

*International Peace Bureau
Contributions to Nobel Peace Laureates
Summits 2002-2006*



International Peace Bureau Founded 1892 – Nobel Peace Prize 1910 – UN Consultative Status



Bureau International de la Paix
Internationales Friedensbüro
Oficina Internacional de la Paz

41, rue de Zurich, 1201 Geneva, Switzerland
Tel.: + 41 22 731 64 29, Fax: + 41 22 738 9419
E-mail: mailbox@ipb.org, Web: www.ipb.org

Dear Friends:

Over the past few years the International Peace Bureau (IPB) has been privileged to participate actively in the Nobel Peace Laureate Summits in Rome, Italy and, most recently in Gwangju, South Korea. The presentations of the IPB delegates are substantive and substantial. We are proud to share them with you here. What we are most pleased with is the fact that the Final Statements at each of these Summits has implicitly endorsed the concerns and priorities that the IPB has determined are most important for a peaceful world.

As President of a member organization of IPB which focuses primarily on education and advocacy of the necessity to eliminate nuclear weapons through strengthening the international rule of law, I encourage you to read the presentations herein of the IPB representatives and consider the value of this unique global network capable of advancing an integrated approach to peace which includes disarmament, human rights, gender equity, sustainable development and environmental responsibility. If you support this agenda, please consider becoming part of an international voice that is not bounded by nationality, religion, or gender and puts the security of real individual human lives at the center of policies. Yes, states and nations are important, but their value must be established by how they treat people and the living systems of our shared precious planet.

The IPB presentations and the Statements of the Nobel Laureates succinctly and clearly state the principles and policies needed to for a world where the pursuit of war is placed where it belongs -- in history's rubbish bin alongside apartheid, slavery, gender chauvinism, and the divine right of kings.

Sincerely,



Jonathan Granoff, President
Global Security Institute
and an IPB Delegate to Nobel Laureate Summits
www.gs institute.org
www.ipb.org

Cover Photo, left to right: Mary Ellen McNish (American Friends Service Committee), Ron McCoy (International Physicians for the Prevention of Nuclear War), Jonathan Granoff (International Peace Bureau), Mairead Corrigan-Maguire, Wangari Maathai, Kim Dae-jung, Mikhail Gorbachev, Shirin Ebadi, Lilian Goncalves-Ho Kang You (Amnesty International), Paulo Cotta-Ramusina (Pugwash Conferences on Science and World Affairs), Gwang-Seo Park (Mayor of Gwangju)

Nobel Peace Summit Documents 2002-2006

Table of Contents

2002: Third Global Summit of Nobel Peace Laureates October 19-20 Rome, Italy

"Battle for the Planet" By Senator Douglas Roche, O.C. Report on the Summit	5
Final Statement: Laureates Challenge Doctrine of Unilateral Militarism	9

2003: 4th World Summit of Nobel Peace Laureates November 27th- 30th Rome, Italy

"Ethics and Policy" By Ambassador Jayantha Dhanapala	12
"Peace and Security" By Jonathan Granoff	16
"The Human Right to Peace: Ethics and Policy" By Senator Douglas Roche, O.C.	21
A Report from the President	25
Event Report	26
Final Statement: Ethics and Policy	28

2004: 5th Summit of Nobel Peace Laureates November 10-12 Rome, Italy

"Reflections on Human Unity" By Jonathan Granoff	31
"Lifting Up the World: Building a Culture of Peace" By Alyn Ware	49
Event Report: Nobel Peace Laureates Express Grave Concern about New Nuclear Arms Race, Call for Strengthening of NPT and UN By: Urs Ciplat	53
Event Report By Jonathan Granoff	56

Final Statement: A United World or a Divided World? Multiethnicity, Human Rights, Terrorism	60
--	----

2005: 6th Global Summit of Nobel Peace Laureates-Emergency Africa
November 24-26
Rome, Italy

Statement by Jayantha Dhanapala	63
Contributions from the Founder of the Bangwe and Dialogue Association By Colette Samoya	68
“From Words to Actions” By Edouard A. Mancini	72
“In Memoriam of a True Human Being: Joseph Rotblat” By Jonathan Granoff	75
Final Statement: Emergency Africa: from Attention to Action	78

2006: 7th World Summit of Nobel Peace Laureates
June 15-17
Gwangju, South Korea

“Ending War, Pursuing Peace” By Jonathan Granoff	82
Thank you, Gwangju Poem By Jonathan Granoff	91
IPB Event Report	92
Final Statement- Gwangju Declaration	95

**Third Global Summit of Nobel Peace Laureates
October 19-20, 2002
Rome, Italy**



Betty Williams and Senator Douglas Roche

**Battle for the Planet
By Senator Douglas Roche, O.C.
October 20, 2002
Summit Report
Rome, Italy**

This article was published in the UN Chronicle. Volume XL, Issue 1, 2003

SUMMARY: The 3rd World Summit of Nobel Peace Laureates was held at Rome October 19-20, 2002, under the sponsorship of Mikhail Gorbachev, President of the Gorbachev Foundation and the Nobel Peace Laureate of 1990. Under President Gorbachev's leadership, a statement (see below) was issued, to be distributed throughout the U.N. system and to many world leaders, calling for a solution to the Iraq-U.S. crisis by the U.N. Security Council and not unilateral action. Security Council resolutions must be fully adhered to, and the rights of the Iraqi people respected. The struggle against terrorism must not become a pretext for unjust constraints on human rights. The statement sharply criticized new military doctrines which make a pre-emptive nuclear weapons attack possible. The statement, calling for the abolition of nuclear and other weapons of mass destruction, said: "Nuclear weapons are immoral and every use of them is illegal." The statement concluded: "A culture of peace must overcome today's culture of war." With the theme of the meeting, "Beyond Johannesburg: Water Emergency and Other Emergencies of the World," participants supported a "Water for Peace" initiative flowing out of the Johannesburg Declaration, "Battle for the Planet," signed by six Nobel

laureates and the mayors of several large cities. Six Nobel Peace laureates attended the Rome meeting with the representatives of 14 other organizations that received the Nobel Peace Prize. President Gorbachev awarded a "Man of Peace" prize to Italian actor-director Roberto Benigni.

1. A two-day program dealing with wide themes of war and violence, international terrorism, poverty, water and the ecological crisis was attended by Nobel Peace Laureates: Adolfo Perez Esquivel (1980), Mikhail Gorbachev (1990), Lech Walesa (1983), Rigoberta Menchù (1992), Joseph Rotblat (1995), Betty Williams (1976) and these Nobel Prize-winning organizations: Institut de Droit International, International Peace Bureau (represented by Senator Douglas Roche, O.C. of Canada), International Red Cross, American Friends Service Committee, UNHCR, UNICEF, International Labour Organization, Amnesty International, International Physicians for the Prevention of Nuclear War, United Nations Peace-keeping Forces, Pugwash Conferences on Science and World Affairs, International Campaign to Ban Landmines, Medecins Sans Frontières, United Nations. Messages were sent by U.N. Secretary-General Kofi Annan (2001), Yasser Arafat (1994) and Aung San Suu Kyi (1991). The meeting was held at the Roman Campidoglio, overlooking the ruins of the Roman Forum, with Mayor Walter Veltroni as co-sponsor. A City of Rome reception and concert at the Fontana di Trevi were included in the program.

2. A strong presence at the meeting, President Gorbachev insisted that, with the 2002 Johannesburg Summit ending in some ambiguity, this Nobel meeting should send out a clear signal to the world: a crisis of civilization exists, brought about by war, violence and the instability caused by poverty. The status quo of dominance by a few cannot be allowed to continue. He warned about the over-abundance of power in NATO, now expanding once again, which possesses 70 percent of the military power in the world. Quoting President John F. Kennedy's famous address to American University June 10, 1963, Mr. Gorbachev said a Pax Americana was not what was needed today; rather the cooperation of all must overcome the tendencies of unilateral domination. Thirty-one countries now have the ability to develop a nuclear weapon, and that is a terrifying situation. He excoriated governments for pleading that they did not have enough money to cure poverty but, at the same time, spent enormous sums on arms. He especially criticized the development of nuclear weapons. This will go on and on, he said, unless the world community is energized to stop it. Certainly, he said, new weapons are not needed to fight terrorism. Take a principled position against nuclear weapons, he urged. The world could contribute to the alleviation of terrorism by implementing new models of development. Expressing a strong no to nuclear war, he said, let us get on to the next stage of civilization. The meeting gave him prolonged applause.

3. The participants called on both Palestinians and Israelis to reject extremism and violence. On Iraq, the final statement said:

The problems concerning Iraq must be resolved on the basis of United Nations Security Council resolutions. Unilateral action is not acceptable. The world community must ensure that Security Council resolutions are fully adhered to. This will help normalize the

situation in the Middle East and bring stability and safety to the region. In particular, this implies respect for the rights of the Iraqi people, and for Iraqi sovereignty and territorial integrity.

4. A two-hour "Extraordinary Session" was held, co-chaired by Senator Douglas Roche, O.C., and Jonathan Granoff, President of Global Security Institute, on "Overcoming Unilateral Militarism: Responding to Threats to Human Security." With the Nobel laureates and the representatives of Nobel organizations grouped around a table, the discussion ranged from the urgency of today's crisis to the need to preserve human rights values while fighting terrorism, and the need for a code of ethics for scientists. Some highlights:

a) Nobel laureate Betty Williams insisted that female Nobel laureates could play a stronger role for peace and said a delegation of women should be sent to Iraq to let the suffering people of that country know they have much support in the outside world. Bypass the superpowers, she said, take positive action.

b) Professor Joseph Rotblat, following up his earlier address, "The Nuclear Threat Is Real," said that resumed nuclear testing (of the new "bunker-buster" nuclear weapon) could lead to nuclear war. He pointed to the outstanding contradiction of our time: "Nuclear weapons are horrible—we are told—and their possession must not be allowed by countries like Iraq, but the possession and use of these weapons by the United States is justified for the sake of world peace."

c) Lech Walesa, the Nobel laureate who is a former President of Poland, said his thinking is somewhat different from what he had been hearing. The September 11 tragedy could hardly have been responded to as effectively by the United Nations as it was by the United States. Until the U.N. itself had a force to combat terrorism and keep the peace, he said, we should be grateful for the action of the U.S. It was the U.S. that brought an end to fighting in the Balkans. To stop Iraq, there is presently no alternative to the U.S. However, in considering the draft statement which included the reference to the immorality and illegality of nuclear weapons, President Walesa said that, even though this went against the prevailing doctrine of the nuclear powers, it was important to make this statement and he would support it.

d) Dr. Ron McCoy, president of International Physicians for the Prevention of Nuclear War, noting that China had thus far been neglected in the discussion, suggested that the real reason for the U.S. National Missile Defence system may be protection against what the U.S. deems as a possible future enemy in China. He said developments in China should be watched carefully. The future, he added, contained the possibility of genetic weapons. For the present, we must beware of unleashing uncontrollable forces set off by a "Muslim martyr," through a war against Iraq. Long-range strategies by an informed civil society breaking through the media blanket are needed for true security. He appealed for Nobel laureates to promote the U.N. Study on Disarmament and Non-Proliferation Education, released October 9 by the United Nations.

e) Summarizing, Jonathan Granoff pointed to the "two incompatible visions" today: the 2000 NPT Review's 13 Practical Steps under the rule of law, and the United States Space Command's Vision 2020, a unilateralist approach to U.S. security. He called for cooperation to bring the world's cultures and economies together for true global security.

5. The Nobel Meeting endorsed the "Water for Peace" initiative of Green Cross International, whose Vice-President, Alexander Likhotal, warned of future wars fought over water. Increasing the access of people to water, he said, "is a tool of peace." Solving the global water crisis is key to sustainable development.

6. The Meeting also endorsed the Johannesburg Declaration, "Battle for the Planet." This statement summarized world conditions:

We stand at a critical moment in Earth's history: a time when humanity must choose its future. As the world becomes increasingly interdependent and fragile, the future holds great peril, and we, the People, have great responsibilities. Ten years ago, the world was swept up in a wave of optimism with the end of the Cold War and the adoption of Agenda 21 at the Rio Earth Summit. Today, however, the report on the state of the planet is overwhelming: the environment continues to deteriorate, poverty is increasing and the number of armed conflicts is on the rise. In addition, the globalizing economy appears to thwart all possibility for change. The main causes of an unsustainable future include: growing populations, which need more energy and resources; affluence, which increases material consumption and waste; poverty, which limits choices on how to use the environment; technologies, which use energy and dispose of waste inefficiently; insecurity, which leads to massive spending on military budgets and the construction of nuclear, chemical and biological weapons of mass destruction; and financial institutions and policies, which avoid addressing the most pressing problems and exclude stakeholders and key social actors, especially women, indigenous people and the poor.

"Battle for the Planet" demanded, inter alia, that governments:

- Commit resources to halve global poverty by 2015.
- Adopt a common ethical framework and recognize the Earth Charter to build global partnerships for sustainable development.
- Reform the U.N. system to give the U.N. more power to enforce decisions for peace.
- Increase Official Development Assistance (ODA) to help developing countries eliminate crippling debts.

7. The role of the Nobel Peace laureates themselves came under examination, with several participants encouraging a more concerted, active role as messengers of peace. The possibility for such action was considered enhanced by the award to the latest recipient, Jimmy Carter, former President of the United States.

Third Global Summit of Nobel Peace Laureates Final Statement- Laureates Challenge Doctrine of Unilateral Militarism

October 21, 2002

Rome, Italy

The 3rd World Summit of Nobel Peace Laureates was held from October 18th to 20th, 2002. It was organized by Mikhail Gorbachev and Walter Veltroni, Mayor of Rome.

The participants included: Mikhail Gorbachev, Rigoberta Menchú Tum, Adolfo Pérez Esquivel, Joseph Rotblat, Lech Walesa, Betty Williams, Institut de Droit International, International Peace Bureau, American Friends Service Committee, United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees, International Labour Organization, Amnesty International, International Physicians for the Prevention of Nuclear War, United Nations Peace-keeping Forces, Pugwash Conference on Science and World Affairs, International Campaign to Ban Landmines, Médecins Sans Frontières, and the United Nations.

The participants of the 3rd World Summit of Nobel Peace Laureates refuse to accept the cynicism and despair that crushes hope and vision. They affirm strongly our common humanity and capacity to work cooperatively, informed by compassion and inspired by love. Our humanity demands this.

The meeting encouraged an open exchange of opinions regarding threats to world peace, and the contradictions and instability of the current world order. The Nobel Peace Laureates participating in the meeting sought solutions to the principal challenges of our time: widespread war and violence, including international terrorism; poverty; and environmental degradation. There is an urgent need to find solutions leading to a new world order that emphasizes peace, humanity and equality.

1. Of particular concern to the participants is the increased reliance on violence and war as a primary means to resolve political disputes. It is imperative to seek peaceful political solutions to conflict and to deepen collaboration among states, be it through the United Nations or other regional security organizations.

A primary goal is to halt the new arms race, and to demilitarise international relations. The participants are concerned about the new military doctrines that contemplate the use, even pre-emptive, of nuclear weapons. Nuclear weapons continue to pose a real threat due to a renewed tendency toward proliferation, made more dangerous by the possibility that terrorists may acquire them. Nuclear weapons are immoral and their use is illegal. It is imperative to achieve the total abolition of nuclear weapons and other weapons of mass destruction.

It remains important to maintain tight control over the commerce of

conventional arms, and to destroy landmines that continue to disproportionately kill and maim civilians and children.

The participants unanimously agree that the struggle against terrorism needs to be intensified, but it must not become a pretext for unjust constraints on human rights, or for ethnic, racial and religious discrimination. The solutions must actively involve non-violent measures including dialogue, collaboration, and increased understanding between different societies, cultures, and religions. A Culture of Peace must overcome today's dominant culture of war. To do so, educational institutions must incorporate curricula that include peace education, with particular emphasis on non-violent means of conflict resolution.

2. The participants express their full support of efforts to achieve a peaceful political resolution to the crisis in the Middle East, and call upon both Palestinians and Israelis to reject extremism and violence. Israel's right to security must be fully guaranteed, as must be the right of the Palestinian people to have a sovereign State. A successful peace process may require the parties to focus on core problems, while postponing complete resolution of every aspect of the conflict.

The participants are satisfied with the initiatives of the "four" (the United Nations, the United States, Russia, and the European Union) and believe that any agreements must be accompanied by guarantees, made primarily by the four promoters themselves.

The problems concerning Iraq must be resolved on the basis of United Nations Security Council resolutions. Unilateral action is not acceptable. The world community must ensure that Security Council resolutions are fully adhered to. This will help normalize the situation in the Middle East and bring stability and safety to the region. In particular, this implies respect for the rights of the Iraqi people, and for Iraqi sovereignty and territorial integrity.

3. The participants recalled the United Nations' 2002 World Summit on Sustainable Development in Johannesburg. They expressed their regret that the Summit did not lead to concrete and binding decisions to address fundamental problems, such as poverty, environmental degradation, and the increasingly acute energy crisis.

The participants unanimously declare that the problems of poverty, suffering, the humiliation of millions of people, and the growing gap between North and South represent a time bomb. These problems are a source of conflict and are fertile soil for terrorism.

There is no alternative to sustainable development. Therefore, the fundamental goal must be to improve living conditions and protect the environment and

natural resources. There must also be respect for workers' basic rights, meaningful occupation and dignity for current and future generations, and the elimination of the scourge of child labour.

The participants recommend that governments ensure the right of all peoples to health and guarantee access to basic medicines.

They stress their preoccupation over the destiny of children who are the future of the world.

4. The participants give their support to the "Water for Peace" initiative of Green Cross International and urge governments, state bodies, and the representatives of science, business, and civil society to contribute actively toward its successful implementation.

Solving the global water crisis represents an important step toward achieving the goals of sustainable development, and will improve life and health conditions for millions of people, not only in the developing world, but also in the developed world. This goal is of vital importance.

The participants endorse the Johannesburg Joint Declaration of Nobel Peace Laureates and Mayors of major cities, "The Battle for the Planet." It is an efficient consolidation of efforts in favour of sustainable development, and it provides a useful blueprint for action.

The participants are determined to continue, each in their own country and according to their abilities, to implement the activities required to meet the objectives stated above. They will keep in contact with each other and will gather again at the Forum in Rome to continue their collective work.

This statement will be delivered to the Secretary-General of the United Nations, the Permanent Members of the United Nations Security Council, the Prime Minister of Israel, the Chairman of the Palestinian Authority, the President of Iraq, the leading organs of the European Union, the Prime Minister of the Republic of Italy, His Holiness Pope John Paul II, and all other Nobel Laureates.

2003-4th World Summit of Nobel Peace Laureates
Ethics in Policy, Economics and Science
November 27th- 30th
Rome, Italy



Ambassador Jayantha Dhanapala

Ethics and Policy
By Jayantha Dhanapala
November 28, 2003
Honorary President of the International Peace Bureau
Rome, Italy

It is indeed a privilege and an honour for the International Peace Bureau (IPB), which I represent, to open this discussion on “Ethics, Values and Policy: Our Deeper Unity, Our Common Humanity ” – a theme that is clearly timely and relevant in the current context of global affairs. The IPB was founded in 1892 as a direct result of the third Universal Peace Congress held in this eternal city of Rome in 1891. As the world’s oldest and most comprehensive international peace federation and the Nobel Peace Laureate in 1910, we continue to be proud to be associated with the Nobel Laureates Summit and we thank the Gorbachev Foundation and the City of Rome for your hospitality and the arrangements.

The IPB would like to propose that our consideration of this agenda item be structured in three parts. This initial session will consist of an overview of the subject. Thereafter we will have a session entitled, “Peace and Security: Multilateral and Disarmament Imperatives.” The final session will be “Sustainable Development: Building a Culture of Peace.” This is not of course a rigid compartmentalization because building a culture of peace requires an integrated agenda.

The use of the term “Ethics” for a set of moral principles presupposes that we are all bound by a common understanding of what we mean. In a very broad sense, we are talking about the absolutely irreducible minimum of humankind’s cultural, moral and spiritual achievement over centuries of civilization. It is not only what distinguishes the human species from other living beings, but also the soul of humankind. It is the quintessence of all religious philosophies and the highest common factor among all cultures.

Ethical choices are central to the human condition and can not be marginalized. Each one of you in your exemplary lives, and every institution represented here is uniquely equipped to describe how ethics played a role in the policies pursued by you in advancing the common causes of humankind. It is widely, but wrongly, assumed that the realm of ethical values and the world of pragmatic politics are wide apart and that never the twain shall meet. Your achievements alone illustrate that there can be a fusion between ethics and policy, and it is this fusion that contributes to the betterment of mankind and to peace. All of you have felt the heat of political expediency and the pressures of powerful forces luring you away from ethical values. That you withstood that heat and those forces is a measure of your contribution to humankind.

We are still in the early days of the first century of a new millennium in the human saga leaving behind the bloodiest century of all time. There is a unique opportunity for us to use the indisputable influence we wield, individually and collectively, to shape a world order that is built more solidly on ethics than on the pursuit of individual profit or national self-interest. In the year 2000 the largest ever gathering of Heads of State and Government met at the United Nations in New York and issued the historic Millennium Declaration. Significantly, before the Declaration embarks on setting objectives in respect of the different areas of peace, security and disarmament including the elimination of weapons of mass destruction especially nuclear weapons; development and poverty eradication; human rights, democracy and good governance including the Millennium Development Goals; protecting the vulnerable and meeting the special needs of Africa, it addresses the issue of fundamental values underpinning international relations in the twenty-first century. That demonstrates a remarkably sound judgment of priorities. If the leaders of the world cannot agree on the ethical values that bind them together, they are unlikely to agree on common goals and common strategies to overcome what Secretary-General Kofi Annan has called ‘problems without passports.’

It is relevant for us therefore to review these shared values set out in the United Nations Millennium Declaration as a common ethical base. They comprise six of the most basic aspirations of humankind – **freedom, equality, solidarity, tolerance, respect for nature and shared responsibility**. From each of these fundamental values we draw our guidance for the specific action plans that the international community committed itself to in the Millennium Declaration. It is a moral compass for us all. As universally shared values and principles they are the essential components of peace and non-violence leading humankind away from conflict and the clash of arms towards the peaceful settlement of disputes. Individually these values represent powerful forces that have

inspired and motivated humankind throughout millennia of history. They have been accelerators of human progress. Collectively they represent the benchmark against which we must judge our performance as individual nations and as the world community in taking humankind forward to a better and safer world.

- ❖ **Freedom** - was the spur that rid the world of slavery, colonialism and apartheid: it is the ethical value that protects men, women and children from fear, exploitation and abuse, from injustice and deprivation and from want and hunger.
- ❖ **Equality** - is what drove societies to abolish discrimination on the basis of colour, creed, wealth, ethnicity, aristocratic origin and gender: it is the ethical value that empowers individuals in society and nations in the international community whether big or small, rich or poor, mighty or meek.
- ❖ **Solidarity** - is the sense of a common identity as one human family with reciprocal duties and obligations that has led to social contracts and social security within countries and to the aid and assistance of the wealthy and developed countries to those who are stricken with disease, disaster and endemic poverty: it is the ethical value that must ensure the elimination of injustices, asymmetries in globalised development and absolute poverty.
- ❖ **Tolerance** - is the glue that has bonded us together as human beings with mutual respect for each other despite our astonishing diversity both within nations and the international community: it is the ethical value that will prevent ethnic and religious conflict within nations and the ‘clash of civilizations’ on a global scale ensuring instead a ‘dialogue among civilizations’ and the celebration of human diversity as an endowment.
- ❖ **Respect for nature** - is what has preserved the available and potential natural resources of our planet Earth and our ecological system as our common heritage to serve the genuine needs and not the greedy wants of humankind: it is the ethical value that will guide us to sustainable development managing our consumption of resources equitably and wisely so that we pass on the world which we occupy as a trust, to generations to come in at least as healthy and wholesome a state as we received it from preceding generations. Finally,
- ❖ **Shared responsibility** – is the common realization that we are one brotherhood and sisterhood placed together in a world that is more integrated than ever before through the processes of globalization and that the management of public goods has to be achieved optimally through participatory, people-centred endeavours and good democratic governance at the national level and through multilateralism and international organizations - with the United Nations at its apex - in the collective response to global challenges to international peace and human security: it is the ethical value

that will prevent humankind from anarchy and self-destruction through selfishness and profligacy and the insurance policy to achieve a rule based international order founded on the bedrock of international law, human rights, equity and justice.

