

Zentrum für Europäische Integrationsforschung
Center for European Integration Studies
Rheinische Friedrich Wilhelms-Universität Bonn



Weltachsen 2000

**International Congress
11./12. November 1999
Bonn**

Documentation

Discussion Paper

**C 69
2000**

Table of Contents

Introduction	
<i>Bärbel Dieckmann</i>	5
<i>Klaus Borchard</i>	9
<i>Ludger Kühnhardt</i>	11
<i>Mary Robinson</i>	
The Universality of Human Rights.....	17
<i>Wole Soyinka</i>	
The Dialogue of Cultures.....	29
<i>Olivier Blanchard</i>	
Global Markets and the Future of the State	43
<i>Oscar Arías Sánchez</i>	
Conditions for Good Governance.....	53
<i>Karan Singh</i>	
Development as a Global Agenda: Poverty as a Global Challenge...63	
<i>Lech Walesa</i>	
The Evolution of Ethics.....	71
<i>Klaus Töpfer</i>	
Mankind in the 21 st Century.....	79
Contributors	89
Center for Development Research (ZEF)	
Short Information	93
Center for European Integration Studies (ZEI)	
Short Information	95

Introduction

Bärbel Dieckmann

Mayor of Bonn

It was a great pleasure to welcome more than 750 people in the International Congress Center - Bundeshaus Bonn on the occasion of the opening of the International Congress „Weltachsen 2000“ (World Axes 2000) on November 11th and 12th, 1999. This conference was in fact a special première in the former Plenary Assembly Hall of the German Parliament. For the first time this place was not the theatre of political debates on laws and decrees but a place of international discussions. The fact that the participants were debating the crucial problems of mankind

which will arise in the next century fits very well into the young tradition of this building. Because of its special design the architect Günther Behnisch and his partners received international approval. For it is characterized in particular by transparency and communicativeness which are two properties that reigned over the discussions of the congress „Weltachsen 2000“.

For 50 years Bonn was the capital of the Federal Republic of Germany, seat of the parliament and the government. The - however partial - loss of these functions is to be attributed essentially to the German reunification which has led to the re-establishment of Berlin as the capital and as the seat of nine of the 15 ministries of Germany. The congress „Weltachsen 2000“ took place at the tenth anniversary of the fall of the Berlin Wall. This event has proved to be the starting-point of a fundamental change in Europe which has enabled the peoples of Eastern Europe to become again part of the community of democratic countries.

Since 50 years the name of Bonn stands for a successful German democracy and for a positive tradition of German history. Bonn is the city where the German Fundamental Law was deliberated on and adopted. This Constitution has since served as a model for other countries of the world. For 50 years Bonn has been one of the points of intersection of global policy.

Presently, the city is undergoing fundamental change. New attributes will be connected with the name of Bonn in the future: seat of United Nations' organisations and center for international co-operation which focuses on environmental and development issues. As a city of international dialogue and as a scientific center Bonn will continue to participate in finding solutions for the major problems of mankind.

Two newly founded research institutes of the Bonn University have organised the congress „Weltachsen 2000“ in cooperation with the City of Bonn and they will incorporate the results of the discussions into their work. These two future-orientated research institutes of a unique type in

Introduction

Germany, the Center of European Integration Studies (ZEI) and the Center of Development Research (ZEF) are typical representatives of the new profile the city of Bonn is developing.

The conversion of the city into a center of science and research is one of the future key activities of Bonn. As a center of science and research Bonn intends to become a motor of international discussion about issues of the future of human society and to give impulsions. Bonn is particularly suited to this task: Besides the existing scientific institutions of Bonn, a great number of other resident institutions are acting in essential future-orientated fields. For instance the Secretariat of the Framework Convention on Climate Change of the United Nations, the United Nations Secretariat to Combat Desertification or the Bonn International Center for Conversion (BICC). Furthermore, Bonn has proved to have just the right size for easy and quick establishment of working relations between institutions and organisations.

The Federal City of Bonn, the Center for European Integration Studies and the Center of Development Research of the University of Bonn had invited distinguished personalites from different regions of the world who represent various fields in order to give them the opportunity to join in thinking about the key issues of mankind. On behalf of the organisers I would like to thank them all for having accepted to cooperate in this task.

Klaus Borchard

Rector of the Rheinische Friedrich-Wilhelms-University Bonn

The Rheinische Friedrich-Wilhelms-University is proud to participate in the formation of the new profile of the federal city of Bonn. As one of the leading research universities in Germany, the University of Bonn has always been at the forefront of the development and definition of new and innovative scholarship. The high quality of university teaching in Bonn is rooted in the thorough research potential in numerous academic fields. Innovation has always guided the Rheinische Friedrich-Wilhelms-University Bonn. It is therefore with particular commitment that we have taken up the challenge to help in defining the new academic and international profile of the federal city of Bonn.

The foundation of the Center for European Integration Studies and the Center for Development Research are the most prominent and substantial expressions of this commitment. Both research institutes have been founded in the context of the so-called „Bonn-Berlin-contract“. The Center for European Integration Studies and the Center for Development Research are independent research institutes at the Rheinische Friedrich-Wilhelms-University Bonn. The work of ZEI contributes to the solution of problems of European integration and Europe’s role in a global context. The work of ZEF contributes to the solution of the most challenging development problems of our time. The work of both institutions is highly innovative in the context of the academic scene in Germany. The work is interdisciplinary and multifunctional. ZEI integrates legal, economic and social, cultural and political issues, ZEF integrates natural sciences and environmental, economic and rural development issues and problems of cultural and political change. Both institutes have already become highly visible through their future-oriented research work, their numerous publications, the evolution of sound policy

advice, fruitful dialogue between researchers and decision makers and innovative concepts in postgraduate and doctoral education.

Their potential is very promising because their initial period has been very successful. Currently both research institutes have an international academic and professional staff of more than hundred people and work already in close co-operation with partners all around the world. The speeches published in this documentation, and the discussions both in the plenary and in the foray of this congress will contribute to the further development of focused research agenda of both our new flagships.

The Federal Government provided a grant for the start-up period of both research institutes. The international recognition which their work has gained in their short period of existence gives us optimism that the future quality of work of the Center for European Integration Studies and the Center for Development Research will clearly produce a sustainable and lasting demand for both ZEI and ZEF. Our research institutes are a demonstration of the innovative potential of German universities.

This most impressive congress was more than an intellectual firework without lasting effects. It is part of the strategy of both the Center for European Integration Studies and the Center for Development Research to communicate, to the far reaches of the world and to carry the academic reflections about this communication into our own society as well as into the other societies of our common globe. By definition and its nature, scientific work is universal. It needs the dialogue with the world outside the university to contribute to the best of its ability to understanding the consequences and options of practical political and economic developments. The universities need much advice in producing inspiration in their own work. No better context and substance could have been found by our colleagues at the Center for European Integration Studies and the Center for Development Research than the agenda of this congress „Weltachsen 2000“. It is the agenda of the next century, to which the University of Bonn will contribute to the best of our ability.

Ludger Kühnhardt

Director at the Center for European Integration Studies (ZEI)

On September 7th, 1949, the Social Democrat Paul Löbe, a former President of the democratic German Reichstag and the most senior member of the newly elected German Parliament, opened the first ever session of the German Bundestag in Bonn. In the Plenary, the government benches were still covered with colourful flowers. On the right, the three Western High Commissioners and their delegations formed a group of their own. On the benches of the Bundesrat, the second German chamber, the Prime Ministers of the German Länder had taken their seats. Paul Löbe called on the parliamentarians to leave behind them the aggressive style and loudness of the election campaign which had taken place in the summer of 1949. He paid tribute to the victims of the National Socialist dictatorship and called upon his colleagues to help overcome the dark years of German history.

On July 1st, 1999, the Christian Democrat Helmut Kohl, the Chancellor of German Unity, gave the last parliamentary speech in the German Bundestag in Bonn. He appealed to his colleagues and to all those who would follow, to continue to build in Berlin on the democratic foundation laid in Bonn. He called on German politicians and the public not to disrespect and neglect the smaller neighbours and to continuously strive for confidence among her partners. More than ever before, Germany would need the virtue of modesty. Germany, the country with the highest number of neighbours in Europe, would need partners and friends, and this would require continuity and trustworthiness in German politics. Since September 1999, the German Bundestag is convening in Berlin. Bonn has become the Federal City.

On November 11 and 12, 1999 more than 750 people participated in the first ever international congress in the former Plenary of the German

Bundestag in Bonn. Civil society followed state politics. The world followed German politicians.

Only two days before, the Federal Republic of Germany and many people abroad had commemorated the 10th anniversary of the Fall of the Berlin Wall. Sometimes it seemed to me that people outside of Germany were more happily rejoicing than many Germans. For me it was always clear: the 9th of November 1989 was a day of happiness, because it was a day of freedom for the whole of Europe. On November 9th, 1999, the German Parliament in Berlin was looking into the agenda for Germany as it had developed during the last decade. On November 11 and 12, 1999, the congress „Weltachsen 2000“ („World Axes 2000“) was echoing the happy and solemn tenth anniversary by paying tribute to the global agenda for the new century. Berlin will continue to deal with the German agenda and will shape the future political order of this country. Bonn, the Federal City, will contribute to the global agenda. This is the new and constructive division of labor between Berlin and Bonn. The congress „Weltachsen 2000“ defined at least some parameters for the new role of Bonn and set standards for the future use of this historic building. It could be done because of many successful efforts of many institutions and individuals who have already contributed to the new profile of Bonn during the past years.

The future message from this city and this, its most symbolic and historic building is clear: it is a message of co-operation and dialogue, of commitment to European and global challenges, a message of learning and bridge-building. The Center for European Integration Studies and the Center for Development Research are part of the new infrastructure that wants to make this possible. My colleagues and I are grateful to the University of Bonn, to which we legally belong, and to the City of Bonn, in which we are glad to live and work, for their encouragement and support for our institutions which are unique in Germany.

The agenda of the congress „Weltachsen 2000“ was ambitious and broad. Yet it was an agenda of well connected topics. Very distinguished

Introduction

personalities from all corners of the world oriented the thinking of the participants and their discussions. The inspiration that all of those participating received from global leaders will serve the future work of our two think tanks and will certainly have an impact on the future considerations of all present.

Universality of human rights – hardly any other topic of the contemporary world order could better describe both the proximity and the distance between the people and nations of our common globe. The idea of human rights has become the most powerful notion for all those who want to humanize the face of politics. But all efforts to spread the principles of human rights, as they are laid down in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and other documents of the United Nations, are necessary only because of the unfortunate absence, as yet, of a global consensus and of local implementation of the principles of human rights in many regions of the globe. Nobody could better reflect the situation and outline the challenges ahead than Her Excellency Mary Robinson, the Former Head of State of Ireland and since 1997 the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights.

It is one of the fundamental questions of the human rights debate whether and how far human rights are truly universal or only relative because of the cultural differences in the world. Without the recognition of certain universal principles, there cannot be a universal dialogue at all. But nothing is more important than this dialogue among cultures. A lot has been said and written about the return of culture and civilization as an element of politics. We know of clashes in the name of culture and we know of convergence in the name of culture. The dialogue of cultures will be the single most important contribution of civil societies in all parts of the world to the future shape of our common globe. When we read the brilliant books of Wole Soyinka - starting with „The Interpreters” - we meet one of the foremost interpreters of culture and advocate of cultural dialogue. We are carried into the midst of real-life conditions in Africa, as they have developed as a consequence of the encounter of African

traditions with the colonizing Europeans. But we are also confronted with the sad dimensions of Africa, which is after all Europe's southern neighbouring continent. Africa cannot be neglected the way it is today without hurting ourselves in Europe. For us in Europe, it will be one of the big challenges of the 21st Century to rediscover Africa as a continent of potential and not as a basket case of despair. The Nobel laureate Wole Soyinka invited us to an important, yet often neglected dimension of the dialogue of cultures. Wole Soyinka is one of the greatest African souls of our time.

Literature, and culture in general, cannot do away with the fact that the modern economy has become the most powerful and visible dimension of many so called globalizing trends. The reflection about its consequences has reached all states in the world. The economic and social discussion is not only related to the future development of markets and its social effects. Globalization is fundamentally affecting the future of the state. Here in Europe, the EURO has become the symbol of the most advanced pooling of state sovereignty. What does this mean for the future of the state in Europe? And what does globalization mean for the future of all states? There is hardly any better place on the globe to reflect about the relationship between global markets and the future of the state than at the top American research universities. The chief economist of the world-famous „Massachusetts Institute of Technology“ in Cambridge, Mass., Olivier Blanchard, demonstrated how practical and relevant economic theory can be for the understanding of our realities.

The future of the state is thoroughly connected to normative dimensions of governance. „Good governance“ has become one of the catchwords of many global discussions about the future legitimacy of political power and the organization of political regimes. Internal and external peace are dependent upon constitutional democracy, rule of law and the accountability of politicians. The positive and peaceful democratizing developments in Latin America during the last two decades are impressive proof of this concept. A fascinating thinker and activist and one of the

most successful and respected shapers and makers of the new Latin and Central America is Oscar Arias Sanchez, the former President of Costa Rica and Nobel Peace Prize laureate. His calls for increased aid and a global code of conduct for arms exports confirmed his position as a world figure of renown.

For the vast majority of mankind, poverty remains a daily reality. Whenever the United Nations or any development research paper talks about „sustainable development”, what they are really talking about is the desire to provide humane living conditions for all human beings, to develop lasting economic and social conditions that enable and support the dignity of man. As son of the last Maharaja of Kashmir, Kharan Singh knows all the dimensions of the historic change and political development in South Asia during this century. In fact, he has lived many of them. As a former cabinet Minister of India and today as Member of the Rajya Sabha, the Upper House of the largest democracy on earth, Kharan Singh has dealt intensively with the global development problem and its South Asian specifics. He serves as the voice of Asia in the „Club of Rome”, one of the most distinguished and influential bodies which is working to deepen mankind’s understanding for our common causes.

