Opening Address

Gaishi Hiraiwa

Prime Minister Obuchi, Dr. Boutros-Ghali, ladies and gentlemen.

As chairman of the Japan Institute of International Affairs (JIIA), I take pleasure in addressing you on the opening of this symposium commemorating the fortieth anniversary of JIIA.

JIIA was established in December 1959 on the initiative of Prime Minister Shigeru Yoshida to conduct wide-ranging research and surveys in fields related to international affairs and diplomacy. Its aims were "to create a major research facility in cooperation with academe, the bureaucracy, politics, business, the press, and other spheres, and prepare a system for empirical research oriented toward advancing our new democratic diplomacy." Thus it was established on the basis of the consensus of opinion leaders in a variety of fields.

In the 40 years since then, JIIA, true to the spirit of its founders, has expanded its fields of activity in response to international trends and changes. With the recent rise of so-called track-two diplomacy, JIIA, as a leading Japanese think tank, prides itself on having made significant contributions to the formulation of Japanese foreign policy.

With the cooperation of Dr. Hans van Ginkel, rector of United Nations University, and others at UNU, we have organized this symposium on the theme "In Quest of Human Security." During this symposium, we will have the opportunity to hear the valuable opinions, informed by penetrating insight, of eminent authorities from both Japan and overseas as they discuss measures for conflict prevention, promotion of sustainable development, and enhancement of human dignity—all core issues of human security.

Prime Minister Keizo Obuchi, who will deliver the first keynote speech today, has taken the initiative in pleading the importance of human security to the world and has demonstrated leadership in regard to the establishment of a special fund for that purpose within the United Nations. Dr. Boutros Boutros-Ghali, who will deliver the second keynote speech, made heroic efforts for world peace as Secretary-General of the UN, presenting the initiative known as *An Agenda for Peace*.

Thank you very much for taking part in the JIIA 40th Anniversary Symposium, “In Quest of Human Security.” I hope and pray that this symposium will serve to deepen understanding of human security and further advance efforts to create a more peaceful and affluent international community. In closing, I ask your support for JIIA.

Welcoming Address

Hans van Ginkel

Your Excellency, Mr. Keizo Obuchi, Prime Minister of Japan; excellencies; ladies and gentlemen; distinguished guests and participants: Welcome to UNU House.

Among our highly respected guests, I would just like to single out one person—former Secretary-General of the United Nations, a well-known academic, Boutros Boutros-Ghali, who officially inaugurated this UNU House in February 1993. Dr. Boutros-Ghali's presence and the presence of so many highly qualified speakers, panelists, and participants from around the world illustrate the strong convening power of the Japan Institute for International Affairs and its new president, Hisashi Owada.

I extend my sincere congratulations to the Japan Institute for International Affairs, its chairman, Gaishi Hiraiwa, and Ambassador Owada, for 40 years of distinguished service to a safer life in a better world for all. It has been a pleasure and privilege to work together with JIIA in preparing for this symposium.

We have great expectations of the substance and the outcomes of this symposium. Human security is problematic still and highly deserving of attention. It is appropriate to further clarify the concept and practical ways to achieve human security to guarantee human dignity to all in the light of the initiatives taken by Japan, in particular by Prime Minister Obuchi. Mr. Obuchi's presence and alliance confirm his commitment to human security, a commitment that is shared by UNU. I wish you all a challenging and productive symposium.

KEYNOTE SPEECHES

In Quest of Human Security

Keizo Obuchi

Peace, Development, and Democratization

Boutros Boutros-Ghali

In Quest of Human Security

Keizo Obuchi

Ladies and gentlemen.

Thank you very much for inviting me to address the 40th Anniversary Symposium of the Japan Institute of International Affairs (JIIA). It is a great honor to have been given the opportunity to deliver the keynote speech at this gathering of distinguished opinion leaders from around the world, and I wish to convey my gratitude to the cohosts, JIIA and the United Nations University (UNU).

I also wish to express my heartfelt congratulations to JIIA on its fortieth anniversary. In 1959, when former Prime Minister Shigeru Yoshida proposed the establishment of JIIA, Japan had almost no institutions fully dedicated to research on international affairs. JIIA was a pioneer in this field and has continued to spearhead Japanese research on international affairs. I hope and trust that JIIA will continue to engage in activities promoting peace and prosperity for Japan and the world as a whole, and will continue to develop and flourish.

I have addressed gatherings here at UNU on a number of occasions. The university is making great scholarly contributions to the United Nations' objectives of peace and development for humanity as a research and training institution addressing such global issues as peace and governance, the environment, and development. I also understand that UNU is active in the field of human security. In June this year, for example, UNU and the Ministry of Foreign Affairs cohosted a seminar on development and human security. I hope that this symposium, cohosted by two such distinguished institutions, will yield significant results.

The Cold War, which had shaped the world for almost 40 years after World War II, ended exactly 10 years ago with revolutionary upheaval in Eastern Europe, followed by the dissolution of the Soviet Union. We must not forget that one major factor behind this structural change in the international community was the massive and swift global movements of people, goods, money, and information, and the much closer linkages among peoples brought about by these transnational economic activities and information flows. Not even the iron curtain, symbolized by the Berlin Wall, could withstand those currents, and the peoples in Eastern Europe and the Soviet

Union won their freedom and democracy. The advance of globalization brought unprecedented prosperity to the world. For example, trade transactions worldwide tripled between 1985 and 1996, while exchanges of information more than quadrupled. In addition to this bright side, however, globalization has a dark side. Such phenomena as the widening gap between the rich and poor and progressive environmental degradation threaten human life and dignity and people's livelihoods.

The collapse of the bipolar Cold War order epitomized by U.S.-Soviet confrontation greatly reduced the possibility of another world war. Unfortunately, however, a new post–Cold War world order has yet to take form; the international community is still searching for a new order. Meanwhile, religious and ethnic tensions that once smoldered beneath the surface are triggering more frequent armed conflicts in the form of civil wars. Armed conflicts and other threats to human life and security have emerged in various parts of the world. These have led to grave situations, generating huge numbers of refugees and, through antipersonnel landmines and so on, inflicting great harm on countless women, children, and other civilians. Other threats to human life and security have also surfaced, including violations of human rights, terrorism, drugs, international organized crime, and infectious diseases.

In light of these developments, "human security," which focuses on individual human beings, is now being taken more and more seriously by the international community. UN Secretary-General Kofi Annan has discussed human security in various reports, and this can be regarded as an indication of the international community's growing awareness of its importance.

Thirty-six years ago, when I was still just a student, I traveled on my own to 38 countries in Asia, the Middle East, Africa, Europe, North America, and Latin America as a backpacker, something that was exceedingly unusual at the time. This solitary journey taught me the importance of the links between people, and of people as individuals. Ultimately, I believe, it gave me an appreciation of "human security." One of my first actions as minister for foreign affairs was to sign the Convention on the Prohibition of the Use, Stockpiling, Production and Transfer of Anti-Personnel Mines and on Their Destruction, the so-called Ottawa Convention, thus shifting the Japanese government's policy on this issue. My underlying thinking was "human security." And, as prime minister, I have taken every opportunity to persuade the international community of the importance of the perspective of human security and have done my best to make it a pillar of Japan's diplomacy.

Threats to human security differ by country and region. In Africa, for example, the chief threats are poverty, disease, and conflict; in many developed countries, the threats include drugs and organized crime; in Cambodia, they include landmines. In addition, the threats sometimes change the way in which they manifest themselves, as when the Asian countries that had been achieving dazzling economic growth were suddenly plunged into economic crisis. All this shows that there are many arguments on what the threats are. What is now required of national governments is to find ways to incor-

porate the perspective of human security into policy implementation, translating it into concrete action.

It was with this in mind that I proposed the establishment of the Human Security Fund within the UN in the policy speech I delivered in Vietnam in December 1998. Japan will continue to take the initiative to see that the perspective of human security is reflected in concrete measures.

All three of this symposium's sessions—"Measures for Conflict Prevention," "Promotion of Sustainable Development," and "Enhancement of Human Dignity"—address important and interrelated aspects of human security. I would like briefly to share some of my own thoughts on these topics.

The theme of session I, "Measures for Conflict Prevention," deals with the prevention of armed conflict, the greatest threat to human life, dignity, and livelihood. I believe a comprehensive approach to conflict prevention in two senses is important. First, such an approach should be seen in terms of a series of processes: elimination of poverty and the other latent causes of conflict, resolution of conflict when it does break out, and steady postconflict reconstruction to prevent recurrence. Second, it is important that countries take a comprehensive approach at each stage, mobilizing all possible policies and measures—political measures, financial and other socioeconomic policies, development policies, and so forth.

Regulation of all weapons that can be used as means of conflict, including pistols, machine guns, and other small arms, as well as antipersonnel landmines, is also important. In regard to landmines, the Ottawa Convention, which as already mentioned I decided to sign when I was foreign minister, took effect on March 1, 1999. I will continue to work for early realization of the target of "zero victims" not only in bilateral fora but also through international organizations and nongovernmental organizations (NGOs). In the area of the regulation of small arms, Japan has been in the forefront of the international community, taking the lead through chairing of a UN expert group, and intends to continue to work actively to ensure the success of the UN conference on small arms regulation to be held in 2001.

In regard to the theme of session II, "Promotion of Sustainable Development," I wish to emphasize the importance of both the developing countries' independent efforts for development and their linkages with developed countries as members of the international community on an equal footing; in other words, developing countries' *ownership* and their *partnership* with aid donors. In October last year, Japan cosponsored the Second Tokyo International Conference on African Development (TICAD II), aimed at African countries' socioeconomic development and poverty reduction and their integration into the global economy. The Tokyo Agenda for Action drawn up at TICAD II is based on the concepts of ownership and partnership.

I also wish to emphasize the importance of creating opportunities for more people to participate in economic activities by means of individual self-reliance and improvement of people's ability to stand on their own feet. Enhancement of education and

promotion of such measures as the provision of funds at the grass-roots level are important in this context.

The theme of session III is "Enhancement of Human Dignity." Conflict prevention and the realization of sustainable development are requirements for ensuring human security. In addition, human security requires the building of societies in which people are respected as individuals, can fully realize their individual potential, and can function as responsible members of society. I believe that citizens' voluntary initiatives are essential to ensuring individual freedom and potential. In that sense, the role of NGOs and other components of civil society has become important. Notably, NGOs have played an extremely important role in regard to landmines and global warming, encouraging and supplementing intergovernmental negotiations. I believe that in the future, governments will need increasingly to value cooperation with NGOs and to support their activities.

Although I may digress somewhat from the theme of this symposium, I would like to take advantage of the invaluable opportunity afforded by this gathering of intellectual leaders from around the world to share some of my thoughts about three important items on Japan's current diplomatic agenda: the Kyushu-Okinawa Summit, relations with North Korea, and diplomacy vis-à-vis East Timor and Indonesia.

As we approach the year 2000, globalization and the information revolution are advancing apace, as I mentioned before, but not a few people feel apprehension and discontent in the face of the rapidly changing socioeconomic environment. I trust that the Group of Eight leaders will bring to the Kyushu-Okinawa Summit, being held in the final year of the twentieth century, a determination to build a more prosperous and peaceful twenty-first century. Also, since this will be the first G8 Summit in Asia in seven years, I hope it will transmit a strong and positive "Okinawa Message" from Asia.

In regard to relations with North Korea, Japan's basic policy is to strive to normalize relations, which have been anomalous since the end of World War II, in close concert with the Republic of Korea and the United States and in full awareness of the importance of maintaining peace and stability in Northeast Asia. The government welcomes the success of the recent mission to North Korea of Japanese parliamentarians of all the major political parties, led by former Prime Minister Tomiichi Murayama, which aimed through interparty talks to prepare a climate conducive to the smooth conduct of intergovernmental negotiations on normalization of relations, and takes seriously the joint announcement achieved by the mission. The government considers it desirable to establish a full-fledged forum for overall dialogue between the authorities of Japan and North Korea and is now carefully studying the talks between the Murayama mission and the North Korean side, undertaking a detailed analysis of their content. As part of this process, the government is reviewing the measures taken against North Korea following the August 1998 missile launch.

Moving on to East Timor, it is important to advance the process of independence and nation-building smoothly while working to improve conditions for refugees and

displaced persons. This is an extremely important issue for all of us from the perspective of human security, as well. Next week Xanana Gusmão, president of the National Council of Timorese Resistance, and Sergio Vieira de Mello, Special Representative of the UN Secretary-General and transitional administrator for East Timor, will visit Tokyo to attend the Donors' Meeting for East Timor. Japan, as an Asian country, intends to provide as much assistance as possible for development in the fledgling nation of East Timor. In this context, I wish to say a few words about Indonesia, which is extremely important for the stability and prosperity of the Asia-Pacific region. Two weeks ago, I visited Indonesia, the first foreign leader to do so after the democratic instatement of the new administration. To support continued reform efforts under President Abdurrahman Wahid, I explained Japan's future economic assistance policy and presented specific proposals, especially for the creation of a safety net for the socially disadvantaged.

