



# The World Political Forum

Founding Conference  
(Turin, 19/20 May 2003)

## INDICE

<b>MESSAGGI DI ADESIONE</b> .....	2
<b>M.S. Gorbachev, President WPF</b> .....	5
<b>Gyula Horn, Former Prime Minister of Hungary</b> .....	10
<b>Boutros Boutros-Ghali, Former Secretary General of the United Nations</b> .....	12
<b>Bono, rock star, leader of the group "U-2"</b> .....	14
<b>Toshiki Kaifu, Former Prime Minister of Japan</b> .....	17
<b>Gianni De Michelis, Former Italian Minister for Foreign Affairs</b> .....	18
<b>Marshall Goldman, Political scientist</b> .....	21
<b>Keba Mbaye, former Vice President of the International Court of Justice</b> .....	25
<b>Hans Dietrich Genscher, Former Minister for Foreign Affairs of Germany</b> .....	26
<b>Emilio Colombo, former Italian Prime Minister</b> .....	28
<b>Robert Skidelski, Member of the House of Lords, Professor of Political Economy at Warwick University</b> .....	30
<b>Giulio Andreotti, Senator and former Prime Minister of Italy</b> .....	33
<b>Federico Mayor Zaragoza, Former General Director of UNESCO</b> .....	35
<b>Jian Mingjun, President of China Association for the Promotion of International Technology and Economic Cooperation in North-East Asia and President of the United Nations Development Programme</b> .....	37
<b>Rudolph Schuster, President of the Slovak Republic</b> .....	39
<b>Georgi Parvanov, President of Bulgaria</b> .....	40
<b>Alexandre Bessmertnykh, former Minister for Foreign Affairs of the Soviet Union</b> .....	41
<b>Benazir Bhutto, former Prime Minister of Pakistan</b> .....	44
<b>Wojciech Jaruzelski, Former President of Poland</b> .....	46
<b>Jacques Delors, former President of the European Commission</b> .....	49
<b>Jack Matlock, former U.S. Ambassador to the USSR</b> .....	52
<b>Milos Zeman, former Prime Minister of the Czech Republic</b> .....	54
<b>Inder Kumar Gujral, former Prime Minister of India</b> .....	56
<b>Klaus Naumann, former Chairman of the North Atlantic Military Committee</b> .....	60
<b>Tadahiro Sekimoto, Chairman of the Institute for International Socio-Economic Studies</b> .....	64
<b>Antje Vollmer, Vice-President of the German Bundestag</b> .....	66
<b>Morimasa Goya, Chairman of the Kanehide Group and Board Member of UNESCO</b> .....	68
<b>Mons. Andrea Cordero Lanza di Montezemolo, Archbishop and Apostolic Delegate – Vatican</b> ...	69
<b>Francesco Cossiga, Senator, Former President of the Italian Republic</b> .....	71
<b>M.S. Gorbachev, President of the World Political Forum - Conclusions</b> .....	74

## MESSAGGI DI ADESIONE

Message by His Holiness the Pope, **John Paul II**

Most illustrious Mr Mikhail Gorbachev

Occasion: inaugural meeting in Italy of the World Political Forum, aimed at the analysis of possible future perspectives for the development of a new society based on co-operation and mutual respect among all peoples.

The Supreme Pontiff extends His greetings and wishes every success to the speakers, the experts and all the participants in the meeting, hoping that the works planned for this conference will contribute to the support of specific initiatives for the promotion of human dignity and rights and the understanding among peoples, based on right reason and the eternal values inscribed by God in the nature of every human being. The Holy Father is glad to give you His warm greeting and blessing, as a sign of His esteem and benevolence.

Cardinal Angelo Sodano  
Secretary of State of His Holiness.

**Silvio Berlusconi**, Italian Minister of Foreign Affairs

Dear President,

I considered with great interest the contents of the initiative about which you kindly informed me with your letter of August 9<sup>th</sup>.

I'm persuaded that those who deal with international issues, whether with government responsibilities or state functionaries, must be able to count on a solid intellectual basis of reference as well as on the strong participation of civil society.

The institution of the Foundation Forum for a culture of independence fully corresponds to this twofold demand, as the regional and local realities play a fundamental role in it together with eminent international personalities. Furthermore, the Foundation is planning the constitution of a Research Institute capable of elaborating the contents and concrete proposals of a foundation that does not intend to be just a seat for high-level debate, as its presentation clearly shows.

The international context does indeed offer many occasions for debate. What is totally non-existent is a channel to connect three different levels: a strong ethical inspiration towards the major problems of humanity, professionally elaborated ideas

and a policy able to find realistic applications by means of national as well as international mechanisms.

As the Foundation's aim is so ambitious, it is important not to neglect the fundamental aspect of the resources needed to turn this plan of high intellectual and civic profile into a real capacity to express an internationally authoritative and incisive voice and a global point of reference.

On this point, I think that the identification of substantial and consistent sources of financial support is essential to ensure the success we wish for this project, (from which our country would gain an important political-intellectual impetus, together with gratifying visibility), particularly if we realistically consider the limitation of public resources. For this reason, I am sure the early involvement of the Bank Foundations in the initiative is an appropriate and promising decision.

I am convinced that the commitment of Piedmont Region and the Province of Alessandria, together with the location of financial support, constitutes an excellent omen for a quick start for the work of the Foundation.

On my behalf, I can assure you that the Ministry of Foreign Affairs will give every possible support, also concerning possible forms of collaboration with the Foundation's research institute.

My best wishes,

Silvio Berlusconi

**Sergio Chiamparino**, Mayor of Turin

It is an honour for Turin to host this Founding Session of The World Political Forum. I would like to welcome in particular the many political and cultural personalities who in dramatic and contradictory phases of our world's history – some of them even in recent times – have been able to hold their positions being always inspired to the principles of coexistence and tolerance and so to peace. In difficult situations, politics can not always do what it would like to. But it does what is within its possibilities, and often being able to do to the best what is possible is already a great achievement.

Turin is particularly glad to host this Founding Session of The World Political Forum, after the Establishment meeting about one year ago in Bosco Marengo, above all because this is a city with a true international calling. Many institutions, from the United Nations to the EU, have in fact one of their seats in Turin and run their activities here. I would like to recall, in particular – partly because it received much attention during the recent Johannesburg meeting on the world environment – the School of Water that we have opened in collaboration with Turin University, the ILO and local institutions. Using our experience and expertise in technology and education in all areas that regard the use of water, we have designed training courses

for people from developing countries, where the correct use of water is one of the basic conditions to support their growth.

Your work today enriches Turin's international vocation, leaving our city important elements of political, cultural and scientific reflection. I thank you again for being here and hope you will enjoy your work for the Forum.

**Oscar Luigi Scalfaro**, Senator and Former President of Italy

It is with great pleasure, dear President Gorbachev, that I receive your invitation to the inaugural conference of The World Political Forum, an initiative I personally deem as particularly important in a political arena still wounded and shocked by the divisions and arguments brought about by the war in Iraq. We still firmly intend to fight against terrorism, but not through wars which involve entire innocent nations.

I express all my support for this important meeting, which I hope will be useful and successful.

My kindest regards,

Oscar Luigi Scalfaro

Lord Dahrendorf, **Sociologist, philosopher and former EU Commissioner**

I much regret that parliamentary duties in the House of Lords make it impossible for me to attend the foundation meeting of the World Political Forum. President Gorbachev's initiative is very timely and welcome. Had I been able to come, I would have emphasised above all the need to advance the Rule of Law on the global scene. The coming decades may well see a struggle between those who wish to exercise their power without any fetters and those who seek rules, which domesticate and civilize the exercise of power. The World Political Forum can contribute to defining the rules, which should form the foundation of a new international order, and to preparing the ground for its creation. I hope to be able to make my own modest contribution to this and future meetings.

Lord Ralf Dahrendorf

**M.S. Gorbachev, *President WPF***

I would like to welcome all the distinguished participants in the Founding Conference, as well as our guests and, right at the outset, let me express my gratitude to our Italian friends for their intellectual contribution to the preparation of the forum and their tremendous organizing efforts, and in particular to the regional authorities and to the Italian government for their attention and support.

It is natural that Italy has become the birthplace of this unique, wide-ranging and unprecedented project. This country is a meeting point of the European and the Mediterranean cultures, between the Balkans and the Middle East, between the Christian and Muslim worlds, and this is what makes Italy likewise unique, because we are meeting at the crossroads.

I am very grateful to all participants in the Founding Conference, to those who responded to my invitation and have arrived here to found the Forum, sharing my concern for today's world, but above all for the world of tomorrow. There is no denying that we share a common responsibility for its future, because all those who have come here today have, both on their own and, often, working together, contributed to ridding the world of ideological confrontation and of the real threat of a devastating nuclear conflict.

Many other political leaders have given their agreement to join the Forum as founding members or wish to attend and take part in the work of the Forum's next first session, which will be held in autumn. Among them there are President Clinton, Cardoso, the former President of Brazil, the Chairman of the Standing Committee of the National People's Congress of China, Li Peng, President Nursultan Nazarbayev of Kazakhstan, President Rudolph Schuster of Slovakia, the former President of the Republic of Korea Kim Dae Jung, the former President of Finland Mauno Koivisto, the former German Chancellor Helmut Kohl, the former Australian Prime Minister Frazer, the Prime Minister of Lithuania Algirdas Brazauskas, the President of the Autonomous Region of Catalonia Mr Pujol, the former Portuguese President Mario Soares, the Nobel Prize Laureate Archbishop Desmond Tutu, the former Managing Director of the International Monetary Fund Michel Camdessus, the former Prime Minister of Israel Shimon Peres, and the former Prime Minister of France Michel Rocard.

I have named many of them but not all, because the list goes on. And let me also note that the possibility to join the Forum as founding members is still open.

Dear friends, we have met here today because of our common concern for the world's future. When two years ago we began to think over the idea of the World Political Forum, we could not imagine that future events would confirm so clearly and so painfully that we were right in expressing our concern over the fact that the course of international events was becoming chaotic, alarming. I should even say dangerous, and politics was substantially losing control over events. We are now facing an evident crisis in world politics. The decades of the cold war have been followed by numerous conflicts and "hot wars", that violence, first of all in the form

of terrorism, which mars international relations, and war is once again used as a readily available tool of international politics.

We have to note that international organizations, conceived as arbiters of international relations and plenipotentiary representatives of the emerging international community are now in crisis, a crisis brought about by their ineffectiveness in facing new realities. One could say, of course metaphorically, that after the Twin Towers of the World Trade Center, the building of the United Nations in New York has almost been destroyed in the wake of September 11 and, of course, of the Iraqi crisis.

While the UN charter does not prohibit the use of armed force, it is considerably restricted by it. Force has now been used in violation of international law, while preventive diplomacy, meant to prevent conflicts, is being replaced by the doctrine and practice of preventive war, meant to remove perceived threats. It should be clear, however, that exclusive reliance on the use of force ignores the extreme complexity of the roots of age-old conflicts and reflects a simplistic approach to a multi-faceted reality.

This perspective generates a pessimistic view of the contemporary world – a view that we do not share. We start from the conviction that history cannot be, and is not, preordained. In every kind of situation there is always room for initiative, and this presupposes the need for political action, not only by politicians, but also by civil society, organizations and movements.

We reject pessimism in evaluating our current and future possibilities because pessimism could result in an irreconcilable conflict between civilizations from which no modern armament could save us – something that would become the living evidence of a historic failure of politics and politicians.

All that I have just briefly outlined places a heavy burden on international politics, which is already subjected to extreme pressure as a result of uncontrolled processes of globalisation.

Let me mention only the most dangerous challenges, the global ones, which the world is facing in the third millennium. The greatest of them used to be the threat of nuclear war, which put in jeopardy mankind's future and in fact its very survival. Today, we are witnessing changes in the global environmental balance, the dissolution of the tacit covenant of peaceful coexistence between man and nature, and this has caused a world-wide transformation: in the interdependent world of today, linked by modern means of communication and transport, a local fire, a problem such as AIDS or SARS, can spread with the speed of lightning everywhere. There are also dramatic problems, first of all poverty and often hunger of billions of people that can no longer be considered national problems or even regional calamities. Finally, there is the need to manage globalisation, since the spontaneous processes set off after the end of the Cold War have undermined the hopes we then had regarding the possibility of creating a new world order.

We already live in a different world: history has accelerated, politics is not keeping pace with the course of events, and this lag has been demonstrated with particular evidence during the Iraqi crisis.

There is one question that needs to be asked: has the military victory in Iraq drawn us closer to a solution of problems that arise from the link between terrorism and the weapons of mass destruction?

To me, it is clear that the answer is no. This victory has actually set us back and made such a solution more difficult, because the temptation of asymmetrical responses to the overwhelming military might of the world's only remaining superpower has grown instead of diminishing. As we have seen over the past few days, terrorist actions are occurring in many regions of the world, practically all over the world.

Politics therefore clearly needs a new impetus. And this is the fundamental aim of the World Political Forum. I see the Forum as a place for interaction, in this particularly difficult age, of both former and active political leaders as well as scientists, men of letters, artists, economists, academics and political observers. We want to involve in our project as many people as possible, people with different ideological views and vocations, to involve them in a common discussion on the concrete problems of modern politics.

I am convinced that the participation of research centres and think tanks is of particular importance for our mission, not only Western ones but also those representing Asia, Africa, the Muslim world, and Latin America. Some of them have already declared their willingness to participate in the work of the World Political Forum and make their intellectual contribution available to us for analysis and documentation, and I am sure that the World Political Forum will welcome their participation. I am perfectly conscious of the difficulty of the enterprise we are embarking upon today. Your reflections, proposals and ideas are extremely important in achieving our goals.

The Forum should generate new ideas, and this is what I want to emphasize as we start discussing its task and activities. I substantially agree with the remarks of President Ghigo, my co-chairman and president of Piedmont Region, who has said that we won't be taking any decisions. We are not here to assume the functions of the institutions of foreign and domestic policymaking. Our responsibility, our mission, as I see it, is to provide information to and share knowledge with politicians, the business community and international organisations, because it is a lack of knowledge that has often made politics so misguided and unpredictable, based as it is mostly on intuition and hasty evaluations and conclusions. Too often, we have seen actions that have little to do with the responsibility that politicians should feel to their nations and to the rest of the world but rather reflect the calculus of how much these actions could strengthen one's position on the eve of elections.

So this our mission: to develop new ideas on the basis of profound study of the main problems of our time and to contribute to restoring dialogue to its rightful place as the principal method of addressing the world's problems. I am referring here not only to political dialogue, the dialogue between states, although it certainly comes first and foremost, but also to dialogue between politics and research centres, think tanks, dialogue between politics and society, the institutions of civil society.

To those who disdain public opinion, it may seem that I have been belabouring the same point far too long, but I will keep saying it again and again: politicians alone cannot cope with all the challenges that the world presents today. Politics has to interact with civil society, with the intellectual community. Therefore, again, dialogue is needed, a wide-ranging dialogue that will help us develop workable approaches to meeting the challenges of our globalised world.

I would like to repeat once again that history is not preordained. There is room for alternative solutions. What are needed are vision and the will and perseverance to make it a reality. This is extremely important. We need to cultivate a new culture, stimulate new approaches. We all really need a culture of peace. And naturally, even if we have a vision appropriate to the challenges of the contemporary world, even if we have the political will, we still have to make sure that there are the necessary mechanisms to implement the decisions, or else all of it is just so much empty talk.

Recent events have dealt a heavy blow both to international law and to multilateral political institutions such as the United Nations and its Security Council. It is being said that these institutions can no longer serve their purposes or perform their functions. Actually, there is nothing new about this; the same things have been said for a long time. I participated in the work of at least two commissions set up to develop proposals for a systematic reform of the UN. The reports of some of those commissions formed the basis for a document entitled Agenda 21. Among us today we have the Secretary General of the United Nations at that time, who might be willing to share with us the reasons why that Agenda not only has never been realised but was essentially rejected. Was there something wrong about it or, rather, was there some other reason?

We do need reforms of those international institutions that can still function, but we also need new institutions that could keep abreast of the new politics of the 21st century. To help politicians to envision the real issues on the world's agenda and together to seek convincing responses: this, as I see it, is a worthy programme and mission for our Forum.

The World Political Forum as a meeting point for comparison of different view-points and approaches could become a valuable tool for developing new policies, for high level contacts, and for seeking new methods of research leading to common solutions.

Among the most important themes for wide-ranging international discussion I would like to point out those related to global governance. I think it is worth repeating that only by continuing the processes of democratisation in the world, only by guaranteeing democratic procedures as the functional basis of international institutions, will it be possible to extend to everyone the benefits of modern society, to integrate various proposals and choose the most appropriate ones. Nothing can be achieved if pressures and a quest for supremacy replace the democratic approach.

We have seen enough utopias in our lifetime. The communist utopia, the one of the perfect world order, and now a third utopia is appearing: that of imposing democratic regimes through the use of force and so on. But all of them are wrong. I would say even more: every utopia in the end makes us all pay a high price for it. It is

something worth discussing, to try and understand some facts of our past history and to propose answers to the issues that concern us today.

**Gyula Horn**, *Former Prime Minister of Hungary*

We have been talking about the fact that a new situation has developed in the world, new challenges and new problems without adequate answers. This is why I wish to wholeheartedly support our commitment and the creation of a forum for world politics. I would like to thank the organizers and our hosts.

What can be done? What should we do? I think that first and foremost an accurate and detailed analysis of the world: answers have to be sought, conclusions and alternatives have to be developed in politics.

I believe the core of the issue is the following: in the history of mankind we have had to deal with countries, with a country, which is able to govern international relations on its own. This country is the US, currently able to determine what will happen in war and peace, for its enemies and allies. Let us not forget that the US has a 15-20 year lead start in the weapons industry compared to other NATO partners. Furthermore, if the US is able to complete its missile defence programme this will generate a new scenario: in fact the balance of military forces will become less important, as will the role of deterrents. The US is also the strongest economic power in NATO, a gap which is increasing because compared to the other NATO partners America invests five times more in technical and scientific research. This situation is untenable, and Europe must prove it is able to answer this challenge.

