



Association of  
Southeast Asian Nations

United Nations Educational,  
Scientific and Cultural Organization



**Within the framework of the UNESCO project 'Towards a Culture of Peace'  
and in the context of ASEAN's cooperative peace activities**

# PROCEEDINGS

## COOPERATIVE PEACE IN SOUTHEAST ASIA

R E G I O N A L S Y M P O S I U M  
ASEAN Secretariat – Jakarta, Indonesia, 11 – 12 September 1998

CULTURE OF PEACE  
COOPERATIVE PEACE  
CULTURE OF PEACE  
COOPERATIVE PEACE  
CULTURE OF PEACE  
COOPERATIVE PEACE  
CULTURE OF PEACE  
COOPERATIVE PEACE  
CULTURE OF PEACE  
COOPERATIVE PEACE

**Editors:**

Moufida Goucha, Senior Special Adviser to the Director-General of UNESCO  
René Zapata, UNESCO Focal Point for Peace and Security Affairs  
Isabelle de Billy, UNESCO Programme Specialist

The ideas and opinions expressed in this publication are those of the participants in the Regional Symposium on Cooperative Peace in Southeast Asia and do not necessarily reflect the views either of UNESCO or of the ASEAN Secretariat.

The designations employed and the presentation of material throughout the publication do not imply the expression of any opinion whatsoever on the part of UNESCO or of the ASEAN Secretariat concerning the legal status of any country, territory, city or area, or of its authorities, or concerning the delimitation of its frontiers or boundaries.

Any communication concerning this publication may be addressed to:  
Mr René Zapata, Focal Point for Peace and Security Affairs  
Office 5035 – UNESCO – 7, place de Fontenoy – F-75352 PARIS 07 SP  
Tel: (33-1) 45 68 12 77 – Fax: (33-1) 45 68 55 21

CAB-99/WS/3

Published in 1999 by the United Nations Educational,  
Scientific and Cultural Organization  
7, place de Fontenoy  
F-75352 PARIS 07 SP

Printed in UNESCO's workshops

© UNESCO  
*Printed in France*

# ORGANIZING COMMITTEE OF THE SYMPOSIUM

**H.E. Mr Rodolfo C. Severino Jr.**  
Secretary-General of ASEAN

**H.E. Mr Federico Mayor**  
Director-General of UNESCO

Assisted by

---

## UNESCO

**Ms Moufida Goucha**  
Senior Special Adviser  
to the Director-General

**Mr René Zapata**  
Senior Programme  
Planning Specialist  
Focal Point for Peace and Security Affairs

**Ms Isabelle de Billy**  
Programme Specialist

---

## ASEAN Secretariat

**Mr M. C. Abad Jr.**  
Special Assistant  
to the Secretary-General

**Mr Termsak Chalermphanupap**  
Assistant Director  
for External Relations

**Mr S. Pushpanathan**  
Assistant Director  
for External Relations

---

In collaboration with

**The UNESCO Jakarta Office**

and

**The Indonesian National Commission for UNESCO**

# CONTENTS

## **PREFACE**

by <b>H.E. Mr Rodolfo C. Severino Jr.</b> , Secretary-General of ASEAN and <b>H.E. Mr Federico Mayor</b> , Director-General of UNESCO . . . . .	9
--	---

<b>OBJECTIVES OF THE SYMPOSIUM</b> . . . . .	13
--	----

## **INTRODUCTION: A shared vision for the peoples of Southeast Asia**

by <b>Ms Moufida Goucha</b> , Senior Special Adviser to the Director-General of UNESCO and <b>Mr René Zapata</b> , UNESCO Focal Point for Peace and Security Affairs . . . . .	17
---	----

## **STATEMENT ON PEACE IN SOUTHEAST ASIA**

<b>ON THE EVE OF THE THIRD MILLENNIUM</b> . . . . .	23
---	----

## **OPENING CEREMONY OF THE SYMPOSIUM** . . . . . 27

### **Inaugural address**

by <b>H.E. Mr Bacharuddin Jusuf Habibie</b> , President of the Republic of Indonesia . . . . .	31
---	----

### **Opening speech and keynote address on cooperative peace in Southeast Asia**

by <b>H.E. Mr Rodolfo C. Severino Jr.</b> , Secretary-General of ASEAN . . . . .	35
---	----

### **Opening speech and keynote address on the culture of peace**

by <b>H.E. Mr Federico Mayor</b> , Director-General of UNESCO . . . . .	39
--	----

### **Keynote address on the role of regional organizations in the maintenance and promotion of international peace and security**

by <b>H.E. Mr Ali Alatas</b> , Minister for Foreign Affairs of the Republic of Indonesia . . . . .	43
---	----

## **FIRST SESSION OF THE SYMPOSIUM: ASEAN AND UNESCO DISCUSSION PANEL** . . . . . 47

### **Introductory remarks of the Chairperson of the First Session**

<b>Mr Tozammel Huq</b> , Senior Special Adviser to the Director-General of UNESCO . . . . .	51
--	----

<b>The cooperative peace process in Southeast Asia</b> by <b>Hon. General José T. Almonte</b> , Former National Security Adviser of the Republic of the Philippines . . . . .	53
<b>Presentation of UNESCO's transdisciplinary project 'Towards a Culture of Peace', highlights of the project in the Asia-Pacific region and of the preparations for the International Year for the Culture of Peace (year 2000)</b> by <b>Mr Leslie Atherley</b> , Director of UNESCO's Culture of Peace Programme Unit . . . . .	57
<b>Track two activities in the Asia-Pacific region</b> by <b>Mr Mohamed Jawhar Hassan</b> , Director of ISIS, CSCAP Malaysia . . . . .	63
<b>Discussion of the first three presentations</b> . . . . .	69
<b>PRESENTATION OF OTHER REGIONAL EXPERIENCES</b> . . . . .	71
<b>Beyond the peace accords</b> <b>Foundations of the culture of peace in Central America</b> by <b>Ms Anaisabel Prera Flores</b> , Senior Special Adviser to the Director-General of UNESCO . . . . .	73
<b>Conflict prevention and culture of peace in Africa</b> by <b>Mr Mohamed Sahnoun</b> , Special Adviser to the Director-General of UNESCO . . . . .	85
<b>The culture of peace in the Middle East and in the Arab region</b> <b>A future-oriented strategy</b> by <b>Ms Moufida Goucha</b> , Senior Special Adviser to the Director-General of UNESCO . . . . .	89
<b>The culture of peace in Europe</b> by <b>Mr Vladimir Lomeiko</b> , Special Adviser to the Director-General of UNESCO . . . . .	97
<b>Closing remarks of the Chairperson of the First Session</b> <b>Mr Tozammel Huq</b> , Senior Special Adviser to the Director-General of UNESCO . . . . .	101
<b>SECOND SESSION OF THE SYMPOSIUM: WORKSHOPS</b> . . . . .	103
<i>First Workshop:</i> <b>The Southeast Asian experience: the values involved, the actors concerned (parliamentarians, women, youth, etc.) and the resources to be mobilized (education, science, culture, communication, etc.)</b> . . . . .	107
<b>Introductory remarks of the Chairperson of the First Workshop</b> <b>Hon. General (R) Bernard Norlain</b> , Former Director of the Institute for Advanced Studies on National Defence of France . . .	109
<b>Report on the deliberations of discussion group A</b> <b>Ms Savitri Suwansathit</b> , Secretary-General of the Thai National Commission for UNESCO . . . . .	111
<b>Report on the deliberations of discussion group B</b> <b>Mr Asoka Rasphone</b> , Officer of the ASEAN Department Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the Lao People's Democratic Republic . . . . .	113
<b>Observations from the floor</b> <b>on the deliberations of the two discussion groups</b> . . . . .	115
<b>Closing remarks of the Chairperson of the First Workshop</b> <b>Hon. General (R) Bernard Norlain</b> , Former Director of the Institute for Advanced Studies on National Defence of France . . .	117

<b><i>Second Workshop:</i></b>	
<b>Peace and development in Southeast Asia: perceptions and opportunities . . . . .</b>	<b>119</b>
<b>Introductory remarks of the Chairperson of the Second Workshop</b>	
<b>Mr Mohamed Sahnoun,</b> Special Adviser to the Director-General of UNESCO . . . . .	121
<b>Report on the deliberations of discussion group A</b>	
<b>Ms Savitri Suwansathit,</b> Secretary-General of the Thai National Commission for UNESCO . . . . .	123
<b>Report on the deliberations of discussion group B</b>	
<b>Mr Asoka Rasphone,</b> Officer of the ASEAN Department Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the Lao People's Democratic Republic . . . . .	125
<b>Observations from the floor on the deliberations of the two discussion groups . .</b>	<b>127</b>
 <b>PRESENTATION OF CONSOLIDATED REPORTS</b>	
<b>ON THE DELIBERATIONS OF THE TWO WORKSHOPS . . . . .</b>	<b>129</b>
<b>Consolidated report on the deliberations of the First Workshop by the rapporteur</b>	
<b>Mr Termsak Chalermpanupap,</b> Assistant Director for External Relations–ASEAN Secretariat . . . . .	131
<b>Consolidated report on the deliberations of the Second Workshop by the rapporteur</b>	
<b>Mr S. Pushpanathan,</b> Assistant Director for External Relations–ASEAN Secretariat . . . . .	135
 <b>CLOSING SESSION OF THE SYMPOSIUM . . . . .</b>	
<b>Chairperson</b>	
<b>H.E. Mr Makaminan Makagiansar</b> Vice-Chairperson of the Executive Board of UNESCO	
<b>Verbatim record of the Closing Session . . . . .</b>	<b>141</b>
<b>Signing of the Agreement of Cooperation between ASEAN and UNESCO . . . . .</b>	<b>143</b>
<b>Award of the UNESCO Gandhi Medal to the Secretary-General of ASEAN . . . . .</b>	<b>145</b>
<b>Presentation of the main conclusions of the ASEAN and UNESCO discussion panel</b> by <b>Mr M. C. Abad Jr.,</b> Special Assistant to the Secretary-General of ASEAN and <b>Mr René Zapata,</b> UNESCO Focal Point for Peace and Security Affairs . . . . .	
	147
<b>Closing speech</b> by <b>H.E. Mr Federico Mayor,</b> Director-General of UNESCO . . . . .	
	151
<b>Closing speech</b> by <b>H.E. Mr Rodolfo C. Severino Jr.,</b> Secretary-General of ASEAN . . . . .	
	153
<b>Closing speech</b> by <b>H.E. Mr Makaminan Makagiansar,</b> Vice-Chairperson of the Executive Board of UNESCO . . . . .	
	155

<b>APPENDICES</b> .....	157
I. List of participants .....	161
II. Agreement of Cooperation between the Association of Southeast Asian Nations (ASEAN) and the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO) .....	175
III. Bio-sketches of the principal speakers .....	177
IV. Inventory of Asia-Pacific dialogue channels .....	181
V. How to achieve sustainable peace .....	187
VI. ASEAN in the twenty-first century: ASEAN youth development in the next millennium .....	191
VII. ASEAN VISION 2020 .....	197
VIII. Hanoi Declaration .....	201
IX. Preamble and Article 1 of the Constitution of the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization .....	205
X. Resolutions concerning the Culture of Peace and the International Year for the Culture of Peace .....	207
XI. Other UNESCO publications of interest .....	211
XII. Web sites of interest .....	213
XIII. Agenda of UNESCO's activities concerning the promotion of a new approach to security 1994-1999 .....	215
XIV. Information document on the International Year for the Culture of Peace disseminated by UNESCO in 1998 .....	219

**PREFACE**

**BY H.E. MR RODOLFO C. SEVERINO JR.,  
SECRETARY-GENERAL OF ASEAN  
AND  
H.E. MR FEDERICO MAYOR,  
DIRECTOR-GENERAL OF UNESCO**



From left to right: H.E. Mr Federico Mayor, Director-General of UNESCO, and H.E. Mr Rodolfo C. Severino Jr., Secretary-General of ASEAN

**Preface**  
by  
**H.E. Mr Rodolfo C. Severino Jr.,**  
**Secretary-General of ASEAN**  
and  
**H.E. Mr Federico Mayor,**  
**Director-General of UNESCO**

As we stand on the very threshold of a new century and a new millennium, we must all strive to join forces to make peace the hallmark of the future of peoples throughout the world. As the twentieth century comes to a close – a century during which war and violence have taken such an enormous toll on humanity and on human dignity itself – it is imperative for us to make, together, *a new start in the building of peace.*

In the framework of the UNESCO-ASEAN Regional Symposium on Cooperative Peace in Southeast Asia, which was held in September 1998 in Jakarta, Indonesia, all the participants made an important contribution to this new start.

They brought together two key concepts, that of *cooperative peace*, which ASEAN has fostered since its creation in Southeast Asia, and that of a *culture of peace*, which UNESCO is striving to transform into a worldwide movement. The participants – on the basis of an open and wide-ranging discussion of different ongoing projects and experiences both in Southeast Asia and in other regions of the world – were most successful in this endeavour because they went to the heart of the matter. They showed that *since cooperative peace and a culture of peace are based on common and shared values, their constant interaction can*

*be, as of now, a most fruitful way to strengthen the building of peace for the benefit of all peoples.*

Even more importantly, they succeeded in paving the way for increased cooperation and mobilization in favour of peace *by identifying the ways and means by which all the actors of society can intensify their efforts to make peace a daily reality for all.* Indeed, we are convinced that the contents of the Statement on Peace in Southeast Asia on the Eve of the Third Millennium, which was approved by acclamation by all the participants at the closing session of the Regional Symposium, will inspire many, in Southeast Asia but also throughout the world, to take action on a daily basis in favour of peace by promoting, in particular, the values of non-violence, dialogue, tolerance and reconciliation.

We, at ASEAN and at UNESCO, will continue to do our utmost to foster peace by undertaking common initiatives in the spirit of the Statement on Peace and, in particular, in the framework of the Agreement of Cooperation between our two organizations which we signed during the Regional Symposium. We will work together to prepare the celebration of the year 2000, which has been proclaimed International Year for the Culture of Peace by the General Assembly of the United Nations.



Rodolfo C. Severino Jr.  
Secretary-General of ASEAN



Federico Mayor  
Director-General of UNESCO

## **OBJECTIVES OF THE SYMPOSIUM**

# OBJECTIVES

1. Having taken note of the far-reaching changes taking place in peace-related issues as the century draws to a close, the Association of Southeast Asian Nations (ASEAN) and the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO) have decided to focus their attention on this subject of joint concern and to organize together a Regional Symposium on Cooperative Peace in Southeast Asia.

with a forum in which they can pool their opinions on the chosen theme, 'Cooperative Peace in Southeast Asia', to enable them to discuss a number of subjects of common interest, in particular the relevance of the Southeast Asian experience and the interactions between peace and development, and to find ways of working more closely together in the future.
2. UNESCO and ASEAN both offer a context in which all these questions can be addressed without prejudice. ASEAN is able to draw on thirty years' experience in promoting peaceful cooperation at regional level, while UNESCO is bound by the principles of its Constitution to be attentive to the root causes of conflict, since its mission is to promote a culture of peace worldwide.
3. The aim of the two-day meeting of representatives of institutions dedicated to the promotion of peace is to provide the participants
4. The Regional Symposium will be an opportunity to strengthen cooperation between ASEAN and UNESCO in the building of peace, in particular with a view to mobilizing their different partners in the region for the year 2000, which has been officially proclaimed International Year for the Culture of Peace by the General Assembly of the United Nations. Indeed, the time is ripe to bring together the cooperative peace concept developed in the framework of ASEAN in the last decades and the culture of peace concept which UNESCO is promoting worldwide.

## **INTRODUCTION**

### **A SHARED VISION FOR THE PEOPLES OF SOUTHEAST ASIA**

**BY MS MOUFIDA GOUCHA,  
SENIOR SPECIAL ADVISER TO THE DIRECTOR-GENERAL OF UNESCO  
AND  
MR RENÉ ZAPATA,  
UNESCO FOCAL POINT FOR PEACE AND SECURITY AFFAIRS**

# A SHARED VISION FOR THE PEOPLES OF SOUTHEAST ASIA

by Ms Moufida Goucha,  
Senior Special Adviser to the Director-General of UNESCO  
and  
Mr René Zapata,  
UNESCO Focal Point for Peace and Security Affairs

Since July 1997, when the financial crisis began in Southeast Asia, the eyes of the world have been riveted on this region, one of the most densely populated and culturally rich and diverse of the planet. And, as the crisis unfolded, with its severe social consequences, those who outside the region had for years praised its economic growth discovered, as if by chance, its shortcomings. They did not hesitate to adopt a critical posture which, as of today, remains confined to financial issues and to the short term.

## Cooperative peace, a major achievement of Southeast Asia

At the same time, many major achievements of Southeast Asia in other fields were set aside, in particular in the field of education, and notably the fact that Southeast Asia has become in recent decades a region in which consensus-building in favour of peace and dialogue has acquired an *exemplary dynamic*, in particular in the framework of the Association of Southeast Asian Nations (ASEAN).

Needless to say, the enhancement of this consensus-building in favour of peace and dialogue is today essential for the future of Southeast Asia, at a moment when the social backlash of the financial crisis could create new tensions within societies which, if left unchecked, might eventually lead to the straining of relations between the states concerned.

It should also be stressed that the building of cooperative peace within the framework of ASEAN is of *paramount importance for other regions* and their respective intergovernmental regional organizations. Indeed, much can be learned from the methods of the ongoing

cooperative peace process within ASEAN for opening up new avenues conducive to the building of peace and to the strengthening of the security of populations.

## The need for a new approach to security

Since the end of the Cold War, the concepts of peace and security, so closely interlinked in the United Nations Charter, have been the object of many discussions in different fora throughout the world. The end of bipolarity and the emergence of many intrastate conflicts in almost all regions of the world led, in particular in the early 1990s, to the formulation of tentative new approaches to peace, security and most important, to the interactions between them.

The *Agenda for Peace* of the United Nations Secretary-General, the 1994 UNDP Human Development Report on human security, and many other books, articles and documents were at the heart of heated debates concerning the perspectives of peace and security in the post-Cold-War era, as the needs in the field of peace-keeping multiplied in different regions. The hope was even expressed at the time that dividends of peace would follow the end of the arms race between the two superpowers.

Defence budgets and arms exports have diminished globally since then, but the dividends of peace have failed to materialize, in particular in favour of development; intrastate conflicts have continued to take their toll, in particular on civilian populations, and conflict prevention has been largely left to diplomacy.

If today it is increasingly clear that peace cannot be merely defined as the absence of war, and that security is much more than a

*Southeast Asia has become in recent decades a region in which consensus-building in favour of peace and dialogue has acquired an exemplary dynamic.*

*It should also be stressed that the building of cooperative peace within the framework of ASEAN is of paramount importance for other regions and their respective intergovernmental regional organizations.*

*In this context, UNESCO considered that it would be most opportune to reinforce its cooperation with ASEAN, in particular with a view to ensuring the coming together of the cooperative peace concept of ASEAN with that of the culture of peace of UNESCO.*

defence strategy, there is nevertheless no real consensus on the ways and means to prevent conflict, to build a lasting peace, and to give security a multidimensional content for the benefit of the populations concerned, defined in respect of their security needs. For it is primarily *those needs that have to be taken into account*, and not those of the defence and security establishments that have changed so little since the end of the Cold War, as they continue to thrive on perceptions of threat that are rarely conducive to conflict prevention and the building of peace.

### UNESCO's activities to promote a new approach to security

UNESCO, as the intellectual organization of the United Nations system, responded from the early 1990s to the new challenges brought on by the end of the Cold War, in particular through the launching of its activities aimed at the establishment of the 'culture of peace', which can be defined as *all those values, attitudes and forms of behaviour that reflect respect for life, for human beings and their dignity and for all human rights, the rejection of violence in all its forms and the commitment to the principles of freedom, justice, solidarity, tolerance and understanding among peoples and between groups and individuals.*

In the framework of its wide-ranging activities in favour of a culture of peace, UNESCO has given a pre-eminent place to cooperation in this field with a wide variety of partners, which include regional intergovernmental organizations, women's and youth organizations, parliamentarians, mayors, ombudsmen, defence and strategic studies institutes, armed and security forces, religious and indigenous leaders, etc. Also within this framework, the Director-General launched at the end of 1994 UNESCO's activities relating to the promotion of a *new approach to security*. The activities since carried out in this field aim to:

- first, establish a permanent cooperation with defence and strategic studies institutes, in order to sensitize them to the need of better elaborating the concept of global security on the basis of the experience of the different regions of the world;
- secondly, establish working relationships with the armed forces of different regions in order to enhance their role in the

strengthening of democracy as well as in the implementation of development strategies;

- thirdly, open up a debate with eminent specialists who could shed new light on the new non-military dimensions of security and their interaction and on the ways and means for responding to populations' needs.

### Cooperation between UNESCO and ASEAN

In Southeast Asia, cooperation began in the field of the culture of peace with the Second International Forum on the Culture of Peace, held in Manila, the Philippines, in November 1995 and hosted by the Government of the Republic of the Philippines and UNESCO. During this forum, a special session was dedicated to the Philippines peace process in Mindanao, and various references were made to other culture of peace initiatives in the region.

UNESCO was concurrently launching various initiatives in order to establish closer cooperation in the field of peace-building with different regional intergovernmental organizations, such as the Organization of American States (OAS) and the Organization of African Unity (OAU), which resulted in the setting up of various common initiatives concerning conflict prevention.

In this context, UNESCO considered that it would be most opportune to reinforce its cooperation with ASEAN, in particular with a view to ensuring the coming together of the cooperative peace concept of ASEAN with that of the culture of peace of UNESCO. In order that this cooperation should have a sound basis, the ASEAN Secretariat and UNESCO made every effort to open up the widest possible space for dialogue and mobilization between the different actors concerned, *inter alia*, the representatives of the Member States of ASEAN and of UNESCO, the National Commissions for UNESCO in the ASEAN region, representatives of the institutes of defence and strategic studies of several of the countries concerned, and representatives of parliamentary, women's and youth organizations.

The result of these efforts was the Regional Symposium on Cooperative Peace in Southeast Asia, held at the ASEAN Secretariat in September 1998. As these Proceedings most eloquently show, the exchange of experiences between different regions as well as the in-depth discussion of ongoing initiatives, shed

new light on the elaboration of innovative strategies aimed at the building of peace, based on shared values at the level of the region as a whole. And the Statement on Peace in South-east Asia on the Eve of the Third Millennium, adopted by acclamation by all the participants, is in itself a framework for future common action by ASEAN and UNESCO and all concerned by the promotion of cooperative peace and the culture of peace as brought together by the symposium.

### ASEAN moves forward

In December 1998, ASEAN held its Sixth Summit of Heads of State and of Government in Hanoi, Viet Nam, at the end of which the Hanoi Declaration was made and the Hanoi Plan of Action was adopted. The first of these documents is reproduced here, as well as ASEAN VISION 2020,<sup>1</sup> a future-oriented document of great richness that could inspire other regions to establish long-term strategies in various key fields. Such long-term strategies are often sadly lacking at a time when the complexity of ongoing processes on a world scale requires, more than ever, that the essential should not be set aside or, worse, forgotten, in the name of the logic of urgency that too often prevails in many fields.

### Mobilization in favour of the International Year for the Culture of Peace

It is hoped that the coming together of the cooperative process and of the culture of peace in Jakarta will contribute to mobilize all those dedicated to the building of peace, in particular in the framework for the preparations for the year 2000, which has been proclaimed International Year for the Culture of Peace by the General Assembly of the United Nations, as well as the International Decade for a Culture of Peace and Non-Violence for the Children of the World (2001–2010) that the United Nations has just proclaimed.<sup>2</sup> It also should be mentioned that the General Assembly has also proclaimed the year 2001 as the International Year for the Dialogue of Civilizations. A continuum has thus been established at the international level that now requires conviction, inspiration and imagination from all for it to have a concrete impact on peoples' lives.

As the celebrations of the fiftieth anniversary of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights have shown, humanity must redouble its efforts to protect the dignity of each human being, at a time when it is acknowledged that extreme poverty and intolerance are among the main threats to peace and security.

January 1999

*... humanity  
must redouble its  
efforts to protect  
the dignity of  
each human  
being, at a time  
when it is  
acknowledged  
that extreme  
poverty and  
intolerance are  
among the main  
threats to peace  
and security.*

1. See Appendices VII and VIII.

2. See Appendix X.

**STATEMENT ON PEACE IN SOUTHEAST ASIA  
ON THE EVE OF THE THIRD MILLENNIUM**



The participants in the Closing Session of the Symposium on Cooperative Peace in Southeast Asia

# STATEMENT ON PEACE IN SOUTHEAST ASIA ON THE EVE OF THE THIRD MILLENNIUM

*Adopted in Jakarta, Indonesia, 12 September 1998*

*We, the participants in the Regional Symposium on Cooperative Peace in Southeast Asia, held in the framework of UNESCO's project 'Towards a Culture of Peace' and in the context of ASEAN's cooperative peace activities, held in Jakarta, Indonesia, on 11 and 12 September 1998, at the joint initiative of the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO) and the Association of Southeast Asian Nations (ASEAN)*

1. *Aware* that, on the very eve of the twenty-first century, the nations of Southeast Asia are called upon to rise to unprecedented new challenges, in a spirit of reinforced cooperation and solidarity, in order to consolidate peace and foster development for the benefit of their peoples,
2. *Underlining* the importance of the progress made in the framework of ASEAN for ensuring a cooperative peace in Southeast Asia,
3. *Acknowledging* the importance for the peoples of Southeast Asia of the new perspectives opened by the culture of peace which UNESCO has been promoting throughout the world 'in order to build the defences of peace in the minds of men', as called upon by its Constitution,
4. *Convinced* that the spirit of intellectual and moral solidarity, equality and partnership as promoted by UNESCO and ASEAN is a key factor for ensuring lasting peace, sustainable social and economic development, and dialogue among peoples and cultures,
5. *Considering* furthermore that without peace there can be no development and that without development there can be no lasting peace,
6. *Underlining* the fact that the construction of peace, sustainable economic and social development and respect for the democratic principles of justice, freedom, mutual tolerance and solidarity go hand in hand,
7. *Conscious* that a new approach to security is necessary in order to take into account non-military threats to peace and security, in particular extreme poverty, environmental degradation and the aggravation of social inequalities, and in order to identify the ways and means for their eradication at source,
8. *Aware* of our responsibility towards future generations and their right to live in peace and in a healthy environment,
9. *Stressing* the need for the reinforcement of the long-standing cooperation between the nations of Southeast Asia and UNESCO in the fields of education, science, culture, and communication, in particular with a view to enhancing the contribution of the stakeholders in these fields to peace, development and democracy in the region,
10. *Recalling* that the General Assembly of the United Nations has proclaimed the year 2000 as the International Year for the Culture of Peace, for which UNESCO will act as lead agency within the United Nations system,
11. *Recalling* that the Fifth ASEAN Summit, held in Bangkok on 14–15 December 1995, declared that 'Cooperative peace and shared prosperity shall be the fundamental goals of ASEAN',

## **Do hereby state**

12. The nations of Southeast Asia, bound together by centuries of history and culture, have made significant progress in the last three decades to found a prosperous and peaceful community in the framework of ASEAN. They are called upon today, maybe more than ever before, to reaffirm their determination to ensure their peaceful, progressive and endogenous development in accordance with the ideals and aspirations of their peoples. Indeed, the economic, financial and environmental issues which have affected many of the countries of the region during the past year must be addressed on the basis of strengthened bonds of regional solidarity and cooperation, considering that the countries of Southeast Asia share a primary responsibility for strengthening the economic and social stability of the region as embodied in the ASEAN Declaration of 1967.
13. In this context, strategies for attenuating the effects of the current problems on the poorest sectors of the population, in particular in the fields of education, health, nutrition, and productive employment, should be implemented rapidly in a spirit of a caring society. Preventive strategies should also be implemented in the field of environmental protection with a view to preserve and ensure the sustainable use of the natural resources of each country and of the region as a whole. At the same time, the achievements made in the nations of Southeast Asia in the fields of education, science and technology development must be preserved from erosion at a time when national budgets are faced with various constraints derived from the economic and financial situation affecting the region.
14. The interactions between peace and development in the context of open societies, consistent with their respective national identities, shall continue to progress in the region, through the effective mobilization of all pertinent institutions and key social actors, towards fostering of a culture of peace. Indeed, the peaceful resolution of conflicts, the dialogue between cultures and religions, and the promotion of tolerance are, *inter alia*, key factors for giving a solid foundation to all endogenous development efforts, ensuring the participation of all. In this framework, education has a key role to play in nurturing shared values and, in particular, education for cooperative peace, social justice, rule of law, tolerance and international understanding, which should be fostered at all levels of education.
15. The progress made in the field of cooperative peace in the framework of ASEAN should be consolidated through the mobilization of all institutions and individuals who are committed to building a lasting peace in Southeast Asia, in particular on the occasion of the year 2000, proclaimed International Year for the Culture of Peace by the General Assembly of the United Nations.
16. We therefore call upon UNESCO and ASEAN to reinforce their cooperation through the undertaking of joint endeavours, which can contribute to the consolidation of peace and security, development and democracy in Southeast Asia.
17. We commend UNESCO and ASEAN for having jointly taken the initiative of organizing the Regional Symposium on Cooperative Peace in Southeast Asia, which will undoubtedly open new avenues for closer dialogue and cooperation in Southeast Asia as well as between Southeast Asia and other regions of the world. Indeed, we cherish the hope that all the above-mentioned initiatives will contribute to strengthening the foundations for peace in the third millennium for all the nations of Southeast Asia, and express our commitment to further the cause of peace and dialogue through a thorough implementation of those initiatives. For it is in peace and through peace that the nations of Southeast Asia will be able to secure the future of their peoples and contribute to the maintenance of international peace and security and the attainment of the common ends of mankind.

**OPENING CEREMONY  
OF THE SYMPOSIUM**



From left to right: H.E. Mr Rodolfo C. Severino Jr., Secretary-General of ASEAN, H.E. Mr Bacharuddin Jusuf Habibie, President of the Republic of Indonesia, H.E. Mr Sudarsono, Minister of Education of Indonesia, H.E. Mr Federico Mayor, Director-General of UNESCO



From left to right: H.E. Mr Federico Mayor, Director-General of UNESCO, H.E. Mr Ali Alatas, Minister for Foreign Affairs of the Republic of Indonesia, H.E. Mr Rodolfo C. Severino Jr., Secretary-General of ASEAN

# OPENING CEREMONY OF THE SYMPOSIUM

## AGENDA

### **Inaugural address**

by H.E. Mr Bacharuddin Jusuf Habibie,  
President of the Republic of Indonesia

### **Opening speech and keynote address on cooperative peace in Southeast Asia**

by H.E. Mr Rodolfo C. Severino Jr.,  
Secretary-General of ASEAN

### **Opening speech and keynote address on the culture of peace**

by H.E. Mr Federico Mayor,  
Director-General of UNESCO

### **Keynote address on the role of regional organizations in the maintenance and promotion of international peace and security**

by H.E. Mr Ali Alatas,  
Minister for Foreign Affairs of the Republic of Indonesia

**N.B.** The Opening Session was held at ASEAN Headquarters on 11 September 1998 in the morning. The official inauguration was held at the Istana Negara Palace, on 11 September 1998 in the afternoon. It is on this occasion that H.E. Mr Bacharuddin Jusuf Habibie, President of the Republic of Indonesia, delivered his inaugural address in the presence of all the participants, members of the Government of Indonesia and of the diplomatic corps.



H.E. Mr Bacharuddin Jusuf Habibie, President of the Republic of Indonesia, and H.E. Mr Federico Mayor, Director-General of UNESCO

# INAUGURAL ADDRESS

*by H.E. Mr Bacharuddin Jusuf Habibie,  
President of the Republic of Indonesia*

Excellencies,  
Distinguished symposium participants,  
Ladies and Gentlemen,

ON behalf of the Indonesian Government and people as well as of myself, I would like first of all to welcome all guests and participants of the Regional Symposium on Cooperative Peace in Southeast Asia. Allow me to extend my congratulations to UNESCO and the ASEAN Secretariat on taking the initiative to organize this very important symposium. We are organizing this symposium in spite of the fact that, as we are aware, certain parts of society even believe that we should rather concentrate on economic issues in general and financial issues in particular for, they reason, these issues deserve more urgent solutions than other issues.

However, if we ponder in more depth, economic and financial issues are indeed relevant issues which need to be discussed in a symposium on peace. In this era of globalization and interdependency, it is no longer possible for us to separate economic and financial issues from political and security issues. Political and security stability constitutes one important unity absolutely needed for building up a stable, just and prosperous society at the national, regional and global level. Along this line of thinking, I feel honoured to be given an opportunity to speak at this Regional Symposium on Cooperative Peace in Southeast Asia.

Ladies and Gentlemen,

For more than one year now countries in the East-Asian region have suffered from the impact of grave financial and economic crises. These crises have given rise to adverse effects

in the socio-political stability of the countries concerned. Ironically, the countries suffering the worst impact of the crises are exactly those which had previously enjoyed a dynamic economy. These countries had also adopted an open economic policy and had strong economic foundations. Unfortunately, the economic structures which had been painstakingly built up suddenly fell to pieces in just a matter of weeks.

To overcome this adverse situation, the countries which had been hit by the crises took various measures, among other things by performing economic reforms, even social and political reforms. At the regional level, ASEAN countries have established a Monitoring Mechanism supported by the Asian Development Bank. This mechanism is meant to enable us to detect early warnings so that similar crises can be prevented from taking place in the future, as was the case over a year ago. In addition, various forms of international assistance have arrived from friendly countries and from international financial institutions. We wish to express sincere thanks for the aid.

The financial and economic crises rampaging through the countries in the East-Asian region are not separate or discrete crises. These crises are part and parcel of global and systematic crises. The intensity of the crises and the magnitude of the spread of their effects require that integrated and cross-sectoral measures be taken. All of these cannot possibly be taken by just one or two countries. For that purpose, an international cooperation is needed which has high intensity, encompassing interrelated sectors. In a nutshell, efforts towards overcoming the crises require a spectrum of actions which can be seen as a 'cooperative peace' endeavour in the region.

Ladies and Gentlemen,

In the context of discussing peace, a view which has been held to date emphasizes the importance of military power as a force with which a war can be prevented from breaking out. This view finds its reflection in the Western saying *si vis pacem para bellum*, which means that whoever wishes for peace must be prepared for war. This 'deterrence' view – designed to secure security and peace – has dominated international political thinking for centuries.

Without people realizing it, that 'deterrence' view has given rise to a competition of weaponry. The nuclear weapon competition during the Cold War – which continues to prevail in certain regions – is a clear example for all of us to see, in spite of the fact that it is not impossible that nuclear weaponry can threaten the very existence of mankind. A huge nuclear explosion not only poses a major threat to mankind, but also causes an irreparable damage to the one and only earth of ours.

We should be grateful to God that now nations no longer fully subscribe to the deterrence view. Historical experience has made nations aware that a war always wreaks havoc, not only to the losers but also to the winners. Experience to date also shows that we cannot rely on world peace through a 'world police' which in fact relies on sheer power.

The threat to world peace nowadays is not solely in the form of the military threat. Poverty, environmental deterioration, and social injustice can pose a new threat to peace on a larger scale. These issues can trigger internal instability. If the problem cannot be solved, it will spread to other neighbouring countries, causing disharmony in the relations between and among the countries concerned.

Other issues related to the threat to peace which we have to seriously grapple with are the trade in narcotics and other drug abuses. In addition, organized crime tends to rise and go international. Riots in one country can even have an impact on other countries, thus can upset regional peace.

In view of the foregoing realities, I believe that dependence on the power of weaponry for maintaining peace is decreasing. Nowadays, things depend on the perception, attitude and actions of the community of nations. The issues which arise from new threats to peace which I mentioned earlier increasingly require the active involvement of nations all over the world.

The government of a given country cannot protect the living environment unless its people support their government's efforts and unless they lead environment-conscious lives. Anti-narcotic and drug abuse campaigns will yield no results if there are still drug abusers within the community. Therefore, the maintenance of peace and stability depends very much on the community at large as well as on the social norms which are conducive to the social support needed.

In line with this, UNESCO has actively popularized what is referred to as a 'culture of peace'. In this connection, I am sure that Southeast Asian countries and ASEAN play a significant role and provide a substantial contribution. The role, along with the contribution, of ASEAN in the effort to enhance peace and stability in this region has been recognized not only by the ASEAN dialogue partners but also by the international community.

Ladies and Gentlemen,

History has shown that when ASEAN was established in 1967, the Southeast Asian region suffered from economic stagnation, disputes and armed conflicts, which were caused, among other factors, by external powers. Since the time of its establishment, ASEAN has been able to make solidarity and the habit of cooperation grow not only within its Member States, but also among other countries in the region. Year in and year out, the cooperation grows closer and closer. The awareness of the common future of ASEAN has unified its Member States. All of them realize that it is necessary to cooperate to solve various problems in order to benefit from opportunities which are opening up within the ever-changing global situation.