The translation of these ethical values in the daily world of human interaction – to do the right thing for the right reason – presents all of us with an enormous challenge. I am deeply convinced that with the influence you command, you can and must make a difference. At the end of this discussion I know that what you will say collectively will be heard throughout the world. We are here because of a common bond of having served the cause of international peace and security. We have to continue to serve that noble cause although we may not be in government and although we may not all be policy-makers. But we cannot ever underestimate our collective potential to influence Governments and to guide policy formulation on ethical lines. So can civil society collectively. We can provide leadership to civil society. No Government or group can claim a monopoly over wisdom. Nor can they claim to be the sole interpreters of the national or global interest. We are not exempt from this general premise but we can contribute towards the public discourse on national and international policy by emphasizing the ethical dimension. Already there are danger signals that illustrate an erosion of the ethical base we have in the world. Terrorism, nihilism and anarchism are ominous symptoms. Are they the result of perceptions that the policies pursued in the past have been divorced from ethics? Or are they the emergence of a new threat for which our collective response must not be militarism but a return to implementing our shared value base of ethics honestly, transparently and consistently?

Let us launch our joint quest for a greater role for ethics in the formulation of policy to respond to the new threats to security and to the other challenges facing humankind today. It is an urgent task to preserve and develop the mainsprings of our common humanity for a new and glorious chapter of human history. Despair is a terrible condition breeding cynicism and destructive violence. We must give the world hope based on fundamental moral principles. It is the certain path for humankind's future.



Rigoberta Menchu Tum, Jonathan Granoff, and Juana Vasquez

Peace and Security

By Jonathan Granoff

November 28, 2003

International Peace Bureau Delegate

Rome, Italy

We are the first generation making ethical decisions that will determine whether we will be the last generation. Science, technology and sophisticated social organizational skills have gifted us with unprecedented capacities for enrichment or destruction. I believe that there is an ethical responsibility to future generations to ensure we are not passing on a future of horrific wars or ecological catastrophe. As individuals and organizations that have received the Nobel Peace Prize, we, particularly, have a heightened responsibility to encourage and empower ethically informed policies.

Each of us knows that our individual life is precious and fragile. We are now reminded that our collective existence is fragile. This compels us to address, among other issues, ensuring bio-diversity and ending the destruction of thousands of species; reversing the depletion of fishing stocks; controlling ocean dumping; preventing ozone depletion; halting global warming; controlling and eliminating nuclear and other weapons of mass destruction; ending terrorism whether by States or non-State actors; fighting pandemic diseases; ending the tragedy of crushing poverty and lack of clean drinking water; and addressing crises arising from States in chaos. No nation or even a small group of nations can succeed in addressing these issues alone.

Some solutions must be universal. Chlorofluorocarbon from a refrigerant in the

US or China can harm the ozone in Chile, New Zealand or anywhere. If one country allows oceanic dumping, others will follow. Viruses do not recognize religions, races or borders. Our futures are interconnected in unprecedented ways. Wise people have been instructing us for millennia to recognize our deeper human unity. But, now necessity alerts us: the galvanizing power of moral leadership cannot be ignored in deference to short-term parochial interests. Our collective challenges require principles that are uplifting, inspiring, affirmative of our highest potential and universal. Hope must overcome fear.

Fear is the twin of ignorance, generating a false realism. Nicolo Machiavelli stated it in *The Prince*: “Where the safety of the country depends upon resolutions to be taken, no consideration of justice or injustice, humanity or cruelty, nor of glory or shame, should be allowed to prevail.” This policy of “emergency” can hardly make sense as a norm if we are to be ethical beings living in community. Such so called “realists” invariably assert broadly that power in their own hands is necessary to ensure the security of their individual State. Overlooking the intricate interconnectedness of living systems, they exalt social Darwinism. Strength is good, ultimate strength is better. In the quest for the ultimate weapon, an absurd result is obtained. The means to security and the pursuit of strength undermine the end of security. Such improved means to an unimproved end is most aptly articulated by nuclear weapons whereby the means of pursuing security undermines the end of security. This is not realistic. This is irresponsible.

They also rely on a rigid world view in which the pursuit of the good and the pursuit of the real are divisible. They say that only what can be measured, predicted and controlled is relevant in policy discussion. What gives our lives meaning, what makes us human, what exalts our lives, is thus not considered. They leave little room in the making of policy for conscience, love, or other immeasurable, formless, human treasures. Not the least of these treasures that give our lives meaning is compassion, the twin of wisdom.

Compassion is essential to our ethical nature and has universally guided every successful culture. It is upon the foundation of ethical principles that policies must become based. Without compassion, law cannot attain justice, and without justice, there is never peace. When kindness and compassion guide our policies, our rules become golden.

Buddhism: “Hurt not others in ways that you yourself would find hurtful.” *Udana-Varga, 5:18*; “A state that is not pleasing or delightful to me, how could I inflict that upon another?” *Samyutta Nikaya v. 353*.

Christianity: “All things whatsoever you would that men should do to you, do you even so to them.” *Matthew 7:12*.

Confucianism: “Do not unto others what you would not have them do unto you.” *Analects 15:23*; “Tsi-kung asked, ‘Is there one word that can serve as a principle of conduct for life?’ Confucius replied, ‘It is the word ‘shu’ – reciprocity. Do not impose on others what you yourself do not desire.’” *Doctrine of the Mean 13.3*; “One should not behave towards others in a way which is disagreeable to oneself.” *Mencius VII.A.4*.

Hinduism: “This is the sum of duty: do not unto others which would cause you pain if done to you.” *Mahabharata 5:1517.*

Islam: “No one of you is a believer until he desires for his brother that which he desires for himself.” *Hadith.*

Jainism: “A man should journey treating all creatures as he himself would be treated.” *Sutrakritanga 1.11.33*; “Therefore, neither does he [a wise person] cause violence to others nor does he make others do so.” *Acarangasutra 5.101-2*; “In happiness and suffering, in joy and grief, we should regard all creatures as we regard our own self.” *Lord Mahavira, 24th Tirthankara.*

Judaism: “...thou shall love thy neighbor as thyself.” *Leviticus 19:18*;
“What is hateful to you, do not do to your fellow man. That is the law; all the rest is commentary.” *Talmud, Shabbat 31a.*

Native American: “Respect for all life is the foundation.” *The Great Law of Peace.*

Roman Pagan Religion: “The law imprinted on the hearts of all men is to love the members of society as themselves.”

Shinto: “The heart of the person before you is a mirror.”

Sikhism: “I am a stranger to no one; and no one is a stranger to me. Indeed, I am a friend to all. *Guru Granth Sahib, p. 1299.* "As thou hast deemed thyself, so deem others."

Taoism: “Regard your neighbor’s gain as your own gain, and your neighbor’s loss as your own loss.” *Tai Shang Kan Ying Pien, 213-218.*

Yoruba Wisdom (Nigeria): “One going to take a pointed stick to pinch a baby bird should first try it on himself to feel how it hurts.”

Zoroastrianism: “That nature only is good when it shall not do unto another whatsoever is not good for its own self.” *Dadistan-I-Dinik, 94:5.*

Philosopher’s statements:

Plato: “May I do to others as I would that they should do unto me.”
Greece, 4th Century BCE.

Socrates: “Do not do to others that which would anger you if others did it to you.”
Greece, 5th Century BCE.

Seneca: “Treat your inferiors as you would be treated by your superiors.”
Epistle 47:11 Rome, 1st Century CE.

This principle of reciprocity is the ethical and moral foundation of all the world's major religions. Multilateralism is the logical political outgrowth of this principle. An international order based on cooperation, equity and the rule of law is its needed expression.

Where this rule of reciprocity is violated, instability follows. The failure of the nuclear weapons states to abide by their pledge, contained in the Nuclear Nonproliferation Treaty, to negotiate the elimination of nuclear weapons is the single greatest stimulus to the proliferation of nuclear weapons. For some to say nuclear weapons are good for them but not for others is simply not sustainable.

The threat to use nuclear weapons on innocent people can never be ethically legitimate. Thus, there is a moral imperative for their abolition.

I would like to add two new rules:

First, the Rule of Nations: **“Treat other nations as you wish your nation to be treated.”**

Second, the Rule of the Powerful: **“As one does so shall others do.”**

We are faced with a moment of collective truth: the ethical, spiritually based insights of the wise coincide with material physical imperatives for survival. The value of the love of power must give way to the power of love. In today's world, leadership must be guided by the duty to love one's neighbor as oneself. This includes the duty to protect the weakest neighbor. And, today, the whole world is one neighborhood – a moral location, not just a physical one.

What was once an admonition as a personal necessity for inner growth has now become a principle that we must learn to utilize in forming public policies. The rule is offended by ethnic and religious exclusivity and prejudice, nationalistic expansionism, economic injustice and environmental irresponsibility. How should we view the security of people? May I suggest that Timothy Wirth, when he was United States Under Secretary of State for Global Affairs, was correct when he stated that a productive focus of multilateral security should begin with people:

Security is now understood in the context of human security. Human security is about the 1 billion individuals who live in abject poverty. It is about the 800 million people who go hungry every day -- the 240 million malnourished. The 17 million who die each year from easily preventable diseases fall into this definition of security, as do the 1.3 billion people without access to clean water and the more than 2 billion people who do not benefit from safe sanitation.

Failure to change from the flawed paradigm in which security is pursued primarily through violence reinforces the brutality inflicted upon millions of daily lives destroyed by conventional weapons, including small arms and anti personnel land mines. And we

cannot overlook the exorbitant economic waste and social costs of militarism -- more than ten trillion dollars since the end of the Cold War. If we do not quickly get over the ridiculous excessive attachment to that which divides us, we will fail to establish effective institutions and policies in our time and we will fail to treat future generations as we would be treated. Such failure cannot be accepted by any parent who has looked into the eyes of their children.

We have developed excessively sophisticated technologies for destruction. For our survival, we require appropriate social and human technologies for cooperation, for disarmament -- for our very humanity.

An Eskimo elder at the Millennium World Peace Summit at the United Nations said, "Our history goes back 40,000 years and only now are we finding lakes in the Artic ice cap. You have technology that is melting the ice. When will we develop a technology to melt the human heart?" Let our deliberations for peace and security also help develop that technology.

The Human Right to Peace: Ethics and Policy

By Senator Douglas Roche, O.C.

November 28, 2003

International Peace Bureau Delegate Rome, Italy

So overpowering is the culture of war that it discourages many from even thinking that they could be instruments of change. A cynicism and mistrust are deeply imbedded in populaces. Many who do speak up for change are dismissed as idealists. Yet despite a political and societal climate that supports the entrenched culture of war status quo, there are significant signs that “a culture of peace” is being born. Already the ideas and formulation of a culture of peace have taken shape and been given a structural basis. A culture of peace may still be a goal rather than the dominant reality, but, just as Mahatma Gandhi and Martin Luther King’s principles of non-violence were taken up by many, so too the programs for a culture of peace are slowly taking shape.

A New Vision of Peace

The idea of a culture of peace to overcome – in a non-violent way – the culture of war was first taken up at a conference of scholars in 1989 at Yamoussoukro, Ivory Coast, as a “new vision of peace” constructed “by developing a peace culture based on the universal values of life, liberty, justice, solidarity, tolerance, human rights and equality between men and women.” The conference emphasized that violence is not an endemic part of the human condition. UNESCO then began to formulate a culture of peace as a set of ethical and aesthetic values, habits and customs, attitudes toward others, forms of behaviour and ways of life that draw on and express:

- Respect for life and for the dignity and human rights of individuals.
- Rejection of violence.
- Recognition of equal rights for men and women.
- Upholding of the principles of democracy, freedom, justice, solidarity, tolerance, the acceptance of differences, and
- Understanding between nations and countries and between ethnic, religious, cultural and social groups.

A culture of peace is an approach to life that seeks to transform the cultural roots of war and violence into a culture where dialogue, respect, and fairness govern social relations. In this way, violence can be prevented through a more tolerant common global ethic. The culture of peace uses education as an essential tool in fostering attitudes supportive of nonviolence, cooperation and social justice. It promotes sustainable development for all, free human rights, and equality between men and women. It requires genuine democracy and the free flow of information. It leads to disarmament. The culture of peace is, at its core, an ethical approach to life. It recognizes that the world is experiencing a fundamental crisis. Though this crisis is often expressed in economic, ecological or political terms, it is fundamentally a crisis of the human spirit. It is a crisis of all humanity which, in the journey through time, has reached the point where we are capable of destroying all life on earth just at the moment when the recognition of the inherent human rights of everyone is beginning to take hold. A choice in how we will live, which path we will follow, is illuminated. The culture of peace offers the vision of a global ethic

toward life in full vibrancy; the culture of war offers the prospect of misery and annihilation.

When he was UNESCO Secretary-General, Federico Mayor dedicated himself to three initiatives to develop a culture of peace: a proposal for an International Year for the Culture of Peace (2000); a proposal for a U.N. Declaration and Programme of Action on a Culture of Peace; and an initiative of the Nobel Peace Laureates' "Campaign for the Children of the World" that would eventually become the International Decade for a Culture of Peace and Non-Violence for the Children of the World (2001-10).

The centerpiece of this work is the Declaration and Programme of Action on a Culture of Peace adopted by the U.N. General Assembly September 13, 1999. It is perhaps the most comprehensive programme for peace ever taken up by the United Nations.

The Programme of Action on a Culture of Peace followed and defined eight areas of action:

- .-Education;
- .-Sustainable economic and social development;
- .-Respect for all human rights;
- .-Equality between women and men;
- .-Democratic participation;
- .-Understanding, tolerance and solidarity;
- .-Participatory communication and the free flow of information and knowledge;
- .-International peace and security.

U.N. Secretary-General Annan pointed out that, while each of these areas of action have long been U.N. priorities, "what is new is their linkage through the culture of peace and non-violence into a single coherent concept ... so that the sum of their complementarities and synergies can be developed."

Implementing such an extensive Programme of Action is a long-term challenge. This is why the U.N. called for partnerships to develop among various actors (governments, civil society and the U.N. system) towards "a global movement for a culture of peace." The Programme would be aimed at not only the 2000 International Year for the Culture of Peace but at the decade that followed. Nobel Peace Prize Laureates performed a great service when they drafted Manifesto 2000, translated into more than 50 languages, to act as a guideline for public awareness campaigns:

- .-**Respect all life:** Respect the life and dignity of each human being without discrimination or prejudice;
- .-**Reject violence:** Practice active non-violence, rejecting violence in all its forms: physical, sexual, psychological, economical and social, in particular towards the most deprived and vulnerable such as children and adolescents;

- .-**Share with others:** Share my time and material resources in a spirit of generosity to put an end to exclusion, injustice and political and economic oppression;
- .-**Listen to understand:** Defend freedom of expression and cultural diversity, giving preference always to dialogue and listening without engaging in fanaticism, defamation and the rejection of others;
- .-**Preserve the planet:** Promote consumer behaviour that is responsible and development practices that respect all forms of life and preserve the balance of nature on the planet;
- .-**Rediscover solidarity:** Contribute to the development of my community, with the full participation of women and respect for democratic principles, in order to create together new forms of solidarity.

The Effect of September 11

The culture of peace should not be considered the technical solution to every world problem; rather it supplies the moral foundation for a better individual and global order, a vision which can lead people away from despair and society away from chaos. However, just as the Programme was starting, chaos struck in the terrorist attacks on New York and Washington.

Since September 11, a deep sense of fear has pervaded the general populace. We have been violently attacked. We have been told that we do not know where the next attack is coming from. *We must be ready. We must prepare ourselves for this new kind of aggression. If preemptive attacks are necessary, so be it. War against this unseen enemy must be fought.* Media relentlessly feed us images of destruction and ceaselessly convey the message that the military's might is now necessary to protect us. The culture of war was given a great gift by the terrorists of September 11. If you want peace, the Romans said, prepare for war. The terrorists have apparently confirmed this. In this environment, the culture of peace can hardly be heard let alone obtain the political attention and government funding to make an impression on electorates. In addition to being fearful, many are cynical about peace ever being achieved in such a turbulent world. The arms manufacturers, who mount such powerful lobbies in the legislative halls of Western countries, discount the elements of peace as so much naiveté. To challenge militarist thinking is to run the risk of being considered unpatriotic. The fences enclosing creative thinking are indeed high.

But the machinery of war has not in the past built the kind of world in which people everywhere can achieve human security. Why can it be expected to do so in the new conditions? Rather, it is the slow, painstaking construction of a new culture of peace that offers hope for a better future. The values of such a culture are well worth the time it takes to develop them. The momentum of history, buttressed by new life enhancing technologies, is on the side of the culture of peace.

The Human Right to Peace

The culture of peace prepares the way for greater understanding of the human right to peace. Indeed, the work already accomplished in the United Nations system to develop the concept of the human right to peace is one of the world's best kept secrets. The culture of war so pervades public opinion that it has drowned out voices asserting that the human right to peace is a fundamental right of every human being and is, in fact, the major precondition for all human rights. The time has come to emphasize that the peoples of the world have a sacred right to peace.

The subject of the human right to peace has clearly entered circles of discussion at the U.N. Some hold that it is already a component of developing international law. This is a signal moment because a full discussion of the right to peace puts a new spotlight on the age-old question of the abolition of war itself. In the new era of weapons of mass destruction, the viability of war as a legal means to resolve disputes is clearly over. War today can lead to the obliteration of humanity. Unfortunately, the world community, held in check by the forces of the culture of war, is a long way from outlawing war. The debate on the human right to peace, therefore, is a step forward. As it is pursued, it will force the political system to face up to its responsibility to at least avoid war.

The debate inevitably will centre on the deeply controversial question of the future of nuclear weapons. The International Court of Justice has already given its view on this matter: it says nations have a legal obligation to get rid of them. While the abolition of nuclear weapons will not by itself guarantee peace, it is an elementary fact of the 21st century that as long as nations brandish nuclear weapons there can be no peace. The proponents of nuclear weapons do indeed know which way the debate on the human right to peace is headed. That is why they will use every argument they can think of, every political device they can find, and every form of intimidation they can invent to derail the debate. They derailed the debate in UNESCO. They have rendered nuclear weapons abolition resolutions at the U.N. inoperative. They have used the tragedy of September 11 to scare the populace into believing that only gigantic amounts of weaponry can head off the terrorism of the future. They have already caused an erosion of civil liberties in the guise of combating terrorism.

These proponents of militarism as the route to peace appear to operate today from the commanding heights of public opinion. But against this insidious thinking that war equals peace is rising a new army – not of soldiers but of highly informed, dedicated, and courageous citizens of all countries who do see the perils ahead. There is a blossoming of both understanding and action in the new phenomenon of an alert civil society calling governments to account for paying only lip service to their human rights commitments. Buttressed by the dynamic means of electronic communication, they are bringing new energy to the global quest for peace.

4th Nobel Peace Summit: Event Report

By Jonathan Granoff

International Peace Bureau Delegate

November 28, 2003

Rome, Italy

This has been a year of struggle, war and extraordinary efforts by those who yearn for a world at peace. Despite many set backs, especially the US government's promotion of new nuclear weapons and doctrines that lower the threshold for use, world opinion is clearly converging on a consensus that abhors all weapons of mass destruction and confirms that war is not an answer to security concerns. Working to end the scourge of war and terrorism, eliminating nuclear weapons, and bringing leadership back onto a course that promises a sustainable future is our collective passion. Men and women with the capacity to inspire and lead are so valuable at this time. I am pleased to share a short report that centers on such people.

An expression of morally coherent and politically sophisticated leadership describes the 4th Summit of Nobel Peace Laureates, which took place in Rome, Italy. I had the privilege of joining the delegation of the International Peace Bureau (IPB) along with delegation leader Ambassador Jayantha Dhanapala, former Under-Secretary-General of Disarmament at the UN and Special Advisor to the Middle Powers Initiative (MPI); and Senator Douglas Roche O.C., Chairman of the MPI. The Global Security Institute (GSI) is a member of the IPB, which won the Nobel Peace Prize in 1910. IPB, in turn, is a founding member of MPI, a program of GSI.

Through such a tightly interconnected network of organizations, we coordinate our collective passion for peace and nuclear disarmament. It was gratifying to find that our concerns were completely resonant with some of the world's most courageous, intelligent and visionary leaders. The Summit's powerful and inspiring Final Statement (see below), which was co-drafted by our delegation, found broadest acceptance among the Nobel Peace Laureates. Though widely covered by international media, the Final Statement was largely ignored in the United States.

In an effort to give the important Final Statement the prominence and publicity it deserves, I called upon my friend Congressman Edward Markey, who took the laudable initiative to introduce the Final Statement, together with a short report about the Rome Summit, in the United States Congressional Record (see below).

Inspired by the beauty of the Campidoglio (the Capitol), where the Summit took place and where – in a distant past – dreams of empire were realized and dashed, I wish to express my sincere hope that each one of us will heed strongly the closing paragraphs of the Nobel Peace Laureate Statement.

4th Nobel Peace Summit: Event Report **November 27-30, 2003** **Rome, Italy**

From 27 to 30 November 2003, the 4th World Summit of Peace Nobel Laureates took place in Rome, Italy. It was convened upon invitation by **Mikhail Gorbachev** and **Walter Veltroni**, Mayor of the City of Rome.

Jonathan Granoff, President of the Global Security Institute, Senator **Douglas Roche**, Chair of the Middle Powers Initiative, and Ambassador **Jayantha Dhanapala**, former UN Under-Secretary-General for Disarmament, participated in the Summit as representatives of the **International Peace Bureau (IPB)**, which received the Nobel Peace Prize in 1910. Ambassador Dhanapala, who led the IPB delegation, is IPB's Honorary President.

The following Nobel Peace Prize Winners – individuals and organizations – participated in the Summit: The XIV Dalai Lama Tenzin Gyatso, Mikhail Gorbachev, Mairead Corrigan Maguire, Shimon Peres, Joseph Rotblat (represented by Professor Robert Hinde), Oscar Arias Sanchez, Lech Walesa, Betty Williams, Jody Williams, American Friends Service Committee, Amnesty International, International Campaign to Ban Landmines, International Labour Organization, International Peace Bureau, International Physicians for the Prevention of Nuclear War, International Law Institute, Pugwash Conferences, Quakers Peace and Social Witness, United Nations, United Nations Children's Fund, United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees, and United Nations Peace Keeping Forces.

The Summit's theme was "*Ethics in Politics, Economics and Science.*" The IPB delegation worked closely with the Summit organizers in planning the program on Ethics and Policy, and served as facilitator for the three sessions dealing with this topic during the opening day.

