find other methods for a solution that are different from those applied up until now. We have, until the present, been using the method whereby states criticize other states and where international institutions condemn governments – often with no success – and then human rights violations sometimes lead to humanitarian catastrophes. Upon reaching particular dimensions they can become more and more of a reason for a necessary armed intervention. It is worrying to remark that there is often a direct link between indignation at human rights violations and justification for such interventions. Therefore, moral turbulence spreads out of these countries and to the international level, but this is not always the correct basis for a proper solution. What at first seems to be a right and important trend within international relations loses, with a better analysis, its power of persuasion that this is a good solution.

There are three reasons for this situation.

Firstly, it depends on the many factors which put countries at the core of the International Community's criticism because of their human rights violations and political will, but it does not depend only on the intensity of human rights violations in the country concerned. The criteria, according to which countries are criticized and often readily condemned, particularly by big mass-media campaigns, are arbitrary and they actually depend on economic, political and media factors instead of complying with objective parameters. As a

matter of fact there is no legal institution able to evaluate or make justified judgments. In this area there is a lack of the rule of law.

Secondly, countries that have been criticized and for which there are often proper moral reservations tend to have a hardened attitude and it is completely impossible to persuade them, bring them to a discussion or help them. Here, I would like to remember the case of North Korea. The possibility of a peaceful solution to the conflict is proportional to the intensity dedicated to this problem by the mass-media of the public opinion.

Thirdly, in weak countries, critics leave their countries – or maybe they stay in their country or possibly they are allowed to stay – and then join the opposition political groups or promote structural reforms of the country they have lost. If they still stay in their country, they work for NGOs and for groups that exclusively criticize their country. They usually only feel disdain at the necessary reconstruction of national institutions and this was the main problem in many post-communist countries. If we now give a look at the time of the conflict between the two blocs and of the Cold War, in those years the situation was completely different. With the Helsinki process the topic of human rights has developed its strongest effect. It has become a strong and revolutionary instrument of individual human rights against the considerable power of totalitarian states and bureaucracies that did not have the problem of being too weak, but, instead, they were too strong to respect individual human rights. Nevertheless today's weakness of states and their institutions is the main problem, especially after being set free.

In my opinion, the International Community's policy to protect people and minorities, has turned into a crisis of legitimacy, not because of the values it represents, but because of its efficiency in coming up with a good solution. I would like to remind you that there are countries with a large amount of press freedom, such as Guatemala, Algeria and Columbia, that, at the same time have suffered more and more social chaos and sometimes this has led to disaster; although today, the social conditions in Algeria are getting better.

I would like to propose a possible model, which can help more of these states and which starts from our country's experience. The Federal Republic of Germany has begun with a country, which, up until now, saw nobody mention and which development might be imagined if it broke up following the model of the Soviet Union, and that is to say China. The Federal Republic of Germany has begun a dialogue on the State of Right and a dialogue on the institutions and structures that a State of Right needs. Astonishingly, in this case, China and the Chinese government, whose sensibility is well known when it comes to human rights and who have often disagreed with our actions, have stated: 'In terms of State of Right we consider China as a developing country'. From this point of view there are many developing countries.

Within the governmental actions, the NGOs and the law associations, we began dialogues characterized by the principle: 'Which institutions and instruments of the division of powers does a functional State of Right need?' I can only tell you that I think all this has a very strong stabilizing effect and that it is also the reason why this is a positive offer. Furthermore, it brings together opportunities of change and of a State of Right with

possibilities for a predictable reform and transformation, through which, in the mean time, it is possible to keep its own guide lines. This is very important for the Chinese. I believe that a debate on legal institutions, structures of the State of Right, rule of law, training for jurists and lawyers and prison directors may help people who are victims of human rights violations more than only a mediation of values. Because, anyway, the countries concerned by this approach deny the use of these instruments for their implementation. I hope this becomes an important program of United Nations.

Milan Gjurcinov, *Writer*

I recently had the opportunity to visit most of ex-Yugoslavia, Bulgaria, Albania and Romania.