Therefore, to date ASEAN has become one of the major powers to maintain peace, stability and economic cooperation. The impact of all of these is felt not only in Southeast Asia but also in the Asia-Pacific region. In 1994, ASEAN launched the ASEAN Regional Forum (ARF) in the hope that by upholding dialogues and consultation concerning political and security issues the strategic changes within the region can take place peacefully.

Through consultation and cooperation in a spirit of transparency and mutual trust in the context of ARF, this forum is expected to become an effective instrument in the effort towards preventive diplomacy to solve problems in the interest of its members. The ASEAN

countries have also enhanced their role as the catalysts of economic cooperation by accelerating the establishment of AFTA. They have also provided their support for the establishment of area growth, actively participated in APEC and launched the ASEM Process. The high level of confidence in ASEAN causes no country to feel threatened by the rapid expansion of membership within the last few years.

ASEAN is confident that everlasting peace can be achieved only if every nation has an interest in maintaining peace and stability. In other words, peace cannot be promoted in the absence of social, economic and political cooperation. Basically, peace is the result of a feeling of togetherness among all nations. By establishing the ASEAN Foundation this year, ASEAN has striven to provide support for the formation of the ASEAN society through contact and cooperation among their respective communities. This process should be considered as a way to create peace.

Ladies and Gentlemen,

As shown by various events during the period of the Cold War, peace within a region could be influenced by the interference of external powers. During the Cold War era, we witnessed the utilization of military power in unilateral actions violating the sovereignty of other countries. We were able to clearly witness the strong oppressing the weak. Double standards in international relations were applied in the relations among countries. Meanwhile, the gap between rich countries and poor ones was increasingly widening.

Genuine world peace will not materialize if double standards still apply. Peace cannot prevail when there is disparity and injustice. Peace cannot be maintained if external viewpoints

and values are imposed on a given country. In reality, those that claim to be the supporters of peace and justice often turn out to deny it and even force their own values on to others.

In order to prevent such actions, ASEAN endeavours to make itself aware that this organization was established on the basis of the diversity of its members. Various forms of political and economic systems, disparities in growth levels and differences in race, ethnicity, culture and religion, characterize ASEAN. These differences do not hinder the growth of close and harmonious cooperation. The unity of ASEAN is in fact made possible thanks to its strong commitment to cooperate in order to bring common prosperity into reality in everlasting peace. The ASEAN solidarity is based on feelings of togetherness.

Ladies and Gentlemen,

Although ASEAN and similar regional organizations may in fact have different regional contexts, whatever we do is basically to take part in maintaining world peace, as does the symposium organized today. The context of its deliberation is regional. However, the deliberation will eventually touch on global aspects.

I hope that the effort to enhance cooperative peace at the regional level will eventually bring all of us closer to the creation of world peace on the basis of common justice and prosperity. I also hope that the discussions in this symposium will yield a significant contribution to the International Year for the Culture of Peace, that is the year 2000. This, briefly, is what I would like to convey on this occasion. To conclude, I hereby declare the Regional Symposium on Cooperative Peace in Southeast Asia officially open.

# OPENING SPEECH AND KEYNOTE ADDRESS ON COOPERATIVE PEACE IN SOUTHEAST ASIA

*by H.E. Mr Rodolfo C. Severino Jr.,  
Secretary-General of the Association of Southeast Asian Nations  
(ASEAN)*

Your Excellency, Mr Ali Alatas, Minister for  
Foreign Affairs of the Republic of  
Indonesia,

Your Excellency, Mr Federico Mayor, Director-  
General of UNESCO,

Distinguished participants in the ASEAN-  
UNESCO Regional Symposium on  
Cooperative Peace,

Excellencies,

Ladies and Gentlemen,

ON behalf of the Member States of the  
Association of Southeast Asian Nations,  
I welcome you all to the ASEAN Secretariat.

We are deeply honoured to have with us  
today two giants in the pursuit of peace in the  
world and in our region, Ali Alatas and  
Federico Mayor.

The ASEAN Secretariat is most pleased  
to work with the United Nations Educational,  
Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO)  
on this important project within the frame-  
work of UNESCO's 'Culture of Peace  
Programme'.

In December 1995, the United Nations  
General Assembly adopted Resolution 50/173  
endorsing UNESCO's transdisciplinary project  
entitled 'Towards a Culture of Peace'. At about  
the same time, ASEAN's heads of government  
were holding their Fifth Summit and declaring  
that 'Cooperative peace and shared prosperity  
shall be the fundamental goals of ASEAN'.

The timing of the two declarations was not  
a coincidence. Both simply articulated the  
burning desire and aspiration of our time.

The search for peace resulted in various  
approaches and ways of thinking among the  
practitioners and scholars in this field. There is  
the concept of 'comprehensive security', accord-  
ing to which the promotion of peace requires a

multi-dimensional approach. 'Common security'  
refers to a commitment to joint survival and  
the achievement of security with others and  
not against them. Finally, 'collective security'  
pertains to mutual defence arrangements,  
which commit each party to come to the aid of  
any of the other parties should it come under  
attack.

We understand cooperative peace as the  
opposite of a cold peace. It takes initiatives in  
building mutual confidence by undertaking  
cooperative activities not only to maintain order  
but also to promote development. Cooperative  
peace is both a process and a goal. It creates an  
environment conducive to development. In  
turn, development helps to promote a lasting  
peace.

But while the terms 'culture of peace' and  
'cooperative peace' have been coined only  
recently, these conditions have been the ulti-  
mate aim and primary focus of the United  
Nations, ASEAN, and many other organizations  
and individuals over the years.

The value of the Culture of Peace Pro-  
gramme of UNESCO is that it goes beyond  
policy-making and institution-building. It pur-  
sues a long-term approach to the question of  
peace through measures 'to firmly anchor  
peace in the minds of men and women'.

On the other hand, ASEAN is founded on  
the universal principles of regional coopera-  
tion. ASEAN's founding document, the  
Bangkok Declaration of 1967, states that 'the  
cherished ideals of peace, freedom, social jus-  
tice and economic well-being are best attained  
by fostering good understanding, good neigh-  
bourliness and meaningful cooperation among  
the countries of the region already bound  
together by ties of history and culture'. Peaceful  
cooperation does not come about automatically

*Cooperative  
peace is both a  
process and a  
goal. It creates  
an environment  
conducive to  
development. In  
turn, development  
helps to promote  
a lasting peace.*

*The value of the  
Culture of Peace  
Programme of  
UNESCO is that  
it goes beyond  
policy-making  
and institution-  
building. It pur-  
sues a long-term  
approach to the  
question of peace  
through measures  
'to firmly anchor  
peace in the  
minds of men  
and women'.*

*The Human Agenda believes that the tie that truly binds ... is a commitment, a sense of caring and sharing, a sense of participation and ownership, a sense of belonging and attachment; in other words, a sense of community, which can only be nurtured in the spirit of real, live human beings.*

*The issue is not whether such processes as the 'culture of peace' and 'cooperative peace' are new approaches to promoting peace or simply new expressions of the same ideals long cherished by peace-loving nations and communities. Instead, the task before us is to dwell on ways of fulfilling their common aspirations.*

as a function of a regional organization. It evolves and flourishes in a certain environment. Towards this end, the ASEAN Concord of 1976 states that 'Member States shall strive, individually and collectively, to create conditions conducive to the promotion of peaceful cooperation among the nations of Southeast Asia on the basis of mutual respect and mutual benefit'.

Cooperative peace in Southeast Asia aims to promote regional resilience based on the specific principles embodied in the 1976 Treaty of Amity and Cooperation in Southeast Asia. These principles include: (a) mutual respect for the independence, sovereignty, equality, territorial integrity and national identity of all nations; (b) the right of every state to lead its national existence free from external interference, subversion or coercion; (c) non-interference in the internal affairs of one another; (d) settlement of differences or disputes by peaceful means; (e) renunciation of the threat or use of force; and (f) effective cooperation among themselves.

### ASEAN, above all, is a state of mind

A group of distinguished men and women of Southeast Asia met in 1994 and again in 1996 to exchange views on the state of Southeast Asian engagement. Their efforts culminated in a document entitled *Towards a Southeast Asian Community: A Human Agenda*. The Human Agenda reaffirms that communities are about people and that community-building is a process of creating a state of mind. The Human Agenda believes that the tie that truly binds is not faceless institutions and agencies, impersonal agreements and procedures, but a commitment, a sense of caring and sharing, a sense of participation and ownership, a sense of belonging and attachment; in other words, a sense of community, which can only be nurtured in the spirit of real, live human beings.

The Human Agenda affirms that 'Peace for the people is not only the absence of war, but also involves the presence of positive conditions, supportive of security of life and property at all levels and conducive to mutually beneficial exchanges among nation-states and peoples'.

ASEAN has achieved important milestones in its pursuit of lasting peace. The Declaration on the Zone of Peace, Freedom and Neutrality

recognizes that all countries of Southeast Asia 'share a primary responsibility' for the maintenance of peace, freedom and independence. The ASEAN Treaty of Amity and Cooperation in Southeast Asia binds the contracting parties to renounce the threat or use of force and prescribes a process for the pacific settlement of disputes. The Treaty on the Southeast Asia Nuclear Weapon-Free Zone is the region's contribution to the global campaign for the elimination of weapons of mass destruction. The Manila Declaration on the South China Sea commends peaceful, restrained and cooperative approaches to managing disputes in the South China Sea. The establishment of the ASEAN Regional Forum, consisting of all Southeast Asian countries and all ASEAN dialogue partners, demonstrates ASEAN's inclusive approach to building common peace and security with its immediate neighbours and beyond. For three decades now, the spirit of ASEAN solidarity has overshadowed whatever remains of bilateral disputes between Member States.

Both the ASEAN Summit Declaration of 1995 and the relevant United Nations General Assembly resolutions on the culture of peace, therefore, represent reaffirmations of a common commitment to the cause of peace. The issue is not whether such processes as the 'culture of peace' and 'cooperative peace' are new approaches to promoting peace or simply new expressions of the same ideals long cherished by peace-loving nations and communities. Instead, the task before us is to dwell on ways of fulfilling their common aspirations.

We understand that UNESCO has drafted a provisional programme of action on a culture of peace that is currently under consideration by the UN General Assembly.

At the same time, ASEAN is formulating a plan of action to implement ASEAN VISION 2020<sup>1</sup> that was adopted by the ASEAN heads of government in Kuala Lumpur in 1997. The ASEAN leaders envision a community of Southeast Asian nations at peace with one another and at peace with the world. They see ASEAN as an effective force for peace, justice and moderation in the Asia-Pacific region and in the world. The ASEAN Plan of Action will be adopted at the Sixth ASEAN Summit to be held in Hanoi in December 1998. I trust that the result of this symposium could serve as a

1. See Appendix VII.

valuable contribution to the formulation of that important document at this crucial stage in ASEAN's history.

Excellencies,  
Ladies and Gentlemen,

Cooperative peace requires a shared commitment to pursue cooperative actions at the

international, regional, national and community levels. This regional symposium is ASEAN's contribution. We do not seek an easy road to peace. We toil to build a strong foundation that will overcome the threats to peace.

Once again, I warmly welcome you all to the ASEAN Secretariat. May you have a pleasant stay in our host city of Jakarta.

*We do not seek an easy road to peace. We toil to build a strong foundation that will overcome the threats to peace.*

# OPENING SPEECH AND KEYNOTE ADDRESS ON THE CULTURE OF PEACE

*by H.E. Mr Federico Mayor,  
Director-General  
of the United Nations Educational,  
Scientific and Cultural Organization  
(UNESCO)*

Your Excellency, the Minister for Foreign Affairs  
of the Republic of Indonesia,  
Your Excellency, the Secretary-General  
of ASEAN,  
Excellencies,  
Distinguished participants,  
Ladies and Gentlemen,

TODAY marks the beginning of a new relationship between UNESCO and ASEAN. It is my great pleasure to welcome you all here today. Let me express first of all my warmest gratitude to our hosts and to all those who helped to organize this important event, with special thanks to Mr Severino and ASEAN and to Professor Napitupulu, Executive Chairman of the Indonesian National Commission for UNESCO and to all its members. Your remarkable support and cooperation have ensured, I am certain, that this symposium will be a truly successful event.

I am particularly happy that it is taking place in Jakarta. It is here and now that we can be inspired to try the new ways and new approaches that are necessary in order to bring about truly sustainable peace, development and democracy. The current situation in the world makes it clear that we must rethink many aspects of the way in which we address the economy, the environment and security. I like to repeat that big problems need big solutions. So, this morning, as we open this conference, I call upon everyone taking part to think big, over the next two days. Let us make this symposium one of opportunities: opportunities identified, opportunities seized.

We are meeting at a time when Southeast Asia is coping with major challenges, as are many other parts of the world. Both ASEAN and UNESCO, in their different and comple-

mentary ways, provide excellent frameworks for well-focused support strategies. Routine reflection, routine responses have no place here today. We have much to learn, it is true. But also we have much to unlearn. Together, we can perhaps push back some of the borders of conventional thinking, break new ground and find the resolve and will to embark on the path to new solutions – far-reaching solutions which make the most of each opportunity, great or small.

We need greater far-sightedness. Many of the problems in our world today arise because only short-term perspectives are used. What we have to do is find new approaches, new ways of acting together, new ways of getting involved. As you know, the commission I set up to study the main trends and possible solutions for education in the twenty-first century, chaired by the then President of the European Commission, Mr Jacques Delors, concluded that we must learn to know, to do, to be and above all, to learn to live together. I may add: learn to think together, to find new solutions, hand in hand. This is indeed what your organization, as was just emphasized by its Secretary-General, has done since it was founded.

ASEAN's original objective was to promote economic cooperation and development. Its subsequent efforts to foster cooperative peace have broadened and deepened that mandate. First, geography demanded that you find ways to live together. Today, history demands that you act together and UNESCO wants to join you in this action. The new framework we are establishing at this symposium can give us a new focus, a new impetus, and a new interconnectedness. More than ever, our global society teaches us that no man is an island. As Albert Einstein said: 'The world today is one or

*We have much to learn, it is true. But also we have much to unlearn. Together, we can perhaps push back some of the borders of conventional thinking, break new ground and find the resolve and will to embark on the path to new solutions – far-reaching solutions which make the most of each opportunity, great or small.*

*Today, history demands that you act together and UNESCO wants to join you in this action. The new framework we are establishing at this symposium can give us a new focus, a new impetus, and a new interconnectedness.*

*We have to do this in order to take early preventive action rather than react after the event. We have to do this in order to set in motion far-sighted, long-term policies ...*

*Foresight and anticipation are the key words for a different future.*

*Today, more than ever, we need the guidance of universal values. It is very clear that we cannot be guided by the market. We cannot be guided by interests.*

*Economic development cannot be approached as separate and self-contained, divorced from human development and cultural development.*

none'. That makes interaction indispensable. The problems of other peoples have consequences for us all, be they economic, social, cultural, environmental or political.

But even when we are fully aware that this really is one world, it is very hard, in practice, to change our mindset. It is a struggle to change ingrained habits, to move from the short-term perspective to a long-sighted framework of action. I must emphasize the role of knowledge in this respect. We are submerged in information, but there is an immense difference between information and knowledge, and what we need is knowledge. Often we have the knowledge, but we do not dare to apply it. We have to use our ability to foresee and to anticipate events. We have to do this in order to take early preventive action rather than react after the event. We have to do this in order to set in motion far-sighted, long-term policies which take into account the interests of our own future and that of future generations.

I was very impressed when Professor Long was talking about the need to take preventive measures rather than adaptive ones, because if we simply adjust to events, this means that events prevail, without us being able to anticipate, to forecast and to foresee. The mission of ASEAN, the mission of UNESCO, is, through development, to prevent conflict, violence and intolerance. Foresight and anticipation are the key words for a different future. It is a future where we learn to harness all the abilities of our scientific research base, to help decision-makers at all levels to anticipate. It can be done. The predictive powers of science are improving in such crucial areas as health, environment and climate. We need not only the warning, but the solution and the solution must be applied in good time. A reporting society is a postponing society!

One of the areas of cooperation which UNESCO and ASEAN will examine is the strengthening of regional links in science and technology in order to make the best use of these crucial areas of knowledge. Basic science is needed in order to address concrete problems. I remember when I was Minister of Education and Science in the Spanish Government: often the Minister of Finance and the Minister of Industry said, 'what we need is applied science'. I always answered with the saying: 'there is no applied science if there is no science to apply'. We must help each country build up its own scientific base.

Today we are more conscious than ever of our shared stewardship of this planet and of our shared responsibilities. We are also more aware that successful solutions to contemporary problems are local. Global reflection, global analysis, global guidelines, global ethics and values. But local applications, local adaptations, local know-how and local relevance. The founders of UNESCO made it clear in our own Constitution that there are some democratic ideals to be shared at the universal level. These pillars are very simple: justice, freedom, equality and solidarity. As we are an intellectual Organization, the founders of UNESCO added: intellectual and moral solidarity.

Today, more than ever, we need the guidance of universal values. It is very clear that we cannot be guided by the market. We cannot be guided by interests. Unfortunately, at the worldwide level, we see many asymmetries. There is the gender gap, the wealth gap and the knowledge gap. The key word now is 'endogenous' development: development which allows you to master your own processes and your own destiny, not development which remains neo-colonial, following a blueprint which is handed down from above, not development in the hands of international conglomerates or determined solely by global markets. Development which responds to local needs and corresponds to the realities of the local context. Development which cannot be wiped out by speculators.

The concept of endogenous, sustainable development is one of the most important breakthroughs in thinking on development. But it is only half the picture. There is a second, equally crucial aspect to development which is also far better understood today: economic development cannot be approached as separate and self-contained, divorced from human development and cultural development. A thriving culture is the very foundation of economic development. We have to remember that the goal of economic development is human welfare, not growth for its own sake. Economic development, human development, culture – all these essential dimensions are interlinked. This gives UNESCO a special role to play within the UN family: putting education, culture, communication and science into the development equation; ensuring that all groups in society, especially women and young people, are central to that equation.

It is because we have come to see that all aspects of development are interlinked that we

can better understand a further fundamental connection: if development is to succeed, it has to go hand in hand with peace and democracy. Very often, democracy has been presented as a kind of template to be imposed on different countries, on different cultures. No! Democracy cannot be left to specialists! It cannot be imported by overseas experts or picked up from a handbook. By its nature, democracy comes from the people. They determine its characteristics. They hand it down from one generation to the next. It is a process that starts in the schoolroom. It is to count and not just to be counted at election time. Democracy fosters justice, freedom of expression, civil rights and human rights, enjoyed by well-informed, active citizens.

Freedom of expression is highly important. The first Article of our Constitution says that UNESCO must guarantee the free flow of ideas through word and image. Why? Because, through the voice of the people, through freedom of expression, legality becomes justice. One talks about 'the rule of law'. Better still is the rule of true justice, where the voice of the people is heard. Almost three years ago, when addressing the Second International Forum for a Culture of Peace in Manila, in the Philippines, I said: 'Neither democratic structures, nor the timetable and pace of electoral reform can be imposed, either from outside or from above. We are challenged to help countries find their own new roads to democracy.'

Ladies and Gentlemen,

Three years later, it is very encouraging to see so many of the nations of Southeast Asia pursuing their own paths to democracy, sometimes through rough periods. UNESCO has tried to meet the challenge of finding ways to help countries build these paths, with new partnerships, with parliaments and town councils, through the Mayors for Peace awards, women's literacy programmes, training programmes for journalists: all these are examples of ways in which we try to strengthen the fabric of democracy and human rights. Human rights belong to and are the hope of each single human being. Democracy is linked to development, based on sustainability and on better sharing, on the reshaping of our budget priorities.

This implies a new approach to education, one where alongside the effort to provide basic education, lifelong learning allows people to improve their living conditions; one where

literacy is not just the theoretical ability to read and write, but allows people to acquire income-generating skills; education without frontiers, that really does reach the unreached and includes the excluded; higher education in which Article 26 of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights is fully applied. This Article says that access to higher education is based on merit. Have we ensured that this is the case in all the countries of the world? No! Then, to pay tribute, to celebrate the fiftieth anniversary of the Declaration of Human Rights, let us apply those rights.

When we link peace, development and democracy, it is not only our approach to education or citizenship which is affected. It also implies a fundamentally new approach to security. Security is not only a matter of well-protected frontiers, it includes above all citizens' security and a well-functioning, efficient and rapid justice system. It includes environmental security, where many man-made disasters are prevented, and natural disasters meet with a rapid and well-prepared response.

The approach to security across the world may vary greatly from one country to another but one can detect some general trends. There has been change in the way countries use their military, since the days when ministries of defence were called ministries of war. Now, I am sure that before long they will be called 'ministries of peace'. Can we not hope for a world where peace-building and peace-keeping will be the essential role of the military? I believe that the more firmly security is placed in the hands of civilian governments elected by, and answerable to, a mature citizenship, the more we will see all these aspects of security developed.

Since its inception, UNESCO has borne a special responsibility for furthering peace, a responsibility made clear in the opening words of its Constitution: 'since wars begin in the minds of men, it is in the minds of men that the defences of peace must be constructed'. UNESCO's core mission therefore goes beyond peace-keeping to peace-building. This approach is clearly reflected in UNESCO's concern to build a culture of peace. We do not see peace purely in terms of keeping the peace. The peace we are aiming for is not simply the absence of armed conflict. It does not rest on the balance of military power or so-called nuclear dissuasion. A culture of peace uniquely combines the concepts of peace and security. It holds the promise of a truly secure peace

*Democracy cannot be left to specialists! It cannot be imported by overseas experts or picked up from a handbook. By its nature, democracy comes from the people. They determine its characteristics. They hand it down from one generation to the next.*

*When we link peace, development and democracy, it is not only our approach to education or citizenship which is affected. It also implies a fundamentally new approach to security.*

*A culture of peace uniquely combines the concepts of peace and security.*

*But let me make this absolutely clear: a culture of peace is not a luxury. It is not an option to be added on at the end of the process of recovery. It has to be built in from the very earliest stages.*

*Southeast Asia has a unique opportunity – an opportunity born of crisis – to set in motion a new approach to recovery, a new approach to development, one which averts the risks of conflict and which, at every stage and at every level, reinforces peace, development, human rights and democracy.*

*I can assure you that UNESCO will put all its energies into making the outcome of this meeting a concrete and positive reality.*

because it works to ensure the permanent, interactive link between development, peace and democracy. Without this interactive triangle, no peace is secure, no economic development is secure, no political power is secure, no future is secure.

We have to make the transition from a culture of violence, oppression and war to a culture of dialogue, tolerance and non-violence. If we may sum up at this end of the century and of the millennium: we have done really wonderful things for humanity, but, in terms of war, we have paid a terrible price. Millions of young people have given their lives for the peace that we have today but nothing has been solved with violence. This is why we want, together with you, to advance the aims of a culture of peace through cooperation.

You may ask what relevance UNESCO's concept of a culture of peace has for those countries of Southeast Asia where years of rapid economic growth have come to an abrupt end? When I describe a culture of peace, I do so knowing that your countries are grappling with many difficulties. It would indeed be wrong to set impossible goals when your priority is to respond to sudden change and embark on the path to recovery. But let me make this absolutely clear: a culture of peace is not a luxury. It is not an option to be added on at the end of the process of recovery. It has to be built in from the very earliest stages. It is just as essential as credit-ratings and monetary policies. It is structural.

To my mind, the question is not 'can we afford to think about a culture of peace at this stage?', but 'can we afford not to?' Let me refer you to the brochure that has been prepared for this symposium: 'Building a Culture of Peace in Southeast Asia'. It gives a very clear idea of just how many areas of activity and just how many types of action are involved when we address the tensions of development and seek to avert those trends which lead to disharmony, conflict and the spread of violence. At the simplest level of all, it comes down to the everyday behaviour of each and every one of us.

Ladies and Gentlemen,

Southeast Asia has a unique opportunity – an opportunity born of crisis – to set in motion a

new approach to recovery, a new approach to development, one which averts the risks of conflict and which, at every stage and at every level, reinforces peace, development, human rights and democracy. The region already has strong foundations for such an approach: its own tradition of cooperative peace, its extraordinarily rich history, values, culture and heritage, its wealth of resources and skills. I believe the region can show the rest of the world the way: a new way! As other regions now face the threat of economic recession, they will look to Southeast Asia to see how the situation is being handled here.

The challenge is to find new methods to deal with the problems triggered by recession, new methods which embody a new approach. UNESCO offers its partnership in every way it may prove to be of use. The foundations are already in place and can be further developed: our school network, the Associated Schools Project, and the Asia-Pacific Network of International Education for Value Education, for example. Our university network, UNITWIN and the UNESCO Chairs Programme, our scientific research programmes, whose disciplinary networks reach across the world: an excellent example is the East Asian Biosphere Reserve Network which involves conservation and economic activity in cross-boundary biosphere reserves – a practice that is now spreading through Southeast Asia.

All these and other programmes can be called on to contribute to recovery strategies, to the building of a culture of peace in this region and to the building of secure and lasting development. I hope this symposium will serve as a space for dialogue, as a testing-ground for new ideas and as a forum from which new proposals, new plans and new perspectives will emerge. I ask you all to bear in mind the absolutely crucial importance of implementation and follow-up. I can assure you that UNESCO will put all its energies into making the outcome of this meeting a concrete and positive reality. This is the best tribute it can pay to the peoples of Southeast Asia, to the decades of untiring efforts they have made to ensure that their children experience a better quality of life. The practical start which we make here is a pledge for their future, and for a new beginning for each and every child in this region.

# KEYNOTE ADDRESS ON THE ROLE OF REGIONAL ORGANIZATIONS IN THE MAINTENANCE AND PROMOTION OF INTERNATIONAL PEACE AND SECURITY

*by H.E. Mr Ali Alatas,  
Minister for Foreign Affairs of the Republic of Indonesia*

Your Excellency, Mr Federico Mayor,  
Director-General of UNESCO,  
Your Excellency, Mr Rodolfo C. Severino Jr.,  
Secretary-General of ASEAN,  
Excellencies,  
Distinguished participants,  
Ladies and Gentlemen,

I am greatly pleased and honoured to be able to join you in this Regional Symposium on Cooperative Peace in Southeast Asia. The pursuit of cooperative peace in the Southeast Asian region is the very endeavour that underpins much of Indonesian foreign policy and the cause to which much of my own diplomatic career has been dedicated. I should therefore like to convey my sincere appreciation to UNESCO and ASEAN for taking this important and timely initiative which addresses with a fresh outlook the most fundamental concern of our region as well as of the world at large.

It should now be clear to any rational human being that war is not a viable option in the solution of disputes between states, for the cost of going to war can become so prohibitive that no side will gain from it, not even the victor. Yet, at any moment today, somewhere in the world there is armed conflict – if not between states, within states.

More than fifty years ago, representatives of the international community gathered in San Francisco, in the wake of the Second World War that devastated the capitals of Europe and Asia and brought death and terror to hapless populations, and established the United Nations so that never again would humankind suffer the scourge of war. That ultimate goal has never been realized although, through the instrumentality of the United Nations, the international community has managed to forestall

the breakout of a third world war and a possible nuclear holocaust.

The truth is that, given the inequities and imbalances of international relations, and considering the limited resources of the United Nations and the proclivity of human beings to take up arms to solve their problems, it is not realistic to expect the United Nations to be able to bear the entire burden of peace and security problems on its shoulders. The United Nations, working on a multilateral basis for peace and security at the global level, could use much needed help from the regional level. As early as 1945, therefore, the role of regional organizations in maintaining international peace and security was embodied in Chapter VIII of the UN Charter.

In more recent times, the then UN Secretary-General, Boutros Boutros-Ghali, in his report entitled *An Agenda for Peace*, observed that 'regional organizations and agencies in many cases possess a potential that should be utilized in serving the functions (of) preventive diplomacy, peace-keeping, peace-making and post-conflict peace-building'. He went on to stress that 'regional action as a matter of decentralization, delegation and cooperation with the efforts of the United Nations, could contribute to a deeper sense of participation, consensus and democratization in international affairs'.

Thus over the years, in various parts of the world, regional organizations, including those that were founded for cooperation in the economic, political and socio-cultural fields, have been contributing to the reduction of tensions, the peaceful settlement of disputes and the exercise of restraint in armament programmes and enhancing mutual confidence. In view of the trend towards regional cooperation in

*It should now be clear to any rational human being that war is not a viable option in the solution of disputes between states, for the cost of going to war can become so prohibitive that no side will gain from it, not even the victor.*

*Thus over the years, in various parts of the world, regional organizations, ... have been contributing to the reduction of tensions, the peaceful settlement of disputes and the exercise of restraint in armament programmes and enhancing mutual confidence.*

*ASEAN has served as a consistent advocate of self-restraint and as a force for dialogue, consultation and cooperation, thereby contributing substantively to the achievement and maintenance of peace not only in its own corner of the world but also in the greater Asia-Pacific region.*

*The social impact of that crisis threatens the political stability of the affected countries. Yet the situation of relative peace in Southeast Asia and the rest of the Asia-Pacific region is holding and, so long as it holds, the countries of the region can focus on the social and economic crisis confronting them and there is realistic hope for an early recovery even for the most direly affected countries.*

various fields and the contributions of regional organizations to the cause of peace and security, I have no doubt that states and especially developing countries will increasingly turn towards regional arrangements as a means of overcoming or mitigating their security concerns, both real and perceived. For the strategy of seeking security through military alliances with the major powers has long been proven to be counterproductive and will indeed become increasingly irrelevant. Likewise, ever-increasing purchases of arms for security purposes have diverted sorely needed resources away from national development efforts without resulting in greater security.

In Southeast Asia, ASEAN was for many years regarded as an association for economic cooperation, although its genesis was such that security considerations and an impulse toward peace also attended its birth, in 1967. In fact, ASEAN has been an early advocate of comprehensive security which, apart from addressing military threats to security, also takes into account the more insidious threats to peace and security such as poverty, environmental degradation and social inequities, while stressing such positive factors as dialogue, negotiations and multilateral commitment to peace. Indeed, over the years, ASEAN has served as a consistent advocate of self-restraint and as a force for dialogue, consultation and cooperation, thereby contributing substantively to the achievement and maintenance of peace not only in its own corner of the world but also in the greater Asia-Pacific region. In a very real sense, therefore, ASEAN has been a fervent advocate and practitioner of cooperative peace and security.

It is no coincidence that since ASEAN was founded more than thirty years ago, until last year when the Asian financial crisis broke out, the economies of the entire Southeast-Asian region were averaging annual growth rates of about 5 per cent while the world average growth rate was 3.5 per cent. During that time, the economies of the founding members of ASEAN were averaging a phenomenal 7 per cent. Most of the economies of East Asia were enjoying similar robust growth during the period.

Much of that dynamism must be attributed to the fact that these economies benefited from a situation of relative peace and stability in the Asia-Pacific region. In that atmosphere of relative peace, entrepreneurial initiative and economic cooperation flourished. It may be said

that the prosperity that Southeast Asia and East Asia then enjoyed was the fruit of peace and that, conversely, their economic dynamism has contributed to peace in the region – for peace and development are inextricably linked.

Today, that dynamism has been strangled by the financial and economic crisis. The social impact of that crisis threatens the political stability of the affected countries. Yet the situation of relative peace in Southeast Asia and the rest of the Asia-Pacific region is holding and, so long as it holds, the countries of the region can focus on the social and economic crisis confronting them and there is realistic hope for an early recovery even for the most direly affected countries.

This relative peace came rather late to Southeast Asia and the larger Asia-Pacific region. Even today, the region is by no means free of tension and the anxiety of potential conflict. The history of the region is replete with intermittent conflict, chronic instability and armed contention among rival powers. For there is no escaping the fact that in this region converge the physical presence as well as the political interests of four major powers, China, Japan, the Russian Federation and the United States. Their intensive and sometimes hostile interaction as well as the influence they exert on the countries of the region will always have a direct bearing on the security situation there.

Moreover, the region faces a number of security concerns born of persistent inter-state disputes, especially territorial disputes and overlapping claims of sovereignty that could intensify if their potential for conflict were not effectively managed. These include the tension on the Korean peninsula, the territorial disputes between the Russian Federation and Japan, the China-Taiwan problem and the overlapping claims to sovereignty and jurisdiction in the South China Sea.

In the face of these challenges and concerns, the ASEAN countries have fashioned two basic approaches to peace and security. The first is based on a concept of comprehensive security in which the ASEAN countries individually and jointly would develop their political, economic and socio-political capabilities that, in addition to a basic military capability, constitute a nation's real capacity to withstand threats from within and without. This is the essence of the concept of national and regional resilience, which can best be achieved not through military alliances or through arms build-up but through regional cooperation.

Complementing this internally directed approach to security is another basic concept that ASEAN applies to the wider Asia-Pacific region: the concept of a Zone of Peace, Freedom and Neutrality (ZOPFAN) in Southeast Asia. As the basic framework for regional peace and peaceful cooperation, it comprises a set of principles and policy guidelines that would serve as a code of conduct governing relations among the states within the zone as well as those outside it. ZOPFAN spells out the measures and voluntary restraints to which the zonal states as well as the external powers, especially the major powers, would commit themselves. If accepted and implemented by all sides, such a regime could obviate the need for direct military intervention by the major powers and, conversely, discourage the regional powers from again inviting or provoking major power interference in their bilateral disputes and problems. On the part of the Southeast Asian countries, this would entail commensurate political determination and greater autonomous capacity for peaceful resolution of conflicts, such as, for instance, in the South China Sea. On the part of the major powers, it would require a review of their perceptions of their interests in the region so that they could make appropriate adjustments in their security doctrines and strategies.

Some of the elements of the ZOPFAN concept have already been incorporated in the 1976 Treaty of Amity and Cooperation (TAC) to which ASEAN and all Southeast Asian countries, as well as Papua New Guinea, have subscribed. The treaty is now open to non-Southeast-Asian powers that wish to associate themselves with its principles and purposes. An essential component of ZOPFAN, the establishment of a Nuclear Weapon-Free Zone in Southeast Asia, has been realized with the signing of the NWFZ Treaty by all ASEAN and Southeast Asian countries in December 1995. It is hoped that the nuclear nations will endorse it by acceding to the protocol of the Treaty.

In the late 1980s, ASEAN, with Indonesia serving as its main interlocutor, set into motion a process of negotiations on the Cambodia conflict that culminated in the eighteen-nation Paris Agreements of 1991. These Agreements governed the Cambodia Peace Process, which paved the way for elections and the establishment of a constitutional monarchy. Since then, the process of national reconciliation and rehabilitation has been distracted by another bout of political turmoil that persists today in spite of

the recent elections that international observers deemed reasonably free and fair. Through all these developments, ASEAN endeavoured to help the Cambodian people in their efforts to solve their problems, through a troika composed of the Foreign Ministers of the Philippines, Thailand and Indonesia.

It was in the same spirit of regional cooperation for peace that Indonesia earlier this decade served as facilitator of the peace talks between the Government of the Philippines and the Moro National Liberation Front (MNLF). The talks resulted in a Peace Agreement that ended two decades of armed conflict in the southern Philippines and put it back on the road to development. Today the MNLF is working hand in hand with the Philippine Government in social and economic development programmes as well as a UNESCO-sponsored campaign to promote a culture of peace.

In 1994, ASEAN launched the ASEAN Regional Forum (ARF) so that, through dialogue and consultation, strategic change in the region could be managed in such a way that a stable relationship among the major powers and the regional powers could evolve peacefully over the next decade. Besides the ASEAN countries, ARF participants are ASEAN's dialogue partner countries, consultative partner countries and observer countries. Together they represent all the major powers and those countries whose activities and interests impact greatly on the security climate of the region.

Since its inception, ARF has concentrated its work on confidence-building measures but it has also begun putting into place aspects of preventive diplomacy that can be combined with confidence-building measures. Another activity that encompasses aspects of both preventive diplomacy and confidence-building measures is the ongoing Workshop on Managing Potential Conflict, which Indonesia launched several years ago. Today the largely informal workshop has agreed on several cooperative projects that will not only build confidence among the participating China Sea countries but will also bring concrete benefits to all the countries in the area. We hope that the South China Sea countries will now contribute to and participate in the actual implementation of these projects.

Apart from attending to political and security concerns, we in ASEAN have also taken conscious steps to integrate our economy with the world economy. We are now endeavouring

*On the part of the Southeast Asian countries, this would entail commensurate political determination and greater autonomous capacity for peaceful resolution of conflicts, ... On the part of the major powers, it would require a review of their perceptions of their interests in the region so that they could make appropriate adjustments in their security doctrines and strategies.*

*In 1994, ASEAN launched the ASEAN Regional Forum (ARF) so that, through dialogue and consultation, strategic change in the region could be managed in such a way that a stable relationship among the major powers and the regional powers could evolve peacefully over the next decade.*

*This endeavour to build a regional network for peace, to my mind, is a concrete example of the striving of a regional organization to ensure the security of its members through multilateral dialogue, consultation and cooperation.*

*I do believe that we in ASEAN are moving, in our own way and at our own pace, towards a culture of peace.*

*It will be a community that has embraced the values that reject violence and inspire mutual tolerance and sharing. In such a community, encompassing a wealth of many cultures, there will be one transcending culture – the culture of peace.*

to complete the establishment of an ASEAN Free Trade Area (AFTA) by 2003 as a contribution to a global regime of open and free trade and investment.