When studying American-European relations we can not forget that America has traditionally been present in the crisis of the old continent, first and foremost in the Balkans. Their 9/11 tragedy is unique in that it was a direct attack against a state or national policy and the country wishes to exercise its right to self defence to the utmost.

It is a fact that Europe has not conducted an effective struggle against international terrorism so far: unfortunately, much of Europe did not understand the intentions of the US in and towards Iraq, although this is not only our fault. The American leaders did not maintain the necessary contacts, and the consultations with allies were very loose. The 'European attitude' and the behaviour of certain countries made it very difficult to support the American intentions in this respect. There are elements in the situation suggesting that the American military action was not legitimate, but founded. Furthermore, Europe will not succeed on the basis of an anti-American policy.

There should not be an arms race against America, but at the same time NATO countries must decide on the organisation of their armaments and upgrading of their arms as I believe the strengthening of the common ground against terrorism is one of our main objectives.

Let us think of the ways in which countries which finance terrorism could be punished, and how to help those countries which actually fight this threat: if there is a just war, then there must be a just peace. The meaning of this peace is the achievement of the aims of the just war.

Our relationship with America requires us to strengthen common political values: values of democracy, freedom, the rule of law and the defence of human rights. All this may play a fundamental role in the normalisation of the US-European relations. In this respect it is worth establishing permanent contacts between the European Parliament and the US Congress.

Furthermore, we should also help the modernisation of the UN.

Lastly, I suggest we should study the 'cohesion' or intertwining between the Europe and US economies and draw the appropriate conclusions.

**Boutros Boutros-Ghali**, *Former Secretary General of the United Nations*

When President Mikhail Gorbachev invited me to take part in this first meeting of the World Political Forum, I was honoured to accept his invitation, given the importance and strength of his project, which induces us to think in a critical but also ambitious and constructive way about the future of our planet.

This conference takes place at a rather particular moment in time, a few weeks after the diplomatic, legal and political crisis caused by the intervention of the United States in Iraq and fomented, to a lesser degree, by the handling of the post-war situation in Iraq. If we look at the reactions both of countries and public opinion and at the new light under which the role and the power of the United Nations is now seen, I think it is legitimate to say, without forgetting the suffering inflicted upon the Iraqi population, that this war is a clear symptom of the situation generated by default after the end of the Cold War. I say "by default" because after the end of the Cold War we were not able or did not want to set up a new world order, as had been done after the end of the First World War with the creation of the League of Nations or, after the Second World War, with the institution of the UN.

This hasn't prevented the world from changing: globalisation has created new forces, players and powers with more or less noticeable and serious consequences.

First of all, space and time have taken on a new dimension.

Secondly, borders have become more blurred and the features of the nation-state are now weaker, in an era when most of the problems and the related solutions are tackled at the transnational level and supranational laws multiply.

Thirdly, the non-national players, such as multinationals, non governmental organisations and organised crime or international terrorist networks have acquired more importance.

We have also witnessed a crisis of identity and of representation at the local level. This has led to the spreading of closed attitudes, to the rooting of ethnic, racial and religious claims, to the rise of conflicts within countries and to the increase of the socio-economic and digital gap between North and South.

Finally, the crisis of multilateralism broke out, caused by the existence of countries more and more prone to abusing their almost undisputed power.

In the light of the changes which are taking place in the world and the new challenges that such changes imply, we must realise how necessary and urgent it is to leave illusions and, even more importantly, resignation behind and finally start defining new models, strategies and tools to stop or manage these evolutions and make globalisation a more human and democratic process.

I will not go into further details now, I will simply suggest four main priorities I would like you to reflect upon, although there are certainly other issues which fully deserve our attention. First priority: spread and strengthen democracy within the very system of the United Nations. This implies a reform of the Security Council, created just after the end of the Second World War on the basis of the balance of powers at the time. More than fifty years have passed and that balance does not exist any

longer. The reform of the Security Council has been on top of the agenda for about ten years, but the situation will not change unless the countries which can exercise their veto will stop refusing to share their privileges and the countries without the right to veto are able to find an agreement on such a reform.

Second priority: involve all the non-national players - non governmental organisations, parliaments, mayors of large cities, universities and multinationals - in developing rules and taking decisions on the future of the planet. If we want to create a global, open and participatory democracy, it is fundamental to take into account not only the will of political actors and the behaviour of economic players, but also the aspirations of social and cultural actors. It will not be easy to involve the non-national actors in the decision-making processes of the daily management of international politics, but we have no other choice, as they will keep on influencing the evolution of the new international system regardless of the countries' will to involve them in making decisions.

Third priority: we are all aware of the fact that the globalisation of economy is generating poverty at a global level. I believe this is the scandal and at the same time the challenge of the new century. The international community must demonstrate its solidarity by reducing the debt, relaunching the support for development, opening the markets of the industrialised countries, regulating markets and defining their mechanisms, bridging the digital gap between North and South. At the same time, we must accept the idea that developing countries will have to play a more important role in multilateral commercial negotiations. On this point, I agree with those who would like to transform the UNCTAD (United Nations Conference on Trade and Development) into the World Parliament for Globalisation, a forum for the discussion of the great challenges related to commerce, development, the environment and also of the negative effects caused by the adjustment measures imposed by the international financial institutions.

Fourth and last priority: the promotion of cultural diversity and of the dialogue between cultures. If we want to avoid the Cold War developing into a cultural clash driven by international migratory movements, it is necessary to establish as soon as possible a dialogue based on the knowledge, recognition and respect of cultures in their plurality and complexity. This is mainly a political challenge, as cultural lives are privileged spaces of solidarity which, when they meet and mingle, are the best guarantee of democracy, peace and development.

**Bono**, *rock star, leader of the group "U-2"*

Hello, my name is Bono and I am a rock star.

No, Mikhail Gorbachev is a rock star, I am a fan and I am here because he asked me to come. I like him. I respect him. But politics and art need each other even if they don't like each other.

It was rock music and not politics that woke me up from the comfort of my freedom as a teenager and rock music keeps me awake with the noise of nagging questions to this day. Rock music, if it means any one thing to me, means liberation: sexual, spiritual and indeed political. I am rebelling against my own indifference. I am humbled to be in the room with people who have given their lives in public service full-time, not just part-time, like myself.

President Gorbachev, thank you for inviting us. Your legacy, your continued leadership speaks volumes about the power of one person to change the course of history. And not content with doing that, you are taking advantage of a new century to move into the business of how to set the course of history. We've got lots of leaders here from former communist states, some of your countries are members of the EU already, others have that in their future. The bounties of capitalism, of globalisation are supposedly round the corner, maybe there is a lot to look forward to. I come from a country, Ireland, that has benefited greatly from globalisation. It's not just that you can get fresh Italian tomatoes on your pizza, it's about jobs. Well the truth is, as it stands today 19<sup>th</sup> May 2003, there is a crisis in capitalism. The open markets that have done so much for Ireland and for Italy are not working for countries like Malawi or Ethiopia. In fact, most of the lives that globalisation touches, for people in these countries where daily choices are about survival, globalisation is at best a dream and at worst a lie.

If globalisation is about trading and trading up for everybody, I'm not anti-globalisation. And no rock star with a fast car and a swimming pool can rightly be too anti-capitalist. But I'll tell you what, I'm anti other people not having the same chance as I have. And I'm not a happy member of the club, because the club is too exclusive. At the moment it operates like one of those country clubs that wouldn't admit women or blacks or Irish or Jews. Well, we won't stand for those kind of country clubs now, yet we stand for this. With the benefits of globalisation come responsibilities. Whether we need new rules or new clubs is what this week is all about, I think. The last time I was in this neck of the woods, the streets of Genoa were on fire. It was the G8 summit, there was loss of life in riots; it was hard to see any clear agenda. But under the yellow fog of tear gas and smoke was a movement of people that instinctively knew they would be judged by the moment they were in, by the way their leaders dealt or didn't deal with the millions of lives that depended on them. These people simply weren't going to accept that an accident of latitude or longitude determines whether your child will live or die. And they were right. The fact that a few antagonists with a different agenda infiltrated it, does not take away

from that. This was not rent-a-cad, this was not rent-a-cause. These people were raising the alarm.

I've been to Africa too many times now, the alarm needed to be raised.

Just on Aids, just in Africa: seven thousand lives are lost each day because Africans cannot get to medicines we take for granted here; every day, seven thousand lives. The anger on the streets of Genoa, in Seattle and if it happens this year in Evian or Paris, comes from the fact that there is a holocaust happening on our watch and I do not use that word lightly. In the failure of Africa we see the failure of globalisation at large. Africa's problems are not all natural calamity, famine and disease. It's not all corrupt leadership. But the people who marched in Genoa were protesting another kind of corruption. The corrupt relationship that we in the Northern hemisphere have fostered with the South. You in this room, of all people, know we can't fix every problem. That's for sure. But the ones we can fix we must.

The debt issue that I was involved with, for example. Holding children to ransom for the debts of their grandparents is not a charity issue, it's a justice issue. An international insolvency procedure is long long overdue. And I put it forward in this World Political Forum to be discussed. The issue of unfair trade; protecting our markets while not letting the poorest of the poor put their products on our shelves is a scandal. It's not about charity, it's about justice.

The truth is that Africans want to come off the nipple of aid, they want to trade their way out of poverty. This September in Cancun the WTO, the World Trade Organization meets again and they'd better get serious.

I bring all this up because these are the issues that are in our control and, unless we address them, it won't just be capitalism careering towards a crisis, it will be freedom itself. And those we won't let join our country club where we enjoy luxuries like clean drinking water and vaccinations, well, those people are going to join somebody else's club and they are going to burn ours down. And this is the connection with the overriding sentiment in the room today.

The media is wrong about the violence in the Middle East, they say it is unrelated to all of this: well, it's not. Take a look at the UNDP's report on Arab human development. It shows how the fires of extremism are stoked by poverty and despair. This is not just a moral challenge, not just a political problem, it's a security issue. No war on earth is more destructive than the Aids pandemic. I didn't say that, Colin Powell said that. The war against terror is bound up in the war against poverty. I didn't say that, Colin Powell said that. Even military men know that this war against terror cannot be won by military means alone. Afghanistan was a haven for terrorists because we abandoned it. It was a collapsed state. There are ten potential Afghanistans teetering in Africa and I think history will judge us by whatever we do to help them succeed. History and God will judge us harshly if we fail. But will judge us even more harshly if we fail to even try.

In the wake of WW2 the United States understood that it would prevent the next world war only if it could turn its enemies into allies and build a stable and secure world order. The Marshal Plan to rebuild Europe cost the Americans 1.1% of GDP for about four years. The United States, by the way, spends about 0.1% of GDP

at the moment and Europe, with the exception of the Scandinavians, not that much more. But what an investment the Marshal Plan was. The brand name “USA” was never brighter. They prevented WW3 and they helped a lot of us here to prosper in peace.

That was the Cold War. This is the Hot War. We need the same sort of investment, the same sort of vision for the developing world now. Peace is expensive. But if we wait, it’s more expensive. The war against terrorism isn’t over and nobody knows when it will be, if we wait until the victory parade to start shaping a better future, we won’t be having a victory parade, we’ll be having a wake. And not an Irish wake, either. We have fun when we are burying our dead, as well as tears; this will not be fun.

I met a congressman recently in my work, in Washington D.C.: congressman Lantos. He spoke of the holocaust. He spoke of his memories of a child being put on a train to Auschwitz. He said, the thing that haunted him the most were the looks on the faces of the crowds who watched them being put on the train. Blank faces, blank faces that would never ask the question: “Where are these people going?” They never raised the alarm. I asked this great survivor if the situation with Aids and no medicines emergency was analogous. He not only agreed, he wrote me a letter imploring me to use his story. It’s a powerful word: holocaust. He didn’t use it lightly. President, friends, dignitaries, the press. We are watching human beings again being put on trains to hell. Our brothers and sisters in Africa are not a write-off. How many, in this moment of history are prepared to lie across the tracks and stop this train.

**Toshiki Kaifu**, *Former Prime Minister of Japan*

First of all, President Gorbachev, I would like to thank you on behalf of all my Japanese friends for organising this conference.

After September 11th, we were forced to face several problems.

In an interview published in a major Japanese newspaper, I even stated that it might be better if the United States took decisions only after a period of reflection. I also suggested that they not rush into anything, as this could jeopardise the steps previously made to build a democratic world. The three parties in the coalition of our government listed the reasons for our support for the United States and these can be summed up as follows.

Firstly: the United States does not have territorial ambitions.

Secondly: it acts in good faith.

I remember the final phase of the first Gulf war, during which we particularly committed ourselves and made several efforts with president Gorbachev. During that particular historical time, the United States greatly supported the world balance. At the time we thought that that balance was the core of the new international order and that it also represented a defence against new conflicts. Now, despite the different opinions on the matter, we need to discuss the reform of the United Nations, a particularly topical issue, today more than ever before. Many Japanese political parties follow the debate with great attention, so this is one issue we need to discuss in detail.

Further topics I would suggest for discussion are international terrorism, the environment, drugs and diseases, included SARS, which is now afflicting Eastern Asia. These problems must be faced not only by so-called "Hard Power", but "Soft Powers" should also be involved, although this would be a further topic we can debate.

The Japanese parliament is currently very busy discussing the national budget, so it has been rather difficult for me to come here today. Nonetheless, when I mentioned President Gorbachev's invitation, everyone incited me to take part in this meeting as all the topics which will be discussed during this session of the Forum are very important for Japan. Also, my country is trying to find new alternative solutions to the use of force.

I would like to thank again Mr Gorbachev and I shall conclude here for now, in order to stay within the time limit given for my speech.

**Gianni De Michelis**, *Former Italian Minister for Foreign Affairs*

I believe the first question we should answer as we gather here in Turin thanks to President Gorbachev's initiative is 'what use are we?'. In other words, if you form a group of people such as we are, we certainly have one thing to offer, and that is experience, experience in international affairs which may be of use at a time like this.

This is an exceptional period: the world is experiencing difficult times and the future of the human race will be influenced for a long time by our ability to overcome them. Daily events suggest that public opinion, decision makers and the ruling classes, the leaders of our planet are rather confused right now: Just open the papers and read them to realise the difficulties we are facing.

We are in the midst of a world-wide conflict that even the least observant have noticed, and the conflict has been going on for two years now. The conflict has complex and new characteristics which, as many of us remarked, would be a long and drawn out difficult conflict although a lot of people turned a blind eye especially here in Europe. Recent events are proving us right as they unfold. I believe it is useful to have an arena where a certain number of people of proven experience, good will and a constructive attitude can meet, thinking and offering a contribution to overcome this difficult passage. Although at times events such as this may appear a little redundant, I think this one, as it has been illustrated and its ideas put forward, can prove extremely useful.

The reasons why we stand where we are, are both well known and easily understandable: we are at the heart of the conflict, and I repeat it is a world conflict, because we have allowed a worldwide disorder to develop. We have allowed it to thrive because world leadership, especially the leaders of the most important countries have not concerned themselves with the problem they ought to have dealt with first, that is to say the development of a new world order able to replace the one which disappeared in the course of those extraordinary months between November 1989 and 25 December 1991.

Some of the people sitting at this table were leading figures at the time, and right from the onset they clearly understood how important it was to create a new world order. The decision was announced but soon forgotten.

Nearly ten years went by – I call it the time of lack of attention and easy living - and the leaders of the main countries, especially of the great democracies that were the 'moral and political winners' of that war that had never been fought, that had just finished with the end of the previous regime, disregarded what was their main duty. Their main thesis was developed in the book by a political scientist called *The End of History*. The leaders, especially in the US found it very easy to slip into that explanation and ignore all the issues they should have faced. Bin Laden worked within this lack of attention, this disregard, as did Al Quaida. 9/11 proved that *History* was far from dead and that the problem was there in all its dramatic implications, facing the world and its ruling classes.

The problem is how to conclude the conflict now that it has exploded: the solution, easily defined in general terms, is the creation of a new order. But in practice it is very difficult to create it, because history teaches us a new world order is something traumatic and difficult and since we allowed the conflict to come to a head, we have to move beyond it (I don't wish to use the expression 'win the war').

In dealing with the conflict, the option is not 'War or Peace' and I know this sounds a something of a provocation, but in Italy and in Europe we have addressed the issue incorrectly. I believe most human beings and most world leaders are in favour of peace, the issue being how does one attain peace? Peace develops by creating the conditions for reduced conflict, that is to say by enhancing security and by eliminating the conditions that could destroy that security. At times this may require the use of strength or force. The group of people here know this and we share this experience. We know that overcoming conflict and finding peace are two different but not opposing approaches.

Current slang uses the words hard and soft power, the power of weapons, strength, military capacity, diplomacy, politics and solutions. You need a combination of the two to overcome conflict and move towards more order and security. Clearly only those who use strength will have the authority and the political clout to use soft power solutions such as political and diplomatic tools if needed. Recent events over the past few weeks, months and even now are a case in point

I am one of those who considered the decision of the US to use hard power in Afghanistan and Iraq as right, but I am also one of those who said that once they had used hard power, the Americans should have been aware that they would need to use soft power in the Israeli-Palestinian conflict, because that is a case when hard power is not enough – and recent events unfortunately confirm this picture. Intelligent weapons or US military super power are unable to solve the issue of the legitimate aspiration of the Palestinian people to have their State, nor can they guarantee security for Israel, which is just as legitimate and due to the State of Israel and its citizens. We seem to have reached a dead end.

The Americans say: "You Europeans should not think that we will ever impose on Israel, which is a democratic country, any solution of the security issue". At the same time they say: "We are committed to the creation of democracy in Iraq". This is the main objective, the political legacy of the Bush Presidency in this period of history. "...our way of concluding the conflict, of overcoming the terrorist threat is to create more security and order", which is the way to create peace.