The future of mankind cannot flourish without the evolution of global ethics. All great religions in the world play the most important role for the ethical foundation of truth. I am convinced that there is no truth without religious faith as its base. But also in the world of politics can we find moral authority, at least sometimes. Wherever we look, it is the experience that values are only convincing as long as they are practised and lived, as long as testimony is given to them. For Europe, the last twenty years have been enormously crucial for our of new insights into the relationship between public life and virtue, and for the human search for freedom and solidarity. Today, the new Europe, aside from a few archaic regimes, is free from dictatorship and oppressing ideologies. More than to anybody else, Europe and the World owes the Fall of the Wall and the end of communism to two Polish citizens: Pope John Paul II

and Lech Walesa. Both have reinvigorated confidence in European values and have given the most impressive examples of moral leadership in our time. Lech Walesa, the former President of Poland and Nobel Peace Prize laureate, is the symbol of freedom and solidarity in today's Europe, one of the most impressive and successful personalities in the 20th century.

Professor Klaus Töpfer, is serving as Chairman of the International Board of Trustees of the Center for Development Research, and the honourable Hans-Dietrich Genscher is serving as Chairman of the International Board of the Center for European Integration Studies. The congress „Weltachsen 2000“ closed with a vision and reflection on the future of mankind in the 21st century. For Klaus Töpfer, the Under Secretary General of the United Nations, Chairman of the United Nations Environmental Program (UNEP) in Nairobi, this was somewhat of a homecoming to a place in which he has often taken the floor as German Minister for Environmental Protection and as a Member of Parliament.

The congress „Weltachsen 2000“ looked at a wide variety of issues and heard very distinguished speakers and discussants from all corners of the globe. The guiding principle of our discussions was the same: Mankind in the 21st century. Through this congress, we were handing over the historic plenary of the former German Parliament to the search for the best possible answers to our common human challenges.

Mary Robinson

The Universality of Human Rights

Bonn holds a special place in the history of Germany and of the Rhineland. The 50 years during which Bonn served as capital of the Federal Republic have perhaps overshadowed its long, distinguished history as a famous university town and a seat of learning and research. The establishment of a Centre for European Integration Studies and a Centre for Development Research are proof of Bonn's determination to continue to play a vital role in the intellectual and political life of the country.

Inevitably, the events of ten years ago and the fall of the Berlin Wall are in our minds this week. Time can lessen the memory of the flagrant

human rights abuses which the Wall symbolised - the lives lost, the denial of freedom, the splitting up of families. But we should not forget that what happened in 1989 was one of the most remarkable democratic achievements of recent times. The unification of the German people was a victory for human rights, for democracy and for the right of people to determine their own destiny. It sent a positive message to the world that change, even major change, could come about in a peaceful, democratic way.

The aim of this congress is to examine the most challenging issue facing mankind. Human rights certainly fall into that category. Human rights are at centre stage in the world and are the subject of intense debate. Over the past half century there has been a gradual but steady advance in the direction of the internationalisation of human rights. There is increasing awareness that human rights must be respected and defended irrespective of whatever nationality a person has or where they live or what place they have in society.

In addition, there have been marked advances in the codification of human rights laws and norms. A large body of legal instruments now exists which embody the common understanding of human rights by the international community.

And there have been important improvements in the international machinery to monitor human rights situations in all parts of the world and to ensure that human rights are protected as stipulated in the international instruments.

The emphasis now must be on implementation. We have moved from the era of standard setting to putting the agreed human rights norms into practice. And that is where the greatest challenge presents itself. Because, as anyone can see in looking around the world, there remains a huge gap between the ideals of the human rights movement and the reality on the ground. The most extreme abuses are those we see on our television screens - in Kosovo, in Sierra Leone, in East Timor - but there are many

less spectacular examples where the human rights performance falls well short of the ideal.

Yes, human rights are high on the international agenda. But there must be practical results, improvements in people's lot, if there is not to be an erosion of the credibility of human rights and a rise in cynicism.

Universality

One of the questions that has been raised is whether human rights are truly universal. The implication is that the fundamental rights set out in the Universal Declaration and other human rights instruments may not apply in some countries or societies. If we look at the text of the Universal Declaration we see that the drafters certainly intended the document to be universal. The Preamble describes the thirty articles that follow as;

„A common standard of achievement for all peoples and all nations, ...“

The Preamble also declares that;

„Recognition of the inherent dignity and of the equal and unalterable rights of all members of the human family is the foundation of freedom, justice and peace in the world.“

The preparatory work on drafting the Universal Declaration demonstrates that it was not simply a product of Western thought as is sometimes claimed. Representatives of African, Asian and Latin American countries contributed substantially to the drafting which took place in the Commission on Human Rights and the General Assembly. The record shows that the drafters sought to reflect in their work the differing cultural and religious traditions in the world. The result is a distillation of many of the values inherent in the world's major legal systems and religious beliefs including the Buddhist, Christian, Hindu, Islamic and Jewish traditions.

The World Conference on Human Rights which was held in Vienna in 1993 carried out a major review of the state of human rights and gave

detailed consideration to the question of universality. The Declaration and Programme of Action, adopted by all of the 171 participating States, gave a ringing endorsement to the full range of rights as set out in the Universal Declaration. Article 1 of the Vienna Declaration says that;

„The World Conference on Human Rights reaffirms the solemn commitment of all States to fulfil their obligations to promote universal respect for and observance and protection of all human rights and fundamental freedoms for all in accordance with the Charter of the United Nations, other instruments relating to human rights and international law. The universal nature of these rights and freedoms is beyond question.“

Further evidence of the concept of universality, if it is needed, can be seen from the fact that the Universal Declaration has inspired regional instruments for the protection of human rights throughout the globe, all of which have reaffirmed its precepts. I think of the African Charter on Human and Peoples' Rights of 1981 and the Arab Charter on Human Rights of 1994, both of which reaffirm the principles embodied in the Universal Declaration.

Cultural Diversity

In championing the cause of universality I should emphasise that universality does not negate cultural diversity; on the contrary, I believe that it reinforces and protects cultural diversity. One of the most interesting activities of my Office last year was to organize a seminar on Islamic perspectives on the Universal Declaration on Human Rights which took place in Geneva. When I addressed the experts I said that the search for cultural diversity is a particular responsibility of the United Nations. And I quoted Secretary General Kofi Annan's belief that „alongside a global diversity of cultures, there exists one worldwide civilisation of knowledge within which ideas and philosophies meet and develop peacefully and productively.“

I noted that in all of the discussions no one expressed doubts about the Universal Declaration or denied the legitimacy or universality of

international human rights standards. Rather, we heard about the relevance of international standards, including the Universal Declaration, to promoting and protecting human rights at the national level.

And our attention was called to how human rights are actually lived. The principles of Islam relating to human dignity and social solidarity are a rich resource from which to face the human rights challenges of today. Islamic concern with human dignity is old; it goes back to the very beginning.

The seminar on Islamic commentaries brought home to me the importance of dialogue between cultures so as to get away from the tendency to be deaf to, and even to demonise, cultures different from our own. I am inviting a number of scholars to meet with me again to continue the dialogue which I hope will be beneficial to all of us.

A final point in this context. I do not believe, as some have argued, that human rights is a substitute for religion or a new form of secular religion. As I said, the drafters of the Universal Declaration drew on ethical principles from many of the world's great religions - and from different areas of secular thinking. But their aim was not to replace religions. The great documents of human rights spell out the individual's fundamental rights and show how these can be achieved and how they ought to be protected. To read more into the texts of human rights would be to force them to carry an excessive weight.

All Countries Subject to Scrutiny

For human rights to be universal it follows that the performance of every country in the human rights field must be open to scrutiny. The charge is sometimes made that only weak countries are criticised for human rights abuses while bigger countries get away with serious violations.

My position on this is simple: I aim to see human rights observed everywhere and I will go on campaigning to that end. Much of my work with governments will necessarily be carried out confidentially; that is

often the best way to achieve results. But it does not always work and if the situation calls for it, I will not hesitate to speak out. I will call attention to great breaches of human rights and humanitarian law wherever I see them, whether it is in Kosovo or in Chechnya - where the situation is extremely grave at the moment.

Because the fact is that the aspiration to a culture of human rights is still very far removed from the reality. If anyone is in doubt about the scale of gross human rights violations in the world they need only read the Report on Civilians in Armed Conflict which the Secretary General submitted to the Security Council last month. This year alone I have seen some of the worst violations which are taking place - murder, expulsions, maiming, rape. I have assumed a burden of listening: to the pain and anguish of the victims of violations, to the fears and anxieties of human rights defenders. I intend to go on listening to those who suffer in this way, and to be a voice for them. That applies wherever violations occur.

A promising development in recent years is the movement towards making those guilty of grave human rights violations accountable for their actions. The principle of universality applies here too: all such violations should be accounted for - wherever, whenever and by whomever they were committed. The adoption of the Rome Statute providing for an International Criminal Court is a major step forward. I urge States to ratify the Statute without delay so that the Court can get on with its vital work.

More attention must be paid to addressing the root causes of human rights violations so as to prevent them from taking place. There is no shortage of studies which show the value of prevention but the international community still does not place sufficient emphasis on prevention. The tendency is to wait until a situation has become so inflamed that open conflict has broken out. Prevention is a normal part of our lives in so many ways so why should we not apply it to conflict situations? .From the point of view of cost alone, the burden of reconstruction can dwarf the cost of prevention. From the point of view of the victims of conflict, action taken after the situation has exploded is too late.

The Universality of Human Rights

Nor should we think of human rights violations as being something that affects only faraway countries. There are human rights failures here in Europe, in the treatment meted out to asylum-seekers, in hostility towards people of different nationalities and cultures, in discrimination against minorities, indigenous people and migrant workers. Racism and xenophobia are not hard to find and they are taking new forms such as hate-filled messages on the Internet.

Racism is on my mind because I have just been appointed Secretary General of the World Conference against Racism which will be held in two years time. We are launching the information campaign for the Conference on 10 December next, Human Rights Day, in Geneva. The Conference will provide a valuable opportunity to devise new strategies against this fundamental violation of human rights - hatred of a person on the grounds of their race. I would appeal to all of you to help me make this Conference a practical, productive event which restores to us a sense of appreciation of how sterile and destructive the forces of racism and xenophobia are and the immense value that there is in diversity.

Let me pause here and share with you one of my deepest concerns as High Commissioner for Human Rights. It goes back to ten years ago and the fall of the Berlin Wall - the end of the Cold War- the excitement of a new beginning. This should have resulted in a break-through in our shaping of the debate on what we mean by the term human rights.

During the Cold War the West emphasised civil liberties and the communist block emphasised progress on economic and social rights. But, ten years later, there is still - deep divided - the developed world still seeing human rights as primarily protection of civil and political rights - freedom of expression, freedom from arbitrary arrest, freedom of religion and so on.

Developing countries put emphasis on how extreme poverty is a fundamental denied of human rights - the right to food, basic nutrition for children, education, basic health care. It is important to bridge the divide.

All Human Rights for All

As well as being universal, human rights are indivisible. The Universal Declaration refers to „common standards of achievement for all peoples and all nations.“ What this means is that civil and political rights, on the one hand, and economic, social and political rights, on the other, are both demanding of protection on the same plane. The two sorts of rights are interdependent and interrelated. Economic, social and cultural rights need to be realised with the same degree of affirmation and conviction as civil and political rights. Freedom of speech and belief are enshrined but also freedom from fear and want. Fair trial and the right to participatory and representative government sit shoulder to shoulder with the right to work, to equal pay for equal work, and the right to education.

I have sought to place more emphasis on economic, social and cultural rights and the right to development because there has been this imbalance over the years in favour of civil and political rights. In fact, I believe that rich countries are sometimes guilty of a kind of double-speak: they are strongly - and rightly - critical of human rights abuses in the civil and political field. But they are much less vocal about economic, social and cultural rights. The right to decent living conditions, food, basic healthcare, education, are laid down in the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights and which have been endorsed repeatedly by governments - at the summits in Vienna, Cairo, Beijing and Copenhagen, for example.

Yet the record in securing these rights has been poor. Any number of statistics are available to show how the gap between rich and poor is ever widening. The case was eloquently put recently by the President of the International Committee of the Red Cross, Cornelius Sommaruga when he said:

„It is more crucial than ever that we reflect on the humanitarian principles that alleviate the suffering of the vulnerable, the weak, the defenceless. Poverty, like social injustice and massive human rights abuses, is one of the causes of armed conflict. In the limbo of contemporary history are

any number of regions with hardly any economy - except the arms market.“

Rich countries should abide by their solemn undertakings to assist in development. It is simply not credible to talk about human rights and preventing conflicts and at the same time to cut ODA budgets. There is a new focus on the human-centred, rights-based approach to development which deserves all our support.

All Actors should be involved

Embedding human rights in society calls for the active involvement of all the different players - governments, international organisations, developmental bodies, non-governmental organisations, human rights defenders.

In the global world we now inhabit the role of business corporations is particularly important. Businesses can in some ways exert more influence on national economies than governments. That power can be a potent force for good or for ill. There are signs that business leaders are recognising their responsibilities in this regard and that they are prepared to take positive action. Last week I addressed a meeting of Business for Social Responsibility in San Francisco and I quoted the words of the new Director General of the World Trade Organisation, Mike Moore who said:

„Increasing numbers ... feel excluded, forgotten and angry, locked out and waiting for a promised train that may never arrive. They see globalisation as a threat, the enemy. A central policy challenge for governments is to make the prosperity that flows from globalisation accessible to people.“

I sincerely hope that the upcoming Seattle Ministerial Conference of the WTO will be able to contribute to the aims Mr. Moore has set for himself: an outcome which benefits the world's most vulnerable economies, a more open trading system that can contribute to better living

standards and a safer world; a World Trade Organisation which reflects the needs of *all* its members.

Germany's Role

We are coming to the start of a new century with a strong momentum behind the international human rights movement. There may never be as opportune a time again to translate the goodwill towards human rights into reality. We must all play our part in bringing this about - at community at national and at international level.

Germany is well placed to make a significant contribution to the championing of human rights. It can do so by example. The Basic Law of the Federal Republic, which was adopted 50 years ago, has been described as a model of its kind and its human rights provisions inspired other countries' constitutions. It has been consistently interpreted in broad terms by the German Constitutional Court and is testimony to Germany's commitment to the protection and promotion of human rights.