As an outward-looking association very much aware of the growing interdependence and the progressive integration of the world economy, ASEAN decided at the turn of the last decade that the time had come to develop more effective modalities for wider and more intensive cooperation among the economies of the region. Thus, when at the initiative of Australia, the consultative forum called the Asia Pacific Economic Cooperation (APEC) was launched in 1989, the ASEAN countries were among its first participants. Since then, APEC has grown to include nineteen of the most dynamic economies of the Asia Pacific. Its proceedings have gone beyond consultation to intensive cooperation and policy coordination. Now with a set of ambitious but realizable objectives, with an agreed time frame for the achievement of free trade and investment – 2010 for developed countries and 2020 for their developing partners – APEC is steadily moving forward on the basis of individual and collective action plans that the APEC economies have been refining in the past few years.

ASEAN can thus be seen to be actively engaged in two vital processes that cover the wider Asia-Pacific region: ARF in the political-security field of which it is the driving force, and APEC in the economic field. These, together with the other arrangements and processes in which ASEAN is involved, such as AFTA and the Treaty of Amity and Cooperation, complement one another in a positive and synergistic way. This network or web of arrangements, processes and agreements towards security, stability and prosperity in the region would be completed if all the nuclear countries would endorse the Nuclear Weapon-Free Zone of Southeast Asia.

This endeavour to build a regional network for peace, to my mind, is a concrete example of the striving of a regional organization to ensure the security of its members through multilateral dialogue, consultation and cooperation. By engaging in these labours, we in ASEAN are confident that we will be rewarded with the fruits of peace secured through regional cooperation – in brief, cooperative peace.

We have now been engaged in this endeavour for more than three decades. The funds of trust, confidence and candour that we have invested in this long process have borne tremendous interest. These have given us a habit of dialogue and working together, a sensitivity to one another's anxieties and aspirations, as well as a comfortable and high degree of transparency in our dealings with one another. On that basis, I do believe that we in ASEAN are moving, in our own way and at our own pace, towards a culture of peace.

And I also believe that in the years to come, that pace will increase as ASEAN expands to include all ten states of Southeast Asia in fulfilment of the vision of its founding fathers. For an expanded but socially cohesive and economically integrated ASEAN should become an even more effective initiator of constructive and cooperative undertakings. These undertakings should lead us to the realization, by the year 2020 or earlier, of our shared vision of an ASEAN that is a community of caring societies, of vibrant and open societies consistent with their national identities, where all peoples enjoy equitable access to opportunities for total human development regardless of gender, race, religion, language or social and cultural background.

It will be a community that has embraced the values that reject violence and inspire mutual tolerance and sharing. In such a community, encompassing a wealth of many cultures, there will be one transcending culture – the culture of peace.

**FIRST SESSION OF THE SYMPOSIUM**  
**ASEAN AND UNESCO DISCUSSION PANEL**



From left to right: Mr Mohamed Sahnoun, Ms Moufida Goucha, Mr Leslie Atherley, Mr Vladimir Lomeiko, Mr Tozammel Huq, Hon. General José T. Almonte, Ms Anaisabel Prera Flores, Mr Mohamed Jawhar Hassan



From left to right: Mr Vladimir Lomeiko, Mr Tozammel Huq, Chairperson of the ASEAN and UNESCO Discussion Panel, Hon. General José T. Almonte

# FIRST SESSION OF THE SYMPOSIUM

## ASEAN AND UNESCO DISCUSSION PANEL

### AGENDA

**Chairperson:** Mr Tozammel Huq,  
Senior Special Adviser to the Director-General of UNESCO

**Presentation of the cooperative peace process in Southeast Asia**  
by Hon. General José T. Almonte,  
former National Security Adviser of the Republic of the Philippines

**Presentation of UNESCO's transdisciplinary project 'Towards a Culture of Peace',  
highlights of the project in the Asia-Pacific region  
and of the preparations for the International Year for the Culture of Peace (year 2000)**  
by Mr Leslie Atherley,  
Director of UNESCO's Culture of Peace Programme Unit

**Presentation of track two activities in the Asia-Pacific region**  
by Mr Mohamed Jawhar Hassan,  
Director of the Institute of Strategic and International Studies (ISIS),  
CSCAP Malaysia

**Discussion of the first three presentations**

**Presentation of other regional experiences**

**Beyond the peace accords**  
**Foundations of the culture of peace in Central America**  
by Ms Anaisabel Prera Flores,  
Senior Special Adviser to the Director-General of UNESCO

**Conflict prevention and culture of peace in Africa**  
by Mr Mohamed Sahnoun,  
Special Adviser to the Director-General of UNESCO

**The culture of peace in the Middle East and in the Arab region**  
**A future-oriented strategy**  
by Ms Moufida Goucha,  
Senior Special Adviser to the Director-General of UNESCO

**The culture of peace in Europe**  
by Mr Vladimir Lomeiko,  
Special Adviser to the Director-General of UNESCO

**N.B.** During the First Session, the different speakers summarized the highlights of the full written text of their presentations, which were distributed to the participants and are reproduced in these Proceedings.

# INTRODUCTORY REMARKS OF THE CHAIRPERSON OF THE FIRST SESSION

*Mr Tozammel Huq,  
Senior Special Adviser to the Director-General of UNESCO*

Your Excellencies,  
Ladies and Gentlemen,

We will this morning open the ASEAN and UNESCO discussion panel, on the occasion of this Regional Symposium, by calling on distinguished personalities, closely associated both with ASEAN's efforts to establish a cooperative peace and with UNESCO's efforts in favour of the culture of peace, to present different aspects of ongoing initiatives in Southeast Asia and throughout the world.

Indeed, as was emphasized yesterday at the opening of the symposium, the linking of the cooperative process within ASEAN with the culture of peace process launched by UNESCO is of paramount importance and should be based on the permanent exchange of information and experiences within the different regions.

This discussion panel provides us with an ideal opportunity to further this exchange of information and experiences and to strengthen the bonds between all those currently engaged in different kinds of projects, aimed at the building of peace.

The first part of the panel will be dedicated to the presentation of the cooperative peace process in Southeast Asia, involving track one and track two initiatives taken by ASEAN, and of UNESCO's transdisciplinary project, 'Towards a Culture of Peace'. We will then have a short discussion concerning the first three presentations and move on to the presentation of regional experiences in support of the establishment of a culture of peace in Latin America, Africa, the Middle East and Europe.

Thank you.

# THE COOPERATIVE PEACE PROCESS IN SOUTHEAST ASIA

*by Hon. General José T. Almonte,  
Former National Security Adviser  
of the Republic of the Philippines*

## I. ASEAN's concept of cooperative security

My appointed task is to present to you the cooperative peace process in Southeast Asia, which is being pursued by ASEAN, the Association of Southeast Asian Nations.

ASEAN's concept of *cooperative security* in Southeast Asia is very similar to UNESCO's approach toward nurturing a culture of peace. Our concept of cooperative security differs from the traditional idea of collective security in the same way that preventive medicine differs from intensive care.

A *collective security* pact – such as SEATO or NATO during the Cold War – is an arrangement for deterring aggression through counter-threat and for defeating an attack if it occurs.

*Cooperative security* is designed to ensure that organized aggression does not start on any large scale. This it does by enmeshing individual states within a given geographic area in an ever-thickening web of cooperative associations that – by building mutual trust – enables them peacefully to resolve bilateral or collective problems through negotiation and dialogue long before these problems have worsened to the point that they compel a resort to force.

### **We cannot enjoy peace in isolation**

The concept of collective security divides regions and even continents into mutually hostile blocs of 'we' and 'they'. Cooperative security, by contrast, is all-inclusive. It strives constantly to ensure that all the relevant countries belong. In short, there is only one block to cooperative security, and that is us. Its basic philosophy is 'We Belong'.

This is why ASEAN is determined to incorporate all of the ten Southeast Asian countries – and also why ASEAN has taken the lead in both the ASEAN Regional Forum (ARF), and the Asia Pacific Economic Cooperation grouping (APEC).

We in ASEAN are acutely aware we cannot make peace – and enjoy it – on our own, in isolation from the larger Asia-Pacific region. Historically, Southeast Asia's strategic location and its accessibility to sea-power have made it permeable to the currents of great-power competition. And it has been most progressive during the periods it has been most open to foreign commerce, foreign cultures, and foreign peoples. Thus, ASEAN's keen interest in East Asian and Asia-Pacific peace is part of its 'doctrine of security in depth' – a doctrine that includes the development of shared values.

### **Accentuating the positive**

ASEAN's incorporation of Myanmar was criticized by the United States and the European Community as 'legitimizing' an oppressive regime in Yangon. But, to ASEAN, that Myanmar is part of Southeast Asia is strategic reason enough for its membership. ASEAN sees the liberating effect of the market system and its own moderating influence as eventually 'socializing' Myanmar into the global community – while its continued isolation would only worsen the xenophobic and oppressive tendencies of its ruling generals.

Mindful of the political and cultural diversity of Southeast Asia, ASEAN also recognizes that the usefulness of its cooperative-security principle depends on a strict definition of its limits. Thus ASEAN does not try to impose a

*Cooperative security is designed to ensure that organized aggression does not start on any large scale. This it does by enmeshing individual states within a given geographic area in an ever-thickening web of cooperative associations that – by building mutual trust – enables them peacefully to resolve bilateral or collective problems*

*Thus, ASEAN's keen interest in East Asian and Asia-Pacific peace is part of its 'doctrine of security in depth' – a doctrine that includes the development of shared values.*

*... in the coin of cooperative peace, security is the other side of well-being.*

*The basic lesson the ASEAN peace process teaches is that differences or even disputes should not stop countries from promoting mutually beneficial relationships, because the very act of getting together can build mutual trust and confidence.*

*The institutions for achieving this are the twenty-one-member ASEAN Regional Forum, which discusses security and political affairs; and APEC, the economic grouping of eighteen leading Asia-Pacific states. The two are the mutually reinforcing strands in the strategic framework within which most of the East Asian states now define national security.*

common standard of political rule on its component states, nor even to intrude into their internal affairs.

The ASEAN approach accentuates the positive – focusing not on controversy but on areas of common interest, on which multilateral cooperation could be developed and expanded. Decisions are made not by majority rule but by consensus. Divisive issues are simply set aside for later resolution, or until they have been made either irrelevant or innocuous by time and events. This process has generated a veritable ASEAN culture of security *with* and *not against* others, and prosperity *with* and *not at the expense of* others. For, in the coin of cooperative peace, security is the other side of well-being.

## II. Lessons from the ASEAN peace process

What are the lessons the ASEAN peace process offers other regions, particularly in the developing world?

The basic lesson the ASEAN peace process teaches is that differences or even disputes should not stop countries from promoting mutually beneficial relationships, because the very act of getting together can build mutual trust and confidence.

When ASEAN's five founding states first got together thirty-two years ago, the Philippines and Malaysia were estranged over their conflicting claims to North Borneo; and Indonesia's relations with both Malaysia and Singapore were even worse, because of pin-prick attacks on the Malay peninsula by Indonesian forces carrying out Sukarno's 'confrontation' policy. In fact, diplomatic relations between Indonesia and Malaysia were restored after – not before – ASEAN was established.

### **The market as a spur to political cooperation**

In ASEAN, governments have also deliberately used the market system as an aid – and a spur – to their political cooperation. Already the market system has enabled 'anti-communist' ASEAN painlessly to incorporate 'communist' Viet Nam. And already it has raised assertive middle classes in Thailand and Indonesia.

The market also inclines national leaderships toward cooperating with their neighbours.

Within ASEAN, governments are deliberately 'using economics to outflank politics' – through cross-border groupings that bring together capital, labour and natural resources from neighbouring states in 'Growth Triangles'. In five years' time, Southeast Asia is likely to be unified in the ASEAN Free Trade Area.

ASEAN also realizes that its relations with the great region outside Southeast Asia – particularly with its powerful neighbours – must be managed and transformed into constructive partnerships. And the end-goal here is exactly the same: to nurture the cooperative habits that will enable the Asia-Pacific region to replace the stability now *enforced* ultimately by American arms with the *unforced* stability of a Pacific Community, where large and small states are virtually equal in the restraints that group opinion places on their behaviour. The institutions for achieving this are the twenty-one-member ASEAN Regional Forum, which discusses security and political affairs; and APEC, the economic grouping of eighteen leading Asia-Pacific states. The two are the mutually reinforcing strands in the strategic framework within which most of the East Asian states now define national security.

### **Building mutual confidence among the powers**

The ASEAN Regional Forum (ARF) developed in 1993 from the yearly conferences at which the ASEAN foreign ministers invite their counterparts from key countries to talk informally about current political and diplomatic issues. The initial aim of the forum is to build mutual confidence among the Asia-Pacific powers; and then to focus on 'preventive' diplomacy.

In the ASEAN manner, its approach is incremental and graduated. The ARF is informal, without an intervening bureaucracy, and built on personal and political relationships. Given the great disparities in interest, power and even diplomatic style among the member states, this seems the only feasible approach to regional political problems.

The ASEAN Regional Forum is supported by a network of national-security 'think tanks', whose policy prescriptions are passed on to ASEAN leaders. Since December 1997, the ASEAN heads of government have also begun to meet informally with their counterparts from China, Japan, and the Republic of Korea in a yearly East Asian political summit.

### III. ASEAN's peace process in a time of crisis

Over much of the last twenty years, Southeast Asia has enjoyed political stability and economic growth – which seemed to confirm the correctness of ASEAN's approach. But now that period has ended abruptly, ASEAN's basic principles are being increasingly questioned.

The critics argue that ASEAN members should be allowed to openly discuss each other's internal problems if these problems have an impact outside their own borders. And they cite as examples the coup in Cambodia in July 1997 and the continuing political repressions in Myanmar – both of which could harm neighbouring states and undermine regional stability – as well as the now widespread currency crisis, which has already wrought an epochal political change here in Jakarta.

In my view, the ASEAN foreign ministers *correctly* rejected proposals to replace their principle of non-interference. It is hard to see what allying with one side or another in an internal quarrel would accomplish in practical terms. Staying outside the fray would at least allow ASEAN to try and mediate, and individual ASEAN leaders to practise their personal diplomacy – just as both Malaysia's Mahathir and Singapore's Goh Chok Tong did intensively, during the recent Indonesian crisis.

The question of ASEAN's 'failure' to turn up *collective* solutions to Southeast Asia's currency crisis is not at all strange because the currency crisis was set off largely by the failure of *individual* governments to supervise their *individual* banking and financial systems closely enough. But I expect ASEAN to lead in the international effort that must now begin to develop a global policy to regulate the world economy.

#### **The downside of globalization**

The financial crisis has dramatized for Southeast Asia's political and economic leaders the downside of globalization. But the majority of the ASEAN states have chosen to remain open to the global economy. Only Malaysia has decided to insulate itself. And I do not expect this sole divergence from the market system to endure. The Southeast Asian countries first to emerge from the crisis will certainly be those that establish the standards of financial transparency that investors require.

In the end, the currency crisis is likely to produce more homogeneous economic and political systems in Southeast Asia. And the end result of increasing interdependence and globalization should be enhanced interaction within ASEAN, which will allow the association to deal more and more effectively with its collective problems.

### IV. Towards the culture of peace

*Finally*, the cooperative security process that ASEAN is pursuing is not an end in itself. It is only a means toward the culture of peace which is also ASEAN's own vision. And this end-goal is not merely the peace which is the absence of war, but 'a warm and robust peace' – not only among the Southeast Asian states but among the states in the wider Asia-Pacific community as well.

ASEAN's leaders accept that they have a long way to go before they reach this end-goal. Regionally, habits of cooperation must be internalized; within each state, civil society must be nurtured – and for these our countries need time.

In ASEAN's thirtieth year (1997), its leaders pledged the completion, by 2020, of the ASEAN journey which began a generation ago. By then, they hope to attain a *Pax ASEANA* – an ASEAN Economic Commonwealth – and to complete the evolution of 'democratic, people-serving institutions suited to each unique national society'.

In this hope of forming *civic communities*, within the region and within national societies, ASEAN is no different from other regions seeking to escape the culture of violence.

A democratic system that emerges organically from the workings of the free market – *individual freedom* which is not the gift of some 'big man' or all-powerful political party – civic engagement which defines self-interest in the context of broader public needs – these are values that are neither 'Western' nor 'Asian': these are values shared by all of humankind.

And these are the values that ASEAN is striving to implant in this region of a world that is shrinking at such a rate that cruelty, want, and injustice anywhere are seen as diminishing not just their immediate victims but peoples everywhere.

*... I expect ASEAN to lead in the international effort that must now begin to develop a global policy to regulate the world economy.*

*Finally, the cooperative security process that ASEAN is pursuing is not an end in itself. It is only a means toward the culture of peace which is also ASEAN's own vision.*

*A democratic system that emerges organically from the workings of the free market – individual freedom which is not the gift of some 'big man' or all-powerful political party – civic engagement which defines self-interest in the context of broader public needs – these are values that are neither 'Western' nor 'Asian': these are values shared by all of humankind.*

# PRESENTATION OF UNESCO'S TRANSDISCIPLINARY PROJECT 'TOWARDS A CULTURE OF PEACE', HIGHLIGHTS OF THE PROJECT IN THE ASIA-PACIFIC REGION AND OF THE PREPARATIONS FOR THE INTERNATIONAL YEAR FOR THE CULTURE OF PEACE (YEAR 2000)

*by Mr Leslie G. Atherley,  
Director of UNESCO's Culture of Peace Programme Unit*

When the founding fathers of UNESCO met in 1945, they were fully conscious of the fundamental task set out in the recently approved charter of the United Nations 'to save succeeding generations from the scourge of war'. They thus gave a very special mandate to the organization of building the defences of peace in the minds of men and women. But it is important to note that they agreed that this peace must be founded on the intellectual and moral solidarity of humanity. That characteristic has been taken very seriously in our programming. However, while UNESCO has many tasks in the fields of education, science, culture and communication, it has one mission, that of building peace. One of the ways in which this has been translated into current UNESCO programming is by the transdisciplinary project 'Towards a Culture of Peace'.

What do we really mean when we speak of the culture of peace and what is its relevance to people's daily lives? Further, if it is relevant, how does it get started and begin to grow? It clearly has a very catchy ring and conjures up a variety of images of the activities which might be consistent with it, whether one is concerned with the prevention of violent conflict or with peace-building after a conflict has been settled.

A culture of peace is a process of individual, collective and institutional transformation. It is vital to security and development and is based on values, attitudes, behaviours and ways of life that reinforce non-violence and respect for the fundamental rights and freedoms of every person. It hinges upon the celebration of people's right to be different and their right to a peaceful, secure existence within their communities.

We have often heard peace spoken of only in terms of absence of war but the culture of

peace transcends such a negative conception. It has a positive focus rooted in mutual understanding, tolerance, economic and social development, democracy and freedom. This peace is more than ever necessary and more difficult to achieve. It calls for a reversal of the dominant culture of war which has pervaded almost all aspects of our life.

UNESCO has the duty to lay the foundations of peace by working in its fields of competence, namely education, science, culture and communication, to contribute to the acquisition, transfer and sharing of knowledge, to serve human rights and to foster the values of liberty, dignity, justice and solidarity. As has been highlighted earlier in this symposium, peace, development and justice are inextricably linked to a culture of peace. A peace which can only exist when the major threats to security and existence are removed. These threats are present in all societies as they are found in extreme poverty, intolerance and structural violence – the way the structures or conditions of society produce difficulties or disadvantages for people. The only way to reduce the adverse consequences of these is by preventive action where education in the broadest sense is the cornerstone. An education addressed not only to youth, but to the full range of society, both in terms of age and the different roles which people play.

With such thoughts in mind, the General Conference of UNESCO approved a programme that places a culture of peace at the heart of the Organization's activities.

I will continue by answering the question of how UNESCO translates this concept into action, more and more often with a range of partners. In doing this, I will briefly touch on the history and evolution of the concept and

*A culture of peace is a process of individual, collective and institutional transformation. It is vital to security and development and is based on values, attitudes, behaviours and ways of life that reinforce non-violence and respect for the fundamental rights and freedoms of every person.*

*As has been highlighted earlier in this symposium, peace, development and justice are inextricably linked to a culture of peace. A peace which can only exist when the major threats to security and existence are removed.*

*... the programme works to transform violence and post-conflict instability into a more positive atmosphere amenable to peace and development.*

*Themes include non-violence in schools and the surrounding communities, the contribution of the media to peace-building, the training of women as peace promoters, the role of armed forces in contributing to a culture of peace and the socio-economic integration of vulnerable groups, especially child soldiers, the demobilized, and returning refugees.*

programme within UNESCO, its aims and objectives, an indication of the nature of its activities and its rapid growth into a global movement. Finally, I will touch briefly on some of the types of action in the Asia and Pacific region which promote a culture of peace and introduce the special importance of the year 2000, the International Year for the Culture of Peace.

The concept of the culture of peace was first proposed within UNESCO at the International Congress on Peace in the Minds of Men, held in Yamoussoukro, Côte d'Ivoire, in 1989. There, it was felt that the emphasis throughout this century has been on war and violence and that with the ending of the Cold War there was the distinct possibility to change to a culture of peace. The Culture of Peace Programme (CPP) is a relatively recent initiative created in 1994 as an organizational response to the Yamoussoukro Congress, the United Nations Secretary-General's 1992 *Agenda for Peace* and a call by UNESCO's Executive Board to coordinate actions which promote, reinforce and create conditions for peace, security and sustainable development in societies which have suffered from violent conflict or which are at risk of succumbing to violent conflict. The twenty-eighth General Conference in 1995 declared that the transition from a culture of war to the culture of peace is one of the greatest challenges facing the world at the end of the twentieth century and dedicated UNESCO's Medium-Term Strategy for 1996–2001 to its promotion.

Culture of Peace programme activities are based on the principles of inclusion, participation, the need to promote and reinforce peace-building and dialogue. In keeping with these principles, the programme works to transform violence and post-conflict instability into a more positive atmosphere amenable to peace and development. When the programme first started, its focus was on post-conflict peace-building in countries where the United Nations had brokered peace agreements, but there is now an equal concern with the prevention of violent conflict. In both these areas there is one important feature, the fact that nationals must play a central role and that there should be a wide range of political and other perspectives represented. Briefly, the activities are in the following areas:

- The planning and execution of national culture of peace programmes. These programmes are essentially development programmes and incorporate specific projects which fall within UNESCO's field of

competence and which have a peace-building component. Within countries, coordinating bodies made up of a wide range of opinions and interests and incorporating the NGO community are key to the success of project activities. These projects can, for example, provide human rights training to journalists, technical assistance in devising peace curricula, training activities with parliamentarians on democratic practices and festivals for youth.

- A focus on specific themes which are critical to allow societies to learn to live together. Some of the topics which are currently being developed include non-violence in schools and the surrounding communities, the contribution of the media to peace-building, the training of women as peace promoters, the role of armed forces in contributing to a culture of peace and the socio-economic integration of vulnerable groups, especially child soldiers, the demobilized, and returning refugees. By conducting activities on these topics simultaneously in a number of countries, a rich comparative perspective enhances what is being done in each setting.
- The development of a networking and information system. The system links many intergovernmental organizations (IGOs), government agencies, non-governmental organizations (NGOs) and research institutions and individuals promoting a culture of peace throughout the world. Through these links – newsletters, an interactive website and occasional publications – it seeks to draw maximum benefit from UNESCO's network of partners and supporters and coordinate the gathering and sharing of information.
- The coordination of peace-building activities within UNESCO and the United Nations system and the establishment of a wide range of partners in support of the programmes. The importance of interagency cooperation in the United Nations for a culture of peace is gaining increasing recognition. Cooperative actions are being developed with other international organizations, including regional organizations and other UN agencies and programmes and the NGO community.

There has been significant change after the first two years of the programme, and since 1996 it has been expanded into a transdisciplinary project, in order to maximize the benefit from the expertise within the various sectors of UNESCO. The framework of the project now

has three main lines of activity: (i) education and training for peace, human rights, democracy, tolerance and international understanding, including elaboration and dissemination of teaching materials and pedagogical aids in different languages; (ii) policy-oriented research, advocacy action, and exchange and dissemination of information; and (iii) capacity-building and technical support for national, subregional, regional and international projects.

UNESCO has specifically adopted a trans-disciplinary approach for a number of reasons. This approach mirrors real life by looking at a situation in its entirety, and identifying a comprehensive strategy for dealing with all aspects of a particular problem. Additionally, peace-building and post-conflict reconstruction within devastated societies cannot be easily compartmentalized and the areas of need cannot be separated into their component parts. Often, several sectors within UNESCO with different mandates find themselves engaged in similar activities or find their projects overlapping with those of other sectors or even other UN agencies. Because of the desire to avoid overlap of activity and to support comprehensive development, UNESCO relies on a transdisciplinary approach.

We therefore now have a more integrated approach to peace-building and development projects. This includes projects developed with local, regional or international partners. To give only one example, they can focus on thematic issues such as the UNESCO project on violence in urban schools, in association with the Associated Schools Project (ASP). This project seeks to promote non-violence and a culture of peace in educational institutions and in the surrounding communities, where the risk of violence is high, through:

- the development of written and audiovisual materials which can be used for training teachers, educators, community workers and administrators in a variety of contexts;
- the elaboration of texts and other materials which promote, among other things, non-violence, tolerance, human rights, gender equity and active and responsible citizenship;
- the development of an inventory of examples and case studies of best practices in new educational texts, teacher-training manuals and related initiatives.

The Culture of Peace Programme also places a great deal of emphasis on the contribution of women to the culture of peace. It deals especially with the empowerment of women and an

examination of roles of men and women so as to promote a gender-sensitive approach to decision-making. In our peace-building programmes, women's organizations have taken the lead as peace promoters within the community. Reflection on this has led to concern about male roles and masculinity in the perspective of a culture of peace, and this was thoroughly examined in September 1997 at an expert group meeting in Oslo, Norway. It is thus being recognized that it is important to promote women's political and economic empowerment and adequate representation at every level of decision-making as a critical contribution to fostering a culture of peace.

The opportunity for the development of a wide and varied range of programmes and activities within the transdisciplinary project can be gleaned from a brief sample of some actions and the aims and objectives to which they are responding.

The many University Chairs in Human Rights and a Culture of Peace are a way of focusing on values which are important to removing threats to peace and security. They are more the focus of attention in this year 1998 when we are celebrating the fiftieth anniversary of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights.

The response to the promotion of tolerance and solidarity among peoples and respect for cultural diversity has been treated in actions in intercultural education in treating the study of routes around which some activities are set – the Silk Roads and Slave Routes – as well as in meetings with representatives of a number of religions.

The importance of democratic participation is seen not only in the actions which have been undertaken with political leaders and parliamentarians, but in the practice of decision-making in project activities at national and community levels.

The importance of the role of the media has been highlighted in meetings of publishers, the development of a major activity within the framework of the UN Special Initiative for Africa on communication for peace-building and the support for independent media.

The culture of peace is not only a product – a goal to be achieved – it is equally a comprehensive process. In all our activities both aspects have to be kept in mind. We are now living in a world where the importance of ethical issues is claiming our attention and where educational activities deal more and more with values. A culture of peace provides

*We therefore now have a more integrated approach to peace-building and development projects. This includes projects developed with local, regional or international partners.*

*It is thus being recognized that it is important to promote women's political and economic empowerment and adequate representation at every level of decision-making as a critical contribution to fostering a culture of peace.*

*The culture of peace stresses the need for addressing values and attitudes to encourage people to learn to live together. In this respect the Asia and Pacific Network of International Education for values education is providing critical support to the region for underlying values which are important for a culture of peace.*

the younger generation with a set of values which can help them shape their destiny and participate actively in constructing a more just, humane society and a peaceful world.

### Asia and Pacific region

All of the regions in which UNESCO is organized have undertaken actions to promote a culture of peace. During the course of this meeting you will be introduced to the variety of activities in each of the regions which are consistent with our efforts to promote a culture of peace. For Asia and the Pacific there is already a review which has been prepared by the UNESCO Office in Jakarta and there will also be some mention of the activities in the Central Asian Republics when the paper which is mainly focused on the Europe region is presented. However, I would like to make a few brief references to the culture of peace in the Asia and Pacific region.

The first point is that culture of peace activities are led by nationals. In this respect, the example of the Philippines has been seen by UNESCO to be outstanding. Here, through the Office of the Presidential Advisor on the Peace Process, a comprehensive programme has been developed which in its paths to peace has all the characteristics and principles of the UNESCO Culture of Peace Programme. The people of the Philippines have shared their experiences with UNESCO, their experts have participated in a number of our activities worldwide and they assumed a central role in the organization of the Second International Forum on the Culture of Peace in Manila in 1995. They are now developing a centre for the culture of peace which, it is hoped, will be organizing programme activities in the Mindanao region. The UNESCO office in Cambodia has recently worked with nationals in preparing a major series of projects which, in cooperation with UNDP, we hope will be starting soon. These projects focus on issues related to:

- the reintegration of demobilized soldiers;
- the reconstruction of society; and
- the promotion of democratic citizenship and governance.

The culture of peace stresses the need for addressing values and attitudes to encourage people to learn to live together. In this respect the Asia and Pacific Network of International Education for values education is providing critical support to the region for underlying

values which are important for a culture of peace. The network's overall objective is to ensure that peace, universal values and non-violence become an integral part of education.

There are a number of initiatives which are characteristic of actions in this region, but only a few areas will be highlighted:

- In the promotion of gender-based actions we have recently been requested by an NGO in India and by a parliamentary group to assist in the organization of a programme which stresses the contribution of women to promoting a culture of peace.
- In communication, there is in Afghanistan a radio programme entitled 'New Home, New Life', produced in cooperation with the BBC, which through a soap-opera format introduces concepts and practices to support learning to live together.
- In Mongolia, a project is supporting the reinforcement of local democracy through the transfer of authority from the central administration to local administrations.
- The Silk Roads Project, which involved a number of countries of the region, is an example of promoting better intercultural understanding as a mechanism towards a culture of peace.
- There are many educational projects consistent with the promotion of a culture of peace. I will mention only one here, support for a programme in Sri Lanka, which includes peace education and conflict-resolution to promote a culture of peace at the community level in the northern part of the country.
- Lastly, many programmes begin with a national forum which identifies topics and groups which might be specifically concerned with this type of programme. One such case is the Pakistan subregional workshop on the culture of peace in Central South Asia.

### 2000, International Year for the Culture of Peace

The International Year for the Culture of Peace 2000 was proclaimed by the General Assembly of the United Nations on 20 November 1997 in its resolution 52/15.<sup>1</sup> The year 2000 is, in itself, special as it has a landmark significance coming

1. See Appendix X.

at the end of one millennium and heralding the beginning of a new one. Special years are proclaimed by the United Nations to highlight a specific group or condition and to gain worldwide attention. The main objectives of the year are to strengthen respect for cultural diversity and to promote tolerance, solidarity, cooperation, dialogue and reconciliation based on activities at national and international levels.

The International Year presents a golden opportunity to reinforce ongoing activities in support of a culture of peace or to begin new ones. It could be used to stimulate national authorities to produce plans of action and to link a wide number of partners in the interest of peace and development within the community. At the regional level, the year can enhance the emphasis on peace, democracy and development and reinforce the central role of the UN in promoting a culture of peace. A major emphasis will be placed on mobilizing public opinion and to do this all countries will be centrally involved and it is expected that national commissions will be playing a key role. The year will afford an opportunity to make actions to promote reconciliation and national unity and to prevent violent conflicts. Special plans are being developed for media focus and information exchange.

The culture of peace has taken on its own pattern of growth and from a modest beginning is turning into a global movement. The real power of the programme is in the partnerships

which it forges and in the vast number of independent actions which are beginning to be carried out by a variety of countries and organizations. We are regularly discovering many new and interesting initiatives.

In closing on this note of the culture of peace being a global movement, I wish to signal some of the main participants, first of all the United Nations. In a series of resolutions from 1995 onwards, the UN has followed the development of UNESCO's actions for a culture of peace. However, the resolution in 1997 requested a draft programme of action, intended as an integrated approach to pursuing the goals of a culture of peace for the entire UN system. In the recent preparation of our programme of action which is currently before the General Assembly, there were numerous contributions from each of these agencies signalling how they themselves, within their programmes, are supporting the culture of peace. In addition, there is an almost unending list of the many organizations and groups who are fully involved in promoting a culture of peace. Among these are parliamentarians, religious leaders, mayors, ombudsmen, and the armed forces.

It is this momentum which we hope to see being kept up. In this way, the start of the new millennium will not only herald peace but the deep cultural roots of war will be eradicated and replaced by a culture of peace.

*The main objectives of the year are to strengthen respect for cultural diversity and to promote tolerance, solidarity, cooperation, dialogue and reconciliation based on activities at national and international levels.*

*... there is an almost unending list of the many organizations and groups who are fully involved in promoting a culture of peace. Among these are parliamentarians, religious leaders, mayors, ombudsmen, and the armed forces.*

# TRACK TWO ACTIVITIES IN THE ASIA-PACIFIC REGION

*by Mr Mohamed Jawhar Hassan,  
Director of the Institute of Strategic and International Studies (ISIS),  
CSCAP Malaysia*

## Introduction

The 1980s saw the beginning of a surge of track two activities in the Asia-Pacific region, first in the economic sphere, then in the political/security sphere. The number of track two processes and meetings has since proliferated, and one assessment in 1994 cited over thirty channels focusing on the security dimension.<sup>1</sup>

This paper discusses the following aspects of track two activity (understood to mean interactive processes involving think tanks, analysts and government officials acting in their personal capacity) in the security domain in the Asia-Pacific region:

- the circumstances which favoured the rise of pan-Pacific track two activity in the security field;
- the nature of the process in the region, including its fundamental characteristics, some of the more important actors and activities, the areas of focus, funding, etc.;
- the contribution of track two activities;
- prospects for track three activities by way of conclusion.

## Environment for track two activities

Various factors conspired to make the late 1980s and early 1990s particularly conducive for the expansion of track two activities covering the Asia-Pacific region in the security field. They may be summarized as follows:

### 1. Growth of Asia-Pacific consciousness

The gradual emergence of the idea of the Asia Pacific as a discrete region can be attributed in

the first instance to growing economic integration or interdependence among Asia-Pacific economies. For instance, intra-Pacific trade among ASEAN, the Asian newly industrialized economies (NIEs), China, Japan, the United States, Canada, Australia and New Zealand grew by nearly 700 per cent between 1970 (US\$53.1 billion) and 1983 (US\$368.7 billion).<sup>2</sup> Australasia's main trading partners, once located in the United Kingdom and Europe, shifted to the Asia-Pacific region.

Developing apace with this integration were regional fora for Asia-Pacific economic dialogue and cooperation at business, intergovernmental and non-governmental levels. Hence the Pacific Basin Economic Council (PBEC) comprising business leaders formed in 1967; the non-governmental forum of academic, government and business representatives called the Pacific Economic Cooperation Conference (PECC) founded in 1980; and the intergovernmental Asia-Pacific Economic Cooperation (APEC) established in 1989.

The growing interdependence of regional economies which spawned the above-mentioned track two dialogue processes contributed to a nascent consciousness of the Asia Pacific as a discrete region. This was reinforced further by the interlocking business and economic networks as well as political contacts mushrooming in the region and the burgeoning prosperity of the area spearheaded by Japan and the NIEs as well as the rapidly growing

*The growing interdependence of regional economies which spawned the above-mentioned track two dialogue processes contributed to a nascent consciousness of the Asia Pacific as a discrete region.*

1. Pauline Kerr, 'The Security Dialogue in the Asia Pacific', *The Pacific Review*, Vol. 7, No. 4, 1994.

2. Seung-Soo Han, 'The Japanese Role in Pacific Cooperation: A Korean View', in Robert Scalapino and Kongkoo Lee (eds.), *Korea-US Relations - The Politics of Trade and Security*.

*This thawing of the Cold War proved favourable to the initiation and growth of track two processes in the region. Barriers were crumbling, but deep suspicions remained to provide added rationale for inclusive dialogue spanning the region.*

economies of ASEAN and China. The Pacific too, was home to the world's largest economy, that of the United States.

## **2. Winding-up of the Cold War**

As the 1980s wore on, the ideologically driven political conflict between Leninist societies and democratic/market systems began to subside. Though conflictual vestiges remained, most prominently with regard to the issue surrounding the Korean peninsula, ideological difference was no longer a major impediment to political and security dialogue. Moscow and the United States soon began to cooperate on many issues, relations between China and the Democratic People's Republic of Korea, on the one hand, and Japan and the Republic of Korea, on the other, began to improve, and the atmosphere between the Indochinese states and the then ASEAN Six also became noticeably better following Vietnamese withdrawal and consensus on Cambodia.

This thawing of the Cold War proved favourable to the initiation and growth of track two processes in the region. Barriers were crumbling, but deep suspicions remained to provide added rationale for inclusive dialogue spanning the region.