Well the two previous statements contradict each other and it is up to someone, governments, leadership, the intelligentsia, NGOs, to explain it to the US Government and the other world leaders. None of the citizens or members of the Islamic or Arab world will be prepared to be on the side of an order based on democracy, economic cooperation and so on unless the West and the Americans in particular show they can solve the Israeli-Palestinian conflict fairly. In other words, they must prove they are able to have a single rather than a double standard in terms of soft power, not two weights and two measures. They haven't got a chance of creating democracy in Iraq unless they create this premise. Currently we are facing

what a few months ago I called “Al Quaida’s and the terrorist movement’s third move”.

After 9/11, after the wait, came the military answer in Afghanistan and Iraq and today they are back because they know that at this point they know that the coalition or front that wanted to wage a war on terrorism cannot afford a fourth military move. It would be sheer folly if the Americans and all of us were to consider a new war against Iran or Syria or Saudi Arabia to fight the terrorist threat which would get worse in the time to follow. The possible answer is the political and diplomatic answer which can not be limited to the Palestinian issue as there are also all the problems which Bono mentioned earlier on, referring to the haves and have nots. However, the Israeli-Palestinian issue is unquestionably the key to it all.

This is why somewhere on this planet a group of human beings is going to have to begin thinking about practical solutions in terms of soft power tools. The past decade has not enjoyed a bounty of thinking; a lot of time and money have been wasted, and a lot of intellectual potential was left neglected and unused.

In the past, the ruling classes or leadership which preceded us had to face comparable problems, it has happened, it happened many times in the course of history, but it was all much easier. Because the solution always came from strength: this is what history teaches us. Order, disorder, order: all passages governed by the use of strength which was a terrible, negative but very easy system.

Currently, the issue is that of a balance between Hard and Soft Power, which presumes a more complex intellectual, ethical and political effort and, in practice, we are still far behind.

These are the reasons why I accepted to join this project launched by President Gorbachev and which our friends and authorities from this beautiful city and region have welcomed and promoted.

I too would like to close my remarks with a joke: we are here in Turin, at the end of May and in a few days in Evian, the other side of the border, just a few miles from here, there will be a meeting of the main world leaders. It will be a large meeting which will include Chinese leaders and they will have to address major issues. Well, if we were able to offer signals, suggestions, indications of good will, political and diplomatic intelligence, well it might be of some use to them.

**Marshall Goldman**, *Political scientist*

I will speak first on the general issues that President Gorbachev has set out and clearly later I might be willing to address some of the positions that the United States has taken, although I must say that normally I view myself as a critic of the present administration, so I am not sure I am entirely sympathetic with all the issues and the present stance of the United States.

I think President Gorbachev's speech this morning set the issues out in much the same way I would, but I would like to follow up a little bit, to further define some of the issues and suggest some further challenges and, if I may, to put some of these issues into historical perspective.

This certainly seems to be a time of radical change. The fact is that the Cold War is indeed over. I must say that some, including my wife, are nostalgic for the Cold War. The world seemed to be much simpler. Certainly, in retrospect it seemed to be much simpler than it is now. The two sides seemed to be well defined, there seemed to be a certain amount of discipline and the alliances seemed to be relatively firm.

We seem to forget, in looking back, that we were always worried about nuclear destruction; but since that didn't happen, the past, the cold war, seems to be relatively peaceful.

Now, in today's world we have one hegemonic superpower. You would think that this would also be a time of peace because there should be less jockeying. There's one power, and that's the United States; and certainly there seems to be less danger of nuclear war today than there was ten-twenty years ago. But in fact, there may not be nuclear war but there certainly seems to be more uncertainty. New dangers, terrorism and, to some extent, this new concern about globalisation. So what I'd like to do is examine why there is now this greater uncertainty. Is this really a new situation? And then, what are the challenges that face us, some of which the other speakers, particularly President Gorbachev, have spelled out?

Why, first of all, is there today more uncertainty than there was in the era of the two superpowers, the Soviet Union and the United States. On the surface this does seem to be a new era.

If you go back to George Orwell and his 1984, it was assumed that somehow or other there would be three major powers in the world and there would be shifting coalitions. But never did George Orwell or any of the others of us think of a world with only one superpower. So, the reason for the uncertainty, despite the fact that there is one superpower, is because the penalties for dissent against that superpower are not threatening enough. The United States, as powerful as it is, is unable to retaliate against every challenger, so there's a lot of room for making mischief, particularly for unorganised or non-State entities, such as Al Quaida. Moreover, there is almost no check on the behaviour of that superpower. If President George W. Bush decides he wants to do something it's very difficult now to impose a check. There is no Court of Appeal if the United States decide to flaunt public opinion.

Moreover, and this I think is an issue we have been generally aware of, but haven't made explicit, the institutions that we presently have were designed to deal with a Cold War environment, particularly the United Nations, and the confrontation that took place during that Cold War environment.

But many of those institutions are no longer effective in dealing with a single hegemonic superpower. The United Nations was imperfect, but it did lend itself as a forum for both sides to meet one another during the Cold War. Now the United States, in many cases, sees no need for the United Nations and will only support the UN when the United Nations seem to be able to carry out some of the policies that the United States wants to implement.

Now this seems to be unprecedented, but what I want to suggest to you is that it is not and this may help us to understand the future challenges. It is clearly not the first time that the world has had to deal with only one superpower. Let me give you three examples.

First of all in Italy we can talk about the Roman Empire. The Roman Empire imposed its own standards on the world at that time. Looking back, we see that many of those standards were indeed very important and useful. The French, Napoleon, brought with him his own standards; and indeed Napoleon, as he moved across Europe, tried to bring those standards to the rest of Europe. The British Empire, again, brought with it its own standards and there were not many who could challenge it.

Now, after each of these empires, each of these superpowers, there was a need to change the institutions and in a sense we are simply repeating that process. Nor is it the first time that our societies have had to deal with terrorism. In Russia there was the assassination of Alexander II, by the Norodnia Vola, which was a revolutionary group. In Europe there have been many assassinations, one leading to the beginning of WW1 and in the United States we have had four presidents assassinated: Lincoln, Garfield, McKinley and, most recently, President Kennedy.

But there are differences. All of this is made more complex by what we today consider globalisation and advanced technology. And certainly globalisation exacerbates the problem, the example of SARS now being the most recent. Just like Chernobyl, it's impossible today to hide this disease because of news circulating. Despite the Chinese efforts at concealing it, it couldn't be concealed.

The use of cell phones, in particular, has made it possible for even the Chinese to spread that information. But again, we should keep this in perspective. It's not the first time that we've had this kind of international impact. The plague, typhoid, they also spread around the world, just like SARS. The only difference is that SARS, because of air travel, spreads much more rapidly. But those diseases did spread. This is not the first time we are meeting such a situation.

Now, the impact of technology today has both its positive and negative impacts. We used to argue that technology would make totalitarian states stronger and more intimidating. The use of the computer would make it possible to control everyone. The use of television would influence what people say, but, at the same time, technology has served to undermine this system. Television provided an

opportunity for people behind the Iron Curtain to see what was happening. The radio did the same thing. And today's cell phones and cameras are achieving the same thing.

Now, similarly, economics has made us more interdependent. No country can cut itself off from the rest of the world. There's no such thing today as an Iron Curtain. And if you did try to cut yourself off you would fall behind that technology as indeed the Soviet Union found. But if one country has economic problems, those problems are likely to spread, as we are seeing today, around the rest of the world. Japan has deflation; now we are worried that the United States might have deflation and that might effect Europe as well.

But again, we should keep in mind that this is not the first time such problems have spread to others. We saw it in the nineteen thirties, we saw it in the nineteenth century. What I want to suggest, in other words, is that many of the problems that we see as being so unique today really have historical precedents. That doesn't mean that they are easy to solve but it doesn't mean that we can't solve them and address them as well. So, let me look to the future.

There will always be differences and disputes among countries no matter what we come up with; no matter what super international organization, there will be these problems, just as there are problems between husband and wife. We see it, of course, even within countries as presumably you have gathered from the sort of things I'm saying about the United States. But we do need a forum to work these things out. Whether it be the United Nations, the World Trade Organization, the International Monetary Fund or the organizations that I hope we will be able to come up with here.

What we need today, though, and what is different, at least in the 21<sup>st</sup> century, is to find some way to work with the world hegemonic power, a superpower that has its own agenda. So this Forum, in my mind, can be very useful to debate and to examine what possible new organizations there might be. At the same time, I don't think we want to abandon the forums that we have been working with.

The United Nations, for example. Even though the United Nations was clearly designed to work with the cold war environment, it does provide us with an opportunity to tackle this difference: this difference we have just heard about between hard power and soft power. There is no doubt in my mind that there are situations in which two contending powers want someone. They may not admit it, but want someone to come along and force them, just like two children, to resolve their issues. And I would give as an example the case of Israel and the Palestinian Authority. It seems to me that both of them, whether they would acknowledge it or not, would like someone to come along and force them to negotiate their differences. Because of reasons of pride, because of reasons of history, they may not, indeed, be willing to sit down alone this way, but they recognize that after months of trying to do it a different way, only through negotiation imposed by the outside will they be able to resolve their differences.

So, let me conclude. The trick is to see if we can try some way, here, to design these new institutions that will deal not only with the problems that we've become used to these last fifty years during the Cold War, but the new issues, where there is a

hegemonic power, a superpower that's going to go its own way. Maybe this will require some new institutions that will keep evolving and to suit the whims of the superpower and at least to nudge the superpower into ways that will be more acceptable to the rest of the world community. Otherwise, I'm afraid, we will be having these difficulties for some time to come, or at least until we have the next election in the United States.

**Keba Mbaye**, *former Vice President of the International Court of Justice*

Given the widespread fear of a war between civilisations, I believe that the era of dialogue between civilisations must start from the "civilisation of the universal".

The need for this approach derives from a reflection upon several important points: the perverse effects of globalisation, the many evils afflicting the world, the lack of influence of the traditional institutions, the inadequacy of the existing concertation mechanisms and the fact that we must be cautious and not try and destroy or change too drastically the current international system.

This reflection makes clear the need for an instrument aimed at influencing international politics in such a way as to guarantee the well-being of the entire world population. First of all, we need a diagnosis of the current evil. This is a difficult task, as evil takes on different forms in today's world. There is no single evil, there are several evils and each one of them is perceived differently in different areas of the planet and sometimes even within communities.

Through a detailed analysis though, we discover that they all have one common origin. Bono was extremely clear when he mentioned what I usually define as the lack of the realm of justice in contemporary society. I believe we will manage to fight the problems afflicting today's world only if the principle of justice will prevail everywhere. It is not up to single individuals, groups of people, states or regions to apply such principle. This is the responsibility of the international community or what we are trying to transform into an international community.

In order to test the principle of justice, let's simply try and imagine applying it in all those situations we condemn, such as terrorism, the absence of democracy, underdevelopment, the deterioration of the terms of trade, etc.

I am sure that if the principle of justice was applied everywhere and by everyone, the world would be a different place. But are people really willing to give up their privileges and ideals in order to let justice reign? Can they accept that the "islands" of peace and prosperity are only a mirage? This aspect does not involve us directly, as the people gathered today in this room are not responsible for the actions on the field, but rather for the search of the means through which our society can be improved. We must pursue this objective following only our soul and our conscience. We can't be the victims of pragmatism, we must follow our ideals.

President Gorbachev has just been talking about utopias. But there are also good utopias, like the idea of a universal justice, the one Bono mentioned and upon which I invite you to reflect.

Ours is undoubtedly a difficult and ambitious task, but only if we deeply believe in utopias will we be able to translate them into reality. I thank you for your kind attention.

**Hans Dietrich Genscher**, *Former Minister for Foreign Affairs of Germany*

I think that this conference takes place at the right moment and deals with the right topics. Furthermore, it takes place in the right place, because Italy represents a particular step in the historical union of Europe; Italy belonged to the founding group, to the six founding states of our European Community, the present European Union.

In particular, I would like to thank Mikhail Gorbachev for this initiative. It is not a surprise that he has taken this initiative. He was the one that talked about global challenges before the United Nations in December 1988, at a time when many people still thought within the categories of the Cold War. He was the one able to look beyond the problems of that time that still had to be solved.

In the second half of the 20<sup>th</sup> century we Europeans had the task of unifying the democratic part of Europe. And this task was fulfilled through the foundation of the European Community. At the same time we had to overcome peacefully the division of our continent – for us Germans it also meant overcoming peacefully the division of Germany – and to put an end to the Cold War. As was demonstrated at the end of the 20<sup>th</sup> century, we have been able to reach both our goals. But we have been able to do something more, and that is to say, in Europe a new culture of living together has been brought about through our actions. The States of the European Union, no matter if they are large or small, live together with the same rights and under the same conditions of equality that belong not only to individuals but also to all the people in general. And this way of living together in the European Union is a good example for the challenges we have to meet in the 21<sup>st</sup> century.

Now it is important that we Europeans unify the whole continent. And when in a few months another ten states join our European Union, this will be a great success, not only for all the people of Europe, but it will be an important contribution for stability in the world as well. And at the same time we have to meet the challenge of making a contribution to the new world order. We will have a new world order, but we still have not found an answer to the question: “What will it be like?” And it depends on us and on our responsibility that this new world order is based on equal opportunities for the peoples of the world, no matter if they are large or small or if they live in the North or in the South of our planet. So, a new world order that all people may feel and conceive as an equal order.

I would like to thank all those that have spoken here today and that have emphasised the particular challenges we have to meet in our neighbouring continent, Africa.

Now the Europeans, through their experience in the process of unification, may give a good example of the way a new world order may be created. We all know that during the Cold War there was a bipolar world order with Washington and its allies on one side and Moscow with its socialist countries on the other side. This bipolar world order has finished, it does not exist anymore. But what has taken its place? Is it a monopolar order concentrated on Washington? Or a multipolar world order with many centres spread throughout the world? Isn't it time that the other parts of the

world also have the same right to participate in the creation of the new world order, as the States of the North do? And the Europeans and the Americans have to bear in mind that their intense co-operation is a premise to the creation of a stable new world order. Also because Europe and America have the material possibilities to offer an opportunity to the Third World States. And this is their particular responsibility. There are several different challenges in front of us, but they all have a common aspect: it does not matter if it comes down to the spread of weapons of mass destruction or international terrorism and - closely linked to this – organised crime at the international level, protection of the natural bases of life, economic growth, or the fight against hunger, the tasks of education and training, disarmament, all these aspects concern all the peoples of the world, the small and the big ones and for this reason this world order may become stable only when it is rooted in the thought that in the new world order we cannot underestimate the interests of the small compared to the big, and the interests of the southern ones compared to the northern ones.

All this requires the strengthening of the international institutions and that we recognise the principle of equal opportunities in the economic sector of the World Bank, of the International Monetary Fund, of the World Trade Organisation and in all other important organisations. This requires our action to strengthen and not weaken the United Nations, if we have to reform it, and we must reform it with the aim of intensifying its influence. This is true for the creation of an international law order as well. As a matter of fact, this new world order cannot be a world order without any values, it needs fundamental values, ethical bases that have already been fixed in the Charter of the United Nations within the pacts of human rights on civil and social rights. It is therefore a great challenge, and for this reason the task of this Forum is to give an important contribution to this debate.

I would like to say here as a citizen of the European Union and of a member state of the western alliance of NATO that the European Union may give a good example and NATO has shown that, through transatlantic co-operation, through the close co-operation between NATO and Russia and through the admission of new member states, it represents an important contribution to world stability. And for this reason we cannot underestimate its importance and we do not have to underestimate, here in Europe and in America, the importance of the OSCE, the Organisation for Security and Co-operation in Europe.

Ladies and Gentlemen,

If this conference is taken into account seriously by all of us, actually we have gathered here because we consider these topics serious, then we still have a long way to go, but the great British historian Toynbee said: “The future of a civilisation and the future of the people depends upon whether they are able to give new answers to new challenges at the right time”. And I believe we should provide this answer. History does not usually repeat its offers. Today we have the opportunity to create a peaceful world order based on the equality of rights. Let us take this great historical opportunity and give our contribution as members of this Forum!

**Emilio Colombo**, *former Italian Prime Minister*

We are not gathered here to create a school of political studies, perhaps destined to be identified in the future with some political power not foreseeable now. But, President Gorbachev, through your experience, and that of us all, we want to unite the cultural deepening which politics and a study of the political conditions need, to provide suggestions and inspirations for the future.

I would like to mention to President Gorbachev that this morning I made a sacrifice for him. Among the many functions this modern hotel offers us, to render its hospitality attractive and refined, I found a little “anti-age” bottle. I decided not to use it, since we are fine as we are here, with our age, because of the purpose we have in mind. Not only those who are here on the stage, but also on the other side – we are all people who lived most of the “short century”, the century of ideologies, their birth and their tragic fading, the consequences we inherited, especially as politicians who lived and are now living the times that followed. Probably, we didn’t complete the task that we had set ourselves, the task to re-create a new international order – just when bipolarism was disappearing, with all its negative aspects.

When speaking of peace, those who belong to my school can use two Latin definitions: “tranquillitas ordinis” or “ordo iustitia pax”. I prefer the second expression. The first is more peaceful, it presumes the stillness of order, almost a reality existing by its very nature. The second one is instead operative: there is peace only if there is justice. And it is in the light of these concepts of peace that we can pose the questions or the priorities which we would like to examine. Here are some questions: do we talk, will we talk, do we worry about globalisation? I include it in our discussion because I would like to gather in this room those thousands of young people that are discussing it: yes or no to globalisation. This is a contrived dilemma which is posed within the question of globalisation: the argument between “pessimistic globalists” and “global optimists”. I am asking the question that the Economy Nobel Prize Laureate Amartya Sen posed to himself: “between those who express a vision, an uncritical acceptance of the market mechanisms and their distributive virtues and those who instead theorize the growing impoverishing effect of the logic of world capitalism on poorer and marginalized countries, this alternative risks bringing us the same desperate result”. Sen concludes that nothing can be done to better the world, because we already live in a Garden of Eden or because we are confined to hell. There is instead a tertius genus to which we can refer, though we cannot look at it in depth here, except as an indication for the future: govern evolution, correct anomalies, diminish injustices, regulate energies, turn this movement in order to solve the greatest number of the problems which are on the table. But who will do this? At this point, both in this club and in the world, it comes again, with a capital “P”, politics, in the highest sense of the word, and it’s up to us to help it emerge.