In my speech in Vietnam in December 1998, I declared my belief that the twenty-first century should be "a century of peace and prosperity built on human dignity" for Asia. Governmental efforts alone will not guarantee human security in Asia and the world in the coming twenty-first century. To advance human security, the process of intellectual exchange, whereby intellectual leaders of the international community meet, pool the results of their endeavors, and have them reflected in government policies, is also essential. The intellectual leaders representing JIIA, UNU, and the broader international community are all expected to fulfill such a role. This being the case, I strongly hope that lively and useful discussions will take place during the two days of this symposium.

Peace, Development, and Democratization

Boutros Boutros-Ghali

First of all, let me express my gratitude for having been invited to the celebration of the fortieth anniversary of the Japan Institute of International Affairs.

Japan, through a group of scholars, has played an important role in the promotion of international law and the study of international affairs. I should like especially to thank both Ambassador Hisashi Owada and Judge Shigeru Oda, two colleagues and friends. I mention them particularly because I have worked with them for a long time. I have read their publications and followed with admiration their careers in international affairs.

Today, my purpose is to speak about the connection between peace, development, and democracy in the post–Cold War era. All three are interlocked, and I will try to explain what this means with reference to the three agendas I presented during my mandate as the Secretary-General of the United Nations: *An Agenda for Peace* in 1992, *An Agenda for Development* in 1994, and *Agenda for Democratization* in 1996.

Peacekeeping, development, and democracy are being redefined and extended in the post–Cold War era. The connections between them are beginning to emerge. We will need a new level of understanding and a new depth of commitment to understand the importance of this connection if we want to make human security a reality.

Let me mention each one in turn. The first concept is *peace*.

I. Peace

After the heavy hand of the bipolar system has been lifted, violence has erupted in many regions of the world. The UN in the Cold War decades created the concept of peacekeeping. After the Cold War, UN peacekeepers took on vast new duties. The UN started as many new operations in my term as Secretary-General as in the previous 45 years.

We must realize that today's operations are not peacekeeping in the traditional sense. The earlier missions involved UN forces that were lightly armed. First, they were

interposed between two states in order to maintain a ceasefire. Second, they were there with the agreement of all concerned. Third, they were an international presence, not a force expected to take drastic action or to intervene.

First, UN operations may take place today where there is no peace to keep. Second, they take place where new forms of assertive action may be required. UN forces protect relief shipments, provide services for victims, respond to refugee needs, enforce embargoes, remove antipersonnel mines, and try to confiscate arms. Third, UN operations now involve a large civilian dimension beyond military-related steps, such as monitoring elections, public safety, information and communication, institution-building, and the restoration of infrastructure and administrative services.

Peacekeeping today is vastly different from the past in both quantity and quality. It is even chronologically different. Peace requires preventive diplomacy, peace-making, peacekeeping, and postconflict peace-building. The cycle continues through perpetual rounds. Increasingly, we can see that work for peace provides us with no place of rest. It is a continuous process.

Peacekeeping must take place before, during, and after conflicts.

(1) *Before conflict*, preventive diplomacy is of vast importance. In matters of peace and security, as in medicine, prevention is obviously better than cure. It saves lives and money, and it forestalls suffering. This approach has traditionally involved personal contacts, good offices, fact-finding missions, and early-warning systems. No other endeavor for peace repays our time, effort, and investment so well.

Today, the concept of preventive diplomacy is expanding. It may require, for example, observers as a means of dealing with violence. UN observers in South Africa, in Haiti, in Georgia, and in Guatemala have helped reduce tensions, contain demonstrations, and stop clashes from getting out of control.

And within this concept has come a step never before taken by the UN: preventive deployment. In December 1992, the Security Council decided to put units of UN peacekeepers into the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia in order to prevent a wider Balkan war. This is an example of the new range of actions needed for preventive diplomacy in the future.

(2) *During conflict*, expanded forms of peacekeeping are taking place. In a growing number of conflicts, protection of humanitarian relief shipments is required. This need was most dramatically evident in Somalia, Liberia, and Sierra Leone. Similarly, the Security Council authorized UN forces to secure Sarajevo airport and related lines of communication so that vital humanitarian aid could get through to the former Yugoslavia.

Enlarged peacekeeping during conflict also may require sanctions when ceasefire agreements break down. Military measures such as “no-fly” zones may be involved. In

Cambodia, in 1992, the Security Council imposed petroleum sanctions against any party not complying with the ceasefire disarmament or national reconciliation requirements of the Paris Agreements.

And when the rules of engagement for peacekeeping operations are not sufficient, UN forces may need authorization to react to force. In some cases, they may use force to prevent an escalation in violence. In the former Yugoslavia, for example, in Eastern Slavonia, if territory was not given up in accordance with an agreed peace plan, "peace enforcement" by UN troops on the ground was the only solution.

(3) *After conflict* must come postconflict peace-building. This involves sustained efforts to identify and support structures to build trust and well-being among peoples. Such measures include commercial, cultural, and educational projects that are necessary to build bridges between parties to a conflict. The goal is to forestall a reemergence of cultural and national tensions that could spark renewed hostilities. Without such efforts, no peace agreement is likely to last for long. The concept of postconflict peacebuilding is the counterpart of preventive diplomacy, which seeks to avoid the breakdown of peaceful conditions. On a deeper level, both are contributions to the second stage of work for world peace: development.

II. Development

Just as the concept of "peacekeeping" needs a new definition, so it must be for the concept of "development." What was once a matter of economics is now seen to involve many other dimensions.

We are forced to this new perception by the failure of development as it has been known in the past. The Soviet model for development has collapsed. Western policies and programs of assistance have often proved disappointing. Development, in its traditional meaning, has failed to transform poor countries and countries in postconflict situations. Achieving a new foundation for development may well be the most difficult intellectual task of our time.

The situation is, however, far from hopeless. There is no excuse for pessimism. It is true that many socioeconomic problems have not been solved. But it is also true that many countries have radically transformed their societies and economies. Industrialization and information technology provide a new basis for cooperative international progress. And this has contributed to agreement on some common values and a shared vision of the kind of world we want to see: the global village of tomorrow.

Development cannot guarantee peace; but without development on the widest scale, we know that the young will be restless and resentful. Land will not be productive. People will fight for resources. And creativity will be misdirected, and disorder may prevail.

Without a new and workable concept of development, the UN will face an endless

sequence of the types of conflicts we are confronting at this moment. And new conflicts, with worsening implications, can be expected.

Like peacekeeping, development is best understood as involving stages.

Before conflict, development can help prevent it from breaking out. By engaging people's energies positively, development can absorb the impact of differences, can ease confrontations, and can help avoid economic and social deterioration.

During conflict, development is replaced by humanitarian relief. Under conditions of conflict, development cannot go forward. Out of necessity it is replaced by humanitarian assistance to people made hungry, driven from their homes, or otherwise harmed by the fighting. Such relief efforts, even when successful, conclude with a situation that is worse than before conflict began.

After conflict, development takes the form of reconstruction, rehabilitation. When conflict has stopped, true development once again may take root. Postconflict peacebuilding can start.

A long-term vision is required at this point. An example is the new concept of "sustainable development." At the UN Conference on Environment and Development (UNCED) in Rio de Janeiro in 1992, the leaders of the member states of the UN agreed that every nation's domestic economic policy must take into account its impact on the global environment. The Rio Conference thus added to the body of established principles that bind us all. Abuse of environment for economic gain destroys its very purpose; it kills the goose that lays the golden egg. Sustainable development will be central to development's new definition.

In 1995, which was the fiftieth anniversary of the founding of the UN, a summit on social development took place. It has provided a new momentum in favor of the concept of development. It called upon us to produce a comprehensive vision and an integral plan of action. It was the historical moment when all the many dimensions of development were brought together.

The third concept is democracy.

III. Democratization

There can be no flowering of development as I have described it without the third great concept I want to emphasize: democratization. Peace is a prerequisite to development. Democracy is essential if development is to succeed over the long term.

Real development of a state must be based on the participation of its population and requires some form of democracy. To ensure such an achievement, democratization must not only take place inside a state, but among states in the international community. Key factors are (1) international law, (2) human rights, and (3) international assistance to democratization.

The present decade, which will end in a few days, was dedicated to international law. Virtually every aspect of what we call the "international community" is rooted in

the great project of international law that began with Grotius over three centuries ago. It is a process to which distinguished lawyers of different parts of the world have contributed a great deal.

The importance of international law in dealing with settlement of conflict is obvious. What is less obvious, but equally important, is that international law is critical to development. A network of uniform commercial codes can speed commerce and link different cultures in common commitments. Economic transactions, from the smallest farmer to vast global corporations, insist on reliability. That requires rules that span borders, as well as mechanisms for the peaceful resolution of commercial disputes.

The cause of human rights has advanced considerably in the last four decades. Human rights are principles of value in themselves. But they also make practical sense. Development cannot fully succeed where human rights are neglected. This is the age of information and communication. And it is the age of people-centered development. People must be free to think, act, and communicate not only as political but also as economic beings. So human rights and human security become a pillar of development.

Human rights, equal rights, government under law, economic opportunities, freedom of thought and speech, individual involvement, and governmental accountability: all are the attributes of democratization.

Throughout most of this century and the last one, democracy was regarded as something possessed by a few fortunate states and practiced within their borders. The international scene was defined by power politics. A balance of power provided an international system for the nations of the world; democracy among states, international democracy, was not even considered as a possibility.

The UN Charter offered a new vision. With its opening words, "We the Peoples of the United Nations," democratization was built into the world organization. Even states whose internal politics were not democratic joined a representative parliament in which all states, large and small, were equal. The UN is taking on a wide array of new responsibilities to assist the progress of democratization within states *and* among states.

Like peacekeeping and development, the process of democratization is best understood as involving stages.

Before conflict, democracy *within* a state can help prevent internal confrontations and disputes. By engaging political parties, ethnic groups, minorities, or tribes in discussion, debate, and negotiation within the framework of national institutions, democracy can help to avoid the use of force.

Democracy among states can perform the same service. Studies based on serious statistics have proven that wars and armed conflicts between two democratic states seldom happen. On the contrary, nondemocratic states are more tempted by military adventures.

During armed conflict, democracy hardly exists. Military objectives will prevail, disinformation will prevail, and opposition will not be tolerated. In the case of a civil

war, the situation will be more complex, and often the basic governmental institutions will cease to function.

After conflict, the transition to democracy in states emerging from war is particularly difficult. The economy is completely destroyed, and civil society becomes weaker or disappears. In civil war, the leaders are usually the same leaders that were formerly engaged in the armed conflict. Furthermore, the potential recurrence of the conflict may threaten the peace process. This is what happened in Angola.

In recent years, the UN has ventured into an entirely new field: long-term monitoring of human rights. El Salvador, Mozambique, and Cambodia provided the first examples, in the context of the peace agreements that brought an end to the armed conflicts in these countries.

The UN sent missions to study the situation of human rights in Lithuania and Estonia. This was conceived as an effort of preventive diplomacy to defuse tensions between these nations and the Russian Federation.

In the UN Secretariat in New York, a new office was created whose purpose, in essence, is to deal with electoral assistance requested by member states. This is a part of the effort to promote democratization. In the short period since 1992, this office has handled dozens and dozens of requests from Asian states, Eastern European states, Latin America, and Africa. All these require technical and electoral assistance and sending observers.

In the International Organization of the Francophonie, of which I am secretary general, we have given electoral assistance to many countries in cooperation with the UN, the Commonwealth, the Organization of African Unity, the Arab League, and the European Union. Our assistance was not limited to the electoral period only, but we were also involved in the preparatory stages of the elections, discussion with the political parties, and civic education of the population. Furthermore, we have often taken part in the postelectoral process to ensure a peaceful transition to the new majority.

But democracy within states may only be fully sustained over time if linked to increasing democratization among states and at all levels of the international system.

Among states, the UN is providing a framework for democratization. It is a forum where all voices can be heard. It provides a means of consensus-building. Preserving the moral authority of the UN requires the fullest participation and engagement of all states. This, in turn, calls for the involvement of all levels of international life: nongovernmental organizations (NGOs), academic institutions, parliamentarians, business and professional communities, the media, and the public at large. It also means applying the principles of democratization within the UN itself.