## **3. Changing security configuration**

Various other factors in the evolving security environment also helped to make track two activity more viable. The region was never fully bipolar even during the Cold War. China was a major actor, besides the Soviet Union and the United States, and a number of countries especially in Southeast Asia stayed out of direct involvement in the ideological contest. The decline of the Cold War along with the increasing marginalization of the collapsed Soviet Union; a reduced (though still very significant) American presence; the withdrawal of Russian forces; and the increasing prosperity of Japan and other East Asian countries, all reinforced a growing multipolar configuration in the region.

This situation favoured the empowerment of middle and smaller powers in the region. As suspicions regarding the intentions of major powers persisted and they cancelled out each other, the initiatives of middle powers such as Australia, Canada and especially the ASEAN grouping which had no obvious alignment with any of the major powers gained in credibility

and influence. These countries had a greater vested interest in more diffused and multilateral security arrangements that gave them a greater voice and influence in shaping the regional agenda.

Finally, the major powers who had feared that multilateral arrangements would undermine their unilateral influence or bilateral arrangements or which would otherwise put them at a disadvantage, themselves gradually relaxed their opposition to multilateral processes while they retained whatever bilateral arrangements they had. The much emaciated Russia and rising industrial Japan, in particular, sought greater roles through these processes.

## **4. Expansion of trans-border issues**

As spectres of Cold War threats receded, other issues came to the foreground in regional concerns. Many of them were trans-border in nature, requiring increased collaboration among government bodies and peoples' organizations at the bilateral, subregional, regional and global levels. These issues included the environment, destabilizing cross-border population flows, illicit drug trafficking and human rights questions. They also required the engagement and involvement of non-government actors for better management.

## **5. Growth of think tanks and strategic studies institutes**

The 1980s, in particular, also saw the establishment and growth of many think tanks and strategic studies institutes in East Asia and especially in the ASEAN region. The factors behind this growth often varied between countries. They included the following:

1. The increasing realization in society and among governments of the value of the contributions that these organizations could make to more in-depth understanding of the issues involved and to policy formulation.
2. Declining government distrust of the involvement of non-governmental organizations (NGOs) and academic institutions in issues of national interest. This distrust had been particularly strong in countries where communist movements had subverted mass organizations and where activist NGOs generally adopted positions

*As spectres of Cold War threats receded, other issues came to the foreground in regional concerns. Many of them were trans-border in nature, requiring increased collaboration among government bodies and peoples' organizations at the bilateral, subregional, regional and global levels.*

hostile to the government and agitated against it.

3. Government support for the establishment of think tanks and strategic studies institutes even extending in some cases to initial funding in the form of endowments and subsidies. In some instances, government support was provided to enable these bodies to engage in networking with other think tanks and institutes in the region and in the West, or to lead non-government dialogue with foreign counterparts.
4. Significant Western support in the form of both funds and networking expertise, especially from institutions such as the Asia Foundation and, more recently, European and Japanese foundations. Funds for travel conferences and research programmes were provided by these institutions when they were perceived to advance their interests, which often coincided with those of the Asian think tanks and institutes. The significance of the Western and Japanese funding for track two activities cannot be underestimated. Most of the financing for joint initiatives comes from these sources.

### Track two processes and activities

As noted above, there are a large number of track two processes and activities in the region, and there are several ongoing initiatives to document and analyse them. In the meantime information is patchy. A sample of the track two processes may be found among others in a paper by Paul Evans entitled 'Building Security: The Council for Security Cooperation in the Asia Pacific (CSCAP)'.<sup>1</sup> The appendix to his paper is reproduced as Appendix IV of this publication.

This paper focuses on three among the most important track two establishments and processes in the region:

1. ASEAN-ISIS, the ASEAN Institutes of Strategic Studies;
2. CSCAP, the Council for Security Cooperation in the Asia Pacific;
3. APAP, the Asia-Pacific Agenda Project.

### ASEAN-ISIS

The ASEAN Institutes of Strategic Studies is a grouping of the leading non-government think

tanks/institutes in the Southeast Asian region, namely the Centre for Strategic and International Studies (CSIS) in Jakarta; the Institute of Strategic and International Studies (ISIS Malaysia) in Kuala Lumpur; the Institute of Strategic and International Studies (ISIS Thailand) in Bangkok; the Institute of Strategic and Development Studies (ISDS) in Manila; the Singapore Institute of International Affairs (SIIA); the Institute of International Relations (IIR) in Hanoi; and the Cambodian Institute of Cooperation and Peace (CICP) in Phnom Penh. ASEAN-ISIS was formed in 1988 by the Institutes in Jakarta, Kuala Lumpur, Singapore, Manila and Bangkok, and expanded its membership over the years.

ASEAN-ISIS is recognized as an ASEAN NGO by ASEAN, and its primary purpose is to organize track two conferences and studies of policy relevance to regional peace, security and well-being. Its members have varying degrees of influence on their respective governments individually, and as a body have access to ASEAN. The greatest input and contribution of ASEAN-ISIS to ASEAN has been in the political and security fields, though some of the members, especially ISIS Malaysia and CSIS Indonesia, have a wider in-house capability encompassing economic and other fields.

Although together they act as ASEAN-ISIS, separately they are free to conduct their own activities in accordance with their respective briefs. For ISIS Malaysia, in particular, which devotes a greater part of its attention to domestic issues of interest to the country (economy, environment, education, etc.), the larger part of its activity is focused on work inside the country.

ASEAN-ISIS activities consist primarily of organizing track two conferences focusing mainly on the Southeast Asian and Asia-Pacific regions, holding bilateral dialogues with leading track two organizations in other countries, and providing policy inputs to ASEAN through memoranda and annual meetings with ASEAN senior officials.

The flagship conferences of ASEAN-ISIS are currently the annual Asia-Pacific Round Table, the ASEAN 2020 Forum, the Colloquium on Human Rights, Good Governance and Civil Society, and the ASEAN Young Leaders Forum, and a proposed ASEAN Assembly or People's Congress in the year 2000. All are track two in nature except for the last, which will also

*ASEAN-ISIS activities consist primarily of organizing track two conferences focusing mainly on the Southeast Asian and Asia-Pacific regions, holding bilateral dialogues with leading track two organizations in other countries, and providing policy inputs to ASEAN through memoranda and annual meetings with ASEAN senior officials.*

1. *The Pacific Review*, Vol. 7, No. 2, 1994.

*The approach to security of ASEAN-ISIS is both cooperative and comprehensive. Generally security is perceived in the widest sense as including not only state-centred military security but also the security and well-being of the community and the human person which includes political, economic, social and environmental factors.*

*CSCAP aims to promote confidence-building and security cooperation in the Asia-Pacific region. A major function is to provide policy recommendations on political-security issues to government bodies.*

engage other NGOs active in various fields including the social and cultural. This could signal the beginning of a significant track three process in the region.

The approach to security of ASEAN-ISIS is both cooperative and comprehensive. Generally security is perceived in the widest sense as including not only state-centred military security but also the security and well-being of the community and the human person which includes political, economic, social and environmental factors. A sample of the breadth of ASEAN-ISIS' security focus may be gathered from the agenda of the Twelfth Asia-Pacific Round Table held from 31 May to 4 June 1998. The theme of the round table is conflict-reduction and confidence-building, and the areas covered included the following:

- the strategic, economic and social impact of the current financial and economic crisis, and the remedies;
- the impact of the financial crisis on women;
- the threat from environmental pollution;
- the future agenda for good governance;
- transnational crime;
- security problems relating to the Korean peninsula and Cambodia.
- US-China relations;
- the prospects for security cooperation in the North Pacific;
- the value or otherwise of security alliances in the post-cold-war world;
- the nuclear threat.

The precursors of the ASEAN 2020 Forum were the Southeast Asia Forum (SEAF) and Southeast Asia Round Table on Economic Development (SEARED). Both SEAF, which seeks to enhance national security as well as political and security cooperation among Southeast Asian states, and SEARED, which seeks to promote market economics and economic collaboration in the region, also have similarly extended agendas.

The Human Rights Colloquium, as the name suggests, focuses on human rights issues.

ASEAN-ISIS conferences and dialogues are typical track two events led by think tanks/institutes and involving academics, senior government officials acting in their personal capacity, corporate figures, journalists, etc. The largest of the ASEAN-ISIS events is the annual Asia-Pacific Round Table held in Kuala Lumpur, which was launched in 1987 and which now attracts more than 200 participants from all over the Asia-Pacific region every year. Discussions are informal and off-the-record to promote maximum candour and free exchange of ideas.

## CSCAP

The Council for Security Cooperation in the Asia Pacific (CSCAP) was established in June 1993. Compared with the Asia-Pacific Round Table, it is more structured and institutionalized. It is also more officious in tone, with state interests coming more to the fore in deliberations. CSCAP consists of broad-based (think tanks, strategic institutes, academics, government officials, etc.) member committees from each participating country whose representatives form the Steering Committee. There are two Co-Chairs serving two-year terms, and one of them is always from an ASEAN member committee. All Asia-Pacific countries including the United States, Canada, the Russian Federation and Mongolia, but excluding Cambodia, Myanmar and Papua New Guinea, are represented at present as full members. The Institute of Defence and Security Affairs (IDSA) of India and the committee from the European Union CSCAP are associate members.

CSCAP aims to promote confidence-building and security cooperation in the Asia-Pacific region. A major function is to provide policy recommendations on political-security issues to government bodies.

CSCAP has been tremendously active through its working groups. There are five such groups at present covering different areas: concept of cooperative and comprehensive security; confidence and security-building measures; maritime security; North Pacific security cooperation; and transnational crime. ASEAN institutes are again involved as at least one of the Co-Chairs of each working group. CSCAP working group deliberations have resulted in four memoranda so far, all submitted to the ASEAN and ARF SOM for their consideration. These memoranda concern The Security of the Asia-Pacific Region; Asia-Pacific Confidence and Security-Building Measures; Concept of Comprehensive and Cooperative Security; and Guidelines for Regional Maritime Cooperation.

As the titles of the CSCAP working groups indicate, the approach to security of CSCAP is again comprehensive and all-encompassing in nature. Nevertheless, conventional security issues continue to dominate CSCAP attention.

The council is attempting to gain more formal recognition from the ASEAN Regional Forum as the primary track two and research back-up institution for ARF in areas where CSCAP is working. So far, however, ARF has preferred to work through its members and its Inter-sessional Meetings and Support Groups. Nevertheless, the

institutes involved in the ARF bodies are often also participants in the CSCAP process, so CSCAP continues to be able to contribute other than by the submission of its memoranda.

CSCAP is still a new process, and the influence it exercises upon formal security processes in the region including the ARF may grow in the future.

## APAP

The Asia-Pacific Agenda Project was launched in 1995 by a group of prominent regional institutes: the Japan Center for International Exchange; the Institute of Southeast Asian Studies (ISEAS) of Singapore; The Brookings Institution in Washington, D.C.; the Ilmin International Relations Institute of South Korea; CSIS Indonesia; the Research School of Pacific and Asian Studies, the Australian National University; the Institute of American Studies, CASS; York University/University of Toronto's Joint Centre for Asia-Pacific Studies; and the Institute of Strategic and Development Studies of the Philippines. The primary mover is the Japan Center.

While, like APR and CSCAP, it is a track two activity, the government official element is relatively less than with the other organizations, and the think tank/strategic institute component is more prominent. Its objective is to generate collaborative policy research and dialogue pertinent to the future of the Asia-Pacific region. The primary areas of focus at present are the impact of and response to globalization; 'new' emerging security issues; civil society; good governance; and sustainable development. The research agenda is a flexible one, and is determined as each project phase is concluded.

It is felt that the APAP project is contributing some quality inputs into research work in the areas it is involved in, and would be of some policy relevance for strategic planners.

### Contribution of track two activities

Given the proliferation of track two activities in the region, it is not surprising that their product and contribution is of uneven quality. Some dialogues generate little light; they sometimes fail to even generate constructive heat. Some end up being little more than talking shops. The quality of research work and papers produced is also occasionally not very note-

worthy. Government attendance at times is low, signifying lukewarm interest or faith in the usefulness of track two efforts on the part of the government concerned. And how much of track two work does filter into and inform policy is sometimes questionable, the fault lying as much with officialdom as with think tanks or academia.

Nevertheless, the more credible and substantive track two activities may be said to have made the following significant contributions:

1. They bring together government policy-makers and non-government policy researchers in an intense activity of exchange which at its best informs both sides to mutual advantage. ASEAN and ARF, for example, have both acknowledged constructive contributions from ASEAN-ISIS and CSCAP in their deliberations. As an example, an ASEAN-ISIS proposal for a Pacific Concord outlining norms and principles for security cooperation in the region will shortly be discussed together with a Russian proposal at an ARF event in Vladivostok.
2. They help in facilitating networking among far-flung strategic institutes and the pooling of collaborative study resources across countries and cultures. This is clearly evident, for example, from the diversity of prominent role players in the Asia-Pacific Round Table organized by ISIS Malaysia/ASEAN-ISIS in Kuala Lumpur every year.
3. By providing a forum for candid and informal exchange, they are excellent platforms for discussing sensitive issues and testing ideas which may be new or controversial and which track one events find too sensitive to address. Human rights abuses, for example, are more openly discussed in track two forums.
4. States in conflict, such as the two Koreas, and other interested parties, are able to articulate and defend their positions more freely in track two forums. This can assist in greater understanding and confidence-building. Government officials, in particular, can air official interests in their private capacity without implicating their governments, though they sometimes still feel constrained by their official status.
5. Bilateral track two dialogues, such as those between ASEAN and China, are generally better than track one forums for illuminating opaque areas, clearing misunderstandings

*The primary areas of focus at present are the impact of and response to globalization; 'new' emerging security issues; civil society; good governance; and sustainable development.*

*And how much of track two work does filter into and inform policy is sometimes questionable, the fault lying as much with officialdom as with think tanks or academia.*

*The paucity of credible and sustainable civil society institutions and NGOs is a major drawback in Asian countries.*

and clarifying differences, thereby again promoting understanding helpful to cooperation between governments and peoples. They can never, however, replace track one forums.

6. Publications of track two proceedings and papers are useful for academics and policy-makers alike.

## Conclusion

Multi-country track three activities can make an important contribution to the cause of peace in

the Asia-Pacific region. At present they are underdeveloped due to various reasons. The paucity of credible and sustainable civil society institutions and NGOs is a major drawback in Asian countries. Lack of funding and expertise and language impediments are other factors. The prevailing economic crisis has only served to compound matters further.

Initiatives to foster track three processes and activities therefore need to take these factors into consideration. They are perhaps more viably organized in the ASEAN region initially due to the better-developed infrastructure and conducive environment in this region.<sup>1</sup>

---

1. See Appendix IV for further information on Asia-Pacific dialogue channels.

## DISCUSSION OF THE FIRST THREE PRESENTATIONS

### Chairperson

I think we ought to hold the discussion on the three presentations made this morning. Would you identify yourself and then ask your question, please.

### Comment from the floor

Thank you, Mr Chairman. I am Gracia Hari and I represent the National Women's Federation of Indonesia. I should like to congratulate all the speakers of today on their lucid presentation. But I should also like to express my dissatisfaction that there are so few women represented here. I would like to refer to what the Director-General of UNESCO said yesterday: peace is a concern not only of men, but of women as well.

More a concern of women, perhaps, if I may say so. And this is why more women should be invited to such forums. But this dissatisfaction has been somewhat compensated by seeing two women speakers at the conference table.

Mr Chairman, speaking of peace-building and prevention, I think it should be stressed that in the ASEAN context there is a Confederation of Women's Organizations which has peace-building and anti-violence on its agenda. But what I would like to say is that (although of course, it is not always pleasant to hear for the gentlemen present), if we speak of peace, then we should be very much aware of women's human rights, and of the urgent need for men to really understand that gender

equality should be promoted in every aspect of development, because without this gender equality, there will be no peace and no justice in this world, especially not in ASEAN.

But, on the other hand, I am quite happy with the ASEAN attitude towards women. A Declaration on women's advancement was issued, some ten years ago, but there has been little action on it. So I would like to see the ASEAN mechanism include more women at decision-making level. What would be supportive to the building of a peace culture, a cooperative peace culture, in ASEAN particularly, is that the Youth Exchange Programme should include more women, and probably a target should be set – perhaps 30 per cent of seats allocated to women. By doing this, youth can further promote the principles of cooperative peace, and the ASEAN principles in daily life. Thank you.

### Chairperson

Thank you very much indeed. I think the applause has proved beyond any shadow of doubt that everyone here in this hall fully shares your views. As for UNESCO, women are of course one of the priorities of the Organization's programmes and the Director-General has always denounced the asymmetry that exists. I would now like to request Ms Anaisabel Prera Flores, Senior Special Adviser to the Director-General for Latin America, to present 'Foundations of the culture of peace in Central America'. Madam, you have the floor.

*... if we speak of peace, then we should be very much aware of women's human rights, and of the urgent need for men to really understand that gender equality should be promoted in every aspect of development ...*

## **PRESENTATION OF OTHER REGIONAL EXPERIENCES**

# BEYOND THE PEACE ACCORDS

## FOUNDATIONS OF THE CULTURE OF PEACE IN CENTRAL AMERICA

*by Ms Anaisabel Prera Flores,  
Senior Special Adviser to the Director-General of UNESCO*

At its twenty-seventh General Conference (1993), UNESCO, in accordance with the Agenda for Peace submitted by the United Nations Secretary-General, created a Programme of Action to Promote a Culture of Peace.

I quote from some statements made at that session of the General Conference:

'... The quest for peace was the initial motivation for the creation of UNESCO after the Second World War. Its founding charter declares that since wars begin in the minds of men, it is in the minds of men that the defences of peace must be constructed.'

... UNESCO can 'contribute to the construction of a new concept of peace, through the development of a culture of peace based on the universal values of respect for life, for liberty, justice, solidarity, tolerance, human rights, and equality between men and women'.

The text goes on to state that '... conflicts are inevitable and necessary, and can even be beneficial with regard to innovation and activity, identity and reflection. But those benefits will depend on our ability to manage conflicts, resolve them adequately and impede their violent and destructive manifestations. The Culture of Peace Programme ... calls for a new definition of power on the basis of cooperation rather than domination'.

'... The consolidation of peace after conflicts constitutes a particularly difficult task. ... From the first phases of a peace process, a culture of democracy must be developed, recognizing its close interaction with a culture of peace.'

Referring to the consolidation of peace after conflicts, the document proposes 'the adoption of measures to protect human rights, the reform or strengthening of governmental

institutions and the promotion of traditional and non-traditional processes of political participation' as well as 'the reduction of hostile perceptions through educational interchanges and reforms to programmes of study'.

In this document UNESCO recognizes that the greatest guarantee for the sustainability of peace is the promotion of a culture of peace that replaces, in people's minds and in institutions, the hegemony of a culture of war.

With this, we are not asserting that peace is only a cultural fact, but rather that a solid and lasting peace will only be possible when economic, political and social systems – which carry with them values, principles, doctrines, models of behaviour, attitudes and institutions – are ruled by the logic of a culture of peace. And this is the case not only as a matter of principle, but also as a matter of realism and pragmatism.

### I. Components and characteristics of a culture of peace

Today the world is moving in response to new paradigms, a new model of humanism.

Some of the important paradigms that are being converted into a family of broad movements are:

- protection and re-creation of the environment;
- sustainable human development;
- human rights, in all of their generations, renewed in response to the new dimensions and times of humanity;
- respect for a diversity of cultural expressions, recognizing their inherent value and their part in the world's heritage, without being overshadowed by more globalized cultures;

*UNESCO  
recognizes that  
the greatest  
guarantee for the  
sustainability of  
peace is the  
promotion of a  
culture of peace  
that replaces, in  
people's minds  
and in  
institutions, the  
hegemony of a  
culture of war.*

*The culture of peace is not just an instrument but also an end in itself for individuals and societies. This is peace as a right and not just a condition.*

- a new conception of governance and governability.

The culture of peace can be defined as a new paradigm, which is globalizing, difficult to achieve but rationally viable, and which appears to be the necessary alternative to the status quo of the culture of war. Normally the parties to a conflict sign a cease-fire and seek a solid and lasting peace because they have come to the conclusion that a national project of stable and equitable development is only possible in a context of peace. This sees peace as a condition for development.

But the culture of peace is also a goal, the purpose of development, if one sees development in terms of human beings. The culture of peace is not just an instrument but also an end in itself for individuals and societies. This is peace as a right and not just a condition.

At the same time, the existence of a project to create a culture of peace does not mean that the society should be homogenized. A culture of peace does not do away with the natural conflicts and differences that exist in all societies; rather, it seeks to find fundamental common interests that work to impede the disintegration of a society and allow the construction of a just and equitable future for everyone.

The consensus that we are talking about assumes that the parties to a conflict, acting on the basis of and in coherence with their principles, recognize the need for a consensus on a project for the nation, affecting certain fundamental economic, social and political issues.

The culture of peace does not deny differences; it sees them as a natural source of enrichment.

Similarly, neither contradiction nor competing priorities exist between the culture of peace and economic and political changes. It has been shown that economic and political models can only be consolidated and legitimated to the extent that they are transformed from mere theoretical propositions into values, attitudes, models of behaviour, institutions, laws that are recognized by the majority as valid and transcendental, that is, as cultural realities.

## II. Institutionalization and incorporation of the culture of peace

The process of creating a culture of peace calls for strategies to institutionalize and to incorporate.

What is at stake is the institutionalization of a new form of social coexistence; converting the components of the culture of peace mentioned above into laws, norms, habits, customs, institutions and even common sense.

But the challenge is not just to institutionalize, but also to incorporate and internalize all of these values, attitudes, norms, models of behaviour, so that they come to be part of the everyday personality of all of the members of the society.

## III. Characteristics of the culture of peace as a project

The consolidation of peace in those societies that are experiencing peace processes after an armed conflict requires a new form of social coexistence marked by the culture of peace, and this, in turn, demands the following conditions:

### 1. The culture of peace is a national project

The historic decision to build a culture of peace demands that the principles, strategies and lines of action of that project be the product of a consensus between the different sectors of the society. As we stated earlier, this does not mean that the society should be homogenized, nor does it mean that differences and conflicts will disappear.

### 2. The culture of peace is a process

For all of these reasons, the construction of a culture of peace cannot be an act, nor a collection of activities or projects, but rather it must be a participative process, based on consensus, that is, systematic and global.

Like all processes, it has certain laws. One goes from the simple to the complex, from points in common to differences, from the urgent to the postponable, from learning about each other to negotiation and consensus-building.

### 3. The culture of peace is a strategic project

A cease-fire can be a tactical decision. A project for the building of a culture of peace for a new society can only be strategic.

*But the challenge is not just to institutionalize, but also to incorporate and internalize all of these values, attitudes, norms, models of behaviour, so that they come to be part of the everyday personality of all of the members of the society.*

The viability of a solid and lasting peace demands that it become part of the fabric of a society, in the national culture and identity and, precisely for that reason, the culture and identity of a people can never be a tactical or temporary project.

#### IV. The peace process and the foundations of a culture of peace in Central America

In the light of the paradigm of the culture of peace promoted by UNESCO, we would like to reflect on the peace processes of the countries of Central America in the last decade.

It is no coincidence that in 1993 Federico Mayor Zaragoza, Director-General of UNESCO, launched the 'Call from San Salvador' from Central American soil, calling on the world to build a culture of peace. This call was taken up by the General Conference of UNESCO, which, at the end of 1993, created the Culture of Peace Programme.

We do not intend to discuss here the contents of that programme or the progress that it has achieved in Central America and Latin America as a whole.

We intend, instead, to make a modest attempt to discern, in the light of UNESCO's call, objective tendencies in the constitution of a culture of peace, the seeds of which we believe can be found in the Central American peace processes, as well as the difficulties and limitations that accompany them. The following analysis of these processes and their actors thus intentionally limits its focus to those aspects that carry with them the seeds of the culture of peace and those that arise as obstacles or limitations in the experience of that paradigm.

#### **Recognition of a central structural conflict as a cause for armed conflicts**

In all of the Central American peace accords, the parties that are signatories recognize that the central causes of the armed conflict are those objective, historic and structural conditions that act against the rights of the human being and do not guarantee the conditions necessary for the exercise of a satisfactory democracy and for the peaceful resolution of inevitable conflicts. Although not always

explicitly, the actors in the peace accords recognize the existence of a central structural conflict at the root of the armed conflict, around which the peace accords are negotiated.

All of the peace accords commit themselves to go beyond the mere signing of a cease-fire. They all undertake commitments to structural and institutional changes that seek to resolve the central conflict. They all promote, in one way or another, the immediate start of a process of national reconciliation and reconstruction, that is to say a national consensus-based plan to address the issues of greatest interest for the entire society.

Some among many examples of these kinds of changes, which are intended to overcome the central structural conflict, are the creation of Civil Police forces, constitutional reforms, judicial system reforms, the creation of Offices of the Human Rights Ombudsman or Popular Defense Offices, and the recognition of the multi-ethnic and multilingual nature of some countries.

With regard to the recognition of a central structural conflict, we must include here some paragraphs from the declaration of the Defense Ministers and Heads of the Armed Forces of Central America, who in a 1996 meeting, reflecting on the culture of peace under the auspices of UNESCO, stated that:

'democratic security being necessary to guarantee the people's enjoyment of liberty, health, culture, economic well-being and social justice, the military institutions that we represent have a great responsibility to contribute to meeting the objectives established by our governments, to ensure that the residents of the different parts of the Isthmus have justice, security in the laws and that the common good is respected. ... At the root of the conflicts currently being experienced by societies in different latitudes, it is possible to identify, among others, the existence of causes arising from poverty, social injustice, corruption, drug trafficking, money laundering, the deterioration of the environment; causes that demand adequate answers in the legal arena and the quest for mechanisms for negotiation and conciliation that would allow for their resolution with the participation of all sectors, in a culture of dialogue, negotiation and consensus-building.'

In these and other similar texts, the region's military leaders assume that the roots of possible future military conflicts lie in these historical and structural limitations.

*Although not always explicitly, the actors in the peace accords recognize the existence of a central structural conflict at the root of the armed conflict, around which the peace accords are negotiated.*

*At the root of the conflicts currently being experienced by societies in different latitudes, it is possible to identify, among others, the existence of causes arising from poverty, social injustice, corruption, drug trafficking, money laundering, the deterioration of the environment ...*

*In this sense, the peace accords are a pivotal moment in the history of these countries and allow the redefinition of the direction in which these societies are moving, on the basis of new foundations of legitimacy.*

## V. Legal reforms and peace accords

### **A problem of legitimacy and legality**

The agreement by governments to negotiate peace accords in some cases posed problems of legitimacy and legality. Any peace accords that a government might negotiate and sign with forces that until then had been defined as 'illegal' or 'irregular' required reforms to laws, not just to legitimate the accords themselves, but also to establish the framework for later structural changes included in the accords. In the case of Central America, these reforms, including constitutional reforms, have been made before, during and after the signing of the accords. In this sense, the peace accords are a pivotal moment in the history of these countries and allow the redefinition of the direction in which these societies are moving, on the basis of new foundations of legitimacy. What is concrete, humanist, and just is recognized and opens the doors to a new legitimacy that is more coherent with the culture of peace.

### **The verdict of history or the reconciliation of historical memory**

In the armed conflicts that we have been discussing here, the parties were in a state of radical confrontation, often with black-and-white judgements about the concepts and practices embraced by the adversary. Both sides presented and promoted, with weapons in hand, their own conception of national identity and of what should be a national project to benefit everyone. Once the peace accords are signed, it becomes necessary to reconcile historical memory and reach consensus on a basic definition of the national identity. This process is part of a real national plan, in the context of a culture of peace.

In practice, although coming from opposite sides, the parties to the conflict signed the accords on the basis of their own principles, together with a large dose of pragmatism and political maturity. The accords do not attempt to answer everything, nor can they. This means that very important issues are left as 'unfinished business'.

Through the signing of the accords, one cannot fail to address fundamental questions such as: What was good and what was bad

about the recent period of conflict? What should be forgotten, what should be judged, what should be condemned or pardoned? Which principles and practices of each of the parties can be taken up as shared national values? The answers are far from easy, but it is very important not to reject them or sweep them under the carpet. In some countries, 'Truth Commissions' were created, whose role it was to establish what really happened, who committed grave violations of human rights, to what extent the political and military conflict went beyond the limits established in international agreements that attempt to place humanitarian limits on war.

Most people now agree that the serious and complex problem of establishing the truth is not at all the exclusive responsibility of this kind of commission. No analysis or report of this kind can replace the need for a process of national reconciliation, which calls for more than a simplistic focus, whether it be political, legal, ethical or social.

We do not know of any completely satisfactory experiences in this area, either in Central America or the rest of the world. The only thing that is clear is that the answer cannot be only political, or only legal, or only ethical. Without denying, ignoring or forgetting, without falling into the temptation of revenge, promoting at the same time the requests for pardon from unjust aggressors and the magnanimous granting of that pardon by victims, it is necessary to accept that under these kind of circumstances, society is obligated to make qualitative leaps in history in order to redefine, on the basis of consensus, a new form of social coexistence.

No peace accord can escape the tremendous historical challenge of these questions: How, on the basis of consensus, can a new national identity be reconstructed? How can historical memory and a model for social coexistence be reconciled? What is the objective version of recent history and how can that history be written?

Almost all of the answers in the region assume formulas that combine doses of ethical and political judgement with large doses of pragmatism. But controversies will continue for a long time about whether it is necessary to forget, amnesty, or pardon, and whether in order to pardon it is necessary that the unjust aggressor first ask for pardon from the victim.

This is precisely one of the first areas and opportunities for the construction of a culture

*No peace accord can escape the tremendous historical challenge of these questions: How, on the basis of consensus, can a new national identity be reconstructed? How can historical memory and a model for social coexistence be reconciled?*

of peace: national reconciliation, especially between those who have been most affected by the armed conflict.

### **Peace accords, differences and conflicts**

At the same time, at least implicitly, the peace accords assume that differences and conflicts are inevitable in a society, even after the signing of peace accords, but that they can be positive if the society learns to manage them from a different, humanist conception, that is, in the light of a culture of peace and if there is a sincere and institutionalized commitment to eradicate the main causes of injustice, discrimination, poverty and intolerance. This agrees with the statements included in the UNESCO document on the culture of peace.

The challenge for a culture of peace lies in institutionalizing and incorporating a culture of dialogue, negotiation and consensus-building, a culture of tolerance, of recognition and appreciation of differences, all on the fundamental basis of common rights, that is, the rights to social justice, participatory democracy and equality of opportunities. In other words, it refers to an option for common rights for everyone – undeniable and non-negotiable – and, from here, for the promotion of the reign of those differences that enrich.

This process of culturization first goes through all of the areas and moments of education, whether they be formal, non-formal or informal. Coherent, pertinent, democratic and effective education is the main instrument for the construction of the new culture.

### **VI. Starting points rather than ending points**

Anyone who reconstructs the history of the peace process in Central America discovers that its development was not linear. It almost always started with high levels of mistrust and a wavering faith and the necessary political will grew, in the midst of crisis and in spiralling phases. At the end, the results vary depending on the context and the quality of the actors, but in all of the processes, sufficient conditions did exist.

Later it was possible to show that almost all of the negotiating parties held some of their cards under the table, foreseeing the possible failure of the negotiations and a return to armed conflict.

In this sense, the peace accords are a school on the peaceful resolution of conflicts and the construction of a culture of peace, whose lessons and exemplary nature have yet to be adequately systematized.

At the same time, it may be seen that a peace accord is a system of more or less articulated accords. That is to say that an accord advances piecemeal in different areas, seeing growing levels of political will for peace and faith in the sincerity of the adversary and of the facilitators, as agreement is reached on different points.

It should be noted that all the signatories to the accords were not always very clear about the extent of the commitments undertaken until the time came to put them into practice. Thus, for example, there were frequent mistakes in the programming of time periods for compliance with these commitments, there were important sectors that were left out of the benefits of the accords, etc. These are imperfect human processes, but not necessarily less effective and transcendental.

The accords were taking shape as the parties to the negotiations finally accepted that every issue had to continue to be negotiated and that the real difficulties related to compliance could not be handled with fundamentalist criteria.

It was understood that the words were important and necessary but that the spirit was fundamental, the willingness to make peace a way of life and coexistence and a faith that this was possible and beneficial for everyone.

We are really looking at historical and social processes. We believe that some methodological principles that UNESCO's Culture of Peace Programme has promoted in Central America are present in these processes, at least implicitly.

Thus, for example, the Culture of Peace Programme in El Salvador, sponsored by UNESCO and drawn up in 1993, asserts that:

"The Program in its execution has been a process, in which both national and international initiatives and consensus agreements have converged, and a moment of maturity arises in the objective and subjective conditions of these consensus agreements. Nevertheless, it is necessary for all of the actors in its design and execution to be constantly aware that the Program is a process that will move forward without the benefit of previous examples to use as reference points. Its very conceptual framework will be validated through a process of reflective and evaluative praxis. It is for that

*This process of culturization first goes through all of the areas and moments of education, whether they be formal, non-formal or informal. Coherent, pertinent, democratic and effective education is the main instrument for the construction of the new culture.*

*The accords were taking shape as the parties to the negotiations finally accepted that every issue had to continue to be negotiated and that the real difficulties related to compliance could not be handled with fundamentalist criteria.*

*We believe that, little by little, awareness is growing about the limitations of the peace accords and the need to see them more as a starting point rather than an ending point ...*

reason that the systematization and conceptualization of the practice is of the first importance. ... In this sense, the Program can only be executed if it is able to innovate, in coherence with the conditions, roots, rhythms and even the contradictions that define the society ...'

At the same time, the programme proposes to move from what is held in common to the different, from the simple to the complex, from the urgent to the non-urgent, concurring with the methodology of the peace agreements of the region in which ethical and historical responsibility hold force.

We believe that, little by little, awareness is growing about the limitations of the peace accords and the need to see them more as a starting point rather than an ending point, if the purpose is to build a national project for sustainable development, social justice and human rights on the basis of a consensus.

All of the peace accords include processes of disarmament, demobilization and reinsertion of the anti-government combatants, as well as some degree of reduction in the armed forces.

Together, these processes lead to a reduction of military forces of all kinds in the society.

The reinsertion processes are very complex and have given rise to serious reflection on the basis of the Central American experience.

In fact, the word 'reinsertion' is in itself unsatisfactory. It carries with it the connotation of a return to the past (everything that is contrary to the attitude of 'taking up arms' for political-military and ideological reasons). Perhaps the reality is better expressed if we speak of the reorientation and reactivation of historical and social forces.

Peace is achieved to the extent that there is agreement not to return to the past of any of the parties to the conflict, while at the same time not imposing the future dreamed of by any of them, but rather a present and a future that have been negotiated and agreed on the basis of what is good for everyone.

At the same time, due to limited resources, these reinsertion processes are far from satisfying all needs and guaranteeing the resources necessary for an active reinsertion both for the demobilized and for the communities in which they are found.

In several circles that have reflected on this issue, a new concept has appeared: it is necessary to demobilize from the war, but this must be done in order to mobilize immediately in favour of peace, and of a national project for development and democracy.

Based on this experience, it would be helpful to reconceptualize the reinsertion processes and turn them into an opportunity for demobilization/mobilization. Ex-combatants from all sectors are people with a great aptitude for conversion into combatants for the culture of peace, of democracy and of development, if they commit themselves and apply themselves with the same intensity and coherence that they applied to the political-military struggle.

We are facing a challenge of culturization and special education.

It is no exaggeration to assert that it would be worthwhile to create a proposal for special education for these populations. To a certain extent it is a question of basic education on the institutions, mechanisms, and economic, political, social and cultural structures of the society. Nevertheless, it would be a serious mistake to think that the demobilized, whatever their origin, are socially, economically and politically 'illiterate'. Most of them have shown signs of creativity, organization and the ability to maintain a continuing learning process. Many of them are natural candidates for validation of their educational levels based on maturity and experience.

Even more, the education systems have much to learn from the teaching/learning processes and experiences through which ex-combatants reached a level of knowledge, aptitudes, skills, abilities, etc., outwith the official and formal education system. Beyond the horrors of an armed conflict, it is possible to adopt certain values, as in all human processes, that can be placed in the service of a new cause.

### **National reconstruction after the accords**

With greater or lesser intensity, an armed conflict in a developing country lacking a strong economic and social apparatus brings about a serious deterioration of the economy, infrastructure and the entire social fabric. Only the rich countries can grow under a war economy; the small and poor countries pay a high price for armed conflict.

Although some Central American countries experienced overall growth in their economy during the period of the war, all faced the challenge of reconstruction of the country after the armed conflict.

This challenge carries with it demands that are as great or greater than the signing of the peace accords themselves.

*Beyond the horrors of an armed conflict, it is possible to adopt certain values, as in all human processes, that can be placed in the service of a new cause.*

In effect, the socio-economic reconstruction of a poor country torn apart by war is a titanic task. Given the difficulty of the task and the experience of strength of each of the warring parties, it is clear that a national consensus on a reconstruction project will be imposed. For many countries, the decisive phase in the construction of a culture of peace begins here.