Jayantha Dhanapala chaired the first panel on "*Ethics, Values and Policy – Our Deeper Unity, Our Common Humanity.*" The theme of this session built on the following statement by the UN's Commission on Global Governance:

"We need a set of common values around which we can unite people, irrespective of their cultural, political, religious or philosophical backgrounds... . Foremost [?] these values must include the duty of care for one's neighbor. In a neighborhood, all are neighbors. In our global neighborhood, therefore, the duty of care is owed to all who share the planet. This duty, of course, is more compelling the more the neighbor needs care."

Participants in this panel included Shimon Peres, Yassir Arafat (represented), Lech Walesa, Adolfo Perez Esquivel (represented), and Kofi Annan (represented).

Jonathan Granoff chaired the second panel, entitled "*Peace and Security – Multilateral and Disarmament Imperatives.*" This session took an integrated approach to security. Numerous human security problems, especially those

relating to environmental concerns such as global warming, diminished biodiversity, ozone depletion, and over-fished and polluted oceans can only be addressed effectively through multilateral cooperation. The necessary level of cooperation to resolve these pressing issues will not be obtained unless multilateralism becomes the norm in international affairs. Moreover, the dangers of proliferation of weapons of mass destruction cannot be eliminated unless a universal norm of disarmament is established as is required by the relevant treaties. There remains a moral, ethical and legal duty to work together to obtain the elimination of nuclear weapons and to pursue security in a multilateral manner.

Participants on this panel included Jody Williams, Joseph Rotblat (represented), Oscar Arias Sanchez, Mary Ellen McNish (representing the American Friends Service Committee), Ron McCoy (representing IPPNW), Elizabeth Bernstein (representing the International Campaign to Ban Landmines), and Paolo Cotta Ramusino (representing the Pugwash Conferences).

Senator **Douglas Roche** presided over the third and final panel of the opening day, titled "*Sustainable Development – Building a Culture of Peace*." This session addressed a sustainable future in the broadest context. Social organization based on inequity and environmental indifference kept in place by force demonstrates the impoverishment of violence. This violence, whether through military application or callous indifference to human suffering, diminishes the human spirit and undermines ethics. All social and political actions must be evaluated on the basis of the explicit ethical standard of whether they enhance or diminish the capacity to develop a Culture of Peace. Not only is peace a right, but it is now an imperative for our collective survival. Peace has become an ethical imperative. And peace now involves not only human rights but a healthy and secure environment.

Speakers on this panel included Mikhail Gorbachev, Tenzin Gyatso (the 14th Dalai Lama), Mairead Maguire Corrigan, Jerzy Makarczyk and Christian Dominicé (representing the Institut de Droit International), and Marian Pink (representing Amnesty International).

4th World Summit of Nobel Peace Laureates Final Statement-Ethics and Policy

November 30, 2003

Rome, Italy

We are the first generation making decisions that will determine whether we will be the last generation. We have an ethical responsibility to future generations to ensure that we are not passing on a future of wars and ecological catastrophe. For policies to be in the interest of humanity, they must be based on ethical values.

We express our profound anxiety that current policies are not creating a sufficiently secure and stable world for all. For this reason, we need to reset our course based on strong ethical foundations.

Compassion and conscience are essential to our humanity and compel us to care for one another. Cooperation amongst nations, multilateralism, is the logical outgrowth of this principle. A more equitable international order based on the rule of law is its needed expression.

We reiterate our conviction that international politics need to be reformed to address effectively three critical challenges: ending wars and violence, eliminating poverty, and saving the environment.

We call upon everyone to join us in working to replace the culture of war with a culture of peace. Let us ensure that no child is ever again exposed to the horrors of war.

Recent events, such as the escalation of the conflict in the Middle East, bloodshed in Afghanistan, Iraq and Chechnya, as well as in parts of Africa and Latin America, confirm that problems with deep economic, social, cultural or religious roots cannot be resolved unilaterally or by armed force.

International terrorism is a threat to peace. Multilateral cooperation and the promotion of human rights under the rule of law are essential to address terrorism and its underlying sources.

The threat of weapons of mass destruction remains with us. We call for an immediate end to the newly resurgent arms race, which is being fueled by a failure to universally ratify a treaty banning nuclear testing, and by doctrines that lower the threshold of use and promote the creation of new nuclear weapons. This is particularly dangerous when coupled with the doctrine of pre-emption.

For some to say that nuclear weapons are good for them but not for others is simply not sustainable. The failure of the nuclear weapons states to abide by their legal pledge to negotiate the elimination of nuclear weapon, contained in

the Nuclear Nonproliferation Treaty, is the greatest stimulus to their proliferation.

Nuclear weapons are immoral and we call for their universal legal prohibition. They must be eliminated before they eliminate humanity.

We support the treaty to ban landmines and call for effective agreements to limit conventional weapons and arms trade.

Trillions of dollars have been spent since the end of the Cold War in developing military approaches to security. Yet, the daily lives of billions remain bereft of adequate health care, clean water, food and the benefits of education. These needs must be met.

Humanity has developed sophisticated technologies for destruction. Appropriate social and human technologies based on cooperation are needed for survival.

The international community has a proven tool, the universality of the United Nations. Its work can and must be improved and this can be done without undermining its core principles.

We assert that unconditional adherence to international law is essential. Of course, law is a living institution that can change and grow to meet new circumstances. But, the principles that govern international relations must not be ignored or violated.

Ethics in the relations between nations and in government policies is of paramount importance. Nations must treat other nations as they wish to be treated. The most powerful nations must remember that as they do, so shall others do.

Economic hardship is often the result of corruption and lack of business ethics, both internationally and locally. Through utilizing more effective ethical codes of conduct the business community can contribute to protecting the environment and eliminating poverty. This is both a practical and moral necessity.

The scientific community could serve human interests more fully by affirmatively adopting the ethical principle of doing no harm.

The international community has recently recognized the importance of establishing an ethical framework. Leaders of States issued the Millennium Declaration at the United Nations and set forth common values of freedom, equality, solidarity, tolerance, respect for nature and shared responsibility. From these values, a plan to address sustainable development and poverty, the

Millennium Development Goals, emerged. We urge all to join in implementation of these goals and prevent any retreat from specific commitments. Moreover, we share the principles of the Earth Charter and urge governments at all levels to support this important document.

For globalization to enhance sustainable development, the international community needs to establish more democratic, transparent, and accountable forms of governance. We advocate extending the benefits of democracy and self governance but this goal cannot be achieved through coercion or force.

After a special session, the Nobel Peace Prize Winners have agreed that the death penalty is a particularly cruel and unusual punishment that should be abolished. It is especially unconscionable when imposed on children.

We affirm the unity of the human family. Our diversity is an enrichment, not a danger. Through dialogue we gain appreciation of the value of our differences. Our capacity to work together as a community of peoples and nations is the strongest antidote to violence and our reason for hope.

Our commitment to serve the cause of peace compels us to continue working individually and together on this path. We urge you to join us.

Summary Regarding Participation and Venue

From 27 to 30 November 2003, the 4th Global Summit of the Peace Nobel Laureates took place in Rome, Italy. Upon invitation by Mikhail Gorbachev and Walter Veltroni, Mayor of the City of Rome, the following Nobel Peace Laureates - individuals and organizations - participated in the Summit: The XIV Dalai Lama Tenzin Gyatso, Mikhail Gorbachev, Mairead Corrigan Maguire, Shimon Peres, Joseph Rotblat (represented by Professor Robert Hinde), Oscar Arias Sanchez, Lech Walesa, Betty Williams, Jody Williams, American Friends Service Committee, Amnesty International, Doctors Without Borders, International Campaign to Ban Landmines, International Labour Organization, International Peace Bureau, International Physicians for the Prevention of Nuclear War, International Law Institute, Pugwash Conferences, Quakers Peace and Social Witness, United Nations, United Nations Children's Fund, United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees, and United Nations Peace Keeping Forces.

5th World Summit of Nobel Peace Laureates A United World or a Divided World

November 10-12, 2004
Rome, Italy

**A United World or Divided World? Multiethnicity, Human Rights,
Terrorism: Reflections on Human Unity**

By Jonathan Granoff
International Peace Bureau Delegate
November 11, 2004
Rome, Italy

This article sets forth the author's personal reflections that can form the basis for promoting interfaith and intercultural dialogue and a method for success using existing institutions such as universities and the United Nations. The author wishes to thank Alyn Ware of the International Peace Bureau and Dr. Urs Cipolat for their editorial assistance.

Introduction

Saadi, the Persian poet of the 13th century, sang:

*The human family is one body with many parts
Creations arising from one unseen essence
Any harm to any part summons an awakening
a dis-ease and a healing response from all parts
You who fail to feel the pain of others cannot be called truly human.*

On the Casuarian Coast in the flat mangrove swampland of Indonesian New Guinea, where water and land intermingle with a rhythmic ebb and flow, a tribe of about 20,000 people live in harmony with the environment. They call themselves the Asmat, "the people -- the human beings." Everyone else is called Manowe, "the edible ones." They are cannibals. The Asmat do not organize for total war. Their killing practice is ritualized, limited and controlled. We ignore at our peril the fact that the civilized nations of the world since World War II have spent astronomical fortunes, in excess of ten trillion since the end of the Cold War alone, organizing killing apparatus capable of destroying all life on the planet many times over. Today, conflicts rage in over twenty killing fields driven by religious, ethnic and racial bigotry. In good conscience religions permits these horrors where the vast majority of victims are innocent women and children -- noncombatants.

Coupled with weapons of mass destruction, this modern capacity for organized carnage, if guided by religious bigotry, could easily lead to the unspeakable. This makes us all "edible ones". Al Quaida utilizes religious symbols and language in its attempts to

rationalize its crimes against humanity. Such abuse is certainly not new and has occurred in many guises. For example, Europe suffered population decimation through thirty years of chaos when Protestants and Catholics slaughtered each other between 1618 and 1648. The Treaty of Westphalia, in which the basis of the modern nation state system was formally established, deftly divested political process from the capacity of religions to stimulate endless war. What Europe experienced in the 17th Century cannot be tolerated on a global scale with today's technologies.

In the face of current challenges many recognize a growing global awareness of the power of universal compassion nested within each religious tradition, and this awareness does not diminish the knowledge that each tradition has the ability to dehumanize and destroy the "other" either by conversion or genocide. We come together as a human community when we awaken the unity expressed by Saadi in the quest to fulfill our own humanity. For us who are aware of the power of universal compassion, for us, there are no "edible ones."

Threats and Solutions

We cannot ignore the dangers inherent in the use of force outside international legal constraints coupled with a culture of violence and fear. We simply must commit to promoting a culture of peace founded on the rule of law, the dignity of our higher qualities, and deeper dialogue amongst peoples to bring us back on track.

The greatest threat that faces humanity might be understood as the indifference toward extraordinary human suffering from poverty, environmental practices that ignore our responsibility to future generations, and the willingness to threaten the use of nuclear weapons. (See Appendix A) This indifference indicates a failure of caring for life, a failure of love. Its severe consequence is political apathy toward critical issues and a reversion toward violence, provincialism and prejudice. This indifference must be overcome by an awakening of our capacity to learn to live together as one human family.

It is now common knowledge that for the human community to survive we must live in harmony with the natural world. This ecological consciousness can be taught, universally and effectively. We must now learn that coexistence between and amongst peoples can be taught, universally and effectively. The old model of competitive and dialectical discourse where one attempts to refute the claims of the other must now grow into a new model of cooperation and dialogue.

One crucial step will be the promotion of interfaith and intercultural understanding through the institutionalization of forums for dialogue. Scriptures of the major religions, from the Bhagvad Gita, to the Bible and the Quran, are replete with explicitly acceptable violence as well as admonitions upon which to base universal love, justice and appreciation. We must find ways of institutionalizing the loving dimensions so that "loving ones neighbor as oneself" can become the norm. In the Quran (Sura 49:13) we find "O humanity, God has created you male and female, and has made you nations and tribes that you may know one another. The noblest of you before God is the one with

deep piety and good deeds. Behold God is all knowing and all aware." How can such directions be fulfilled unless we really come to know each other?

We need not come to agreement about theology in order to seek mercy and justice. Why should there be fear of the "tribe" with whom we might disagree? Abraham, with the most profound insight into the nature of justice and as an example of fulfilled humanity, pleaded passionately for mercy for those with whom he did not agree -- the people of Sodom and Gomorrah. **We need not agree on theology to address cooperatively the global crises of human rights, justice, poverty, hunger, ecological destruction and nuclear annihilation. Compassion and helping those in need are universally recognized spiritual principles. We need to communicate to learn this.**

Who is the beneficiary of today's Good Samaritan and to whom do we owe a sense of responsibility in an interconnected world? Why should the Imam not visit the temple and share and the Rabbi not visit the mosque and share? Will someone be diminished or confused? Why should the priest not share with the minister? How else will we really learn what is profoundly held as truth by our neighbor so that we might love one another?

The contemporary Sufi master Bawa Muhaiyaddeen often said: "Separate from yourself that which separates you from other lives." The same qualities that separate us from other lives -- such as anger, fanaticism, falsehood, pride, jealousy, greed, hatred, hastiness -- separate us from the immeasurable power of goodness beyond name, gender and form that many call God. The same qualities that bring harmony with other lives -- such as, love, compassion, tolerance, peacefulness, patience -- bring us into harmony with our self and its source. That harmony ultimately awakens wisdom, which can investigate the meaning of our lives. How glorious, unifying and full of justice is this mystery known only to those who open their hearts to lives other than their own.

If we do not learn such principles of harmony and put them into practice, we face a world ruled by the law of power, rather than the power of law; a world ruled by the love of power, rather than the power of love.

Pride of Power

Nuclear weapons represent a form of security apartheid. Like apartheid, both sides are injured. Those threatened reasonably feel the terror of destruction. Those threatening have their moral foundations corroded or live in denial of what they are doing. The continued reliance on these horrific devices provides the modern world with its most severe and divisive irony. The means of pursuing security are serving to breed insecurity. And the inequity inherent in the system pulls at the fabric of human unity. As Vartan Gregorian of the Carnegie Corporation recently pointed out, "All declared nuclear powers -- the US, Russia, Great Britain, France, and China and now India and Pakistan (Israel in an undeclared nuclear power) -- insist they possess nuclear weapons only to deter others from using them. Yet there have been many times in the past, and there will surely be times in the future, when major powers have used their nuclear capability to gain some political end by intimidation."

Intimidation through the threat of annihilation of millions of innocent people is unjustified legally, morally, and remains the greatest threat to the stimulation of the proliferation of weapons. Thus, continued threat to use these weapons is impractical. One must therefore wonder if the irrational pride of power informs the policies of those who seek to perpetuate and “improve” their arsenals of devastation. One must wonder if the club of possessing states consider themselves somehow superior, a bizarre form of technological pride. This pride must never mix with religious pride.

Pride of Religious Exclusivity

The mystery of the source of life and creation itself from which we come, toward which we return and in and through which we live and are sustained cannot be measured nor can it be fully described by symbols or the intellect. In fact, even the great religions are only means of honoring, remembering and describing – sacred metaphors – but not the actual reality itself. Thus, exclusivity based on the elegance of the metaphors does an injustice to the primacy of the unbounded foundation. The founders of the world’s great faiths reached out with good news and a universal embrace, particularly holding the outcast, the downtrodden, the rejected – quite the opposite of today’s exclusivists.

Today’s exclusivists have turned their backs to the power of the original embrace of love and compassion upon which each of their traditions rests. This attitude is caused by ignorance, fear and arrogance. It leads to the quest for unlimited power based on insecurity. Exclusivism cannot effectively open hearts, a precondition of the wisdom needed to understand the divine mystery, nor address adequately the three evil dynamics of this modern age – unnecessary pandemic poverty, irresponsible selfishness that leads to environmental degradation, and the irrational hazardous reliance on the threat to use nuclear weapons as a means of pursuing security.

On the contrary exclusivism will only exacerbate our present inadequate levels of cooperation. Its main characteristic is the belief, “Our way of thinking and pursuing reality is the only good way.” What does it mean to say that the way to the Father is through Jesus unless His quality of love is pursued? What does it mean to be one of the Chosen People without treating one’s neighbor as one wishes to be treated? What does it mean to follow the dharma without seeking refuge in the power of compassion? What does it mean to honor Allah without affirming the quality of mercy by which He is known? The characteristic of the founders of each faith has been extraordinary, immeasurable kindness, mercy, compassion, love and wisdom.

Many exclusivists actually believe that the divine only has ears for their language. Others believe that his messenger(s) require a building at a particular location in order to save souls. Others believe that establishing real estate boundaries is more important than cultivating love and understanding. They are incapable of imagining that blessings can be universal. They all believe that their method of explaining the origins of the universe and the end of days are the only true way. Although none of them have ever actually seen the creation of their holy scripture they all believe that it is the unique word of truth and that

all others are wrong. Many are willing to kill for their ideas about the divine mystery and many others are willing to die for these ideas. Few have experienced, integrated and are capable of sharing divine love, mercy, or compassion. All have strongly held ideas.

Exclusivism is most dangerous in the potential short-term political advantage that its passions can provide to a political leader. Imagine the temptation to politicians to cater to the mythology that exclusivists propound? Imagine what can happen in a modern state with global influence when its leaders are identified with such passions? Imagine the dangers if leaders in a country with weapons of mass destruction become subject to the interests of exclusivists in their society?

Even if a person believes a stone is the Lord, their beliefs should pose no concern to the political order; however, if they want to throw the stone or condemn those who believe the Lord is formless, then concern is warranted. Likewise, those who believe God is formless and want to stone those who believe in stones can hardly be considered models of mercy, love and compassion. **It is not the fundamental beliefs of any religion that is a problem; it is the exclusivist arrogance of those who use religion to acquire power over others that is the problem.**

The quest to enforce any one faith that derogates all other beliefs will surely fracture the peace of the world. The capacity to use religious faith to dehumanize others coupled with modern technologies of killing presents an unacceptable risk. We simply cannot ignore this risk.

Hot Spots

Without even addressing the extremely hot conflict over real estate in Jerusalem, where exclusivists in three faiths believe that the Savior of humanity requires their group to possess a particular piece of real estate (the present location of the Dome of the Rock where the Temple of Solomon used to be located) in order to save humanity, it is easy to see numerous extremely volatile regions flamed recently by religious misunderstandings. Let's just list a few:

Bosnia: Serbian Orthodox and Roman Catholic Christians and Muslims

Cote d'Ivoire: Muslims, Indigenous, and Christian

Cyprus: Christians and Muslims

East Timor: Christians and Muslims

India: Animists, Hindus, Muslims, and Sikhs

Indonesia, Ambon and Halmahera: Christians and Muslims

Kashmir: Hindus and Muslims

Kosovo: Serbian Orthodox Christians and Muslims

Macedonia: Macedonian Orthodox Christians and Muslims

Nigeria: Christians, Animists, and Muslims

Northern Ireland: Protestants and Catholics

Pakistan: Suni and Shiite Muslims

Philippines: Christians and Muslims

Russia, Chechnya: Russian Orthodox Christians and Muslims

Serbia, Vojvodina: Serbian Orthodox and Roman Catholics
South Africa: Various Animists
Sri Lanka: Buddhists and Hindus
Sudan: Animists, Christians, and Muslims

In most instances, civilian populations are terrorized. In most of the instances where these conflicts are in the developing world, there is a history of fortunes squandered through the purchase of weapons, almost exclusively from one of the five permanent members of the UN Security Council – US, Russia, France, UK, or China. In each of these cases, killing has been performed in good conscience, with the blessings of religious figures.

Thousands were needlessly killed at the World Trade Center. But, what about little Rwanda, a tragedy of epic proportion which could have been stopped? It could have been prevented had there been concerted efforts to bring intercultural understanding into the lives of the people in a systematic and sustained fashion. It could have been prevented had there been a political will to look at the depth of the hatred and address it squarely. It could have been prevented if there had been a rapid deployment of international forces through the UN or other multilateral channels. The risks of tribalism, like religious exclusivism, must not be ignored.

The events of 9/11 demonstrated that low technology can be leveraged to cause tremendous injury and the risks of tribalism, whether ethnic or religious, cannot be permitted to overtake the world. This is especially so when there are literally tons of inadequately safeguarded nuclear materials in Russia and inadequate resources being allocated to protect them. Yet, we cannot throw up our hands and surrender the future to a world riddled with untenable risk, where identity politics could drive us into an abyss the horror of which Dante alone could describe. Can we expect unilateral militarism of one superpower to save us? Can we sit back and watch a slow descent into new fault lines of religious bigotry? Do we have any choice but to strengthen multilateral cooperation for security building based on the rule of law?

Nuclear materials, for example, can be safeguarded if the US and Russia decide to do so. Russia lacks the resources and the US lacks the present political will. This is foolish. They should lead in eliminating weapons of mass destruction and, while doing so, take extreme precautions to ensure that nuclear materials are not available to terrorists. **But, the passions that drive ethnic and religious violence must be addressed at a community level. Changing hearts cannot be accomplished by the application of technology nor by diplomacy and the stroke of a pen. It is far too subtle and subjective.**

We can and must establish institutional structures to systematically address prejudice and hatred and build a culture of peace. We must demonstrate at a public level that interfaith understanding is to be promoted.

Practical Proposals

1. Establish UN Centers for Nonviolent Conflict Prevention at Universities around the World

There is a critical need to promote interfaith understanding through interfaith dialogue. The United Nations is in a unique position to help create structures where greater utilization of the faith-based traditions in the pursuit of preventive diplomacy could be achieved. So many are today inspired by key United Nations documents such as the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and its premise that those rights we wish for ourselves shall be granted to others as well. Imagine the great universities of the world equipped with UN Centers for Nonviolent Conflict. Prevention where intercultural and interfaith dialogue and experiences could be promoted. The cost would be very low and the prestige and value high for the participating institution. **Such centers could help create a critical mass of educated people who are committed to greater levels of interfaith and intercultural understanding and who are able to help ensure a global norm of tolerance and an appreciation for the value of pluralism.**

Franchising businesses are successful by licensing a method of operation associated with the goodwill of a trade name. Franchisors guarantee consistent quality wherever their trade name is used. Franchisees gain the knowledge of the method of operation and the benefit of the goodwill associated with the trade name. The UN has methods of operations which are associated with its high profile and valuable trade name. Universities could enhance their services to their students, communities and nations by utilizing a UN license to operate Centers for Nonviolent Conflict Prevention. The UN and the world would benefit from this increased outreach and the participating universities would benefit with heightened prestige and excellent useful programs. Such Centers could serve to strengthen understanding of global challenges the UN addresses, such as the need for sustainable environmental practices, ending gross poverty and gender inequities, and the disarmament of weapons of mass destruction.

These Centers could educate students and the general public about the mission and programs of the UN and thus help create a constituency that can see beyond mere national interests. Such persons are able to address the underlying problems that give rise to terrorism. Preventive diplomacy aims to prevent disputes from arising between parties, stop current disputes from escalating into violence, and limit the spread of conflict. Governments alone cannot accomplish this. In fact, religious institutions, academic institutions, non-governmental organizations, businesses and professional communities all need to see the value of greater levels of intercultural and interfaith understanding. They need to participate and feel a sense of responsibility to help accomplish goals of peaceful coexistence.

2. Establish a UN Center for Nonviolent Conflict Prevention and Resolution at UN Headquarters

A Center for Nonviolent Conflict Prevention and Resolution as part of the UN headquarters could utilize all available means of mediation, negotiation, conciliation, and nonviolent conflict prevention and resolution in addressing current and potential conflicts. The Center would utilize fully the good will of many of the world's religious leaders.