Germany can promote human rights both nationally and within the European Union. And Germany's Official Development Assistance programmes enjoy a justifiably high reputation. I hope that Germany will continue to play a strong part in this field even at a time of financial constraints. I was particularly appreciative of the symposium hosted last year here in Bonn on the strengthening of human rights field presences. That meeting produced very valuable insights into this important topic.

I will conclude by recalling the words of Konrad Adenauer when he addressed the first meeting of the Bundestag 50 years ago:

„Those values - protection of the law, protection of individual rights and freedoms - of which we were deprived for many years, are so precious that we must be thankful for recovering them.“

The words could be applied to all of us, wherever we live. We are fortunate to live in an era when respect for human rights is accorded the highest priority by the international community. The challenge we face is

The Universality of Human Rights

to translate that interest and commitment into genuine human rights for all.

Wole Soyinka

The Dialogue of Cultures

Do cultures dialogue? Should they? Rhetorical questions on the surface of it, if only one remained blissfully unaware of the deliberate suffocation of the channels of cultural encounters, due to fear, mistrust, sense of superiority or plain xenophobia. Left alone, we know that cultures do dialogue, and it is futile to attempt to prevent them from an activity that is indeed a function of their nature. Communication is culture, and dialogue can lay valid claim to being its most sophisticated form. In the short run of course, the truly desperate may succeed in placing a cordon sanitaire around a society, or against any cultural encounter. There are causative histories that provoke the move towards isolationism, some of them

histories of external domination that dictate strategies for full self-retrieval in all aspects of social life, the cultural being the most assertive. Usually, this is a reactive strategy to an existing anomaly.

Others causes may be ideological. Economic programming being dependent on production and consumption habits, the latter of which may be distorted by the accessibility of both essential and purely ostentatious trade items, the economic priorities of a society sometimes propose the erection of a barrier against anything that may be categorised as „foreign“ . Social history is thus replete with instances of nations that deliberately close their doors to external cultural ideas, employing the argument that the mere awareness of such modes of taste or objects of craving might lead, through comparative assessment, to an erosion of confidence in the productive goals of the state or appreciation of the actual products of a people. And then of course, most notoriously and often inhumanly, there is the impulse of religious purism.

And yet how pure can even this last „justification“, or indeed any other, be truthfully accounted? Does this, or any other rationalisation not sometimes disguise a goal that transcends its stated claims, be such a claim the mental liberation of a people from external dominance, preservation of an internal cultural purity, acceleration of the productive capacity of a people, or a spiritual submission to the imagined injunctions of one deity or another? The Cultural Revolution of the Republic of China, in its own time, cannot be totally divorced, in a comprehensive analysis, from the desire of the ruling party to renew its own power base and resuscitate a flagging political momentum. The late Mobutu Sese Seko, easily one of the most ardent preachers of our time of the need for a culturally „authentic“ African persona, was blatantly long on rhetoric and short on conviction. His personal tastes, life style and wealth disposition were anything but African or Zairois, yet he carried his slogan of an African authenticite not only into the territory of sartorial choices for the people but into the state regulation of personal names. His subjects

were required to abandon their foreign names and adopt only indigenous ones, while he set an ostentatious example by changing his from the original Desiree into an extravagant praise-song of a personal self-regarding that signaled his intention to subject his people to systematic rape. In Afghanistan, the populace has been flung back into the Darkest Ages, pursuing cultural norms that not only preclude half of that nation's humanity - the female sex - effectively from public life, but have virtually reduced them to the status of chattels. When even the length of the beard of a male citizen becomes a cause for reprimand and worse, we know that Culture is not the god to whom obeisance is being paid but simply conformism. And to what end is such a rigid - and often brutal - regimen of conformism? Obviously the elimination of identity and pluralism, a time-tested mechanism of control, the suppression of individual will, choice and initiative - in short - the project of Power and Authoritarianism.

What, however, has been the lesson of human development? Simply that, in the long run, cultural boundaries have the virtue of porosity, the ability to let in foreign matter, and that culture itself has certain penetrating attributes of its own that enable it to find a vulnerable entry zone through the skin of the most hermetic carapace that has been moulded around the pristine existence of any human community. Now should this be surprising? Commerce, or the exchange of material goods, is one the very earliest activities of the human community, and commerce is the wind on which the spore of culture has been borne from time immemorial, leading to cross-pollination and hybridisation. War and conquest are vehicles that developed much later. It is only a question of determining whether such commercial normality be viewed from an enemy perspective - the barbarian culture beating on the citadels of a pristine world on wings of commerce, or as an expansion of the knowledge of humanity about itself.

McDonalds - the ever-proliferating Golden „M“ - may serve us as a current model of emotive incursion. It is, in the view of several societies

or - more accurately - within certain strata of most nations - it is a symbol of the phillistine tendency in cultural terms, most especially in France. The current hero figure in that country, it would seem, is an erstwhile unknown who took his championship of French identity to the extent of vandalising the foundations of yet another McDonald eatery that was about to pollute, in his view, the cultural integrity of the French landscape. Equally instructive has been the saga of Disneyland on that same landscape - most people may have forgotten the immense hostility that was aroused by Disneyland when it attempted its first inroad into France - indeed, the French appeared to have taken a leaf from the response of the Igbo people, one of the major Nigerian cultures, when Christianity first arrived in that land and its missionaries demanded a tract of land for their first church.

The elders met, opinions varied about what response to give. Some felt that the village should take these pernicious intruders by surprise, attack them (like the French anti-McDonald warrior) and chase them out of the country. Others cautioned that there was an element of mystery about this religion, some secret strength which, if aroused through hostility, might bring the wrath of yet unknown, but powerful gods, on the populace. It was best therefore, they argued, to welcome them, albeit with ill grace, and permit the missionaries to settle in their midst. In the end, the winning voice was that which counselled a kind of middle-of-the-road strategy.

It so happened that the village possessed an evil bush in which criminals, lepers and unwanted children were abandoned or buried. No sane human being ever built on that land, farmed it, or walked through it without some powerful self-fortification. Give the missionaries a piece of that land, the wise voice counselled. If their god was truly powerful, he would protect them, if not, they would perish and no one would account the village guilty of their fate. This was the counsel that the French appeared to have followed in rejecting the original piece of land requested by

Disneyland - the American invaders were banished to some piece of wasteland on the remote outskirts of Paris where, if my memory serves me right, they began by incurring losses of millions of dollars in the first few years of operation. Since then however, it would appear that the American „juju“ has proved more powerful than the French, judging by the busloads of even French tourists who patronise today, the once cultural outcasts of French civilisation.

The world is however filled with examples where the intersection of cultures through commerce was far less hostile, where, in effect, new cultures have emerged, and of such durability that they are hardly remembered today as specific historic hybridisations, as opposed to organic evolutions from within. One such is that of East Africa - Zanzibar and the Tanzanian coastland - a culture that may be described, for convenience, as Swahili culture. This marriage of Arab, Indian and autochthonous African cultures was not without its dark side however, as it owed as much to regular commerce - in cloves, dates, coffee etc. - as it does to the Indian Ocean and trans-Saharan slave trade. Nevertheless, the „Swahili“ culture is one that provides an example of the vibrant potential of an unimpeded dialogue of cultures, one that has enriched both the architectural, religious, culinary, craft and artistic of that region, and turned it into a unique cultural terrain in all of the African continent.

We could take ourselves even further back in antiquity, asking ourselves what were the tributaries into the famed Greek culture in its now designated classical sublimity. If the evidence of Herodotus, Homer and others is to be believed, the so-called classical Greek culture was in fact a product of Egyptian culture. Among other scholars, the ethnologist Cheik Anta Diop of Senegal - *The African Origin of Civilisation* - and, more recently, and with even more detailed material both from iconography and religion, Martin Bernal - *Black Athena* - both offer arguable to incontestable evidence that the much vaunted cultures that now serve as canonical outposts for some of the attributions of the cultures of the world

are in themselves triumphs of hybridity. The European Renaissance should therefore be accounted less a product of a rediscovery of an ancient Aegean civilisation and more as an energised continuity of the language of cultures, mobilised to serve as cultural stormtroopers against the ramparts of the Middle Ages and the stifling authority of scholasticism.

But perhaps our most instructive instance is the world of Brazil where, much in the same way as the Egyptian gods and goddesses often metamorphosed into what has been long designated as the Greek pantheon, the African deities - but mostly especially those of the Yoruba race - entered into a syncretic identification with Roman Catholic saints, and the commemorations of African deities became fused with the calendar dates of the Roman Catholic Church. Each phenomenon of fusion or syncretism does have a different origination. In the case of Brazil, as in much of the Caribbean, it was simply a strategy of survival for the slaves who found their religions and cultural observances forbidden by their new masters. For the latter, African religions and associated music and dance were considered pagan and barbaric, or else the nervous plantation masters feared that these strange observances could serve as camouflage for conspiracies among the slaves for an uprising or escapes. The slaves, determined not to abandon their gods and their customs, simply continued to celebrate them under the guise of paying homage to the Roman Catholic saints. Today, representations of both Yoruba deity and Catholic saint share a place of honour at the altars of both santeria and church cathedral. Sometimes the two intercessors to the Supreme Deity are totally fused, with both African and European symbols designating the single figure of the saint-deity. What is even more instructive for the world is that the devotees of the candombles, the bembe, santeria etc. will be found just as proportionately among the descendants of the African slaves as among the white descendants of the Spanish or Portuguese conquistadors..

I distinguish of course between „globalisation“ and „dialogue“. The immediately preceding narratives attest to a relationship that may be accurately described as „dialogue“. It takes place surreptitiously or haphazardly, in subtle progression, and tends towards an egalitarian resolution of the concourse of cultures. Indeed, such a dialogue is usually a by-product of other forms of interaction, such as commerce, conquest or religious proselytisation, the ironic consequences of which sometimes record the cultural conversion of the aggressive or domineering partner - such as in the cited instance of Brazil, or indeed the cultural domestication of both Islam and Christianity in parts of Africa, especially in the West. Only an incorrigible phillistine would wish to see the fruits of the near millenia-old cultural dialogue on the Iberian peninsula - albeit commenced, enforced, and often sustained with the force of arms - between the Spanish and Arab worlds - destroyed. It is not merely the presence of haunting architectural monuments that owe their inspiration to North African and Arab invaders, but the overall fingerprints of Moorish cultural life all over the cities, towns, villages and landscape of Spain and Portugal, not to forget its literature - especially poetry - its musical modes, cuisine and dress, that give this part of the world its uniqueness, setting it apart from most cultural crossroads of the world.

Of course we have to acknowledge also the unsuccessful interactions, indeed virtually imposed monologues of the conqueror mentality, whose heritage still troubles certain societies, centuries after the initial experience of such intrusion. A terrible revenge is then exacted from the convertites to the invading culture over several generations, so that both political and social marginalisations become the pattern of existence in reversed cycles of domination, creating a legacy of orgies of iconoclasm and cultural waste. The legacies of such invading cultures are meticulously erased, as a policy of state - which of course doubly impoverishes the nation in question. Cultural self-retrieval can prove a double-edged sword. The palpable impact of such sequences of intolerance can be truly heartbreaking, as I witnessed in certain East

European countries where testaments to the brutality of the now defeated forces are inscribed in stone and marble, and both citizens and tourists are taken on a pilgrimages to such memorials - but not solely for the purpose of inducting them into the prior history of such nations. Rather, it is to explain and justify the existing repressive policies of the nation: this is what they did to us, this is what they did to our cultures, and so we eradicate the use of their language, forbid the adoption of both personal and place-names that belong to that culture, even forbid their songs, dances and rituals.

Paradoxically though it may appear, despite this negative face of dialogue, one that is clearly a travesty of dialogue, a case of force-feeding and counter-rejection, enough resistance from the tenacious virtues of the disowned, and/or repressed culture sometimes instigates an existing inner tension, a dynamic presence that promises an eventual process of symbiosis, a potentiality that is to be preferred to what now goes under the dubious expression of globalisation.

Globalisation is a conscious project, a project not of consenting adults (or even dissenting, like reluctant lovers, one of whom, at worst, might even end up consuming the other) but, from all appearances an orgiastic, synthetic and indiscriminating affair that denies one even the consolation of recognisable distinctions in the fruits of association. It is not simply the dominance of one or the other culture, it is a motion towards sameness, where uniqueness in cultures may become atrophied, resulting in one single sub-culture, whose spores are scattered everywhere, borne on technological and economic muscle. Culture, after all, is not abstract. It is a recognisable, often palpable precipitation of a people's creative intelligence and discrimination between multiple options that can enhance leisure, environment, tastes, and social relationships. This means that we see culture manifested not only in the material world but in the sensibility of its peoples.

Let us briefly return to the theme consumption: a predisposition to consumption and acquisition is as much a yardstick of culture as the tastes that are manifested in the choice of what is actually consumed. A craving for novelty for its own sake, is as much a culturally identifying mark of a people as extreme conservatism and hostility towards novelty, and even towards the innovating intelligence. The ability to discriminate or not, is a mark of culture or the lack thereof. And thus we come to a suspect understanding of what our French maverick was protesting as he picked upon the ubiquitous presence of McDonalds, went beyond whether or not he enjoyed or despised the taste of a hamburger. What he saw was the corruption - in his view - of the tastes of his own community, the attenuation of that faculty of discrimination which commences in one aspect of human activity but soon extends to others and takes over the quality of social existence and the shaping of the human personality. I have not had the privilege of interrogating this particular individual of course, but I know I have met him, indeed that I have encountered hundreds like him - including one that I often encounter when I look in the mirror. In short, I freely confess that I have myself felt more than a passing urge to drive a bulldozer through the latest excrement of such instant gratifications of human needs, to declare war on the surreptitious encroachment of that very space of uniqueness into which one enters periodically on arriving at a new or familiar environment. And sometimes this happens even when one merely turns a corner within an environment of a life-long association, encountering, with an intense sense of wonder, a niche of altered perceptions of whose existence one had long remained unaware.