From what I have seen, I can say that the situation in all these countries is mostly identical. It is very serious in those countries with a heterogeneous ethnic or religious structure and slightly better in Slovenia, where the ethnic composition of the population is more homogeneous.

I don't want to give you too pessimistic a picture, so I will start on a positive note.

I believe that the most positive aspect in the post-communist history of this area of the world, which began at the end of the Cold War, lies in the disappearance of totalitarian regimes, ideological pressures and the suppression of people's freedom of thought and free will.

Nonetheless, worryingly enough, all such countries are dissatisfied with their current situation and are waiting for a future full of unknowns. Their economic situation is disastrous, social unrests are increasing, their gross domestic products are among the lowest in Europe, unemployment has now reached critical figures and the levels of corruption are among the highest in the world. Breaking the ties with the tyranny of the past has thus generated a deep fear of the future. Some argue that this new idelogical indoctrination, which has superseded the old communist dogma, is now over its peak and that the situation has currently calmed down.

I wouldn't be so sure: after twelve years of independence, peace and justice have disappeared, small countries rarely think together about their future, new conflicts and new rivalries have arisen, all these countries, which in the past decade have experienced the tragedy of extermination, lead now a much more worrying and uncertain existence than they did in the past.

As an intellectual who tries to observe life around him without fostering any kind of prejudice, please let me highlight a few problems and briefly suggest some solutions.

First of all, we must realise that the progress of the world is coming to an end, both from a material perspective, but also from a spiritual and moral one. The balance among these three dimensions is constantly threatened by the excessive technological development. The quality of life and the trust in life's values are eroding in the whole world, both in industrialised and in underdeveloped countries.

Also, we must stop believing the widely shared idea that political parties can only be built at national level or on the basis of common religious beliefs. Such an idea shouldn't even exist in the modern world, although unfortunately it still holds strong in the Balcans.

Finally, we must think about the need of an urgent transformation. I believe that culture has a fundamental role in this inevitable change and I therefore completely agree with those authors who maintain that culture is both a key factor and a decisive force for our future development.

Alberto Piatti, *General Director ASVI*

The World Political Forum is a pilot project, a case of success and an international cooperation project. To introduce it, let me quote a great man, or perhaps 'the' leading actor of the century that has just closed and the one that has just begun. Pope John Paul II, in the *Redentoris Missio*, says: 'the development of a people does not derive primarily from either money, material aids or technical facilities, but from the development of mentality and customs. Man is the centre of development, not money, not technology'.

I began with this quotation from His Holiness, because I feel that this project, which is considered a successful case on the international level, offers an exemplary form of this criterion, which sees the unique and unrepeatable dignity of the person at the centre of every cooperation project. Started in 1992, this is a project that has concerned an area of pile-built favelas, in a zone of the State of Bahia, at Salvador de la Vila in particular, once called Ribera Azul, but with the population density on such levels that you can imagine there is no blue sky left in Bahia.

I like to recall that this project originated from the explicit request of Cardinal Morero Nieves to intervene to provide after-school activities for these seriously deprived children. And so, year after year, development models have been conceived and shared every day with an important and significant presence. These 18,000 people all live with greater dignity in their own homes and no longer in pile dwellings. The model has thus drawn the attention of the World Bank, with the *Cities Alliance* programme, that believed it was worth coming to visit and to propose that we extend it to an area of 150,000 people. Those 150,000 people, who, in the neighbouring bay, live in the same drastic conditions.

I believe that this is the first example, since Bretton Woods, in which the Bank deigns to talk with a non-governmental organization. Moreover it was not a problem of negotiating over the figures, even if significant – $5 million – but on the respect of the identity and therefore the method of intervention. We are now working in a sort of laboratory, in a real partnership between the Federal State and the State of Bahia, the municipalities, an international non-governmental organization like the one I am honoured to represent and the civil society in the Favelas, bringing out the positive elements that people have in some way managed to construct. I believe that it is an extremely interesting laboratory, in which there is the possibility of dialogue according to a principle to which we attach great importance and believe fundamental for any action, whether in situations of conflict, post-conflict or cooperation, which is that of subsidiary.

Verso una nuova civiltà.