Over 1,000 religious leaders gathered at the UN for the Millennium Peace Summit and nearly every one expressed a willingness to help in such an endeavor. The UN Center for Nonviolent Conflict Prevention and Resolution in New York could also serve as a place:

- a. To utilize the great religious traditions of the world as a resource for promoting transnational ethical values. Thus we recommend an ongoing forum where religious leaders can dialogically address the pressing need to establish common values and serve as a resource to advise the Secretariat and the Member States.
- b. To explore the promulgation of programs that teach tolerance, cultural appreciation and harmony at a profound level by creating forums for authentic inter-religious dialogue and the experiential sharing of the different methods of prayer, contemplation and meditation. We suggest the promotion in UNITAR and amongst UN personnel and the personnel of all national missions to the UN of retreat seminars focused on prayer and meditation in each of the world's major religions. The resulting shared understanding represents preventive diplomacy at the deepest level, for when there is authentic spiritual sharing, trust and confidence are easier to accomplish. Also, the UN community will begin to actually be a model of intercultural respect and tolerance to which the Member States can look for guidance.
- c. To provide experiential courses on each of the religions' prayer and meditation methods. Each of the world's religions utilizes prayer and contemplation to help achieve inner peace and harmony. Such experiences lead people to a greater ability to perform inspired public service. We thus encourage the use of such methods be made explicitly available to all in the UN community in the form of offerings of on-going regular events designed to enrich multi-religious, ethnic and cultural development and understanding and for the enrichment of the personnel such that greater inspiration in documents and programs might be forthcoming from the UN.
- d. To engage religious communities in service to the suffering. Charity, service and compassion are universally recognized values in all religions and areas of social development that can be more fully utilized by the UN. Religious communities, as a world resource, have been underutilized in this regard, and could help in coordination of resource distribution.

e. To create a true vocation of service at the heart of UN work, forums need to be created in which spiritual and moral shared values and experiences can be expressed by UN personnel to one another.

The UN Center for Nonviolent Conflict Prevention and Resolution will reinforce the regional offices at which on-going multi-cultural, interreligious, and inter-ethnic dialogue can take place as a method of preventive diplomacy. It could take full advantage of the world's religions and could, in this context, be utilized to preempt cycles of misunderstanding, fear and violence. The extraordinary waste of resources on armaments and the suffering caused by their uses simply cannot be overlooked when addressing poverty. As long as resources are disproportionately diverted to pursuing peace and stability through military means and fortunes expended on weapons ending poverty will remain beyond reach. The costs of these Centers would be miniscule compared to military expenditures.

By finding ways of promoting openly the process of interfaith appreciation, the quiet study of our common humanity is stimulated. One of the greatest gifts received by the open hearted is the gratitude of being part of the human family, a sense of joy in its variety of expressions of awe, love, and the sacred. Those who have this sense of gratitude are the ones who can step forward to assert our common ground, the place where exclusivism and fanaticism cannot flourish. Where our common humanity is affirmed and love expressed, fear, the breeding ground for fanaticism, is overcome. Where our common humanity is affirmed, the precondition for justice is established. Justice is the foundation for peace. 9/11 has shown us that a fractured world where fanaticism is allowed to grow, where grievances find no peaceful means of redress, where people demonize innocents who do not believe as they do, could, if it grows, be catastrophic.

Clearly, where compassion leads to actions that give hope based on a sense of justice without regard to religion, race or national situation, the environment where visions based on hate, hopelessness and fear will be dried up. Let us be warned and plant places where our higher nature is affirmed.

Whether garbed in extremist political ideology, racial or tribal identity, or religious dogma, the exclusivist's vision diminishes our common capacity to work cooperatively, reason together, identify our common interests and establish rules and laws of governance. The successes of the modern world have demonstrated that Hobbes, who believed life to be short, brutish and nasty, was trumped by Locke and his philosophical stepson Jefferson, who viewed our fate with the faith that we are blessed with inalienable rights, regardless of our religious beliefs, that no state can remove and that we are capable of establishing institutions to protect those rights. This optimistic view is the basis of the United States, the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, and the UN System. It challenges all fanatics who deny civilized give and take. A first step to discover that all people possess such human capacities is through direct interfaith interaction.

We no longer have the luxury of living in religious ghettos. We must come into the open space of our greater humanity and assert the highest ideals that the founders of every faith proclaimed: “Love thy neighbor as thyself.” Our humanity is revealed the deeper we realize and live this admonition.

Let me conclude with two quotes. The first is obviously informed by spiritual experience, while the second arises from a man with unassailable scientific credentials.

Bawa Muhaiyaddeen:

*If each of you will open your heart,
your actions, your wisdom, and your conduct and look within,
you will see that every face is your face,
every nerve is your nerve, each drop of blood is your blood,...
all hunger is your hunger, all poverty is your poverty...all lives are your life.
You will experience this in your nerves, in your body and in what you see.
When that state develops inside you, that is God's love...
If that love develops you will not hurt any other living thing,
you will not cause pain, you will not reject any life,
and you will not torture any other life, because if you hurt anyone it will hurt you.”*
Book of Gods' Love, p.23.

Albert Einstein:

Oh Youth:

Do you know that yours is not the first generation to yearn for a life full of beauty and freedom?

*Do you know that all your ancestors have felt the same as you do –
and fell victim to trouble and hatred?*

*Do you know also that your fervent wishes can only find fulfillment
if you succeed in attaining a love and understanding of people,
and animals, and plants, and stars,
so that every joy becomes your joy and every pain becomes your pain?”*

Quoted in David and Beatrix Hamburg's comprehensive work,
Learning to Live Together, p. 363.

Appendix A – Fact Sheet
Global Challenges, Threats to Humanity
Poverty

*In 1999, some 2.8 billion people—two in every five humans on the planet—lived on less than \$2 a day. ¹

*There are 1.1 billion people in the world living on less than one dollar per day (PPP US\$). ²

*In 2000, one in five people in the developing world—1.1 billion total—did not have “reasonable access” to safe drinking water. ³

*2.4 billion people worldwide—two out of every five—live without basic sanitation. ⁴

*In 46 countries people are poorer today than in 1990. ⁵

*11 million children under the age of 5 die every year. ⁶

*The global economy has grown sevenfold since 1950. Meanwhile, the disparity in per capita gross domestic product between the 20 richest and 20 poorest nations more than doubled between 1960 and 1995. Of all high-income nations, the United States has the most unequal distribution of income, with over 30 percent of income in the hands of the richest 10 percent and only 1.8 percent going to the poorest 10 percent. ⁷

*104 million children are not in school, 59 million of them girls. ⁸

*44 million primary-aged children in sub-Saharan Africa are not in school, 23 million are girls. ⁹

*At current rates of progress, Sub-Saharan Africa would not achieve universal primary education until 2129 – another 125 years.¹⁰

*In 25 countries more people go to bed hungry today than a decade ago.¹¹

*There are 831 million people that go to bed hungry across the world today.¹²

Nuclear Weapons (see also Appendix B)

*There are approximately 30,000 nuclear weapons in the world.

*Over 95% of them are in the hands of Russia and the United States. Of these, a total of nearly 4,500 remain on hair trigger alert status just as they were at the height of the Cold War.

*There are five declared nuclear weapon equipped States: Britain, China, France, Russia, and the US. Additional States that have acquired nuclear weapons over the past fifty years include India, Israel, Pakistan and possibly North Korea.

*The International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA) estimates that a total of 44 countries presently possess the resources and technology to develop nuclear weapons, and that another 60 States could become capable doing so in the near future.

*In spite of a treaty based prohibition to engage in the horizontal or vertical proliferation of nuclear weapons, the US and Russia are currently engaged in the development of a new generation of nuclear weapons – so-called mini-nukes and bunker-busters. These weapons are designed for actual use on the battlefield and not – as were their predecessors – for mere deterrence (that is, use prevention).

Religion & Terrorism

*One in five (13 of 65) groups in 2003 engaged in terrorism could be identified as seeking religious domination or ethnic cleansing.¹³

*Over 3,000 people died in the 9/11 attacks on the United States. This loss of human lives is tragic. When evaluating the threat posed by terrorism, however, one must keep in mind that more than 1.2 million people are killed on the road annually (more than 3,000 people per day). Millions more are injured or disabled. In some low and middle-income countries, road crash victims occupy up to 10% of hospital beds. Deaths from all types of injuries are projected to rise from 5.1 million in 1990 to 8.4 million in 2020 - with road traffic injuries as a major cause for this increase.¹⁴

*Globally, estimates suggest that the economic costs of road traffic injuries amount to US\$518 billion per year. In developing countries, the costs are estimated to be US\$100 billion, twice the annual amount of development assistance to developing countries.¹⁵

Military Spending

*World military expenditures in 2001 were conservatively estimated at \$839 billion—almost \$100 million every hour or \$2.3 billion each day.¹⁶

*The United States is now the world's sole military colossus, accounting for 36 percent of all military spending, or \$302 billion. U.S. spending is now projected to rise to \$414 billion (in 2001 dollars) by 2009.¹⁷

*Expenditures for United Nations peacekeeping operations from July 2002 to July 2003 equaled roughly \$2.6 billion. As of late December 2002, U.N. members still owed the organization \$1.34 billion for peacekeeping operations. The United States accounted for 40 percent of unpaid dues, or \$536 million.¹⁸

*James Wolfensohn, President of the World Bank said on May 23, 2004 at his commencement address at Brandeis University: “You young people should understand that the way the world is spending its money today. We are spending \$900 billion a year on military expenditures, \$350 billion a year on agricultural subsidies, which affect developing countries adversely, and maybe \$50 to \$60 billion a year on development. We should be spending \$900 billion on development, and then we would only need \$50 billion on military expenditures.”¹⁹

Resource Wars

*Resource-related conflicts during the 1990s killed more than 5 million people and displaced 17 to 21 million.

*Roughly one-quarter of the world’s 50 wars and armed conflicts of recent years have involved a struggle for control of natural resources like gemstones, timber, and oil—all of which are highly valued by wealthy consumers in the developed world. Virtually all of these conflicts have occurred in poor countries where a particular ethnic group or economic elite has gained control of resources at the expense of the poor majority.²⁰

Death by Preventable Causes

*Almost 11 million children die every year from preventable and treatable causes, according to the World Health Organization (WHO) and the United Nations Children's Fund (UNICEF).²¹

HIV / AIDS Epidemic

*The number of people living with HIV/AIDS rose to 42 million at the end of 2002. Five million people became infected with HIV in 2002, and another 3.1 million died of AIDS-related causes.

*For the first time, women account for half the people living with HIV/AIDS. Heterosexual transmission, particularly in Africa and the Caribbean, is the primary cause of infection among women, who are two to four times more likely than men to become infected during unprotected vaginal sex.²²

Over fishing

*Nearly 75% of the world's fisheries are classified as overexploited, depleted or in a state of collapse. ²³

Global Warming

*Since the late 1970s, an ozone hole has formed over Antarctica each austral spring (September / October), in which up to 66 percent of the total ozone is depleted.²⁴

*Scientists have linked the warming trend that accelerated in the twentieth century to the buildup of carbon dioxide and other heat-trapping gasses. By burning fossil fuels, people released some 6.44 billion tons of carbon into the atmosphere in 2002. With less than five percent of the world's population, the United States is the single largest source of carbon from fossil fuels—emitting 24 percent of the world's total.²⁵

*With less than five percent of the world's population, the United States is responsible for a large share of the world's fossil fuel burden, accounting for 26 percent of global oil use, 25 percent of coal consumption, and 27 percent of natural gas use. U.S. automobiles—totaling more than 128 million, or one quarter of the world's cars—emit roughly as much carbon as the entire Japanese economy, the world's fourth largest carbon emitter.²⁶

*The United States produces almost 40% of the world's ozone layer-depleting chemicals.²⁷

*23 percent of the world's Carbon Dioxide Emissions come from the United States alone. Per capita that's 19.8 metric tons.²⁸

Deforestation

*Overall rates of flora and fauna extinction are now estimated to be between 1,000 and 10,000 times greater than in the recent past.²⁹

*Tropical forests are being destroyed at the rate of 0.8% to 2.0% per year.³⁰

*Rainforests cover 6 % of all the earth's land but contain 40% of its plant and animal species.³¹

Appendix B – Fact Sheet

Why Nuclear Weapons remain a deadly threat.

About the bomb. The most devastating arms known to humankind, nuclear weapons derive enormous explosive power from a nuclear reaction. A fission reaction releases energy by splitting atoms of uranium and plutonium (known as fissile material). The only two nuclear bombs ever used in conflict, dropped by the United States on the Japanese cities of Hiroshima and Nagasaki in 1945, were fission weapons employing uranium and plutonium, respectively. In the 1950s the United States and the Soviet Union developed hydrogen weapons, which use a fission reaction to drive a fusion process, and release an explosive power many times that of their fission brethren: while the Hiroshima blast had explosive power equivalent to fifteen kilotons (15,000 tons) of TNT, some fusion weapons are on the magnitude of twenty megatons (20,000,000 tons) of TNT, making them more than 1,300 times more powerful. Less than 200 nuclear weapons could cause a nuclear winter rendering civilization untenable. Credible estimates place the number of nuclear weapons required to destroy Russia at 50 and the US at 120.

The effects of a nuclear weapon. Comparisons with TNT are incomplete, since in addition to the blast effect, a nuclear weapon releases thermal and nuclear radiation. Thermal radiation scorches exposed parts of the body and can ignite devastating fires over a wide radius. Nuclear radiation, which results from the neutrons and gamma rays associated with fission, is lethal in high doses, and has many insidious and lingering effects, including increased cancer rates and organ damage. A large-scale exchange would threaten the very existence of the human species. According to an analysis in the May 31, 1962 *New England Journal of Medicine*, if one 20 megaton bomb were dropped on a city such as Boston, almost 2.5 million people would be killed. Deaths from a full nuclear exchange, even one targeted at military facilities, would be exponentially greater. In a potential phenomenon known as "nuclear winter", the debris raised by multiple nuclear explosions and the resulting fires could effectively block out the sun, gradually choking off life as we know it.

Senator Alan Cranston emphasized that a peace based on the threat to use these devices is unworthy of civilization, constituting a kind of terrorism. In less than fifteen minutes the leader of Russia or the US must verify an incoming attack, consult advisors and give orders, if computers notify him that there may be an attack. Several accidents put us on the brink of accidental nuclear war. According to the US Navy, the number of accidents, malfunctions, and false alarms is in the hundreds. For example, in January of 1995 Russian radar mistook a weather satellite for a Trident launch and placed its President in an unacceptably risky position for about ten minutes.

Nuclear weapons, ethics and law. The willingness to utilize a weapon that cannot distinguish between civilians and combatants is morally and legally problematic. In 1996, the International Court of Justice ruled that the threat or use of nuclear weapons is generally illegal, and that states have an obligation to conclude negotiations on their

elimination. The Holy See has said that nuclear weapons “cannot be justified. They deserve condemnation.

The danger of hair-trigger alert. Even today, US and Russian leaders have 15 minutes from the time a computer senses a possible attack to verify the incoming attack, consult advisors and give orders to strike with a nuclear weapon before their own arsenals are hit. Several accidents put us on the brink of accidental nuclear war. According to the US Navy, the number of accidents, malfunctions, and false alarms is in the hundreds. For example, in January of 1995 Russian radar mistook a weather satellite for a Trident launch and placed its President in an unacceptably risky position for about ten minutes.

The costs of nuclear weapons. The United States alone spent in excess of \$4.5 Trillion dollars, with minimum public discussion, to build its arsenal and currently spends over \$90 million per day to keep it ready. The IAEA has a budget of less than \$600 million per year to inspect and safeguard nuclear materials.

Fissile materials. There are over 2000 metric tons of weapons-grade plutonium and uranium in the world. In Russia alone, there are approximately 1200 tons of fissile material, much of which is improperly safeguarded. It takes only 30 pounds of this material to build a crude bomb with the capacity of the one dropped on Hiroshima. A missile is not needed to deliver such a device. A tugboat or truck could be used.

Nuclear disarmament. 188 countries have signed and ratified the NPT which codifies a promise by the five declared nuclear weapons states to eventual elimination of their nuclear arsenals pursuant to a negotiated disarmament process in return for a commitment by the non-nuclear states not to acquire nuclear weapons.

US General Lee Butler, former Commander in Chief of US Strategic Command, General Andrew Goodpaster, former Supreme Allied Commander of Europe, Admiral Stansfield Turner, former Director of the Central Intelligence Agency, and General Charles Horner, former Head of US Aerospace Command among many other leading US military figures have called for the elimination of nuclear weapons in powerful statements. For example, in 1996, 60 leading Generals and Admirals from 17 countries, including many from the Russia, issued such a statement. Hundreds of civilian leaders, including past and current heads of state, scientists, and business, religious, municipal and cultural leaders have since issued similar pleas. We wish to join in this call for a safer world.

The prestigious Canberra Commission, convened under the auspices of the Australian government stated the issue clearly in two striking paragraphs:

"Nuclear weapons are held by a handful of states which insist that these weapons provide unique security benefits, and yet reserve uniquely to themselves the right to own them. This situation is highly discriminatory and thus unstable; it cannot be sustained. The possession of nuclear weapons by any state is a constant stimulus to other states to acquire them....The proposition that nuclear weapons can be retained in perpetuity and never used - accidentally or by decision - defies credibility. The only complete defence is

the elimination of nuclear weapons and assurance that they will never be produced again."

There are threat reducing steps which could be taken incrementally which would further efforts to make us safer and move toward achieving the global elimination of nuclear weapons:

- Taking nuclear forces off alert by removal of warheads from delivery vehicles
- Creating an inventory and safe storage system for all weapons grade fissile materials
- Ending deployment of non-strategic nuclear weapons
- Ending nuclear testing
- Initiating legally binding, verifiable, irreversible agreements to further reduce US and Russian nuclear arsenals
- Agreement among the nuclear weapon states of reciprocal no first use undertakings, and of a non-use undertaking by them in relation to the nonnuclear weapon states
- Commencing negotiations on a universal verifiable convention to eliminate nuclear weapons as has been done with chemical and biological weapon

¹ *State of the World 2004: Consumption By the Numbers*. World Watch Institute. January 7, 2004.

<http://www.worldwatch.org/press/news/2004/01/07/>

² Fukuka-Parr, Sakiko et al. *UN Human Development Report 2004: Cultural Liberty in Today's Diverse World*. United Nations

Development Program. 2004. pp. 129. http://hdr.undp.org/reports/global/2004/pdf/hdr04_complete.pdf

³ *State of the World 2004: Consumption By the Numbers*. World Watch Institute. January 7, 2004.

<http://www.worldwatch.org/press/news/2004/01/07/>

⁴ Ibid.

⁵ Fukuka-Parr, Sakiko et al. *UN Human Development Report 2004: Cultural Liberty in Today's Diverse World*. United Nations

Development Program. 2004. pp. 132. http://hdr.undp.org/reports/global/2004/pdf/hdr04_backmatter_1.pdf#page=8

⁶ Ibid.

⁷ *Rich-Poor Gap Growing*. Vital Signs 2003. Worldwatch Institute. May 2003. pp. 88-89.

<http://worldwatch.org/pubs/download/EVS301/>

⁸ Fukuka-Parr, Sakiko et al. *UN Human Development Report 2004: Cultural Liberty in Today's Diverse World*. United Nations

Development Program. 2004. pp. 130. http://hdr.undp.org/reports/global/2004/pdf/hdr04_complete.pdf

⁹ Ibid.

¹⁰ Ibid.

¹¹ Ibid.

¹² Ibid.

¹³ Fukuka-Parr, Sakiko et al. *UN Human Development Report 2004: Cultural Liberty in Today's Diverse World*. United Nations

Development Program. 2004. pp. 74 http://hdr.undp.org/reports/global/2004/pdf/hdr04_chapter_4.pdf#page=2

¹⁴ *Leading Global Institutions Come Together to Address Rising Death Toll on the World's Roads*. World Health Organization. September

2003. <http://www.who.int/mediacentre/news/releases/2003/pr68/en/>

¹⁵ *Leading Global Institutions Come Together to Address Rising Death Toll on the World's Roads*. World Health Organization. September

2003. <http://www.who.int/mediacentre/news/releases/2003/pr68/en/>

¹⁶ *Peacekeeping Expenditures Down Slightly and Military Expenditures on the Rise*. Vital Signs 2003. May 2003. pp. 76-77 and 116-117.

<http://www.worldwatch.org/features/vsow/2003/09/17/>

¹⁷ Ibid.

¹⁸ Ibid.

¹⁹ Wolfensohn, James. *Brandeis University Graduation Commencement Address*. President, World Bank. May 23, 2004. See World

Bank website for entire speech:

<http://web.worldbank.org/WBSITE/EXTERNAL/NEWS/0,,contentMDK:20214844~menuPK:34472~pagePK:34370~piPK:34424~theSitePK:4607,00.html>

²⁰ *Resource Wars Plague Developing World*. The Worldwatch Institute. Vital Signs 2003. May 2003. pp. 120-121.
<http://www.worldwatch.org/features/vsow/2003/08/21/> For an in-depth analysis of resource –related conflicts, see also: Renner, Michael.

The Anatomy of Resource Wars. October 2002. <http://worldwatch.org/pubs/download/EWP162/>

²¹ *Unfinished Business: Global Push to Save 11 Million Children*. World Health Organization. March 2002.

http://www.who.int/consultation-child-adolescent/Documents/Press_Release_en.htm

²² *HIV/AIDS Pandemic Spreads Further*. The Worldwatch Institute. Vital Signs 2003. May 2003. pp. 68-69.

<http://www.worldwatch.org/features/vsow/2003/09/24/>

²³ 75% is the combined total of those stocks that are fully fished (47%), over-fished (18%), or depleted (9%). Food and Agriculture

Organization of the United Nations. <http://www.fao.org/DOCREP/FIELD/006/Y3354M/y3354e28.htm>

²⁴ *Severe Loss to Arctic Ozone*. BBC News Online. April 5, 2000. <http://news.bbc.co.uk/1/hi/sci/tech/702388.stm>

²⁵ *Carbon Emissions and Temperatures Climb*. Vital Signs 2003. Worldwatch Institute. May 2003. pp. 40-41.

<http://worldwatch.org/pubs/download/EVS301/>

²⁶ *Fossil Fuel Use Up and Vehicle Production Inches Up*. Vital Signs 2003. Worldwatch Institute. May 2003. pp. 34-35 and 56-57.

<http://worldwatch.org/pubs/download/EVS301/>

²⁷ *Environmental Indicators: Ozone Depletion*. Environmental Protection Agency. July 2004.

<http://www.epa.gov/ozone/science/indicat/index.html>

²⁸ Fukuka-Parr, Sakiko et al. *UN Human Development Report 2004: Cultural Liberty in Today's Diverse World*. United Nations

Development Program. 2004. pp. 127. http://hdr.undp.org/reports/global/2004/pdf/hdr04_complete.pdf

²⁹ Sale, Dr. John. *Biodiversity Loss*. John Ray Initiative. <http://www.jri.org.uk/brief/biodiversity.htm>

³⁰ Ibid.

³¹ Ibid.