Cultural chauvinism and expansionism go hand in hand however, and an irony that was clearly lost on our warrior-protector of French purity was that the Macdonalisation of the cultural landscape of France was only a kind of poetic justice and a replay of history, with a reversal of the roles of victims and aggressors. Not that such mundane aspects of cultural life were on the minds of the poet and statesman Leopold Sedar Senghor,

Aime Cesaire and other cultural resisters of their time when they launched their combative manifesto of Negritude on the sidewalk cafes of that same France in the nineteen-thirties. Theirs was a far profounder protest, initiated within the enemy camp, of the lop-sided dialogue between France and her colonies, one that had turned the colonised African into a mere cultural appendage of France. This rejectionist response recognised more than mere pinpricks in the body of the physical landscape, but launched its combat against a comprehensive intellectual and visceral negation. Thus Negritude was compelled to commence by a strategy that, to begin with, restated African culture in contradistinction to the European. The implication of this, on the surface, was that these were two distinct, parallel cultures, with no common reference points, and this of course provoked accusations of a counter-racism levelled at these cultural nationalists, phrased more elegantly perhaps by Jean-Paul Sartre as - anti-racist racism.

But then, Jean-Paul Sartre, in this way, also articulated the prospects for a more optimistic destiny for the movement that resulted from these encounters, one whose beginnings - given its origin in an intellectual strategy of separatism - could be regarded as inauspicious. His dialectical approach - one culture as the thesis, the other as the antithesis, could only lead in one direction - a synthesis of both - and a glimpse of the universalist destiny of cultures. We need not labour too hard to determine whose culture, for Jean-Paul Sartre, was accorded the status of the *a priori* thesis - the European of course, with the African serving as the anti-thesis.- nevertheless, as a general principle that pointed the way to a common destiny for even cultures in conflict, it boded well for a harmonious resolution of dubious beginnings. In any case, Jean-Paul Sartre's eurocentric bias only formalised the „reactive“ approach that was adopted by Leopold Senghor and his colleagues in various forms. Negritude was the product of a reaction, and one can only react to what one admits as already existing. The pro-active part was however, the real heart of Negritude - an exhortation to the African and black world to

firstly take an inventory of its own values, reassess them where necessary and vigorously promote them in order to ensure that they did not remain junior partners in the inevitable dialectical process. This approach could hardly be faulted, since the conduct of Europe towards alien cultures had been, for centuries, one of denial, denigration or expropriation. And it was this renewed confidence that led to the opening out of the Arts to the experience of the world in Senghor's Senegal, most especially in the sixties and seventies, a promiscuous experimentation in the various genres - painting and sculpture, tapestry art, the cinema, theatre and dance, the last involving the cross-pollination of Senegalese traditional dance forms with the choreographic art of Maurice Bejart who spent a number of years in Senegal immersing himself in a hitherto alien artistic sensibility.

Recovering the cultural past - the primary aim of Negritude - had to come first, however, and for historical reasons. The adventurous Frobenius, for instance, not only missed, but foreclosed a unique opportunity of establishing the phenomenon of a cultural dialogue in his approach to much of the evidence of past civilisations located *in situ* during his peregrinations in West Africa. Frobenius had a choice: on observing that those particular forms of artistic production appeared to have fallen into disuse, he could investigate and explain the reasons for this loss in continuity, explanations that were overabundant in the history and changes of the economic practices and political fortunes of such communities. The other alternative, the easier one that was preferred by Frobenius was simply to deny altogether that such material evidence of a culture pertained to the cultural reality of such places, or indeed that a continuity could be found if only one looked into the other arts, mores and belief systems of such a community. He chose the latter - which was of course the easier option. Arriving in Ile-Ife where he was confronted with sculptures of both technical refinements and classical beauty, he chose to attribute such overpowering manifestations to some nomadic sophisticates who left their imprint and disappeared without a trace. If ever there was a case of a denial of the naturalness of a cultural dialogue

in historic experience, Frobenius in Yorubaland must be held to exemplify it. He preferred to formulate the vaporous thesis of a vanished civilisation of Atlantis as explanation of the remarkable artistry whose evidence was so sumptuously arrayed before him

We have moved beyond Frobenius however, and the ultimate findings are in favour of the thesis of a symbiotic, or osmotic language between cultures, even during periods of religious or political hostility, and even when we begin with the tactical articulation of a separatist identity as a means of ensuring that one culture is not overwhelmed by the aggressiveness, the economic or technological advantages of the other. There are core values in every culture that must be protected, core values that define the nature of a people's relationship to external phenomena, to the real and imagined universe, values that protect and preserve humane relationships but above all, values that acknowledge the intrinsic humanity of the individual entities that make up a community. Cultures do dialogue, but each culture must preserve the faculty of discrimination, one however that commences with an acceptance of the equality of all cultures.

Now, to accept that foundation for cultural discourse is to accept a certain profound universal responsibility, indeed, a commitment. It is to accept that while humanity is varied, it nevertheless remains indivisible. And thus, wherever we discover internal challenges, contradictions or ambiguities within a culture, or where culture is made to wear more than one face, both grounded in tradition or usage, then of course we must refer culture to some defining parameter of choice, no matter from what extremities of the globe a challenge to existing cultural claims has originated. That defining consideration goes simply thus: does the contested reading of culture serve the project of Power? Or is it allied to the humanistic imperative of - Freedom and Human Dignity? The cynical evocation of culture in the service of repressive hegemonies must never be permitted to rest unchallenged: between a cultural evocation for the

The Dialogue of Cultures

legitimation of malignant Power; and a culture that liberates and enhances humanity, there can only exist a dialogue of rejection.

On this platform primarily and ultimately, we insist, should any meaningful dialogue of cultures occur, in order to serve the humanity that produces culture in the first place, and which must in turn, be served by the product of its creative intelligence.

Olivier Blanchard

Global Markets and the Future of the State

For much of this century, there were two basic ways of organizing economic activity. One was capitalism: Relying on markets as the coordination device. The other was central planning: Relying on the state as the coordination device.

Ten years ago or so, having proven its inability to do the job, central planning disappeared from the picture and we are left with markets. Indeed, markets seem to be the run away winner, and the role of the state appears to be very much in question.

Some argue that, for the most part, the state should indeed stay out of the economic sphere. Privatize firms, they argue. Not only that, privatize highways, privatize social security, dismantle the welfare state, and, free of its shackles, the economy will soar.

Others argue that this advice misses the point. Whatever advice we give about what the state should do, this advice is becoming largely irrelevant. In fact, they argue, governments can do very little, and the trend will only get stronger. Flows of physical and financial capital can make or break governments. You have all heard and read the arguments, the slogans. Multinational companies, international speculators, U.S. pension funds rule the world, not governments.

So, what should governments do, and can they do it? These are the questions. Let me preview the answer. There is plenty that governments should and can do.

I shall proceed in three steps. Let me call them: Global markets and the importance of good governance. Global markets and the scope for redistribution. And finally: Global markets and the lessons from the Asian crisis.

1. Global markets and governance

What governments both should and can do is provide good market institutions.

This statement has long been a kind of mantra, invoked and then put aside. In economics, economists focusing on the role of institutions, such as Douglas North, were at the margin of the profession. This is no longer the case. The importance of institutions is now obvious to all.

Ironically, what has made it obvious has been the transition from central planning to market. Here were economies which were highly distorted: Prices reflected neither the forces of supply nor the forces of demand. There was no competitive pressure on firms to adapt, to improve

productivity. One would have thought that moving from such a distorted system to a market economy would produce right away an output boom. As we all know, this is not what happened.

Even in the countries which are considered today success stories, say Poland or Hungary, the start of transition triggered a sharp decrease in output. Only now, after 10 years, can we say with some confidence that these economies have a higher level of output than before the transition started. And, in other countries, the story is much worse. According to official statistics, output in Russia stands at less than 60% of its pre-transition level. This is surely an underestimate, but there is no question that there has been a substantial decline. Why?

Because, to function well, markets need market institutions, and these were just not there. If, when I lend to a firm, I am not sure I will get my money back, I will not lend in the first place. So, efficient lending requires good contract laws, good bankruptcy laws. If, as a shareholder, I cannot prevent the manager of a firm from misbehaving, from milking the firm and moving funds to Switzerland, I shall not invest and buy shares in the first place. Equity finance requires information disclosure, laws on the protection of minority shareholders, and so on. If, as the manager of a firm, I am not sure that, when I have produced a good to order, the customer will not renegotiate when the good has been produced, I will not produce the good. And so on.

Russia is a catalog of these problems. But the proposition is much more general and extends far beyond Russia. In the last decade, much work in economics has looked at the relation between institutions and growth. What has made it possible is the development of a number of surveys around the world--survey which were constructed precisely to help firms decide whether to invest in a country or not. Using these surveys, we have constructed measures of institutions, from "the rule of law" to "contract enforceability" to "corruption of government officials" to "quality of bureaucracy". There is strong evidence that these are strongly

related to growth. Our best econometric equations suggest that moving from bad to good institutions might lead to a sustained increase in the growth rate of close to 2% per year. Such econometric results should always be taken with a grain of salt. But the message is clear. Building and maintaining strong institutions is something that governments should and can do. This is job number 1. Otherwise, firms and jobs will go elsewhere.

2. Global markets and distribution

The first point was the easy one. Now to the harder one. A lot of what governments do is redistribution, from the rich to the poor, from the lucky to the unlucky. The question is: Can they continue to do it? And what happens if not?

Globalization is clearly changing the environment here. In two fundamental ways:

First, increasing competition seems to be reward skills more strongly. This is clear of the market for superstars: the relevant market for Placido Domingo is now 6 billion people, not the few millions of a few decades ago, or the few thousands of a century ago. But this is true more generally. Those with more skills are seeing an increase in their relative wage. Those with few skills are falling behind, at least in relative terms. Globalization is not the only reason, but it is an important part of the story.

Looking at the bottom of the wage distribution, this is clearly worrisome. There is nothing in the functioning of a market economy which guarantees that the workers with the fewer skills (and even more so workers with physical or mental handicaps), will earn a living wage. This means that, absent redistribution, an increasing number of workers may not have enough to live on, clearly an unacceptable social outcome.

Second, and even more ominously, globalization puts stringent constraints on how much redistribution governments can achieve. The crucial factors of production, capital, and brain power, are becoming increasingly mobile. Try to tax firms more than other countries do, and firms, or at least their headquarters, will relocate to more tax-friendly countries. Try to tax the very rich, and again, they will move to Monaco, or to Switzerland. In the limit, it would seem, there is simply no room for redistribution. Only those who need it the most, the poor, the sick, are immobile. All the others can go away when you try to tax them.

So what happens next? Do governments have to stand idle while society becomes more unequal? The answer is no.

At this point of the discussion, it is usual to introduce the distinction between social insurance and redistribution.

A pure case of social insurance is when we are all identical, and we all face the same risk, for example the risk of becoming unemployed. Then if, as is often the case, private markets do not supply this type of insurance, then the government can and should step in, and make all of us better off. Just like good institutions, good social insurance is something that governments can and should offer, even in a globalized world.

A pure case of redistribution is when some of us are rich, some of us are poor, and the government wants to redistribute from the rich to the poor. The situation is very different. The rich know who they are, and if they can move before they are taxed, they will. Redistribution is what is hard to do in a globalized world.

The distinction is useful. It suggests a clear role for social insurance, a limited role for redistribution. But the real world is more complex, for at least two reasons.

The first is that the distinction is much fuzzier in practice. There are few cases of pure social insurance. We are not all facing the same risk of unemployment. For example, I do not: I have tenure in my department.

Many of us are able to self insure, and would rather do this than pay into the unemployment insurance pool. In other words, nearly all social insurance programs have an element of redistribution. This makes it harder to run them in a globalized world.

The second reason can be seen as the reason for more optimism. In short, one should not overplay the role of mobility.

Firms, especially large ones, are indeed quite mobile. Absent coordination between countries, there may indeed be a race to the bottom. We see it with tax free zones around the world. We have seen in Ireland since the mid 1980s. We saw it in Scandinavian countries in the early 90s. But coordination between major countries may be feasible, and this is what we are observing. Corporate tax rates have substantially converged in the EU since the early 1990s, not to 0% as the pessimistic scenario would imply, but to about 35%.

People are even less mobile. There are fortunately other dimensions to life than the tax burden, and the evidence is that in Europe, labor mobility is low, within countries (much lower than within the United States), and even more so across countries. Also, people are not totally selfish, and may well be willing to pay for some redistribution. The fact that Sweden offers more protection than the UK may well come from the fact that the Swedes may be more generous than the English...

These are not just pious words and vague hopes. Europe has an amazing array of social insurance and redistribution systems. It ranges from the cradle to grave protection of Scandinavian countries, to the limited safety net system of the UK. Yet, despite the large increase in competition due to the European construction, convergence has been surprisingly small. The difference between the social protection systems in Scandinavia and the UK is smaller than it was 20 years ago. But it is still surprisingly large.

Let me summarize my second point: Globalization surely puts stringent constraints on redistribution. But there is still room for a safety net and

some redistribution. How and how much we honestly do not know. It is what governments around Europe, from Tony Blair to Lionel Jospin, are exploring, each in their own way. We shall learn from their explorations.

3. Global markets and lessons from the Asian crisis

The last set of issues is triggered by the Asian crisis. So far, I have roughly argued that responsible governments will do well in the global economy. The focus was on what “responsible” meant.

This optimism is not universally shared. One reading of the Asian crisis goes as follows: Asian governments were pursuing exactly those responsible policies, when, for no good reason, financial investors decided to pull their money out, triggering an economic collapse and suffering.

According to this view, the lesson is a sad one: Responsible policies are not enough. Governments are increasingly at the mercy of Wall Street, and of its whims. The Asian crisis is the first crisis of the 21st century. We are moving to an increasingly unstable world where markets reign, governments cannot do much, and crises are inevitable.

How much truth is there to this line of argument? There are many steps, and a bit of truth at each step. But I do not think it adds up to a solid argument. To state my conclusions simply, the Asian crisis should be seen more as the last crisis of the 20th century, rather than the first crisis of the next one.

Let me expand a bit.