The Church, with all its wisdom, talked about “interdependence of peoples” when discussing this theme. It is a vision according to which we can overcome the

dilemma “yes or no to globalisation”, to preserve identity and differences, though in solidarity. There is also the theme of the disappearance of bipolarism, and of the artificial silencers, posed by the ruling ideologies, which made the emergence of the issue of identities and differences possible. Today, talking of differences and identities, only the tendency to repress or to value them emerge. What is the way forward? The way is that of mutual recognition, but before we need to know where, how, and what the differences are in cultural, ethnic and religious terms. Then, having learnt the differences, we must recognize each other. I am thinking about the great problem, certainly not appearing for the first time, of mutual recognition between the values of the western world (mostly based on Christianity) and much of the southern and eastern world (where Islam is prevalent). When inter-religious dialogue is felt as a need, the term “governance” appears in our language, and almost with a magical effect. What is it? Where is it expressed? Hans Dietrich Genscher rightly said: look to Europe for example.

Well, let’s have a look at it: if we wanted to define Europe in this moment, even if unification is not complete, we could say it is the governance of the set of European diversities (of peoples who opposed each other because of their historical, cultural, economic differences). Now these peoples decide freely to live together. Meantime, the unilateralism of the USA emerges suddenly on the political field, but not so suddenly as a cultural fact. We who believed, and I think we should go on believing, that the collaboration with the United States of America is important, have the duty to tell the USA that the great problems of the world will not be solved through unilateralism or supremacy. They will be solved, instead, through multipolarism and understanding; there are other means, apart from force, there is even culture, diplomacy, ancient experiences, old relations.

And to make this multipolarism real, Europe must fulfil its duty. Creation of the convention is positive, but if Europe decided right now to have a common foreign and defence policy, it would have already added another element of security and certainty in this world which has not yet found its way and its capacity for aggregation. The constitution of organic understanding among the great forces could give us the chance to realize the governance of the world, and thus to solve the problems that globalisation poses.

I thank President Gorbachev for having launched this initiative, because the things we are saying to each other in a few words touch on issues that should be deepened, probably in a more silent, less official, more private seat. This will let us understand what new elements stand in front of us and the old and new problems we have to face.

**Robert Skidelski**, *Member of the House of Lords, Professor of Political Economy at Warwick University*

The system of international relations we have known since the Second World War is in ruins. In my view, the reasons given for the attack on Iraq were largely fraudulent. However, it is also true that the people of Iraq will be much better off and there is a reasonable chance that the Middle East will be reshaped for the better.

The balance sheet of the war is not clear. The way the Iraqi war came about has disorganized relations between the great powers and frightened the smaller powers. To give just one example, the United States actions have threatened to decouple a large part of Western Europe from the United States, something that Soviet diplomacy in the old days dreamt of, but never achieved. An accepted theory of international relations no longer exists. The doctrine of national sovereignty is giving way to the idea that military interventions are justified to remove rogue states or to reform failed states. The right of self-defence authorized by article 51 of the UN Charter has been replaced by a potentially unlimited “doctrine of pre-emptive action”. This means that its most powerful member no longer considers the UN Charter binding.

It is obvious, looking back, that what reshaped the context of international relations was the fall of communism. That established the United States as the world’s hyper power; it also unleashed the politics of religion and race. American policy has become steadily more assertive, even as resentment against American actions has grown. The instability inherent in this state of affairs has been masked for many years by the delusive promises of globalisation. Economics, we were told, was creating a “world village” based on democracy, peace and free markets. However, this ignored not just the tensions inherent in globalisation, but also the fact that an unstable system in international politics cannot create a harmonious system of international economics. So, how can this crisis be overcome? What message should go out from this forum?

Let’s consider three possibilities. The first is that we are at the start of a Pax Americana.

Secondly, a multipolar system could emerge, which would in effect be a new balance of power. For example, the European Union, Russia and China might form an “Axis of emancipation”.

A third possibility would be a cooperative hegemony of the United States and the great powers, working through a reformed United Nations and other multilateral agencies. In such a system, American actions would be constrained by the need to reach agreement with the most important players.

Well, what about the first, the Pax Americana. Some building blocks of this system are already in place. The United States and its allies currently occupy and administer Iraq. No one expects a rapid withdrawal. Indeed the chances are that the United States will become the imperial power of the Middle East as a whole.

In the ideas of failed states, rogue states, nation building, the war against terrorism and the stress on hard power to keep the peace, we already have the linguistic basis for an imperial ideology. And it's more than an ideology, it has logic to it, because the war against terrorism has no territorial limits, any bad state anywhere can provide a haven for terrorists and thus a justification for intervention and control.

Well, America, you will often hear, is not an imperial nation. It can't undertake such a project, history is against it, it won't stick around, and it's no good at nation building. I think these arguments need to be treated with a considerable degree of scepticism. Nations don't start off as imperial; they sometimes have imperialism thrust upon them. And as for history, an American President I quote said: "Chronic wrongdoing or an incompetence which results in a general loosening of ties of civilized society may require intervention by some civilized nations". The President was Theodore Roosevelt and the words quoted are his message to Congress in 1904.

Let me point out too that current republican realism sits quite well with democratic idealism. If terrorism is a product of dictatorship, to rid the world of dictators and to install democracies is not just an antiterrorist policy, but it's a moral duty. So we mustn't expect the Bush policy to end with Bush and stop in the Middle East: there are North Korea and Taiwan's relations with China and many other trouble spots. The more important arguments against the imperial project concern the reaction of others. I discount the argument that terrorism will drive the Americans out of the Middle East, but overlordship of the Middle East is only one element in a new assertiveness which is global, which comprises both hard and soft power, and ranges from the unilateral use of force, to rejection of political, juridical, security and economic treaties which bind the United States or are seen against its interest. So the question is, what reactions will this evoke?

Well, the instinctive response to an overweening power is to form a combination of powers to check it, a new balance of power system. The European Union might develop some genuine military capacity. There has been talk of a French, Russian, Chinese axis. There are some things that European Union countries should certainly do: it is shameful that they could not lift a finger in the Balkans without a nod from the United States. Today, hundreds of thousands are slaughtered in Central Africa without EU countries doing anything about it. And, to give another set of illustrations, there is no security reason for American troops to stay in Europe, no reason for the continued existence of NATO.

In short, Europe should take more responsibility for its own fate, should revive a more audacious sense of its mission. I think talk of an anti-American combination is a pipe dream, for one thing: it would split Europe down the middle, and I am not just talking about my own country. Of course, Russia and Europe should come together with oil providing a geo-political nexus, but Russia is decades away from being a genuine great power. So the main reason for thinking that the American imperial project is unsustainable is not that a powerful combination will rise against it, but that the United States will become progressively overstretched. To work, American leadership needs the cooperation of others. And this brings me to my third and last

point, which is a new multilateralism. And I think that should be the message that should go out from our forum: what does a new multilateralism mean? Well I think it means four things.

Reform of the United Nations Charter. A way must be found of making beneficial interventions legal; otherwise the UN will become irrelevant. The Charter should be reformed to allow three types of intervention, in my view: to prevent or stop genocide, to restore good government in failed states possibly through a revival of the mandate system and to prevent the spread of weapons of mass destruction.

Secondly, in conjunction with these reforms, the United States might consider abandoning its unilateral quest for security. Such action brings no real security. The United States should recognize that the most effective way to fight terrorism and other threats is through international cooperation.

Thirdly, the European Union needs a new constitution, I agree, but in that constitution should be a declaration of independence. Europe should think of itself as the responsible authority for Africa. It must develop enough capacity to meet any requirements for interventions authorized by the United Nations.

And finally, the World Political Forum, we, should set our faiths firmly against the idea of an inevitable clash of cultures between the west and Islam.

We should do everything possible to encourage a dialogue between the two civilizations as a condition of world peace and prosperity.

**Giulio Andreotti**, *Senator and former Prime Minister of Italy*

I believe that what Mikhail Gorbachev did as President of the Soviet Union is in itself enough to give him a place in history, which is why we are all the more grateful to him for having created a new opportunity to help world history be channelled in the right direction.

We have to state clearly what we are and what we are not: most of us are former soldiers of the political world, that is to say we hold neither executive responsibilities nor will this Forum create an alternative for those in power. Our thoughts will hopefully be of assistance to Parliaments and Governments to choose the right direction by taking the good from what we can draw from our past experience.

I would like to list three points which I believe are all linked to the activity which President Gorbachev has developed so far.

The first point concerns the United Nations: as has been mentioned, in 1988 Mr Gorbachev spoke about the need to proceed with its reform. Certainly there were difficulties due to the very large number of countries – currently 191 – and to veto privileges, as the regulations say that the five countries which emerged ‘victorious’ from World War Two maintain veto rights.

New ways of working have to be developed although there is a caveat: we have to defend the current system and try to make it work until such time as we have a new one, because it would be a big mistake if we were to forget the meaning of the UN and how hard it was for us to join. Italy joined in 1955 and Mr De Gasperi died bearing the bitterness for having failed; Germany joined much later. Hence the need to believe in the UN, the need for reform, bearing in mind all the things that have happened since. To give the UN a new role without weakening it, let us remember what happened to MERCOSUR (the Latin American Free Trade Agreement) and the crisis of the OAU (Organization of African Unity), possibly a utopia but still there. This is the framework we ought to be operating in.

The second point I wish to focus on is the dialogue among religions seen in terms of its weight in politics and in terms of how it affects relationships among peoples: one of the facets of communism which frightened us most was not just it being atheist, but its intention to destroy other religions. I recall that here in Turin there was an image of Saint Giovanni Bosco praying that the Russian horses should not quench their thirst at the fountains of St Peter’s Square. It did not happen. President Gorbachev came to St Peter’s Square and in a memorable speech stated that religions cannot only help, but in fact have already helped the development and improvement of my country.

We should remember this, as well as remembering what President Bush rightly said the after the 11<sup>th</sup> of September when he stated that Bin Laden was a traitor to his religion. Thus he avoided a crusade against Islam, which would have stupidly compacted a North-South economic and social divide with a contrast between Jews, Christians and Islam. Fundamentalism is a bit everywhere and while we have to

acknowledge its existence and would be very mistaken not to, the ‘demonisation’ of Islam also has to be avoided. This might also help us solve the problem of cohabitation, and I am referring to the Palestinian issue, to the relationship of Israel with its neighbouring countries.

The third point I wish to make flows from President Gorbachev’s history: let us not forget the outstanding season of human progress when, in the Reagan-Gorbachev talks, issues of disarmament and human rights were discussed, leading to a 50% reduction of nuclear stockpiles. I think we should remember this considering the present difficulties between the United States and the rest of the world. We have to bear in mind the trauma of 9/11: with a deceased person at home – as we say – it is difficult to make general statements, and this is the way they feel and it can not be forgotten.

Now, as then, we do not wish to increase weapons but reduce them, then halve them, just as happened with nuclear weapons through dialogue between the US and the NATO countries, and the Soviets on the other. A dialogue which involved the whole world.

I would like to offer a few concluding remarks: we are about to have a very important event here: the Winter Olympic Games. In ancient Greece, wars were interrupted during the Olympic Games. Then after World War 1 and 2 we were faced into a situation where we had to have two separate villages, one for Eastern athletes and one for Western ones. In 1960 in Rome, when we organised the Olympic Games, we refused to have two separate villages because it was against the Olympic spirit and nothing terrible happened. So I would like to hope, addressing this to you too, that there will be no wars to interrupt during the Olympic Games you are preparing so carefully and that these Games will help us overcome the lack of communication in this world.

Genscher reminded us today – and unfortunately too little is said about it – about the Commission on Security and Cooperation in Europe (CSCE), that is to say about the agreement which exists between all European countries, the US and Canada. The organization is still operative and the US is an active participant whilst it has lost momentum in many other organizations such as the Inter-Parliamentary Union which it has not attended for years. I would also like to add, if anyone is a little sceptical, that when the final CSCE act was signed in Helsinki on August the 1<sup>st</sup>, many could not believe it. Mr Aldo Moro signed for Italy both as Prime Minister of Italy and as President of the EU, which then was the EC. When asked what cooperation and security meant as Mr Brezhnev was referring to limited sovereignty in Easter Europe, Mr Moro answered: “Mr Brezhnev will pass and the seed we are sowing today will bear fruit”.

Our duty as former fighters is to keep that seed thriving.

**Federico Mayor Zaragoza, *Former General Director of UNESCO***

Dear President Gorbachev, in the excellent letter in which you invited us to join you in this enterprise, you wrote that the forum will attempt to offer a vision of how to solve the problems that the world is now facing. Our commitment is for peace, justice and equality and (I quote) we identify the protection of human life and dignity as our principal priorities. Human life and dignity as principal priorities. Following your guidelines, I would like to underline some aspects of the current situation.

First, the evolution from the beginnings that placed us in a framework of a democratic world, in which the peoples were united by the Charter of the United Nations, up to the oligarchy of the G7 or G8, now G1. The situation has gradually evolved to the point of a non-binding role of the United Nations, forgetting the role that the United States itself had played in San Francisco in 1945. Leading also to complete impunity on the global level.

Trafficking of all kinds: arms, capital, drugs, people. People trafficking and tax havens and the lack of a code of conduct in economic, social, environmental, cultural and ethical fields. Lack of governance and what is, in my opinion, at the root of the present situation, the shift of responsibility from politicians and parliamentarians to the market, which has led to a progressive weakening of the nation state and the strengthening of multinational corporations. The globalisation of poverty and exclusion, increasing the distance between the haves and the have nots, has produced frustration, radicalisation, hatred, aggression, terrorism and the migration of “desperados”, those who no longer have any hope.

The dependency on technology and its exploitation, the appropriation of the natural resources of the developing countries. There is a question to which I would like an answer.

Who does Africa belong to? Africa, the place of wisdom. They need our support, but today, with all their resources, who do these resources belong to?

Where does all its immense wealth go? Starting from the exodus of talents we know as the “brain drain”. Thousands of PhD graduates from developing countries are today providing their intellectual and creative contribution in the most highly developed countries. This is a pity. A pity for all of us, the fact that between 30 and 50 thousand people die of hunger every day or because of the impossibility of gaining access to medical care or drinking water.

The triple cure for AIDS, as you know, is too expensive, while expenditure on arms is around 2 billion dollars a day.

At the same time, and this is my second point to outline the situation, environmental degradation risks reaching a point of no return. The degradation of the air, oceans and soil. How can we look our children in the eyes without blushing?

The third point that I want to add is the progressive risk of cultural standardisation as I believe that cultural diversity and creative ability, a distinctive

ability of human beings, are our hope. Diversity and uniqueness are our common wealth, and together with universal values are our strength.

Now: solutions. One: a global vision. There are 6.1 billion human beings and, according to Article 1 of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, we all have the same dignity. We must bear in mind these 6.1 billion human beings. How can we, the so-called westerners, sometimes take decisions that affect the whole of humanity, when a single country, India, has more inhabitants than all of the west put together?

Second criterion: policies and actions must be based on values, on universal principles dictated by the Declaration of Human Rights.

Third criterion: in-depth understanding of reality. A profound understanding of reality without which we cannot change it.

Fourth: better sharing. Dare to share, including, first and foremost, the sharing of knowledge.

Fifth: perspective, a preventive attitude. See, foresee, foresee to forewarn.

These criteria should be applied in particular to the two following solutions.

One is education (and for me this is THE solution). Education for everyone, for one's whole life and for a new citizenship, for a new citizenship, as Gorbachev indicated. A new citizenship that enables everyone to be themselves and to act according to their own conscience. Enabling participation in a true construction of democracy. Making endogenous development possible. Making a knowledge-driven economy possible. Making it possible to anticipate and avoid events contrary to human dignity. Allowing the passage from a culture of force and imposition to one of understanding and peace. Allowing all human beings and not the privileged few to develop their immense creative potential. Allowing all to voice their opinions, their agreement or disagreement. Allowing them to protest and propose, as happened in Porto Alegre, where civil society proclaimed peacefully that another world is possible.

Encouraging everyone to participate, to raise their voices together, as happened on 15 February this year, when opposition to war was heard, especially to so-called preventive war, to support pluralism in a multicultural context, to develop a new political culture that takes us from the "peace of security" to the "security of peace".

The second solution is the refoundation of the international institutions. This has been said by many speakers today, in particular about the United Nations. Local democracy in a framework of global democracy. This is the solution to tackling the main challenges today.

The foundation of a culture of peace that President Gorbachev himself presented in my country two years ago has been taken up by the University of Barcelona, in Catalonia with a "network of networks", with the precise purpose of promoting in civil society the reform of international institutions.

An Ancient Greek philosopher wrote: "they can because they believe they can". Another writer, Albert Camus, wrote at the end of World War Two: "I accuse them because they were able, but did not dare". I hope that our grandchildren will have no reason to accuse us as, following the initiative of Gorbachev and our Italian partners in Piedmont, we will dare to dare.

**Jian Mingjun**, *President of China Association for the Promotion of International Technology and Economic Cooperation in North-East Asia and President of the United Nations Development Programme*

The fact that leaders, politicians, public figures and academics from many countries are getting together today in Turin to discuss major issues of mankind's development and to promote the noble cause of peace and development in the world is very important.

This event is both timely and historically significant in the long term. Today the world is undergoing complex and profound changes. On the one hand, peace and development continue to be the main issues of our era, and people in different countries are hoping that the new century will be a century of peace, security and successful development. But, on the other hand, people are concerned about the considerable growth of uncertainty factors that adversely affect peace, security and sustainable development in the world.

There are continuing and even growing signs of hegemonies and of the policy of brute force. Terrorism has become an international scourge.

The situations in Iraq and in the Korean peninsula require close attention. Recent developments have shown, once again, that to keep the peace and pursue common development throughout the world we need to rely on joint efforts for the world's people and states, to strengthen international agreements and cooperation and promote the leading role of the United Nations. The United Nations as the most representative and recognized international organization is indispensable in keeping world peace, promoting common development and building a just and effective international political and economic order. The task for the United Nations in the new century is becoming ever more complex, which requires its role to be strengthened rather than undermined.