The time has come to fulfill the logic of the UN Charter and pursue democratization not only within states, but throughout the international system. These then are the three great tasks of the United Nations as set down by the charter:

- *Without peace*, there can be no development and there can be no democracy.

- *Without development,* there can be no democracy, and without the basic elements of well-being, societies will disintegrate and enter into disputes.
- *Without democracy,* no real development can occur. And without such development, peace cannot long be maintained.

Thus the three great priorities are interlocked. The heart of this interconnection is the difficult question raised by timing among peace, development, and democracy. In some cases, peace, development, and democracy have been pursued and achieved simultaneously. Such was the case in El Salvador and Mozambique, where the UN's effort in support of democratization served as a link between conflict resolution on the one hand, and reconstruction and development on the other hand. In other cases, however, the joint pursuit of these three goals has proven more difficult at times, contributing to political instability, social disarray, and economic crisis.

Democratization requires as a precondition the achievement within a nation of a certain level of peace and a certain level of development. Both development and peace are essential; yet the articulation between development and democracy is more complex when development is based on foreign assistance. Can the democratization of a state be a condition for foreign assistance? Can the interruption of the democratic process be a reason for aid suspension? What are the criteria regarding what constitutes a regressive situation in the democratic process?

I do not pretend to provide easy answers to these questions. The discussion which we will have later may help us to find solutions in order to understand the new approach to international assistance.

Let us conclude by trying to understand the complexity of the articulation between peace, development, and democracy by formulating four basic rules:

- The potential recurrence of conflict is a constant threat to the peace process and to human security. Hence any external support for postconflict peace-building, postconflict development, and postconflict democracy-building must be consistent and sustained.
- International assistance must be phased over time, focusing on development before the conflict, humanitarian aid during the conflict, rehabilitation after the conflict, and sustainable development aid in order to build peace and promote human security.
- There is no one model of democratization or democracy suitable to all societies. Democracy cannot be exported or imported. Each state must be free to decide for itself its priorities for the welfare of its people.
- Democratization within states must also be supported by a process of democratization among states. The globalization of the market economy must be controlled by a global democracy.

PRESENTATIONS

Session I
Measures for Conflict Prevention

Hisashi Owada

Session II
Promotion of Sustainable Development

Jesus P. Estanislao

Session III
Enhancement of Human Dignity

Hans van Ginkel

Session I

Measures for Conflict Prevention

Hisashi Owada

I. "Human Security" and Conflicts

"A new breeze is blowing." So declared George Bush 10 years ago, in his January 1989 inaugural address as president of the United States, as he referred to the signs of change emerging in Eastern Europe. A mere 10 months later, the Berlin Wall came tumbling down like a flimsy stack of blocks. No mere "breeze," what Europe experienced was rather a powerful hurricane of major reform, bringing an end to the Cold War structure that had dominated the world for over 40 years since the end of World War II.

While Bush demonstrated foresight in his assessment, so great are the changes we have seen in the decade since then that his remark can now be regarded as "the understatement of the century." And it has become clear that neither the collapse of the Berlin Wall nor the end of the Cold War symbolized thereby has brought us to "the end of history."

As we approach the start of a new millennium, the shifts that we are confronted with in international society go beyond such readily visible historic episodes as the crumbling of the Berlin Wall. Not only do they proclaim the end of the international order that has prevailed in the half century since the end of World War II, but they indicate to us that we are experiencing a truly historic structural transformation in the international system that has supported the world from the seventeenth century up to our own times. Ever since the birth of the modern international society symbolized by the Peace of Westphalia, the prevailing order has been composed of sovereign states and grounded in the twin principles of sovereign equality among them and noninterference in each other's internal affairs. In that sense the modern international system may be said to be an order founded on equilibrium among sovereign states within a multipolar structure. The culmination of this was the bipolar structure of the Cold War era. The end of the Cold War has clearly revealed to us that a world is emerging in which this sort of order, built on equilibrium among sovereign states, can no longer prevail. How is this structural transformation likely to affect the world in the period ahead?

First of all, the disappearance of the international order maintained through a "balance of terror" between the United States and the Soviet Union as the world's two superpowers can be taken as a major change for the better inasmuch as it has freed us from a situation in which our greatest security concern was the threat of all-out nuclear war. On the other hand, however, we still cannot draw even the outlines of a new order to guide the world of the twenty-first century in place of this former bipolar structure. Amidst the rapidly progressing integration of international society, not only are the ties of mutual interdependence among states growing dramatically closer, but also human activities are becoming globalized in a way that transcends the framework of state power; this situation is becoming the biggest factor regulating international relations. Under these circumstances, it is quite implausible to think that the disappearance from the scene of one of the two superpowers that previously sustained the bipolar order will lead immediately to the emergence of a unipolar order. At the same time, the notion that a classical multipolar order based on equilibrium among sovereign states will now reemerge must be seen as anachronistic thinking that fails to grasp the structural transformation taking place in the international society that sustained the previously prevailing international system.

Second, the collapse of the order grounded in ideological confrontation on a global level offered the major possibility of leading international society from a divided world to a unified one. At the same time, however, it allowed the emergence of numerous internal confrontational factors that had previously been bottled up within the overall structure of confrontation between the U.S. and Soviet camps. The crumbling of the Cold War structure has led not so much to increased interstate confrontations between sovereign states as to the proliferation of intrastate conflicts based on religious, racial, ethnic, or other historical or cultural factors, a phenomenon that we see occurring in Africa, Europe, Asia, and elsewhere. Under these circumstances, the problem of "security" cannot be solved merely by ensuring security of the state as such; we must also direct our efforts at the search for ways to achieve "human security," through ensuring security of the individuals that constitute the state. In other words, policies aimed at national security centering on military power are no longer sufficient; we now need policies based on a more comprehensive perspective to deal with the issue of security for human beings, the constituent elements of the nation.

Third, amidst this structural transformation of the international system, the question arises as to who are the principals for whom the international order seeks to assure justice, safety, and prosperity. Under the traditional international system, we have tended to think of international relations as being exclusively relations between and among states. Now, however, the end of the Cold War has revealed to us a new set of circumstances under which issues that cannot be handled by states as units are more numerous than those that can. We must also note that the emerging situation is one that poses a question concerning the values that international society should seek to achieve, such as the realization of justice, the guarantee of security, and the achieve-

ment of prosperity: The contents of these values relate not to sovereign states but to the individual human beings who are their constituent members.

The situation relating to the crisis in Kosovo in 1999 was symbolic of this problem, inasmuch as it highlighted, with such clear contrast, the dilemma of today's international society concerning the international public good that the contemporary international order should seek to protect, that is, the dichotomy between "justice in sovereign terms," meaning the securing of freedom and dignity for sovereign states, and "justice in human terms," meaning the securing of freedom and dignity for individuals. The situation presented us with these two mutually incompatible alternatives and demanded that we choose between them.

It is in this context that the concept of human security is of extreme significance today. In contemporary international society, nation-states bear the responsibility of ensuring security toward their people through securing the safety of the state. However, that alone is insufficient. The basic framework for our handling of the large issues of security in today's world must be one that not only secures the safety of the state but also secures the safety of individual human beings.

II. The Contemporary Significance of Conflict Prevention

In the light of the above, inasmuch as the conflicts that arise within international society—whether in relations between states or out of causes within a single country—cannot be ignored from the standpoint of the order of international society as a whole, it follows that international society must take steps to keep them from occurring in the first place and to counter them when they do occur. When a conflict leads to conditions that interfere with people's right to development and prosperity and that infringe upon their human dignity, international society can no longer avert its gaze on the grounds that the conflict has no external impact on the national security of sovereign states.

If we consider the issue of conflict prevention from this perspective, it should be clear that international society cannot take the approach of waiting for situations to develop from disputes into conflicts and to emerge full blown on the scene of international relations before considering them to be the proper object of international concern and of the application of international law. And if we adopt a stance of treating the issue of conflict prevention in this sort of broader context, then it is necessary for international society to strengthen its preventive strategy to deal with all the stages ranging from that of preventive diplomacy, seeking to change the underlying conditions that foster situations liable to cause a conflict, through, ultimately, that of preventing the recurrence of a conflict by turning the temporary lull following a ceasefire agreement into a peace that will endure.

In this sense, as former United Nations Secretary-General Boutros Boutros-Ghali pointed out in his keynote speech at this symposium, in our quest to achieve human

security, it is crucial to pursue peace, development, and democracy in a balanced, comprehensive manner. The absence of any one of these elements is liable to pose a threat to human security. The current Secretary-General, Kofi Annan, also presented his concept of a "culture of prevention" to this year's General Assembly, noting that it is far more effective to prevent conflicts from happening than to deal with them after they occur. This may be considered an observation that should be viewed in the same context.

In particular, given that so many of the conflicts in the post–Cold War world are not conflicts between states but rather intrastate ethnic or religious conflicts, we must seriously consider a conflict prevention strategy that is directed not just at the former but also at the latter. This is also a manifestation of the sense of crisis arising from the ineffectiveness of approaches based on the traditional international system, which focuses on relations between states, in dealing with conflicts of the sort that are currently proliferating.

Bearing the preceding points in mind, it should be clear that when we consider the issue of conflict prevention in today's circumstances, it is important to take a *comprehensive* approach to the strengthening of preventive functions in all the following stages:

(1) How to contain and eliminate the underlying root causes (including social, economic, and cultural factors) that give rise to the outbreak of conflicts.

(2) How to keep a crisis situation from leading to an explosive escalation of tensions.

(3) How to stop the outbreak of conflicts in the form of the use of force.

(4) How to prevent the recurrence of conflicts after the use of force has been halted.

III. Concrete Proposals Concerning Conflict Prevention

In January 1998, the Japanese government organized a pioneering event in this connection, the Tokyo International Conference on Preventive Strategy, at which concerned individuals conducted extremely broad-reaching deliberations about the proper shape of preventive strategy in regard to the preceding four aspects, with particular reference to the question of how to strengthen the functioning of the UN and other international institutions. The focus of the deliberations was especially on ways of strengthening the conflict prevention roles of the UN and regional organizations, but even so, its conclusions are so comprehensive and pregnant as to be quite adequate to serve as the starting point for the discussions in the current session of this symposium.

For the details I would refer you to the official report of this conference attached to this paper, but allow me to touch on the salient points relating to each of the four stages to which I have just alluded.

(1) Preventive efforts in improving economic, social, and cultural infrastructure

The Tokyo International Conference noted the importance of promoting and

strengthening respect for social diversity, elimination of extreme poverty, construction of a participatory democratic system based on respect for human rights and the rule of law, and tolerance of diversity as part of an effort to prevent conflicts from a long-term, fundamental perspective. Of special weight in this connection is the promotion and strengthening of the spirit of tolerance.

When different ethnic groups, religions, cultures, and traditions coexist within a single country, the maintenance of social stability requires the individual citizens of the country to keep up a spirit of tolerance toward each other. If major cracks appear, the result is confrontation, which can then escalate into violent conflict. The conflict in the former Yugoslavia may be said to have occurred because there were underlying gaps between the Serbian, Croatian, and Muslim populations that produced confrontations, and the lack of mutual tolerance provided fertile ground for these confrontations to escalate into a conflagration.

Everyday education is an important key to the fostering of a spirit of tolerance. Education must inculcate both the preciousness of peace and the need for tolerance. In this respect, the practice of Malaysia, where ethnic Chinese and Malay populations coexist, and where education aimed at fostering mutual tolerance between ethnic groups is regularly carried out, can well be of reference for the effective prevention of conflicts.

The importance of "education for peace" goes without saying. As stated in the Preamble to the UNESCO (United Nations Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organization) Constitution, "since wars begin in the minds of men, it is in the minds of men that the defenses of peace must be constructed." Particularly in recent years, attention has focused on the importance of protecting children affected by armed conflicts. With respect to those who have taken up arms, including child soldiers, the goal should not be merely to get them to lay down their arms; in order to build a culture of conflict prevention over the long term, there is a fundamental need for the provision of adequate basic education, including literacy and elementary arithmetic, and also for education in the meaninglessness of armed conflict and the preciousness of peace. Without such a foundation, we cannot hope for true national reconciliation after conflicts are over.

(2) The importance of early warning

The participants in the Tokyo International Conference also discussed the importance of early warning. In particular, they discussed concrete proposals for translating early warning functions into action as practical policies. Early warning can be seen as being of extremely great importance as a prerequisite to the ability of international society to respond promptly with the aim of countering situations in which the sparks of latent confrontations have emerged and tensions are escalating.