True, the policies followed by Asian countries were indeed mostly responsible: In terms of the institutions I talked about earlier, these countries have put in place good, if not great, institutions. Capital is largely safe, contracts largely enforceable. Still, in crucial areas, institutions were

Olivier Blanchard

[photo documentation – not included in pdf-file]

Global Markets and the Future of the State

[photo documentation – not included in pdf-file]

weak, from banking regulation to banking supervision. And, more importantly, the financial system was fragile. Faced with an adverse shock, in this case the sudden departure of foreign capital and the sharp depreciation of their currency, many borrowers, who had borrowed in dollars, found themselves in serious trouble.

The shock however was not all due to problems with Asia, but also to problems with financial institutions on the other side of the ocean, in particular in the United States. Investment funds, which thought they were well hedged against major risks, found out that they were not. And, when the crisis started, they had no choice than to sell many of their investments, often at a large loss, amplifying the crisis.

Why go through these rather technical points? Because they suggest that the Asian crisis was not the result of globalization per se, but rather the result of insufficient foresight and insufficient regulation and supervision, both in Asia and in the United States.

The good thing about crises is that we learn from them. Investment funds, hedge funds, have learned their lessons. They do business very differently today. Countries, be it the United States or Asian countries are also thinking hard about regulation and reducing fragility. These are difficult issues, but progress has already been made. For these reasons, I am reasonably optimistic that the Asian crisis is not a signal of things to come, is not the first crisis of the 21st century.

Let me summarize. Globalization changes the role of governments. Building good institutions becomes of the essence. So is rethinking the scope for and the methods of redistribution. On both counts, there is a lot more to be done, and many complex issues of implementation to solve. But the bottom line is clear. Those governments which do well along these lines can reasonably hope for both good economic and social performance.

Oscar Arías Sánchez

Conditions for Good Governance

Good governance in the new millennium will be a challenge. There will certainly be a need for inspired leadership and competent administration in the twenty-first century, for we live in a complex and rapidly changing world. Just last month, the world's population surpassed six billion. As the number of people on the planet continues to grow, governments and international institutions will have to confront difficult environmental, social, and economic problems. And in this age of globalization, these difficulties will increasingly spill across national borders.

Indeed, despite the technological advances that we have seen in recent years, despite the economic boom that many developed countries have

experienced, despite the end of the Cold War, I tell you today that we are living in a time of crisis. I say that it is an economic crisis when nearly a billion and a half people have no access to clean water, and a billion live in miserably substandard housing. I say that it is a leadership crisis when we allow wealth to be concentrated in fewer and fewer hands, so that the world's two hundred richest individuals have assets that exceed one trillion dollars. I say that it is a spiritual crisis when – as Gandhi said – many people are so poor that they can only see God in the form of bread, and when other individuals seem only to have faith in a capricious God whose „invisible hand” guides the free market. I say that it is a moral crisis when forty thousand children die each day from malnutrition and disease. And I say that it is a democratic crisis when one point three billion people live on an income of less than one dollar per day, and in their unrelenting poverty are totally excluded from public decision-making.

To solve these complicated problems, we will have to work together as an international community to create the conditions for good governance in every country around the world.

Before proceeding any further, we must define what constitutes „good governance.” I believe that good governance occurs when political leaders insist that we grapple with the hard problems of our day. Moreover, good governance requires the responsible use of natural resources, and it requires respect for fundamental human rights. Good governance occurs when police officers effectively ensure the safety of the people, and it occurs when public officials use their positions to serve citizens rather than to enrich themselves. Good governance requires the implementation of economic and social policies that will benefit society as a whole rather than a particular social group. In short, good governance takes place when leaders confront such challenges as poverty and inequality head-on, and it is guided by a moral and ethical vision of the world as it should be.

Governing with ethical vision means engaging history, understanding past mistakes and advances, and gathering wisdom from those humanists who have come before us. We still can learn much from the sages of ancient Greece. From Plato, we know well the relentless mission of Socrates, who, he said, goes „about doing nothing but persuading you, young and old, not to care for ... money ... so much as you care for the excellence of your soul.” And even as he is sentenced to death, Socrates provides an important lesson in leadership. He tells his judges: „It is true I have been convicted for a lack; not a lack of words, but a lack of bold shamelessness – an unwillingness to say the things you would find it pleasant to hear.” How many of our leaders have the courage of Socrates, to tell people not the things they want to hear, but the truths that they need to know? How many will not speak mere pleasantries to powerful interests, but instead insist that the contemporary evils of inequality and deprivation be immediately eradicated?

Perhaps the most important prerequisite for good governance is democracy. Only democratic institutions can provide for the accountability and responsiveness that are fundamental to good governance. In non-democratic societies, good governance is rare, and it is not sustainable. While it is true that semi-authoritarian regimes have presided over dramatic economic growth in some East Asian countries, the price has been the restriction of individual freedoms which none of us would be willing to give up.

While democracy is a necessary precondition for good governance, the existence of democratic structures is not enough to guarantee responsible and enlightened leadership.

Consider the case of Russia. Less than ten years ago, we celebrated the triumph of democracy in the former Soviet Union, but today many Russians have lost faith in their new system of government. The country's leadership has been unwilling or unable to contain the power of the criminal underworld, and while some Russians have become fabulously

wealthy, the government has failed to provide for its needy citizens. While many Russians go cold and hungry, the democratically elected government is waging an expensive and bloody war in Chechnya. As poor Russians watch their standard of living fall, some long for a return to the days when they had jobs, a return to the days when there was stability. These Russians have no use for democracy. They see no evidence that democracy promotes good governance.

Consider also the case of India. With more than one billion people, India is the world's largest democracy. It has held elections regularly since it gained independence more than fifty years ago. However, democracy has not prevented the rise of fundamentalist political parties that fan the flames of sectarian hatred. Democracy has not prevented the Indian government from spending hundreds of millions of dollars on a nuclear arms program, while hundreds of millions of Indians live in abject poverty.

Finally, consider the case of Colombia. Elections have long been a fundamental feature of Colombian politics, and yet the democratically elected leadership is unable to exercise effective control over large areas of the country. Drug traffickers and guerrilla groups challenge the authority of the government, and paramilitary factions commit atrocious human rights violations with the support of certain elements in the security forces. Instability and armed conflict have forced hundreds of thousands of Colombians to flee from their homes.

The failings of the governments of these countries seem to suggest that democracy is somehow a hindrance to good governance. But democracy is not the cause of the problems of these countries. Rather, what these nations need is more democracy, not less.

Too often, democracy is discussed only in the most formal sense. People are satisfied that democracy has a place in the constitution of the state, but they do not consider that democracy can only work when all people have access to educational, financial, and economic resources. For, at its core,

democracy is a radical philosophy of civic participation. It is the faith that through public dialogue and inclusive deliberation, ordinary individuals can build ever-better systems for living together. Democracy rests on the need for all citizens, not only the most powerful, to be able to influence meaningfully the political and economic institutions that affect their lives.

In order to build inclusive, highly participatory democracies capable of good governance, we as an international community must work to expand educational programs and to reduce poverty. Around the world, nearly one billion people are illiterate and one point three billion people live on an income of less than one dollar per day. These uneducated and economically disadvantaged people will not be able to take part fully in the political life of their countries until they receive real educational and economic opportunities. Therefore, policy-makers and concerned individuals around the globe must strive to empower previously neglected communities in order to promote democracy and good governance.

I would like to suggest three areas upon which world leaders should focus in order to encourage the development of inclusive democracies. If debt forgiveness programs are expanded, if foreign aid budgets are increased, and if military expenditures are contained, then I have no doubt that opportunities for the world's poor will expand dramatically, and democracies will be strengthened as a result.

In many nations, the burden of foreign debt is a particularly serious impediment to the effective functioning of democracy. In sub-Saharan Africa, the world's poorest region, debt payments exceed public spending on health care and education by a factor of four. Consider also the case of Nicaragua, a country in which thirty-four percent of the adult population is illiterate. Last year, Nicaragua spent approximately one million dollars every day just in order to keep up with the interest payments on its foreign debt. This is a huge sum, especially considering that the total value of all goods and services produced in Nicaragua each year is only two billion dollars. The need to pay such large amounts to service the

foreign debt has crippled the Nicaraguan economy and made it extremely difficult for the Nicaraguan government to provide adequate social services. After the devastation wrought by Hurricane Mitch last year, the situation there became even more desperate.

While international institutions and some governments have recently taken positive steps to reduce the burden of debt that afflicts many poor countries, more must be done in order to allow governments to focus on developing a decent educational infrastructure. The debt relief that has been offered so far carries many conditions, and thus it has made a difference for only a small number of countries. A more thoroughgoing program of debt forgiveness will have to be launched to further self-determination and to strengthen democracy in the developing world. All that is necessary is the mobilization of political will. When East Asia faced an economic crisis in 1997, rich countries and international financial institutions raised one hundred billion dollars within a few months. The international community must show a similar level of energy in raising the much smaller sum of seven billion dollars, which would be enough to finance debt forgiveness programs in twenty African countries.

A second way in which industrialized countries can help to strengthen democracy and promote good governance in the developing world is by expanding their foreign aid budgets. At this time of unprecedented human need, the world's richest countries are allocating less money to development assistance than ever before. In real terms, foreign aid is down by almost a fifth since 1992. Donor countries provide just 55 billion dollars in development assistance, which accounts for only 0.25 percent of their combined gross national product of 22 trillion dollars.

Unfortunately, many people in rich countries see development assistance as money wasted on ungrateful foreigners. We must cultivate a new understanding of the importance of foreign aid. Development assistance is not just a form of charity. Indeed, foreign aid can help to create new investment opportunities and new trading partners. It can help to build

new friendships and alliances. It can help to contain the flow of undocumented immigrants into industrialized countries. And it can help to defuse the tensions that inevitably arise in the face of inequality. The dangerously wide gap between rich and poor that exists in the world today is perhaps best illustrated by the fact that the three richest people in the world have assets which exceed the combined gross domestic product of the world's poorest forty-three countries, which have a total population of more than six hundred million people. As a result of this high level of inequality, the West is sometimes viewed with hostility in the developing world. To people struggling to survive, Western culture might seem decadent and corrupt. However, if the world's richest countries were to make a concerted effort to improve the lives of people in the developing world, then resentment of the West would be replaced by appreciation. Former British Prime Minister Clement Attlee understood the importance of helping poor countries to fulfill their economic and human potential. He once said, „We cannot survive if we create a paradise within our frontiers and tolerate an inferno outside them.”

Finally, reducing military budgets will be essential if disadvantaged people are to be empowered to participate in the democratic process. Both in Western Europe and in many poor countries, excessive defense spending diverts resources that are desperately needed for essential social services. How many of you realize that Germany spent nearly forty billion dollars on its armed forces in 1997? Every dollar that is spent on unnecessary weapons represents a missed chance to improve the life of a person in need of food, shelter, education, or health care. At the height of the Cold War, U.S. President Dwight Eisenhower is said to have remarked, „Every gun that is fired, 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. The world in arms is not spending money alone. It is spending the sweat of its laborers, the genius of its scientists, the hopes of its children.” Without a doubt, military spending represents the single most significant perversion of worldwide

priorities known today. The 780 billion dollars spent on weapons and soldiers in 1997 constitutes a global tragedy.

In India and Pakistan, in the Middle East and sub-Saharan Africa, in Indonesia and many other nations, bloated military budgets have led to profound human suffering. Unfortunately, half of the world's governments dedicate more resources to defense than to health programs. Such distortions in national budgets contribute to poverty and retard human development. War, and the preparation for war, are among the greatest obstacles to human progress, fostering a vicious cycle of arms buildups, violence, and poverty.

The progress that could be realized if military spending were redirected is tremendous. If we channeled just forty billion dollars each year away from armies and into anti-poverty programs, in ten years all of the world's population would enjoy basic social services – education, health care and nutrition, potable water, and sanitation. Another forty billion dollars each year over ten years would provide each person on the planet with an income above the poverty line for his or her country. Shockingly, this life-giving eighty billion dollars would represent only ten percent of world defense expenditures. Truly, excessive military spending represents a lost opportunity for momentous human advancement. World leaders must accept the fact that militaristic investment is not a valid measure of national well-being, and they must embrace multilateral efforts that recognize the complex and politicized nature of contemporary security questions.

In pursuing true solutions to defense concerns, and in creating policies that will allow us to focus on human welfare, we urgently need to work together as an international community to limit the availability and spread of expensive and deadly weaponry. Did you know that Germany is the world's fifth biggest exporter of conventional arms? Between 1993 and 1997, German arms manufacturers sent more than seven billion dollars worth of weapons to foreign countries. As you know, many of the guns,

tanks, and fighters that are sent overseas end up in the hands of brutal dictators. For this reason, I have advocated an International Code of Conduct on Arms Transfers. This agreement demands that any decision to export arms should take into account several characteristics pertaining to the country of final destination. The recipient country must endorse democracy, defined in terms of free and fair elections, the rule of law, and civilian control over the military and security forces. Its government must not engage in gross violations of internationally recognized human rights. And the Code of Conduct would not permit arms sales to any country engaged in armed aggression against other countries or against its own people.

Such a Code of Conduct would allow democratic nations to provide for their own defense, but it would prevent unaccountable undemocratic regimes from squandering money on a military build-up. Considering that eighty-two percent of U.S. military exports to developing countries went to non-democratic regimes during President Clinton's first term, a Code of Conduct is desperately needed to ensure that scarce resources are directed toward human needs rather than arms purchases.

Many say that such a Code of Conduct is impractical, but I am not alone in denouncing the status quo and in supporting an International Code of Conduct on Arms Transfers. Seventeen winners of the Nobel Peace Prize have endorsed the Code. More importantly, thousands of individuals, groups, and community leaders have expressed their belief that a Code of Conduct is not only a morally sound idea, but also a politically necessary agreement. It is these people, and the force of their convictions, that turn possibility into progress, and turn impractical ideas into reality.

Within the past twenty years, democratization has transformed Eastern Europe, Latin America, South Africa, and other parts of the world. We should celebrate the victory of freedom over tyranny. But we must also remember that the emergence of democratic structures in many nations does not necessarily mean that the people of those countries are being

governed well. Democracy can only function effectively when all citizens are able to participate fully in the political process, and such participation is only possible when all people have access to educational and economic opportunities.