There are countries in which it has not been possible to begin a real process of economic and social reconstruction after the signing of the peace accords because the political and social forces have not been able to overcome the wounds of the past. This often leads to what could be described as an ungovernable democracy.

The deterioration created by this situation can be equal to or worse than the armed conflict itself. It cannot be said that it would necessarily unleash the same kind of war seen in the past. What has been observed, however, is that this possibility or lack of governability places a country in a situation that produces effects as negative or worse than those of the recently ended war.

These conditions in turn create a situation in which ex-combatants may take up arms once again, continuing the war, with different intensity and strategy but with equally negative consequences.

In such cases, the polarization of society continues and there is a strong tendency to continue treating the debts of the past as unfinished business without being able to achieve the consensus necessary for a national project oriented towards the future.

Nevertheless, in other countries it has been possible to achieve political, economic and social actions oriented more towards the future.

The failure to recognize the need for a national project on the basis of a consensus for the reconciliation and reconstruction of a nation necessarily leads to situations that are no improvement on the past and that threaten to abort the foundations for a culture of peace as established in the peace accords.

These historic experiences allow us to assert that the only way to guarantee a solid and lasting peace is by making peace part of the day-to-day culture. That is, on the basis of the peace accords, the practice of dialogue, negotiation and consensus-building are not seen as a series of experiences and tactical moments but rather as strategic attitudes and behaviours, as permanent ways of being part of the national identity.

Again, it has been demonstrated that the culture of peace is necessary, not just as a matter of principle, but also as a matter of pragmatism.

### **Democratic elections after the signing of peace accords**

One of the components of the peace accords has been the negotiation of a new governability.

The issue of the guarantees protecting democratic, honest and transparent elections has always been part of the commitments.

In some countries agreement was even reached to move elections forward, and in more than one country special emphasis was placed on the accompaniment, cooperation and assistance of the international community in the process.

In all cases, the guarantee of efficient, transparent and confidence-inspiring mechanisms in the new electoral processes after the peace accords is one of the basic measures of the consolidation of peace.

We must not forget that one of the reasons that moved people to opt for an armed struggle was the lack of civic opportunities to resolve differences and the loss of faith in electoral processes as instruments of democracy. In some countries, the political-military movement in opposition to the government has achieved the status of being the number two political force in the first elections held after the peace accords and in all cases there has been an enrichment of political pluralism.

This process almost always entails legal and constitutional reforms and the modernization of electoral structures as well as a profound educational process among the people.

International cooperation should contribute as much as possible to ensure that the necessary economic, diplomatic and technical resources exist for the consolidation of efficient and democratic processes. This is a critical factor in the construction of a culture of peace.

Unfortunately, history teaches that once the accords are signed and the bloodshed stopped, international cooperation loses its impetus and the process of building peace is forgotten.

## **VII. Actors in the peace process – new scenario, new functions**

Although war affects all members of a society in one way or another, it cannot be denied that

*The failure to recognize the need for a national project on the basis of a consensus for the reconciliation and reconstruction of a nation necessarily leads to situations that are no improvement on the past ...*

*In some countries agreement was even reached to move elections forward, and in more than one country special emphasis was placed on the accompaniment, cooperation and assistance of the international community in the process.*

*An armed conflict and peace process transform the entire society and establish conditions for the appearance of new actors, reinvent active roles, and create and change functions and status.*

there are central actors in an armed conflict and the negotiation of a peace accord.

An armed conflict and peace process transform the entire society and establish conditions for the appearance of new actors, reinvent active roles, and create and change functions and status. We believe that more analysis is needed on this point in order to better understand the new society that arises after this period.

We address below the role of some of the actors in the peace process, without trying to be exhaustive.

### ***Governments and political-military opposition movements***

Governments and political-military opposition movements are the main actors in peace processes. Nevertheless, experience shows that a peace accord project always involves not only the executive branch of the state but also the other powers, the legislature and the judiciary. Moreover, a peace accord concerns the whole society; it is a national project.

In fact, as a consequence of the accords, all of the state apparatuses in Central America have gone through reform processes that have in some cases been very profound.

In practice, the peace accords have been primarily a process of negotiation between leaders, although both parties are aware that their decisions deeply affect the entire society.

For this reason, it is important that peace processes seek mechanisms that allow for the most aware, responsible and active participation possible by all sectors of society, so that the accords can truly become national processes. If, because of the nature of the conflict, this cannot take place in a satisfactory manner at the time of the negotiations themselves, the alternative remains to open the doors wide for all sectors of society during the processes of national reconciliation and reconstruction after the signing of the accords.

The conditions of peace that are created facilitate this participation. The consolidation of the peace that has been achieved requires that the entire society later take up the commitments made in the accords, given that compliance with these commitments will be extremely difficult, even impossible, if there is no national consensus.

*The phrase 'participatory peace' has even been coined in the region to describe this aspiration, understood as the right and obligation of the entire society to express its point of view and its wishes regarding the content of the accords.*

### ***'Unofficial' combatants***

In Central America we have seen cases of sectors that participated very actively, although extra-officially, in the military confrontation and who, at the time of the signing of the peace accords, were not recognized as part of the warring forces and thus were excluded from the 'benefits' (land transfers, credit programmes, protection, etc.). These were sectors that collaborated with each of the parties, were armed by them and fought with very irregular means but with no less intensity.

For reasons of justice and even through a pragmatic common interest, special attention must be paid to this kind of population group. In several cases, these sectors have expressed their demands and resentments in a violent manner.

In the post-peace-accord phase, it is very important to give some kind of response and recognition to these groups, even where the letter of the accord does not include them. This is one of the cases in which the spirit of the accords and the demands of a culture of peace go beyond the words of the documents.

### ***'Silent' sectors within civil society***

Those sectors of civil society that apparently were not actors in the armed conflict have rarely maintained neutrality during the armed struggle.

Armed confrontation presses people to make commitments and its impact forces the commitment of even the most passive. The warring parties tend to spontaneously attract or to force the collaboration of those sectors that are trying to maintain neutrality.

In some cases it has been seen that sectors of civil society have demanded the opportunity to participate and be taken into consideration during the negotiation of peace accords. The phrase 'participatory peace' has even been coined in the region to describe this aspiration, understood as the right and obligation of the entire society to express its point of view and its wishes regarding the content of the accords.

### ***Armed forces***

A government's armed forces are not only one of the key participants in an armed conflict but also a determining element in the signing of peace accords, the later reconciliation of the society and the construction of a consensus-based national project in the future.

The Central American Military Forum for a Culture of Peace held by the Defense Ministers and Heads of the Armed Forces of Central America under the auspices of UNESCO in 1996 is an extremely interesting document on the post-peace-agreements actions of this sector of society. We have already quoted some paragraphs from that declaration.

Armed forces are one of the sectors at risk of crisis as a result of the changes in institutional status, functions, plans and projections. The management of this issue by a society and the international community and the way in which the armed forces cooperate in the definition of their new functions and status are very important tasks that have a great impact on the construction of a new society.

The importance of these sectors cannot be denied in a process of national reconciliation as well as in the construction of a consensus-based national project for reconstruction and development.

Without being triumphalist, it can be asserted that in Central America, in general, the armed forces of the different governments have played their role in achieving compliance with the accords and have oriented their efforts toward defining their role in new national projects in a constructive way.

Were they doing so at the risk of becoming redundant? We would point out that events such as the First and Second Central American Military Forums for a Culture of Peace, as well as creating an opportunity for dialogue and coordination (the Conference of Central American Armed Forces) intended to foresee and peacefully resolve potential conflicts in the area, represent a very interesting aspect of this behaviour.

It would seem that in general there is sufficient awareness among members of the armed forces of the strategic change that has been experienced by the society and of the consequences that this change implies for the functions, status and behaviour of the armed forces.

Some of these military personnel, shaped by the experiences of war and the negotiation of peace, could become valuable advisors in peace processes that are similar to those that they experienced, given training to complement their experience.

### ***Churches and other sectors that create ethical consciousness***

A type of social sector exists that may be described as creators of opinion or of

conscience. Among them could be included the Churches and those institutions and people who exercise moral and ideological influence on society in general.

On several occasions these sectors have played a positive role, whether in remembering and promoting religious or ethical principles in the midst of armed conflict, or offering their services in the facilitation of dialogue and negotiation and even in the verification of compliance with the peace accords in Central America.

It goes without saying that these functions are very delicate and often exposed to the subjective value judgements of the opposing forces in the armed conflict.

Many members of these sectors have been accused of collaboration with the other party, almost always as a product of the fatal logic that argues that 'if you're not with me, you're against me'. In some cases people have offered their lives as part of the ethical function that they espoused. In the proposals for a consensus-based national project for a culture of peace after the signing of peace accords, Churches, the creators of ethical consciousness, as well as the media, are called upon to become key points in the incorporation and institutionalization of the new paradigm. They are sectors with special aptitudes and potential to promote profound sociocultural changes.

### ***The international community***

In all of the accords and peace processes in Central America, the international community (United Nations, the European Community, Groups of Friendly Nations, etc.) has played a very important role.

A number of documents already analyse the nature, strategies, strengths and errors of this function and these actors. The positions taken by the analysts vary with regard to the positive or negative value assigned to this area. In general, the correctness and pertinence is recognized of an intervention that always worked towards achieving world and regional peace and respect for self-determination and the sovereignty of nations.

We shall not deal with this issue in depth, but given the aim of this document we must note that:

(a) For the United Nations, its participation in the Central American peace accords continues to be the most successful experience in its peace-keeping and peace-building work.

*... the armed forces of the different governments have played their role in achieving compliance with the accords and have oriented their efforts toward defining their role in new national projects in a constructive way.*

*In the proposals for a consensus-based national project for a culture of peace after the signing of peace accords, Churches, the creators of ethical consciousness, as well as the media, are called upon to become key points in the incorporation and institutionalization of the new paradigm.*

*The levels of participation reached in the accords are not a satisfactory model for future day-to-day coexistence. The democracy that is to be built and consolidated through the signing of the peace accords will always have to go beyond these levels of participation.*

*Compliance with the accords entails a very high cost. International cooperation has been substantially reduced after the signing of the accords, precisely when more support is needed ...*

- (b) For UNESCO, not only did the Director-General, Federico Mayor Zaragoza, launch the call to the world to build a culture of peace from Central America, but this was also the area where this proposal, converted into a programme, took its first steps, with positive and exemplary results.

### VIII. Limiting characteristics and unfinished tasks in the peace accords

We would like to note, without treating them in detail at this time, some of the limiting characteristics of the Central American peace accords with regard to guaranteeing the foundations for the construction of a culture of peace.

Identifying these elements with honesty and clarity, and defining plans and actions to overcome them, are the immediate challenges facing all sectors of society, if they wish to close the door to the possibility of a return to armed conflict, with different expressions and actors but with equally negative consequences. Several of these characteristics may be compared with those of other regions with similar experiences.

- (a) For obvious and understandable reasons, the peace accords were negotiated and signed by the leadership of the main participants in the armed conflict. It would appear that, given the nature of war and the actual conditions of the time, there was no other way. Nevertheless, it is important to note the effective limitations on the participation of the population as a whole, including the grass-roots level of the parties to the conflict. The levels of participation reached in the accords are not a satisfactory model for future day-to-day coexistence. The democracy that is to be built and consolidated through the signing of the peace accords will always have to go beyond these levels of participation. To summarize, the participatory methodology of the accords is valid only for that moment and should be bettered.
- (b) The reinsertion processes, while fulfilling their immediate function of 'normalization', were not sufficient to guarantee a fully active reinsertion that might allow for the development of the full potential of the demobilized members of the parties to the conflict, especially at the grass-roots level.
- (c) The unfinished business remains of continuing this process with other projects and

resources, beyond what was invested during the first phases of the reinsertion. In other words, the reinsertion needs to be more than just a fleeting moment in the process of demobilization.

- (d) 'Affirmative action' (special help or subsidies granted to those demobilized on both sides) has sometimes provoked resentment and conflict among the population not involved in these benefits. In some cases, using the argument that 'those who do not take up arms are not taken into consideration', some sectors have demanded their rights in a violent manner after the signing of the accords.
- (e) The agreed time periods for compliance with the accords have almost never been long enough and their scheduling has had to be renegotiated. The fact that it has not been possible to foresee with accuracy the rhythms and timetable of this process is not serious if the parties prioritize the spirit over the letter of the accords.
- (f) Compliance with the accords entails a very high cost. International cooperation has been substantially reduced after the signing of the accords, precisely when more support is needed for the cost of compliance and for the consolidation of peace and democracy. In this sense, the role of the international community continues to be of great importance.
- (g) To the extent that the peace processes assume and bring with them changes in the status and functions of the actors, they tend to engender crisis. Identity crises are common among demobilized sectors, especially at the grass-roots level. These people are not always able to comprehend the reasons for putting an end to the struggle to which they had dedicated themselves, and they sometimes feel abandoned and betrayed. How can it be easy for them to understand that all of the ideals and principles for which they were willing to give their lives have lost their reason for being? In some cases, these grass-roots sectors have risen up again, sometimes even joining forces with those of their former enemy. Many of the ex-combatants experience the disintegration of their reference groups. A tendency has been noted towards the dissolution of the authority that had been exercised by former leaders. Some of the demobilized, moved by the profound changes in their lives and not finding ideals

and employment that give new meaning to their lives and a way to survive, opt for rebellious and even criminal behaviour.

- (h) The difficulty of establishing satisfactory mechanisms to establish the truth about what happened, make judgements and apply sanctions to the crimes committed during the war is a problem that goes beyond all of the accords. This is one of the most complex challenges and the answers that have appeared so far are very heterogeneous and incomplete. Overcoming this problem is a process that will need to continue for a considerable time after the signing of the peace accords.
- (i) The complexity and, sometimes, the insufficiency of the disarmament processes, seem to be among the reasons for the appearance of new forms of violence and crime after the signing of the accords. In some cases, in the post-peace-accords period, the danger to citizens equals or surpasses that experienced during the war.

## IX. From the promise of peace to a culture of peace – the tentacles of day-to-day violence

Despite the well-merited recognition that Central America has received for the signing of the peace accords, which in their objectives and desires go considerably beyond a mere cease-fire, it is clear that the culture of peace is not the culture that reigns in daily life.

The culture of war, understood as the culture of discrimination, social injustice, violence, violation of the rule of law and the failure to respect human rights, continues to be strongly in place. It continues to be a culture, a way of being, that is perceived as 'natural', present everywhere, every day.

The peace that the Central American people agreed to was to end a conflict, define its deepest causes and to begin immediately a real war against the culture of war, the root of all of the historical conflicts in the region.

Many voices point out and condemn the growth in the number and seriousness of common crimes, cases of corruption and organized crime in the countries of the region.

Some attribute the phenomenon to the end of the war. Nevertheless, although it cannot be denied that the aftermath of the war (tens of thousands of weapons circulating on the black

market, habits of armed aggression, some groups of the demobilized who are unable to adapt themselves to civilian life under the rule of law, high unemployment rates) has a great deal to do with this wave of violence, it is also true that even without these factors, what we describe as the 'culture of war' now affects countries and societies that have not gone through this experience and do not face its aftermath. This means that the causes of the culture of war go beyond the recent historical past of our societies. It is enough to point to the massacre of children committed by killers who are children themselves, 11 and 13 years old, with firearms handled with professional ability in Arkansas, in the United States, a society with a recent past very different from that of Central America.

This is a clear case of an action in a 'culture of war' in which the values, knowledge, attitudes, models of behaviour, skills and abilities of a way of being are institutionalized and incorporated. We are facing an act that indicates the existence of a true culture.

The Medusa of the 'culture of war' extends its tentacles far beyond the context of the end of a war.

We cannot emphasize enough that what is being discussed here is a culture, a system of values, attitudes, models of behaviour, skills, abilities and institutions that make up the way of being for a given society or a large part of the society.

A lucid commentator, Jorge Ramos Avalos, discussing the recent massacre of children in Arkansas, wrote the following: 'The first reaction of many North Americans has been to explain what happened in that Jonesboro, Arkansas school as an isolated act. It makes all of us feel better to say something like that. But it is a lie. ... No, what happened in Jonesboro is not an isolated act. It is part of a troublesome tendency to violence among the young of this country ... since 1993, twenty-five people, most of them students and teachers, have been killed in the schools of the United States. And all of the killers in these incidents are from 11 to 21 years old.' And the journalist added, 'We are facing a troublesome and mortal pattern of behaviour that will not be solved with metal detectors in the entryways of the school'.

There is no doubt that the construction of a culture of peace in Central America demands the eradication of the violence that has become a culture in all levels and areas of society. But the worst error that could be committed would

*The difficulty of establishing satisfactory mechanisms to establish the truth about what happened, make judgements and apply sanctions to the crimes committed during the war is a problem that goes beyond all of the accords.*

*... the 'culture of war' now affects countries and societies that have not gone through this experience and do not face its aftermath.*

*There is no doubt that the construction of a culture of peace in Central America demands the eradication of the violence that has become a culture in all levels and areas of society.*

*... we must recognize that in the modern world, the entire society, not just the school, is the educator, for better or for worse.*

be to develop plans for action on the basis of superficial, incomplete or even biased analyses. The dimensions of the problem require all sectors to make two initial decisions:

- (a) To invest what is necessary to clearly understand a problem that is complex and systemic and to define not only the phenomena but also their causes.
- (b) To define the specific contribution of each sector in the transformation of what Jorge Ramos, cited above, calls a 'pattern of behaviour', that is to say a way of being, acting, defining oneself on a daily basis, and not just isolated acts.

Several analysts point out that the most basic measure to be taken is a transformation of the school system, arguing that it is here that the patterns of culture are created that lead to this kind of behaviour. This assertion has a great deal of validity, but it is far from being complete and integral.

In addition to other elements that do not depend directly on the formal school system (the children who killed in Arkansas attended the same school as did the heroic teacher who sacrificed her life protecting one of her students from the shooting), such as the family system and the informal education that the entire society transmits without restrictions on an everyday basis, we believe that it is time to recognize that the entire society is an educator, as is asserted in the Delors Report for UNESCO.

It is very true that education is decisive in the formation of a culture and of the values, knowledge, attitudes, models of behaviour, skills and abilities of its members, but we must recognize that in the modern world, the entire society, not just the school, is the educator, for better or for worse.

Therefore, without going into details of strategies and methods because of the limitations of this occasion, we simply note that all sectors and individuals can and must contribute from their positions and functions as educators for a culture of peace, in addition to their influence and actions as citizens, to promote the necessary transformation of the formal education systems.

The question is simple: What values, attitudes, knowledge, models of behaviour, skills and abilities are we transmitting, formally or informally in the exercise of our functions,

within our institutions or groups, and outwards towards the society to which we belong?

This same question can be asked in order to make a value judgement about the other institutions of a society, but first of all the questioning should be inward. The cultures of violence, of crime, of corruption, are integral phenomena that penetrate all sectors of a society, while at the same time feeding on them.

This is not about homogenizing responsibility but rather about recognizing that in a system, all of the elements are interrelated and interdependent. It is clear that the strategy cannot be based solely within the sectors over which we have most direct control; all sectors of society are within our jurisdiction and responsibility as citizens.

It can be asserted that the Central American region finds itself at an historic moment of possibilities for beginning the construction of a culture of peace, and becoming the face of the new social, political and cultural identity.

For this to happen, we must be aware, among other factors, that the peace accords and the process of which they are a part are not just another event in history nor are they an ending point in and of themselves. The accords and peace processes were the goal in a phase of history that, the day after their signing, became starting points: the construction of a new Central American society, whose characteristics must include the paradigm of a culture of peace.

At the same time, having accepted that the construction of a culture of peace is a national project that concerns all sectors and institutions, no one can exclude themselves from the reflection required to define the process of reconversion, the new mandate, the new functions and the measures that should be adopted in order to assume, with responsibility, their status and role.

This decision, this commitment, is not just an attractive ideal: it is necessary, urgent and, as history has shown, possible.

In this struggle to transform our millennial culture of unjust violence, in a certain sense the small and large nations are of an equal standing. The goal should not be only, or primarily, that of sustainable development but rather that of a sustainable society, whose identity is the culture of peace.

*It can be asserted that the Central American region finds itself at an historic moment of possibilities for beginning the construction of a culture of peace, and becoming the face of the new social, political and cultural identity.*

# CONFLICT PREVENTION AND CULTURE OF PEACE IN AFRICA

*by Mr Mohamed Sahnoun,  
Special Adviser to the Director-General of UNESCO*

When I was carrying out my mission in Somalia as Special Representative of the Secretary-General of the United Nations, it became clear to me that I was witnessing a civil war and crisis whose deep causes were as much ecological as political. Just think that in the Horn of Africa, Somalia and Ethiopia in particular, 70 to 80 per cent of the soil has lost its green cover affected by erosion and desertification in little more than half a century. This has necessarily led to very significant movements of population and unstable sociological and economic situations that have been further worsened by poor governance.

It is difficult, for example, to see the flaws in Somali society because of its ethnic, cultural and linguistic homogeneity. Insecurity, however, may reveal unsuspected demons lurking in the cultural imagination. So it was in the clan, the subclan, or even simply in the family, that Somalis sought the kind of fortress that would provide for their security and survival. This implied factional fighting, the dysfunctioning, and ultimately the destruction, of the social fabric and of the state itself.

Good governance, by both those in power and those in opposition, but also by international institutions and developed countries, means being aware in advance of the possibility of ecological and sociological breakdowns in underdeveloped environments and putting in place ways and means of minimizing their effects. Conversely, a policy of deficient governance accentuates conflicts by playing on sociological and ethnic divisions and thus seeks to perpetuate an unstable system. *Environment, development and governance: these are the fundamental parameters of latent and open crises, especially though not only in Africa.*

Having emphasized the importance of these parameters, it will be useful to recall a number of historical, cultural and systemic factors which have generally favoured the outbreak or development of conflicts in Africa, and which the culture of peace has to analyse to prepare for preventive action.

## **1. The integration process**

The creation of a nation-state is dependent upon this integration process. In almost every country there are differences of ethnic, tribal or linguistic origin which, while representing a degree of cultural potential which could in other circumstances be put to good use, tend, if they are manipulated by bad governance or external interference, to slow down the integration process.

## **2. The decolonization process**

The aftermath and the legacy of colonization may be a major obstacle to the creation of a nation-state. The drawing of borders by colonial powers, the former colonial arrangements and structures which benefit existing oligarchies, have often stirred up or revealed latent antagonisms and made the process of stabilization more complex.

## **3. The legacy of the Cold War**

Here it is a matter of liberation movements being diverted and, as it were, taken hostage by the protagonists of the Cold War, which has wreaked havoc, in Angola and Mozambique, for example (as was the case in Viet Nam and Cambodia in Asia, or Nicaragua and El Salvador in Latin America).

*Environment, development and governance: these are the fundamental parameters of latent and open crises, especially though not only in Africa.*

*These elites exploit formal differences, for political ends or through Messianic zeal, and thus exacerbate apprehension, distrust and feelings of marginalization.*

*It is essential not to allow the situation to deteriorate from the economic, humanitarian and institutional points of view. Nothing should prevent or hinder urgent economic, humanitarian and technical assistance, ...*

*... today, more than ever, new peace-building structures are needed to make it possible to move from a culture of war to a culture of peace.*

#### **4. Religious antagonism**

Religious peace and cohabitation which is an indication of the degree of tolerance in a society is often threatened by the feeling of insecurity in times of economic difficulties and by the role of some religious and political elites, which have themselves poorly assimilated the religious message. These elites exploit formal differences, for political ends or through Messianic zeal, and thus exacerbate apprehension, distrust and feelings of marginalization.

#### **5. Social tensions**

These are social revolts, whether rural or urban. They are caused by the perception of injustice and the feeling of 'having had enough' that the disinherited people in the society may have. They should be checked in time, before a larger conflict occurs.

These are only five of the factors which are conducive to the outbreak of the conflicts we are witnessing. They may be found together in any particular conflict in Africa. They seldom occur in isolation. Once again, they are not the deep-rooted causes which, in my opinion, lie in the *fundamental parameters of development, environment and governance.*

It is none the less necessary to analyse correctly the details of these factors in each case and determine our approach and concentrate our efforts on preventive action and the resolution of a nascent conflict while there is still time. It is one area that UNESCO is addressing through workshops and studies.

Decentralization and making people aware of their responsibilities are the principles on which the culture of peace bases its strategy in order to understand and deal with internal conflicts more effectively.

Chapter VIII of the United Nations Charter requires Member States to exhaust regional means of settling crises before turning to the machinery of the United Nations. Regional and subregional organizations in Africa have recently taken steps in this direction with the setting up of the Organization of African Unity (OAU) mechanism for conflict resolution.

It is essential not to allow the situation to deteriorate from the economic, humanitarian and institutional points of view. Nothing should prevent or hinder urgent economic, humanitarian and technical assistance, since large-scale deterioration of the situation always results in a rapid decay of moral values and civic sense

and the disappearance of a number of institutional and sociological landmarks which leads directly to anarchy.

The culture of peace also stresses the fact that, although civil society is not yet fully organized or structured, there are forces that can be identified and assisted. Institutions and individuals in the worlds of religion, traditional chieftainries, merchants' groups and women's groups, and human rights associations, generally represent relevant forces that must be cemented, strengthened and encouraged. They must be helped so that they themselves are able to take a step back and develop peace strategies in a situation that is essentially one of anxiety and irrational impulses. A great deal of work must be devoted to managing the collective memory of earlier conflicts. Poor management of such memory, including failure to 'metabolize' traumas that arise during a crisis, can perpetuate conflicts.

Therefore, with respect both to intergovernmental structures and the role of civil society, there must be closer contacts with the populations and regions concerned. As a UNESCO manifesto on the culture of peace puts it, today, more than ever, new peace-building structures are needed to make it possible to move from a culture of war to a culture of peace.

It was with this aim that UNESCO organized meetings and activities to back up work for peace in a number of African countries.

In the Congo in 1993, at a time when the country was experiencing the first rumblings of a potential civil war, UNESCO organized a wide-ranging series of meetings at local level in the villages and towns of the country in order to establish a dialogue between the elements of civil society, including leaders of the political class. Such a process enable a large-scale national forum to be held which resulted in an initial reconciliation, facilitating the establishment of a government of national unity, and avoided a serious conflict then.

The Culture of Peace Forum in Mali in March 1997 exemplifies cooperation between a country engaged in post-conflict peace-building, neighbouring countries, and the coordinated actions of the United Nations. The forum drew upon the peace momentum of the 'Flame of Peace' ceremony at which the Government of Mali destroyed some 3,000 weapons voluntarily surrendered by the Tuareg rebels. Following recommendations of the forum, a National Programme on Education for a Culture of Peace and Human Rights has been launched with the support of UNESCO and UNDP.

In Mozambique, the Culture of Peace Programme produces educational and training materials and works with a variety of partners in civil society to train peace promoters, ranging from journalists and human rights organizations, to returning refugees and organizations of demobilized soldiers.

In Burundi, the UNESCO House of the Culture of Peace is carrying out activities which engage all parts of the society in peace education, training and promotion of democracy and human rights, as well as supporting the activities of local associations.

UNESCO also promotes peace progress and national dialogue in the Sudan in collaboration with UNDP. Two culture of peace symposia were organized in 1995 and 1996 with amazing results. We were able, at these symposia, to adopt a document which stated that the Sudan is multicultural, multilingual, multiracial and that this diversity finds its expression in the institution and in the constitution of the Sudan. This document was supported by both sides of the conference: the government and its Southern opposition. It is now being used by the formal IGAD negotiating process.

UNESCO's Programme for Emergency Educational Reconstruction (PEER) continues to provide education to Somali refugees and displaced populations in Somalia. Following the recommendations made by a series of UNESCO-sponsored symposia which have

brought together Somali intellectuals from all sides of the conflict in that country, a project of civic education using the media has been initiated last year with the support of UNDP, and attempts to reach the entire population of Somalia.

Finally, a special project on Women and a Culture of Peace in Africa includes inter-agency women's peace missions to conflict areas in order to strengthen women's roles as peace-promoters and amplify local women's voices for peace. Case studies and information and training materials on women's best practices in peace-building are being developed in a number of countries, including Burundi, Cameroon, the Congo, the Central African Republic, Namibia and the United Republic of Tanzania.

Similar UNESCO initiatives have been undertaken in other conflict areas in Africa with the participation of civil society, non-governmental organizations, women's and elders' associations, alongside political parties and military factions.

In conclusion, let me say that I can never emphasize enough the importance of what I will call a maturing process in preparing the warring parties more effectively to take part in serious negotiations which will have the best chance of success because they are based on a better understanding of the aspirations of the populations themselves and derive their credibility from the support of those populations.

*I can never emphasize enough the importance of what I will call a maturing process in preparing the warring parties more effectively to take part in serious negotiations which will have the best chance of success because they are based on a better understanding of the aspirations of the populations themselves ...*

# THE CULTURE OF PEACE IN THE MIDDLE EAST AND IN THE ARAB REGION

## A FUTURE-ORIENTED STRATEGY

*by Ms Moufida Goucha,  
Senior Special Adviser to the Director-General of UNESCO*

Mr Chairperson,  
Excellencies,  
Ladies and Gentlemen,

Since practically the end of the Second World War, which coincided with the creation of UNESCO, until today, the Middle East has been considered as a region of primordial strategic importance, owing to two major factors: the first is, of course, that various countries in that region possess immense oil resources, and the second is that, from 1948 to 1992, various states of the region were at different times in open confrontation with Israel and, in some cases, between themselves.

### I. Misperceptions of the future of the peoples of the Middle East

This strategic importance has, for almost five decades, overshadowed many other developments in the Middle East, and in the Arab region in general. Indeed, the logic that drives strategic analysis and which is mainly aimed at the definition of risks and threats, has contributed much to creating a perception of the countries involved as been characterized essentially by instability and/or insecurity. Allow me to give just two examples.

With the launching of the 'clash of civilizations' thesis by Samuel Huntington in 1993, an attempt was made to transform into a threat the very core of the values which deeply inspire the lives of the great majority of the populations of the Arab world in general, and of the Middle East in particular, that is, Islam.

Huntington went so far as to speak of 'Islam's bloody borders', of a 'Muslim propen-

sity toward violent conflict', etc., and explained 'Muslim violence' in the last two decades by the 'absence of one or more core states in Islam' or on the 'demographic explosion of Muslim societies and the availability of large numbers of often unemployed males between the ages of fifteen and thirty'.<sup>1</sup> Needless to say, these explanations and others referred to by Huntington are part of a clear-cut attempt to isolate what he calls the 'West' from the 'rest' of the world, with a view to legitimizing the unbridled exercise of armed power politics in the twenty-first century. Even though many scholars have been highly critical of Huntington's ideas, one should be careful not to underestimate the influence they continue to exert on the strategic and defence communities in the United States and Europe.

Some time before, the 'water wars' thesis was stressed by other defence and security specialists, on the basis of summary analysis of the water scarcity in some parts of the region. Even though this perception of 'water wars' cannot be compared in terms of scope with that of Huntington, it also has caused much damage in the sense that it tends to perpetuate the image of a crisis-ridden Middle East. It is exactly the opposite of what conflict prevention should be. Indeed, instead of opening up new perspectives on the basis of what regional cooperation has already achieved, in matters relating to the cooperative management of scarce water

*This strategic importance has, for almost five decades, overshadowed many other developments in the Middle East, and in the Arab region in general.*

*Even though many scholars have been highly critical of Huntington's ideas, one should be careful not to underestimate the influence they continue to exert on the strategic and defence communities in the United States and Europe.*

1. Samuel P. Huntington's first article on the clash of civilizations appeared in 1993 in *Foreign Affairs*, Vol. 72/4, summer 1993. He developed his views in the book *The clash of civilizations and the remaking of the world order*, New York, Simon and Schuster, 1996. See in particular pages 255-65 for the remarks quoted here. The first debates on Huntington's theses were published in Samuel Huntington et al., *The clash of civilizations. The debate*, New York, Council on Foreign Relations, 1993.

*This is the essential point: the future of the peoples, what is to become of their aspirations, what will be their contribution to the enrichment of diversity and, above all, to peace, democracy and development?*

resources or on contributing to establish the agenda for future cooperation, we are left, by and large, with the perception that the so-called 'water wars' are inevitable. Nothing is said on the struggle against desertification in the Maghreb, at national and regional level, no mention is made of mechanisms such as the IGAAD, which has played an essential role concerning the uses of the waters of the Nile, nor of the progress made towards the creation of other intergovernmental mechanisms. For what we must strive to do in this field, as Aaron T. Wolf has well said, is 'to elaborate a framework for evaluating technical and policy options that might be available to particular basins dependent on values for technical, economic, and political viability, as well as a process for cooperation inducing design for development plans and projects'.<sup>1</sup>

These are just two examples that, taken together with many others, allow one to say without exaggeration that a stage has been set in which information on the Middle East is largely dominated by information on potential conflict and in which almost no references are made to what has been achieved in terms of social and economic development in the fields of culture, of education and of science, among others.

## II. What future for the peoples of the Middle East?

This is the essential point: the future of the peoples, what is to become of their aspirations, what will be their contribution to the enrichment of diversity and, above all, to peace, democracy and development?

Their future cannot be reduced to population growth, nor to the exploitation of natural resources; neither can their beliefs, values and convictions be identified as a whole with the actions of those who have tried to monopolize the interpretation of one of the great religions of humanity to further their political agenda by violence and intolerance. Here we cannot tolerate the intolerable. It is thus that UNESCO took a strong stand against the attacks of which many journalists, professors, teachers and students were victims in Algeria. In the widely circulated publication entitled *Violence*, UNESCO denounced these attacks as being the manifestation of forces which were completely at odds with the precepts of the religion they claimed to defend.

For the future of the peoples to have a meaning, it is necessary to contribute to the creation of the conditions for the empowerment of all individuals, to allow them to learn, discover, create and communicate in peace, in order to contribute to their having a future. It is thus that the International Commission on Education for the Twenty-first Century, in its report to UNESCO *Learning: the treasure within*, placed great emphasis on one of the four pillars that it 'proposes and describes as the foundations of education: *learning to live together*, by developing an understanding of others and their history, traditions and spiritual values, and, on this basis, creating a new spirit which, guided by recognition of our growing interdependence and a common analysis of the risks and challenges of the future, would induce people to implement common projects or to manage the inevitable conflicts in an intelligent and peaceful way'.

No one can be excluded from this action. And UNESCO, which strongly believes, as its Constitution states, that 'peace must therefore be founded, if it is not to fail, upon the intellectual and moral solidarity of mankind' and not solely on treaties between states, cannot, by principle, adhere to the vision propounded by strategic analysis such as it exists today. By principle, but also in its action within its different spheres of competence – education, science, culture and communication – with the aim of building a culture of peace in the Middle East and in the Arab region in general. And if this action is to be efficient, it must by definition have long-term perspectives and not be solely enmeshed in responses to crisis or emergency situations. For what is at stake for UNESCO is much more than the temporary alleviation of the suffering of the dispossessed or the sanctioning of the unjust. Yes, of course, we must respond to immediate needs but only in such a way that our response will open up new perspectives and new possibilities of empowerment for those for whom we act.

Yes, we must denounce the unjust, but we must also propose new visions.

1. Aaron T. Wolf, *Hydropolitics along the Jordan River – Scarce water and its impact on the Arab-Israeli Conflict*, Tokyo, United Nations University Press, 1995.

*UNESCO cannot, by principle, adhere to the vision propounded by strategic analysis such as it exists today. By principle, but also in its action within its different spheres of competence – education, science, culture and communication – with the aim of building a culture of peace in the Middle East and in the Arab region in general.*

### III. Towards a new vision of the future

In order to move forward into the future, we must first of all have a clear vision of the peoples concerned. In terms of human development, few countries of the region are listed at the highest level (Bahrain, the United Arab Emirates, Qatar, the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya and Israel), the rest being classified among the countries having a medium level of human development, with the exception of Mauritania, Yemen and the Sudan, which are among those having a low level of human development.<sup>1</sup> *Population growth* has diminished in various countries of the region due to progress made in education, but in particular in those countries, such as Tunisia, and to a lesser degree in Egypt, where compulsory primary education was extended parallel to the introduction of family-planning courses at all levels of education. In many countries of the region, *youth* represents between 40 and 60 per cent of the total population. The situation of young people in terms of employment and participation in political life remains a critical factor in the definition of new development strategies in the Arab region. The situation of *women* remains critical in many countries, except in Tunisia, with its Code on personal status. In other countries, discrimination is still prevalent in terms of education and participation in political and cultural life. Nevertheless, the appearance of strong non-governmental organizations is contributing to the enhancement of women's role in social life, despite the many obstacles encountered.

### IV. Resources: education, science, culture and communication

The resources for moving into the future must also be identified at the human level, for it is through the empowerment of individuals that the future will be constructed.

In the field of *education*, much remains to be done in the Middle East and in the Arab region. The declaration of the 1997 Arab Regional Preparatory Conference for the Fifth International Conference on Adult Education noted that 'although Arab countries have expended laudable efforts in the field of development and stated the principle of education for all, there are, however, internal and external factors which hold up the fulfilment of the desired aims'. There are many reasons for this.