The dramatic advances in information technology (IT) have ushered in the age of an "information society," in which information from all around the world is transmitted

instantaneously. Under these circumstances, some may well judge that the mechanisms to enable early warning and prediction are already fully in place and that this is not a problem point for conflict prevention. There is no guarantee, however, that the information concerning the heightening of tensions in social relations will always be transmitted accurately to international society. In fact, we have repeatedly seen situations in which international society has not taken note of problems until confrontations have escalated to the stage of armed conflict. It is of extreme importance even in today's information society to construct a setup that will assure that accurate information is quickly made available on international networks so that international society will promptly learn of such rising tensions.

In this connection we need to note the importance of the role played by regional institutions and organizations. Information about rising tensions in local communities is available first to international institutions and nongovernmental organizations (NGOs) that are operating locally. It is thus crucial to improve the ability to gather this information, to secure close and organic cooperation among those concerned at every stage of the information-analysis and policy-making process, and to enhance systems and measures so as to minimize the time required for this process. For this purpose, it is important to share accurate information and analysis abilities with these regional institutions and organizations and to provide technology for the improvement of the early warning system.

One area that bears consideration is the possibility of creating such a network and implementing joint training programs among those involved—meaning donors and other concerned countries, the UN and the regional institutions, NGOs, and others, including those at both the local and the central levels. Improving the early warning system and the software that is the key to its operation through measures like these and thereby making it possible to keep the system in constant readiness will raise the political determination of the constituent members of international society to prevent conflicts and will create the foundation to enable action based on shared perceptions.

However, what is most decisive is not to obtain early warning information but rather to translate this information into action and deter conflicts from occurring. In other words, when the early warning system reveals a rise in social tensions in a certain region, international society must respond quickly and take effective measures before it escalates into a violent conflict based on the use of force.

As a practical matter, given the constraints imposed by the principles of sovereign equality and noninterference in domestic affairs within the present system of international relations, the means that can be used are extremely limited. As I explained earlier, international society is now in a transitional period as it experiences a major structural transformation in the international system. While tears are appearing in the fabric of the principle of sovereign equality, this principle cannot yet be labeled completely obsolete. Under these circumstances, even when international society judges on the basis of information provided through the early warning system that some sort of

action must be taken, it is possible that the country or countries involved will resist or refuse such action in the name of the principles of sovereign equality and noninterference in internal affairs. It will be difficult, both theoretically and practically, for international society to use compulsion against such countries. Particularly in cases of this sort, it should be both beneficial and practical for the UN and regional institutions, acting in the name of international society, to attempt monitoring of the situation and persuasion aimed at improving it. This is clear from the effectiveness of the pressure from international society in dealing with the situation in East Timor.

We must also note the importance of "preventive deployment" based on some form of international presence, alongside diplomatic efforts at the international and regional levels, as a means of prompt action to deal with tense situations. It is widely understood that the UN presence implemented as preventive deployment in the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia has been effective. We should also recall the existence of cases like that of Papua New Guinea, where preventive deployment encouraged progress in peace negotiations.

In order to prevent tensions from immediately escalating into armed conflicts, it is also important to block the availability of arms for use in such conflicts. The majority of the weaponry presently used in regional conflicts consists of so-called small arms, landmines, and such. The prompt implementation of embargoes on exports of arms like these in situations where confrontations are intensifying should be effective in terms of preventing conflicts from expanding.

To make such measures work in practice, it is important to secure transparency in the process of acquiring arms of this sort even in peacetime. It would be effective for this purpose to establish an international arms transfer registration system.

(3) Intervention to prevent the outbreak of conflicts

Even when it appears that fighting cannot be avoided, it is important to make utmost efforts to prevent the outbreak of a full-fledged armed conflict and to keep it from expanding. Conflicts particularly victimize the innocent civilians who become refugees and displaced persons. Providing ample humanitarian assistance to such people is also essential from the standpoint of human security. In some cases, a military presence may be required in order to secure the safety and effectiveness of humanitarian aid. In such cases, there may be a problem in defining the relationship between such activities and traditional "peacekeeping." I would suggest that it will be necessary to clarify the nature of these activities as an extremely limited form of humanitarian intervention.

Especially in cases of this sort, it will be necessary to pay ample attention to balancing these activities by international society with the traditional principles of state sovereignty and noninterference in internal affairs. However, one distinctive feature of domestic conflicts in recent years is that many have been occurring in "failed states," meaning countries where the government responsible for protecting people's property

and lives has fallen into functional paralysis. Under such circumstances, it should be helpful to characterize the international actions as being implemented from the standpoint of achieving human security.

Finally, interventions of this sort require huge amounts of money. International society needs to achieve a common recognition of the point that the prompt, ample, and effective provision of human and financial resources is the key to the success of such activities.

(4) Preventing recurrence of conflicts

Even after a conflict has been halted by a ceasefire agreement, this represents no more than the achievement of a temporary lull. It is extremely important to take good advantage of this opportunity as the occasion for "peace-building" activities, including the achievement of national reconciliation and the rebuilding of social infrastructure and democratic institutions. This is the way to lay the groundwork to prevent the recurrence of conflicts. In this sense, it is important at times to coordinate peacekeeping and peace-building activities not sequentially but through simultaneous operations (a successful example of this being UNTAC, the United Nations Transitional Authority in Cambodia). At this stage as well, the activities of NGOs and other nonstate actors and the cooperation of regional institutions should be helpful in terms of avoiding friction with the principles of sovereignty and internal noninterference.

In order to prevent the recurrence of conflicts, it is essential to advance the process of national reconciliation. And it is important once again to foster the spirit of tolerance among the people of the nation. In this connection the education referred to earlier has a major role to play.

At the same time, we should note that effectively punishing those who have trampled on peace in the recent past has a deterrent effect for the sake of peace in the future. The UN Security Council has established special courts that have prosecuted and punished people responsible for crimes in Rwanda and the former Yugoslavia. It will be helpful to make people realize, through the effective functioning of such tribunals, that international society is unanimous in its determination to make the instigation of conflicts a "losing proposition" and to see that the instigators are brought to justice. In this connection, a UN-organized conference in 1998 adopted the Rome Statute of the International Criminal Court, a treaty for the establishment of a permanent court to carry out these functions. It is of epochal significance that moves are underway to establish an international framework to punish the activities of individuals as international crimes for the first time in history.

The disarmament of former combatants once a conflict is over may be cited as an extremely important undertaking. And the larger the scale of the conflict, the greater the human and financial cost of accomplishing the subsequent disarmament. In regions and countries where tolerance is fragile and the seeds of potential conflict are present, it is important both to get people to lay down their arms at the earliest pos-

sible moment and to settle them into their proper lives. International society must recognize that measures to achieve this are part of the essential cost of building peace for the future.

IV. Conclusion

I have offered an overview of the issue of conflict prevention as one of the core concepts for the idea of "human security." It is true that there is no better way to eradicate conflicts than this prevention. But to implement conflict prevention effectively is no easy matter. This is because "prevention" is by its very nature something that is difficult to see. What kinds of concrete efforts can prevent what kinds of conflicts? This is the theme we should pursue at this symposium.

The proliferation of regional conflicts, political crises, and various other cases since the end of the Cold War has taught us the entire cycle from the outbreak of conflicts through their conclusion. Applying what we have learned to deepen our understanding of conflict prevention is an important part of building the "culture of prevention" of which Secretary-General Annan has spoken. This is the basis on which we must marshal our wits and come up with a comprehensive conflict prevention strategy.

In conclusion, I want to mention the most important point: It is that a coherent approach is needed that encompasses the level of the state, the bilateral level, the level of regional frameworks, and the global level so as to deal effectively with the increasingly complex conflicts of the post–Cold War era. The task cannot be limited to states, the traditional actors in international relations; it will be important to promote the roles of new actors, including civil society and NGOs, in helping to carry out conflict prevention strategy. These new actors are already making remarkable achievements in many fields, but the development of a comprehensive conflict prevention strategy that includes roles for them will be essential for the promotion of human security. I wish to conclude by pointing out that conflict prevention is not an issue just for governments; it is an issue for us as individuals.

Session II

Promotion of Sustainable Development

Jesus P. Estanislao

It is with great delight that I join all the other guests and participants in extending congratulations and expressing best wishes to the Japan Institute of International Affairs (JIIA) on the occasion of its fortieth anniversary.

In addition, I wish to acknowledge with sincere gratitude the invitation to participate in this symposium. In particular, I wish to congratulate JIIA for the choice of the symposium title, "In Quest of Human Security." The choice bespeaks the need to learn the lessons from our work in this century, and our determination to apply those lessons to our work in the next.

One of those lessons is highlighted by the structure of this symposium. Topics relating to politics and the need for conflict prevention, to economics and the need for sustainable development, to civics and the need for enhancement of human dignity may be treated separately. But there is a fundamental recognition of their close interconnection and the need for an integral, indeed an integrated, view of human security, if we are to promote it at all.

I. Development from the Viewpoint of Human Security

The attraction of the human security paradigm lies in its wisdom to center all of our attention on the human individual. The human person—each and every human being on earth—is brought to the very center of all our concerns, whether political, economic, civic, or social. Indeed, each person is the alpha and the omega of development. It should also be stressed that each person is the principal agent and instrument for the process of development to unfold on a sustainable and progressive basis.

Over several decades of work, as we have used separate paradigms and journeyed on separate courses to development, we have taken various twists and turns. Fads have come and gone. Issues have surged and ebbed. Debates have heated up and cooled down. But as we stand on the threshold of the turn of the century (and of the millennium), many of us have come to the conviction that individual people do matter, and they matter preeminently in development. This is why under the human security para-

digm we insist: Individual human rights are to be respected; individual human potentials are to be developed; and individual human dignity is to be enhanced.

The centrality of the individual person in the process of development gives us a framework for ensuring that development is by, for, and of every individual person. This framework encompasses the key elements that must be promoted in any development process. These elements are productivity (by people), welfare (for people), and progress (of people). They highlight the imperative of working well, of having more, and of becoming better. Efficiency, material well-being, and the overall quality of life as human beings are thus brought all together and jointly emphasized.

This is an expansive view of development, and rightly so, since every human person is expansive, being a composite of body, mind, and spirit. That is why, if we develop a human person at all, we must ensure for each the provision of basic human needs, basic education and training, and the prospect of advancement in culture, expertise, and values. We speak of basic human needs to include not only food, clothing, and shelter, but also other material needs such as safe water, clean air, and affordable health care services. We speak of basic education and training as the equipment needed by each individual to participate in the work force, gain some employment, and exercise the rights of citizenship. But over and beyond these basic needs are the higher needs (for advancement in culture and expertise as well as toward values) that make any human person humane, capable of participating in the exciting enterprise of promoting human progress itself, starting with oneself and extending to the whole of humanity.

From this rather comprehensive view of development, with its broad components that are closely and intimately linked with each other, we see a dynamic process. This process, if it is to sustain itself at all, must keep on aiming at its all-encompassing objective, focused on each individual person. Thus for development to be sustainable, it has become clear that it must give due regard to the physical environment and the preservation of the quality of its resources. (Unless the physical environment is properly taken care of, resources can be abused and life itself can be put under grave threat.) It also has to make markets work more effectively and competitively. (Unless markets are made to work, inefficiencies pile up and distortions build up to stunt growth and reverse progress.) It must also secure the rule of law and the fresh, often heady air of freedom. (Unless people are free to pursue their own enterprises, creativity dries up and initiative is stifled.) It is not a surprise that at a time when we are justifiably concerned about the sustainability of development, we are rightly stressing the importance of maintaining environmental standards, promoting a level playing field in competitive markets, and preserving the gains of democratization and liberalization in every field of endeavor.

The environment, market competition, and liberal democracy are no longer separate issues to be pursued and promoted separately. Rather, they are interconnected as fundamental requirements for the sustainability of development. They are also all

happily put together under the comprehensive, all-encompassing umbrella of human security.

II. Instruments for Promoting Sustainable Development

The requirements of development, which can sustain itself so as to uplift every individual toward a condition of progress, are enormous. They are clearly beyond the exclusive power and purview of any instrument that is used singly and exclusively, without cooperation and contribution from other instruments. Fortunately, we have various instruments that can make their own distinct contribution. The challenge is to make them work in close cooperation with each other so as to secure progress for every individual in the decades and the century ahead.

First and foremost, we have families and other natural communities in society. They are, less arguably today, the most effective instruments for helping secure basic human needs as well as basic education and training. To them belongs the primary role of securing these needs. They may have to be assisted by subsidiary institutions, such as schools, whose role is secondary to families in the education and upbringing of children. Thus, we can cover a lot of ground, travel a great distance, by helping and equipping families to take very good care of their own. Instead of supplanting them, we should aim to supplement the efforts and initiatives of families in providing for the most basic needs of the body, mind, and spirit of the young, whom they care for.