We must act in full compliance with the main objectives and principles of the UN Charter and continue to strengthen the authority of the UN and its Security Council in international affairs. No state or group of states may arbitrarily arrogate the rights belonging to the UN or ignore its authority. At a time of great change and complexity in the international situation, it is essential to manage relations between the states while keeping peace and stability throughout the world. All states, regardless of their size, are members of the international community and must treat each other as equals, coexist peacefully, pursue friendly international exchanges and dialogue and continue to strengthen and develop mutual understanding and friendship.

Conflict between states should be settled by peaceful means rather than by the use or threat of force. Any state bent on unilateralism or hegemony, no matter how strong economically or military, will ultimately face the protest of the world's nations.

Today people in various countries of the world are deeply concerned about the development of the situation in Iraq. We proceed from the consistent position that the

problem of Iraq should be solved by political means within the UN framework and we will spare no effort to this end. It is deplorable that a war finally broke out. We are deeply saddened by the humanitarian disaster as well as by the damage done to the stability of peace and development in the region and in the world as a whole.

People throughout the world share an aversion to war and want peace. We urge the states involved to put an end to military action and return to the right path of a peaceful solution to the Iraqi problem.

Today, when the international situation is dramatically changing, the question of military action in Iraq and of the ways of rebuilding the country have a direct bearing on the creation of a new international political and economic order, on the problem of the UN's unity and authority and on the issues of peace and stability in the Middle East and in the world.

We all share common responsibility for the important historic mission of the new era to keep lasting peace in the world and promote the common development and general welfare of all nations.

**Rudolph Schuster, *President of the Slovak Republic***

(Message presented by Ambassador Joseph Miklosko)

I regret that due to urgent tasks connected with my office I was prevented from having the pleasure of your company, therefore I use this possibility to address you through the ambassador of the Slovak Republic to Italy.

May I emphasise, right at the onset, that I highly appreciate the invitation from the founder of the Forum, my friend, ex president Gorbachev, to participate in its activities. I fully subscribe to his idea of a forum associating well-known, experienced and respected political figures of the world who, even after leaving political office in their own countries, are not oblivious to what is going on in the world and can give a meaningful contribution to discussion on the issues of peace and security, stability and prosperity of nations and states.

I watched the preparation for this Forum very closely. I was determined to take an active part. On the one hand, the fact that my country is currently nearing the culmination of its integration project is the reason for my inability to be with you today, but on the other hand I have a feeling of great satisfaction because, after its upcoming entry to well-proven Euro-Atlantic integration groupings, the Slovak Republic will join the effort of the North Atlantic Alliance and the European Union to strengthen world security and peace and to foster international understanding and cooperation.

The pro-integration stance of the citizens of the Slovak Republic means an exceptional commitment for me as the first directly elected Head of the State in our country. This also underlines my decision to personally join in the declared ambition of the World Political Forum, which is to seek solutions to problems afflicting the world of today. May I wish the World Political Forum a successful start, productive discussions and, last but not least, satisfaction with its inspiring results.

**Georgi Parvanov, *President of Bulgaria***

(Message presented by Andrei Pantev)

Ladies and gentlemen, it is a great honour for me to address you as founders of the World Political Forum. I highly value the noble aspiration that has brought you to this hall to identify the visions and methods of meeting and coping with the challenges that face humanity in the new century. Developments in recent months have brought us the urgent need for new ideas to regulate world development; a task that will focus the attention of this future World Political Forum.

There has been frequent talk about the crisis in the current world political and legal order, or a new world “disorder”. There are various theories explaining the state of the world today, but none of them is a recipe for the salvation of the world tomorrow. Today, the world is facing dangerous divisions and confrontations between communities and nations, even between allies and governments sharing common humanitarian values. The risk of these divisions deepening, exacerbating, looms before humanity and is no less now than at the time of the cold war.

The fight against terror and against dictatorship can only be meaningful and successful if it is a part of a global effort to create a world based on the rule of law and respect of human rights. Force is not always adequate to the law and what appears fair is not always legally warranted. Humanity needs a stable and secure international rule of law. Without this regard for the interest of others, in today’s interdependent world no single international organization alone is in a position to cope with the new challenges.

None of them can do as they please. International law is applied on various levels through an extensive, universal system of international cooperation. We also need new answers to the issues of containing poverty on the world scale and tackling growing disparity in incomes of developed and developing states. The deepening contradictions between rich and poor and the threats of a clash between the haves and have nots. The same applies to environmental problems, demographic explosions, ethnic and religious conflicts, mass unemployment, migration, the globalisation of crime, the spread of new and old epidemics. There is growing concern about the future of the universal human culture in the face of the new, serious challenges.

Ladies and gentlemen, we are united by common concerns and shared threats.

I feel confident that the World political Forum will seek and find new answers and new solutions. I can assure you that we, in Bulgaria, will be following closely the result of your activities and your messages to the international community.

I wish the Forum you are inaugurating today success; a Forum that will stimulate the wisdom and the abundant political experience of the great names in world politics, with the common sense and profound knowledge of scholars and experts.

**Alexandre Bessmertnykh**, *former Minister for Foreign Affairs of the Soviet Union*

My first words are to praise President Gorbachev and all the people around him who participated in this great decision to conceive and establish the World Political Forum. I would also like to add some words of praise to the national, regional and local leaders of Italy who decided to give permanent residence to the World Political Forum in this great city of Turin.

The idea of establishing this institution is not only wise and useful, but also very timely. We are living in the third year of the third millennium: a time of transition and a time filled with many uncertainties. But it has always happened this way, usually at the crossroads of history. When a new century starts, humanity feels uncertain about the future. We are at the crossroads of history and we can not guess what to expect next. Here we are again. We are at the start of the 21<sup>st</sup> century and we are concerned, frankly, with the prospect of the times we are going to live soon. The current century and the forecast for its future are very gloomy, unfortunately.

What do we see around us? First of all we see the global population is growing and there is a great movement of people. The scale of that movement from the South to the North is, in my view, even greater than it was seven centuries ago, in the fourteenth century; it is greater than that, and maybe the consequences are not clearly calculated and understood by the leaders and by the academic and intellectual communities of the world. There should be no more war according to the calculations made by the experts. There should be no more oil on the planet by the end of this century. We are probably going to face one of the greatest struggles we have ever had: the struggle for energy resources. I suspect that we saw the first steps in that direction several weeks ago. Iraq is not only a geopolitical or humanitarian action, it was also an action associated with the oil situation in the world.

There will be water crises: an enormous crisis that may be even greater than the oil crisis. The Mayor of Turin just stated that the School of Water has been established here, which indicates the sensitivity of this country towards this forthcoming crisis. The environment is deteriorating dangerously; nuclear weapons proliferate. We are all talking about non-proliferation of nuclear weapons, but they are proliferating. And this is a fact, a fact which will influence our future. Poverty, all over the world, especially outside that of the “golden billion”, is growing, and Bono talked about this so brightly and persuasively. It is one of the problems we’ll have to face.

So the question is: are these situations we are facing going to stay? Will the future of this world be as gloomy as it looks at the very beginning, like the 20<sup>th</sup> century looked so quiet at the very beginning but turned out to be so difficult? People and their leaders very often fail to grasp the essence of developments and events. But even when they do understand the content of the changes, they are very often unable to identify the consequences of those changes. And with a powerful system of global communication we face another problem. We find ourselves living under the very strong pressure of quickly developed stereotypes and imposed perceptions.

One of those erroneous perceptions that seriously hamper our vision of the world today is the idea of unipolarity. World public opinion is conditioned to believe that after the Cold War, with the demise of the Soviet Union, only one centre of power remained: the United States. There is no question about the fact that the United States is the strongest nation on earth today, economically and militarily, but it was almost the same story during the Cold War. The United States was the strongest country, economically and strategically. The global balance was maintained, not so much by positioning the United States against the Soviet Union, but rather by restraining relationships between the so-called camps. There were three major camps: the Western camp, the transatlantic alliance based on NATO; the socialist camp, the USSR, Eastern and Central Europe based on the Warsaw Pact; and a group of non-aligned nations with China manoeuvring between the two blocks. So, the end of the Cold War brought about fundamental changes, especially in that inter-camp relationship. The Warsaw Pact was disbanded, the NATO block has developed two centres of power, with some relationship between them: I mean the United States and the European Union.

The non-aligned group produced a strong centre of power within itself: India, which is the fourth most economically powerful country in the world with nuclear weapons and great intellectual capacity to lead. China and Russia cut off their relations as military allies some time ago. Since then, they have turned those relations into a relationship of partnership, which is a euphemism for just good relations without suspicion. China's position in the world is that of an independent and self-sufficient nation with remarkable economic success. Japan, despite going through serious although temporary economic problems, remains a strong nation with great potential. Russia, which was weakened by awkwardly designed reforms, economic and political errors, is now rebounding; it wasted nearly ten years but it is now coming back economically and strengthening itself politically.

So, on to the European Union. I like what was said by my friend Minister Genscher, who said that Europe has developed a new culture, an absolutely unique culture of living together. The history of the world has never seen before nations voluntarily yield their sovereignty just to live closer together than before.

Thus, what I want to say is that we now live in the world of multipolarism. It is a multipolar world. Not all the poles are equal and nobody ever expected them to be equal. The New World is being created, but it is not yet organized. A transitional period is necessary; I don't know how long it is going to take, but it should be there. The new centres of power recognize their strength and they recognize their role, but they are reticent about it, they don't want to declare it, to speak about it. Why? I think there are at least three reasons for that.

First of all they have not yet finished the programme of transformation of all the elements of their greatness: political stability, economic development and military self-reliance.

Secondly, they are concerned that overstatement of their power base may be perceived by the rest as a pretext for regional dominance and they don't want to be seen that way. So they follow, maybe without knowing it, an ancient Chinese saying:

“hide your brilliance and stress your weaknesses”. Since the United States’ economy is a power engine for all economic dynamics, the centres of power move cautiously in order not to jeopardise their opportunities in the United States market. And the United States market is stronger, in my view, than US diplomacy and US military power.

So, if this picture is reasonable, then we may find a key to future world stabilization. And the key is the development of an interconnected network of balances between all the power centres, current and future.

The United States, of course, will be an integral part of this new system. It should, probably, be a leading component of this new balanced system of the 21<sup>st</sup> century. The world will be unstable if we don’t build it and we don’t plan it, because it cannot sit just on a one legged chair. The system would not be stable enough.

As to the mechanisms to develop in this direction, the first, as some friends have already stated today, is the restoration of the basic rules of international law in foreign affairs. Democratisation of world affairs cannot be achieved by weakening international law and its institutions.

Last March, March 2003, President Bush said that the United Nations and I quote: “will fade into history as an ineffective, irrelevant debating society” The United States and all of us should not allow that to happen. If that occurs, forces of chaos and anarchy, criminals and terrorists will celebrate their greatest victory, the destruction of the greatest edifice of peace and stability. Yes, the United Nations may not be perfect, totally perfect today. Some of its elements need modification. The Security Council should have more permanent members; all the centres of power which I mentioned should have their seats on the Security Council. We have to change the rules on decision making within the Security Council because I do not believe that the power of veto is acceptable in today’s world. But what should we do? I think, at least this is one idea, we could have two or three negative votes that could block a decision, but not just one.

Supranational institutions are necessary and should be strengthened. We can’t allow the degradation of international structures. We have to build a new balance of power in the 21<sup>st</sup> century. If we do not, we won’t be able to solve the major, most pressing problems of today: nuclear proliferation, the growing arms race. By the way, the arms race is going to grow after this Iraqi war; international terrorism is not a problem for the whole of the 21<sup>st</sup> century, I believe, but at least for the first decades of it; the preservation of democracy within nations and between nations. I think one of the targets of terrorism is to destroy democracy first within nations and then between nations. And this may happen, because in protecting ourselves from terrorism, we have started to limit our domestic, internal democracy.

So, as a final point, I would like to say that reasonable democracies should work together in order to prevent the appearance of democracies that may become unreasonable. And I believe that our newly established Forum should strongly support this movement because this is a mission that is possible, not impossible.

**Benazir Bhutto**, *former Prime Minister of Pakistan*

Mr President, with Iraq divided into American, British and Polish control zones, we gather together in Turin at an extraordinary and difficult time. Whatever our own views on the path that led to the recent Iraq war, it is now time to look forward. It is time to reassess the new world reality. The post-Iraq international situation gives us an opportunity again to look for ways to promote the cause of democratisation, human rights and the global community to which we are all committed. Many in the international community felt uncomfortable with a war without the United Nation's sanction. Demonstrations for peace broke out in the heart of Europe and sometimes these demonstrations were larger than the demonstrations in the Muslim world.

No one likes war and no one likes repression. Western societies have learnt how to absorb dissent. Non-Western societies are yet to deal with the challenge of those who are victimized, persecuted, imprisoned, tortured and exiled because of their political views. This community of the politically disaffected and politically disenfranchised played a pivotal role both in saving Afghanistan and Iraq. In Kabul and Baghdad popular voices of the people were denied political space by the dictatorships there and it was these political dissidents that formed the political front for a war to reclaim their own land. I believe that countries descend into the darkness of international terrorism and state terror when pluralism is disrupted, when diversity is suppressed, when one man determines the destinies of millions of people, be it a Mullah Omar, Saddam Hussein or another dictator.

America's president, George Bush justified war claiming: "Men and women in every culture need liberty like they need food and water and air. Everywhere that freedom arrives, humanity rejoices and everywhere that freedom stirs, let tyrants fear."

Post-Iraq, tyrants should fear. I find it troubling that some tyrants still feel little fear. In the case of Pakistan, a repressive regime run by a sitting General, a sitting Chief of Army Staff, exiles the popular opposition, imprisons dissidents and rigs elections. In the post-Iraq world that dawned this April, the words "rationalizing the Iraq war" can and should be used to press all nations to make a consistent application of democratic principles the essence of internationalism in the new millennium.

There were moments in recent history that were squandered. When the finger of history writes of the end of the 20<sup>th</sup> century, it will write of the international community's failure to reinforce the democratic breakthrough that the end of the Cold War brought as the era's greatest missed opportunities. I recall speaking to the European Parliament proclaiming that armies all over the world had finally returned to their barracks, that freedom had won on every continent.

In retrospect, I fear, it was merely a mirage. The forces of real-politik were waiting to collide with the forces of ideology. We proclaimed a new moral era at the end of the Cold War, but actually we constructed an era of moral relativity. Our standards remained inconsistent and our policies selective. Those that decried

dictatorship in Burma remained silent about tyranny elsewhere. Many in this room rightfully demand self-determination for the people of Palestine but are less vocal about the rights of the Kashmiri people. And moreover, I would add, that we evaluate national security by hardened borders and tanks and missiles but true security is linked to the fight for economic justice that will liberate nations. True security is linked to the fight against famine and Aids. True security means protecting our environment.

I remember a time when the world walked away from Afghanistan, after the withdrawal of the Soviets in 1989. The fundamental mistake was that in Afghanistan at that time, we were not consistently committed to the values of freedom, democracy and self determination that ultimately undermine terrorism. The result was Taleban dictatorship, Al Qaida and terrorism. Dictatorship doesn't constrain fundamentalism or terrorism, dictatorship provokes it. The goal of rational foreign policy must always be to simultaneously promote political stability and strengthen democratic values. The stakes are high. Every war in the South Asian sub continent from where I hail started when my country was under a military dictatorship. And I do not know of a single case after the Second World War when one democratic country went to war against another democratic country.

Ladies and gentlemen, I believe that the answer lies in democracy, and I believe that democracy is the best guarantee of the respect and dignity of the people of Pakistan. I believe that a democratic Pakistan living by the rule of law within and without is the best guarantee of the triumph of moderation and modernity amongst one billion Muslims who today stand at the crossroads of history, who today have to choose between the paths of dictatorship and democracy, of modernity and terrorism.

These are difficult times. We stand at the crossroads of a new world order. We witness the dawn of a unipolar world, a unipolar world environment where wars can take place with the coalition of the willing. We witness disunity in the United Nations Security Council, in NATO, in Europe and in the Muslim world. But we can also remember that the future is in our hands, as the European philosopher, Goethe, once wrote: "freedom must be reinvented in every generation".

This is our turn, yours and mine to reinvent freedom, and I know we shall prevail.

**Wojciech Jaruzelski, *Former President of Poland***

Many an interesting thought has been voiced in this hall, many I subscribe to entirely, and since there is a strict ten minute rule for every speaker, allow me to leave the text of my contribution on the chairman's table and to exchange a few ideas on what I feel are the most important topics.

Globalisation is changing the world, but the clash between different political philosophies and interests can be easily seen. At times politicians, governments and organizations look as if they are talking to themselves in the mirror. When they represent their points of view, voice their positions and express their opinions, they fail to take into due consideration the fact that those they are speaking to have another vision and specific interests. I believe this is the Forum's sphere of action, for instance by organizing and promoting observatories, special workshops on how to make compromises and reach mutual understanding.

First of all, actions have to be foreseen and prevented: this is why we have to detect and prevent danger in its early stages and inform world opinion promptly before situations become dramatic and painful. The current wave of terrorism confirms this need.

Globalisation is not a merely economic dimension: there is globalisation of information that brings people closer but also more antagonistic. There is amazingly wide access to information and the poor, especially the poor in the Third World see a violent contrast between their own dismal lives and the wealth others enjoy. This has contributed to the triggering of migration waves, and is a fertile terrain for extremist international terrorism. However, in many developed countries the constant drumming of vulgar advertisements, the pushiness of the electronic means of communication, the fierce competition, all have a negative impact on the conscience of the community or society. The negative consequences of these effects could multiply and our Forum ought to address these problems to assess them and make suggestions.

Most of the people in this room belong to the middle and older generations although they will be deciding for the young and very young. Are they being educated to tolerance and culture or quite the opposite, chauvinism, to become fanatics and ignorant?