Economic recession at the beginning of the decade has been followed by slow economic growth, hampered by a decrease in oil prices on the world market. This, coupled with internal conflicts, has given rise to socio-economic problems that threaten social stability and harmony. Military expenditure often takes a great share of the government budget. Moreover, high population growth rates have increased pressure on basic services, especially in poorer communities. Finally, a large share (sometimes 30 to 40 per cent) of the reduced education budgets goes to higher education.

The balance sheet for the Arab States indicates the gravity of the problem. Although the region as a whole has managed to expand access to primary education – increasing enrolment by some 5.4 million children between 1990 and 1995, and reducing the number of out-of-school children from 9.1 to 6.7 million – nearly one in five children is still not in school, and 64 per cent of out-of-school children are girls. UNESCO projections show that if future enrolment follows the present trend, two in five Arab children will be living in countries lacking universal primary education by the year 2000, and even by 2025, not all school-age children will be in school.

Education for girls remains a priority and a cause for concern despite significant improvement over the past twenty years (54 per cent of girls enrolled in 1975 and 79 per cent in 1995). In countries where co-education is prohibited, girls study much less mathematics and science than do boys and are deprived of physical education classes. On the positive note, some countries have made great efforts to close the gender gap. In the community schools in Upper Egypt, for example, where teachers are young women selected from the area, 80 per cent of the pupils are girls. In the Syrian Arab Republic, the increase in the girls' school enrolment is double that of boys. Moreover, in Yemen, one of the most traditional countries in the region, research shows that traditional attitudes are not necessarily barriers to girls' education: family awareness combined with better school conditions and a curriculum adjusted to the needs of rural populations can overcome initial parental reticence.<sup>2</sup>

*The situation of young people in terms of employment and participation in political life remains a critical factor in the definition of new development strategies in the Arab region. The situation of women remains critical in many countries, ...*

*UNESCO projections show that if future enrolment follows the present trend, two in five Arab children will be living in countries lacking universal primary education by the year 2000, and even by 2025, not all school-age children will be in school.*

*Education for girls remains a priority and a cause for concern despite significant improvement over the past twenty years (54 per cent of girls enrolled in 1975 and 79 per cent in 1995).*

1. *World Report on Human Development*, United Nations Development Programme, 1998.

2. *Basic Education in the Arab States: The best guarantee of peace*, EFA 2000, No. 23, October–December 1998.

*In the field of sciences, the situation is critical, given that the Arab States invest only 3.3 per cent of their GNP in scientific and technological research, one of the lowest ratios in the world, ...*

*In the field of culture, the impact of various complex globalization processes must be better managed ...*

*In the field of communication, the role of independent media must be strengthened ...*

*Respect for human rights and the consolidation of democracy are two major issues that the states of the Arab region will have to deal with in innovative ways in the coming decade.*

Through UNESCO's Regional Programme for the Universalization and Renewal of Primary Education and the Eradication of Adult Illiteracy in the Arab States (ARABUPEAL), a network set up in 1987, Arab governments work to develop new strategies to improve the quality of education. The modernization of curricula is another area of concern. Several countries have taken action in this regard. Tunisia has made a great effort to teach human rights and democracy in its schools, while other countries have introduced new subjects such as nutrition, reproductive health, and environmental issues. In Palestine, where the quality of education has fallen dramatically over the last two decades, the first truly Palestinian curriculum was adopted earlier this year, emphasizing languages, mathematics, science and technology, the development of critical thinking and problem-solving skills. Saudi Arabia and the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya have established mobile education services especially designed for their nomadic populations.

In the field of *sciences*, the situation is critical, given that the Arab States invest only 3.3 per cent of their GNP in scientific and technological research, one of the lowest ratios in the world, and contribute only 0.7 per cent of scientific publications. This is further aggravated by the fact that very few women participate in scientific research activities. Research in the basic sciences, and also in the social sciences, must be furthered strengthened in order for these sciences to contribute effectively to development in the region.<sup>1</sup>

In the field of *culture*, the impact of various complex globalization processes must be better managed in order to avoid isolation in closed cultural identities and to enhance the contribution of Arab culture to world cultural diversity. Mention should be made of the activities of ALECSO, of the Islamic Organisation for Education, Science and Culture (ISESCO), and the Research Centre for Islamic Art and Culture of the Organisation of the Islamic Conference (IRCICA), which have considerably strengthened their activities in the last decade, assuming a dynamic role in meeting the changing needs of the international cultural environment.

In the field of *communication*, the role of independent media must be strengthened in order to create spaces where debate and discussion on issues central to society can take place in a spirit of freedom and dialogue. In the Declaration of Sana'a adopted in 1994 by the Seminar on Promoting Independent and

Pluralistic Media, organized by UNESCO, it is thus stated that 'Arab States should provide, and reinforce where they exist, constitutional and legal guarantees of freedom of expression and of press freedom and should abolish those laws and measures that limit the freedom of the press; government tendencies to draw limiting "red lines" outside the purview of the law restrict these freedoms and are unacceptable. The establishment of truly independent, representative associations, syndicates or trade unions of journalists, and associations of editors and publishers, is a matter of priority in those Arab countries where such bodies do not now exist. Any legal and administrative obstacles to the establishment of independent journalists' organizations should be removed. Where necessary, labour relations laws should be elaborated in accordance with international standards. Sound journalistic practices are the most effective safeguard against governmental restrictions and pressures by special interest groups. Guidelines for journalistic standards are the concern of the news media professionals. Any attempt to set down standards and guidelines should come from the journalists themselves. Disputes involving the media and/or the media professionals in the exercise of their profession are a matter for the courts to decide, and such cases should be tried under civil and not criminal codes and procedures. Journalists should be encouraged to create independent media enterprises owned, run and funded by the journalists themselves and supported, if necessary, by transparent endowments with guarantees that founders do not intervene in editorial policies.'<sup>2</sup>

Mention should also be made of the Regional Symposium on the Arab World and the Information Society, held in Tunis in May 1997.<sup>3</sup>

Respect for human rights and the consolidation of democracy are two major issues that the states of the Arab region will have to deal with in innovative ways in the coming decade. Indeed, they are the basic keys that open the door to the exercise of freedom, an aspiration that is becoming stronger every day, in particular among young people and women.

1. *World Science Report*, Paris, UNESCO/Elsevier, 1998.

2. *Textes fondamentaux sur la communication 89-97*, Paris, UNESCO, 1998, p. 43.

3. [http://www.unesco.org/webworld/public\\_domain/tunis97/tunis97/html](http://www.unesco.org/webworld/public_domain/tunis97/tunis97/html)

## V. UNESCO's action

I would like to stress the importance of two basic elements of UNESCO's stance which are particularly relevant to the Middle East and to the Arab world in general.

- The first element is its *future-oriented strategy*; indeed, we cannot pretend that we can progress only by exploring the rich labyrinths of the past. Memory is essential, but only if it contributes to sustain a future-oriented action that can contribute to dialogue and peace. The glorification of the past can only lead to the paralysis of the present and to the barrenness of the future. This is often a harsh lesson, but it must be learned.
- The second element that I would like to stress is UNESCO's *prevention-oriented overall strategy*, which derives from the sentence of its Constitution that defines its overall mission in the context that 'it is in the minds of men that the defences of peace must be constructed'. This is far from mere rhetoric; on the contrary, these few words are of utmost importance for the construction of peace. For if it is true that we are in the realm of the intangible when we speak of the minds of men, it is that intangible element in which every person opts either for war or for peace, for confrontation or for dialogue. Weapons will decide nothing more than what men want them to decide; resources, however profuse or scarce, will only nourish those who men decide to nourish, not only today, but also tomorrow.

Since its creation, UNESCO has had to confront, at each step of its action in the Middle East, for the peoples of the Arab world and for the people of Israel, the complex legacy of the past, the often painful uncertainties of the present, but also the formidable challenges of the future.

Allow me to comment briefly on some examples of UNESCO's action, regarding in particular issues related to Palestine. Indeed, since the United Nations General Assembly approved its resolution on the future government of Palestine approved on 29 November 1947 – the so-called partition resolution – to implementation signing of the Declaration of Principles on Interim Self-Government Arrangements, agreed in Oslo and signed by Yasser Arafat and Itzhak Rabin in September 1993. Critical issues have had to be dealt with:

education for the Palestinian people, the issue of Jerusalem and the dialogue between Palestinians and Israelis which are relevant to the three dimensions to which I referred above – past, present and future.

### **(a) Education for the Palestinian people**

UNESCO has been contributing since 1950 to the education of Palestinian refugees in close cooperation with the United Nations Relief and Works Agency (UNRWA) and today, in the framework of its Programme of Assistance to the Palestinian People (PAPP) it strives to continue efforts to guarantee freedom of movement to the Palestinian students of Gaza and of the West Bank, to support the five-year plan drawn up by the Palestinian Ministry of Education and the Palestinian Ministry of Culture and Ministry of Higher Education. All these and other actions are undertaken in the framework of the activities of the UNESCO/Palestinian Authority Coordinating Committee.

### **(b) The issue of Jerusalem**

As you know, during the June War in 1967, the Arab sector of Jerusalem, including the old walled city, was captured by Israeli forces, which went on to occupy all the Jordanian territory lying west of the river Jordan. At the end of June 1967, the Knesset passed legislation incorporating the Arab sector into a reunited Jerusalem under Israeli sovereignty, while the boundaries of the municipal area of Jerusalem were greatly extended, reaching to near Bethlehem in the South and incorporating Kaladia airport close to Ramallah in the North. More than thirty years have elapsed since then and the Jerusalem issue remains high on the agenda of UNESCO, as is the case of the educational institutions in the occupied territories. Indeed, since 1967 to the present, UNESCO has followed closely the evolution of this issue, in particular the status of the Old City of Jerusalem which is included on the World Heritage List and the List of World Heritage in Danger. It is thus that UNESCO has voted many decisions and resolutions on the safeguarding of the cultural heritage of Jerusalem, requesting that no measure or act be undertaken that alters the religious, cultural, historical or demographical nature of the city or impairs the balance of the site as a whole, pending the outcome of negotiations on the final status of Jerusalem. In that

*Memory is essential, but only if it contributes to sustain a future-oriented action that can contribute to dialogue and peace.*

*For if it is true that we are in the realm of the intangible when we speak of the minds of men, it is that intangible element in which every person opts either for war or for peace, for confrontation or for dialogue.*

*... the Jerusalem issue remains high on the agenda of UNESCO, as is the case of the educational institutions in the occupied territories.*

*Since 1993, the application of the Oslo Agreements has met, as we all know, with many obstacles. But these obstacles, as we also all know, have been created by short-sighted visions of the future of the Middle East, dictated mainly by prejudice and intolerance.*

*The strategic logic which functions in terms of the definition of threats ... is both daunting by the way in which it reduces the future of peoples to a constellation of threats, not only to themselves but also to other peoples, and totally irresponsible, ...*

*Peace will be strengthened only if democracy gains weight as a daily practice in all fields, through dialogue, consensus-building and enlarged participation of all the actors of society.*

framework it has also supervised restoration work undertaken by the Waqf on Sammâm ash-Shifah and Sammâm al-Ain, the project for the preservation and restoration of the manuscripts of the Al-Aqza Museum and Library. Many countries, among them Indonesia, have greatly contributed to the safeguarding of the cultural heritage of Jerusalem.

### **(c) Dialogue between Palestinians and Israelis**

Only three months after the signing of the so-called Oslo Agreements, UNESCO convened in Granada, Spain, an international encounter entitled 'Peace, the day after' in the framework of which Israeli and Palestinian intellectuals, as well as personalities from different countries, attempted to define the contours of a common future in the Middle East. Yasser Arafat, Shimon Peres and Federico Mayor inaugurated the encounter whose objective was to make a daily reality of the historic reconciliation begun with the Oslo Agreements. Since 1993, the application of the Oslo Agreements has met, as we all know, with many obstacles. But these obstacles, as we also all know, have been created by short-sighted visions of the future of the Middle East, dictated mainly by prejudice and intolerance. To move forward, the process of daily reconciliation must be furthered. For this reason, UNESCO is to convene in 1999 a second encounter between Israelis and Palestinians in Granada in order to consolidate the bridges constructed five years ago, through the launching of common endeavours in the fields of education, science, culture and communication.

### **(d) Other initiatives and ongoing projects**

UNESCO also protects many cultural and natural sites in the Arab region and, through its network of subregional offices, it strives to respond to the countries' needs in matters within its fields of competence.

It thus promotes inter-religious dialogue between Islam, Christianity and Judaism in the framework of its Routes of el-Andalus, Routes of Faith and Bayt el Hikma projects, involving many countries of the Mediterranean.

In the framework of its Mediterranean Programme, it fosters the networking of ongoing local, national and subregional initiatives in all its fields of competence, in particular on environmental matters. Through the support it

gives to the PEACE programme, it strives to foster Palestinian-European Academic Cooperation in Education, with the participation of seventy European and North American universities and all eight Palestinian universities.

## **VI. Parameters of conflict-prevention and peace-building in the Middle East and in the Arab region**

The strategic logic which functions in terms of the definition of threats – their identification, the subsequent transformation of these threats into enemies or, if need be, the creation of imaginary threats and divisions such as those propounded by Huntington – is both daunting by the way in which it reduces the future of peoples to a constellation of threats, not only to themselves but also to other peoples, and totally irresponsible, since the representatives of that strategic logic are very rarely, if ever, accountable when their predictions fail to materialize or, worse, when their analysis contributes to the unleashing of armed conflict inside states, between states and in some cases to foreign intervention.

We must leave aside that strategic logic and create a new strategy based on the following fundamental parameters:

1. Development strategies must be reoriented as a function of the aim of peace.
  2. No real development will be achieved if democracy is not strengthened by the participation of all in the definition of development strategies and in their implementation.
  3. Peace will be strengthened only if democracy gains weight as a daily practice in all fields, through dialogue, consensus-building and enlarged participation of all the actors of society.
  4. The democratic security of populations will be ensured only when there is consensus at the national level on what the new security requirements are, in particular concerning the non-military threats to security, such as exclusion, extreme poverty, discrimination, environmental degradation, etc.
- UNESCO has launched various activities in order to foster such a democratic security of populations, by promoting a new dialogue with defence and strategic institutes as well as with the representatives of the armed forces in various regions, particularly in Central America

and in Africa, and with regional intergovernmental organizations such as Organization of American States and the Organization of African Unity.<sup>1</sup>

## VII. Lessons for other regions?

At a time when regional perspectives are daily carrying more weight, it is of utmost importance to establish a dialogue between regions. No one today holds the key to the future, to our common future. And if that future is to be

common, we should not close the door to what can be learned from others, and neither should we try to give lessons. We can no longer deal in terms of models, but in terms of solutions based on common experience. Peace cannot be imposed, it must be shared.

In conclusion, may I add that peace is not just a condition, it is also a right. I would like to add that it is a right to which all peoples aspire today, at a time when the non-military threats to peace are every day becoming more important. We must face that change, in order to give a new content to peace that can be shared by all.

*We can no longer deal in terms of models, but in terms of solutions based on common experience. Peace cannot be imposed, it must be shared.*

---

1. See Appendices XI and XIII for publications of interest and UNESCO's agenda concerning a new approach to security.

# THE CULTURE OF PEACE IN EUROPE

*by Mr Vladimir Lomeiko,  
Special Adviser to the Director-General of UNESCO*

1. At this end of the twentieth century, the world has essentially changed, that is, globalization has become its most characteristic feature and the appearance of global problems, in turn, has determined the interdependence of human existence. Therefore planetary responsibility and mutual efforts are needed to solve global problems.
2. The end of the Cold War and of the confrontation between *the East* and *the West*, on the one hand, and *the deepening of the ecological crisis* and *the gap between the rich North and the poor South*, on the other, in the history of humankind offer for the first time both the possibility and the necessity of re-evaluating philosophies and strategies for the development of the world in the third millennium.
3. The *dilemma* is the following: *either* humankind reduces its expenditure on arms production and on ecologically-damaging technologies and spends much more on the restoration of an ecological balance and the gradual reduction of the development gap between rich and poor countries, *or* the international community will inevitably face war and ecological and social shocks from new conflicts, leading to the *decline of civilization*.
4. The only salutary way out of this situation is by changing views and practices to solve both global problems and conflicting questions at every level, so that *a culture of violence and war may be gradually replaced by a culture of dialogue and peace*.
5. To contribute to this task, the concrete assistance of individuals is necessary. They must be convinced and must convince others that every person, every public organization and every state, acting in the interests of present and future generations, has a responsibility and a right to promote by words and deeds a culture of dialogue and peace so as to eliminate the culture of violence and war from the conscience and practices of humankind.
6. Taking into consideration the difficult and contradictory process of forming human views and reflexes of behaviour, first of all those people who are invested with the confidence of the public, particularly in the fields of education, science, culture and information, must be trained as 'life-long' citizens.
7. The experience gained from UNESCO's activities in this field in Europe proves that the promotion of a culture of peace is closely related primarily with the mobilization of public opinion through the involvement of those representatives of culture, science and the mass media who have professional and moral authority over the citizens of their countries.
8. It also proves that representatives of culture and science in the countries of Central and Eastern Europe and in Central Asia are interested in developing cooperation in the framework of joint projects. In this regard, the UNESCO project 'For Peace and Tolerance, for a Dialogue between Cultures' for the countries of Central and Eastern Europe and Central Asia serves as an example. It was proposed by Georgia and Kyrgyzstan at the twenty-eighth session of the UNESCO General Conference in 1995 and included in the transdisciplinary project 'Towards a Culture of Peace'.
9. By implementing this and other projects in Europe, UNESCO aims to maintain and strengthen the following processes formed

*To contribute to this task, the concrete assistance of individuals is necessary. They must be convinced and must convince others that every person, every public organization and every state, acting in the interests of present and future generations, has a responsibility and a right to promote by words and deeds a culture of dialogue and peace ...*

*... first of all those people who are invested with the confidence of the public, particularly in the fields of education, science, culture and information, must be trained as 'life-long' citizens.*

*The concept of a culture of peace and tolerance which must replace a culture of war and violence should be perceived as a long-term programme of activities; it requires complex efforts from governmental and public structures and the mobilization of all public forces.*

after the end of the Cold War and political and ideological confrontation between the East and the West:

- strengthening of relations in the framework of the pan-European process for security and cooperation;
  - democratization in the countries of Central and Eastern Europe and the countries of the Commonwealth of Independent States;
  - settling of inter-ethnic conflicts, first of all in regions of increased tensions (the Balkans, the Caucasus, Central Asia, etc.).
10. The experience of UNESCO in the promotion of a culture of peace in Europe proves that:

*In the first place*, the concept of a culture of peace and tolerance which must replace a culture of war and violence should be perceived as a long-term programme of activities; it requires complex efforts from governmental and public structures and the mobilization of all public forces.

In partnership with the Council of Europe, the European Commission and other inter-governmental and non-governmental organizations, UNESCO has undertaken a comprehensive programme for the support of civic education in Central and Eastern Europe. The programme addresses the recommendations made by the 1995 Conference on Curriculum Development: Civic Education in Central and Eastern Europe, organized by UNESCO in Vienna in October 1995, and a series of related conferences and workshops held since then in Austria, Bulgaria, Denmark, Estonia, Finland, Georgia, Poland, the Russian Federation and Turkmenistan. Activities include the publication and dissemination of civic education textbooks and teachers' manuals, teacher-training seminars, inter-school projects, and a weekly supplement on civic education in the widely read Russian *Teachers' Newspaper*.

In the former Yugoslavia, UNESCO has been the United Nations lead agency for assistance to the independent media during the reconstruction period. The UNESCO SOS MEDIA programme includes a television programme bank, which provides all television stations of Bosnia and Herzegovina with 300 hours of free, quality programmes promoting a culture of peace, tolerance, mutual understanding and democracy. An antenna of the programme bank now supports local productions with funding and professional advice, based on the same principles.

*Secondly*, the most active participation in the promotion of the culture of peace in Europe must be that of representatives of culture and science. Frequently, it is they who possess a heightened feeling of moral responsibility who are the most consistent and active forces in the promotion of a culture of peace. Their initiative and persistence and their professional and moral authority find a wide resonance among the public and give an important psychological and moral support to those politicians who stand for a culture of peace, against a culture of war.

In this context, I wish to give the following examples of UNESCO's participation in important international events for which I was coordinator.

- The international forum 'For Solidarity against Intolerance, for a Dialogue of Cultures' which took place in Tbilisi (Georgia), in July 1995. More than 140 representatives of culture from 42 countries participated in the work of the forum. They adopted the Tbilisi Appeal and the Programme of Action which were published in the newspapers of Georgia and other countries, distributed as official documents at the following session of the United Nations General Assembly, and continue to be implemented.
- In October 1996, in conformity with the Programme of Action of the Tbilisi International Forum, the International Conference 'Training of School Teachers in the Conditions of Multinational Societies' was also held in Tbilisi. It is important to stress that in Georgia many teachers, on their own initiative, have started classes on a culture of peace and tolerance.
- In the framework of the project 'For Peace and Tolerance, for a Dialogue between Cultures' the international conference 'Ideas of Tolerance in Central Asia' was held in June 1996, in Bishkek (Kyrgyzstan). It approved the documents and programme of action in support of a culture of peace and tolerance. This conference initiated the creation of a Central Asian Centre for Conflict Prevention in Bishkek, where a scientific magazine, *Culture of Peace in Central Asia*, is now published.
- In August 1997 and August 1998 in Baden-Baden, Germany, two international conferences devoted to the problems of the culture of peace, organized on the initiative of the International Institute of Advanced

*Frequently, it is they who possess a heightened feeling of moral responsibility who are the most consistent and active forces in the promotion of a culture of peace.*

Studies in System Research and Cybernetics, in cooperation with UNESCO, were held. More than 100 scientists from over 30 countries of Europe, North America and Asia participated in these meetings and adopted unanimously a declaration in support of the culture of peace.

- Following the appeal of Moldovan representatives of culture, an international forum 'For the Culture of Peace and Dialogue of Civilizations, against the Culture of War and Violence' was held on 15–19 May 1998, in Kishinev (Republic of Moldova). More than 160 eminent cultural figures from 35 countries participated. They adopted the Kishinev Declaration and Programme of Actions in Support of the Transition from the Culture of War to a Culture of Peace. The forum was widely covered in the press and a documentary film was prepared about it.

It is an interesting characteristic that the international forums in Tbilisi and Kishinev, as well as the conference in Bishkek, were held in regions where there is inter-ethnic tension and which have experienced armed conflicts. The representatives of culture in conflict regions who expressed personal initiative and were supported by their colleagues from many countries of the world who attended the forums, demonstrated the psychological and moral support and solidarity with the partisans of peaceful settlement of conflicts and contributed to the support of public opinion in favour of a culture of peace.

*Thirdly*, for the promotion of the concept and programmes of a culture of peace, particular importance is attached to the fact that committed representatives of culture have created international institutes and UNESCO Chairs for the Culture of Peace. Thus, over the last few years the following were created: the International Institute for the Culture of Peace and Democracy in Moscow (1996); the Central Asian Institute for the Culture of Peace in Bishkek (1996); the International Institute 'Youth for the Culture of Peace and Democracy' in Moscow (1997); UNESCO Chairs for the Culture of Peace and Democracy in Minsk (Belarus) and several cities of Russia and in Tbilisi (Georgia).

These Institutes and Chairs organize seminars and lectures about a culture of peace and democracy and publish teaching materials. Thus, in 1997 the handbook entitled *Culture of Peace* was published by the International Institute for the Culture of Peace and Democracy (in English and Russian).

The international conference 'From the Stereotypes of War to the Ideals of Peace through Culture and Education' held in Moscow in December 1997 at the Ministry for Nationalities and Federal Relations of the Russian Federation, in cooperation with UNESCO, approved this handbook and recommended it as a teaching aid for secondary schools and academic institutions.

*Fourthly*, from the point of view of the promotion of the spirit and practice of the culture of peace, the activities of those figures of culture who are themselves convinced of this concept and wish to know how to inspire others are most effective. They represent the most valuable potential of a culture of peace which, in turn, should be supported by all possible means. With the European experience, the independent networks and institutions devoted to the ideals of the culture of peace achieve the best results.

I would like to give several examples to illustrate this thought.

- The above-mentioned teaching aid, the handbook *Culture of Peace*, was written and published in two languages, English and Russian, at the initiative of Academician Alexander Tchubarian, Director of the Institute of Universal History of the Russian Academy of Sciences, who also is Director of the International Institute for the Culture of Peace and Democracy. This teaching aid has been distributed among Member States of UNESCO, the Russian Parliament and major libraries of Russia and other countries.
- In spring and summer 1997, on the initiative of several representatives of culture, including the Director and the Founder of the Museum of Children's Art of Armenia, Mr Guenrik Iguitian, an international exhibition 'Children of the Caucasus Draw for Peace, Against Violence and Wars' took place in Armenia, Azerbaijan and Georgia. Thousands of children and adults in the three republics of the conflict region visited this exhibition and an album with the children's drawings was published and disseminated in Japan and other countries.
- In summer 1997, Professor Serguei Kapitza, Vice-President of the European Academy of Natural Sciences, director and author of the television programme 'Obvious Yet Incredible', prepared a special issue of this programme devoted to a culture of peace, with the participation of the Director-

*From the point of view of the promotion of the spirit and practice of the culture of peace, the activities of those figures of culture who are themselves convinced of this concept and wish to know how to inspire others are most effective.*

*With the European experience, the independent networks and institutions devoted to the ideals of the culture of peace achieve the best results.*

*In order to change this situation, no additional funds are needed. Only one thing is necessary: the moral support and enthusiasm of all educators for a culture of peace.*

General of UNESCO, Federico Mayor. It was shown on the first channel of Russian television and was seen by more than 20 million viewers in all the countries of the former Soviet Union.

All these publications, exhibitions and television programmes were prepared by enthusiasts with very modest financial support from UNESCO, but primarily thanks to the efforts of their authors. This proves the existence of a great potential for the promotion of a culture of peace when committed intellectuals are involved in these activities. It is important to bear in mind that their activities have always received moral support from national and international governmental and non-governmental organizations which increasingly contribute to the promotion of the culture of peace.

It is a paradox that medals and orders exist for military achievements, with many publications praising battles and victories, that there are monuments to the heroes of war in the squares of many cities, but the efforts of those who contribute to the strengthening of ideals of peace in the minds of men are rarely recognized by public opinion and governmental structures.

In order to change this situation, no additional funds are needed. Only one thing is necessary: the moral support and enthusiasm of all educators for a culture of peace.

In November 1997, the United Nations General Assembly proclaimed the year 2000 as the International Year for the Culture of Peace, and thus gave UNESCO the role of the lead agency in this intellectual and moral mission in its appeal to the whole of the world community.

## CLOSING REMARKS OF THE CHAIRPERSON OF THE FIRST SESSION

*Mr Tozammel Huq,  
Senior Special Adviser to the Director-General of UNESCO*

Your Excellencies,  
Ladies and Gentlemen,

We have come to the end of the ASEAN and UNESCO Discussion Panel and first of all I wish to congratulate all the speakers on the wide-ranging vision they have given us, both of the cooperative peace process undertaken within ASEAN and of UNESCO's culture of peace initiatives in different regions.

I think that it is quite clear now that there is every reason to link ASEAN's cooperative peace process with UNESCO's action to promote a culture of peace. Indeed, we perceive much more clearly how mutually enriching this will be.

First, it is clear that the cooperative process in Southeast Asia, with its different tracks, is an

excellent example that other regions can follow in their efforts to establish a culture of peace, in particular within the framework of their respective regional intergovernmental organizations.

Second, we also can perceive more clearly how the scope of the culture of peace process, in particular through its mobilization of all actors within societies, can help to buttress the cooperative peace process within each country, contributing to the active participation of each and every individual in the building of peace.

Finally, I think that this panel has very efficiently paved the way for tomorrow's workshops, which will be dealing in detail with the Southeast Asian experience and with the interactions between peace and development in the region.

*We also can perceive more clearly how the scope of the culture of peace process, in particular through its mobilization of all actors within societies, can help to buttress the cooperative peace process within each country, contributing to the active participation of each and every individual in the building of peace.*

**SECOND SESSION OF THE SYMPOSIUM**

**WORKSHOPS**

# SECOND SESSION OF THE SYMPOSIUM

## WORKSHOPS

### AGENDA

#### *First Workshop:*

##### **The Southeast Asian experience:**

**the values involved, the actors concerned (parliamentarians, women, youth, etc.)  
and the resources to be mobilized (education, science, culture, communication, etc.)**

**Chairperson:** Hon. General (R) Bernard Norlain,  
former Director of the Institute for Advanced Studies on National Defence of France (IHEDN)

**Rapporteur:** Mr Termsak Chalermphanupap,  
Assistant Director for External Relations–ASEAN Secretariat

Introductory remarks of the Chairperson of the First Workshop  
Report on the deliberations of discussion group A  
Report on the deliberations of discussion group B  
Observations from the floor on the deliberations of the two discussion groups  
Closing remarks of the Chairperson of the First Workshop

#### *Second Workshop:*

##### **Peace and development in Southeast Asia: perceptions and opportunities**

**Chairperson:** Mr Mohamed Sahnoun,  
Special Adviser to the Director-General of UNESCO

**Rapporteur:** Mr S. Pushpanathan,  
Assistant Director for External Relations–ASEAN Secretariat

Introductory remarks of the Chairperson of the Second Workshop  
Report on the deliberations of discussion group A  
Report on the deliberations of discussion group B  
Observations from the floor on the deliberations of the two discussion groups

#### ***Presentation of consolidated reports on the deliberations of the two workshops by the rapporteurs of the two workshops<sup>1</sup>***

Consolidated report on the deliberations of the First Workshop  
by Mr Termsak Chalermphanupap,  
Assistant Director for External Relations–ASEAN Secretariat  
Consolidated report on the deliberations of the Second Workshop  
by Mr S. Pushpanathan, Assistant Director for External Relations–ASEAN Secretariat

---

1. These presentations were made at the Closing Session of the symposium.

## **FIRST WORKSHOP**

*The Southeast Asian experience: the values involved,  
the actors concerned, and the resources to be mobilized*

Chairperson: Hon. General (R) Bernard Norlain,  
Former Director of the Institute for Advanced Studies on National Defence of France  
(IHEDN)



From left to right: Mr Termsak Chalernpalanupap, Rapporteur, Hon. General (R) Bernard Norlain, Chairperson of the First Workshop, Mr René Zapata, UNESCO Secretariat

# INTRODUCTORY REMARKS OF THE CHAIRPERSON OF THE FIRST WORKSHOP

*Hon. General (R) Bernard Norlain,  
Former Director of the Institute for Advanced Studies  
on National Defence of France (IHEDN)*

Excellencies,  
Ladies and Gentlemen,

Fortunately, General Almonte spoke yesterday morning in this conference room, so, also being a general, I can chair this workshop without any complex today.

Before we start the discussion of the workshop, I would like to say that I am very proud to have contributed to this UNESCO Programme two years ago. At that time, I was the Director of the Institute for Advanced Studies on National Defence of France. This Institute is located in a huge, eighteenth-century building, the École Militaire, the Military School. And, by coincidence, the UNESCO Headquarters was built just in front of the École Militaire, on the other side of the street, at the Place de Fontenoy.

For decades, there was no contact between our two institutions. And I suppose that, a decade ago, the sight of a general walking along the corridors of UNESCO would have been considered as rather a hostile intrusion; but times change, and Mr Federico Mayor, with his advisers, took the initiative to organize in cooperation with my institute at UNESCO Headquarters an international symposium entitled 'From Partial Insecurity to Global Security' with the defence and strategic studies institutes of different countries and regions, and through them, with the armed forces, which have a fundamental role to play in the construction of a culture of peace.

As I said to the Director-General of UNESCO in my opening address at that symposium, the Battle of Fontenoy, which gave its name to the square between our two institutions, went down in history because of the phrase addressed by the French to the English enemy: 'Shoot first, gentlemen'. It was a time when the art of war

yielded to that of culture. It is therefore no coincidence that the Place de Fontenoy should bear the name of that battle. Military history and the prestige of culture both benefited from it. As I also said to Mr Mayor, as the Director-General of a prestigious institution, dedicated to education, he was able to see from his office that the school nearest to UNESCO is the École Militaire.

Beyond this anecdote, and without waiting for the day when ministers of defence will be known as ministers of peace, everyone knows that peace depends on security.

It is very important to point out that in the Charter of the United Nations the concept of peace is always linked with that of security. There is never any mention of peace without security, or vice versa. And in the new post-Cold War situation, military people are more and more involved in peacekeeping, peacebuilding and peacemaking operations. For this reason, it is necessary to include the military in the new thinking. That is my first point, that peace and security are closely linked together.

The second point that I would like to stress is that security must be global in its political, economic, military and social dimensions, among others. And subsequently, peace is not possible without international security.

The third point that I would like to make is that there can be no general international security without regional security. In that perspective, we clearly see the importance of the role of international and regional organizations such as ASEAN. As the Secretary-General of ASEAN, Mr Rodolfo Severino, told us yesterday morning, political and security cooperation in ASEAN began early in its formative years, and he recalled the most important agreements adopted by ASEAN in that field. For this reason, it is important that you share your experience

*For this reason, it is necessary to include the military in the new thinking. That is my first point, that peace and security are closely linked together.*

*... security must be global in its political, economic, military and social dimensions, among others.*

*... there can be no general international security without regional security.*

*The first question is: if we strive to establish a global concept of security, how can we implement this approach at a time when the globalization of the modern world is causing fragmentation?*

*At what point does an internal problem become international? Is there a threshold where international action can take priority over national sovereignty?*

*Is there a conflict between national security and individual security?*

*No genuine international order exists at the present time. So we have to work together to promote a culture of peace, and the best way to achieve this is to share experiences.*

from an individual, national and regional point of view. We will find new ways, new solutions, together. This is the aim, the primary aim, of the workshop, that I have the honour to chair.

Allow me to make some further personal remarks about peace and security, remarks which are, in fact, questions.

The first question is: if we strive to establish a global concept of security, how can we implement this approach at a time when the globalization of the modern world is causing fragmentation? Indeed, the unification, the uniformization of the world, brings with it a reaction, a withdrawal into oneself prompted by a fear of losing one's identity.

Secondly, we see that conflicts between states have been replaced by numerous threats of interstate conflicts. At what point does an internal problem become international? Is there a threshold where international action can take priority over national sovereignty?

The third question concerns the right to peace as both collective and individual. Is there a conflict between national security and individual security?

Indeed, the building of peace raises a lot of questions. These questions are of an urgent nature because the reality of the situation today is the absence of a global and universal security. No genuine international order exists at the present time. So we have to work together to promote a culture of peace, and the best way to achieve this is to share experiences.

This morning we will discuss the following theme: the Southeast Asian experience, the values involved, the actors concerned and the resources to be mobilized. We are, of course, referring to the Southeast Asian experience in the building of peace, in that continuum which is beginning to emerge from the work of the symposium, that goes from cooperative peace to a culture of peace. As you know, over many years, reference has been made to ASEAN values in different contexts. Can we be more specific about them? And if we can identify them more clearly, can we ascertain which of them can most contribute to peace, between states but also within societies? Concerning the actors who can contribute to peace within each society, can we identify those who could be considered in Southeast Asia as the key actors in the building of peace? Concerning the resources to be mobilized, in particular in the fields of education, science, culture and communication, can we define the contours of new strategies to be developed in order that those resources should contribute to the building of peace?

The questions I have just enumerated are to be considered only as suggestions for opening your discussions. I am sure that you will quickly find other questions to be answered and many different answers to each. Finally, I would like to emphasize that the discussion in each working group should be as free as possible, based on your personal experience.

## REPORT ON THE DELIBERATIONS OF DISCUSSION GROUP A

*Ms Savitri Suwansathit,  
Secretary-General of the Thai National Commission for UNESCO*

Mr Chairperson,

We had a very rich and very interactive discussion, with all participants so eloquent and profound that it is almost beyond my ability to come up with a good and truthful summary report of the group discussion. A matrix was therefore adopted as a useful means of presenting our report. (See page 112.)

Before coming up with this matrix, we first looked into each of our own diversified cultures and traditions, and identified values in each culture which are common and which have contributed to the strength of ASEAN as a community, as a regional community. We identified actors and resources later.

First of all, it was stressed that ASEAN *values* are, in fact, common human aspirations and values, based on the respect of human dignity, that are found universally in any community or in any region around the world. Nevertheless, we have our own practices which point to the nest of our specific values, such as our spirit of cooperativeness, our recognition of unity in diversity, our capacity for tolerance, adjustability and adaptability, our means of consultation and non-confrontation for consensus and peace, our concern for human and environmental sustainability, our concern for community participation, respect for dignity for all, and, lastly, a kind of cultural mindset for consensus for peace in our region.

The *actors* we identified start with the family, the parents, and particularly the women, the mothers. Community members and community leaders, politicians and parliamentarians, writers and the mass media, teachers and, of course, educational administrators. Youth, in particular, has also been identified as a major actor within ASEAN and other regional organizations. Our cultural and religious leaders, the agencies concerned with food, nutrition and environmental sustainability and, lastly, the law-enforcement bodies, are also considered to be important actors.