We then have the state and the market. We have now traveled some distance from the simplified paradigms, which put the state, with its visible hands, and the market, with its invisible hand, at two opposite poles in an apparent jostle against each other. Previously, it was assumed that the more leverage and coverage for one, e.g., the market, the less for the other, e.g., the state. No longer! We have now come around to the view that if we want markets to work well and effectively, we need strong governments to regulate and ensure that ground rules are observed. Experience has shown that markets get distorted easily where governments are too weak to supervise and oversee. Experience has further shown that a level playing field for all, where the players are very unequal in terms of capacity and access to resources, becomes a playground with very uneven and unfair results. So, even as we extol the efficiency of market competition and the effectiveness of corporate governance in business enterprises, we should also put in efforts to strengthen government supervision and oversight, and to equip government officials and bureaucrats with the attitudes and expertise of modern public administration and governance.

We also have value systems, which affect the way people think and shape the way people act. Through the existing communications systems and other facilities for people-to-people contact and interaction, ideas travel very quickly today. Information and lifestyles can be shared much more broadly and copied easily.

Globalization has crept in and influenced many elements of culture and shaped the

operative values of peoples. But even as many barriers have come down and borders have become porous, it is not clear whether people are actually adopting a much more global and universal outlook. Thus, progress toward global norms and standards is slow and uneven. Even the institutional arrangements by which issues can be discussed, norms can be agreed, and standards can be set are creaking from their inability to cope with the demands and realities of a more integrated and interdependent world. We should then be working to strengthen the institutional mechanisms for global rules of conduct, while at the same time encouraging the richness and variety of local cultures to flourish and develop. Indeed, as we promote certain fundamental elements of global citizenship, we should give full support to local initiatives and grass-roots programs in many fields of endeavor. Indeed, the challenge for any society is how to do both and combine the approaches of stressing both the global and local in a consistent and coherent fashion.

The challenge is for national governments to take the lead. It is only they, as a practical matter, that can strike the proper combinations and appropriate balances so as to use all the instruments with consistency and coherence. But for national governments to lead effectively, they must learn to make a strategic retreat from the commanding heights they used to occupy and scale down into specific niches they have to claim for proper coordination and supervision. This does not mean to push back and limit the authority and responsibility of national governments. Rather, it is to draw them back from the dangers and inefficiencies of overstretch and push them up to the higher level of taking oversight and supervisory responsibility.

From such a perch, national governments can be much more facilitative and supportive of families, other natural societies, and local governments in the provision of basic human needs and basic education and training. In other words, they seek to broaden the field for initiative and responsibility for the subsidiary units in society, even as they maintain an eagle eye on overall compliance with norms and standards. Increasingly, many of these norms and standards are being set at the international level. Indeed, as the forces of globalization and international interdependence continue to lap into many shores and sectors, there will be many more codes of conduct, conventions, and treaties, statements of best practices, and agreements on goals and timetables forged at the global level. National governments will continue to take responsibility for forging them, and eventually enforcing them, following international frameworks.

It is through proper frameworks that national governments can bestride two principles that need to be brought into mutual complementation with each other. The first of these principles is subsidiarity. This mandates that responsibility and initiative should be brought down to as close to the individual as possible so that the genuine interest of the individual can be most effectively served. The second is solidarity. This stipulates that all initiatives should be undertaken with a view of the whole, in consistency with national and international norms and standards.

III. Some Approaches to Sustainable Development

Guided by these two key principles, moving forward, we should be aiming at the provision of all basic human needs for all individual persons on our planet by certain dates within the first few decades of the next century. The political will must come from the international community and therefore from national governments in concert with each other. They must set targets. They must galvanize the commitment of every region and every national government to put in all the best efforts, the proper framework, and the required resources to meet the agreed targets.

But even as benchmarks are set, it should be clear that most of the initiative and responsibility should be at the subsidiary level, that of families, natural societies, business enterprises, and local governments. That is where most of the action should take place. There, market forces should be made to work. There, competitive efficiency should be fostered. There, supplies, drawn most cost effectively from various sources, for all basic human needs should be increased up to the level of sufficiency.

The provision of adequate opportunity for basic education and training can follow some benchmarking, with sufficient latitude for each national government to stress some specific elements, which can reinforce their claim to specific niches in a more openly competitive global economy. As more and more of these specific elements need to be emphasized, the greater latitude and responsibility each national government should assume. That latitude becomes greatest in the area of advancement of culture, expertise, and values. However, taking into account the tools for open communication and close interaction now available, national governments can encourage and support networking, based on shared and focused interests, of their national institutions with others from the broader regional and global community.

Through benchmarking, stressing and claiming specific niches, and networking, we should be aiming at providing equality of opportunity to meet the most basic needs and requirements of all individuals on a global basis. But we should be discerning, open, and realistic to permit and expect inequality of eventual outcomes, which will be dictated by individual talent, competitive advantage, and the turn of the risk-reward calculus for each initiative and every enterprise. In other words, the starting point for everyone, in each individual's journey toward further development, needs to be secured, with the joint efforts of all. But how far each individual travels and how much mileage each individual covers toward full development is left largely free and open, within as conducive, facilitative, and supportive a framework as can be provided at all levels (familial, local, national, global).

At a time when aid budgets are falling and donor fatigue is gripping the international donor community, we should stress that global leadership and vision should somehow be matched by adequate resources that can go to those societies and communities in most need. Institutional capacities in a number of economies still have to be developed and strengthened. Counterpart funds to local resources devoted to the

human security and sustainable development agenda should be strategically deployed.

Nonetheless, at the global level, there should be much greater reliance on the policy framework and the standards it sets rather than on the aid resources it provides. Over time, the balance is to be tilted very heavily toward the former and away from the latter. At the national level, there should be much greater reliance on the oversight and supervisory authority, which ensures firm and faithful compliance, perhaps within a reasonable time frame, with global standards and international norms. While occasional direct intervention may be required during a crisis, increasingly this would be more the exception rather than the rule. There would also be further retreat from the minutiae of administrative details to greater focus on broader, bigger-picture issues. Responsibility for creative and competitive action as well as for proper conduct, consistent with national and global norms, is shunted down to levels as close to the individual as possible.

This approach is increasingly taken in the critical areas of human security and sustainable development. Environmental quality, market competition, the rule of law, and respect for individual human rights are increasingly brought within the domain of international standard-setting mechanisms. National governments have to intervene for those standards to be observed. Freedom of enterprise at the level of subsidiary social and economic units, however, is gaining greater adherence, and is being fostered more broadly and, it is hoped, also more deeply.

But any and all approaches toward human security and sustainable development can lead us to the comprehensive and all-encompassing goal of caring for and enabling each individual person only if we imbue everyone, at all levels, of the centrality of the individual in the process of development. Precisely because the individual is at the center of it all, success or failure depends on how each individual balances rights with duties, the spirit of enterprise with that of solidarity, freedom with responsibility.

It is on that balance that the fate of each individual hangs. It is on that same balance that the fate of our communities, our nation-states, and the international community also hangs.

So, let us not take our focus away from the individual person—the beginning, the means, and the end of development that is sustainable.

Session III

Enhancement of Human Dignity

On Alienation, Human Dignity, and Responsibility

Hans van Ginkel

Introduction

Much remains to be done in order to prevent conflicts breaking out, and to secure sustainable development. In many regions of the world, war and poverty are still a bitter part of the daily routine of millions of people. In spite of all the efforts deployed in the past decades, the task that lies ahead, if not to end war and poverty but, more modestly, just to contain them, remains immense.

Some very bleak figures about the state of the world in terms of social alienation serve as a reminder of this task. But first it is important to consider the meaning of these figures. Behind the dryness of the numbers and statistics, there are names, there are faces, there are people—people living in such conditions of destitution that it is their very human dignity that is at risk or denied to them.

To be born on the street, to live on the street, and to die on the street is to this day the unchosen fate of millions and millions of individuals. The deliberate killing of street kids in major cities of some countries is an extreme example. For these individuals, life is hardly a life, or at least it is hardly a human life. It is more a question of mere survival.

Indeed, how can one experience the joys and the meaning attached to human life, how can one experience a life of human dignity, when survival from day to day—yes from day to day, sometimes even from hour to hour—is not even ensured? How can one project oneself into the future and build bonds with others if living long enough to see tomorrow constitutes a major challenge?

In view of widespread and profound poverty, some among the lucky and privileged ones will perhaps think that this is not their problem, that it is *not their responsibility*. Besides being morally wrong, such an attitude is certainly bad human judgment. It is bad judgment since, in the end, we cannot put an absolute distance between ourselves and our fellow human beings, wherever they are in the world.

Our own human dignity largely depends upon feeling responsible for others and for helping them when they are in need. Any indignity of condition imposed upon others

that *we* do not attempt to remedy somehow becomes our own indignity. Responsibility, here, is the natural complement of solidarity, of human and social solidarity.

It really is this sense of responsibility and of solidarity that has animated the work of the United Nations since its beginning and that continues to animate it. The United Nations University itself, in its own way, has made the understanding and the unveiling of mechanisms of poverty and of its effects on people one of its key missions. For UNU, this is only natural since, after all, knowledge is a major tool of human empowerment.

I. On Social and Political Alienation

The state of the world, in terms of economic and social development, is quite appalling. Today, global inequalities in income and living standards have reached grotesque proportions. The gap in per capita income between the richest and the poorest countries in the world is wider than ever.

In 1960, the richest countries had, on average, 30 times the per capita income of the poorest. The gap was 60 to 1 in 1990. And last year it approached the ratio of 80 to 1. So, in less than 40 years, the gap between rich and poor has more than doubled, almost tripled. Clearly, the trend indicates that the marginalization of the least-developed countries is increasing year after year.

What does this mean in terms of daily life for the people living in the poor parts of the world? In concrete terms, it means that four trends of deprivation afflict a large proportion of our fellow human beings. First, a short and unhealthy life; second, deprivation of knowledge; third, economic deprivation; and fourth, social exclusion.

First, a short and unhealthy life. The numbers sadly speak for themselves: last year, in the 10 poorest countries of the world, which are all in Africa, the average life expectancy of individuals was around 45 years. At the same time, in the 10 richest countries, life expectancy was 78. This is a huge difference. As a result, a person viewed as elderly in the poorest countries is still a relatively young person, full of potential for the future, in the richest countries, most certainly here in Japan. As a result, also, people in the richest countries outlive, on average, individuals of the poorest countries by almost 30 years, more than the time span of an entire generation. In this context, it is not hard to imagine the lack of access to medical services and safe water, for instance, suffered in the poorer regions of the world.

The second major problem is the deprivation of knowledge. Once again, numbers offer a cruel comparison. In the 10 richest countries, the rate of literacy reaches 99.9 percent. In the 10 poorest countries, the rate of literacy does not go above 42 percent.

The numbers are even worse when it comes to economic deprivation. Last year, the gross domestic product (GDP) or the income per capita did not reach US$400 in the poorest countries. For some of them, it even went down as low as US$200; this is not even a dollar a day.

Social exclusion is the logical outcome of situations of extreme poverty. It cannot be otherwise. Deprived of proper access to health and education services, lacking adequate financial means to ensure their daily existence, people who are trapped in situations of extreme poverty are, literally, falling out of the bonds of society. And, all too often, women, even more so than men, are the first victims of destitution: women and the children they try to care for.

Although extreme poverty is primarily a phenomenon unfolding in the least developed countries, as illustrated by these numbers, it is by no means limited to them. Extreme deprivation is not the exclusivity of poor countries. As a result of some of the negative effects generated by globalization, poverty is a worldwide disease. As such, it also affects affluent societies.

It is not only in the capitals of the poor countries of Africa, Latin America, or Asia that one finds destitution. This is also found in the heart of the developed world, in New York, Paris, London, and elsewhere. The only difference is that, while extreme poverty characterizes the whole life and social fabric of some poor societies, in affluent societies it is confined to pockets of exclusion, especially in big cities.

However, such a difference does not change the overall impact that poverty has on each of its victims. In addition to material hardship pushed to the limits of the bearable, poverty undermines the very sense of self and identity of individuals.

It is not only extreme poverty and social alienation that undermine the very sense of self and identity of individuals. It is also political alienation. These are also the conditions of uncertainty, of fear and even terror, brought upon individuals by political leaders and regimes more eager to satisfy their drive for power than the welfare of their own people.