I argue that the richest and most powerful nations have a special responsibility to promote policies that truly empower neglected communities both at home and in the developing world. I would also like to suggest that individually, we all have important responsibilities. Those of us here today have benefited greatly from the opportunities available in democratic societies, and we must do what we can to share those opportunities with the uneducated and the poor.

In the next century, the construction of more inclusive democracies will not come easily or automatically. Governments and individuals will have to accept their obligations. Bold and imáginative leadership will be necessary. Leaders will have to have the vision and the courage to push for change. Goethe understood the need for visionary leadership. He once said, „When we treat man as he is, we make him worse than he is; when we treat him as we want him to be, we make him what he should be.”

Ultimately, in this time of crisis, it will be up to people like you and me to ensure that progress is made. Good governance will only be possible if each and every one of us is willing to make a personal commitment to improve the lives of those who are effectively disenfranchised. Let us do our part to ensure that the next century will be a time of peace and prosperity rather than a time of tension and poverty. Let us work to create hope while eliminating despair. Let us act with compassion. Let us lead the way to a brighter future.

Karan Singh

Development as a Global Agenda: Poverty as a Global Challenge

1. The twentieth century after Christ which is drawing to a close within the next few weeks has been the most astounding one in the long and tortuous history of the human race on Planet Earth. On the one hand it has seen unprecedented breakthroughs in science and technology, trade and commerce, industry and manufacturing, which have brought vast segments of the world's population to unprecedented levels of affluence. These have changed the very texture of life on earth, and the most dramatic manifestation has been the breaking of the space barrier, the

landing on the moon and the probes into the solar system and the stars beyond. The revolution continues, and the Internet is rapidly becoming the symbol of a new kind of civilisation that is developing on the planet, cutting across traditional barriers of nationality and religion, gender and generation, and knitting people together in ways and with long range implications that we are still only dimly beginning to understand.

2. On the other hand, this century has certainly been the most lethal in human history. Tens of millions of human beings have perished in major and minor wars, concentration camps and gas chambers, slave archipelagos and racial oppression; and the atomic blasts in Hiroshima and Nagasaki have become a symbol of the unimaginable destructive power unleashed by this very science and technology. The stockpiles of nuclear weapons, enough to destroy not only all human beings but all life on the planet many times over, the wanton destruction of the biosphere and pollution of the environment, the air we breath, the water we drink and the earth upon which we walk; the disappearance of thousands of species of flora and fauna; the vast areas of poverty and deprivation that exist around the world, specially in Asia, Africa and Latin America, the malign network of drugs, arms smuggling and trafficking in human beings through crime cartels whose turnover last year is estimated at US\$ 1.5 trillion; the steady stream of horror and violence in the movies and on television which is distorting the consciousness of the entire human race - all these malign manifestations have also developed in this century. The human race is suffering from a severe attack of hubris, acting as if we own the planet, mortgaging the future to the present, stealing non-renewable resources from generations yet unborn.

3. It is in this ambiguous and contradictory situation that we are meeting here in Germany, which itself has been witness to extremes both of the constructive and destructive dimensions in this century. As we transit into the next millennium, we are confronted with crucial choices for human consciousness. The stark reality of widespread poverty among at least 2

billion of the world's 6 billion population, and the fact that 10 percent of the human race has arrogated to itself 90 percent of the world's resources, stands as a cruel paradox that we have to confront. In the ancient Hindu texts there is a concept of the human race as a single, extended family – Vasudhaiva kutumbakam, and yet we have a situation where farmers are paid not to grow grain, and milk is poured down the drains at a time when millions of human beings including women and children, are on the verge of starvation. The eagerly awaited peace dividend that was expected with the end of the Cold War has failed, to materialise. The United Nations and its agencies – specially WHO, UNICEF, FAO, UNEP and others - as well as a number of NGOs and Foundations are trying desperately to bridge the gap between the affluent and the starving, but in the absence of enlightened political will and decisions by the developed countries, their efforts are unable to make an enduring impact.

4. It is true that each nation state has to set its house in order and manage its limited resources -in an efficient and effective manner. But the stark fact is that in many cases a breakthrough is simply not possible without substantial cooperation and assistance from the international community. Thus, poverty alleviation becomes a truly global challenge, and development the prime item on the global agenda as it is crucial for the abolition of poverty. In a world rapidly transiting to a global society, however, it is essential to understand and appreciate the diversity of visions and aspirations that should shape the paradigm of development. It has to be development with a human face, with social equity and economic justice, not merely quantitative economic growth without realising the calamitous impact that growing unemployment or rise in prices of essential commodities can have upon the vast submerged millions who eke out a life of utter deprivation and destitution. My appeal to the developing nations at this juncture is that in their own enlightened self-interest they must drastically change their orientation and policies to enable them to share the abundance of their resources with the developing world which many of them literally exploited during the colonial era.

Without going into statistical analysis, there are reasons to believe that at present, astonishingly enough, the flow is in the opposite direction. Debt repayment and brain drain together are empowering the developed nations to the disadvantage of the developing world, thus replicating in a new formulation the essential features of classical colonialism. It is simply not acceptable for humanity to continue in a situation where millions go without a single square meal a day, while the number of multi-billionaires grows steadily in the developed world. As Mahatma Gandhi said, there is “enough in this world for all men’s need, but not for one man’s greed”.

5. Think-tanks in the affluent societies have begun to develop the concept of ‘failed states’ and are writing off several countries of Africa and Asia with this terminology. This is unacceptable. Let us never forget that each human being on this planet, regardless of race or creed, religion or nationality, represents a unique nexus of physical, psychological and spiritual dimensions; and that in the final analysis the developed world will jeopardise its own security if it continues to ignore the less developed areas of the planet. John Donne wrote the famous words „Never send to ask for whom the bell tolls, it tolls for Thee”. The bell is tolling around the world, but we must have ears to hear. It almost seems as if the affluent nations are like the Titanic; glittering with all the latest technology and wealth, convinced that they are unsinkable, blissfully unaware that the massive icebergs of poverty and hunger are looming up in the darkness ahead. This may sound alarmist, but I would urge the distinguished thinkers from Europe and North America gathered here to ponder deeply over its possible implications. Poverty is indeed a global challenge and its alleviation must constitute the foremost item on the global agenda in the 21st century, but there must be a sense of urgency and commitment. As the Chinese saying goes, it is “later than you think”.

6. In this grim scenario my own optimism flows from a conviction that immanent in each human being is the nascent glow of potential divinity, and that fanning it into the effulgence of spiritual realisation is the highest

goal of human life. But in order to achieve this, a certain minimum level of material inputs are absolutely necessary, otherwise our world will be crowded with children born with emaciated bodies and stunted minds who will never be able to play their legitimate and creative role in ushering human civilisation on to a higher plane of consciousness. The population growth itself, which has now crossed the 6 billion mark, one billion of whom are in India, is one of the major challenges facing the human race. The planet simply cannot continue to support the present exponential rate of population growth and, howsoever unfashionable the concept may be, it is inevitable that Malthusian checks will become operative if the present trends continue. Let us never forget that the four gruesome horsemen of the Apocalypse always lurk in the wings ready to ride forth whenever conditions are conducive, and already lethal pandemics are causing untold misery and mortality around the world.

7. The creative potentialities of the human mind are astounding. We now have all the technologies and resources which, if used with wisdom and compassion, can abolish poverty and want, hunger and malnutrition, homelessness and unemployment from the face of the earth by 2020. The question is whether we collectively have the will and the wisdom to do so, or whether in our heartless hubris we will wait until the whole structure comes crashing down upon us. Implicit in the answer to this question is the future of humanity and evolution of human consciousness. Peace and conflict-resolution must be key thrust areas in the next century, otherwise human civilisation itself could well be in danger of self-destructing. In particular, it is the younger generations who have to assert themselves at this juncture because they have a greater vested interest in the future. I had the privilege of being a member of the Unesco International Commission on Education for the Twenty-first Century, chaired by M. Jacques Delors who played such a crucial role in the development of the European Union. Its report contains constructive and imaginative approaches to the whole question of lifelong education in its multiple dimensions, and I commend it to the attention of this Conference, as its

insights can be of substantial value to those of us who directly or indirectly are involved in the educational processes.

8. While a world-wide programme for developing educational policies aimed at the emerging global society is very necessary, what is really needed is a spiritual revival, and I speak not of different religions but of the golden thread that links together all the religions of humanity. As the Rig Veda said thousands of years ago “the Truth is one, the wise call it by many names”. We must move out of the mindset of exclusivism, fanaticism and fundamentalism that have wrought so much havoc and suffering on the human race for centuries, and move into a new era of Interfaith harmony and understanding. As Chairman of the Temple of Understanding, one of the most active organisations in the worldwide interfaith movement, my endeavour over the last three decades has been to bring together representatives of the world’s great religions for a meaningful dialogue to further mutual understanding. The Third Parliament of the World’s Religions being held next month in Cape Town, South Africa, is an indication that the movement is beginning to gather momentum, but it requires much more attention and support world-wide than it has received so far.

9. In addition to all the effort that needs to be made to alleviate poverty and encourage sustainable development, there is also an inner task that each one of us in our own way has to undertake, whether through the traditional methodologies of prayer and meditation, consecrated service to suffering humanity or by any other means. We have to meld together the shattered fragments of the human psyche into a harmonious whole, beginning with the constellation of our inner consciousness. We have to find within ourselves the spiritual light described by all the great religions of the world, “the light that lighteth every man that cometh into the world”, as the Bible has it, “the Ruhani Noor” of the Muslim Sufis, “the light of a thousand suns” in the Hindu scriptures, the light that is self luminous and casts no shadow. It is only if we are able to open our hearts

and minds fully to that light that it will be possible for us to move beyond the cruel contradictions of this passing century into a new dimension of sanity and harmony, as our planet hurtles headlong into the future astride the irreversible arrow of time.

Lech Walesa

The Evolution of Ethics

I have always been a man of political practice and I always present a very practical approach to anything I do. That is why I have a slightly different vision of the past and of the present situation of the world. I believe that the world was very deeply divided in the past for various reasons, and some of those divisions still remain. Africa, America and Asia developed very differently depending on the distance and on the contacts each continent had, and they followed different directions of development through revolutions, conquests and other means. In the old era, one person was an enemy or a competitor of another and in the old era people usually gained their well-being at the cost of others.

However, technological advancement is bringing us closer to one another. We can now observe errors and mistakes made in our past development. We have decided that freedom is the highest value and we defend it. However, we also realize that technological and civilizational progress forces us to adopt certain common policies towards certain issues. You know that at the beginning of the twentieth century there was no need for traffic regulations, however, had we failed to have invented them, could you imagine what life would be like now without those traffic regulations? Along the same lines, I imagine that many other issues will require the formulation of certain principles that we can follow in the next century. However, the divisions of the world have created great imbalances in its development, creating sections which we have now named the “first world“, and other parts the “second world“ and “third world“. I am very sorry that we use this term “third world“. However, we cannot negate the existence of the differences. Therefore, if we can see the differences, we can obviously see the need to adopt a different approach to slightly different worlds. The era that we are now entering will prove to us that each human being will be crucial, each will be essential to the other, and all will serve as supports to each other. Therefore, we are now entering a new era with completely different interests. And the real challenge that we face is how to overcome the old era, how to close the gap of disproportion. It is in the interest of both the first group and the third group to continue with progress, with technological development, because it will benefit all people. Thinking along these lines, we realize that with the growing globalization we will need a kind of common vision. But how can we adopt this common vision without depriving individuals of their freedom, without imposing a kind of a dictatorship? Some say that this can be based on ethics. The others say that it can be based on full democracy and full freedom.

It is not ethics that undergoes evolution, since ethics is unchangeable because it is based on fundamental and enduring values such as good, truth and justice. In fact, we are the ones changing, we are adjusting our behaviour to fit ethical categories. Once efficiency was the measure of

our political behaviour. Today, at the beginning of a new century, after the experience of two great totalitarian regimes, Nazism and communism, we have realized that human attitudes are essentially the same regarding ethics.

Now, at the end of the second millenium, the discussions we are having are due to the different totalitarian systems having collapsed. And thanks to this, we have a wonderful opportunity to establish a system that ensures us prosperous development in the future. But as to who should develop this system, so far the victorious parties in war or other superpowers have made proposals and everyone else has followed. The United States seems to be such a military, economic and informative leader in the world. However, we do not consider the United States the moral and political leader of the world. Somehow in the course of history we always seem to have been a bit delayed: We start to put out the flames once the fire is already raging. We tend to react to certain events only when forced to react to them. Isn't there an opportunity for us to foresee certain events, to foresee certain developments without depriving people of their freedom? Being a man of political practice, I think that there is such an opportunity, such a chance. How are we able to do this? We need to restructure the existing organizations or establish new ones and define the real problems that we face. It is not very appropriate for an organization like the United Nations, that came into being fifty years ago under completely different political and historical circumstances, to still be in existence, following the same rules it was established under. My suggestion is that we identify the major issues that need to be discussed and solved, and formulate a diagnosis.

Over the last twenty years I have participated in many major breakthrough events and as records are now being introduced of those processes and events, I can already see the facts being distorted. I foresee a difficult century ahead, and I want just and appropriate diagnoses to be formulated today, so that we do not make the same mistakes we made in the past. Therefore, when speaking about the end of communism, I would like to stress as a witness to the events that communism collapsed simply

for the reason that it was not a good system. Not only did it produce a lot of crime, it was a bad, inefficient system. It impeded the development of individuals and of whole nations. There were three major factors that contributed to the acceleration of the fall of communism. The first was that a Pole was elected Pope. The second was the year 1980, when Solidarity numbered ten million people, which was the best proof that those people deprived the official regime of the right to represent the working class. And the third major factor was Boris Yeltsin's attempt at withdrawing Russia from the Soviet Union. Everything else that came afterwards was a result of those three factors, such as the fall of the Berlin Wall. In the future the fall of the Berlin Wall will bring more results than the major factors I referred to. But it certainly could not have happened had it not been for these three factors. Now let us look at Gorbachev's Perestroika and Glasnost. These were simply an attempt to save communism. Just imagine what would have happened if Gorbachev had succeeded in reforming communism. Certainly the Berlin Wall would not have come down. Obviously the role that Gorbachev played was extremely positive, however, he only reacted to what he was forced to do. We need a fair diagnosis on various issues. They are crucial for us, because otherwise tomorrow we will commit more errors.