Concerning resources, we identified both human resources and networks. Agencies and families are important resources. Advocates of gender awareness and the community, the political mechanisms, the mass-media network and education are also essential resources. Then there are youth organizations, various NGO networks at all levels, regional vehicles and networks, institutional links, cultural networks and institutions, health, nutrition and environmental networks, and law-enforcement mechanisms.

As I mentioned earlier, it was agreed that ASEAN values derived from local community-based values in our diversified cultures and settings. But once these are identified as common ASEAN values, we recognize that they are also universal, and as such our actors and resources should be mobilized in order to achieve peace not only in ASEAN as a region, but at the global level as well.

Thank you very much.

ASEAN values	Actors	Resources
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Common human aspirations, dignity, values</li> <li>• Spirit of cooperativeness</li> <li>• Unity in diversity</li> <li>• Tolerance, adjustability, adaptability</li> <li>• Consultation and non-confrontation for consensus of peace</li> <li>• Human and environmental sustainability</li> <li>• Community participation</li> <li>• Respect for dignity for all</li> <li>• Cultural mindset for consensus and peace</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Family, child-rearers</li> <li>• Parents</li> <li>• Women</li> <li>• Community members and leaders</li> <li>• Politicians and parliamentarians</li> <li>• Writers and mass media</li> <li>• Teachers and education administrators</li> <li>• Youth</li> <li>• NGOs</li> <li>• ASEAN and other regional organizations</li> <li>• Cultural and religious leaders</li> <li>• Food, nutrition, environmental agencies</li> <li>• Law-enforcement bodies</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Mothers</li> <li>• Family</li> <li>• Advocates of gender awareness</li> <li>• Community</li> <li>• Political mechanisms</li> <li>• Education and mass media</li> <li>• Youth organization forums</li> <li>• NGOs, networks</li> <li>• Regional networks and institutional links</li> <li>• Cultural networks and institutions</li> <li>• Health, nutrition and environment networks</li> <li>• Law-reinforcement mechanisms</li> </ul>

## REPORT ON THE DELIBERATIONS OF DISCUSSION GROUP B

*Mr Asoka Rasphone,  
Officer of the ASEAN Department  
Ministry of Foreign Affairs  
of the Lao People's Democratic Republic*

First of all I would like to refer to the definition of peace. In fact peace can be defined at the universal level as well as at the regional and local levels. So, for ASEAN, the value of peace is in consensus. To be more precise, the decision-making process oriented towards the establishment of cooperation for peace-building is based on consensus (see page 114). The second point is that for ASEAN, solidarity means essentially the flexibility of each of its member countries. We do not cling to what is established, we can be more flexible.

Also, of course, there is the avoidance of confrontation, on the basis of ASEAN spiritual values. We must stress the consensus among the strong leadership of ASEAN, which has contributed to their solidarity, and the strong unity in diversity, regardless of the scope in each country. An additional value is considered to be external power. ASEAN has external power, I would say, in terms of a military alliance, and we have our own specification, hence the differentiation with other organizations, such as APEC. In ASEAN, we have our own way, the ASEAN way.

Concerning the second point, the *actors* involved with peace in ASEAN have been

considered in different tracks, designated tracks I to IV. Track I concerns the consultation, negotiation and decision-making process among governments and heads of state. Track II concerns institutions, such as ASEAN-ISIS, the Council for Asian Youth Cooperation, etc. Track III concerns NGOs and individuals, and Track IV concerns youth, those involved in education, and the family.

Among the *resources* to be mobilized, we have the ASEAN University, our own specific network, through which we can become closer to each other. The second resource is education, which raises, of course, various questions: What kind of education? At the grass-roots level, at the family level, for marginalized youth, and so on, and how can the curriculum be improved? The third resource consists of the exchange programmes which allow people to understand what ASEAN is about, and the fourth is that of extra-regional actors, in particular as regards the transfer of technology. A final resource to be mobilized is that of stability, through the efforts made to abolish the source of instability, so that we can create awareness of peace and a political consciousness within ASEAN.

Thank you very much.

ASEAN values	Actors	Resources
<p>1. <i>Consensus</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Decision-making process</li> <li>• Comprehensive and cooperative peace-building</li> <li>• Peaceful resolution of conflicts and territorial disputes</li> </ul> <p>2. <i>ASEAN solidarity</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Flexibility</li> <li>• Avoidance of confrontation</li> <li>• ASEAN spiritual values</li> <li>• Strong leadership</li> <li>• Strong unity in diversity</li> </ul> <p>3. <i>External power</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Military alliance</li> <li>• Differentiation with other regional organizations</li> <li>• ASEAN way</li> </ul>	<p><i>Track I, II, III, IV</i></p> <p>I. Among governments</p> <p>II. Among institutions</p> <p>III. Among NGOs, individuals</p> <p>IV. Among youth, educational experts, family</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• ASEAN University</li> <li>• Education (curriculum)</li> <li>• Exchange programmes</li> <li>• Extra-regional actors (technology transfers with particular focus on the West)</li> <li>• Political awareness of sources of instability</li> </ul>

## OBSERVATIONS FROM THE FLOOR ON THE DELIBERATIONS OF THE TWO DISCUSSION GROUPS

### **Comment from the floor**

Mr Chairman, I spoke in Group A, and I would like to emphasize that there must be a *connecting link between values, actors and resources*. As I understand it, in building a culture of peace, we look at the values of a society and identify, on the one hand, which are the values that are conducive to peace, and, on the other, which are the negative values that oppose peace and promote war and violence. It is for the actors to look into this question, to transmit those values that are positive and to attenuate, minimize or eradicate those values that promote war and violence. The connecting link in our matrix is therefore that there should be a flow from values to actors to resources so that, in the end, the objective may be reached, that of building a culture of peace.

Mr Chairman, Sir, I would first like to commend the rapporteur for Group B, for such a magnificent presentation. But I feel that one or two points have been overlooked in the summary of the discussions that he has presented so well. The first is that, on the question of resources, I said that we can look to UNESCO itself. All the competencies of UNESCO must be

used as resources to create this culture of peace universally. The second point was that raised by the delegate from Thailand concerning how to reconcile the traders of war with the idealism of the culture of peace. This was not mentioned either. The third point was raised by my colleague, that if we start to succeed in building the culture of peace, there will be people who do not like, or do not believe in, the culture of peace. How are we going to address the concerns and the barriers set up by these people who may feel that they will be displaced?

Mr Chairman, I would like to add one small thing, which is that once we recognize the ASEAN University as one of the actors we should also take into consideration the fact that ASEAN has established what we call the ASEAN four nations, the main purpose of which is to promote people-to-people contact. Since we have recognized people or families to be among the resources ASEAN already has, a mechanism for promoting people-to-people contact, in many fields of education, including culture, is essential. We hope that through the submissions of the ASEAN Foundation, with PROMOSAT and the culture of peace, this content will be strengthened.

## CLOSING REMARKS OF THE CHAIRPERSON OF THE FIRST WORKSHOP

*Hon. General (R) Bernard Norlain,  
Former Director of the Institute for Advanced Studies  
on National Defence of France (IHEDN)*

Before closing the discussion for this workshop, as your Chairperson I want to thank you very much for your cooperation, and my thanks also go to the rapporteurs of the discussion groups, who have produced excellent conclusions.

From my point of view, the debate was very instructive. May I add that, for a Western observer such as myself, your understanding of what the ASEAN values are, or are not, is extremely important. On the other topics, I noticed, among many things, the necessity to

open the Asian region to outside actors, and not to consider it as a closed entity.

Finally, in terms of the culture of peace, may I point out that the Asian region is one of the largest markets for arms and weapons in the world. For this reason, it is very necessary and urgent to reinforce consultations between the ASEAN Member States, other organizations and individuals, with a view to building peace in the region. I agree with you that the role of the ASEAN Foundation can be very important in this respect.

## **SECOND WORKSHOP**

*Peace and development in Southeast Asia:  
perceptions and opportunities*

Chairperson: Mr Mohamed Sahnoun,  
Special Adviser to the Director-General of UNESCO



From left to right: Mr S. Pushpanathan, Rapporteur, Mr Mohamed Sahnoun, Chairperson of the Second Workshop, Mr René Zapata, UNESCO Secretariat

# INTRODUCTORY REMARKS OF THE CHAIRPERSON OF THE SECOND WORKSHOP

*Mr Mohamed Sahnoun,  
Special Adviser to the Director-General of UNESCO*

Excellencies,  
Ladies and Gentlemen,

I think that the outgoing Chairman appreciated the responsibility that he had and I am going to follow in his footsteps. The theme for this workshop is 'Peace and development in Southeast Asia: perceptions and opportunities'. In a sense, we are now going into the main objectives of this symposium, how to work to strengthen peace and give every chance to development. What is the role of the culture of peace in helping us to achieve this cooperative peace in Southeast Asia? How can we use this instrument which is called a culture of peace?

Different speakers yesterday shared with you their experiences in different continents: Latin America, the Middle East, Africa, Europe, and also, of course, Southeast Asia. So it is important for us now to make a diagnosis.

This is what our perceptions are about. What is the diagnosis? We need to identify the main elements of peace, the positive and negative, what works for peace, and what are the obstacles to peace. And, as we are looking at peace, we have to think of it as both an inter-state peace, that is, between states, and also an intrastate peace, that is, within a state.

What can we learn from your experiences? In a way, ASEAN was created both to check tensions, to see that there is nothing conducive to conflict between states, and also to help to check tensions within each country, and of course its objective is also development through integration and interdependence.

I think that it is very important for us to assess how much progress we have made in that sense, in checking the possibilities of conflict, within ASEAN, and outside ASEAN, in dealing with the tensions that sometimes occur

within Asian countries, which do not directly affect ASEAN. There was even recent talk about a nuclear threat. These are the factors one has to be aware of. Conflicts can also be generated by transnational crime and drug trafficking, for example. It is important for us to learn how ASEAN has been able to handle these tensions. In terms of intrastate conflict, the issues that were stressed yesterday in all the speeches, especially at the opening ceremony – democracy, human rights, the threat from environmental degradation – can also create problems for peace in the region.

What is the role of prevention, what is the role of the culture of peace, how can we ease tensions, what measures can be taken, what is the role, or what could be the role of ASEAN, what is the role of civil societies, what lessons can we draw from experiences in some ASEAN countries? The experience in Mindanao comes to mind. What kind of lessons can we draw from that? These are some of the questions which could be raised.

In terms of development, we can also ask ourselves what was the reason for the original dynamism of ASEAN? And the original success? What was in the development strategy which went wrong, and perhaps contained the seeds of current problems? There is also the problem of justice, which was raised very strongly yesterday by the Director-General of UNESCO, as well as the involvement of people generally. I think that these are very useful questions to ask ourselves.

We are told that in ten years the intra-Pacific trade has increased by 700 per cent. Is this a healthy sign, or does it conceal other problems? It would be useful to ask questions, not so much in technical or economic terms, but in terms of (to relate to the First Workshop)

*We need to identify the main elements of peace, the positive and negative, what works for peace, and what are the obstacles to peace.*

*... what was the reason for the original dynamism of ASEAN? And the original success? What was in the development strategy which went wrong, and perhaps contained the seeds of current problems?*

*Was there an undercurrent of economic development which did not respect some of these values, which now, in a sense, are those with which we are confronted?*

how values have been respected, how the resources of the ASEAN peoples have been used. I think that these are the questions which should be asked.

What is the real significance of the currency turmoil? Did it occur because some values have been neglected? You have spoken of human dignity, you have spoken of ASEAN values. Was there an undercurrent of economic development which did not respect some of these values, which now, in a sense, are those with which we are confronted? Then, of course, to

some extent, the interrelation between development and peace, the strain on currency, can create problems for the stability of the region. Therefore there is a need for us to use all the resources, the people's resources, the civil society, and also the values which you identified earlier. These are the type of question which the two groups in this workshop are going to debate, and give us your reactions, so that we can build on them, to make the culture of peace as adequate and as appropriate as possible, in order to achieve a cooperative peace.

# REPORT ON THE DELIBERATIONS OF DISCUSSION GROUP A

*Ms Savitri Suwansathit,  
Secretary-General of the Thai National Commission for UNESCO*

Mr Chairperson,  
Ladies and Gentlemen,

Discussion Group A initiated its deliberations on the theme of the second workshop, by attempting to define the two essential concepts of peace and development.

Concerning peace, it is quite clear from the deliberations of Group A in the framework of the first workshop, that it is based on shared values at different levels and that the most important factor is the search for consensus-building within the region, in particular through different ASEAN initiatives.

Concerning development, Group A dealt at length with its different dimensions, and particular stress was laid on the fact that it is *sustainable human development* which is at the core of our preoccupations. Indeed, economic, but also social, environmental and cultural factors must be taken into account in devising appropriate development strategies and all levels of society must also be taken into account – the individual, the family, the community level as well as the national level.

The group also identified a series of opportunities for the region, among them the political will expressed at government level to obtain consensus, to cooperate and foster peace and development. The region's resilience was also underlined, and concerning ASEAN in particular, the importance of various initiatives was mentioned, such as ASEAN VISION 2020,<sup>1</sup> the ASEAN Plan of Action, the ASEAN partnership dialogues, etc.

The discussion group also underlined the importance of preventive measures which should be implemented, in particular through social, political and educational reform, judicial reform, media development, the enhancement of the cultural diversity of ASEAN, as well as the exchange and mobility of professionals, students and other members of civil society.

Finally, it was stressed that the region's initiatives in the fields of peace and development must be closely linked with initiatives at the world level, in order for ASEAN to become a future global partner for peace and development.

---

1. See Appendix VII for the complete text of ASEAN VISION 2020.

## REPORT ON THE DELIBERATIONS OF DISCUSSION GROUP B

*Mr Asoka Rasphone,  
Officer of the ASEAN Department  
Ministry of Foreign Affairs  
of the Lao People's Democratic Republic*

Mr Chairperson  
Ladies and Gentlemen,

Discussion Group B centred its deliberations on two major themes, the first being the interactions between peace and development, and the second, the relations between government and society.

Concerning the interactions between peace and development, it was clearly set out that peace is a prerequisite of development, and that development must be oriented towards the strengthening of peace. In this sense, economic growth is not sufficient to promote either peace or development. What is primarily needed is economic and social development, equitable and sustainable.

Peace must be conceived as a dynamic process oriented towards development, in particular through the implementation of confidence-building measures in the region and, in general, through track one initiatives taken at

the level of heads of state and government. A second level for the building of peace concerns regional issues and integration, which should also be considered from a global point of view, given the ongoing globalization and transnational concerns.

As regards the second theme on which the discussion group focused its attention, the relations between government and society, emphasis was laid on the need to enlarge the participation of non-governmental organizations in all issues relating to peace and development. It was also emphasized that ASEAN could play an important role in fostering the mobilization of civil society in favour of peace and development. It is to be hoped that the Hanoi Plan of Action, to be adopted at the ASEAN Hanoi Summit of Heads of State and Government in December 1998 will reflect a new commitment in favour of the participation of the different actors of civil society in favour of peace and development.<sup>1</sup>

---

1. See Appendix VIII.

# OBSERVATIONS FROM THE FLOOR ON THE DELIBERATIONS OF THE TWO DISCUSSION GROUPS

## **Comment from the floor**

Mr Chairman, Sir, with respect to the Second Workshop, in relation to civil society, apart from what the rapporteur has said, I would like very much to emphasize that civil society is the stakeholder of peace and development. By stakeholder, I mean that civil society is made up of all those groups of people who are in bureaucracy or politics, but who are the agents and beneficiaries of peace and development. Therefore, in the process of creating the culture of peace, they are indispensable partners. Civil society is an indispensable partner in bringing forward a culture of peace.

Thank you.

## **Chairperson**

Thank you. I am sure you took note that this was stressed yesterday in the different interventions concerning experiences on other continents. This point has also emerged very clearly during the workshop because, as you said, civil society is a stakeholder and is absolutely indispensable in spreading the culture of peace. Any other comments? Yes, please, go ahead.

## **Comment from the floor**

I would like to add that my comment relates to a principle rather than to a nuance. To me, my intervention concerns the recognition of a legal right, it is not a nuance. In the Philippine context, the right of NGOs is recognized as a constitutional right; the government cannot deprive an NGO of its participation.

Thank you.

**PRESENTATION OF CONSOLIDATED REPORTS  
ON THE DELIBERATIONS OF THE TWO WORKSHOPS**

# CONSOLIDATED REPORT\* ON THE DELIBERATIONS OF THE FIRST WORKSHOP BY THE RAPPORTEUR

*Mr Termsak Chalermphanupap,  
Assistant Director for External Relations–ASEAN Secretariat*

It is not easy to distinguish the so-called ASEAN values from universal values, as shown in the matrix of views from the First Workshop (see pages 132–133). Peoples in Southeast Asia share the same human aspirations as all other peoples in the world. After all, we all come from the same roots – we are all equally human.

Our differences and uniqueness lie in the way we do things to achieve the human objectives in life: peace, security, prosperity, well-being for ourselves, our families, our communities, our nations, our region of Southeast Asia. For example:

- we prefer consultation and consensus in making policy decisions together, rather than confrontation and dissent;
- we in Southeast Asia try to solve problems by peaceful means with respect for human dignity and with the due participation of all parties concerned;

- we like to do things gradually, step by step, to ensure the participation of all and the disagreement of none;
- we also believe in maintaining our strong family ties as a fundamental social foundation for peace, development and cooperation.

At the same time, we see the need to propagate the culture of peace through various means, such as family, education and the mass media. More emphasis should also be given to bringing up children in the right environment and a healthy mindset of tolerance and understanding, outward-looking and responsive to others.

We see the need to mobilize all relevant actors and resources. And we recognize as well as appreciate the role of ASEAN and UNESCO, among others, in working together to achieve this noble aim.

---

\* This report was presented at the Closing Session of the symposium.

The Southeast Asian experience in cooperative peace:  
A matrix of views from the First Workshop

Values	Actors	Resources to be mobilized
Common human aspirations, dignity, family values	<p><i>Track I</i></p> <p>Governments in Southeast Asia</p> <p>ASEAN</p> <p>Governments of ASEAN's dialogue partners (Australia, Canada, China, European Union, India, Japan, Republic of Korea, New Zealand, Russian Federation, United States)</p>	<p>ASEAN</p> <p>UNESCO</p> <p>UNDP, ADB, ESCAP, etc.</p> <p>ASEAN University Network</p> <p>ASEAN Foundation</p> <p>Education (curriculum)</p> <p>Exchange programmes, both within Southeast Asia and with ASEAN's dialogue partners and the rest of the world</p> <p>Transfer of technology</p> <p>Political awareness (awareness of instabilities and the need for cooperation to overcome them through a culture of peace)</p> <p>Enhance role of mother</p> <p>Strengthen the family</p> <p>Support gender awareness</p> <p>Community leadership</p> <p>Enlist mass media in promoting the culture of peace</p> <p>Develop youth organizations, forums</p> <p>Strengthen NGOs, build up their capabilities and networks</p> <p>Develop links between regional institutions</p> <p>Develop health, food and nutrition, and environment networks</p> <p>Judicial reforms to strengthen law enforcement</p>
Spirit of cooperativeness	<p><i>Track II</i></p> <p>ASEAN Secretariat</p> <p>ADB</p> <p>Mekong River Commission</p> <p>UNDP</p> <p>UNESCO</p> <p>ESCA</p>	

Values	Actors	Resources to be mobilized
Unity in diversity	<p><i>Track III</i></p> <p>Law enforcement agencies/ officers</p> <p>Civil society groups</p> <p>NGOs</p> <p>Individuals (community leaders, religious leaders, journalists, writers, politicians)</p>	
Tolerance	<p><i>Track IV</i></p> <p>Youth</p> <p>Educational experts and administrators</p> <p>Families and child-rearers, parents, women</p> <p>Health, food and nutrition experts</p>	
<p>Adjustability, adaptability</p> <p>Consultation and consensus (<i>musyawarah mufakat</i> in policy decision-making process and peace-building)</p> <p>Non-confrontation, face saving in peaceful compromise</p> <p>Resolution of conflicts and territorial disputes</p> <p>Incremental, gradualism</p> <p>Flexibility, non-legalistic approach</p> <p>Human and environmental sustainability</p> <p>Community participation</p> <p>Respect for dignity for all</p> <p>Cultural mindset for consensus, peace and cooperation</p> <p>Regional solidarity</p> <p>National resilience leading to regional resilience</p> <p>ASEAN way: positive attitude in regional cooperation, emphasis on common interest, to do things step by step at a pace comfortable to all, quiet diplomacy in handling sensitive issues, friendship to all, animosity to none, etc.</p>		

# CONSOLIDATED REPORT ON THE DELIBERATIONS OF THE SECOND WORKSHOP BY THE RAPPOREUR

*Mr S. Pushpanathan,  
Assistant Director for External Relations–ASEAN Secretariat*

The workshop on 'Peace and development in Southeast Asia: perceptions and opportunities' revealed many interesting perceptions on peace and development and identified important opportunities presented by the region to harness our only treasure, as mentioned by the Director-General of UNESCO, the future.

From the outset the workshop identified the links between peace and development. Peace was seen as a precondition for development and development as being essential for peace. The synergy between the two was affirmed as the catalyst for cooperative peace and the growth of a culture of peace in Southeast Asia.

The workshop pinpointed the agents for peace and development as human, economic, social, science and technology, environment and culture, and it was emphasized that all levels of society and the state should participate in fostering peace and ensuring development. The participants stressed that peace and development should be targeted at all levels: individual, family, community, national, regional and international. Moreover, addressing moral, ethical and cultural issues was seen as a prerequisite for the promotion and sustaining of peace.

The obstacles that need to be overcome to promote development and peace in Southeast Asia were identified. The first requirement is a change in our Cold War mindset by allowing the participation of civil society in governance to determine, together with the government, the future of the country and the region, civil society being the agent and benefactor of peace and development.

The workshop also identified the factors leading to instability in the region, such as poverty, inequality, social injustice, corruption, transnational crimes and external dependence,

and called upon governments to deal urgently with these issues and to collaborate at the regional level. Concerning the transient issue of the economic and financial crisis, the need for transparency and close cooperation at the regional level was highlighted. There was also a call for understanding within ASEAN on national approaches made by certain member countries in dealing with the economic and financial crisis.

While recognizing the importance of globalization, the workshop also identified the problems caused by transnational crime, which affects the political stability of the countries and the region, as well as the ASEAN economies. The need was emphasized for ASEAN to work closely on the issue in the ASEAN way and by adopting new and innovative approaches. On transnational concerns, such as haze and environmental degradation, there were calls for greater global and regional collaboration through which best practices could be exchanged.

The workshop also deliberated extensively on opportunities in the region for peace and development. One factor that was emphasized was the political will and commitment of the ASEAN countries in ensuring peace and economic development in the region through the various ASEAN mechanisms and programmes. A second factor was the emphasis on human resources development as set out in ASEAN VISION 2020, which was seen as an opportunity to promote sustainable social development in Southeast Asia. The proposed Hanoi Action Plan (HPA) was seen as an important agent for the promotion of human development, social safety nets and human security. The workshop recognized the HPA as an important step in dealing with the economic and financial crisis as well as the social impact arising from the crisis.

Close cooperation with ASEAN dialogue partners was identified as another opportunity to promote peace and development through trade and economic cooperation, scientific exchanges, the transfer of technology and best practices, as well as providing technical assistance for ASEAN endeavours.

The ongoing political, economic and educational reforms in the region were recognized as important for the promotion of peace and sustainable development. The media were also seen as important social agents in promoting the well-being of society.

In essence, the workshop recognized ASEAN's important role in promoting peace and development in Southeast Asia and emphasized the need for ASEAN to continue its efforts, taking into account the new challenges confronting the region. In undertaking this noble task, ASEAN must fully acknowledge

the presence of new actors in the political process and create avenues for the participation and mobilization of these actors, in particular civil society.

In conclusion, it is useful to consider the deliberations of this workshop in the larger context of what has been said by the stalwarts of ASEAN and UNESCO. The Secretary-General of ASEAN envisages that 'Cooperative peace requires a shared commitment to pursue cooperative actions at the international, regional, national and community levels'. Complementing this, the Director-General of UNESCO also emphasized the need to harness our only treasure, our future, through pursuing cooperative action at the regional and international levels. This moment, then, is an ideal opportunity to recall the proverbial truth of Einstein, 'Either we are one or we are nothing'.

Thank you.

## **CLOSING SESSION OF THE SYMPOSIUM**



From left to right: H.E. Mr Federico Mayor, Director-General of UNESCO, H.E. Mr Makaminan Makagiansar, Vice-Chairperson of the Executive Board of UNESCO and Chairperson of the Closing Session of the Symposium, H.E. Mr Rodolfo C. Severino Jr., Secretary-General of ASEAN

# CLOSING SESSION OF THE SYMPOSIUM

## AGENDA

### **Verbatim record of the Closing Session**

**Chairperson:** H.E. Mr Makaminan Makagiansar,  
Vice-Chairperson of the Executive Board of UNESCO

### **Signing of the Agreement of Cooperation between ASEAN and UNESCO**

### **Award of the UNESCO Gandhi Medal to the Secretary-General of ASEAN**

**Presentation of the main conclusions of  
the ASEAN and UNESCO discussion panel**  
by Mr M. C. Abad Jr.  
and Mr René Zapata

### **Closing speech**

by H.E. Mr Federico Mayor,  
Director-General of UNESCO

### **Closing speech**

by H.E. Mr Rodolfo C. Severino Jr.,  
Secretary-General of ASEAN

### **Closing speech**

by H.E. Mr Makaminan Makagiansar,  
Chairperson of the Closing Session

# VERBATIM RECORD OF THE CLOSING SESSION

## **Chairperson**

Distinguished participants, Ladies and Gentlemen, we are about to embark on the last part of our two-day exercise, and I hereby declare the Closing Session of the Regional Symposium open.



The participants in the Closing Session of the Symposium on Cooperative Peace in Southeast Asia

# SIGNING OF THE AGREEMENT OF COOPERATION BETWEEN ASEAN AND UNESCO

We will open with the signing ceremony of an Agreement of Cooperation between ASEAN and UNESCO.<sup>1</sup> And if you agree, Mr Secretary-General, Mr Director-General, we can begin this signing ceremony at once.

[H.E. Mr Rodolfo Severino Jr., Secretary-General of ASEAN,  
and H.E. Mr Federico Mayor, Director-General of UNESCO,  
proceeded to sign the Agreement of Cooperation  
between ASEAN and UNESCO]



H.E. Mr Federico Mayor and H.E. Mr Rodolfo C. Severino Jr., signing the Agreement of Cooperation between ASEAN and UNESCO

1. For the full text of the Agreement of Cooperation between ASEAN and UNESCO, see Appendix II.

# AWARD OF THE UNESCO GANDHI MEDAL TO H.E. MR RODOLFO C. SEVERINO JR., SECRETARY-GENERAL OF ASEAN

## **Director-General of UNESCO**

Mr Secretary-General, I thought that UNESCO's Gandhi Medal would be an appropriate token of our appreciation and our esteem for you personally and, through you, for all the members of ASEAN. On this medal there is one quotation that says 'In the midst of darkness light prevails'. I am sure that this will always be the case in ASEAN. I have great pleasure in giving you this medal.

## **Secretary-General of ASEAN**

Mr Director-General, this honour which you have bestowed upon me on behalf of UNESCO is as deeply appreciated as it was unexpected

I accept it with humility on behalf of ASEAN and the ASEAN Secretariat and will try to live up to the ideals that it represents.

Thank you very much.

## **Chairperson**

Before we continue, I would like to add my congratulations on behalf of my country and myself for the signing of this important agreement between ASEAN and UNESCO. We will now proceed to invite Mr René Zapata, co-rapporteur of the Second Session, to present the main conclusions of the UNESCO-ASEAN panel on regional experiences.

You have the floor, Sir.



H.E. Mr Federico Mayor, Director-General of UNESCO, awards the UNESCO Gandhi Medal to H.E. Mr Rodolfo C. Severino Jr., Secretary-General of ASEAN

# PRESENTATION OF THE MAIN CONCLUSIONS OF THE ASEAN AND UNESCO DISCUSSION PANEL

*by Mr M. C. Abad Jr.,  
Special Assistant to the Secretary-General of ASEAN  
and Mr René Zapata,  
UNESCO Focal Point for Peace and Security Affairs*

Thank you, Mr Chairperson.

The first session of the Regional Symposium on Cooperative Peace in Southeast Asia was composed of three presentations. The first was given by General Almonte, former National Security Adviser of the Philippines, who spoke on the cooperative peace process in Southeast Asia. The second was given by Mr Leslie Atherley, Director of the UNESCO Culture of Peace Programme, on the highlights of the projects in the Asia-Pacific region and on the preparations for the International Year for the Culture of Peace in 2000. Finally, Mr Jawar Hassan, Director-General of the Institute of Strategic and International Studies (ISIS) of Malaysia, presented the contributions of track two activities in the Asia-Pacific region.

General Almonte stated that the basic lesson of the Asian peace process is that differences or even disputes should not stop countries from promoting mutually beneficial relationships. He added that the market also encourages national leaders to cooperate with their neighbours. Finally, he stated that ASEAN has learned that its relations with the broader Asia-Pacific region, particularly with the more powerful nations, must be managed and transformed into constructive partnerships. He ended with the observation that the result of increasing interdependence and globalization should be enhanced interaction within ASEAN, which will allow the association to deal more effectively with its collective problems.

Mr Atherley informed the meeting that the framework of the Culture of Peace Programme now has three main lines of activity: (i) education and training for peace, human rights, democracy, tolerance and international understanding, including elaboration and dissemina-

tion of teaching materials and pedagogical aids in different languages; (ii) policy-oriented research, advocacy action, and exchange and dissemination of information; and (iii) capacity-building and technical support for national, subregional, regional and international projects. Mr Atherley further elaborated on several culture and peace projects in the Asia-Pacific region. He said that these projects are led by nationals, giving the examples of the Philippines and Cambodia. He added that the Asia and Pacific Network of International Education for values education is providing critical support to the region in the underlying values which are important for a culture of peace. The overall objective of the network is to ensure that peace, universal values and non-violence become an integral part of education.

Mr Hassan presented the contributions of the track two process in the promotion of cooperative peace in the Asia-Pacific region. Track two activities are interactive processes involving think tanks, analysts and government officials acting in their personal capacity. Although citing the large number of track two processes in the region, Mr Hassan focused on the activities of the Asian Institutes of Strategic and International Studies (ASEAN-ISIS), the Council for Security Cooperation in the Asia Pacific (CSCAP) and the Asia Pacific Agenda Project (APAP). Mr Hassan summarized the significant contributions of the track two processes as follows:

- (a) they bring together government policy-makers and non-government policy researchers to exchange views and information;
- (b) they help to facilitate networking among far-flung strategic institutes and the pooling of collaborative study resources across countries and cultures;

- (c) they serve as excellent platforms for discussing sensitive issues and testing ideas which may be new or controversial; and
- (d) states in conflict, such as the two Koreas, and other interested parties are able to articulate and defend their positions more freely in track two forums.

Following the presentations, views were expressed on the need to increase the role of women in decision-making structures as well as in the promotion of the culture of peace. The implications were also raised of the present economic and financial crisis on regional cooperation, particularly on the future of political and security cooperation. Following this debate, four UNESCO presentations were made. The first was on the culture of peace in Latin America and particularly in Central America, by Ms Anaisabel Prera Flores, senior special adviser to the Director-General of UNESCO; the second on the culture of peace in Africa, by Mr Mohamed Sahnoun, special adviser to the Director-General; the third on the culture of peace in the Middle East and the Arab region, by Ms Moufida Goucha, senior special adviser to the Director-General; and the fourth on the culture of peace in Europe, by Mr Vladimir Lomeiko, special adviser to the Director-General.

In her presentation, Ms Prera Flores, after describing the pivotal situation of Central America with respect to North and Latin America, analysed the central conflict affecting the region and its two main groups of causes. Internal causes were cited as social, economic and political injustice and the colonial structure of exploitation and long dictatorships, both of which have generated exclusion, poverty, marginalization and racism. The second set of causes are external, which she identified as the geopolitical situation of Central America, the cold war, and the military, political and economic presence of foreign powers. She went on to explain the historical processes which the countries of Central America have gone through over several centuries and which have been institutionalized in what could be termed a 'culture of violence'.

She then analysed the final chapters of the conflict in the 1960s during which various revolutionary movements and organizations sprang up and gained substance, to become the 'prime movers' in political and military opposition to traditional governments. She outlined in detail the process by which the resourcefulness of Central American diplomacy

arrived at the Esquipulas Agreements Summit Meeting of the Presidents of the region, held in the Guatemalan city of that name. She emphasized the fact that it was the first experience in the history of Central America of consensus-building by all governments of the region for the sake of peace. She went on to analyse the different components and traits of the culture of peace and non-violence in the Central American peace process.

Ms Prera Flores also analysed the different programmes carried out by UNESCO in the region, especially since 1993 when the first Culture of Peace Programme was established as part of the UNESCO project. She concluded her presentation by underlining the fact that for the United Nations, its participation in the Central American peace accords continues to be its most successful peace-keeping and peace-building experience. She added that, for UNESCO, Central America is where the proposed programme took its first steps and yielded exemplary results.

In his presentation of the culture of peace in Africa, Mr Sahnoun summarized the complex factors that lead to conflict within African societies. He specifically referred to the Somali case, giving a detailed analysis of the fragmentation of a country during the civil war period which has resulted today in the total disintegration of state structures. Mr Sahnoun also analysed some of UNESCO's experiences working for a culture of peace in Africa, underlying its efforts in countries such as Somalia, the Sudan, Mali, Burundi and its current work in other countries. He stressed the complexity of the situation in Africa, arising from the ethnic, tribal and cultural factors that intervene within each society. He also mentioned the importance of the creation of a mechanism for conflict resolution within the framework of the Organization of African Unity, which is gaining momentum in various negotiations, in cooperation with other subregional institutions.

In her presentation of the culture of peace in the Arab States, Ms Goucha began by pointing out that strategic analysis has largely contributed to the creation of distinct misperceptions concerning the future of that region and, in particular, of the peoples of the Middle East. She underlined the importance of setting aside these misconceptions, such the 'clash of civilizations' thesis of Samuel Huntington, and the 'water scarcity scenario' of other analysts, in order to move forward in the construction of peace. She pinpointed three basic elements for

the construction of the future: the people, resources, and aspirations. She referred to the questions of population growth, youth, and, in particular, women, who are still figures of discrimination in the region. The resources for moving into the future, she stressed, must be identified at the human level. She then analysed the situation specific to the fields of education, sciences, culture and communication. She stressed two basic elements of UNESCO's stance in the region: its future-oriented strategy; and its prevention-oriented overall strategy, which derives from the sentence of its Constitution that defines its mission to build the defences of peace in the minds of men. She underlined three dimensions which UNESCO has to take into account at every step of its action in the Middle East and in the Arab world in general: the complex legacy of the past, the uncertainties of the present, and the formidable challenges of the future. She went on to give examples of UNESCO action on three critical issues: in favour of Palestinian refugees and students; in favour of the safeguarding of the Old City of Jerusalem; and initiatives concerning the dialogue between Palestinians and Israelis in the continuing process from the Granada I meeting in Spain to the Granada II meeting which is scheduled for late 1998. She also mentioned other ongoing projects relating to inter-religious dialogue, the Mediterranean Programme and the PEACE programme.

She ended her contribution by defining some parameters of conflict-prevention and peace-building, relating specifically to the interactions between development, democracy and peace, making particular reference to UNESCO's action in promoting the democratic security of populations and its collaboration with the armed forces in different regions of the world. She concluded by underlining the fact that no one today has the key to the future, to our common future, and if that future is to be common we should not close the doors to what can be learned from others.

In the final presentation on UNESCO's activities concerning the culture of peace, Mr Vladimir Lomeiko analysed different aspects of the promotion of a culture of peace in Europe. First, the promotion of a culture of peace in the European region requires complex efforts from governmental and public structures and the mobilization of all public forces. He went on to describe the comprehensive programme for the support of civic education in

Central and Eastern Europe which addresses the recommendations of the 1995 Conference on Curriculum Development. He mentioned the meeting on Civic Education in Central and Eastern Europe, organized by UNESCO in Vienna in October 1995, and a series of related conferences and workshops since held in various countries of the region. He also referred to UNESCO action in the former Yugoslavia, especially regarding assistance to the independent media during the reconstruction period. He detailed the UNESCO SOS MEDIA programme, which includes a television programme bank with free programmes promoting a culture of peace, tolerance, mutual understanding and democracy.

Second, the most active participation in the promotion of the culture of peace in Europe must be that of representatives of culture and science. Mr Lomeiko described various important meetings organized by UNESCO in different parts of the region. Lastly, he added that from the point of view of promoting the spirit and practice of the culture of peace, the activities of those figures of culture who are themselves committed to the concept and wish to know how to inspire others are the most effective.