Paradoxically, political alienation pushed to the limits of the bearable can be either very systematically organized or the product of uncontrolled violence. The political regimes that dominated Eastern Europe until 1989 are prime examples of the first case, of a cold-blooded and rationalized system of political alienation. To live under these regimes meant, literally, having your life, having your mind, stolen from you. The books authored, e.g., by André Brink and Nadine Gordimer describe clearly such situations in South Africa during apartheid.

It goes without saying that countries with very rigid social structures, where major groups in society are systematically disadvantaged in terms of access to education, the job market, and political power, come very close to the same position. Unequal access to opportunities and lack of transparency and democracy are major threats to human dignity. These so-called horizontal inequalities have been identified in an important UNU/WIDER study as the roots of all major humanitarian emergencies.[1]

Uncontrolled and widespread violence, on the other hand, has been more the po-

1. Jeni Klugman, “Social and Economic Policies to Prevent Complex Humanitarian Emergencies,” UNU/WIDER Policy Brief, Washington, D.C., 1999.

litical and social disease of developing countries not able to stabilize and integrate properly. The media abound with images of the effects of widespread and uncontrolled violence in Africa—think about Rwanda, Liberia, Sierra Leone yesterday and perhaps soon again, Angola, Congo today—in Southeast Asia—Cambodia—and in East Timor and elsewhere.

In both rationalized violence and uncontrolled violence, political alienation is the product of a profound dysfunctioning of the state. It is the product of a state that remains foreign to what it should be and should do, to what is its chief mission: to guarantee the respect and the welfare of people, the enhancement of their well-being and dignity.

II. On Human Dignity

The attack on human dignity, and the difficulty of upholding one's human dignity, is probably the ultimate end result of deprivation and continuous domination. But what exactly is human dignity? And why is it denied by extreme poverty and political alienation?

Human dignity is first and foremost a vision of the individual. It is a vision of the individual that conveys a very central and simple idea: that there are a number of rights that are attached to the fact of being human. Without the minimum respect and fulfillment of these rights, human dignity cannot be achieved—human dignity is denied.

It is this vision that inspired the first modern true democrats, in the sixteenth century, in the Netherlands—and, I must confess, I say this with a certain pride—to lay the foundations of local democracy and of modern republicanism in the Republic of the Seven United Provinces (Union of Utrecht, 1579). In doing so, they paved the way and prepared the rise of democratic culture, at the end of the eighteenth century, in the United States and in France, and then around the world. It is this vision of the individual and of his or her dignity that led the first modern democratic lawmakers, people of great social imagination, to embrace inalienable rights of individuals in the drafting of constitutional documents.

As such, they stressed the almost sacred character of values, such as equality and freedom, and made them the foundation of the establishment of civil, political, and economic rights. In doing so, democratic lawmakers launched a quest for human dignity whose aim has been, since then, to ensure that individuals' basic needs are met. From this foundation, individuals can be the masters of their own destiny, they can find the basis for self-respect in the capacity to take their own decisions within a given economic, social, and political context.

The quest for human dignity has not stopped since. The development of modern democracy has been a movement toward the establishment of rights that meet both the *basic* and the *evolving* needs of people.

In indicating, through the establishment of rights of individuals, what it is to be

human and what it takes for human dignity to be respected, these rights do more than just contribute to secure the egoistic welfare of the individual. They manage to recognize that relationships with others—bonds of socialization—are also a key element of human dignity. This is the second aspect of human dignity.

Rights outline the basis and the conditions for a reasonably established, stable, and sustainable material life. Rights allow individuals to project themselves into the future with others. In doing so, they make it possible for people to envision a life of sharing with others—a life where those values and institutions, such as love and family relationships, which give so much meaning to human life, are possible.

Without having secured the proper economic and political conditions of living, it is close to impossible to project oneself into the future with others. It is close to impossible to build a life made of all the experiences of sharing and bonding that make life worth living, that make life a meaningful human life. Transparency, respect for each living individual, equity, access to opportunities, democracy: These are all among the fundamental concepts underlying human dignity.

Ultimately, the experience of social and political alienation is a profoundly debilitating experience. Not only does it deprive individuals of the necessary and minimum conditions of life. It also tends to deprive the destitute from reaching out to others, from having the possibility to share a life with others. Without food, without shelter, without minimum income, without minimum of freedom and security in their lives, how can people envisage in all serenity the possibility to engage with others? Hardly having a life of their own, how can these people have a life to share?

While it is true that human dignity is very much the will and the power to survive in a decent way against all odds, sometimes the odds are just too much, too overwhelming. In denying to individuals proper conditions of living, social and political alienation forces them into isolation. It forces them into exile from themselves and from others. Here lies perhaps the biggest scandal of social and political alienation, and its most vicious attack on human dignity. Powerless and disconnected from themselves and others, the destitute are, then, stripped of their human dignity.

III. On Responsibility

So, should we close our eyes to so much despair? Should we turn our back on people in distress? Should we let them down? Should we see the struggle against poverty and political alienation, in favor of human dignity, as a lost battle? Of course, *we should not*!

The fact that all the efforts deployed in the past 50 years to eradicate extreme poverty and facilitate the development of democracy, to enhance human dignity, have not always been successful, could certainly be a reason for skepticism and discouragement. It certainly should lead us to reevaluate the public policies that have been implemented to tackle the problems of human security that we are addressing at this symposium.

But nothing, no past failures or frustrations, will ever be a sufficient reason to give

up the fight in favor of human dignity. Especially since we have had some major successes in the past years, as the opening up of the Eastern bloc in Europe after 1989 indicates or the abolishment of apartheid in South Africa or the development of democracy in Latin America. These are not small achievements.

There is a clear moral duty not to give up on those to whom human dignity is being denied. In addition, what is also at stake is what we owe to ourselves as human beings—as human beings aiming at being people of dignity ourselves.

We sometimes tend to forget that responsibility is part of what defines us as human beings. Responsibility is at the same time the expression and the instrument of our humanity as modern human beings. As such, it is also a test, a test of our own human dignity.

The ability to feel that *any indignity from which our fellow human beings suffer is an indignity that we share*. To abstain, not to interfere when we see individuals suffer, lose their human dignity by either human degradation or human violence, makes us in turn lose our own dignity. Identifying with people in need and trying to do something about it is the minimum requirement for expressing and extending a sense of responsibility.

Somehow, we all know this because, in the end, the people whom we tend to admire the most, the people whom we tend to revere the most, are very often the ones who have been able to make this sense of responsibility and solidarity the calling of their life.

Clearly, we cannot dedicate all our energy to this cause. This certainly would not be a very realistic proposition. Yet we should at least see it as an integral part of our identity as human beings and act upon it at our own level.

In that respect, we should never evaluate what we can do in favor of human dignity on the basis of what we have already done or of what others are doing. Acting in favor of human dignity is not about calculating. It is not about comparing. It is about doing as much as one can. Even if we are already doing much, if we have the possibility to do more, let us not be afraid to do so.

This is at least the way I see things, and it is the advice I would give to donor countries, to rich countries that are in the very privileged position to make a difference, to make a huge difference by helping wherever they can. It is so much better to be in the condition to give than to need to receive.

IV. The Contributions of the UN and UNU

It is appropriate now, at the dawn of a new millennium, to revisit and reassess past policies of the international community in the field of poverty eradication, respect for human rights, democratization, and the enhancement of human dignity. Without overlooking and underestimating all their positive aspects, one also must be aware of their limitations and try to overcome them.

This is certainly what the various institutions of the UN system have been em-

barking on in recent years. In fact there has been a wave of appraisal and renewal.

A few years ago, Dr. Boutros Boutros-Ghali made a special effort to ensure that the UN would do as much as possible to facilitate the development of democracy around the world.[2] It is really under his impulse that the UN began to get systematically involved in democratic institution-building in supporting transparency, equity, and equal access.

Today the new attention given by the World Bank and the UN Secretariat to sustainable development and governance issues is also a clear indication of the evolution of the thinking and ways of doing things of the international community. And so is the fact that human security is now more and more viewed as an integral part of the agenda of the UN system. This is a step in the right direction.

War is not the only face of insecurity. It is only one of many. And war usually comes forth from the entrenchment of economic disparity within and between nations, from the systematic marginalization of people and countries, from deprivation and political alienation. This is why the notion of "human security" could prove to be a good analytical and policy tool for a more equitable and more stable world.

As it is currently used in policy and academic circles, it encompasses a triple commitment. It encompasses, first, a commitment to ensure that there is less instability of societies and less vulnerability of people. Second, it encompasses the need to address, intellectually and also on the ground, problems of poverty, of human rights, of democracy, and of human dignity, in a holistic manner.

Finally, it embraces the idea that human rights and human dignity are not primarily a matter of charity or good will. It is a matter of ensuring that interactions among individuals do not generate conflicts and pathologies that, in the end, can only contribute to bringing down the fabric of society.

UNU is committed to human security and does its best to bring its contribution to the debate. Our institute in Helsinki, the World Institute for Development Economics Research (WIDER), has been for some time now at the forefront of the debate. Out of the various projects that it has conducted in the past years on this type of question, a number of publications have contributed to shaping the thinking and the policy initiatives on human security.

Our Peace and Governance Program at the UNU-Centre, in Tokyo, is also planning to dedicate a significant part of its activities of the coming years to human security issues.

Conclusion

Ambassador Owada made a major contribution by identifying "human dignity" as a key dimension of human security. Human dignity is the basic value underlying human

2. Boutros Boutros-Ghali, *Agenda for Democratization,* New York, United Nations, 1996.

rights. It is the driving force enabling human beings, under very adverse circumstances, to continue against all odds, as has been so well illustrated by Sergio Vieira de Mello speaking about the people of East Timor. It is the connecting principle that holds society together and future oriented.

Human dignity, however, is under continuous threat from two sides:

- social (and economic) alienation
- political (and cultural) alienation

We cannot accept an economic system overriding the interests of the weakest in society. We must realize that economic problems are *not* natural disasters; that our economic system basically is a man-made system and can thus be changed. We cannot just stand there and look away from concrete problems.

When we do *not* take responsibility, we are *not* prepared to care and share to uphold human dignity; we will end up somehow *sharing* human "*in*dignity," undermining the future of *humankind*. This explains the grief of the Dutch people over Srebrenica. Because these were our men. We stood by and could not do anything to prevent the tragedy of Srebrenica.

Only the systematic and active promotion of peace, of development and democracy—as Dr. Boutros Boutros-Ghali has championed—can help prevent such disasters in the future.

DISCUSSIONS

Session IV
A Strategy for Consolidating Human Security

Hisashi Owada

Boutros Boutros-Ghali

Hans van Ginkel

Jesus P. Estanislao

Maurice Strong

Yasushi Akashi

Summary of the Discussions

Session IV

A Strategy for Consolidating Human Security

Amb. Hisashi Owada: The final session is a synthesizing session. We have had three sessions: one on prevention of conflict; the second one on the promotion of sustainable development; and the third one on the enhancement of human dignity. All these are salient components of the concept of human security. I would ask the panelists to focus on these three—what I would describe as the "triad of human security"—and offer comments in an effort to come to a common understanding of the basic concept of human security, and then to think about common themes running through this triad, the three major aspects of human security.

For example, the issue of international values in state terms as against global values in human terms was one of the issues discussed in all three of the sessions. Another problem that was raised, either explicitly or implicitly, was the relevance of participatory democracy in promoting the cause of human security in all three areas. Another issue that came up was the role of civil society in this regard. And finally—I believe it was Dr. Boutros Boutros-Ghali who raised the issue—there is the issue of how to approach these different problems, as well as the proposals relating to them that have been advanced in the course of the discussion, in an organically integrated way.

Dr. Boutros Boutros-Ghali: First of all, I would like to thank you for inviting me to participate in this very important symposium and to say that I learned a great deal from this event. I have just a few remarks to make.

First, it appeared that there was a consensus among the panelists—and contradict me if this consensus does not exist—about the new role of civil society in international affairs. We believe that the enhancement of human dignity needs the support and the cooperation of civil society. This being said, there is a crisis of confidence between the states and the possibility of giving a role to civil society. What was also mentioned is that the adoption of certain rules/norms/mechanisms to integrate the nonstate actors in the international system—the United Nations or other specialized agencies—may help to overcome this credibility crisis between the nonstate actors and the states.

I have always been obsessed by the division in the world between rich countries and poor countries, and I believe that you will have a new digital wall which exists with the development of the new technologies. Here again, I am afraid that the participation of civil society tomorrow in the international system will accentuate the division

in the world between North and South, between rich and poor, or between developing and developed nations, because the real nonstate actors are in the democratic countries, and are part of the rich world, where they can afford the existence of nongovernmental organizations or very strong parliamentarians of big cities who have the possibility to get involved in international affairs. This may accentuate the division of the world which is, and will continue to be, the real problem of tomorrow. In fact, if the destruction of the Berlin Wall has put an end to the Cold War and to the confrontation between East and West, there has been no solution to date for the new emerging information society to the confrontation between North and South, and I am afraid that will accentuate this division.