But it seems that we have reached the limits of rational analysis in the present world. The idea of progress has become irrelevant; the purpose of historical development has been questioned. However, a few simple principles have survived and they can lead us on our way into the future. Religious faith ceases to be a prejudice, as rationalists once tried to claim, becoming at the same time the guarantee of values. For we people who believe, faith has become an innate supervisor of our conscience and tells us what to say "no" to. It is a kind of a computer built into our hearts which corrects our errors and marks in red what things we have to get rid of. And in this rationalised world our conscience is precisely such a system for providing guidelines. It tells us what is good and what is wrong, what is worthy of condemnation and what is worthy of praise. Nobody has ever invented a better correctional system than ethics.

The 20th century was a century of hatred. Hatred among social classes, nations and neighbours. It was the century of the worst crimes known in human history. The very implementation of communist utopia caused the death of more than one hundred million victims. Then came the Holocaust, great exterminations and forced migrations.

If we were to characterise the 20th century we would call it the century of crime and hatred. The times of crime implied a certain approach to another human being - they implied perceiving another person as an enemy.

I am confident that the coming century will free itself from hostility. It will be a century of solidarity. People will realise that happiness and well being are not achieved at the cost of another man, but thanks to another man. People will slowly change their outlook - their hostility will evolve into friendliness. This will happen once we stop thinking in individual terms and adopt a global outlook. People must realise that Earth is the planet for us all.

What are the challenges that this new century will make us face? This new century is first and foremost characterised by globalism. The world is shrinking, not in the physical meaning of the word but for example when we look at the flow of information. Satellite television allows us to follow in real time the events happening at the other end of the world. Cellular telephones are also making the world smaller, for they help us communicate with someone in any part of the world at any time. Not to mention the Internet, thanks to which without leaving my Gdansk home I can look through the Library of the Congress or admire the masterpieces of the Louvre. Information goes beyond all borders.

Similarly, there are no borders for ecology. The Chernobyl disaster has proved to us that calamities do not need visas, nor do they care about border checking points. Moreover, American hurricanes influence the weather which has an impact on Polish agriculture. When there are forest fires in Indonesia, they are of concern to the people living in Malaya. We must realise that we are not alone, and therefore we must not be selfish.

Economy, too, goes beyond all borders. Warsaw reacts to all the fluctuations in the Tokyo stock exchange. The “Asian Tigers“ claim that their economic outcome results from the moves taken by a British banker (of Hungarian origin). Great international corporations have long grown beyond their national limits: the executive board has its headquarters in one country, shareholders live somewhere else, the factories are still in another country, and the market is somewhere else. Fibre optic cables allow billions of electronic money to be pumped from one end of the world to the other and these billions do not exist only within the computer.

All this makes us face the inevitability of globalism. Computer scientists, ecologists and economy experts can easily cope with it, however politicians find it far more difficult. As much as politician’s duties and responsibilities are of global character, their electorate is local. And politicians depend strongly on their electorate - they must flatter the electorate, care for its particular interests, because the electorate decides whether to re-elect the politician or not. Therefore, politicians hardly ever look beyond their term of office, when speaking of time, and outside their constituency, on a geographical level. However, they should be able to see at least in terms of a decade and they should have global vision.

It seems that this particular tension between the global character of challenges and the local one of references constitutes the major threat to our times, as in any situation when selfishness dominates responsibilities implied by collective coexistence. Therefore we must be aware of our responsibilities, for our continent, for our Earth - planet of the people. Selfishness in this respect will be called either ignorance or political blindness.

Challenges that we face can be met with our advanced technologies and with our democratic order. The latter suggests that we should treat all the subjects of international law equally. Traffic regulations that provide principles for road traffic do not make any exceptions. Road signs should be complied with by all vehicles, even the privileged ones. It is

unthinkable for a vehicle to be going the wrong direction on a one-way street only because of its size. We either have a law that is equal for everybody, or it is no law. The exceptions in this case do not prove the rule, on the contrary, they deny it. We must not establish laws for the bigger and more powerful. Not only because it is immoral, but also because such an approach ruins the international order. It undermines it just as a huge truck going up a one-way street undermines traffic regulations. Laws must be complied with by everybody or otherwise they stop being laws and become their own negation. I suppose that such an approach is a relic of the Cold War and clearly proves that political situations change much faster than the habits of politicians.

Can you imagine living in the 20th century following the legal regulations of the previous century? Can you imagine driving along motorways and streets without traffic regulations? It would have been unbearable. And we would find it equally unbearable if we entered the coming millennium with the burden of outdated institutions. The events in former Yugoslavia have clearly proved that we lack adequate legal regulations for defending universal values.

Almost half a century ago the United Nations, a kind of world Parliament, was established. The Parliament called to existence a form of an international government, which was the Security Council. It performed its tasks under the circumstances defined by the Cold War. In the system of two opposing blocks, after the Korean war, the Security Council was devised in such a way so as to block decisions, not to make them. The United Nations has no executive powers, nor does it have an executive body. The implementation of decisions that should be made by the UN is carried out by military organisations such as NATO. And this very Pact that is supposed to defend its own members (according to the 5th Article of the Washington Treaty) acts more and more outside its borders. I do not want to claim that NATO bombers acted for the wrong cause, however I want to prove that they should have had more clearly defined legal justification for their acts.

We should establish laws that define such activity. More and more often NATO interferes outside the borders of the Pact. The UN proves more and more ineffective. We need a new constitution for the world and once it is written I do hope that the main attitude characterising the world in the 21st century will be solidarity. "Solidarity" was the name of the trade union that as we know actually opened the way for freedom. Solidarity should thus help us face the challenge of globalization - I mean solidarity among nations, social classes and individuals. After the collapse of two major totalitarian ideologies, that of Nazism and communism, we are faced with a clean page in our history. The word that should be written on it is precisely "solidarity".

Klaus Töpfer

Mankind in the 21st Century

I was asked by the Secretary General nearly two years ago to run for this position as the United Nations Executive Director for the Environment Programme. I accepted and luckily I was elected by the General Assembly. This United Nations Environment Programme was formed some 27 years ago as a result of the institutional reaction to the Stockholm Conference on Human Environment. It was the feeling in those days that it is absolutely necessary to be aware of the fact that the repercussions of consumption and production to the environment needs coordinated action. It was also decided to headquarter this organization in Nairobi, Kenya, in

Africa. And I have to inform you that when I decided to take up my current position, there were quite a lot of good friends saying that it was very fine to be responsible for the environment policy in the world, but in Nairobi, in Kenya, in Africa? How can you handle that? Isn't it an extreme additional burden? Now I have been responsible for UNEP for some 19 or 20 months, and I can only affirm that it is the very best location you could ever have for an UN organization responsible for the environment.

If you came downtown Nairobi with me, and not only there, but in other parts of the developing world as well, you would realize that the most toxic substance in the world is poverty. And that the most challenging topic we are facing in the coming century is linked to this question: How can we overcome poverty without damaging our national environment, without creating another burden for coming generations, making it almost impossible for them to solve these problems. And incorporating social justice in this world as well. The second United Nations Conference, 20 years after Stockholm, was the well known Earth Summit in Rio 1992. The title was changed because it was not the second United Nations conference on the Human Environment, it was the United Nations Conference on Environment and Development. It was the first time and the first signal for the developing world, that environment cannot be misused by the industrialized countries as a barrier for the development of developing countries. Knowing, as was mentioned by Indira Gandhi in 1972 in Stockholm, that the welfare of the developed countries today is linked with externalized costs which are now blocking the development of the poorer countries.

Some days ago we delivered the UNEP Global Environment Outlook for the year 2000. I want to tell you some facts which underline very well that environmental problems are first of all connected with the poverty of the absolute majority of the population in the world. Second, environmental problems are also a consequence of overconsumption and

lifestyle of the minority of this world. Third, environmental problems and poverty in the developing countries are to some extent the reaction to the externalized costs in the developed countries. Two weeks ago, the fifth Conference of the Parties to the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change was held here in Bonn. The majority of scientists integrated in the so called IPCC process, the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change, is convinced that the massive emission of greenhouse gases, mainly of CO₂ and others, are responsible for a climate change creating a warming of our planet leading to abnormal weather conditions, an increase of thunderstorms and natural disasters. We just saw an example of these consequences and the associated human tragedy caused by the recent cyclone in India. There is a high probability that the abnormal weather conditions will continue, recur more frequently and that this global process step by step will have other repercussions as well. Most are convinced that we have to act. Our Global Environment Outlook Report proves that the emissions of CO₂ are going to increase. So far emissions have increased from five billion tons in 1950 to 25 billion tons today. It's very easy to give some additional indicators: In 1950 on this wonderful blue planet earth we had 40 million cars, now we have 680 million. Therefore, we have to ask ourselves why the people are not acting. One of the reasons is that those being responsible for the mitigation are unluckily not the ones suffering from being idle. In other words: The impacts are being felt in other parts of the world than where they are produced. It is extremely clear that those regions where the poorest of the poor live and where the increase in population is the highest will suffer most from the warming process. That's why the stimulation for action is quite low. The problems caused by the emissions are externalized. It is very easy to explain to all our economists that where we don't have any property rights we have a high probability for externalization. In Kyoto member states agreed to a protocol which gives more and new property rights in order to allow trade. It is obvious that we can only trade with something we have an ownership for. This is a

huge problem in itself and I don't want get too detailed. This topic proves that we have to find the solution to avoid the regionalization of the advantages of technological progress and a globalization of the disadvantages. Quite a lot of developing countries gave me the clear signal that it is not fair that this release is something like a debt for them, that they have to pay this debt on ecological and environmental costs which are transferred to them and that it is high time that we have to pay for that debt release. Of course I can only refer to what was said under those circumstances for good governance, but it must be absolutely clear that the externalization on a global level brings the basis for tension.

This is my next example, by the way I have only mentioned one and I could mention more. We try to echo to those externalizations by making the conventions and protocols legally binding to fight and to make others responsible for their action. We have the Basel Convention to prevent the export of hazardous waste. For a long time it was common behaviour to export the negative side of positive development, to bring the hazardous waste of developing countries where they could not be handled and where they are a risk for environment and especially for mankind and health. This Basel Convention will have its tenth anniversary already in December this year. In an evolving world we must be aware of the fact that there are interrelations and new challenges: Now we have an additional problem of export of products related to hazardous waste. We are now negotiating a new convention on, the so called persistent organic pollutants, we call them the dirty dozen of the chemical production, PCB, dioxin and others. Our problem and our risk is by banning those chemicals, we will have an increase in the export of those products. Where we have existing PCB stocks in these countries there will be a lot of problems linked with their safe handling. It will be the same with the pesticides. I hope that in the new century we will be aware of these interrelations. We also have to internalize the costs of the well-being in the developed countries.

This is not a resignative approach, as I mentioned I studied economics, and I always learned that technology is never coming like manna from heaven, but that technology is always stimulated by markets to overcome bottlenecks. As long as we don't have those bottlenecks, I cannot expect that new technologies will be generated. I am absolutely sure that the calculations now made, especially in the United States, about the costs of acting against global warming are absolutely overestimated: At the very moment you really start to act, you will have a technical process and you will decrease the costs. I was responsible for the environment in this country when we had to fight against the SO₂ problem. At the very beginning of the public dispute on dying forests and acidification, our position was to decrease the emission of one ton of SO₂ from our coal power stations was extremely expensive, because until then nobody had asked for a decrease, so there was no technology available. In the very moment where we decided to do something, this decision stimulated a very dynamic process of technological change. If you compare the decrease costs for a ton of SO₂ today with the costs of those days, you will find a completely different dimension. And therefore I believe that it is not a negative, resignative message, it is a message of honesty, a message that avoids conflicts, a realistic message.

Wherever you have the problems of a beggar-my-neighbour policy, you cannot be surprised that the beggar wants to fight against the one who is giving him the problem. The river Rhine is a good example. Our Dutch colleagues downstream suffered until we implemented very clear and very tough limits concerning the pollution of water from our chemical industry. The Dutch had big problems in the port of Rotterdam and they had to invest huge sums to clean the water. They could not use the water because it was contaminated by us upstreamers. The problem of the upstreamers and the downstreamers always exists. And there we have a third example where environment policy is much more than being responsible for diversity, for the stability and the honest preservation of the creation of God. There is a need to use them as efficiently as possible

so that the people downstream, be it on river, be it on soil, be it with regard to the development of desertification linked with climate change, are convinced that they have not to pay what others are asking for their living standards. Therefore, I believe in the future. This century to come will be the century of environment, because if we want to have a peaceful development on this planet, we must avoid these threatening tensions. In UNEP we decided to have a Division of Assessment and Early Warning, because we urgently need the develop vulnerability indices, vulnerability information in the world. We have to have early information about where conflicts and tension with regard to the use of national resources are expected. It is well known that this has already been discussed already with regard to water, I mentioned the river Rhine, luckily I think we succeeded there. But if you go to Bangladesh, the delta country number one in the world, huge challenges in water management still lie ahead. We have the same situation in quite a lot of other river systems, and again, it is not only water, it is the same with soil and other areas.

Environment is a very important pillar of the peace policy of the future. We need new disarmament instruments, new instruments of cooperation in the use of limited national resources and in stimulating those bottlenecks which in the future can challenge science and technology to respond. To challenge our university students and to stimulate questions as to whether we have the correct consumption structure and lifestyle behaviour. If we cannot do this early enough, we will have to pay later. Questions must be asked on the liberalization of trade and the link of trade and environment. We have to discuss how exactly we can avoid that by liberalization, which is urgently needed to overcome poverty, the gap between rich and poor becomes bigger and the repercussions of the environment more important. I am again far from resignating, I am absolutely sure that we have to play a very vital role in making the framework conditions to implement the Agenda 21, thinking in trade and environment, being mutually supportive. I believe that this is possible. But we must be aware of the position of those believing that without a

common approach to the environment we will have something like an environment dumping on the open market, giving the ones with lower standards better access to markets. On the other side there are those believing that these standards are only developed to encourage non-tariff trade barriers and to hinder the poor to develop. They know about the extremely high subsidies for agriculture in the developed countries for example, to protect the one or the other market. So there are lots of those disarmament instruments for the future, and we need them urgently.