Prepared by the Global Security Institute, in consultation with the Nuclear Age Peace Foundation and the Lawyers Alliance for World Security. Additional sources: Brookings Institution, Center for Defense Information, US Department of Defense, International Physicians for the Prevention of Nuclear War, and Scientific American.
www.gsinststitute.org



Dr. Wangari Mathai and Alyn Ware

Lifting up the World: Building a Culture of Peace

By Alyn Ware

November 11, 2004

**Vice-President of the International Peace Bureau
Rome, Italy**

I am honoured to listen and learn from the wisdom and experience and visions and achievements of the Nobel laureates and others who have spoken over the past two days.

I have happily drunk my fill from this fountain of wisdom. I am enriched and inspired and energized by this. I don't think that that I can add to such wisdom. But what I would like to add are some examples of actions and initiatives to realize some of these visions – to help us move from a divided world to a united world.

A key ingredient in moving from such visions towards building a culture of peace – is education – education to help people, especially young people, to learn the skills, attitudes and values to transform conflict and division, fear and pessimism, hatred and misunderstanding into unity and optimism and success and hope and love.

I recall that Martin Luther King once said that "We must learn to live together as friends or perish together as fools". So I will look at a few practical ways of making peace a reality – of building a culture of peace – through peace education.

Education for peace requires action at a number of levels – and I will focus briefly on just a few – schools and youth, parliamentarians, governments and civil society.

I will be drawing from the excellent education programmes being promoted and developed through the [International Decade for a Culture of Peace](#), the [Global Campaign for Peace Education](#), the [UN Study on Disarmament and Non-Proliferation Education](#) and the [UN CyberSchoolBus](#).

I will also use some examples of peace education being implemented through schools in Aotearoa-New Zealand – which now has integrated peace education into the curriculum and where the Ministry of Education and from peace education organizations are very active. The brochure *Peace Education in Schools*, for example, developed by the Ministry of Education on ideas for peace education, was distributed to every school and kindergarten in the country last year.

So briefly what is peace education? I was pleased to hear Mikhail Gorbachev refer to the commencement address John F Kennedy gave at American University on June 10, 1963 – for in that address President Kennedy noted that peace is a process – a way of solving problems and that no problem of human destiny is beyond human beings.

Thus peace education is not merely an aversion to violence and war, but is about helping people to understand and transform conflict in their own lives, in the community and in the world at large.

Peace education is about helping people find and develop their own solutions to conflict. In New Zealand schools, for example, children role play different conflict scenarios, trying out their ideas for solutions.

Simulation games are a fun and powerful way to learn conflict resolution concepts and skills – such as win-win approaches to conflicts. In one game pupils can win a prize if they get the other team across the line three times in fifteen seconds. Some choose to fight and neither team wins. Those who choose to cooperate find that both teams can win – and thus learn the principle of win-win solutions to conflicts.

Other games are employed to help children practice cooperation and trust-building, learn to experience differences between them and others and practice helping others.

Students are also trained to be mediators and so that they can mediate actual conflicts that occur at school. Peer mediation programmes are now established in elementary and high schools throughout Aotearoa-New Zealand and have led to a considerable reduction in conflicts and violence in schools.

Student mediators also study national and international conflicts and learn that the skills and approaches they use to solve disputes at school and home, are the same skills and approaches used by international mediators such as Jimmy Carter and the United Nations

Secretary-General. The terms may be slightly different and international mediations might be more complex, but the basic steps are the same.

The Minister of Education has also determined the week commemorating the nuclear bombings of Hiroshima and Nagasaki to be [Schools' Peace Week](#) – a week of activities in schools for peace. One of those activities is making origami – paper – cranes, the Japanese bird of peace and a youth activity calling for no more nuclear war.

Education activities to prevent nuclear war and achieve nuclear disarmament are carried out in the wider community by a number of organizations – including some present at this conference. Many of these are working together as part of [Abolition 2000](#) – an international network of over 2000 organizations working for nuclear abolition.

A new and exciting initiative is the [Mayors for Peace Emergency Campaign for Nuclear Abolition](#). Established by Mayor Akiba from Hiroshima and Mayor Itoh from Nagasaki, there are now over 600 mayors from around the world working together to encourage governments to negotiate a nuclear weapons abolition treaty.

Another new and exciting initiative is the Parliamentary Network for Nuclear Disarmament which in just a few years has gathered over 300 parliamentarians from 50 countries to work on nuclear disarmament.

One of the areas of interest for many PNND members is the criminalization of the threat, use, development and possession of nuclear weapons and other weapons of mass destruction. The United Nations Security Council, through [UN SC Resolution 1540](#), is now requiring governments to adopt criminal law on nuclear, chemical and biological weapons applicable to non-State actors. As Jonathan Granoff mentioned, terrorism is terrorism regardless of whether it is committed by non-State actors or governments. Thus some parliamentarians are looking at legislation – like [that adopted in New Zealand](#) – which prohibits such acts from both State and non-State actors (See also [International Ju-Jitsu: Using Security Council Resolution 1540 to Advance Nuclear Disarmament](#))

One initiative to reduce the threat of nuclear weapons until they can be eliminated is an [international appeal](#), signed by Nobel laureates, parliamentarians and civil society leaders, calling for the reduction of the threat of nuclear weapons. I encourage you to add your endorsement to this appeal.

I would like to also acknowledge the [UN High Level Panel on Threats Challenges and Change](#), which was reported on earlier in this conference. ([Report of the High Level Panel](#))

The [International Peace Bureau](#) presented the Florence Appeal - an international appeal with recommendations - to the UN High Level Panel last week in New York and copies are available at this Summit.

I want to conclude by returning to the subject of youth. For it is not just enough to educate youth in peace – we have to engage them in the process to build a new world – not just because they are the citizens of the future, not just because they are the source of new leadership – but because they are crying out to be heard, recognized, and involved.

Just look to the music of the youth and you will see this yearning. Black Eyed Peas recently had an international hit with the song “Where is the Love” – a modern day funk hit possibly as powerful as John Lennon’s “Imagine.”

Just look at the lyrics:

*But if you only have love for your own race
Then you only leave space to discriminate
And to discriminate only generates hate
And when you hate then you're bound to get irate
Madness is what you demonstrate*

*People killin', people dyin'
Children hurt and you hear them cryin'
Can you practice what you preach
And would you turn the other cheek*

*Yo', whatever happened to the values of humanity
Whatever happened to the fairness in equality
Instead of spreading love we spreading animosity
Lack of understanding, leading lives away from unity
That's the reason why sometimes I'm feelin' under
That's the reason why sometimes I'm feelin' down
There's no wonder why sometimes I'm feelin' under
Gotta keep my faith alive till love is found*

Where is the love?

The youth are crying out for hope – for love – for possibilities for peace - for all the things represented by this Nobel Summit. Young people could learn so much from being here – from drinking from the fountain of wisdom and hope and visions that I have experienced being here listening to and engaging with Nobel laureates.

If young people could participate in this forum, to share with Nobel laureates, I feel that they, like me, would be inspired to go back out into the world and reach out to their friends and colleagues – to the citizens and leaders of the future - with inspiration and hope and knowledge that love and peace is alive in the international community and that a new world of unity not division is possible and, with the engagement of youth, will be built and we will indeed bear witness to a future of peace throughout the world.

Event Report: Nobel Peace Laureates Express Grave Concern about New Nuclear Arms Race, Call for Strengthening of NPT and UN

by Dr. Urs Cipolat, University of California, Berkeley

November 12, 2004

Rome, Italy

From 10-13 November, twenty-three Nobel peace laureates and laureate organizations met in Rome, Italy for the [5th Summit of Nobel Peace Laureates](#). As in previous years, their annual Summit was organized by the Gorbachev Foundation and co-hosted by former Soviet President and Peace Nobel Laureate, Mikhail Gorbachev, and the Mayor of Rome, Walter Veltroni. Under the theme, “A United World or Divided World?,” the laureates focused on identifying core values and policies that would help political leaders and activists around the world promote human rights, strengthen multi-ethnicity, eradicate terrorism, and stop the new arms race.

The increasing threat posed by nuclear weapons took a central position in the Summit’s deliberations. Numerous laureates and laureate organizations stressed the immorality and illegality of nuclear weapons and called upon the growing number of governments possessing such weapons of mass destruction to eliminate them.

In their [Final Statement](#), the Nobel peace laureates expressed grave concern about the resurgent nuclear arms race, the disrespect for international law and the failure of the world’s governments to adequately address the root causes of terrorism, that is, poverty, ignorance and injustice. The Statement also casts doubt on the long-term viability of the US-led ‘war against terror.’ “Only by reaffirming our shared ethical values – respect for human rights and fundamental freedoms – and by observing democratic principles, within and amongst countries, can terrorism be defeated,” the Statement reads.

The Nobel laureates rejected the existing nuclear ‘double-standard’ and collectively called upon governments, parliamentarians, and civil society as a whole to

- preserve and strengthen the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty, which is the only legally binding instrument that stipulates the total elimination of nuclear weapons;
- uphold the moratorium on nuclear testing pending entry into force of the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty;
- demand the verifiable and irreversible reduction of existing arsenals;
- stop the development of a new generation of ‘usable’ nuclear arms (so-called mini-nukes and bunker busters); and
- reject new military doctrines that view nuclear weapons as legitimate means of war-fighting and threat pre-emption.

In his opening speech to the plenum, former President Mikhail Gorbachev (1990) deplored the missed opportunity at the end of the Cold War to establish a new, more peaceful world order, and called for a Perestroika on the international level that would help strengthen the UN, reduce the rampant levels of violence worldwide, reverse the renewed arms race, and prepare the ground for a genuine culture of peace.

Kim Dae-jung (2000), former President of South Korea, underscored that the ultimate solution to the crisis on the Korean peninsula lies in the total elimination of all nuclear weapons world-wide. The possession of nuclear weapons by some States, Kim pointed out, continues to provide the most powerful incentive for other States and terrorists to acquire them.

Sir Joseph Rotblat (1995) from the United Kingdom emphasized that the retention of nuclear weapons, rather than increasing security, actually threatens it. “[T]he continuous existence of nuclear arsenals in some countries greatly increases the probability of such weapons being used by a terrorist group,” Rotblat argued. Deplored the development of new generations of nuclear weapons, in particular by the US and Russia, the first scientist to quit the Manhattan Project (to develop a U.S. nuclear bomb) when it was discovered that Germany was not developing the nuclear bomb called upon all States to live up to their commitments under the Nuclear Non-proliferation Treaty, which requires the nuclear “haves” to eliminate their arsenals while prohibiting the “have-nots” to acquire such weapons. “If you want peace, prepare for peace,” Rotblat concluded, and pointed out that such preparations can only be successful if States are willing to give up some degree of their national sovereignty to create a truly collective and hence more effective system of global governance.

Jonathan Granoff from the United States of America, Head of Delegation of the International Peace Bureau (1910) and President of the Global Security Institute, reflected on the interconnectedness of the various global threats that humankind is presently facing. Identifying the widespread indifference to human suffering and the pride of power and religious exclusivity as dangerous sources of all man-made threats, Granoff called for the establishment of UN Centers for Non-violent Conflict Prevention across the globe to help foster dialogue between the world’s innumerable cultures, religions and ethnic groups. “We must commit to promoting a culture of peace founded on the rule of law, the dignity of our higher qualities, and deeper dialogue amongst peoples,” Granoff stated. “Where our common humanity is affirmed and love expressed, fear, the breeding ground for fanaticism, is overcome,” he stressed.

According to Granoff, poverty, another driving force of violence and terrorism, could be more effectively addressed if military spending were substantially reduced and resulting surplus funds invested in economic development and social programs. “The US nuclear arsenal costs the American taxpayer over \$100 million a day,” Granoff observed, “yet it failed and will continue to fail

detering terrorists from attacking us. Using these enormous funds – \$36 million per year – to feed the hungry, employ the poor, and educate the disenfranchised around the world would make a real contribution to strengthening national and international peace and stability.”

Alyn Ware from Aotearoa/New Zealand, Vice-President of the International Peace Bureau (1910) and Coordinator of the Parliamentary Network for Nuclear Disarmament, highlighted the need to implement peace and disarmament education at all levels of society in order to build a culture of peace. Ware encouraged Nobel laureates, parliamentarians and civil society leaders to support initiatives that would reduce nuclear dangers and achieve nuclear abolition, including an international appeal on reducing the operational status of nuclear weapons (i.e. to take nuclear weapons off alert and abandon policies of launch-on-warning and first-use of nuclear weapons) and the Mayors for Peace Emergency Campaign for Nuclear Abolition. He highlighted UN Security Council Resolution 1540 (2004) on the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction, and called upon parliamentarians worldwide to use this opportunity to enact national legislation that criminalizes any form of Weapons of Mass Destruction activity, whether undertaken by non-State actors or government officials.

Professor M.S. Swaminathan from India, President of the Pugwash Conferences (1995), observed that an important aspect of the currently divided world is the persistence of nuclear haves and have-nots. Stating his belief that such a two-class world cannot endure and reaffirming that Pugwash is “totally committed to the goal of abolishing all nuclear weapons,” Swaminathan called for a paradigm shift in global security. “We need a shift from a competitive to a cooperative global security system ... which does not depend on nuclear or any other weapon of mass destruction,” Swaminathan observed.

Professor Gunnar Westberg, MD, from Sweden, Co-President of the International Physicians for the Prevention of Nuclear War (1985), underscored that not only terrorism, but also the war against terrorism, keep the world divided and war-torn, and that nuclear terrorism is becoming an increasing danger. He concluded his presentations by identifying nuclear weapons as the most serious threat to the survival of mankind. “Nuclear weapons and mankind can in the long run not coexist. One will have to go,” Westberg said.

Interventions by other Nobel Peace laureates and laureate organizations focused on a variety of issues, including terrorism, poverty, human rights and their violation, or the reconstruction of post-conflict societies. [Link to Presentations by Mairead Corrigan Maguire, Mary Ellen McNish and Paul Lacey] The Summit honored Yusuf Islam aka Cat Stevens with the “Man for Peace” award and issued a supplemental statement demanding the immediate release by the authorities of Myanmar of Aung San Suu Kyi, 1991 Nobel Peace laureate.

5th Nobel Peace Summit: Event Report

Alyn Ware IPB Vice-President

Jonathan Granoff- Head of IPB Delegation

Urs Ciplat

November 12, 2004

Rome, Italy

From 10-13 November, twenty-five Nobel Peace Laureates and their organizations met in Rome, Italy to consider vital issues of multi-ethnicity, human rights and terrorism under the theme of a divided world or a united world.

This, the 5th World Summit of Nobel Peace Laureates, was organized by the Gorbachev Foundation and hosted by the Mayor of Rome. It focused the wisdom and experience of Nobel Laureates on key issues of concern today, and sought to increase the communication and collaboration between Nobel Peace Laureates in order to strengthen their individual and collective contribution to world peace.

The Summit bestowed the 'Man for Peace 2004' award on Yusuf Islam (aka Cat Stevens), held an interactive session with over 2000 students, released a statement condemning the house arrest of fellow Nobel Laureate Aung San Suu Kyi, paid its respects to fellow Nobel Laureate Yassar Arrafat who passed away during the Summit, and produced a final statement which indicated areas of grave concern including a resurgent nuclear and conventional arms race, disrespect for international law, and the failure of the world's governments to address adequately the challenges of poverty and environmental degradation.

The Nobel laureates called for action in a number of key areas in order to transform a growing cult of violence into the building of a culture of peace. These included:

- Addressing the root causes of terrorism in order to respond effectively to such threats without recourse to the use of force
- Ensuring that all children are protected from war and that they are educated in and for peace
- Resolution of the conflict on the Korean peninsula through the development of security assurances, lifting of sanctions and an end to nuclear weapons programmes
- Resolution of the Iranian nuclear program issue through the framework of the International Atomic Energy Agency
- Reduction of military expenditures and conclusion of a treaty controlling the arms trade
- Implementation of the UN Millennium goals on development assistance, fair trade, market access and debt relief
- Implementation of the Kyoto Protocol and development of a framework treaty to assure adequate access to water

- Increased efforts in good faith to solve the Middle East crisis
- Preservation and strengthening of the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty, emphasizing the legal responsibility of the nuclear weapon States to work to eliminate nuclear weapons
- Support for the work of the United Nations High Level Panel on Threats, Challenges and Change

The Nobel Peace Laureates also called for increased interaction between parliamentarians and civil society in order to accomplish these goals.

Jonathan Granoff, President of the Global Security Institute, has played an active role in previous Nobel Summits, and was invited by the Gorbachev Foundation to do so again. He and Alyn Ware (Vice-President of the International Peace Bureau) formed the delegation of the International Peace Bureau (IPB), which received the Nobel Peace Prize in 1910. They were assisted by Dr. Urs Cipolat.

Other Nobel laureates included Mikhail Gorbachev, Kim Dae-Jung, Lech Walsea, Joseph Rotblat, Jose Ramos Horta, Betty Williams, Miaread Corrigan Maguire, Carlos Filipe Ximenes Belo, Adolfo Perez Esquivel, Rigoberta Menchu Tum, United Nations Children's Fund, Pugwash Conferences, International Peace Bureau, International Physicians for the Prevention of Nuclear War, Institut de Droit International, American Friends Service Committee, Médecins sans Frontières, Amnesty International, United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees, International Labour Organisation, International Campaign to Ban Landmines, Albert Schweitzer Institute and the United Nations.

Following the Summit, many of the Nobel Laureates participated in an informal strategy meeting to discuss how best they could collaborate to distribute and promote the final statement and to enact its calls. The meeting also included discussion on proposals to strengthen the collective voice of Nobel Peace Laureates through increased collaboration.

The delegation played a number of key roles in the Summit.

Jonathan Granoff:

- chaired the sessions devoted to Terrorism and Other Threats to Humanity. This was the largest and most in depth session at the Summit.
- gave several speeches on values, elimination of nuclear weapons, international norms and the integration of the security agenda with human rights and sustainable development
- distributed a landmark paper Reflections on Human Unity - with programmatic proposals
- was a principal drafter for the Final Statement of the Summit and the Call for Freedom for Aung San San Suu Kyi at the request of the Nobel laureates and particularly Mikhael Gorbachev
- helped organize and chaired the three-hour interactive session between Nobel

laureates and over 2000 graduate students and other youth

- convened and chaired the post-summit strategy meeting,
- was interviewed by a number of TV and print media reporters,
- chaired the final press conference.

Alyn Ware:

- spoke on education for a culture of peace and gave a well received slide show
- circulated the Florence Appeal - visions and proposals for a world of peace developed by IPB over the course of a year's deliberations with peace advocates from around the world, and aiming to feed into the UN High Level Panel on Threats, Challenges and Change
- highlighted the importance of engaging with parliamentarians
- ensured that the importance of peace education was included in the final statement
- promoted an Appeal on Reducing the Risks of Nuclear Weapons which calls for the removal of nuclear warheads from delivery systems, abandoning launch-on-warning policies and pledges of no-first-use.
- participated in the final press conference and was also interviewed by a number of TV and print media.

Urs Cipolat provided vital programmatic and logistical support including circulation of support documents, arranging meetings and interviews, taking photos, interpreting at meetings, and translating key documents into Italian including the final statement.

Participation in the Summit provided an ideal opportunity to promote concerns and programmes – particularly those relating to nuclear weapons – and to develop a deeper knowledge and understanding of related programmes by the other laureates' organizations and to build positive and collaborative relations with them.

The delegation conducted numerous informal meetings with Nobel laureates. They also took the opportunity in Rome to conduct meetings in the Senate and House of Deputies in order to promote the engagement of parliamentarians in disarmament issues.

There was considerable support amongst the Nobel Peace Laureates to increase the positive impact they could make collectively on current security issues through greater collaboration. The fact that the Laureates come from a wide range of backgrounds and perspectives provides a source of richness and credibility for such a role. However, it also provides sources for conflicts in the efforts to achieve a common voice on various issues. The delegation played a vital role in mediating such conflicts, helping the laureates appreciate the deep

human values which they all shared, and in reflecting this in the final statement and in the work towards greater collaboration between the laureates.

The work of the Nobel Peace Laureates, and especially the final statement, provide a strong and credible platform for the promotion of peace that can be used to assist peace and justice campaigns universally.

GSI made a commitment to assist distribute the final statement to key government officials, former heads of State, parliamentarians, church leaders and civil society leaders in order to enhance its impact.

The 5th World Summit of Nobel Peace Laureates, meeting in Rome from November 10-13, bestowed the 'Man for Peace' Award on Yusuf Islam (Cat Stevens). The award, an art piece designed by Franco Scepi, was given to Yusuf Islam to honour the work he has done through Small Kindness, the humanitarian organization he founded to alleviate the suffering of children in war-torn areas including Kosovo, Bosnia, Albania, Montenegro and Iraq, and for other work for orphans, homeless children, children affected by aids, and victims of the September 11 terrorist attack.

The Nobel Laureates recognized the work of Yusuf Islam in providing humanitarian assistance, facilitating reconciliation, opposing terrorism in all forms and promoting peace and respect between religious and ethnic communities.

The award was presented by the Mayor of Rome Walter Veltroni and by Mikhail Gorbachev, Nobel Peace Laureate and President of the Gorbachev Foundation.

5th Summit of Nobel Peace Laureates Final Statement- A United World or a Divided World ? Multiethnicity, Human Rights, Terrorism

November 10-12, 2004

Rome, Italy

Two decades ago, the world was swept with a wave of hope. Inspired by the popular movements for peace, freedom, democracy and solidarity, the nations of the world worked together to end the cold war. Yet the opportunities opened up by that historic change are slipping away. We are gravely concerned with the resurgent nuclear and conventional arms race, disrespect for international law and the failure of the world's governments to address adequately the challenges of poverty and environmental degradation. A cult of violence is spreading globally; the opportunity to build a culture of peace, advocated by the United Nations, Pope John Paul II, the Dalai Lama and other spiritual leaders, is receding.

Alongside the challenges inherited from the past there are new ones, which, if not properly addressed, could cause a clash of civilizations, religions and cultures. We reject the idea of the inevitability of such a conflict. We are convinced that combating terrorism in all its forms is a task that should be pursued with determination. Only by reaffirming our shared ethical values -- respect for human rights and fundamental freedoms -- and by observing democratic principles, within and amongst countries, can terrorism be defeated. We must address the root causes of terrorism -- poverty, ignorance and injustice -- rather than responding to violence with violence.

Unacceptable violence is occurring daily against women and children. Children remain our most important neglected treasure. Their protection, security and health should be the highest priority. Children everywhere deserve to be educated in and for peace. There is no excuse for neglecting their safety and welfare and, particularly, for their suffering in war.

The war in Iraq has created a hotbed of dangerous instability and a breeding ground for terrorism. Credible reports of the disappearance of nuclear materials cannot be ignored. While we mourn the deaths of tens of thousands of people, none of the goals proclaimed by the coalition have been achieved.

The challenges of security, poverty and environmental crisis can only be met successfully through multilateral efforts based on the rule of law. All nations must strictly fulfil their treaty obligations and reaffirm the indispensable role of the United Nations and the primary responsibility of the UN Security Council for maintaining peace.

We support a speedy, peaceful resolution of the North Korean nuclear issue, including a verifiable end to North Korea's nuclear weapons program, security guarantees and lifting of sanctions on North Korea. Both the six-party talks and bilateral efforts by the United States and North Korea should contribute to such an outcome.

We welcome recent progress in the talks between Iran and Great Britain, France and Germany on the Iranian nuclear program issue and hope that the United States will join in the process to find a solution within the framework of the International Atomic Energy Agency.

We call for the reduction of military expenditures and for conclusion of a treaty that would control arms trade and prohibit sales of arms where they could be used to violate international human rights standards and humanitarian law.