Every country has a right to its memory or legacy, to self-esteem. However, this has to be kept within the bounds of truth and respect for others: the internal, national sphere has to be balanced with the global and universal spheres. Would it not be worth suggesting that the coming Forum could investigate spheres and forms of knowledge, comparison and points in common of our education systems, historical knowledge and their equivalent in the present, with special reference to the relationships among young people?

Religion is known to play a very important role in the lives of many people, and peoples. Religions share a lot in terms of their moral ground, but, notwithstanding this, differences in religion, often paired with ethnic and chauvinistic

factors have been and still are cause for conflict and exasperated contrast. I think we ought to spend a moment to express our gratitude and esteem to Pope John Paul II who has turned 83: he is a tireless fighter for peace and people. He upholds ecumenical principles, actively promoting inter-Christian rapprochement as well as having taken steps towards Judaism, Islam and other religions which he always treats with great respect.

In the many years I spent in an arena which I shared, for ideological reasons we upheld the notion of internationalism: currently, on a vaster scale including the whole of mankind, we have to replace it with a universal philosophy, proposing the coming together of all those who believe in high humanistic values.

I would like to spend a few words talking about weapons: there are no longer two opposing political and military sides. As a result, the arms race should have come to an end and a downward spiral could have been expected. This has actually happened in numerical terms, but not in terms of the quality of weapons since new and increasingly sophisticated weapons have become available, reaching the virtual automation of the battle field. For centuries, fighting implied a shield and sword while now the wealthy, those who enjoy an edge, a technical and technological superiority are virtually able to eliminate their enemy without any losses.

A question springs to mind: where is all this leading? How much money – money that is so needed to overcome poverty and backwardness – will be spent on weaponry? This is why I believe that Michail Sergeevich Gorbachev's historical merits are his lack of fear in going against the tide, opposing the philosophy of interdependency to that of hostility. It became the basis for mutual trust: both sides put their cards on the table, maximum stakes were set, and the global reduction of weapons began.

I realise it is anything but easy to propose a similar process on a global, intercontinental level, but this is where we are going and we have to seek and agree upon criteria of the minimum defence needed to give all sides a sense of security.

What are our aims and intentions? There are tens of international organizations, institutions and bodies, a host of politicians and officials, but their actions do not impact on expectations and needs.

This does not mean there is no aim or scope for our Forum. We have several cards to play.

Why should our voice be heard, why should anyone listen to us? First of all, because most of the people here are outside official politics and therefore have no personal axe to grind. Our positions are all part of the past and as a result our opinion can stand out as independent, original and objective.

Secondly, I would like to recall a proverb 'You will get two new ones for one broken one': I think that in one way or the other all of us here have been 'hit', each one has had a difficult experience, at times has a dramatic story to tell. We come from different countries, countries which differ in ideological terms, in terms of their social and political spheres. We have a range of different backgrounds, many of these things kept us apart, but in spite of all that we are here today and this means that

mutual understanding and agreement are possible. We are the living proof of it and may set an example.

Third point. There are world personalities here: allow me to mention the Nobel Laureate Michail Sergeevič Gorbachev: in this hall there is no need to recall his merits and historical role. I know how hard and tiring it was for him: before the Fall of the Berlin wall, Michail Gorbachev had to demolish a much stronger barrier, the one to be found inside many people's minds, in the conscience of those who hold power or belong to the apparatus.

His international standing, his role in establishing the Forum, the efforts of those of us who have convened here feed into the hopes for the future, that other barriers may be crossed.

And lastly a fourth. The fact that we are no longer Europe-centred and Euro-Atlantic centred is extremely important: we are here from all continents, including the great Far East. This will enhance the prestige and standing of our Forum and will generate new opportunities and chances.

**Jacques Delors**, *former President of the European Commission*

(Message read by Bertrand de Largentaye)

The beneficial or perverse effects caused by the acceleration of world economic integration, the so-called globalisation, and the way in which this phenomenon should be managed in order to overcome existing difficulties are topical issues which deserve due attention.

First goal: the search for more balanced economic relations between developed and developing countries. There is a natural order in the economic relations between developed and developing countries and today this order is extremely disturbed. A developed country is, by definition, a country with efficient infrastructures and with satisfactory production and income levels. It is a country which can and must save more than it invests. A developing country is in the opposite situation: it has to invest in order to create the infrastructures it needs, but its low income level prevents it from saving the necessary money. An efficient globalisation policy should therefore ensure that developed countries have positive trade balances and capital expenditure higher than their revenues, while developing countries should be in the opposite situation. Such an economic order would be natural and promote economic upturn and convergence.

The scandal which characterises the world we live in and that the current globalisation movement has not been able to prevent lies in the fact that there is wide acceptance of a situation in which several developing countries have strongly positive trade balances, and are therefore potential creditors on the financial markets, while the richest economy in the world takes loans for 500 billion dollars a year in order to finance its consumption and investments. This situation makes no sense, it is neither healthy nor stable and it will not last for long. This is why it would be reasonable to define and implement the mechanisms which would allow us to quickly restore the natural order of things.

Second goal: the critical analysis of the prevailing economic doctrine of the past twenty years. I am referring to what has been defined as the "Washington Consensus", a doctrine which, thanks to the support of the large international financial institutions and of the Treasury Ministries of the main developed countries, has become the conceptual basis for the adjustment policies of the countries requiring aid, both developing and transition countries. This theory, of neo-classical inspiration, is centred on reforms aimed at stabilising prices, commerce and currency fluctuations, at liberalising prices, commerce and finance and at privatisation. As it does not take into account the specific situation of single countries, its consequences have been disastrous.

It is enough to think, for instance, of the tragedy caused by the financial liberalisation in Russia or of the serious deficiencies which have characterised its privatisation programme. After the collapse of the Soviet Union the quality of life was mediocre and poverty virtually non-existent; today 40% of the population is

below the poverty line. Similar situations can be seen in Africa, South-East Asia and Latin America. It is now time to think seriously about the consequences of the free movement of capital, and in particular, the free movement of short-term capital, on some developing countries. The stability of the world economy depends on the measures aimed at controlling, not preventing, the movement of capital and in particular short-term capital, which represent a source of speculative instability. It would be possible to systematically criticise the adjustment policies aimed at reducing the domestic demand of debtor countries instead of increasing the demand of creditor countries. In general, what should be ensured is a situation of full employment. This is the main objective and also a guarantee of success of economic policies.

“People are the true wealth” said Bodin: this is the key to attaining social and economic balance. President Clinton had already clearly understood this at the time of his presidential campaign in 1992. The Washington Consensus has no value today and has been replaced by a policy for development which still needs to be clearly defined. The experts recognise the role played by institutions and by the State in guaranteeing the proper functioning of the market economy, and market regulation is again a much debated topic.

Third goal of President Delors: the creation of an Economic Security Council within the United Nations. This Council would make the activities carried out by the different economic agencies of the UN more rational and consistent. It would also give them a common and general vision and the sense of a common mission that they often lack. The autonomy that these agencies currently enjoy is excessive. The UN Social and Economic Council has virtually no authority over them and even its very usefulness is questioned.

The G7-G8, given its nature, would be the most adequate tool to exercise the responsibility for world economic governance and is perceived as the undisputed leader of the Bretton Woods institutions, but it has lost most of its spontaneity and flexibility. Its meetings are now formal occasions, almost a ritual, and its composition is questionable. The Economic Security Council could become the supreme arbitrator of the global regulation which should accompany the process of market liberalisation. This new international institution could become both the guarantor of the rule of law at a global level in the field of economic relations and the keeper of the so-called global public good. We might even, slightly unrealistically, imagine that it could have its own resources, collect global taxes and create a world fiscal system. On this point, several solutions have already been put forward: a tax on carbon emissions or on financial transactions, new special drawing rights, a tax on tourism, etc.

This Economic Security Council could also be the most appropriate institution to relaunch a debate on a world reserve currency different from a credit imposed on the most powerful economy and therefore neutral. With such a reserve currency, we would prevent the lack of equity and the biased politics followed by the international monetary system, which treats the balance deficits of current transactions differently depending on whether they derive from the emitting country or the others. This optimal situation is still a distant idea, nonetheless it would be appropriate that such a

Council, which should include the representatives of large countries and regional organisations, could start its activity immediately and begin an analysis, through open dialogue, of all the obstacles preventing sustainable, human and equal development. This is a fundamental aspect of the adjustment of the United Nations to the new global situation.

Fourth and last goal: Africa can no longer be the forgotten continent, the continent of wars, famines and epidemics nobody talks about. If there had been an international intervention in Rwanda - not necessarily expensive or long-lasting - we would have certainly spared 800,000 human lives. The endless civil war in Sudan has already claimed 2 million victims; after 3 million deaths, the massacres in the Democratic Republic of Congo have resumed in the province of Itury after the retreat of the Ugandan army. A new World Political Forum should try and put an end to the era of suffering and darkness in Africa and devote more attention to this isolated continent and to problems such as corruption and transmittable diseases, which, though not specific to this geographical area, have had the most devastating consequences there. At the time of its creation, the NEPAD (New Partnership for African Development) generated high hopes, but now it has difficulties in exploiting its full potential.

**Jack Matlock**, *former U.S. Ambassador to the USSR*

The effort to bring us together and to organize a World Political Forum is, I think, quite timely. In fact it is overdue. As I was flying to Europe over the weekend I read the review of a very new book by Sir Martin Ryle, the Astronomer Royal of Great Britain, and an eminent astrophysicist.

It is a book that talks about the possible disasters facing us in the 21<sup>st</sup> century and it is disturbingly entitled: "Our final hour". And in that book Sir Martin Ryle calculates that civilization as we know it, has no more than a 50/0 chance of surviving the century. This is a disturbing prognosis because this is not by a politician, not by, you might say, the sort of amateur prognosticator trying to stir up people, but a scientist who looks rather coolly at what he considers the odds. And the odds don't look at all good.

First of all (there are many things that he brings up) because mankind has the physical ability, which it did not have before the middle of the 21<sup>st</sup> century, to destroy civilization on Earth. First of all by the use of nuclear weapons. Now, during the cold war we worried greatly about the possibility of nuclear conflict. And as senseless as in retrospect the nuclear arms race now seems, what is and was absolutely clear to us, involved at that time, is that the purpose, both of the United States and the Soviet Union was to prevent war from breaking out because both of our governments, both of our leaders, understood that a nuclear war would be a catastrophe.

I was privileged to be present at many meetings between President Reagan and George Bush the Elder with President Gorbachev. And I think that was almost a magic moment when both realized that they basically had the same aims. In the case of President Reagan and President Gorbachev, they were probably the only two world leaders who had understood the necessity of moving towards a total elimination of nuclear weapons. They moved us a long way, but since the end of the cold war their successors have not been as successful. We still have a lot to do. Yet, the basic problem is not so much the nuclear weapons that nations possess but the possibility that they will fall into the hands of terrorists. Other speakers have mentioned that terrorism is something that is not new; we've known it before. But I would submit that the sort of terrorism that resulted in assassinations or the sort that was developed as irregular guerrilla warfare was of a quite different nature to what we are seeing today. What we are seeing today is the development of what some American specialists have called the development of "sacred terror". Terror for the sake of destruction.

Convinced by people that life on this earth is not of much value, but that only the life afterwards has any and that they can achieve their aims, they can achieve their place in Paradise by sacrificing themselves in the destruction of as many people as possible to crush our civilization. If terrorists of that persuasion get nuclear weapons, no matter how crude, mankind is in for a terrible future because one could bring on a chain reaction, which could literally threaten life on this earth. This is not the only problem, of course. The problem that most affects people's lives in the future is the

development of organized crime in its international aspects, the tie-in with the illegal drug trade in a massive way, the spread of disease, whether it be AIDS or, now, SARS, which reminds us that globalisation has brought us together not only for good, but also possibilities for bad, including the corruption of government and, in general, anything connected with ineffective government.

Now, as I reflect upon these scourges, these dangers that we face and the fact that our struggle against them has not been very successful up to now, I am also struck by how much of the debate in the international scene really seems almost beside the point. We talk a lot about superpowers, bipolarity, unipolarity, and hyper powers. I'll tell you as an American, and I look at the real problems we face, I can recognize that my country has the greatest military power in the world, perhaps of all times, and usually we have a strong economy, though it's showing weaknesses now, but there is not a single one of the great threats that I have named which that power can solve by itself. Least of all military power. If you are in America you don't feel like a superpower or a hyper power, I'll tell you that. And I think, if I understood Bessmertnykh, he said it very well. He said it's really wrong to think in those terms because we're only going to solve these problems collectively. Are our institutions for collective problem-solving adequate? I think it's clear they're not. And so the recommendation that we look at them again are very important. Most of all I think that so many of our debates and particularly some of the recent ones regarding the war in Iraq are perhaps beside the point despite the importance of many of the issues. I am personally convinced that the United States will not be, does not want to be and will never be the world's policeman. In the long run, the people won't allow it.

There will not be an American empire and there will not be a Pax Americana. I think we will find that the action in Iraq is not going to be repeated, certainly not any time soon. And yet, I would ask others to remember that Americans do feel threatened. Americans do feel that, particularly if nuclear weapons fall into the hands of terrorists, we are going to face a catastrophe. And it seems to most Americans that the world should face up to the problem of failed States and all of the problems that they entail; and not, in the final analysis, assume that if military action is necessary the United States will be there to take it.

Next time we probably won't be.

**Milos Zeman**, *former Prime Minister of the Czech Republic*

What is the core of the question?

Most of us are former politicians who meet here to offer present day politicians, our heirs, general remarks and contributions. Some of today's contributions led me to ask a question: what are we suggesting to our heirs, where is our practical recommendation?

If you tell me that peace and freedom are paramount, that we need human rights, of course it is all true, naturally! So what? We are repeating what others have said before us, before World War 2, but we still had WW2 and other wars have followed. This means we have to focus and provoke: we should not be saying just what we all agree on, but voice arguments which will trigger counter arguments. What can I say to provoke a debate in ten minutes?

I believe some here have already raised the core issue: there was a war in Iraq and there is a risk that similar events may develop in other parts of the world, there is a serious risk that the importance and significance of the UN will be diminished. We are all trying to reform the UN and the Security Council: Guyla Horn, Boutros Boutros-Ghali, Giulio Andreotti and Aleksandr Bessmertnych have already spoken about it but no one has actually said how things stand. We all know the UN and the Security Council need reform, but what is our practical recommendation?

What reform in practice?

I think that we should not focus exclusively on the increase in the number of the permanent members of the Security Council: I agree with the suggestion but it is not the core of the issue. We have to dwell on what has already been said here, that is that there has been the right to veto since the beginning of the cold war and do you know who suggested it? The famous politician Josif Vissarionovič Stalin. The right to veto continues to exist and we would be deluded if we thought that the major powers are going to completely abolish this right of their own free will. In this case we are left with two choices. The major powers will refuse this suggestion and in this case we will live in a world with one major power, the US. As far as I know, the US tried to obtain a resolution from the Security Council but there was a risk of China, France and Russia vetoing it. Had there not been this risk I believe operations in Iraq might have even been conducted under the umbrella of the UN. So this is what I think and that is my suggestion, my friends, practical, limited and detailed.

Please excuse me if I did not say we needed freedom, and human rights. I subscribe to those views entirely and with those who repeat it although I think we need a so called engineering approach. There is an Italian proverb that says that the devil makes the pans but not the lids, which means that he teaches us how to sin but not how to hide it, or deal with the details. Well it is up to us, we have to deal with details and conclude things. You know it is very pleasurable to conceive a baby, but then one has to see it through and the baby has to be raised.

So, Michail Sergeevič, I have another suggestion too: another dear friend of mine, Jarkovan, former Home Secretary of the Czech Republic currently President of

the General Assembly of the UN, one of the world leaders so to speak, could join our group because if we focus on the reform of the UN system he could help us with our suggestions and practical recommendations.

This too is a very practical suggestion.

**Inder Kumar Gujral**, *former Prime Minister of India*

I am happy the World Political Forum has drawn upon the profound experience of public affairs practitioners from every region of the world. For this, I must commend you, President Gorbachev, particularly.

Mr Chairman, as you know, the abiding principle of history is that no great power has ever been permanent. The Greeks, the Romans, the Arabs and the countless other dynasties before them and since, all built the most dazzling empires of their time, but now only ruins remain of them. The nineteenth century saw the zenith of the British Empire, of which it was said, the sun never set. That too collapsed. In India, the “Jewel in the Crown of the Empire”, as it was called, was overcome by an unarmed man in a loincloth, Gandhi, whom the British colonizers had derided as a naked fakir.

Gandhi taught us never to bend before brute power. True power rested in the moral authority to adhere to the path of peace and brotherhood. Truth and non-violence were his only weapons; yet these were enough to shock the mightiest power of that time. “How many divisions has the Pope?” With these contemptuous words Stalin had dismissed the authority of the Vatican, yet, nothing could save Stalin and his vast apprentices of violence from the dustbin of history, when the Pope and his spiritual kingdom are there to be seen better than ever before.

America too had fear of great men. Lincoln led his country into a civil war arguing that no nation can survive half slave and half free. He was right. Of course, there again history testifies no society has prospered which has denied equal opportunity to all its members, where women are subjugated, where minorities face discrimination, where any segment of the people faces alienation.

Mr Chairman, this is the lesson which we Indians have learnt through difficult periods from Gandhi. We built our republic on egalitarian ideas. Not many societies have faced as many dark predictions of imminent collapse as India has at the time of independence. Our former colonial masters held the view that Indians could never govern themselves. As Churchill described it, India was no more a nation than a pure geographical entity, such as the Equator .

More recently, some unfriendly elements in our neighbourhood took the view that the collapse of the Soviet Union heralded the end of multicultural societies and states and all that was needed was to trigger this break-up with the violent Jihad (as they called it). It is true that we have faced multitudes of challenges: poverty, hunger, bitter disputes over religion and languages, to cite just a few , yet it has been our great good fortune to overcome every crisis and emerge stronger each time.

Indian democracy has grown from strength to strength, to become a revolutionary force in our lives. In my own lifetime, if I may say so, I’ve seen this revolution transform a desperately poor subsistence society into a very modern high-tech nation.