The second remark I would like to make is about the discussion on prevention. We all agree on the importance of the prevention of conflict. Unfortunately, the international community, the family of nations, is still not ready to accept prevention as an approach to solve future conflicts. For many reasons, it will not gain the support of public opinion. Public opinion will react only after a disaster has occurred, and you will have thousands of refugees, houses that have been burned—only then will the international community be able to intervene.

My third point is that the state will remain the main actor throughout the next century. And citizens who are not specialists like us interested in the problems of globalization or international affairs will try to return to their villages, to the fundamentals of their religions and traditions, and will be opposed to any kind of transnational organization. So we will have mininationalism on one side and globalization on the other side.

And lastly there is the issue of human dignity. Will human dignity be more protected by the return to the village, or will human dignity be more protected by international conventions, by the supervision of international public opinion, by projection of images through CNN or through other media? This I do not know. I believe that this is a problem that deserves our attention in discussing the concept of human dignity. I agree that human dignity protected by the village, the return to the fundamentals, is a very retrograde attitude; but on a practical level what counts is human beings—will people feel more reassured being in their villages or will they be more reassured knowing that there is a very important NGO that will intervene in their favor? This remains a big question. These are a few of my thoughts on the symposium, and once more, I want to thank you and all the participants of this meeting for their gracious welcome.

Dr. Hans van Ginkel: In science, at the moment, we see a development where the major changes are not on the level of what we can see ourselves. In fact, science is focusing more and more on very macro scales, going into space and having bigger overviews, and going into very micro scales, within cells of living organisms. In order to get a better view—whether very big or very small—we need to develop new equipment and good approaches for meaningful interpretations.

In the world, we can see the same type of development. We go to ever bigger structures, and we go back to smaller structures. On the one hand, there is the process of globalization, and there is a need to organize society, trade at least, on the global scale—through the United Nations or other multilateral organizations. On the other hand, we see decentralization, going back to local levels. Many people who use modern means of technology—communication, transport—in order to be very mobile and to go around the world for their work, these same people seem to need some kind of base where they feel at home. So in the literature you can find "rootedness" as a concept—people want to belong somewhere. That is an important starting point from where they participate in life. For many people in search of a very mobile and flexible "global" world, the basic values are, after all, in the people themselves; these are in the individual and the core group he/she belongs to. So this is where education and socialization become very important elements. Therefore, it is the idea of human dignity, where people start from their own inner views, that is a basic principle on which all other elements are based.

I do not always agree that in this aspect of human dignity there is a very big difference between rich and poor. Certainly the conditions are different, and it can sometimes become very difficult to maintain his or her "human dignity." Nevertheless, for many of us, a prime example of human dignity is Uncle Tom. When we read this book, when we were still very young, *Uncle Tom's Cabin*, we knew that Uncle Tom was not rich and that he was very dependent in some ways. But there was no question about his human dignity. I think we should keep that in mind. Human dignity is a crucial underlying principle, and its importance comes from the fact that it focuses on the individual. It helps to make use of the individual as the major generating power for all development; it makes clear that we need *each* individual, when we want to develop society successfully.

Our society often is quite cynical. At certain stages, in times of high unemployment, also in developed countries, it seems as if new generations and young people get labeled as "not needed" in the job market. At the same time, we define the jobs ourselves, and the distribution of income and the distribution of free time. Making use of each individual as a major support for human security and human dignity makes people more forward looking and prepared to act with responsible social behavior. It helps them to engage themselves in the future and in society. We must appeal to each individual citizen to engage himself or herself in the future. At the same time, human dignity holds society together, and as such, it promotes sustainable development. It must be said again: For that, one does not have to be rich. When you look at Japan, Germany, and most of Europe after World War II in the time of reconstruction, the way people were contributing to that reconstruction; the way in which many individuals in Asia, in the growing economies, have been contributing to that growth; they did it because there was an appeal to each individual person and not to a vague collective. This can only be achieved when there is, indeed, a participatory democracy,

because people need to feel involved; they need to feel that they can make a difference and have an influence. And that is the major role of civil society in sustainable human development. To assume responsibility, to show commitment, and to contribute.

I agree very much with Dr. Boutros-Ghali that it will be very difficult to get positive acceptance and good cooperation between the governmental and nongovernmental levels. I remember in the United Nations Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organization (UNESCO), when the World Conference on Higher Education was being prepared, the governments did not have very clear ideas about the most desired outcomes of the process, so for a long time they let it go. As a consequence, the nongovernmental organizations had a major influence on that conference. And then there was the World Conference on Science. Governments wanted to make sure from the beginning that this would not happen again. This made a major difference in the profile of the two conferences. Nevertheless, the progress is there; step-wise, it is very important. Participation is increasing worldwide. Only in this way will conflict prevention be possible, because horizontal inequalities, exclusion, and excessive income disparities will gradually disappear and be replaced by inclusion and participation, by sharing and caring.

The world needs balance, understanding, compassion. Complex problems very rarely have simple answers; more often they require very nuanced complex answers. We should not, therefore, continuously force our systems out of balance by just replacing one single "solution" or "answer" with another. Therefore, I am sometimes concerned when the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) and others focus too much on governance, and governance only. Governance is, indeed, very important; there is no question about that. One has to look at it. But one also has to look at the working of the economic system and the economic rules. I am very concerned that we did not even use the word "WTO," the World Trade Organization, during this symposium in relation to world security, and the fact that those people who were protesting in Seattle were probably not defending the cause of the people we are specifically talking about here.

Prof. Jesus P. Estanislao: I would like to echo the ideas expressed by Dr. Boutros-Ghali and Dr. van Ginkel. I also wish to highlight the different pushes and pulls we experience in today's world. There is a push toward bigger, wider realities. The word "globalization" probably summarizes many of the forces that are much bigger than the reality of the "state" to which we have been accustomed these past decades.

But we are also being pulled back into giving greater importance to smaller units within society and the subsidiary units within the state, thereby highlighting the individual as well as the institutions that surround the individual. But in looking at all these very different forces, we must realize that—fundamental as the individual is, and important as the world community is—the states are still going to be the main instruments for getting things done.

So it is fundamental that we give consideration as to what states can do precisely in the process of globalization within an international framework conducive to human development and as to what states can do in order to protect and promote the welfare of individuals. What is it that states must do to respond to the forces pushing us toward globalization and those pulling us toward individual dignity?

First and foremost, we must be concerned about strengthening global institutions and making them much more effective. This is absolutely necessary because increasingly the things that we used to take care of at the level of the state are being pushed toward the global level. For example, currency used to be exclusively handled at the national level, but there are now pressures for handling it at the regional level, if not the global. Indeed, many of the functions that the states used to perform are increasingly demanding broader attention at the global scale, and the challenge for different states is to ensure that the mechanisms for attending to problems of the global community could be as effective as the national mechanisms, and are as subject to the usual requirements, e.g., transparency, accountability, fairness, clear rules, etc.

For the individual, states need to respect basic human rights and promote the welfare of individuals by strengthening support mechanisms for individual welfare. In this regard, the village is important, as are the local community and civil society. But as we give emphasis to these institutions that promote individual welfare, let us not forget that, while stressing freedom, we also give due emphasis on social responsibility. Indeed, these two must go hand in hand always, otherwise individuals, families, and civil society will be oriented toward selfish interests and away from their responsibility to the broader common good. The state must take care of this social orientation.

With respect to implementation, I endorse strongly the suggestions of Professor Ryokichi Hirono for the international community to set clear targets to be achieved by a certain date for all basic human needs, e.g., food, clothing, shelter, clean air and water, and basic education and training. We now have access to advances in expertise, as well as to appropriate values demanded by an interdependent world. What is required is the political will at both the state and global levels to make sure that these targets are set and met.

Finally, we have been thinking of individuals mainly as objects to be provided for. But basic to human development and welfare, individuals must also be regarded as agents to promote peace and prosperity. States must also make demands on all individuals and challenge them so they can rise up to their full potential. Dignity is basic because it flows from nature, but it needs to be enhanced through the exercise of virtues, the pursuit of values, the application of skills, and the use of knowledge so that an individual can contribute to the progress of the human family, the village and the local community, the nation-state, and the global family.

Dr. Maurice Strong: I have learned a great deal from this experience. The insights and perspectives of my colleagues have made this one of the most illuminating seminars I

have attended. I will just give a few observations that occur to me at this late stage in the process. One is, of course, on the question of human security. It simply reminds us that the individual human being is the final object of all security exercises. National security that does not produce human security for the citizens of the nation will not be effective. Global security that does not ultimately enhance and protect human security will not be effective. I think it is extremely important, but we need a reminder. The environment issue in dealing with the principles of the 1972 Declaration of Stockholm made it clear that nation-states, while having every right to exercise their sovereignty, had to exercise it on a basis that it did not infringe the rights of their neighbors and the environment of their neighbors. The same is true of human security. Human security cannot be achieved at the level of one individual at the expense of other individuals. So it is not a purely individualistic thing, although the basis for measuring human security is individual.

Many of the things that were said during this symposium remind one of the need for a culture of peace. Now, the culture of peace as approved by the General Assembly of the UN recently is a bit of a catchall. It has a lot of elements in it, and it could be looked at as a very fuzzy and vague thing because of that. On the other hand, it really does capture the essence of our dialogue here, that peace is a complex systemic process that involves the management on a more equitable basis of various sectors of society. I believe that it is very timely that the UN General Assembly has in fact given us this basic framework. It is now up to us to put meat and substance on that framework, but it does provide a very useful basis for fulfilling some of the basic elements that have emerged during the discussion.

Now, sustainable development: I think it is quite clear that we are talking about the sustainability of our societies and sustainability of our civilization; about sustainable development as the pathway to sustainable societies, not as an end in itself. And we recognize that a sustainable civilization requires our ability to manage equitably and sustainably the complex of forces through which our actions and policies are shaping our own future. This not only requires a global context, as Professor Hirono has aptly reminded us, but also, as Professor Rothschild has reminded us, requires a historical context. We not only must look at the global dimension; we must look in depth at the time dimension, at the historical dimension, and we have much to learn from that, as she has said.

Redressing the dichotomies and imbalances to which the technological civilization has given rise: We have the richest civilization ever; in material terms, the most successful civilization ever. And yet, that civilization, while it has improved immensely the lot of many, has left many by the wayside. Dr. van Ginkel gave us some very good information on that. But if we do not redress those imbalances, we cannot hope for a sustainable or a peaceful world at the global or the individual level. Redressing the gross imbalances to which the technological civilization has given rise surely must be the central basis for achieving the kinds of goals to which we were aspiring in this symposium.

Poverty. The elimination of poverty: In the richest civilization ever, pervasive poverty is a moral blot on our civilization, and its persistence clearly makes our future unsustainable. And the gross inequities that are arising: inequities—the gulf between rich and poor—that have been growing as our economy has been growing.

Values: I am very encouraged to hear the almost universal acceptance of the importance of values, what motivates us. We know, we have the capacity today, more capacity than we have ever had; technology has enlarged the tools available to us to create the kind of civilization that we want. The real question is our motivation, our values. We do not have to have a homogeneity of values, but we must have a certain set of common values that we acknowledge. And one of those is, of course, respecting the different values of others, respecting the fact that it is the diversity of the human experience that gives us our richness. In ecological systems, the strongest systems are those that preserve the most variety and diversity; and the same of human systems. We do not need homogeneity, but we do need a certain measure of acceptance of common norms, values, and standards in order to protect the individual freedom and rights of all.

Now, this also means trade-offs. I often speculate that we do make trade-offs between our dignity and our rights, on the one hand, and our opportunities, on the other hand. For example, the automobile. Probably no technology ever opened up more options for human versatility of experience than the automobile. And yet, we accept the fact that we stop at a red light, we need licenses, we drive on a certain side of the road—not the same side in each country—and we accept certain disciplines. When we want to go on air travel, we subject ourselves to the indignity of a personal search, which at some previous times would have been seen as an offense against our personal dignity. Why do we accept it? We make a trade-off to enjoy the benefit of air travel and to do it with a feeling of security and safety. I just want to remind ourselves that these notions of security and dignity do require a balancing, a set of trade-offs. They are not always simple choices.