As Nobel Laureates, we believe that the world community needs urgently to address the challenges of poverty and sustainable development. Responding to these challenges requires the political will that has been so sadly lacking.

The undertakings pledged by states at the UN Millennium Summit, the promises of increased development assistance, fair trade, market access and debt relief for developing countries, have not been implemented. Poverty continues to be the world's most widespread and dangerous scourge.

Millions of people become victims of hunger and disease, and entire nations suffer from feelings of frustration and despair. This creates fertile ground for extremism and terrorism. The stability and future of the entire human community are thus jeopardized.

Scientists are warning us that failure to solve the problems of water, energy and climate change will lead to a breakdown of order, more military conflicts and ultimately the destruction of the living systems upon which civilization depends. Therefore, we reaffirm our support for the Kyoto Protocol and the Earth Charter and endorse the rights-based approach to water, as reflected in the initiative of Green Cross International calling upon governments to negotiate a framework treaty on water.

As Nobel Peace Prize Laureates we believe that to benefit from humankind's new, unprecedented opportunities and to counter the dangers confronting us there is a need for better global governance. Therefore, we support strengthening and reforming the United Nations and its institutions.

As immediate specific tasks, we commit to work for:

- Genuine efforts to resolve the Middle East crisis. This is both a key to the problem of terrorism and a chance to avoid a dangerous clash of civilizations. A solution is possible if the right of all nations in the region to secure, viable statehood is respected and if the Middle East is integrated in all global processes while respecting the unique culture of the peoples of that region.

- Preserving and strengthening the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty. We reject double standards and emphasize the legal responsibility of nuclear weapons states to work to eliminate nuclear weapons. We call for continuation of the moratorium on nuclear testing pending entry into force of the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty, and for accelerating the process of verifiable and irreversible nuclear arms reduction. We are gravely alarmed by the creation of new, usable nuclear weapons and call for rejection of doctrines that view nuclear weapons as legitimate means of war-fighting and threat pre-emption.

- Effectively realizing the initiative of the UN Secretary General to convene a high-level conference in 2005 to give an impetus to the implementation of the Millennium Development Goals. We pledge to work to create an atmosphere of public accountability to help accomplish these vitally important tasks.

We believe that to solve the problems that challenge the world today politicians need to interact with an empowered civil society and strong mass movements. This is the way toward a globalization with a human face and a new international order that rejects brute force, respects ethnic, cultural and political diversity and affirms justice, compassion and human solidarity.

We, the Nobel Peace Laureates and Laureate organizations, pledge to work for the realization of these goals and are calling on governments and people everywhere to join us.

Mikhail Gorbachev, Kim Dae-Jung, Lech Walesa, Joseph Rotblat, Jose Ramos-Horta, Betty Williams, Mairead Corrigan Maguire, Carlos Filipe Ximenes Belo, Adolfo Perez Esquivel, and Rigoberta Menchu Tum; and, United Nations Children's Fund, Pugwash Conferences, International Physicians for the Prevention of Nuclear War, International Peace Bureau, Institut de Droit International, American Friends Service Committee, Médecins sans Frontières, Amnesty International, United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees, International Labour Organization, International Campaign to Ban Land Mines, Albert Schweitzer Institute, United Nations.

**2005- 6th Nobel Laureates Summit-
Emergency Africa: from Attention to Action**
November 24-26, 2005
Rome, Italy



Mikhail Gorbachev and Jayantha Dhanapala

Emergency Africa
By: Jayantha Dhanapala
Honorary President of the International Peace Bureau
November 24, 2005
Rome, Italy

It is indeed a privilege and an honour for the International Peace Bureau (IPB), which I represent, to participate in this discussion on “African Emergency - Strategies to Eliminate Poverty” – a theme that is clearly timely and relevant in the current context of global affairs. The IPB was founded in 1892 as a direct result of the third Universal Peace Congress held in this eternal city of Rome in 1891. As the world’s oldest and most comprehensive international peace federation and the Nobel Peace Laureate in 1910, we continue to be proud to be associated with the Nobel Laureates Summit and thank the Gorbachev Foundation and the City of Rome for your hospitality and the arrangements at

this Sixth Summit

Let me at the outset congratulate this year's Nobel Peace Prize winner, my good friend Dr. Mohammed El Baradei, the Director-General, and the organization that he leads so ably - the International Atomic Energy Agency. My own professional career in peace and disarmament has led to a close association with Dr. El-Baradei and the IAEA and I am well aware of the outstanding role they have played, and continue to play, in containing the spread of nuclear weapons in the world. May I also on behalf of the IPB congratulate Sir Bob Geldof on the 'Man of Peace' award that we have presented to him. It is appropriate that we do so in this Summit which we have devoted to the needs of Africa for which Sir Bob has dedicated so much of his time and energy.

This annual Summit is an event fast acquiring international significance due to the distinguished presence of so many of the Nobel Laureates as well as the moral compass our final document provides in a world which is clearly in need of consensus building with regard to common objectives. The Outcome Document from the UN's 60th Anniversary Summit last September was not as comprehensive as was hoped. Nor was it definitive in the areas it addressed, leaving much to be done in the months ahead. With UN reform a matter of work in progress, the future of Africa must depend on the far-reaching influence of other international fora to supplement the United Nations. The Nobel Laureates Summit fulfills that need. And there is no cause more worthy than the special needs of Africa. We are all stakeholders in the security and development of Africa.

The IPB is gratified that our consideration of this agenda item is structured in the manner that has been proposed in the programme. That is, we discuss the Strategies to eliminate poverty in Africa this morning highlighting the political approaches needed. This afternoon we discuss economic aspects and tomorrow we discuss Human Rights aspects. We would thus be following the theme of the High Level Panel Report on Threats, Challenges and Change submitted to the UN Secretary-General in December last year, which Kofi Annan himself adopted as his thematic motif in his own report "In Larger Freedom: towards development, security and human rights for all." Put simply security, development and human rights are the tripod on which Africa's future must be built. To weaken one of the legs of this tripod or to pay insufficient attention to any one of them would have grave consequences.

Our focus at this Summit on Africa is as timely as it is well deserved. While the Outcome Document of the High-level Plenary meeting of the United Nations General Assembly did include Africa in its general prescriptions of policy, a special section was included for that continent. No other continent received such attention. No other continent is in such dire need of political institution building, economic development and international assistance as Africa, building on the progress that the Africans themselves have achieved in overcoming the burdens that history has imposed on them. The special section was an encouragement to Africa to carry forward the implementation of the New Partnership for Africa's Development - NEPAD - and to welcome the many acts of partnership for development so that Africa - the only continent not on track to meet any of the Millennium

Development Goals (MDGs) by 2015 - can be helped in concrete ways. This covered areas like financial resource mobilization, education and health for all children by 2015, investment, external debt cancellation, trade reform, agriculture, affordable and accessible drugs for HIV/AIDS and the treatment of other diseases and conflict-resolution through the African Union, sub-regional bodies and the UN. We at the Nobel Peace Laureates Summit must endorse and support this.

But we can do more. Indeed we must do more because the moral conscience of humanity cannot countenance a situation where, according to the 2005 Human Development Report of the UNDP, someone living in Zambia today has less chance of reaching the age of 30 than someone born in England in 1840 – one hundred and sixty five years ago; where sub-Saharan Africa accounts for 20% of births worldwide and 44% of child deaths; where aid flows to sub-Saharan Africa, which fell by one-third in the 1990s, must double over the next five years if the estimated cost of achieving the MDGs on target is to be met; where if the share of world exports from sub-Saharan Africa in 1980 had remained the foreign exchange gain would be eight times the aid this sub-region received in 2003; and where the death toll in the Democratic Republic of Congo's conflict exceeds the losses of Britain in both World War I and World War II. Silent tsunamis are causing the inexorable trend that we must collectively seek to reverse so that the MDGs can be met in Africa. Our collective hand wringing will not do. Our fellow human beings in the continent of Africa need immediate and urgent help in concrete ways and means, which can only come about through a combination of policy decisions and practical action. Failure to honour the promises made by nation states will lead to a questioning of the global compacts we make. There must be hope for a better future with co-operation and not exploitation and basic human needs met. In a globalized world our actions benefit all other continents as Africa develops its export and import potential in a tide that lifts all boats.

Africa's historical legacy bears deep scars from her colonial experience. We recall the 'scramble for Africa' when the greedy exploitation of that great continent's rich resources took place in the 19th and 20th centuries. The Berlin Act of 1885 - 120 years ago - superimposed an artificial order on a continent of indigenous cultures and regions fragmenting it politically. That exploitation led to inter-state wars. The Stockholm International Peace Research Institute's prestigious Yearbook records that in 2004, there were 6 major armed conflicts going on in Africa out of the total of 19 in the world. They have revolved around questions more of Governmental power and less on ethnic issues. We must therefore address the issue of security in Africa, which is undeniably the most conflict prone region in the world. In doing so we have to make an effort to understand the nature and causes of poverty in the African context.

We should note in this regard that political science and economic approaches to conflict have assumed different motivations – grievance versus greed – and different explanations – atypical grievances versus atypical opportunities. The economic approach, based on quantitative analysis, asserts that the incidence of conflict is not explained by motive, but by the atypical circumstances that generate profitable opportunities in contrast to the political science approach, based on qualitative analysis, which argues that conflict

occurs when grievances are sufficiently acute that people want to engage in violent protests.

‘Greed and grievance’ models of civil wars developed by Collier, Hoeffler and others, which emphasize the motives and costs of organizing and maintaining rebellions, have been influential in explaining conflicts in Africa and elsewhere. For this purpose, civil war is defined as an internal conflict with at least 1,000 combat-related deaths per year. The Collier-Hoeffler model indicates that the average probability of a new war in the 1960-95 period was 26% for Burundi, as against 7% for the sample. That is, the economic variables that fed the model were useful in predicting the conflict in Burundi.

There is a fallacy that ethnic differences are instrumental in producing violent conflicts in Africa. For example, it is common to see reports implying that violence in Burundi is due to ethnic differences between Tutsis and Hutus. More analytical studies present the case that ethnic or ethno-regional difference could lead to violent conflict only if the allocation of resources among these groups is unequal. Distributional conflicts are often very much of an economic issue. Moreover, violent conflict exacerbates the very conditions that gave rise to it in the first place, creating a classic ‘conflict trap’.

Yet there are signs of hope. The number of cases of ‘one-sided’ violence—defined as the slaughter of at least 25 civilians in the course of a year and called one-sided because the victims cannot fight back—declined from 17 to 11, a drop of 35%, from 2002 to 2003. The National Committee for Disarmament, Demobilization and Reintegration (NCDDR) in post-conflict Sierra Leone successfully ended its operations on 31st March 2004. Foreign aid/debt has a critical role to play in consolidating these gains and laying the foundation for lasting peace and sustainable development. It is also important to realize that aid conditionalities could very well upset a delicate political balance that prevails in post conflict situations. As Boyce and Pastor (1998) note, “Unless politics of peace are allowed to shape economic policy both will fail.”

Also, the governments of conflict-affected Africa have much internal capacity building to do in order to muster all local resources for peace building purposes. The diamond industry in Sierra Leone is a classic example. Though the industry has been prospering since the official cessation of hostilities in 2002, its contribution to the ongoing peace process has been disappointing. Illicit mining and smuggling have deprived the country of much needed revenue. Hernando de Soto points out, “it is easy to make a country prosperous. It needs only security of life and property, and markets in which property rights can be valued and traded.”

We have begun to have good news from Africa as a sign that Africans can and do engage in self-reliant development. Elections in Liberia which elected the first woman President in Africa, and in Burundi are encouraging. So also are developments in Sierra Leone while South Africa and Mozambique continue to be inspiring models. As the African proverb says "However long the night, dawn will break."

While I represent the IPB I also come from Asia which, like Africa, suffered from

colonialism. Fifty years ago as a result of an initiative that began from the capital of my country, Sri Lanka, an Asian-African Summit was held in Bandung, Indonesia. In April this year I was present when this remarkable example of South-South co-operation was commemorated, consolidated and reinvigorated. The Declaration on the New Asian-African Strategic Partnership (NAASAP) that came out of this Summit was issued by countries who had made political gains as independent nations but sought commensurate advances in the social and economic spheres through co-operation, a common commitment to realizing multilateral goals and new linkages to sustain for the common benefit and prosperity of the peoples of the two continents.

While foreign aid flows must increase and foreign debt has to be cancelled or rescheduled, we are aware that foreign direct investment (FDI) is the key to growth. UNCTAD figures show that globally we had inflows of \$ 648.1 billion in 2004 of which \$ 637.4 came from developed economies. \$ 380 billion, or more than half, went back into developed economies. Africa received just \$ 18.1 billion as FDI. Of this a growing percentage is coming from Asian countries like China, India, the Republic of Korea and the ASEAN countries. Clearly this figure has to increase significantly especially from developed countries if we are to make an impact on Africa's development.

But terms of trade are also important as Africa's exported primary products earn less and less on world markets while imported manufactured products cost more. The forthcoming Hong Kong Ministerial meeting of the World Trade Organization's Doha Round of multilateral trade negotiations is a key milestone and an opportunity to address this issue so that free trade in fact translates into fair trade through dismantling of the agricultural and other subsidies that protect the developed economies.

It is not enough to beat the drums about globalization. We have to democratise globalization and make its benefits meaningful to every village in Africa. Agriculture is indisputably the key area. The Doha Round must be more than a bargaining session between the big economic centres of the world.

We have many opportunities to help resolve the problems of Africa. We must all pressure our Governments to act in international fora to take collective action. We can also act individually as Sir Bob Geldof has shown us. Let me end by quoting from one of Africa's greatest sons, Nelson Mandela, who ended his autobiography "Long Walk to Freedom" with these words: "I have walked that long walk to freedom...But I have discovered the secret that after climbing a great hill, one only finds that there are many more hills to climb...with freedom come responsibilities, and I dare not linger, for my long walk is not yet ended." Let us walk together with our African brothers and sisters in their journey, which is our journey.

**Contributions from the Founder of the Bangwe and Dialogue
Association
By Colette Samoya
International Peace Bureau Delegate
November 23-26, 2005
Rome, Italy**

Your Excellencies, distinguished participants, ladies and gentlemen:

It is for me a true privilege and a joy to take part for the first time in a forum of the Nobel Prize laureates, and to take the floor at this 6th meeting, dedicated to Africa. I am grateful to the International Peace Bureau for this opportunity. The association Bangwe and Dialogue, which I have the honor to direct, is an IPB member. Indeed the presence of Africa within the International Peace Bureau is far from being negligible, since out of a total of 265 member organisations, 47 are African.

Allow me to join my voice to those of other speakers to pay homage to H.E. President Gorbachev, who not only established the prestigious foundation which has brought together the Nobel Prize laureates since 1999; but also whose commitment to peace and democracy around the world will surely earn him a special place in 20th century history. My warmest congratulations too, go to Dr. El-Baradei and the IAEA for the Nobel Prize awarded to them this year, and to Mr Bob Geldof, declared 'Man of Peace' 2005.

As part of African civil society, which in almost all countries is felt as a force for change, I am quite sure that even the men and women unable to attend this meeting will appreciate that it centers its reflexion on the urgent and fundamental problems which Africa suffers from acutely, ranging from extreme poverty and the challenges of sustainable development, to the lack of a democratic ideal, respect for human rights, and an end to wars and violence.

Your Excellencies, ladies and gentlemen:

If one requested a class of high-school students in the European Union what is evoked for them by the word 'Africa', I am sure that a good number of them would answer that the term 'Africa' suggests poverty, HIV-AIDS, war, hunger and malnutrition, the oppression of women and more besides. And yet when I was at college between 1960 and 1970, certain history professors taught me the glorious past of a continent recognized as the cradle of humanity. They spoke in praise of the first African who invented fire and the first ploughing implements such as the hoe, who could work iron and other metals, who developed trade routes, created empires and brilliant civilizations. My professors evoked of course the dark centuries of slavery and colonial exploitation. It should be explained that my college years coincided with the time of hope inspired by independence struggles. My country Burundi, with its thousand and one green hills, was called "a land

of milk and honey" by which we understand a country where it is good to live, and which does not know famine.

The moral of this anecdotal testimony is on the one hand the force of imagery in our knowledge of the world around us, and on the other hand, the poverty observed today in the countries of the South in general, and the majority of African countries in particular. This is not the result of an accident, but it developed in an insidious and progressive way, until it could be regarded as chronic. Yes, poverty has a history, and today in the era of globalization, the challenges and the issues that must be tackled in order to break out of the vicious circle require vision, concrete and realistic strategies, and especially action.

The principal stages of this history each had a particular characteristic. Between 1965 and 1970, technical aid for development was at the heart of co-operation between those countries that were developed and those that were not, and for which the vocabulary changed to adapt to a politically-correct language (backward or underdeveloped countries, countries of the South, Sub-Saharan Africa, etc.). A Decade for the Development of the Third World was decreed in 1960 by President John Kennedy. When, in the 1970s, the oil crisis occurred, Africa started to undergo serious repercussions, one of whose chief features was the reforms imposed by the World Bank and the IMF, and the beginnings of over-indebtedness -- which means reforms, i.e. less schools, less hospitals, less employment, and especially more social inequalities, poverty and rural-urban migration. Let us not speak about the 1990s, when wars exploded at an alarming rate in Africa, including the terrible genocide of the batutsi in Rwanda and its repercussions in the neighbouring countries, especially Burundi, known as the twin country to Rwanda. Indeed since it sank into civil war in 1993, my native country (in the past baptized the land of milk and honey) became the land of poverty, humanitarian emergencies, refugees and internally displaced, ethnic conflicts, and AIDS; in certain cases total deprivation has replaced simple poverty. A new political régime has just come to power, sometimes inspiring hope and sometimes fear, according to the realities in which the various ethnic communities live.

The strategies to lead Africa out of poverty require in my view a precise and concrete comprehension of what one understands by poverty. If one tackles this question by its opposite, one could rightly wonder if it is necessary to stigmatize poverty or riches, given that if there were no poor there would be no rich, and vice-versa. Another judicious question is to know if wealth is the same as the accumulation of material riches, living in comfort and luxury.

In my humble opinion, poverty is first of all the lack of security in the satisfaction of basic needs or the lack for the enjoyment of elementary human rights: right to life, possibilities of nourishment, of clothing, of housing, of being looked after when sick. It is only once these needs are satisfied that other levels of development are possible, in particular the production and massive consumption of consumer goods, a place in the international trade system, and subscribing to the ideals of sustainable development. Indeed, how to explain to populations experiencing a humanitarian emergency, with neither food nor roof nor living space, that species threatened with extinction should be

protected, and that they must avoid deforestation. How to say to the orphans of war or AIDS, living in total destitution, without anyone to look after them, and whose daily survival is a challenge, that they must go to school. The Burundian Minister for Solidarity addressing the participants on Human Rights Day in Geneva, testified that a woman she met in a camp for the internally displaced, told her that to build a shelter in branches for her child, she had had to sell her only dress. A humanitarian officer reported that one of the many Rwandan teenage victims of genocide was so deprived that once her periods began her friend had to tear up his shirt so she could use it as a towel.

Some might be surprised that I place the right to life among the fundamental rights, and yet: the millions of deaths recorded over these last years as a result of wars or diseases such as HIV-AIDS, infant mortality rates, the lack of firmness in the suppression of war crimes and genocides, are on a scale to make one doubt if a life in Africa has the same value as elsewhere.

On the level of strategies, two seem to me both urgent and concrete:

Firstly, disarmament for development; implying maximum reductions in the budgets intended for the military to benefit programmes of education and vocational training, the installation or restoration of health infrastructures, and the operation of medical prevention programmes by extending sickness insurance to the poorest communities. Also urgent is the cancellation of the debt of the African countries, not only because its repayment has become almost incompatible with the revival of development projects, but also because the creditor powers have obvious responsibilities as regards the conditions under which the debt has progressively been built up, and all the more since the debt has seen over time an exponential increase. Another equally important strategy is to develop the confidence of Africans in themselves, in their most positive cultural values and beliefs, which allowed their ancestors to resist the challenges to which history subjected them.

Your Excellencies, ladies and gentlemen:

I would not wish to conclude my presentation without mentioning the prevention of conflicts and their nonviolent resolution, the issue of democratic values and gender equality. The least one can say is that these concepts are inter-dependent. The democratic ideal is not built on discrimination of any sort, and especially not those which have affected women down the ages. Appreciable changes appeared over these last decades. On the other hand, war has proved to be enemy number one of equality between men and women, given that it returns each to his or her traditional role, and that humanitarian tragedies hit women and the children the hardest. Allow me to salute the vote on Resolution 1325 by the Security Council of the United Nations in 2000, in which it is recognized that women are the principal victims of war, but which also recognizes that thousands of women have been mobilized in peace initiatives. A study undertaken by Ellen Johnson Sirleaf, the new President-elect of Liberia, has confirmed this. Resolution 1325, whose 5th anniversary celebrated was in October, requires a gender perspective in all peace processes, including at the negotiating table. While on this subject, I also pay

homage to a project which made the front pages of the press on account of its originality, by proposing that the Nobel Peace Prize be awarded to 1000 women from various countries. No matter that the outcome of this project has not yet been successful, it has served to draw the attention of the international community to the role played by women in various initiatives aiming at lasting peace. A book on these women, of which I have the honour to be one, is in the course of publication and a touring exhibition has begun.

Finally, some reasons to hope: poverty in Africa, or elsewhere, is neither inevitable nor an incurable disease. Sustainable development and democratic values are not unknown in Africa. In spite of the many problems found in the education systems, Africa possesses today trained elites, that is to say human resources ready to serve its development, the major challenge being to avoid the brain-drain which grows year by year. In spite of many obstacles, the number of dictatorial régimes has diminished greatly and the populations have acquired more openings to the world, and they demand both more democracy and respect for human rights. Everywhere civil society, in all its diversity, is asserting itself slowly but surely as a counterweight that cannot be ignored. In my country Burundi, the private radio stations run programmes of popular education giving voice to the voiceless, which are much appreciated. But of all the forces of change, the women are without any doubt the most significant, insofar as the burdens which have handicapped their social and community emancipation are tending to dissipate day by day.

In conclusion, Africa is not a special case isolated from the rest of the world. Its problems are those of the remainder of humanity; its development will benefit other continents; and the most advantageous step for sustainable development for all is to prioritise the reduction of inequalities at national and international levels. Indeed, we must work in collaboration for the best use of the planet's resources for the good of humanity, both present and future, without exceptions or discrimination.

I thank you for your attention.

From Words to Actions
By Edouard A. Mancini
International Peace Bureau Delegate
November 24-26, 2005
Rome, Italy

After more or less forty years of decolonization in Africa the only balance sheet we can get today is, " Emergency Africa " is it possible?

In fact, of which Africa are we speaking: North, South, East, West, Central?

Can we say, in other words, that most of the African's countries have sustained, beyond the independence, a social pattern showing a stable look on the one hand mixed with an organised confusion more or less occulted on the other hand?

Is it a reasonable possibility to expect the desperation of the old devils, in Africa and elsewhere, which are : clanisme and tribalisme, as well as the sectarisme phénoména existing such as messiah, glib talker and others promising paradies and a best future towards some populations where the social and economic conditions are the worst? This with more or less the acceptance of the Authorities not obliged to report to the people.

We have explained, during almost forty years, to several generations of african peoples that they are poor as a form of culpability ; this has been an incredible clumsiness, because they finally believed that it was true and year after year they became some peoples under external assistance.