My own life-long carrier in public affairs, where I have had the privilege of contributing to this transformation, permits me to speak on democracy with

conviction and authority. Democracy to us means various things to various people. Some see it in voting in elections. Some see it in the institutions and law-based processes. Other, individual freedoms. All of them are right, of course, yet all miss one central point. To my mind, true democracy is a society with a conscience, in the good sense, to hear and heed this conscience in every doubt and dilemma. Mechanics alone cannot sustain democracy; having a spirit, a soul, that lean instinctively towards the good and the just are the keys.

Mr Chairman, I believe that the great tragedy facing human civilization today is that we have stopped hearing the voice of collective conscience. The Iraq war has brought this crisis into sharp relief. The invading forces claimed that they are fighting a just war, first to eliminate the threat posed by weapons of mass destruction and to deny terrorist access to them. Has such justification been validated? A just war must necessarily be the option of last resort. Can anybody truly say that peaceful options had been exhausted before initiating the war? Has anyone even asked how many civilians, women, children and innocents have died, have been brutalized by this war?

The Iraq war also is unique in the manner in which public opinion was manipulated through sustained media campaigns. People around the world have been relentlessly fed images of victory, the heroics of coalition forces and the villainy of the Iraqi regime. How many have seen the other side of the story, of thousands of innocent lives shattered and destroyed for no good reason. How aware are we that in Iraq today hospitals, schools, power facilities, water, sewage facilities, each and every item of civilian infrastructure is in ruins as cholera and other diseases reach epidemic proportions. Why have all the uncomfortable images been cut from the world on the TV screens. Why are the democracies now relying on this doctrine and distorting the truth. Mr Chairman, you will agree that very few are asking these questions; instead we are told that there is a unipolar world now and if you are not with us, you are against us.

The crisis of Iraq is being posed in terms of reconstruction of contracts, trading privileges, the status of Iraq's debt and other such questions. Not many have the independence left to ask: how fast the patent injustice of this war would be redressed. With the difference that the Iraqi war has also brought into question the role and relevance of the United Nations, the system of multilateral laws, the norms of international conduct it embodies. Indeed, it is now argued that the collapse of the Soviet Union a decade ago has created a unipolar world in which the UN system is not viable. The hawks in the United States establishment view their security concerns as paramount. And this would often require the application of overwhelming power. The United States cannot, according to them, allow its dominant security pursuits to be impeded by the supervision of any multilateral institution.

Mr Chairman, such arguments, in my estimation, are both wrong and dangerous. The United Nations may not have been a perfect institution, and certainly we, in India, hold reservations in some aspects of the decision-making processes, yet the UN does embody certain fundamental values: basic and democratic. Firstly, the UN embodies the rules and norms of acceptable international conduct, establishing thereby an international rule of law. Likewise, the principle of sovereign equality

enshrined in the Charter, recognises that nations may be unequal in terms of state power, they are nevertheless entitled to equal treatment within the community of nations. This is the counterpart to the Equality before Law principle that is central in every democratic society. And finally, the United Nations seeks to delegitimize the use of force in settling international disputes. Here again, the UN draws upon the well established principles of civic law, that punishment cannot be imposed without due process of law.

I could well argue that the UN process is cumbersome and sometimes time consuming and requires improvement, however it does not follow that the UN system and the democratic values it enshrines can be cast aside. For all its perceived faults, the multilateral world order has kept the world free of major wars over the past half a century and so fulfilled the primary objective of saving the future for our children. The democratic basis on which international relations have been run so far has contributed to the willing participation of nations, however large or small, in the management of global affairs, fostering thereby a sense of global community. Human rights have been central in this message.

The global war against terrorism launched using the instrument of the UN in after 11 September 2001 has been an outstanding success in marshalling global resources against this potent economic threat; economic and all other types of threats. The struggle to contain the deadly SARS epidemic would probably have been a failure without the benefit of the WHO. The problems of global ageing, environmental degradation, global warming to name only a few of the crises brewing around us, will all challenge the collective wellbeing of mankind. Co-operation and unity will be required as never before.

You will recall that, little over two years ago, world leaders assembled the UN Millennium Summit and unanimously endorsed afresh the ideals on which the UN was founded. And since I find some distinguished friends here who were present at that meeting, and they had said and I quote: "We reaffirm our commitment to the purposes and principles of the Charter of the UN which have proved timeless and universal."

And this was only thirty months back. What is the way forward from then, now?

A little humility would remind us it is beyond human capability to fully comprehend the shadow of coming events. None of the turning points in recent history, the collapse of the Soviet Union, the terrorist attack on New York, the outbreak of the SARS virus were ever anticipated or could be foreseen. The nature of tomorrow's challenges is beyond the power of human reason. Only the means with which we address and overcome these challenges lie within our grasp.

We must rededicate ourselves to peaceful means. A dangerous permissiveness towards war is becoming the fashion. The war on Iraq was accompanied by wide ranging threats directed at various unhelpful countries. I would often read with distress when it was asked "after Iraq who and after Iraq what?" I think that was something which is now resulting in the increasing military budgets of many societies. Violence is terrible enough when it is perpetrated by individuals, but when

a state policy becomes a part of this violence, then it is infinitely far more dangerous. A violent individual will, at the worst, destroy or endanger some individuals. A violent state consigns generation after generation of an entire society into servitude. Conversely, non-violence and free will are central to any productive human dialogue. As we in India have seen, the wheels of non-violence may grind slowly but, like the wheels of God, they do grind exceedingly surely.

Democracy is idealized by all: whether as individuals or nations, but the hard reality is that democracy is not a natural state of mind. Through the pages of history, democracy and freedom emerge as few brief, shining interludes against the grim backdrop of oppression. For, with democracy, human selfishness does not readily coexist. While democracy speaks the language of common good, the public interest, the rule of law, selfishness (if I may say so) urges unilateralism, narrow self-interest and saying that might is right; and selfishness has a more seductive appeal even as it leads from salvation to bondage.

The search for new civilization, as you have enunciated, will be found in the noble paradigms as we have spelt them out. There is universal justice which protects and empowers those who live by its commands. A nation is welded from warring tribes and factions and when we fail to uphold their justice, we deceive ourselves and disintegrate into isolated individuals with isolated concerns: powerless against the whims of the powerful. Therefore, may I say, let us summon the courage to make the correct choice for our destiny which, as a poet has written, lies not in our stars but in our own hands.

**Gen. Klaus Naumann**, *former Chairman of the North Atlantic Military Committee*

This meeting is both timely and important, since we seem to live in a world on the brink of disorder. Based on the experiences which I gained in my professional life, in which I saw the peaceful end of the biggest confrontation this old continent of Europe had ever seen, it may not come as a surprise to you if I offered a few remarks on the international security situation and add a few thoughts on the steps one should take to restore calculable international order.

First, the post-modern society has learned through the events of 9/11 and thereafter that globalization is more than better integrated economies, cheaper communications and increasing global interconnectivity. It has begun to understand that defence and protection mean much more than military defence. The real challenge is how to prevent conflicts, but one must not forget that eventually one might be forced to fight in conflicts which will involve, increasingly, our extremely vulnerable civil societies.

I believe there is a wider dimension and that is to combat terrorism, a terrorism which does not respect any rules. This is a security challenge which concerns all of us. The United Nations Security Council Resolution 1373 stressed that terrorism requires a comprehensive approach, one which will never be able to limit actions to military actions exclusively. If one wants to fight terrorism, one has to bring together the broadest possible coalition of nations and one has to arrange for the best possible co-ordination between international institutions. But to do so requires an understanding of our world, a world which consists of three different worlds simultaneously: the pre-modern, the modern and the post-modern societies. There's our post-modern world of the network society and globalization. In this world there's a premium placed on transparency, information sharing and communication. In this world international barriers will increasingly melt away. But the international society is also characterized by the persistence of the modern, what many see as the old-fashioned world. Here balances of power, alliances and secrecy remain important to preserve national interests and to deter conflicts between powers that retain a different strategic outlook.

As we examine present conflicts, such as in the Middle East, we cannot allow ourselves to be wholly seduced by the seemingly attractive methods of post-modern diplomacy, confidence building and transparency. On the other hand, we must never believe that the threat and the possible application of force alone will offer a solution. They retain a role, particularly as regional balances of power make the use of force possible, but they are not instruments that address the roots of the conflict. To eliminate the reasons for terrorism through non-military means and to look into confidence building and transparency could well be a promising approach. It seems to me that a review of the success which was achieved in Europe through the Helsinki process may merit attention elsewhere.

Finally we have to take into account that there are pre-modern outposts inhabited by people such as the Taliban, where religious solidarity and mysticism

motivate and govern politics and where there is little productive economic life beyond the agricultural domain. In such spaces, there are sources of political legitimacy which are so different from ours. There is little to no respect for human life and there are different motivations for political and military action. In this world, post-modern conflict resolution with peaceful means does simply not work. The long term trend is towards a more post-modern globalized world; but dealing with the vestiges of the pre-modern while maintaining the order of the modern has now become today's strategic challenge.

The complexity of these intermingling worlds results in the fact that those who hate our modern world use instruments such as global financing and instant communication and also the armaments of our modern world to advance their atavistic goals. And this clearly means that terrorism threatens all of us, regardless of whether we are aligned or non aligned, regardless of where we live. Moreover, the reason for terrorism as an instrument to attack the powerful and the rich by using asymmetric means are likely to grow. There's an ever-growing gap between the rich and the poor on our globe. There are growing populations in the poor countries who do not dispose of the resources to feed, to shelter and to employ their people who, on the other hand learn, in our interconnected world, that a small group of incredibly rich but ageing nations continue to look inwards and do not really care that large parts of our world lives in misery. In the face of these challenges, one has to ask the question: what needs to be done to prevent conflicts and to enhance stability.

As I said, it would be wrong to put all our eggs into the basket of military solutions, but it would be equally wrong to believe that the post-modern approach to conflict resolution, i.e. a peaceful and patient search for compromise, were globally applicable. It is not and it will not be for some time to come, but it has to remain our long-term vision. It would also be wrong to believe that we live in a multipolar world. We do not and we will not for quite some time to come, since the imbalance between the United States of America and the other hypothetical centres of power is simply too big. Hence, the only approach is not to block the United States but to seek to influence it in a multilateral way which will allow the international community to benefit from American power and to use it in common attempts to enhance stability.

But the so-called West is badly divided, across the Atlantic and among the Europeans. The emotions which recent diplomatic and military events have aroused still run high. The interest Americans, Europeans and other peoples in the world should have is to heal the current wounds. When the US, Europe and Russia work together, most global challenges are easier to tackle. And we have to note as well, the United Nations was once again unable to see its own decisions through, but the issues at stake go beyond the United Nations. They regard some of the fundamentals of international law.

It seems to me there are two issues which particularly need to be discussed, namely national sovereignty and self-defence. Turning to sovereignty, the question raised during this crisis is whether an international order which treats democracies and tyrannies as equals, and which therefore offers the same degree of protection against intervention to both of them, can really be the order of the 21<sup>st</sup> century. There

is no answer at this time, but to cling to an order which was born in the 17<sup>th</sup> century and was then heavily influenced by the outcome of WW2 and the defeat of colonialism is also no answer. If the final message of the war in Iraq is that in dealing with the worst human rights violators the ultimate determinant of military action is the resolve of those powers that can exercise it, then we shall never be able to agree on what are suitable cases for intervention when all political attempts have failed. That will be a tragedy for those who believe that the international community has a responsibility to protect populations at risk from genocide and other man-made catastrophes. Therefore a debate on a modern interpretation of sovereignty and on the responsibility of all nations to protect human life is unavoidable.

This is not a new debate. It ran through the nineteen nineties, stimulated by the hopelessly inadequate response to the massacres in Rwanda in 1994 and in Bosnia a year later and by the United Nations failure to agree on intervention in Kosovo in 1999. I was a member of an international commission which reported to the United Nations on the rules that might attract broad consensus on the need to protect human life. Our report, the so-called "Report of the International Commission on Intervention and State Sovereignty" still offers the clearest list of criteria for intervention. We agreed in that commission that sovereignty must be protected, but that it must never be abused by dictators to do to their people what they believe they could do. We were agreed that there must never be a second Rwanda. We agreed that the criterion of just authority is decisive for the decision to intervene, which essentially means that the United Nations Security Council should give its final endorsement.

Where this endorsement is lacking, the argument about legality will end, but not necessarily the one about moral legitimacy. Therefore, if the Security Council declines to act in a clear and conscious shocking case, when all other criteria for military intervention are met, it may put the credibility of the United Nations system at risk if nothing were done. In such a case, and that was the conclusion of our commission, it might be legitimate to act without the United Nation's authorization. But one cannot base international law on exceptional cases. I therefore believe that a debate on a modern interpretation of national sovereignty and the responsibility to protect human rights should start.

I also believe that self-defence requires a new definition, which takes properly into account the existence of weapons of mass destruction and the prospects of cyberwarfare conducted by non-state actors. I'm aware that the rules of international law which govern the legitimacy of military measures require a careful re-examination and possible adaptation to the contemporary circumstances of terrorism, weapons of mass destruction and massive violation of human rights. However, it is of the utmost importance that this re-examination and adaptation should be done by international fora such as the World Political Forum. It may well be the key to finding solutions which will guarantee peace and stability, since it will help to restore a calculable international order.

These steps should be the first in the long, overdue reform of the United Nations and I hope that your Forum, President Gorbachev, and we all, will be able to offer a modest contribution to this effort.

**Tadahiro Sekimoto**, *Chairman of the Institute for International Socio-Economic Studies*

The advance of globalisation has brought negative consequences as well as positive ones. These negative aspects include conflicts such as trade and regional disputes, not to mention the Gulf War and the more recent war in Iraq and international terrorism that affects many parts of the world.

Second item. There are many difficult problems. In order to resolve them, I recommend you take the horonic approach, i.e. one that conserves the autonomy of the individual who is in need of the whole community. Such an approach does not mean combining two things and averaging them out. It means creating something new by taking advantage of the two things' respective qualities and futures. In order to realize this goal, the primary task we must undertake is to share information. The progress of things like satellite communication and the internet has made sharing information easier than ever before. The wounds of war separating East and West were brought to light by the power of the students who had seen the truth about the world thanks to greater sharing of information.

The second task is to share ideas, in particular the world needs banners that it can look up to. I believe there is a wide variety of potential banners, such as freedom, peace and sustainable development, etc.

The third item. I am concerned that the concepts dominating the debate in the world today tend to represent the interest of only a limited number of countries. Examples of this include global standards in industry and a number of information/trade disputes. My stance is that if globalization strengthens the ties binding the country together and makes every country and region indispensable to every other country and region, these conflicts will be reduced. The main barriers to this political outcome are: nationalism and imbalances of wealth and military power between nations. I will suggest the following three ways of resolving this.

The first one is to strengthen the economic partnership and co-operation between nations; regional structures like the EU and NAFTA are an example of this. What is needed is stronger co-operation in the expanded free trade zones.

The second way forward is to create new balance. An example of this would be the creation of an Asian monetary system centred on the Yuan, the Chinese currency or the Yen, the Japanese currency, along the lines of the EMS which, as you know, took over twenty years to establish. The AMS would create a currency to counter the dollar and the Euro and would create a new balance to international relations.

The third way forward is to review and revitalize international organizations like the UN, the WTO and IMF: The war in Iraq drives questions about how the UN operates and I believe there should be renewed debate on this subject. I propose that politicians, pacifists, bureaucrats, academics, the media and hawks should form a neo-hexagon (the six-sided figure) to conduct highly charged discussion and to co-operate closely in considering these issues.

I believe we should manage the world on the basis that politics is two steps ahead, administration one step ahead and industry is on a level footing with the current realities. As a representative of industry, I believe that political leaders can achieve great things, so I therefore have great hopes for this World Political Forum.

**Antje Vollmer**, *Vice-President of the German Bundestag*

I would like to present a remark and two proposals.

My first remark is the answer to the question: “What caused the situation in 1989? The big change? What brought the end of the Cold War?”

More and more frequently, I hear comments that it was the economic power of the western world, the rearmament of NATO, the courage of women and men belonging to the civil rights movements. Many of them are here today with us, Tadeusz Mosowieski is sitting here next to me, and sometimes it seems that this big change took place because one day President Reagan said in Berlin: “President Gorbachev, open the doors!”. It seems to me that something important has been forgotten more and more, that is to say, that at that time there had been a political programme for decades. The political programme of détente and disarmament, of the new Ostpolitik and of the Helsinki process. And this process aimed at the hearts and minds of people that had responsibility in the systems of the Soviet Union. And this only because it was a successful process and President Gorbachev is the most important example of it, but we have many other representatives here today as well: Gyula Horn, Boutros Boutros-Ghali and Mr. Genscher. Only because this was particularly successful did this change take place basically without any form of violence, otherwise, surely, the Soviet system would have collapsed at some time. But the fact that this change took place almost without any violence brought the necessity of trying also to get into the core of the system. And I believe and I would like to ask especially you Mr. President Gorbachev and all those who lived in the period of the great change who are here today: defend the right of this programme and of this strategy for the future too, because when I look at some countries belonging to the axis of evil of President Bush, for example Iran and for example in the end China, I know then through my experience that in these countries there are real opportunities, risky opportunities that may cause a change from inside. And we must pursue this goal, so that in the course of time nobody is interested in developing violent processes of a change. This is my first remark.

My second remark: the Iraq war has been unusual from many points of view. It began without any mandate of the Security Council, it took place in an enormous asymmetry and it has been followed by an incredible media campaign at the international level, but from a certain point of view it has been another classical war. Because it has been a war between two States and it had a beginning and an end. I think that we all have to be prepared for the fact that wars in the future will be much more unstable, much more terrible. And we will face more and more conflicts that are not even declared, and precisely for this reason it is difficult to put an end to these wars that are not waged between States anymore.

Nevertheless, most of these wars have to do with ethnic conflicts, or with minorities, and for this reason I would like to make a proposal. We must tackle the question of the programme of stability, of the ethnic minority conflicts that are often

related to terrorism, we must make a proposal about a different solution to these conflicts, different from this anarchic, violent and often even terrorist manner.