Another of my basic beliefs is that we will never be able to deal effectively with global issues until individual people see the relationship between their own interests and their own behavior and the larger global issues. We have not yet done a very good job of doing that. And even where, as in Seattle recently, people have a perception that things are happening, that perception is often accompanied by inadequate information and knowledge. So, we have a real job of education to do in that field, and with the guidance of Dr. van Ginkel, I hope our University for Peace is going to be able to work with UNU in helping to achieve some of that.

Finally, implementation through governance: We recognize that the system of relationships through which we are shaping our own future—and we should be aware that this is probably the first time in history in which we are shaping our own future—that the actions we take, or fail to take, are actually going to be producing the future to which we aspire, which means we must have some sense of how we are acting in re-

spect to that future. The institutions through which we are dealing with these are not systemic. Unfortunately, governments and the UN are not systemic. And one of the things we are trying to do in UN reform is to develop an issue management system, where around every issue you can collect the particular actors who have a real interest—not just the UN agencies, but all the main actors. This is because in so many of the areas in which the UN is now the logical place to reach global agreement, the UN is not the principal source of capability in these fields. So those who do have the capability must be brought around the table, and that means participation. Participation in decisions might be made on a narrow sectoral basis—like the WTO, like the International Monetary Fund decisions. But we now know that decisions cannot be made in purely narrow technocratic disciplinary terms when they affect broad sectors of society. There must be better mechanisms to enable those affected by the decisions to participate. Earth Council has as its principal purpose helping to empower people at the grass-roots and community level and helping them to participate in the issues that affect them.

Now, one last thing, the rule of law: We absolutely must make, and do need, a workable democratic system at the global level in which the superpower, the United States, has a loyal opposition, where the other powers, the middle powers, and the developing countries are able to provide an effective counterbalance, not as an enemy to the United States, but as a loyal opposition to make democracy work at the global level, which it is not really doing very well now.

Mr. Yasushi Akashi: A lot of useful ground has already been covered by previous speakers, and therefore I will not go into these matters. But I wish to mention a few things. Certainly, the concept of human security has brought us to important post–Cold War issues relating to individuals. They are nonmilitary security aspects, and I think the concept is a useful one. But we must be careful not to make the concept too comprehensive, or else the concept may lose its precise implications. In our interest in the micro approach, we should not lose sight of the macro approach. And, at the risk of being considered some kind of reactionary, I would like to put some emphasis on the traditional sense of security which is covered under conflict resolution or conflict prevention.

In the nineties, we are still faced with more threats to security from a national or regional viewpoint, while the global threat of world war has receded to the background. In South Asia and Northeast Asia, there are significant amounts of tension and the threat of the spread of weapons of mass destruction—nuclear, chemical, and biological. These may even become more serious in the forthcoming century. So, in our emphasis on nonmilitary aspects, and on light weapons and antipersonnel mines, we may forget some of these mounting dangers to the basic security questions.

My second point is globalization and its dark side, to which Prime Minister Obuchi yesterday made reference. Globalization has many welcome aspects—it enhances the

lives of people by and large. But it has led to the revival of an extreme form of nationalism, or to fundamentalism—not just in the Islamic world, but in the Christian world and elsewhere as well. Here again, we must make sure that we proceed with globalization, but with appropriate attention to the identity of cultures and nations. Progress is never linear, and while we should move toward more global acceptance of human rights and human values, we should also take account of the fact that there will be regional and cultural differences in our approaches in attaining these objectives.

My third point is the question of implementation—the role of international organizations, including the UN—a lot of reference has already been made to this. How do we create new laws for civil society, NGOs, mass media, and intellectuals, aside from states as principal actors? And here we must make some hard choices and serious tradeoffs. If we enhance the role of the UN in the area of sanctions, nonmilitary sanctions, we may impinge on individual security in the sense of reducing the standards of living of common people living in the countries that are subjected to sanctions. So there are these hard issues for which there is no easy answer.

I would like to refer to the useful ideas brought forth, particularly by Dr. van Ginkel, around human dignity and human solidarity, because the question of human security is a moving concept. In Japanese society, for instance, the sense of insecurity is more invisible. There is concern about the future, about the relationship between generations, how to distribute the burden of social security between different generations. And because Japan has progressed so fast—some economists say that Japan's standard of living has gone up 15 times in the last 100 years—because of that, it has created a serious spiritual and psychological void. Many people feel insecure because of that fact. This kind of nonmaterial security question within societies—particularly in developed societies, but which I think developing countries will face sooner or later—creates the issue of better communication between generations within society. This is a new dimension of security we are beginning to face today.

Summary of the Discussions

Ambassador Hisashi Owada began his comments by emphasizing that the concepts of national security and human security are not substitutes for each other, but are complementary. Some matters that enhance national security will help guarantee the security of individuals. But simply to concentrate on the enhancement of national security does not necessarily guarantee human security. National security is meant to address the security of the people. In that sense, human security and national security are the same. With the new changes and developments that are coming about, however, there are issues that must be looked at from the viewpoint of the interests of the individuals involved rather than the interests of the state as such.

Professor Hisako Shimura stressed that while sovereign states will continue to be an important element of the international community, real change—whether historical, social, economic, or political—is brought about by forces that impact on the individual. The example of participatory democracy was given. The United Nations monitors and organizes elections, which some consider to be essentially Western-inspired institutions. But after hearing case after case and seeing images of hundreds of thousands of people in different countries walking long distances and waiting for hours in their best clothing to cast their votes, she now believes in the universal value of elections. Although states will continue to be important, civil society and its various nonstate actors should not feel powerless. They should not compete with state institutions, but become partners to create changes, and regard states as agents for institutionalizing the changes. In this way, changes may have a start rooted in the individual.

Professor Ryokichi Hirono expressed his concern with the implementation of matters relating to human security, particularly at the local level. He asked how discussions of human security and the development of common goals for humanity at the global or national level can be translated into issues or problems in the day-to-day lives of common people. He has surveyed citizens of his community for topics on international relations they would like discussed on a weekly program he coordinates at a local radio station. The topics they choose are usually those covered by the mass media—by television and newspapers. While these are important issues, he feels that there must be something more meaningful, because what the media feature are usually issues important to them, but not necessarily important to the common person. He noted that the radio program uses different aspects of the Universal Declaration of

Human Rights to inform the listeners of such ideas as food for all, education for all, health for all, shelter for all, employment for all. He believes that this kind of message will penetrate deeper than just discussing incidents taking place around the world.

Dr. Boutros Boutros-Ghali proposed reaching out directly to younger people through "cyber clubs" so that youth all over the world can communicate with each other, rural radio, education, and contacts through a parliament of young people, where they can participate and give messages to actual parliamentarians. Young parliamentarians all over the world can convene, as was done in 1999 in Geneva, where more than 10,000 responses from young people all over the world were received. He also recommended "voluntaria," sending young people to work abroad for a short period to come in contact with other people and providing opportunities to learn about other continents. The problem is that, all over the world, public opinion is interested not in international affairs but in internal affairs. Unless the public participates in international affairs, international civil society cannot provide support, and even a minimum of international democracy cannot be attained. He believes that education and promotion of international contacts for the young generation will prepare a new leadership for tomorrow.

Dr. Hans van Ginkel pointed out the difference between public opinion and the opinion of the people. Public opinion is steered by the media, and it is based on the assumption that people will be interested in this message. It is the average of the large group that will be interested in that type of message, and in time the public is expected to default to this message. But he concluded that it is something quite different from the opinion of the people, which is fairly diverse, and therefore it is not easy to capture public opinion as one broad concept. He also noted that many problems must be placed in the proximity of people in order to get them interested. There are many problems on the global level or in developing countries, but it is not too difficult to translate them into recognizable problems around the corner. But this is not done generally, and problems are kept on an abstract level.

Professor Emma Rothschild underscored what Professor Jesus Estanislao said about the continuing importance of the state and the centrality of the individual and individual dignity. But one important role for the state is precisely to protect individuals and their rights, and, in this regard, the state is under threat in a number of respects at the moment. She referred to Professor Theodor Meron's statement about civil society and NGOs not being bound by a coherent set of rules. The rapidly increasing power of large corporations, including their influence on policies of international organizations through public-private partnership, is also a major aspect of globalization. She mentioned the example of people queuing up in their best clothes to vote and agreed that participating in democracy is of inestimable importance and that the strengthening of government organizations through a new kind of participatory democracy is the challenge. This is not just a problem for transitional or developing countries. Democracy is a process, and in many ways the most developed countries are losing democratic

flexibility and imagination rapidly. In terms of implementation of matters relating to human security, she stressed the importance of thinking in terms of specific human security projects—the Convention on the Rights of the Child, education, and a free press in institutions, for example. The only way to make sense of such large global political concepts as human security is to list specific things that have been done in specific countries or regions with specific names—including countries that are regarded as preconflict or postconflict—and in three or five years time, or at JIIA's fiftieth anniversary, reconvene and ask, "Did this add up to something called 'human security'?" "Was it a new principle?" and "Was it a good principle?"

Ambassador Rachad Farah concluded that what is important in the end is how those who are living below the poverty level can be assisted. The disparity between rich and poor has become so large that today we no longer talk about "basic human needs," but "human security," which means that the situation is more drastic. The twenty-first century is confronted with a new disease—the fight for the dignity of the human being. This will require education, especially of the general public in rich countries. Support and assistance from the mass media, parliamentarians, and civil society are needed for financing projects in education and health. Concrete action must be taken and funds must be obtained to help the realization of the human security concept. Finally, he asked how much had been spent after World War II for what is called "state security" without making any difference.

APPENDICES

Agenda

Participants

Agenda

Saturday, December 11, 1999

9:00–9:10 Opening Remarks
Mr. Gaishi Hiraiwa
Prof. Dr. Hans van Ginkel

9:10–9:50 Keynote Speeches
H.E. Mr. Keizo Obuchi
Dr. Boutros Boutros-Ghali

10:10–10:40 Session I: Measures for Conflict Prevention
Presenter: Amb. Hisashi Owada
10:40–11:40 Free discussion
Moderator: Dr. Boutros Boutros-Ghali
Panelists: Mr. Jusuf Wanandi
Prof. Hisako Shimura
Dr. Kennedy Graham
11:40–12:30 Questions and Answers

14:00–14:30 Session II: Promotion of Sustainable Development
Presenter: Prof. Jesus P. Estanislao
14:30–15:30 Free discussion
Moderator: Mr. Maurice Strong
Panelists: Amb. Rachad Ahmed Saleh Farah
Prof. Ryokichi Hirono
Mr. Shahid Husain
15:50–16:50 Questions and Answers

Sunday, December 12, 1999

9:30–10:00 Session III: Enhancement of Human Dignity
Presenter: Prof. Dr. Hans van Ginkel
10:00–11:00 Free discussion
Moderator: Mr. Yasushi Akashi

Panelists: Prof. Emma Rothschild
Prof. Ribot Hatano
Prof. Theodor Meron

11:20–12:20 Questions and Answers

14:00-15:30 Session IV: A Strategy for Consolidating Human Security
Free discussion/Discussion with the audience
Moderator: Amb. Hisashi Owada
Panelists: Dr. Boutros Boutros-Ghali
Prof. Dr. Hans van Ginkel
Prof. Jesus P. Estanislao
Mr. Maurice Strong
Mr. Yasushi Akashi

Participants

H.E. Mr. Keizo Obuchi	Prime Minister of Japan
Dr. Boutros Boutros-Ghali	Former Secretary-General of the United Nations
Mr. Yasushi Akashi	Chairman, Japan Centre for Preventive Diplomacy
Prof. Jesus P. Estanislao	Professor, University of Asia and the Pacific/Vice-Chair, Philippine PECC
H.E. Mr. Rachad Ahmed Saleh Farah	Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the Republic of Djibouti to Japan
Dr. Kennedy Graham	Director, UNU International Leadership Academy, Jordan
Prof. Ribot Hatano	Professor, Faculty of Law, Gakushuin University
Prof. Ryokichi Hirono	Professor Emeritus, Faculty of Economics, Seikei University
Mr. Shahid Husain	Former Senior Vice President, The World Bank
Prof. Theodor Meron	Visiting Professor, Harvard Law School
Prof. Emma Rothschild	Director, Centre for History and Economics, King's College, Cambridge
Prof. Hisako Shimura	President, Tsuda College
Mr. Maurice Strong	President, The Earth Council/Special Advisor to the Secretary-General of the United Nations
Mr. Jusuf Wanandi	Former Chairman, Centre for Strategic and International Studies
Prof. Dr. Hans van Ginkel	Rector, The United Nations University
Mr. Gaishi Hiraiwa	Chairman, The Japan Institute of International Affairs/Counselor, The Tokyo Electric Power Co., Inc.
Amb. Hisashi Owada	President, The Japan Institute of International Affairs