May be is it necessary to remind the " CHARTE AFRICAINE DES DROITS DE L'HOMME ET DES PEUPLES de l'OUA", born in Monrovia in July 1979 and published in June 1981. The first part, chapter one " des droits de l'homme et des peuples, " is composed by twenty six very clear articles about human rights.

Chapter two, " des devoirs " can be mentionned as exemple concerning the duties applicable to all without exception. The second part " des mesures de sauvegarde " show a real will of progress towards the decisions applicable at all level and among the numerous contexts cohabiting in Africa.

The Charter seems to be widely influenced by the similar european and others Charter existing beforhand .

However, why with such important dispositions in matter of rights some African countries are still today , following the pictures and comments spread out by the medias, in such state of economic and social difficulties? Is this Charter applicable

without restriction among the African diversity? Let the African peoples reply themselves to this very difficult question.

It is well known that among some African countries, the military budgets are beyond of those devoted to Education and social organisation, perhaps it is one of the major problem limiting progress and wellness of the people.

Violence in Africa or elsewhere is always an obstacle towards development and progress.

The Rwanda's genocide will remind us that it is always possible to transform, within the next minutes a honest family's father as a dangerous murderer because the differences of the name of the tribe, religion, ethnos or political opinion.

This year, we have widely spoken about the Hiroshima events in 1945, however, even if the first atomic bomb was a terrible disaster, there is no comparison with the eight hundred thousands victims of the Rwanda's genocide or others genocides happened in South-East Asia during the XXth century and already so much forgotten.

Into such context where so much parameters are known or not, what can we do, as NGO wishing to pour out the voice of the civil society, towards the authorities, Governments, United Nations and other organisations mainly active in Africa ?

Let us show you our propositions, for instance :

1 - Laïcité, a new idea for Africa ! Why don't we run a general reflexion on this subject which is applied since years in Europe and elsewhere? Of course, laïcité notion is practically non-existent actually in Africa but, why not to approach this subject with the typical african sensitivity, may be some new ideas would be to appear.

2 - Why do not run an international general reflexion about the role of the African's women and their active participation into the modern world of which there is also many very good reasons to associate them.

3 - Why not to proclaim the scandal of water, this vital resource which is something indispensable to the human life and belong to the Humanity without restriction. Nobody has the right to corner it for many and scandalous benefits as it is already the case today.

4 - The last but not the least, we must to insist vigorously for the generalisation of Education for all because , Education means freedom and independence we know that :

The school exists to serve Humanity,

The school has the duty to teach us what it is forbidden, for us, to unaware. The past and actual Education system must be oriented towards the future and made a complete blank of the past as well as the colonial or dictatorial periods .

Their limits have been shown but also their incapacity to jugulate misery and poverty during forty years, even if most of the countries had at their disposal plenty of resources in raw material and wealth of the planet.

For a new Africa, this one of the XXIst century, an Africa of the people, an Africa where each one will be responsible of his future, an Africa able to live correctly without external assistance, where the profit will be equitably share and the human dignity respected ; the help of some NGO working in the field of humanism and Education, in collaboration with UNESCO, UNO and EU would be certainly very useful.

For your information, know that such type of NGO are existing in Italy they are:

1- **International Peace Bureau IPB a Lugo** (Rav) working in the field of several disciplines as : to improve the education budgets, to reduce classic or nuclear weapons and military expenses ; highly involved to find some solutions to reduce misery and poverty in order to avoid the kids soldiers.

2 - **Scuola Strumento di Pace a Roma**, working to promote school for all without restriction, teaching peace, human rights, democratic citizenship education, in collaboration with UNESCO, UNO, EU Council and more than thousand schools in Italy and abroad. An original teaching method has been active since thirty-four years with some very good results.

The synergy between both italian's NGO would be certainly very useful in order to help Africa and elsewhere during the XXIst century, of course if the Authorities and the people of the country are receptive towards the content of the teaching programme and to have the will to apply it.

It is certainly just in time to reduce the words in the offices and increase the concrete actions on the ground ; please don't this chance for Africa disappear under Conventions, resolutions, projects never realised; within the next 10 years it will be certainly too late.

To conclude and because since 40 years it was not possible to take efficiently the relieve of the colonial period for several reasons :

wars, climatic conditions; perhaps also ineffective management, not enough means to work, educational problem ; national, international as well as internal and local difficulties and s.o; why not to start a new Africa era with a more important political participation of the african women?

It is not too late then, why not to start a first project with them?

The answers are into the hands of the peoples of Africa, but, we would be very pleased to know their opinions and particularly those of the african women concerning our propositions .

I have a dream ! Do you remember this sentence pronounced by Martin Luther King the 1964 Nobel Peace Laureate?

Then, why not for Africa ?

Thank you for your attention



Joseph Rotblat , Mikael Gorbachev, Douglas Roche, and Jonathan Granoff

In Memorial of a True Human Being

By Jonathan Granoff

November 24, 2005

International Peace Bureau Delegate

Rome, Italy

In memory of **Sir Joseph Rotblat**, a man who worked untiringly for a world without nuclear weapons. Sir Joseph Rotblat passed away this summer, 31st of August 2005.

It is a deep honor to say a few good words, inadequate expressions of appreciation, about a man whose guidance continues.

One of the greatest men of our time Sir Joseph Rotblat, died on August 31, 2005. His clarity set many of us on a clear course to work for a world without nuclear weapons, where human needs take precedence over the pursuit of power based on fear, and where war is abolished as means of pursuing security. His approach inspired so many of us at the International Peace Bureau, which I am honored to represent here at the Summit. He was a formal advisor to the Global Security Institute. He will always be a bright light to those who look for wisdom to guide human affairs.

May we mourn his passing by committing to honor his memory with our work.

Many date the inception of the nuclear age with the creation of the atomic bomb. The Manhattan Project was designed to deter a potential Nazi bomb. When it became clear

that they could not develop such a threat, Dr. Rotblat walked off the Manhattan Project. His courageous actions served as a warning that rationales for the use of these horrific devices could shift, leading to their actual application and the destruction of innocent lives.

Until his passing, he dedicated his intelligence, passion, and resources to a life of service focused on ending the irrationality of pursuing security by risking the very creation itself through the threat to use nuclear weapons. Most recently, he worked to relegate (see his book *War No More*) the institution of war to be viewed with the same reprehension as slavery – outdated, immoral, and unacceptable. His advice on the practical steps needed to achieve a nuclear weapons free world were always wisely focused on the political dynamics of the moment, advancing policies such as no first use, lowered reliance on the weapons, deep irreversible and verifiable cuts, and de-alerting – always with the clear goal of abolition.

He helped create the statement of the prestigious Canberra Commission:

"The destructiveness of nuclear weapons is immense, any use would be catastrophic...There is no doubt that if the peoples of the world were more fully aware of the inherent danger of nuclear weapons and the consequences of their use, they would reject them, and not permit their continued possession or acquisition on their behalf by their governments, even for alleged needs for self defense."

His advice to us all can be summarized in his Nobel speech titled *Remember Your Humanity*. He demonstrated how to do that by the way he lived – with clarity, courage, humility, humor, intelligence, dedication, selfless service, joy, wisdom, love, patience, and inspiration. His honoring of conscience and the sacredness of life by working to abolish nuclear weapons, end war, and recover common sense and human dignity in the affairs of state, will continue to inspire and guide many of us.

All who walked with him can truly say that we knew a real human being who lived life in an exemplary manner, with a lightness of heart and gentleness of person in contrast to the weightiness of the subjects he addressed. He showed us that to remember our humanity involves being the change we wish to see and that being a person of peace is part of the process of moving the world from the cult of violence to the culture of peace.

May each intention of his heart of gold shine as a thousand suns of blessings of love upon him and all of us who must carry on his work in this world of contrasts and limitations. May the Creator of the mystery of life and death bless Joseph Rotblat with unlimited love and peace. May we honor his memory with strengthened commitment to bring about the kind of world where nuclear weapons and war have no place, a world where people with values such as Dr. Rotblat's guide public affairs.

Hear his voice in the plea so deeply associated with him and Albert Einstein and Bertrand Russell: "There lies before us, if we choose, continued prosperity in happiness, knowledge and wisdom. Shall we, instead, choose death, because we cannot forget our

quarrels? We appeal, as human beings, to human beings: Remember your humanity and forget the rest."

God bless Joseph Rotblat and give us courage to accept his guidance.



Alyn Ware, Joseph Rotblat and Jonathan Granoff

6th Global Summit of Nobel Peace Laureates Final Statement- Emergency Africa

November 26, 2005

Rome, Italy

As Nobel Peace Laureates and Nobel Peace Laureate organizations we have gathered in Rome, Italy these past three days and deliberated on global issues with a particular concern regarding Africa.

Our rapidly changing complex and contradictory world presents several features that must be recognized if we are to build more effective governance for a better world order:

- Globalization is accelerating and despite recognized interdependencies billions of people remain excluded from its benefits.*
- New giants, such as China, India and Brazil are emerging and no solution to world challenges can be achieved without their full participation.*
- Democratic transitions in many countries have had a positive impact on social and political processes but democracy cannot find stability without overcoming poverty and full implementation of human rights.*
- There remains a pressing need to advance a deeper and fuller appreciation for the richness and complexity of the Islamic world. Failure to achieve this could have explosive consequences.*
- Despite growing recognition of our collective responsibility for sustainable development, the environment, and security, governmental institutions are not responding adequately to the voice of the people.*
- Ethnic, religious and nationalistic prejudices stimulate violence, undermining our ability to live in peace in a diversified world. We know such conflicts can be resolved through nonviolent means.*

We recognize that in an interconnected world every individual can make a difference. For that reason we have honored Bob Geldof with the Man for Peace Award for his service to Africa and humanity in mobilizing public attention and causing the G-8 to take steps to help Africa. For that reason we have honored the memory of a great human being, Prof. Joseph Rotblat, and presented the Special Man for Peace Award to PeaceJam and its founders Dawn Engle and Ivan Suvanjieff for their service in finding ways to teach and inspire youth to advance peace. We welcome the launch of Children's Peace Prize during our summit.

We condemn the use of and the rationales for torture as an instrument of policy by any group or nation. Torture cannot be justified under any circumstance. It dehumanizes both its victims and its perpetrators.

This year we focused on Africa because its extreme poverty is morally unacceptable and undermines the foundations of life and human dignity. Additionally, we know the means to reverse this situation are available.

Achieving the Millennium Development Goals (MDG), which have the consensus of the nations of the world, are an indispensable promise to the poor of the world, especially Africa. We are deeply concerned that the MDG goals are not being sufficiently met and were inadequately addressed at the Summit of Heads of State at the United Nations in September of 2005. They provide a framework for progress and a way toward decent work, and full employment opportunity, for all of Africa - the best way out of poverty as stated by the African Heads of State at their extraordinary summit in Ouagadougou in September, 2004. Encouraging small businesses through micro- credit and stimulating investment are but two examples of what needs to be done.

Many African nations are making good faith efforts to advance democracy, improve governance, accountability and gender equity. The world now must fulfill its promises to all the people of Africa. There is an urgent need to end gross human rights violations and assure accountability for all abuses. We abhor child labor. Effective and fair justice systems are essential to ensure stability and economic development.

The G-8 commitments in Gleneagles are a first step. The upcoming WTO negotiations in Hong Kong will be a test of whether these commitments are honored. In this regard, in addition to debt cancellation, we call for increased aid flows, and prompt reform of inequitable policies and practices, especially agricultural subsidies that damage Africa and the entire developing world. We urge the European Union immediately to break the current deadlock on agricultural trade negotiations.

We personally and through our respective institutions commit to scrutinize and hold to account the full commitments of the G-8 at Gleneagles on Africa and we shall remain fully engaged with this critical matter.

As Nobel Peace Laureates we request President Gorbachev and Mayor Veltroni of Rome to convey to President Putin, as next year's G-8 chairman, our request to place on the agenda of the G-8 Summit in Moscow next year the creation of an accounting and monitoring system to ensure fulfillment of all Gleneagles' commitments. At the same time we call upon Africa to continue making progress on the New Economic Partnership for African Development.

Focusing on meeting human needs and having a reverence for life are the foundation of human security. Excessive military expenditures actually breeds

insecurity. Two areas where funds need to be channeled by both African nations themselves and the international community are education and health, particularly regarding the scourges of AIDS, malaria and tuberculosis through both protection and prevention.

While expressing regret that some African nations spend too much on conventional weapons, we commend the entire African continent for becoming a nuclear weapons free zone. It is absurd that the nations with nuclear weapons refuse even to pledge not to use nuclear weapons against all nuclear weapons free nations.

As in past years, we reiterate our insistence that the existence of nuclear weapons is morally unacceptable and condemn military doctrines allowing their use. We demand progress by the nuclear weapons states in fulfilling their disarmament obligations under the Nuclear Nonproliferation Treaty. The corrosion of the nonproliferation regime is a danger to world peace.

We call for full compliance with and universal ratification of the Ottawa Convention Banning Anti-Personnel Landmines.

We salute Mohammed El Baradei and the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA), the recipients of the 2005 Nobel Peace Prize. We emphasize that IAEA strengthened safeguards and inspections are the best solution to concerns regarding proliferation.

We reaffirm our strong belief that there is no alternative to sustainable development. Development is more than just material wealth. Development means being more, not just having more. Being more just, compassionate, and humane is to become fully human. In this regard the nations with material wealth need development as much as the poor. To improve global governance and to engage civil society in developing its full capacities, we propose to start work on drafting a new global social contract and will be inviting wide participation in this process.

We commit to creating a Permanent Secretariat in Italy to amplify our efforts to advance world peace.

A Call for Freedom

We note with deep concern that we have once more been deprived of the presence and wisdom of our colleague Aung San Suu Kyi. A witness for non-violence and democracy should not be silenced. This is a loss for the whole world.

We call upon the government of Myanmar to restore the civil, human and political rights, of Aung San Suu Kyi and her followers, fully, immediately and without reservation. Justice demands this.

We support the International Labor Organization's call for full recognition of trade union rights in Myanmar. We call upon the ASEAN governments and businesses to intensify efforts to obtain full human rights for the people of Myanmar.

We ask all persons of good will to work with us in all these endeavors.

Summit Participants Included:

Mikhael Gorbachev, Lech Walesa, Frederik Willem De Klerk, Betty Williams, Mairead Corrigan Maguire, Rigoberta Menchu Tum, Adolfo Perez Esquivel, American Friends Service Committee, Amnesty International, Doctors Without Borders, International Campaign to Ban Landmines, International Labour Organization, International Peace Bureau, International Physicians for the Prevention of Nuclear War, Pugwash Conferences on Science and World Affairs, United Nations, United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees, UNICEF

**7th Summit of the Nobel Peace Laureates-
6th Anniversary of the South-North Joint Declaration for Peace on the
Korean Peninsula
June 15-17, 2006
Gwangju, South Korea**



Jonathan Granoff and Mairead Corrigan-Maguire

**Ending War, Pursuing Peace
Jonathan Granoff
June 16, 2006
International Peace Bureau Delegate
Gwangju, South Korea**

It is a great honor to share with you here in this Gwangju, Korea, where the bells of courage, freedom and democracy ring so clearly in the hearts and minds of the people, where President Kim Dae Jung and President Mikhail Gorbachev, both close friends of my political mentor, the late Senator Alan Cranston, have brought such a distinguished group together. These two men along with the other Nobel Peace Laureates here and the Nobel Peace organizations have done so much already to contribute to a safer saner world. I hope our efforts stimulate progress in developing a peaceful, sustainable future for Korea and the world. To the people of Gwangju who struggled so hard for the universal values that arise from the human spirit and its quest for dignity and justice, and on behalf of millions not in attendance but who know how much you did for our shared values, thank you.

The fact that war is hell has not stopped men from creating enormous theaters of hell on earth. This truth is not new. War has been with us since the inception of territorial claims.

With the creation of the modern state and its organizational capacities, war has taken on a new dimension. It can end human civilization. This truth is new.

The spiritual exhortation to honor peace and love life contained in Hinduism, Buddhism, Judaism, Christianity, Islam and other religions has not terminated war. In fact, religious identity has and remains a force stimulating and rationalizing violent passions despite religions' core teachings of personal and collective betterment through compassion and tolerance.

International law, until the mid twentieth century, was content to only address conduct in war (*jus in bello*) and justifications for war (*jus ad bellum*) assuming war to be an acceptable fact of life.

The sentiment for non-violence grew as an intellectual movement and spawned hundreds of peace societies in the 19th century in response to the slaughters of the Napoleonic wars. The movement affected political institutions when the Czar of Russia, Nicholas the Second, convened the Hague Peace Conference of 1899.

Its advocacy of systematic peaceful resolution of disputes could not overcome states' intransigent adherence to national autonomy and the unencumbered use of force. Two world wars, begun in the most industrially advanced area in the world, Europe, brought a deluge of immeasurable suffering, bloodshed, terror and destruction. World War I and II, and the failed efforts of the League of Nations to create a council to resolve disputes, forced humanity to rethink and recalibrate its attitude toward war.

In August of 1945, the cities of Hiroshima and Nagasaki blazed under irradiated fires. The heart of humanity shivered with the knowledge that within its hands was the technical means of its own destruction. As Nobel Peace Laureate Dr. Joseph Rotblat said, *"In the nuclear age the human species has become an endangered species."*

No danger hangs over us today like the threat posed by these horrific devices. This danger still forces us to a moment of decision today. Our capacity for technological destruction compelled our recognition of our shared responsibility to one another as united nations, and as one human family, 60 years ago. Apparently 4,000 years of recorded organized ignorance, struggle, tribulation, and sacrifice was not enough. The face of hell drove us to ask society's most fundamental question: would the world continue to be organized around the principle of the law of power, where only the few held sway over the rest, or the power of law, where we shared a greater level of collective security and shared interests?

The former US president General Dwight D. Eisenhower knew the cost of war. He said

...this world of ours, ever growing smaller, must avoid becoming a community of dreadful fear and hate, and be instead a proud confederation of mutual trust and respect. Such a confederation must be one of equals. The weakest must come to the conference table with the same confidence as do we, protected by our moral,

economic, and military strength. That table, though scared by many past frustrations, cannot be abandoned for the certain agony of the battlefield.ⁱ

And how does that confederation define its purposes? “*We, the Peoples of the United Nations, determined to save succeeding generations from the scourge of war which twice in our lifetime has brought sorrow to mankind...*” This statement embodied a new legal and moral norm abhorring war. The UN Charter continues by affirming fundamental human rights and equal rights of all nations. The goal of this majestic legal instrument, stated in its first Article, is to create framework to

...maintain international peace and security. And to that end to take effective collective measures for the prevention and removal of threats to peace and for the suppression of acts of aggression, and other breaches of the peace and to bring about by peaceful means and in conformity with the principles of justice and international law the adjustment and settlement of international disputes.

This puts us all on notice that collective security must be recognized as the process through which each individual state must pursue its own interests.

The use of force by states, including warfare, is prohibited except as authorized by the Security Council or pursuant to Article 51, which addresses other bases for the use of force:

Nothing in the present Charter shall impair the inherent right of individual or collective self-defense if an armed attack occurs against a member of the United Nations, until the Security Council has taken measure to maintain international peace and security.

This right of self-defense is addressed in the Secretary General of the United Nations’ High Level Panel on Threats, Challenges and Change’s recently released “A More Secure World: Our Shared Responsibility”ⁱⁱ which emphasized an important restriction: “*However, a threatened State, according to long established international law, can take military action as long as the threatened attack is imminent, no other means would deflect it and the action is proportionate.*”

This prestigious panel reminded us that during the cold war these rules were violated hundreds of times because the Security Council was paralyzed, but that since the end of the cold war

...the yearning for an international system governed by the rule of law has grown. There is little evident international acceptance of the idea of security being best preserved by a balance of power, or by any single – even benignly motivated -- superpower.”

Recent events in Iraq suggest that these laws have the power of preventive wisdom. As the Vietnam War should have taught, ignoring such rules generates peril.

But some claim that extraordinary weapons and circumstances compel new rules. The High Level Panel addresses this argument squarely. I quote at length:

The problem arises where the threat in question is not imminent but still claimed to be real: for example the acquisition, with allegedly hostile intent, of nuclear weapons-making capability. Can a State, without going to the Security Council, claim in these circumstances, the right to act, in anticipatory self-defense, not just pre-emptively (against an imminent or proximate threat) but preventively (against a non-imminent or non-proximate one)? Those who say “yes” argue that the potential harm from some threats (e.g. terrorists armed with a nuclear weapon) is so great that one simply cannot risk waiting until they become imminent, and that less harm may be done (e.g. avoiding a nuclear exchange or radioactive fallout from a reactor destruction) by acting earlier.

The short answer is that if there are good arguments for preventive military action, with good evidence to support them, they should be put to the Security Council, which can authorize such action if it chooses to. If it does not so choose, there will be, by definition, time to pursue other strategies, including persuasion, negotiation, deterrence and containment -- and to visit again the military option.

For those impatient with such a response, the answer must be that, in a world full of perceived potential threats, the risk to the global order and the norm of non-intervention on which it continues to be based is simply too great for the legality of unilateral preventive action, as distinct from collectively endorsed action, to be accepted. Allowing one to so act is to allow all.

As International Court of Justice Christopher Weeramantry said,

International law depends also on consistency of its application. What is illegal for some cannot be legal for others and international law cannot command respect if those who wish to enforce it violate it themselves. If the law enforcers of a domestic legal system should act in this way, they would expose themselves and the law to ridicule. It cannot be otherwise on the stage of international law.

For some states to engage in aggression based on their own unilateral determinations makes a mockery of the body of law it has taken thousands of years for civilization to create. It diminishes the sacrifices of the millions who have died in the pursuit of justice and peace. Moreover, for some to say that they are not bound by the law while others are bound is not practical.

Hypocrisy does not work in rearing children; it does not work in pursuing world stability. And it certainly does not work in stemming the tide of nuclear weapons proliferation. One cannot ever instruct others to give up smoking with a cigar in one's mouth.

The costs of war and the illusion that "*to prevent war one must prepare for war*" are hard to measure. The largest cost is the failure to pursue the numerous paths toward stability that are based on enhancing justice of society and the quality of life for its people. This is the very oxygen of hope that deters violence best.

I am so proud to represent the International Peace Bureau here because it, like many other civil society organizations, advances practical programs based on sustainable development, gender equity, human rights, conflict prevention, multilateral cooperation, the rule of law, and peaceful resolution to wean us away from the temptations of violence and war. ⁱⁱⁱ

This approach is hardly new. The Marshall Plan helped rebuild the world after the devastation of World War II. Today we need another Marshall Plan, but this time it must be global.

Again, let me quote President Eisenhower at length:

Every gun that is made, every warship launched, every rocket fired signifies, in the final sense, a theft from those who hunger and are not fed, those who are cold and are not clothed. This world in arms is not spending money alone. It is spending the sweat of its laborers, the genius of its scientists, and the hopes of its children. The cost of one modern heavy bomber is this: a modern brick school in more than 30 cities. It is two electric power plants, each serving a town of 60,000 populations. It is two fine, fully equipped hospitals. It is some 50 miles of concrete highway. We pay for a single fighter with a half million bushels of wheat. We pay for a single destroyer with new homes that could have housed more than 8,000 people.

This, I repeat, is the best way of life to be found on the road the world has been taking. This is not a way of life at all, in any true sense. Under the cloud of threatening war, it is humanity hanging from a cross of iron....This we do know: a world that begins to witness the rebirth of trust among nations can find its way to a peace that is neither partial nor punitive...The first great step along this way must be the conclusion of an honorable armistice in Korea...This means the immediate cessation of hostilities and the prompt initiation of political discussions leading to the holding of free elections in a united Korea.