Last month we passed the six billions of inhabitants of this blue planet earth. The sixth billion person was a little baby in Sarajevo. Between the fifth billion and the sixth billion, only 12.5 years passed. But it took 124 years from the first to the second billion. It was also mentioned that year by year we have an increase in the population of some 80 million. It is necessary and important to be aware not only of these facts, but also of the consequences of these facts. Another important factor is the regional distribution. The increase rate of the population in Europe is next to zero, in the Western European countries it is 0.02, in the Eastern European countries it is even -0.3. And when you look at this development, it is again linked with the problem of poverty. I always underline a couple of figures, which I believe are extremely eye-opening: In the year 1950 the population of Africa was one third of the population of Europe. Now, in 1999, the population of Africa is a little bit higher than that of Europe. And in the year 2050 the population of Europe will be one third of the population of Africa. There is a huge regional discrepancy behind these figures.

We must also be aware that of those 80 million extra inhabitants every year some 60 million net will be in our big conurbations. The urbanization process in the next decades and years will continue of an extremely high rate. The increase of urbanization which in Asia is now already going up to 80% with conurbations of 20 to 25 million inhabitants. I am sure that a successful peace policy in the future will

depend of the possibility or impossibility to handle those urbanization processes. How can we handle this urbanization process? Where are the soft technologies of administration and where are the hard technologies from economics knowing that these urban areas will be the centre of economic development? The GNP of Thailand is based upon 40% contribution from Bangkok. If we cannot overcome the diseconomy of urbanization we will not be able to develop. We need more research and more implementation in this area. UNEP and HABITAT are glad that the German government will organize the conference Urban 21 next year in Berlin. This topic is very important, because we know that this is also a decisive point for freedom, peace and stability of societies on a regional basis. Last year's world Habitat day was linked with the headline slogan „Safety in Cities“. You must know that the security in cities is becoming a private good that we have to pay for. If you come to the city where I have the honour to live, safety is already a private good. We have to discuss what is the precondition, how we have to change city structures, if we have to rely on the chaos theory? This cancerenious growth of cities has already lead to divided. Socially very often we have two cities in one. But sustainable development can only be reached in sustainable cities.

And last, but not least, we have to do whatever is possible to avoid that globalization goes hand in hand with uniformity. I think one of the main challenges in front of us is to combine globalization with diversity. With diversity, with regional identity, without a nationalistic or chauvinistic view. How can we avoid that in global markets, in global information communication technologies the regional identities vanish? And by the way this is again directly linked with nature. We just published a very important book, „Cultural and Spiritual Values of Biodiversity“. It is extremely intersting to see that nature and culture are directly correlated. I always quote one statistic: We came to the conclusion that at present there are more than 6400 different languages in this world, 2800 of which are on the red list of endangered languages. If you look at the interrelation with biodiversity, you will find that it is exactly the same.

There is a need to combine these topics: globalization, diversity and identity. From architecture to spiritual values diversity should be built in and recognized. For the same reason I decided not to demolish old buildings for the government in Berlin and replace them with new ones for the government, but to use existing buildings. The city you can see is a mirror of time, a background for the history around you. We must be aware of this stabilizing factor, which is neither nostalgic nor emotional, and the role it plays in urban life. It is a clear lesson that we learned from nature. Wherever you lose diversity, you increase instability. It is an important and challenging part of the work of the United Nations, our friends in UNESCO, our friends in development programmes to ensure that when the UN contributes to the life of people, we are doing more than only economic development, we are also doing something for the stabilization of their society and for the precondition of peace in the future. Therefore, I want to echo what my dear colleague, Mary Robinson, mentioned: Human rights are linked with overcoming poverty in a diversified world.

Contributors

Oscar Ariás Sánchez, President of Costa Rica from 1986 to 1990 and Nobel Peace Laureate of 1987, holds international stature as a spokesperson for the Third World. Championing such issues as human development, democracy, and demilitarisation, he travelled the globe spreading a message of peace and applying the lessons garnered from the Central American Peace Process to topics of current global debate. Dr. Arias studied Law and Economics at the University of Costa Rica. His thesis, „Grupos de Presión en Costa Rica” earned him the 1971 National Essay Prize. In 1974, he received a doctoral degree in Political Science at the University of Essex, England. After serving as a Professor of Political Science at the University of Costa Rica, Dr. Arias was appointed Costa Rican Minister of Planning and Economic Policy. He won a seat in Congress in 1978 and was elected secretary-general of the National Liberation Party in 1981.

Olivier Jean Blanchard is Professor of Economics and Chairman of the Economics Department at the Massachusetts Institute of Technology (MIT). Professor Blanchard studied economics and obtained a PhD from MIT in 1977. Since then he has been teaching at Harvard University as Assistant, Associate and a Visiting Taussig Professor. Between 1983 and 1985 he taught as Associate Professor and since 1985 he is teaching as a Professor at the MIT. His field of work is Macroeconomics. Within this field Professor Blanchard has published widely and holds several positions and memberships, e.g. as a „Membre du Conseil d`Analyse Economique aupres du Premier Ministre”, Paris, and in the Advisory Board at the Center for Economic Policy Research, London.

Mary Robinson, President of Ireland from 1990 to 1997, is the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights since 1997. She holds the principal responsibility for the human rights activities of the United Nations, including the task of streamlining the human rights machinery throughout the UN system as well as supervising the Centre for Human

Rights in Geneva. Mrs. Robinson studied at Trinity College, Dublin University and received a Master of Arts degree in 1970. In 1967 she received a Barrister-at-Law degree from King's Inns. Between 1969 and 1975 Mrs Robinson taught as a Reid Professor of Constitutional and Criminal Law at Trinity College, where she also was a Lecturer in European Community Law. Mrs Robinson has outstanding legal qualifications and has worked in the area of human rights with special expertise in constitutional and European human rights law.

Karan Singh was appointed Regent of Jammu and Kashmir by his father in 1949. Thereafter he was head of the Indian State of Jammu and Kashmir for eighteen years. Dr. Singh studied Political Science and received a Master of Arts degree at the Delhi University in 1957, where he also received his doctoral degree. For many years, he was Chancellor of Jammu and Kashmir University as well as Benaras Hindu University. In 1967 he was the youngest person ever to become a Central Cabinet Minister in India. In 1973 Dr. Singh moved to the Ministry of Health and Family Planning. In 1979 he assumed the portfolio of Education and Culture, both as minister. Dr. Singh holds several positions and memberships e.g., President of the Authors Guild of India, President of the India International Centre, Chairman of the Auroville Foundation with a personal rank of Cabinet Minister, member of the UNESCO International Commission on Education for the Twenty-First Century as well as member of the Club of Rome and the Club of Budapest. Dr. Singh has published widely on the issues of Political Science and Philosophy, has published poetry and received several honorary degrees.

Wole Soyinka who received the Nobel Prize for Literature in 1986, is Woodruff Professor of the Arts at Emory University, Atlanta. Wole Soyinka was educated in Nigeria and England, where he obtained an honours degree in Literature. Dr. Soyinka has held Fellowships and Professorial positions at African, American and European Universities. He has been honoured with several doctorates by the Universities of Leeds, Manchester, Yale, Harvard, Emory, Morehouse College,

Toronto, Paul Valery and Bayreuth. Wole Soyinka has also received many civic honours and artistic recognitions, e.g. Commander of the Legion of Honour, France and the UNESCO Medal for the Arts. From 1967 to 1969 he was imprisoned during the Nigerian Civil War, most of it in solitary confinement. Essentially a playwright, Dr. Soyinka is active as essayist, poet, novelist and theatre director.

Klaus Töpfer is the United Nations Under-Secretary-General and Executive Director of the United Nations Environment Programme as well as Director-General of the United Nations Office at Nairobi and Acting Executive-Director of the United Nations Centre for Human Settlements. Prof. Töpfer graduated from the University of Münster and received a diploma in Economics. In 1968 he obtained a doctoral degree in Philosophy. Between 1971 and 1978 Prof. Töpfer served as the head of the Department for Planning and Information in the State Chancellery of the Saarland. In 1978/79 he taught as a Professor at the University of Hanover, between 1978 and 1985 he served as State Secretary at the Ministry for Social Affairs, Health and Environment of Rhineland-Palatinate. Between 1987 and 1994 Prof. Töpfer acted as the Federal Minister for the Environment, Nature Conservation and Nuclear Safety. Afterwards he served as the Federal Minister for Regional Planning, Building and Urban Development until 1998. Dr. Töpfer has been a member of the German Bundestag (CDU) between 1990 and 1998.

Lech Walesa, President of Poland from 1990 until 1995, is the founding father of Solidarnosc. In 1978 with other activists he began to organise free non-communists trade unions. He was kept under surveillance by the state security service and frequently detained. In 1981 he was elected Solidarity Chairman at the first National Solidarity Congress in Gdansk. General Jaruzelski imposed martial law in December 1981. In 1983, Lech Walesa was awarded the Nobel Peace Prize. It took six more years until Solidarnosc was legalized in 1989. In 1990 he won the first free presidential elections in post-communist Poland. Walesa's contributions to the end of communism in Europe stands besides those of his compatriot

Pope John Paul II. He still is the symbol of Solidarnosc. Walesa has been granted many honorary degrees from universities, including Harvard University and the University of Paris. Other honors include the Medal of Freedom (Philadelphia, USA); the Award of Free World (Norway); and the European Award of Human Rights.

Center for Development Research (ZEF)

Short Information

The Center for Development Research (ZEF) is a major scientific institute of the Rheinische Friedrich-Wilhelms-University Bonn. The decision to establish the ZEF, together with its sister Institute Center for European Integration Studies (ZEI) within the University of Bonn, is closely connected with the German federal government's broader goal of developing Bonn into a worldwide-acknowledged center for scientific research and development policy. The ZEF serves both of these purposes. The ZEF is an international, interdisciplinary research institute that contributes to resolving global development problems. It actively supports interdisciplinary collaboration. The goal of development research at ZEF is to contribute tangibly to sustainable development and the reduction of absolute poverty. With its international staff, the ZEF addresses global and regional development issues, transition economies and development aid and manages the research foci and projects relating to them. The scientific staff is composed of national and international guest scholars, post-doctorate researchers and doctoral candidates, who are recruited to work on specific issues for a limited period. At any given time, approximately 50% of the staff is non-German. The ZEF takes special interest in offering junior scientists from developing countries advanced scientific training in the ZEF-doctoral studies program, where all teaching and dissertations are in English language. The ZEF closely co-ordinates its research activities with its national and international partners. Collaboration with outstanding scientists from research centers in developing countries plays a central role. Scientists and researchers from universities near Bonn and from other western research centers (EU and North America) are also ZEF partners. Ideally, both private and government institutions involved in development co-operation derive benefits from ZEF activities. Other ZEF partners are various multilateral organizations, as well as national and international non-governmental

organizations. The ZEF maintains an ongoing dialog with representatives from politics and economics through national and international conferences and workshops. In this way, ZEF ensures that its research is both policy-oriented and timely, and that it addresses specific future development issues. In this context, two separate activities were initiated in 1998. The „Bonner Entwicklungspolitischer Dialog“ (Bonn dialog on development policy) is a series of lectures and panel discussions in which prominent guests present their views and visions regarding development issues. The ZEF Research Seminar is a scientific colloquium that identifies and discusses current issues in development research.

Directors:

Prof. Dr. Joachim von Braun

Prof. Dr. Paul Vlek

Prof. Dr. Andreas Wimmer

Center for European Integration Studies (ZEI)

Short Information

Founded in 1995, the Center for European Integration Studies (ZEI) is an independent research institute of the Rheinische Friedrich-Wilhelms-University in Bonn. The work of ZEI contributes to the solution of the problems of European integration and Europe's role in a global context through future-orientated research work, sound policy advice, fruitful dialogue between researchers and decision-makers, and innovative concepts in postgraduate education and continuing education. The work of ZEI integrates legal, economic and social, cultural and political issues in an interdisciplinary context. ZEI offers academics as well as policy-makers, representatives of businesses, and lobbyists an international forum for discussion of all aspects of European integration. ZEI currently has an international academic and professional staff of 50 people, and works in close cooperation with partners all around the world. ZEI's research topics cover medium and long-term issues connected with the process of European integration and enlargement. The research program is conducted in interdisciplinary research groups and is flexible, demand-driven and practically orientated. High-calibre speakers from academia, politics, diplomatic circles and journalism present their views on European issues and discuss their ideas with experts and interested members of the public at lectures, international conferences and workshops initiated and organized by ZEI on a regular basis. The research work of ZEI is complemented by regular meetings of selected experts from Germany and abroad, who devise strategies and recommendations on specific issues. ZEI attaches particular importance to its advanced and continuing education program. Lecturers recruited from around the world teach international, interdisciplinary training courses and advanced study programs to prepare a new generation of academics for the challenges of a united Europe. Supported by the Foreign Office of the Federal Republic of Germany and the "Donors' Association for the

Promoting of Sciences and Humanities in Germany” ZEI conducts the one-year interdisciplinary post-graduate program „Master of European Studies“. ZEI’s library collects monographs and journals on all European issues. The latest information technology and research tools and a well-equipped reading room enable interested visitors to investigate current European developments on site and in a pleasant environment. ZEI records the results of its work in various publications, including its own series of publications. ZEI closely cooperates with the Center for Development Research (ZEF). The two centers together constitute the International Academic Forum Bonn (IWB).

Directors:

Prof. Dr. Jürgen von Hagen

Prof. Dr. Christian Koenig

Prof. Dr. Ludger Kühnhardt

Bundesstadt Bonn
Federal City of Bonn

ZEF
Zentrum für Entwicklungsforschung
Center for Development Research
Rheinische Friedrich-Wilhelms-Universität Bonn

ZEI
Zentrum für Europäische Integrationsforschung
Center for European Integration Studies
Rheinische Friedrich-Wilhelms-Universität Bonn

ISSN 1435-3288

ISBN 3-933307-69-4

Walter-Flex-Straße 3
D-53113 Bonn
Germany

Tel.: +49-228-73-1880
Fax: +49-228-73-1788
<http://www.zei.de>