In this area there is a lot of abuse of authority as well. A conflict related to minorities is successful when the super-power is interested in it. When, instead, it is a country like Congo and the super-power is not interested, the conflict is a loser right from the start. This kind of conflict is successful when it reaches the attention of the media at the international level too. This is the second super-power left. I hope that we can begin a debate on the possibility of minorities being able to turn to an international court for minorities and to present their complaints before a neutral law institution.

Again here, the State could have the possibility to take legal action, e. g. the possibility to defend itself. And I know that there are some nation states that would like to defend themselves and that have some matters to present. And after the sentence of this international court, minority rights would be fixed at the international level, which would not always lead to the right of a minority to have its own state. But, in this way, minorities would receive rights. And in the event their nation state continuously refuses to go to such a court, the Security Council could be put in charge of helping this minority by order of the United Nations. I believe that in this way the violent trend of minority conflicts would decrease considerably.

My third proposal. I believe that in the past we actually talked too much about values. It was correct to talk a lot about values, but we did not speak enough about the way these values have to be implemented without violence. If we do not want the right of the strongest to prevail, and if we pursue the strength of the right, then we have to give the UN the task of creating a campaign aiming at development, in order to establish the rule of law and the institutions of the rule of law. In our country, the Federal Republic of Germany, we have begun a dialogue on the rule of law with the Chinese People's Republic and although debates upon human rights with this country are always so difficult, in this case, for the first time, they declared openly: "As far as the rule of law is concerned, we really are a developing country". I think that many countries in the world conceive themselves as developing countries in terms of the rule of law. And I would like the United Nations to focus its attention on the area of projects for the development, consultancy and support in the development of the institutions of the rule of law, the division and separation between church and state, an independent justice system, the training of judges and defence counsels, and I would like it to focus its actions on all this and on the dialogue for human rights, which is still an important topic, but that in this way is integrated by all other aspects in order to make the strength of law the main task of the UN.

**Morimasa Goya**, *Chairman of the Kanehide Group and Board Member of UNESCO*

Please remember my message on behalf of the Okinawa Islands of Japan: let's work together and let's take this responsibility to achieve world peace and political stability for everyone.

I believe that this Forum is enormously meaningful, since the world order has been changing after the September 11 attack. As you may know, more than 70% of the US military bases in Japan are concentrated on the Okinawa Islands. Okinawa's economic structure depends heavily on the income from these bases; but we must and can grow out of this structure and shift to a self-reliant economy by making the most of its favourable characteristics. The peace and stability of the world are indispensable to achieving our aim. For instance, political attention on the Korean peninsula can destroy the new global structure of the economy. To revitalize Okinawa's economy it is necessary for us to have continuous peace and political stability. Okinawa is the southernmost island in Japan and until the middle of the 19<sup>th</sup> century it was an independent kingdom called Duitus. Despite being a small kingdom, Duitus established trade and diplomatic relations between China, Japan and other south-east Asian countries as a keystone for trade. Our Okinawan culture, Champru, has played an important role as a bridge over the various political barriers. We have an extensive global network. It is between the people of Okinawa and the Okinawa who emigrated to various foreign countries, for example Hawaii, Taiwan, Brazil, Argentina and Canada. They have settled there, overcoming hardships and difficulties in their new land and there are now three hundred descendants living in various countries. Our world wide Okinawa Festival that is held every five years demonstrates the broad and powerful bond of Okinawa all over the world.

Economic communication is not only the circulation of money and products, but also a sharing of life, different ideas, cultures and customs. This exchange helps to deepen mutual understanding and strengthen a feeling of coexistence. I believe that interdependence needs mutual independence. I presume that the interdependence of the economy is based on the independence of economies. Therefore it is necessary to support the foundation of economic independence mutually. We are facing various difficulties in the new century, but this century is filled with hope. The end of the cold war brought people a feeling of coexistence and I personally have great respect for Mr Gorbachev, for his role and his historic achievement. Okinawa is known as a keystone of the presence of the US military in the Pacific, but I dream of our island being a keystone of the world economy. We must cooperate to achieve mutual understanding with respect for human rights in the hope of preventing discrimination and alienation. Although it is difficult to reach the same views on politics and cultures, mutual understanding and compassion will bring our world a higher level of peace and harmony. Okinawa is called an island of peace. From our tragic experience of battle in WW2 we strongly desire lasting world peace.

**Mons. Andrea Cordero Lanza di Montezemolo, Archbishop and Apostolic Delegate – Vatican**

On behalf of the Holy See, I would like to greet you, thank you and wish you a successful meeting. This morning, a message from the Holy Father, John Paul II, addressed to this Forum was read, so I will not repeat its contents or make comments on it. I have never been a member of any government or central power, but I have been representing the Holy See in all continents of the world for over forty years. I therefore greet this Forum and would like to express my deep appreciation and best wishes to President Gorbachev for this initiative, which can play an important role in today's world and in overcoming the difficulties that the international community faces. I have listened with great interest to all the speeches of the many personalities who took the floor. They often spoke from a personal point of view, but still reflecting the positions of the different countries and communities they represent. I have heard some very interesting analysis, not only diagnoses of situations, but also some possible "therapeutic" indications.

Today, in a world afflicted by all sorts of difficulties, we need to make more accurate, detailed and innovative diagnoses, we need to exploit the experience of people who can help in carrying out a deeper analysis in order to identify more efficient solutions to our problems. Senator Andreotti made an interesting remark: he said that some of the people who have been invited today are "ex-fighters". I like this term.

These are people who have already fought, some for decades, for the political life of their own countries and who have gathered extensive experience.

This Forum is a gathering of skills and experiences of those people who fought, who encountered difficulties and success, who helped and can still help greatly in the political, social and economic life of the entire world. My wish, on behalf of the Holy See, is that this Forum can contribute to what was mentioned, through careful analysis, in making a difference between Soft Power and Hard Power. The point is not so much to study or criticise the Hard Power, which expresses itself mostly through wars, conflicts and clashes, but rather to strengthen the Soft Power, composed of all the political, diplomatic, cultural, social and religious forces which can contribute to better understanding situations and suggest new, more suitable solutions. Courage is often needed, but so are new minds. Also, we must not forget to base our actions, as the Holy Father John Paul II often recalls, on moral and cultural principles, trying to meet each other on the level of dialogue and not on the level of conflict. Dialogue often means negotiating, giving up something in order to obtain something in return.

I also hope that in a Forum like this, all currents and all geographical areas of the world will be represented. I have seen few representatives from Africa and, I believe, none from the Latin American continent. This, I believe, would greatly contribute to attaining your objective.

My wish to this Forum, which includes people who have been "young for longer", who have accumulated experience for longer, is that it will be truly able to use its skills to the advantage of the whole world.

**Francesco Cossiga, Senator, Former President of the Italian Republic**

I believe we are experiencing a moment of transition and even of crisis, a time when the established powers need a contribution from the so-called civil society, national and international, and, why not, from those who held positions of responsibility in government years ago and have had the opportunity to let the wealth of their political experiences settle after their return to civil society. Around this table there are at least three people who exemplify what I have just said: Mikhail Gorbachev, Wojciech Jaruzelski and Boutros Boutros-Ghali. I believe history will be more generous with them than current affairs reports have been.

Mikhail Gorbachev: the man who was the key to the end of 50 years of sad, painful and dangerous opposition within Europe, of a divided world, two parts of the same apple, human beings. Once, when I was returning from Russia with the Holy Father, he told me that whatever his political creed and ideology were, one thing was sure: Mikhail Gorbachev was a man who held values he believed in. I think that had it not been for him, Europe would have found it difficult to overcome this division, which in itself is the sad legacy of what had been a great victory against the Nazi Fascists.

The second person, my friend General Jaruzelski: I have always told him his contribution would receive belated recognition. He stopped the situation from deteriorating during the Andropov Government, that is before the Gorbachev era, a situation which could have plunged the whole of Europe into a crisis sweeping détente away.

The third is my friend Boutros Boutros-Ghali whom I would not like to embarrass by saying that it would have been everybody's gain if the foolishness of some US spheres had not unjustly forced him into early retirement from his post as UN Secretary General. Possibly if that had happened, the UN would not be experiencing the terrible crisis it is tragically weathering.

One might speak at length of the problem that appears to be overshadowing the world: globalization. However, globalization has yet to be defined. When I meet with Mr A. Negri, one of the most culturally prestigious members of the Italian and European left – an old friend from the days of our membership of Catholic associations – he has to admit: globalization is first and foremost a fact. Given facts, it is up to humanity to make the best of them. In any case, a number of decisive factors that I shall discuss very briefly, will determine how globalization can be managed.

First: the UN crisis. Although I have always been considered a friend of the States, in fact I was known as Kossiga, with a K, my name being spelt as if I were a 'bad American', I voted against the unilateral Anglo-American attack against Iraq, as did my friends Mr E. Colombo, and Mr G. Andreotti, as well as Mr Scalfaro, former President of Italy. The unilateral attack against Iraq was certainly fostered by the weakness of the UN and its crisis. Many hold responsibilities for this, including the

US, but also the UN because of – excuse me for speaking so openly – an ineffective Secretary General’s leadership.

The issue has become to reform the UN: vetoes had a purpose in a bipolar world that they have now lost! Luckily, Yalta’s Europe – a joint East-West project – is part of the past. Vetoes were a means to guarantee order, something to create peace after war. I believe that currently it is only a means of power, or of pre-power of nations that do no longer have power.

The second problem is international terrorism, which has caused many victims, even recently. Terrorism should not be, not just seem a Clash of Civilisations or even a clash of religions. There is a strong temptation to pursue a historical juxtaposition between Christianity and Judaism on one side and Islam on the other. It would be a major mistake to equate Islam with terrorism because terrorism is also an evil inside Islam, so much so that it is reaping victims in the Islamic states that are called ‘moderate Islamic states’.

The third problem is the one between New and Old Europe and the NATO reform. Giulio Andreotti who is here and – as I have already mentioned was one of the strong supporters of the Atlantic Alliance – believes as I do that after the fall of the Berlin Wall, with the end of the East-West conflict, NATO as we know it had no reason to exist. NATO no longer has a defence policy, nor could it have one. It has no clear strategic political objectives because, happily, peace between East and West has made them obsolete. NATO has become a logistical-technical organisation, so to speak. It would be a pity to lose its experience and it could operate as a European conflict-management body – a fact contemplated by the UN Charter as conflict will never leave us although it may change over time. Things being what they are, one fails to understand why the Russian Federation should not be allowed to join NATO. Why should the Russian Federation not be jointly responsible for the balance of Europe along with the other European nations. NATO also has a role to play avoiding conflict between the two sides of the Atlantic: whatever we may think of the current US Administration, we cannot envisage a future of peace for the Old Europe without a close connection with Canada and the US.

Another issue we have to address is the one of Europe, of its growth. Europe is in the process of becoming something which no longer resembles the idea of the founding fathers, which was the small Europe with its set of laws and regulations. In fact the EEC was born close to the Berlin Wall and the Iron Curtain, just as COMECON came from within the Warsaw Pact. Currently the EU with 20, 25 and 30 or more countries is inevitably something different. I hope the European Convention will be successful in suggesting a realistic model of a New Europe.

Personally, I feel a federation, like the US is not viable because in the end America is a country, a nation with shared values. We are not and could not be anything but a Europe of nations. Europe does not exist without Cervantes, Gogol, Dostoevskji, Manzoni, Goethe, Shakespeare, Beethoven, Verdi! Ours will have to be a Europe of nations, as Charles De Gaulle had foreseen. This Europe of nations has to include the Russian Federation in one way or another. Let us not forget that potentially Russia will be or already is one of the great nations of the world once it

has pulled through its economic crisis, and it will. Its history, culture, greatness and economic resources speak of it as one of the great powers of tomorrow. The US, Russia and China are countries with a vocation as Great Powers. Europe too may have the same vocation, but if so, it can scarcely afford an albeit peaceful split, which means a closer relationship with Russia.

I would like to add that I too had doubts about the enlargement of the European Union and NATO, which meant extending it to the borders of Russia: I was afraid this might have meant stressing the 'us and them' decision, underlining otherness.

In fact we are experiencing a changing world, suffering from low intensity conflicts especially in Africa. We remember Chechnya, we remember Islamic terror but we often forget what we failed to give Africa. The Superior of a large Roman Catholic Mission said that Europe had committed two sins against Africa: the first was colonizing without respecting local features, except possibly the British. A second comparable sin was to give them a pseudo-culture and formally democratic institutions they were not ready for.

Colonial domination was unfortunately not followed by freedom or liberation but by an endless series of civil wars which have left or are leaving more dead in their wake than terrorism has throughout the world. An institution like ours can offer a major contribution in addressing – not solving – these problems thanks to our wealth of thoughtful experience accrued in the past. With all due respect, Putin was a boy when Gorbachev was dealing with the huge problems of a changing USSR and Eastern Europe.

I feel we should take our commitment very seriously because I believe all these issues I have outlined, albeit briefly, may benefit from our many cultures and experiences in the world. All statesmen are unavoidably also nationalists because if they weren't they could not rule their countries! I believe that here in the World Political Forum we could act as a great new international organisation for peace and freedom .

**M.S. Gorbachev**, *President of the World Political Forum*

Dear friends, I won't even try to draw conclusions from such an interesting and wide-ranging discussion, which has been lively and characterized by youthfulness of thought, even though many of the speakers already have grey hair.

I have talked to some members of the media and I really appreciated what they said: that this has been a good discussion, that all the speakers had interesting things to say, and that up to now such an experience has been mostly lacking. Indeed we have had quite a discussion here, with 34 speakers participating. It has certainly been a marvellous, unprecedented marathon, with observations expressed by people who represent different opinions, different political parties.

I would like to echo the remarks made here by the previous speakers, particularly Wojciech Jaruzelski and Benazir Bhutto. In evaluating our discussion Mr Jaruzelski emphasized that all of us arrived at this Forum via very different "journeys", which just goes to show that the Forum can integrate the experiences from different countries and different cultures and so reflect the differences that exist in the contemporary world, and our discussion has demonstrated that dialogue is possible. Indeed, we have had real dialogue between people coming from different cultures, continents, religions and political experiences. So, if dialogue is possible, we have already accomplished something very important, since, as Prime Minister Bhutto has rightly observed, we live in a very difficult moment, a moment of great fractures, and this Forum gives us a unique possibility to be together and to launch a discussion based on common interests, on the recognition that we now live in a globalized world, a world continuously interconnecting one continent to another.

I would like to point out some remarks referring to the last speech of this meeting, the one by President Cossiga. He has pointed to the major question of Europe's future, of its role and responsibility. I am referring more specifically to his remark that Europe will be able to play an important role only if it opens its borders to other countries, such as Russia.

I agree with him. I feel he was right in not contrasting the European Union and the United States and, equally important, the EU and the East, broadly speaking. We are talking here about entire worlds: China, India, Japan, and all the other countries. I am convinced that we have to discuss the future and the responsibility of Europe in such terms. But this will probably be the subject of a specific discussion as part of the Forum's future activity.

I have noted that President Cossiga's speech has, in one way or another, returned to the question of the United States. This question has been very much present in our discussion. We have given credit to this great country, to its great people. And we have had a very full discussion of this question, not in terms of opposition or confrontation, and certainly there hasn't been any anti-Americanism in it. But, at the same time, talking about the role played by United States, in one way or another, all speakers have underlined the power of the US, its great and helpful role in achieving democracy and culture – but they agreed that its role can be successful

only if it is played in terms of partnership and not of domination, pressure or hegemony. This has, in substance, been the thrust of what we heard here. In this way our Forum, even through this preliminary discussion, has demonstrated that it will be characterized by common sense and responsibility.

In this regard I would like to refer to the observation made by Ambassador Matlock. I have known him for a very long time. He is a very serious person with whom I worked together for many years. So when he stated today, in front of the World Political Forum, that the United States will never be the world's policeman, that the American people will not support such a course and will not permit anyone to act in this way – well, I can tell you that this is a very serious statement, made by a man of great intelligence, and we should welcome this statement. It corresponds to our best wishes. My own view is that it will be as he said.

I think we all agree that our discussion is very timely and that it is very important that the project of this Forum should have a future. I am sure that this project will arouse interest. We already have some feedback. In my country, Russia, there has been a lively response, as there has been in many other countries. Our initiative has been described as a very interesting idea, which is quite understandable in the world of many contradictions, in the very unstable world in which we all live. Already many new supporters have started to knock at the Forum's door and I welcome them with enthusiasm. This is a positive reaction. It's exactly what I hoped would happen – that people would understand the reasons why we created such a Forum, that people would understand that we are far from assuming the decision-making powers of the executive and legislative branches of government. That, of course, is not our mission.

I am convinced that our primary mission, as I already said at the beginning of our discussion, is to help create favourable conditions for uninterrupted dialogue between policymakers all over the world, dialogue between government and society, dialogue between cultures. I am sure we all have a clear feeling that we are creating an effective instrument.

Tomorrow, at the organizational meeting, we will discuss the draft of our Statute; we will approve it and assign specific tasks for the Forum's ongoing activities. We will also consider the question of the Agenda for the future and, in the light of today's discussion, I would say that the outline of the agenda is almost clear. We will also discuss the form in which we will offer our conclusions, our advice and our suggestions, how we would interact with governments, research centres and think tanks, and more generally with civil society. Our work tomorrow will be very important, since we will discuss how to make sure that this is an effective and not just a symbolic project, on what forces and structures we will rely, with whom the Forum will cooperate. We have already said a lot and, most of all, in this discussion we have already traced the right direction to follow.

Our is a non-governmental initiative, a civil initiative that aims to demonstrate that politics can still succeed, both in elaborating and executing policies, if it learns to interact with civil society and its institutions. It is what politics alone cannot do. So,

that is our goal. You find it ambitious? You are right. But can we settle for anything less in our current situation?

I am very grateful to all my friends and colleagues who have come here with such thoughtful and far-reaching ideas. This has elevated the content of our discussion and projected the vision of The World Political Forum's founding members.