I am not saying that way back in 1953 President Eisenhower had it all correct. We might remain several steps short of reaching to a united Korea, but working now on reconciliation, normalization, stability, peace and development in all its dimension, all the preconditions for unity, can be done now. He certainly helped set forth that remain relevant today when he called for

the dedication of the energies, the resources, and the imaginations of all peaceful nations to a new kind of war. This would be a declared total war, not upon any human enemy but upon the brute forces of poverty and need.

The peace we seek, founded upon decent trust and cooperative effort among nations, can be fortified, not by weapons of war but by wheat and by cotton, by milk and by wool, by meat and by timber and by rice. These are words that translate into every language on earth. These are needs that challenge this world in arms... We are prepared to reaffirm, with the most concrete evidence, our readiness to help build a world in which all peoples can be productive and prosperous. This Government is ready to ask its people to join with all nations in devoting a substantial percentage of the savings achieved by disarmament to a fund for world aid and reconstruction. The purposes of this great work would be to help other peoples to develop the under developed areas of the world, to stimulate profitability and fair world trade, to assist all peoples to know the blessings of productive freedom.

The monuments to this new kind of war would be these: roads and schools, hospitals and homes, food and health. We are ready, in short, to dedicate our strength to serving the needs, rather than the fears, of the world.

We are ready, by these and all such actions, to make of the United Nations an institution that can effectively guard the peace and security of all peoples. These proposals spring, without ulterior purpose or political passion, from our calm conviction that the hunger for peace is in the hearts of all peoples--those of Russia and of China no less than of our own country.

They conform to our firm faith that God created men to enjoy, not destroy, the fruits of the earth and of their own toil. They aspire to this: the lifting, from the backs and from the hearts of men, of their burden of arms and of fears, so that they may find before them a golden age of freedom and of peace.^{iv}

The principles of pursuing peace by serving human needs and strengthening the rule of law are not new. They work well because they are based on our capacity to be human, to understand, tolerate, even forgive and give generously.

To say that these principles are dated because of current terrorist activities is to diminish the strength of the institutions we seek to protect against terrorists. There can be no real war on terrorism. Yes, a rhetorical war – in the sense of a war on poverty or a war on drugs – can galvanize attention to address a particular kind of criminal behavior, behavior that seeks to justify itself by dressing up in political rhetoric or distortions or religious language. Such simple organized crime should not be dignified with being capable of instituting “war.” Activities designed to harm innocent people and engender fear and terror to influence their conduct is criminal conduct. It should be prosecuted in international tribunals when it is multinational and cross-border and causes injury such as to be classified as a crime against humanity. And when such conduct is within a state is should be prosecuted under the law. War is a destructive institution that should not be invoked except under the long-standing principles dealing with states.

Moreover, terrorism is an activity. Like any loathsome activity we must seek to prevent it. But, if we declared war on murder we would be in a universal and perpetual state of war because the potential will continue to exist wherever humans fail to control their anger. Through perpetual war the norm of peace will be corroded. This is an unacceptable standard for the world to follow. Cooperation in prosecution, yes: in war, no.

Even more important than cooperation in prosecuting terrorism is cooperation in building the bridges to a peaceful world. There is a project on this peninsula which I believe can serve as a model. Cora Weiss, President of IPB, has long been advancing the transformation of the Korean Demilitarized Zone (DMZ) from a symbol of war to a place of peace among humans, and between humans and nature, by making it a UNESCO World Heritage Site. The Republic of Korea (ROK) and the Democratic People's Republic of Korea (DPRK) will need to work together to apply for this status. They will also have to work together to rid the area of landmines, and we can all work together to push for universal ratification and full implementation of the Landmine treaty. They could then work with the DMZ Forum^v, an NGO dedicated to this project, to help build a park which would be an example for the entire world. The process itself would be a peace education for millions. What could be a better process than to work collectively for transformation of a place of violence into a place of natural peace?

Much of the DMZ has been untainted by humans for decades. The DMZ can inform world scientists about nature's powers of rejuvenation. The DMZ contains native plants and animals that were driven out of North and South Korea and can be re-introduced to regain biodiversity. It could even be a place of eco-tourism.

The Peace Park is an example for the world that expresses reconciliation, beauty, transformation, and unity. It will be a place where the people of Korea, North and South, can exemplify the capacity of humans to forgive, to cooperate, to move forward. To create it and to protect it, it must become a place where civil society can partner with governments to serve all people, where the divisions amongst peoples can be diminished by affirming our common appreciation for nature. It must be a place where the creativity and contribution of women can be equal to that of men.

Women should be afforded an even more significant role in advancing the Peace Park.^{vi} Imagine if all the women of the entire Korean peninsula knew of this possibility and knew they could help make it happen. This is a social force for good yet to be fully realized.

We cannot afford to marginalize women any longer. It is not practical and it is not just.

What better place to call for Peace Park than Gwangju, a city where human courage helped change history? International civil society in general has not, in fact, had a sufficiently dynamic role in advancing the Peace Park, which would surely be an inspiration to people everywhere. Governments partnering with civil society institutions enhance democracy, the very important value fought for in this wonderful city. This synergy is exactly what is needed to make the dream of the Peace Park a reality.

* * *

Our goal in life must be to make our own lives sanctuaries of peace, peace parks. War is a consequence of forgetting this human purpose, to be at peace and thus to learn and to love. The hatred engendered by war is the ultimate distortion of balance. Balance is achieved best when we move from love of self to selfless love. No other power brings humans into harmony between inner purpose and outer expression as well. When such harmony is achieved, individual lives are at peace. It is my fervent hope that we all be blessed with lives dedicated to serving this principle of peace. Thank you deeply.

ⁱ <http://coursesa.matrix.msu.edu/~hst306/documents/indust.html>

Military Industrial Complex Speech of President Dwight D. Eisenhower 1961, *Public Papers of the Presidents, 1960*, p. 1035- 1040

ⁱⁱ <http://www.un-globalsecurity.org/panel.asp>

The Panel was composed of an outstanding group of experts which included, • Anand Panyarachun (Chairman), former Prime Minister of Thailand; Robert Badinter (France), Member of the French Senate and former Minister of Justice of France; Joao Clemente Baena Soares (Brazil), former Secretary-General of the Organization of American States; Gro Harlem Brundtland (Norway), former Prime Minister of Norway and former Director-General of the World Health Organization; Mary Chinery-Hesse (Ghana), Vice-Chairman, National Development Planning Commission of Ghana and former Deputy Director-General, International Labour Organization; Gareth Evans (Australia), President of the International Crisis Group and former Minister for Foreign Affairs of Australia; David Hannay (United Kingdom), former Permanent Representative of the United Kingdom to the United Nations and United Kingdom Special Envoy to Cyprus; Enrique Iglesias (Uruguay), President of the Inter-American Development Bank; Amre Moussa (Egypt), Secretary-General of the League of Arab States; Satish Nambiar (India), former Lt. General in the Indian Army and Force Commander of UNPROFOR; Sadako Ogata (Japan), former United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees; Yevgenii Primakov (Russia), former Prime Minister of the Russian Federation; Qian Qichen (China), former Vice Prime Minister and Minister for Foreign Affairs of the People's Republic of China; Nafis Sadik (Pakistan), former Executive Director of the United Nations Population Fund; Salim Ahmed Salim (United Republic of Tanzania), former Secretary-General of the Organization of African Unity; and Brent Scowcroft (United States), former Lt. General in the United States Air Force and United States National Security Adviser. Among its many sage suggestions are the following:

*The call on the US and Russia to take measures to reduce the risk of nuclear accidents and de-alert their strategic nuclear weapons.

*The call on all states parties to the Biological and Toxic Weapons Convention to negotiate a credible verification protocol without delay.

*The call on the Security Council to use authority to refer cases of suspected crimes against humanity to the International Criminal Court, and calls on ALL states to sign, ratify and act on ALL treaties for the protection of civilians, including the Rome Statute of the International Criminal Court.

*The call on member states to conclude legally binding agreements on marketing and tracing, as well as brokering and transfer, of small arms and light weapons.

*The recommendation that states should provide incentives for further development of renewable energy resources and phase out environmentally harmful subsidies for fossil fuel use and development.

*The urging that states to begin new negotiations to produce a new long-term strategy for reducing global warming beyond the period covered by the Kyoto Protocol.

*The call on all nations to abide by the Geneva Conventions.

*The reminder to all readers that when the genocide began in Rwanda, "troop contributors withdrew peacekeepers, and the Security Council, bowing to United States pressure, failed to respond."

ⁱⁱⁱ These programs can be found at www.ipb.org and of particular relevance in regards to this Summit are those programs related to disarmament and development, practical steps which when implemented would do so much to bring about greater stability in the host region of this Conference.

^{iv} http://www.edchange.org/multicultural/speeches/ike_chance_for_peace.html

President Dwight D. Eisenhower, Chance for Peace, April 16, 1953

^v www.dmzforum.org

^{vi} Security Council Resolution 1325 addresses the need for such actions promoting gender equity and the role of woman as essential to progress on peace, development and security. We call for its application here and bring attention to the need for our political institutions to fulfill this resolution with greater vigor.

Thank you, Gwangju
By Jonathan Granoff
June 15-17, 2006
International Peace Bureau Delegate
Gwangju, South Korea

Thank You, Gwangju

People rising
 for Peace
 for Democracy
 for Freedom
 for All.

Watered with blood
 flowers blossom.

In fields without fences
 the fragrance fills
 the world yet to come.

Reaching heavenward
 with perfume eternal.

Freedom's seed
 planted for all peoples
 for all time.

Gwangju—
 Your freedom's quest—a divine expression
 Your sacrifice—an act of love for all
 Your reconciliation and forgiveness—new water for new flowers

Thank you, Gwangju.

People rising
 for Peace
 for Democracy
 for Freedom
 for All.

Nobel Peace Summit: Event Report

June 15-17,2006

International Peace Bureau

Gwangju, South Korea

International Peace Bureau representatives **Jonathan Granoff** and **Alyn Ware** joined a landmark **Summit of Nobel Peace Laureate** individuals and organizations held in **Gwangju, South Korea from June 15-17**. The Summit, commemorating the **6th anniversary of the South-North Joint Declaration that opened up the way for peace on the Korean Peninsula**, provided significant political impetus towards reviving the peace process which has stalled following a more aggressive stance by the US as well as North Korea's withdrawal from the NPT.

The Summit was attended by numerous Nobel Peace Laureates and Laureate organizations. A full list is appended to the Gwangju Declaration which is attached. It was a great honor for IPB to have its representatives appointed as core members of the very small drafting and text negotiating committee. The interventions included in the text at the behest of IPB leadership were all well received by the other Summit participants. This is indicative of support for the IPB agenda and its potential for wider political influence.

The Summit Declaration, calling on both North Korea and the United States to take goodwill steps to revive the peace process, was widely reported in media in South Korea and the United States. Below are links to some of these reports. The Declaration is providing substantial support to former President Kim Dae Jung, who initiated the 2000 South-North Declaration, in preparation for his peace mission to North Korea in late June 2006. The statement calls on North Korea to abandon its nuclear weapons policy and accept international inspections. It calls on the US to end financial and economic sanctions on the DPRK and offer security guarantees. It states the principle that nuclear weapons must be universally eliminated in a pointed fashion: "To pursue a nuclear-weapons-free Korean Peninsula or Middle East or South Asia, without credible commitment to universal nuclear disarmament is akin to a parent trying to persuade his teenagers not to smoke while puffing on a cigar." Further it notes specific steps for global nuclear disarmament that must be taken by all nuclear weapon States. Thus it combines the principle of elimination with the practical steps to move there.

Additionally the Declaration calls for increased engagement in the peace process by women, even specifically mentioning [1325](#) (UN Security Council Resolution Oct 2000) by name, utilizing reduced military expenditures to meet human needs while promoting a culture of peace, and, in that regard, further suggests turning the DMZ into a Peace Park. As IPB leadership has consistently emphasized it

called for strengthening international cooperation and multilateralism based on the rule of law and the condemnation of the institution of war "as obsolete as apartheid, slavery and colonization." IPB can utilize the Declaration to advance its highly practical and principled agenda to the widest possible audience.

Tensions between Japan/United States and North Korea flared up immediately following the Summit as a result of US allegations that North Korea was planning a test launch of a Taep'o-dong-2 ballistic missile which has a potential range of 15,000 km bringing it into range of Alaska and the west coast of the United States. Japan and the United States have threatened escalated actions against North Korea if the launch proceeds. However, South Korea has been more restrained stating that the test launch is probably part of a satellite launch program rather than a ballistic missile program. Such restraint likely resulted from growing domestic support for peace and possibly also the extensive publicity given to the peace calls from the Summit of Nobel Laureates.

IPB played a key role in the Summit. Jonathan Granoff gave a major presentation to one of the main plenaries and also presented a self-written poem honouring Gwangju at the high-level dinner hosted by Mikhail Gorbachev and Kim Dae Jung. The poem highlights Gwangju as the birthplace of modern Korean democracy following a massacre of pro-democracy demonstrators in 1980. The Permanent Representative of South Korea to the United Nations, Ambassador Y. J. Choi, had the poem translated into Korean prior to the events so that its presentation was coordinated with a multimedia display in Korean with music. It was very well received by the City Representatives and hosts. Feedback from the other Laureate organizations and Peace Laureates has indicated exceptional satisfaction with IPB's contribution to the process and outcome of the Summit.

Jonathan Granoff also presented an additional statement, adopted by the Summit, calling for the release of Aung San Suu Kyi, a Nobel Laureate who was prevented from attending the conference because of her continuing house arrest by the military junta controlling Burma.

After the Summit, the IPB delegation went to Seoul and, through the extraordinary networking of Alyn Ware who also wears the hat of International Coordinator of the Parliamentary Network for Nuclear Disarmament, met with leaders of different political parties concerned with peace, security and nuclear arms issues. The delegation also met with NGO leaders and in each instance presented the Gwangju Declaration as well as the WMD Commission report and briefing materials of the Middle Powers Initiative which is Chaired by IPB Vice President Senator Douglas Roche, O.C. and which focuses on efforts to obtain the elimination of nuclear weapons.

Pictures with IPB representative in press:

Nobel Laureates Call for Korea's Peaceful Reunification, Chosun, June 16

<http://english.chosun.com/w21data/html/news/200606/200606160035.html>

Nobel winners call on US to ease up on North Korea, Boston News, June 17

http://www.boston.com/news/world/asia/articles/2006/06/17/nobel_winners_call_on_us_to_ease_up_on_north_korea/

Nobel winners call on US to ease up on North Korea, Reuters, June 17, 2006

http://today.reuters.com/news/newsarticle.aspx?type=scienceNews&storyid=2006-06-17T125438Z_01_SEO340687_RTRUKOC_0_US-KOREA-NORTH-PEACE.xml&src=rss

IPB representative advocates for justice in Special Statement in Solidarity with Aung San Suu Ky, <http://www.voanews.com/english/2006-06-17-voa8.cfm>

Sampling of News Coverage:

Nobel Winners:

- Ease Up On North Korea: Gorbachev, Others Say U.S. And North Korea Must Normalize Relations -CBS News, June 17, 2006,

<http://www.cbsnews.com/stories/2006/06/17/world/main1726392.shtml>

- Leaders Call for Peace on Korean Peninsula: Nobel Peace Laureates Gather to Commemorate June 2000 Inter-Korean Summit, By Lee Jin-woo, Staff Reporter Korea Times, June 17

<http://times.hankooki.com/lpage/nation/200606/kt2006061418084911950.htm>

- Nobel Peace laureates urge US to lift sanctions on North Korea, The Star, June 17

<http://thestar.com.my/news/story.asp?file=/2006/6/17/apworld/20060617143538&sec=apworld>

- Nobel Laureates Urge Give and Take Between US, North Korea, By Kurt Achin, Voice of America, June 17,

<http://www.voanews.com/english/archive/2006-06/2006-06-17-voa5.cfm>

- Nobel Peace laureates urge U.S. to lift economic sanctions on North Korea, By KWANG-TAE KIM Associated Press Writer, <http://news.findlaw.com/ap/p/56/06-17-2006/c929001802860a54.html>

- Nobel winners call on US to ease up on North Korea, Reuters, June 17

<http://www.freerepublic.com/focus/f-news/1651092/posts>

Gwangju Declaration of Nobel Laureates: 6th anniversary of the South-North Joint Declaration for Peace

June 17, 2006

Gwangju, South Korea

In Gwangju, the birthplace of modern Korean democracy, we, the Nobel Peace laureates, have reaffirmed our historical responsibility and the hope of human kind to achieve democracy and peace on the Korean Peninsula and the whole world. "The 2006 Gwangju Summit of Nobel Peace Laureates" was held to remember the May 18 Democratic Movement that spurred the democratization of Korea in 1980, and to uphold the spirit of the June 15 South-North Joint Declaration that opened up the way for peace on the Korean Peninsula in 2000. We have gathered in the spirit of the two global events that have occurred on the Korean Peninsula. We will search for, and promote, stable ways to bring lasting peace on the Peninsula and to spread democracy in East Asia. The Summit started from the universal insight discovered over the course of human history that democracy and human rights bring peace; and peace in turn strengthens democracy and human rights. This is not only the spirit of the Nobel Peace Prize but also the purpose of life and the course of action for the Nobel Peace laureates.

The shadows of the Cold War still linger on the Korean Peninsula and the tension and confrontation have become a huge threat to the peace and democracy of not only the Peninsula and East Asia but also the world as a whole. Meanwhile, there are still many places in Asia where democracy has not yet developed and human rights are being jeopardized. This shows us that trees of democracy and peace do not grow easily and that without endless efforts these trees will not grow and sometimes even wither. In this respect, the historical responsibility and common action of the Nobel Peace laureates are all the more crucial. Based upon our strong friendship and common philosophy, we will go to areas where democracy and peace are under threat, wherever that may be, and do our best to fulfill our role and responsibility.

Our practical actions aspire to affirm universal shared values such as compassion, love, justice, forgiveness and generosity.

Based on such goal and philosophy, we, the Nobel Peace laureates, pledge and propose the following:

Global Issues

-
1. *All countries around the world must endlessly strive to further develop democracy and peace, and this must be pursued not by use of force or violence but through peaceful means such as non-violence, forgiveness and reconciliation.*
 2. *There are still many areas not only in Asia but in all parts of the world where democracy and human rights are under oppression. International cooperation, and multilateralism based on the rule of law must be strengthened. Not only political human rights, but also the more basic social human rights such as the right to eat, to receive medical treatment, to be educated and to live in peace must be achieved.*
 3. *Without rooting out poverty we cannot expect development in democracy and human rights, nor can we end terrorism and war. Along with humanitarian emergency aid, the international community needs long-term efforts to reduce poverty and bring sustainable economic development. We urge the G8 leaders meeting in St Petersburg on July 15th to fulfill the Millennium Development Goals for Africa and its peoples, especially through debt cancellation.*
 4. *To ensure a sustainable future we call for: a. Recognition and full implementation of women's rights and the full implementation of Security Council Resolution 1325 on women's role in the peace process; b. Promotion of a culture of peace where security is defined to always focus on meeting human needs with substantial reductions in military spending thus freeing up enormous resources; c. Recognition in action not just rhetoric that without a healthy environment the human community cannot survive; d. Enhancing cooperation amongst people in addressing our collective needs through rendering the institution of war as obsolete as apartheid, slavery and colonization.*
 5. *For the resolution to international disputes and for world peace, the active role of the United Nations must be respected. All countries should do their utmost to closely cooperate with the UN to resolve current global disputes and promote democracy through peaceful diplomatic measures.*

Korean Issues

1. *The May 18 Democratic Movement and the signing of the June 15 South-North Joint Declaration were historic events contributing to democracy and peace not only on the Korean Peninsula but in Asia and the whole world. We, the Nobel Peace laureates, will do our best to uphold the vision and philosophy of both events.*
2. *The Korean Peninsula remains the only place on earth where the darkest shadows of the Cold War still linger. We call for more active cooperation*

-
- and efforts of the two Koreas, and also the concerned nations such as the United States, Japan, China and Russia, and international organizations such as the United Nations to pursue inter-Korean reconciliation and cooperation and end the state of war on the Peninsula to bring lasting peace in the region. As a modest step to enhance such cooperation, we advocate conversion of the DMZ into a de-mined Peace Park, an environmental reserve for the benefit of all people.*
- 3. The tension and confrontation surrounding the North Korean nuclear issue must be resolved. We urge all parties to resume the Six Party Talks in the spirit of mutual respect and equality. In order to advance this important process, we expect that the DPRK will completely abandon its nuclear weapons policy and accept international inspections. We also call for the US to end financial and economic sanctions on the DPRK and offer security guarantees. All parties should avoid any further obstacles to progress. All parties should fully implement the "Beijing Joint Statement" of September 19, 2005. The Six Parties should cooperate to ensure safe, peaceful energy security for the DPRK and implement economic cooperation in the fields of energy, trade and investment, bilaterally and multilaterally. We urge the United Nations and all nations involved to pursue inter-Korean reconciliation and cooperation and end the state of war on the Peninsula to bring lasting peace in the region.*
 - 4. We propose that the six-party talks should not be a temporary meeting to resolve the North Korean nuclear issue and bring lasting peace on the Peninsula but be developed into a permanent multilateral organization to promote peace and democracy on the Korean Peninsula.*

Nuclear weapons

- 1. If we are to have stability we must have justice. This means the same rules apply to all. Where this principle is violated disaster is risked. In this regard we point to the failure of the nuclear weapons states to fulfill their bargain contained in the Nuclear Nonproliferation Treaty to negotiate the universal elimination of nuclear weapons. To pursue a nuclear-weapons-free Korean Peninsula or Middle East or South Asia, without credible commitment to universal nuclear disarmament is akin to a parent trying to persuade his teenagers not to smoke while puffing on a cigar. There are steps available to make progress in this area and they include:*
 - a. Completing a treaty with full verification mechanisms cutting off further production of highly enriched uranium or plutonium for weapons purposes;*

b. Universal ratification of the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty, now ratified by 176 nations;

c. Taking the arsenals of Russia and the US off of hair trigger, launch on warning high alert;

d. Legally confirmed pledges by all states with nuclear weapons never to use them first; e. Making cuts in the US and Russia's arsenal irreversible and verifiable

* * *

We, the Nobel Peace laureates, pledge to pursue joint efforts and strengthen cooperation for the development of democracy, peace and human rights on the Korean Peninsula and the world as a whole. – June 17, 2006, At the closing of the "2006 Gwangju Summit of Nobel Peace Laureates"

- *Mikhail Gorbachev, Nobel Peace Laureate 1990*
- *Kim Dae-jung, Nobel Peace Laureate 2000*
- *Mairead Corrigan Maguire, Nobel Peace Laureate 1976*
- *Shirin Ebadi, Nobel Peace Laureate 2003*
- *Wangari Muta Maathai, Nobel Peace Laureate 2004*
- *International Peace Bureau (IPB), Organization awarded Nobel Peace Prize 1910*
- *American Friends Service Committee (AFSC), Organization awarded Nobel Peace Prize 1947*
- *Amnesty International (AI), Organization awarded Nobel Peace Prize 1977*
- *International Physicians for the Prevention of Nuclear War (IPPNW), Organization awarded Nobel Peace Prize 1985*
- *Pugwash Conferences on Science and World Affairs, Organization awarded Nobel Peace Prize 1995*