### **Chairperson**

The Chair has been informed that a 'Draft Statement on Peace in Southeast Asia on the Eve of the Third Millennium'<sup>1</sup> has been circulated. I would like to invite Mr M. C. Abad, co-rapporteur of the First Session, to read the draft.

[Mr M. C. Abad proceeded to read the Draft Statement]

### **Chairperson**

Now that the Draft Statement has been read out, I submit it to the floor for adoption.

### **Ms Le Kim Hong, Viet Nam Delegation**

Mr Chairperson, I would suggest to all the participants that we adopt the Draft Statement by acclamation.

[Applause]

1. For the full text of the Statement on Peace in Southeast Asia on the Eve of the Third Millennium, see page 25.

**Chairperson**

The Chair takes it that the Statement has now been adopted by acclamation. Thank you very much for the hard work. I am sure that this document will not be simply filed away, but will become part of a common endeavour to encourage the spread of fraternity throughout

the region and the world, in the interest of universal peace.

We have now come to the next item on our agenda where, after the approval of the Statement by acclamation, we invite Mr Federico Mayor, Director-General of UNESCO, to present his concluding remarks.

You have the floor, Sir.

## CLOSING SPEECH

*by H.E. Mr Federico Mayor,  
Director-General of UNESCO*

Mr Makagiansar,  
Mr Secretary-General of ASEAN,  
Distinguished Members of ASEAN countries,  
Excellencies,  
Ladies and Gentlemen,

I would like first of all to express my great satisfaction with the results of the Regional Symposium on Cooperative Peace in Southeast Asia. I wish to thank all of you, each participant, for your precious contribution to the accomplishment of the main objectives of this symposium. This interaction that we have seen between cooperative peace and the culture of peace is extremely relevant because through cooperation, through permanent interaction in all fields – cultural, political, economic – we can progressively establish the peaceful behaviour that lies at the very heart of a culture of peace.

You have been successful because you have dealt with the realities of the region. You have heard of practices in other regions of the world and you have achieved this success, not only through abstractions and concepts but through identifying new ways and means to promote peace on a daily basis, linking the essential values that sustain peace in the minds of women and men, with the key actors in society who can transform these values into action by mobilizing human and institutional resources.

I think, Mr Chairman, that this is a very crucial point. We realize that in a democracy the voice of all the citizens must be heard by the decision-makers, and it is for this that the parliaments and the media and all who play a role, particularly in the municipalities – I would like very much to insist on this – all of these form a part of the process of mobilization. This is absolutely indispensable.

As noted in the Statement on Peace in Southeast Asia on the Eve of the Third Millennium, which I consider to be an important contribution to peace not only in this region but in the world as a whole, you have emphasized to what point peace and security, democracy and development, are interdependent. And so often we realize that the roots of conflict lie precisely in the fact that development has not been based on these democratic pillars of justice, equality, freedom and solidarity. This Statement, which you have just adopted by acclamation, will become, I hope, the cornerstone of UNESCO's and ASEAN's common effort to promote peace and development in the region. But I must be very clear in this respect, as I have said in the case of the fiftieth anniversary of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, it is not with ceremonies, with speeches, with statements, with declarations and with resolutions that we really celebrate this anniversary. It is when human rights become a part of our daily life. It is in the exercise of a pattern of behaviour; it is when human rights progressively become a part of national legislation. The same goes for this Statement, as for all the other resolutions that we adopt in UNESCO, that you adopt in ASEAN. Its relevance will depend on the extent to which the Statement will be incorporated into the practices of ASEAN; the extent to which UNESCO will take it into account whenever peace-building, peace-keeping, reconstruction or reconciliation are addressed. If these do not become a part of the practice of Member States, if they do not become a part of their national legislation, then once again the number of fine but useless documents in our archives will be increased. For this reason, I consider the acclamation by the members of

*You have been  
successful  
because you have  
dealt with the  
realities of the  
region.*

*... you have  
emphasized to  
what point peace  
and security,  
democracy and  
development, are  
interdependent.*

*This Statement,  
which you have  
just adopted by  
acclamation, will  
become, I hope,  
the cornerstone  
of UNESCO's and  
ASEAN's common  
effort to promote  
peace and  
development in  
the region.*

*We must move forward from today onwards, and this is why I have decided to give UNESCO support to a series of projects in the fields of higher education and peace which will contribute to the networking between ASEAN and its Member States.*

*From Jakarta, from Southeast Asia, I appeal to the world to abandon violence, to abandon intolerance and the imposition of force and to practise a sense of togetherness, of dialogue, in a new way of life in which all the inhabitants of the Earth can live together peacefully.*

ASEAN to be so important. It is not the number of dignitaries that makes a resolution, a statement or a declaration relevant.

Recently I attended the ECOSOC meeting at the United Nations, at the time of Rio +5, where we were considering the practical implementation of Agenda 21, of the Earth Summit. With so many heads of state signing, it was a very solemn moment, but we must regretfully conclude that until now all these agreements have not been incorporated into national legislation; they have not been incorporated (even in a very small way) into national budgets; they have not been incorporated into schools, at the different levels and centres of education. Therefore the importance of this Statement will depend on the extent to which we are all permanently aware that violence, conflict and war mean the humiliation of the most important aspects of human dignity. Concerning the Agreement, Mr Chairperson, that I have just signed with the Secretary-General of ASEAN, I again assure you that it is only our first step on the long road ahead and that we will undertake its implementation with resolve. We must move forward from today onwards, and this is why I have decided to give UNESCO support to a series of projects in the fields of higher education and peace which will contribute to the networking between ASEAN and its Member States. We have to move ahead into the new century and we must walk hand in hand, regardless of the size of different countries, the strength of their armed forces, the weight of their GNP. No country is able today to move ahead alone.

A new century, Ladies and Gentlemen, in which human dignity, culture and the moral and intellectual solidarity that is enshrined in UNESCO's Constitution will be at the very heart of all endeavours to better the condition of humanity.

I would like to conclude by wholeheartedly thanking the ASEAN Member States, all the participants at this meeting, the ASEAN Secretariat, – which has been so efficient in contributing to the preparation of the symposium – the Indonesian National Commission for UNESCO which has worked very hard and provided so many facilities, and the Indonesian authorities who by their presence and intellectual contribution have enhanced the work of this symposium. I would like to thank very particularly the Minister for Foreign Affairs of Indonesia and of course His Excellency the President of the Republic of Indonesia who yesterday honoured the official opening.

From Jakarta, from Southeast Asia, I appeal to the world to abandon violence, to abandon intolerance and the imposition of force and to practise a sense of togetherness, of dialogue, in a new way of life in which all the inhabitants of the Earth can live together peacefully. As you have pointed out in your Statement: peace is a behaviour. Let us offer to our children and their children the example of our conviction and resolve. Let us forge in them from the very beginning a spirit of tolerance and peace.

Thank you for your attention.

## CLOSING SPEECH

*by H.E. Mr Rodolfo C. Severino Jr.,  
Secretary-General of ASEAN*

Your Excellency, Mr Makagiansar,  
Vice-Chairperson of the Executive Board  
of UNESCO,  
Your Excellency, Mr Federico Mayor,  
Director-General of UNESCO,  
Distinguished participants,  
Ladies and Gentlemen,

In the past two days you have worked very hard to define and prescribe courses of action for the advancement of the culture of peace, of cooperative peace in Southeast Asia. Intellectual sparks flew, ideas were exchanged, concepts were illuminated and this is very important because, as UNESCO's Constitution emphasizes and as has been repeatedly invoked in the past two days, the defences of peace are built in the minds of men and women. But you have done more than this, although this is important enough. You have also prescribed action and concrete measures for governments and parliaments, non-governmental organizations, religious institutions, families and individual human beings to move forward the aspiration of all humanity, specifically the people of Southeast Asia, for enduring peace in this region and in the world. So for this I would like to thank all the participants who have energetically contributed to the outcome of this symposium. I thank UNESCO and the ASEAN Member States for their support for this concept and for holding this symposium. I thank the

personnel of UNESCO and the ASEAN Secretariat and the Indonesian National Commission for UNESCO for making this symposium possible and of course I thank His Excellency Federico Mayor for the inspiring guidance that he has provided to all of us, for his intellectual contribution to the proceedings, and indeed for his presence, which was an inspiring element in itself. I would also like to thank His Excellency President Habibie and His Excellency Ali Alatas for giving their time to share their ideas with us, ideas which surely helped to guide our proceedings in the right direction.

If we remain faithful to the agreement that Dr Mayor and I have just signed, together with the Statement on Peace in Southeast Asia on the Eve of the Third Millennium and, more importantly, if we act on them and encourage all those concerned to act on them, we will ensure that the hopes and aspirations that we have expressed during these past two days and the work that we have done will continue and will benefit future generations in Southeast Asia. With this in mind I am quite sure that, as I have said, if we give substance and action to these documents, future generations will look back on this symposium as a real contribution to the peace and development that we hope they will enjoy on an enduring basis for generations to come.

Thank you very much.

*... we will ensure  
that the hopes  
and aspirations  
that we have  
expressed during  
these past two  
days and the  
work that we  
have done will  
continue and  
will benefit future  
generations in  
Southeast Asia.*

## CLOSING SPEECH

*by H.E. Mr Makaminan Makagiansar,  
Vice-Chairperson of the Executive Board of UNESCO*

Your Excellency, Mr Federico Mayor,  
Director-General of UNESCO,  
Your Excellency, Mr Rodolfo C. Severino Jr.,  
Secretary-General of ASEAN,  
Distinguished participants,  
Ladies and Gentlemen,

We have now come to the end of our two-day journey of scientific thinking, reflection and sharing of experiences and aspirations which have culminated in the adoption of the Statement on Peace. This afternoon we also witnessed the solemn signing of the Agreement of Cooperation between ASEAN and UNESCO which, I venture to say, will stand in the years to come, when we embark on the new era of the twenty-first century, as a monumental reminder and reference for all of us, in our personal life and in the ethical code of inter-state behaviour. We should not be surprised that the world of tomorrow will be totally different from that of today, a period of human history where the succession of events will proceed at an ever-accelerating rate. It is said that the only certainty in human history is its very uncertainty. Facing a future filled with incalculable uncertainties, fundamental changes and invariably involuntary mutations of the fabric which make up human society, it behoves us not only to think big but it compels humanity, while recognizing the paradoxes of human creation and of its often unintended consequences, to change our present-day mindset. History is nonlinear and, therefore, the human species must think in nonlinear terms, in order to survive. If we fail to see and anticipate the changing paradigm of human life and global happenings, there is no possibility of nurturing, not to speak of possessing, a mindset which enables humankind to cope with the today and

the tomorrow with confidence and hope. And yet, that is not enough, for what distinguishes the human species from the animal kingdom is that we are blessed with that beautiful gift of the faculty of wisdom. Unfortunately, much of the potentiality of wisdom somehow has been left untouched in the course of human development. Rationality, human feelings and emotions are unquestionably of supreme importance in the life of each of us. However, such exquisitely wonderful faculties are of no avail if they are not immersed in wisdom. It reminds me of an important poem by T. S. Eliot which I paraphrase from memory: 'Where is the information that we find in the deluge of data, where is the knowledge that we find in plentiful information, and where is the wisdom that we find the richness of knowledge?' And true wisdom is ethics par excellence. It is therefore timely, before it becomes too late, before traumatic disasters are visited upon us, before the total annihilation of our living world comes to pass, that wisdom and ethics permeate the entire texture and spectrum of our personal life, of our societies and of the international community of nations and states. We are as Fritjof Capra, a distinguished scholar, reminds us, each one and all of us a part of the Web of life. What we do to our Web, to our neighbours, friends, nation and to humankind, is tantamount to what we do to ourselves.

This vision and sense of interconnectedness, interdependency and wholeness between all members of human society and with nature at large, constitute a vital ingredient which makes possible the creating and nurturing of our common goal, the culture of peace. Let me end by reading a poem which in beautiful language conveys to us this important reminder. Will you permit me, Mr Federico Mayor, to con-

*If we fail to see  
and anticipate  
the changing  
paradigm of  
human life and  
global  
happenings, there  
is no possibility  
of nurturing, not  
to speak of  
possessing, a  
mindset which  
enables  
humankind to  
cope with the  
today and the  
tomorrow with  
confidence and  
hope.*

*This vision and  
sense of inter-  
connectedness,  
interdependency  
and wholeness  
between all  
members of  
human society  
and with nature  
at large,  
constitute a vital  
ingredient which  
makes possible  
the creating and  
nurturing of our  
common goal,  
the culture of  
peace.*

clude with your own poem, a poem that gives me personally, and I am sure all of us, not only hope, but reinforces our determination to render our very best to transform the whole of human society and nature into a place where all our children, grandchildren and future generations will feel 'at home' in the purest sense of the word:

*When they ask me  
What is my background  
I shall say I come from  
the whole universe  
From this unceasing flow  
from this weft of clustered threads  
From this weave of mixtures  
great, fertile and passing  
I flow towards darkness  
or towards wholeness?  
My freedom is here:  
this is the one consolation.*

Thank you very much.

## APPENDICES

## LIST OF APPENDICES

### **Appendix I**

List of participants

### **Appendix II**

Agreement of Cooperation between the Association of Southeast Asian Nations (ASEAN)  
and the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO)

### **Appendix III**

Bio-sketches of the principal speakers

### **Appendix IV**

Inventory of Asia-Pacific dialogue channels

### **Appendix V**

How to achieve sustainable peace

### **Appendix VI**

ASEAN in the twenty-first century:  
ASEAN youth development in the next millennium

### **Appendix VII**

ASEAN VISION 2020

### **Appendix VIII**

Hanoi Declaration

### **Appendix IX**

Preamble and Article 1 of the Constitution  
of the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization

### **Appendix X**

Resolutions concerning the Culture of Peace  
and the International Year for the Culture of Peace

### **Appendix XI**

Other UNESCO publications of interest

### **Appendix XII**

Web sites of interest

### **Appendix XIII**

Agenda of UNESCO's activities  
concerning the promotion of a new approach to security 1994–1999

### **Appendix XIV**

Information document on the International Year for the Culture of Peace  
disseminated by UNESCO in 1998

# APPENDIX I

## LIST OF PARTICIPANTS

**H.E. Mr Federico Mayor**

Director-General  
UNESCO

**H.E. Mr Rodolfo C. Severino Jr.**

Secretary-General  
ASEAN Secretariat

**H.E. Mr Ali Alatas**

Minister for Foreign Affairs of the Republic of Indonesia

### CHAIRPERSONS

**Mr Tozammel Huq**

Senior Special Adviser to the Director-General of UNESCO

**Hon. General (R) Bernard Norlain**

Former Director of the Institute for Advanced Studies on National Defence of France

**H.E. Mr Makaminan Makagiansar**

Vice-Chairperson of the Executive Board of UNESCO

**Mr Mohamed Sahnoun**

Special Adviser to the Director-General of UNESCO

### RAPORTEURS and CO-RAPORTEURS

**Mr S. Pushpanathan**

ASEAN Secretariat

**Mr Termsak Chalermphanupap**

ASEAN Secretariat

**Mr M. C. Abad Jr.**

ASEAN Secretariat

**Mr René Zapata**

UNESCO Secretariat

———— INVITED PARTICIPANTS ————

**BRUNEI**

**Mr Hj Emran Bahar**

Deputy Director  
Department of Policy Planning  
Ministry of Foreign Affairs  
Bandar Seri Begawan 1120 Negara  
Brunei Darussalam  
Brunei  
Tel: (673 2) 26 11 77  
Fax: (672 2) 26 17 03

**Mr Krtini Pg Hj Tahir**

Research Officer  
Department of International Organization  
Ministry of Foreign Affairs  
Bandar Seri Begawan 1120 Negara  
Brunei Darussalam  
Brunei  
Tel: (673 2) 24 11 77  
Fax: (673 2) 26 17 03

**CAMBODIA**

**Mr Chuch Phoeuan**

Under-Secretary-General  
Cambodian National Commission for  
UNESCO  
# 74 Prah Sihanouk Avenue, Sangkat  
Bengkengkang II, Camkarmon  
Phnom Penh  
Cambodia  
Tel: (855 23) 21 03 69  
Fax: (855 23) 21 03 69

**Mr Chem Widhya**

Permanent Secretary  
Ministry of Foreign Affairs and  
International Cooperation  
Sisowath Quay  
Phnom Penh  
Cambodia  
Tel: (855 23) 21 61 34  
Fax: (855 23) 21 61 3

**Mr Sry Thamarong**

Counsellor  
Royal Embassy of Cambodia  
Panin Bank Plaza, 4th Floor  
Jl Palmerha Utara No. 52  
Jakarta 11480  
Indonesia  
Tel: (62 21) 548 36 43  
Fax: (62 21) 548 36 84

**FRANCE**

**Hon. General (R) Bernard Norlain**

Director  
Bernard Norlain Conseil  
90, rue de Grenelle  
75007 Paris  
France  
Tel: (33 1) 45 49 34 99  
Fax: (33 1) 40 88 28 39  
E-mail: bnorlain@deloitte.fr

**INDONESIA**

**Mr Kuswanto Anggoro**

Representative  
Centre for Strategic and International  
Studies  
Jl Tanah Abang III, 23-27  
Jakarta 10160  
Indonesia  
Tel: (62 21) 386 55 32  
Fax: (62 21) 380 96 41  
E-mail: kushanggoro@hotmail.com

**Ms Yuli Mumpuni**

Representative  
Department of Foreign Affairs  
Jl Taman Pejambon No. 6  
Jakarta  
Indonesia  
Tel: (62 21) 723 35 66  
Fax: (62 21) 723 35 66

**Mr W. P. Napitupulu**

Executive Chairman  
Indonesian National Commission for  
UNESCO  
Ministry of Education and Culture  
Gedung C 1t 7, Jl Jend Sudirman Senayan  
Jakarta 10270  
Indonesia  
Tel: (62 21) 573 31 27  
Fax: (62 21) 573 31 27

**Ms Diena Trigg**

Treasurer  
Society for Inter Faith Dialogue (MADIA)  
Jl Rawa Bambu 14C pasar Minggu  
Jakarta 12520  
Indonesia  
Tel: (62 21) 781 49 91  
Fax: (62 21) 781 75 20  
E-mail: bdynamix@indo.net.id

**Ms Dindin Wahyudin**

Department of Foreign Affairs  
Staff  
Dit ASPAS  
Jl Taman Pejambon No. 6  
Jakarta  
Indonesia  
Tel: (62 21) 344 15 08

**Mr Hadi Wayarabi**

Director  
Asia Pacific Department  
of Foreign Affairs  
Jl Taman Pejambon No. 6  
Jakarta  
Indonesia  
Tel: (67 21) 723 35 66  
Fax: (62 21) 723 35 66

**LAO PEOPLE'S  
DEMOCRATIC REPUBLIC****Mr Khamtanh Chantala**

Vice-President  
Lao National Commission for UNESCO  
Ministry of Education  
BP-67 Vientiane  
Lao PDR  
Tel: (856 21) 2160 04  
Fax: (856 21) 21 21 08

**Mr Asoka Rasphone**

Officer  
ASEAN Department  
Ministry of Foreign Affairs  
Vientiane  
Lao PDR  
Tel: (856 21) 41 51 09  
(856 21) 41 32 68  
Fax: (856 21) 41 32 68  
(856 21) 41 23 95  
E-mail: mofa@pan-laos.net.la

**Mr Chaleune Warintrasak**

Director-General  
Institute of Foreign Affairs  
Ministry of Foreign Affairs  
Vientiane  
Lao PDR  
Tel: (856 21) 41 51 09  
Fax: (856 21) 41 32 68  
E-mail: mofa@pan-laos.net.la

**MALAYSIA****Mr Sobri Bin Ahmad**

Senior Programme Manager  
Council for ASEAN Youth Cooperation  
S1 International Youth Centre,  
Jalan Tenteram  
Bandar Tun Razac, Cheras  
56000 Kuala Lumpur  
Malaysia  
Tel: (60 3) 971 73 73  
Fax: (60 3) 971 67 00

**Mr Dato Mohamed Jawhar Hassan**

Director-General  
ISIS and CSCAP Secretariat  
Institute Kajian Strategik dan Antarbangsa  
(ISIS Malaysia)  
3880 Kg Sg Penchala  
60000 Kuala Lumpur  
Malaysia  
Tel: (60 3) 293 79 37  
Fax: (60 3) 291 54 35  
E-mail: jawhar@isis-po.my

**Ms Nazirah Hussain**

Principal Assistant Secretary  
Ministry of Foreign Affairs  
Wisma Putra Kementrian Luar Negeri  
Malaysia  
50602 Kuala Lumpur  
Malaysia  
Tel: (60 3) 247 43 03  
Fax: (60 3) 242 45 51  
E-mail: nazirah@kln.gov.my

**Mr Tengku Hussin Syed Md Hasrin**

Assistant Secretary  
Ministry of Foreign Affairs  
Wisma Putra Kementrian Luar Negeri  
Malaysia  
50602 Kuala Lumpur  
Malaysia  
Tel: (60 3) 248 80 88  
Fax: (60 3) 242 45 51  
E-mail: smhasrin@min.gov.my

**Mr James Wong Ka Min**

Director of Ethnic Relations Division  
Department of National Unity  
Ministry of National Unity  
and Social Development  
7th and 19th Floor  
Wisma Bumi Raya, Jalan Raja Laut  
50517 Kuala Lumpur  
Malaysia  
Tel: (60 3) 293 04 00  
Fax: (60 3) 293 91 61  
E-mail: webteam@kempadu.gov.my

## **MYANMAR**

### **Mr Han Tin**

Secretary-General  
Myanmar National Commission for  
UNESCO  
Ministry of Education  
2HD Pyi-Thij Lan Mayangon  
Yangon  
Myanmar  
Tel: (95 1) 514 77  
Fax: (95 1) 28 54 80

## **PHILIPPINES**

### **Hon. General José T. Almonte**

Representative  
National Security Council  
V Luna Road Corner East Avenue  
Quezon City  
The Philippines  
Tel: (63 2) 824 27 76  
Fax: (63 2) 824 73 30

### **Ms Carolina Galicia Hernandez**

President  
Institute for Strategic and International  
Studies  
Department of Political Science  
CSCAP The Philippines Social Science Center  
Room 311  
Commonwealth Avenue, Diliman  
Quezon City 1101  
The Philippines  
Tel: (63 2) 929 08 99  
Fax: (63 2) 929 08 90  
E-mail: cgh@cni.net

### **Ms Juanito Jarasa**

Assistant Secretary  
Asian and Pacific Affairs  
Ground Floor  
Department of Foreign Affairs Bldg  
2330 Roxas Boulevard  
Passay City  
The Philippines  
Tel: (63 2) 834 40 00  
Fax: (63 2) 831 88 73  
E-mail: unescoph@mozcom2.mozcom.com

### **Ms Rosario G. Manalo**

Under-secretary  
Department of Foreign Affairs  
UNESCO National Commission of the  
Philippines  
Ground Floor  
Department of Foreign Affairs Bldg  
2330 Roxas Boulevard  
Passay City  
The Philippines

Tel: (63 2) 834 40 00  
Fax: (63 2) 831 88 73  
E-mail: unescoph@mozcom2.mozcom.com

### **Mr Alfredo Tadiar**

Chairman  
National Amnesty Commission  
4th Floor Golden Bldg  
No. 29 Mindanao Avenue  
Quezon City  
The Philippines  
Tel: (63 2) 924 97 07  
Fax: (63 2) 924 83 08

## **SINGAPORE**

### **Mr Low Pit Chen**

First Secretary  
Singapore Embassy  
Blok X/4 Kav No. 2, Jl HR Rasuna Said  
Kuningan  
Jakarta 12950  
Indonesia  
Tel: (62 21) 520 14 89  
Fax: (62 21) 520 14 86  
E-mail: denpasar@pacific.net.id

### **Mr Tan Wei Yuan William**

Foreign Service Officer  
Ministry of Foreign Affairs  
250 North Bridge Road  
07-00 Raffles City Tower  
Singapore 179101  
Tel: (65 3) 30 57 09  
Fax: (65 3) 30 58 30  
E-mail: william-tan@mfa.gov.sg

### **Mr Khong Yuen Foong**

Deputy Director  
Institute of Defence and Strategic Studies  
Nanyang Technological University  
South Spine 1 level B-1  
Nanyang Avenue  
Singapore  
Tel: (65 7) 99 69 07  
Fax: (65 7) 93 29 91  
E-mail: isyfkhong@ntu.edu.sg

## **THAILAND**

### **Mr Nopadol Gunavibool**

Director  
East Asian Division 1  
Department of East Asian Affairs  
Ministry of Foreign Affairs  
No. 1, Sanannchai Road  
Bangkok 10200  
Thailand  
Tel: (62 22) 21 28 21  
Fax: (66 22) 21 10 46  
E-mail: nopadolg@mfa.go.th

**Mr Jesda Katavetin**

First Secretary  
 Ministry of Foreign Affairs  
 Phaholyothin Place, Phaholyothin Road  
 Bangkok  
 Thailand  
 Tel: (66 2) 619 00 53 / 58  
 Fax: (66 2) 619 005 37 58  
 E-mail: div0803@mfa.go.th

Bangkok 10330  
 Thailand  
 Tel: (66 2) 218 73 21  
 Fax: (66 2) 948 08 68  
 E-mail: tpraneel@netserv.chula.ac.th

**Ms Sathitya Lengthaisong**

UNESCO National Commission Member  
 Director, Human Rights and Peace  
 Education Center  
 Sukhothai Tharumathirat Open University  
 Ministry of Education  
 Rajdamneon Avenue  
 Bangkok 10300  
 Thailand  
 Tel: (66 2) 589 99 61  
 Fax: (66 2) 281 09 53

**VIET NAM****Ms Le Kim Hong**

Specialist  
 Ministry of Foreign Affairs of Viet Nam  
 No. 1 Ton That Dam Street  
 Hanoi  
 Viet Nam  
 Tel: (84 41) 993 60 21  
 Fax: (84 41) 823 07 03  
 E-mail: unescovn@netnam.vn

**Ms Savitri Suwansathit**

Secretary-General  
 Thai National Commission for UNESCO  
 Ministry of Education  
 Roatohadamnoen-Nok Avenue  
 Bangkok 10300  
 Thailand  
 Tel: (66 2) 282 28 66  
 Fax: (66 2) 281 09 53

**Mr Ho Ton Trinh**

Representative  
 Vietnamese National Commission for  
 UNESCO  
 8 Khuc Street  
 Hanoi  
 Viet Nam  
 Tel: (84 41) 852 44 75  
 Fax: (84 41) 823 07 02  
 E-mail: unescovn@netnam.vn

**Mr Pranee Thipparat**

Member of Executive Board  
 ISIS American Studies and  
 Canadian Studies Program  
 Faculty of Political Science  
 Chulalongkorn University  
 Prachuabmoh Bldg,  
 5th Floor

**Mr Nguyen Van Tho**

Deputy Director  
 Policy Planning Department  
 Ministry of Foreign Affairs of Viet Nam  
 No. 1 Ton That Dam Street  
 Hanoi  
 Viet Nam  
 Tel: (84 41) 199 22 25  
 Fax: (84 41) 823 07 02  
 E-mail: unescovn@netnam.vn

———— INVITED OBSERVERS ————

**CANADA****Mr René Cresmonese**

Head  
 Political Economic Section  
 Canadian Embassy  
 Wisma Metropolitan I, 5th Floor  
 Jl Jend, Sudirman Kav 29  
 PO Box 8324/JCS-MP  
 Jakarta 12084  
 Indonesia  
 Tel: (62 21) 525 07 09  
 Fax: (62 21) 571 22 51  
 E-mail: rene.cresmonese@jkrta01.x400.gc.ca

**CHINA****Mr Chunlai Shi**

Secretary-General  
 China National Committee of CSCAP  
 Center for International Studies  
 22 Xi An Men Da Jic, PO Box 1744  
 Beijing 100017  
 China  
 Tel: (86 10) 63 09 07 83  
 Fax: (86 10) 63 09 58 02  
 E-mail: ccis@mx.cei.gov.cn

**Mr An Gang**

Attaché  
 Chinese Embassy  
 Jl Mega Kuningan Barat No. 2  
 Jakarta  
 Indonesia  
 Tel: (62 21) 576 10 22  
 Fax: (62 21) 576 10 34  
 E-mail: steelan@hotmail.com

**Mr He Wei**

Third Secretary  
 Ministry of Foreign Affairs of China  
 22 Xi An Men Da Jie  
 Beijing 100017  
 China  
 Tel: (86 10) 659 21 89  
 Fax: (86 10) 659 21 81  
 E-mail: ccis@mx.cei.gov.c

**INDIA****Mr Chakradhari Agrawal**

Secretary-General  
 WASME  
 27 Saraswati House, Nehru Place  
 New Delhi 110019  
 India  
 Tel: (91 11) 641 14 17  
 Fax: (91 11) 685 21 70  
 E-mail: cda.wasme@gems.vsnl.net.in

**INDONESIA****Ms Anna Tjoet**

Representative  
 Buletin Himahi Airs  
 Jl Sinabung II, No. 8  
 Jakarta  
 Indonesia  
 Tel: (62 21) 739 21 84  
 Fax: (62 21) 722 27 55  
 E-mail: tjoet@usa.net

**Ms Carol Carp**

Country Director  
 Project Concern International  
 Jl Ciasem I No. 32, Kebayoran Baru  
 Jakarta Selatan  
 Indonesia  
 Tel: (62 21) 739 42 67  
 Fax: (62 21) 722 97 31  
 E-mail: pcijkt@rad.net.id

**Ms Helen M. Quirin**

Director  
 Brahma Kumaris World Spiritual University  
 Jl Cibulan III No. 15 Kebayoran Baru  
 Jakarta  
 Indonesia  
 Fax: (62 21) 72 01 90  
 E-mail: brahma@indo.net.id

**Ms Amanda D. Suharnoko**

Chairperson  
 Society for Inter Faith Dialogue (MADIA)  
 Jl Imam Bonjol 39  
 Jakarta  
 Indonesia  
 Tel: (62 21) 33 15 84  
 Fax: (62 21) 32 74 78  
 E-mail: bdynamix@indo.net.id

**Mr Alex H. Sumarauw**

Capacity Building Specialist  
 Project Concern International  
 Jl Ciasem I No. 32 Kebayoran Baru  
 Jakarta  
 Indonesia  
 Tel: (62 21) 722 97 31  
 Fax: (62 21) 722 97 31  
 E-mail: pcijkt@rad.net.id

**Mr Palupi Widjajanti**

Capacity Strengthening Specialist  
 Project Concern International  
 Jl Ciasem I No. 32 Kebayoran Baru  
 Jakarta  
 Indonesia  
 Tel: (62 21) 739 42 67  
 Fax: (62 21) 722 97 31  
 E-mail: pcijkt@rad.net.id

**JAPAN****Mr Suzuki Ben**

Deputy Director  
 Japan Cultural Center  
 Jakarta-Japan Foundation  
 Third Floor Sumitmas I, Jl Jend Sudirman  
 Jakarta  
 Indonesia  
 Tel: (61 21) 520 12 66  
 Fax: (61 21) 525 51 59  
 E-mail: ben-suzuki@jpt.or.id

**THAILAND****Mr Noranit Setabutr**

Thammsat University  
 Bangkok 10200  
 Thailand  
 Tel: (66 2) 623 51 62  
 Fax: (66 2) 623 51 62

**Ms Singhadechakul Chadarat**

Chief  
International Cooperation Development  
Ministry of University Affairs  
3-8 S1 Ayutthaya Road  
Bangkok 10400  
Thailand  
Tel: (66 2) 644 59 13  
Fax: (66 2) 246 40 30  
E-mail: cahada@mva.go.th

**Mr Supachai Yavaprabhas**

Executive Director  
ASEAN University Network  
Ministry of University Affairs Building  
10th Floor  
S1 Ayutthaya Road  
Bangkok 10400  
Thailand  
Tel: (66 2) 213 28 89  
Fax: (66 2) 215 74 35  
E-mail: supachai@pioneer.netserv.chula.ac.th

————— ASEAN SECRETARIAT AND UNESCO PARTICIPANTS —————

**ASEAN****Mr Robert I. Inkiriwang**

Deputy Secretary-General  
ASEAN Secretariat  
Jl Sisingamangaraja No. 70 A  
Jakarta  
Indonesia  
Tel: (62 21) 726 29 91  
Fax: (62 21) 739 82 34

**Mr M. C. Abad Jr.**

Special Assistant to the Secretary-General  
ASEAN Secretariat  
Jl Sisingamangaraja No. 70 A  
Jakarta  
Indonesia  
Tel: (62 21) 726 29 91  
Fax: (62 21) 739 82 24  
E-mail: mcabad@asean.or.id

**Mr Termsak Chalermpanupap**

Assistant Director for External Relations  
ASEAN Secretariat  
Jl Sisingamangaraja No. 70 A  
Jakarta  
Indonesia  
Tel: (62 21) 726 29 91  
Fax: (62 21) 739 82 34

**Mr S. Pushpanathan**

Assistant Director for External Relations  
ASEAN Secretariat  
Jl Sisingamangaraja No. 70 A  
Jakarta  
Indonesia  
Tel: (62 21) 726 29 99  
Fax: (62 21) 739 82 34

**Ms Linda Posados**

Assistant Director  
ASEAN Secretariat  
Jl Sisingamangaraja No. 70 A  
Jakarta  
Indonesia  
Tel: (62 21) 726 29 91  
Fax: (62 21) 739 82 34

**Mr Azmi Mat Akhir**

Assistant Director  
Economic Cooperation  
ASEAN Secretariat  
Jl Sisingamangaraja No. 70 A  
Jakarta  
Indonesia  
Tel: (62 21) 726 29 91  
Fax: (62 21) 739 82 34  
E-mail: azmi@asean.or.id

**Mr Jerry Reyes**

Programme Coordinator  
Culture and Information  
ASEAN Secretariat  
Jl Sisingamangaraja No. 70 A  
Jakarta  
Indonesia  
Tel: (62 21) 726 29 91  
Fax: (62 21) 739 82 34

**Mr Apichai Sunchindah**

Assistant Director  
ASEAN Secretariat  
Jl Sisingamangaraja No. 70 A  
Jakarta  
Indonesia  
Tel: (62 21) 726 29 91  
Fax: (62 21) 739 82 34

**Mr Dhanhan Sunoto**

Director  
Cooperation and External Relations  
ASEAN Secretariat  
Jl Sisingamangaraja No. 70 A  
Jakarta  
Indonesia  
Tel: (62 21) 726 29 91 ext 337  
Fax: (62 21) 739 82 34

**Mr Moe Thular**

Senior Officer  
ASEAN Secretariat  
Jl Sisingamangaraja No. 70 A  
Jakarta  
Indonesia  
Tel: (62 21) 726 29 91  
Fax: (62 21) 724 35 05  
E-mail: moe@asean.or.id

**Ms Anaisabel Prera Flores**

Senior Special Adviser to the  
Director-General  
UNESCO  
7, Place de Fontenoy  
75352 Paris 07 SP  
France  
Tel: (33 1) 45 68 13 93  
Fax: (33 1) 45 68 55 62  
E-mail: a.prera-flores@unesco.org

**Mr Mohamed Sahnoun**

Special Adviser to the Director-General  
UNESCO  
7, Place de Fontenoy  
75352 Paris 07 SP  
France  
Tel: (33 1) 45 68 13 52  
Fax: (33 1) 45 68 55 62  
E-mail: m.sahnoun@unesco.org

## UNESCO

**(a) Special Advisers  
to the Director-General****Ms Moufida Goucha**

Senior Special Adviser to the  
Director-General  
UNESCO  
7, Place de Fontenoy  
75325 Paris 07 SP  
France  
Tel: (33 1) 45 68 13 94  
Fax: (33 1) 45 68 55 55  
E-mail: m.goucha@unesco.org

**Mr Tozammel Huq**

Senior Special Adviser to the  
Director-General  
UNESCO  
7, Place de Fontenoy  
75325 Paris 07 SP  
France  
Tel: (33 1) 45 68 20 77  
Fax: (33 1) 45 68 55 55  
E-mail: t.huq@unesco.org

**Mr Vladimir Lomeiko**

Special Adviser to the Director-General  
Sector of Social and Human Sciences  
UNESCO  
7, Place de Fontenoy  
75325 Paris 07 SP  
France  
Tel: (33 1) 45 68 42 85  
Fax: (33 1) 45 68 55 55  
E-mail: v.lomeiko@unesco.org

**(b) UNESCO Field Offices****Mr Stephen Hill**

Director and Representative  
UNESCO Jakarta Office  
Jl MH Thamrin No. 14  
Jakarta  
Indonesia  
Tel: (62 2) 314 00 66  
(62 2) 314 03 81  
Fax: (62 2) 315 03 82  
E-mail: s.hill@unesco.org

**Mr Antony Victor Ordoñez**

Director  
UNESCO Bangkok Office  
920 Sukhumvit Road, Box 967  
Prangkanong Post Office  
Bangkok 10110  
Thailand  
Tel: (66 2) 391 08 97  
Fax: (66 2) 391 08 66

**Mr James Bentley**

Head  
UNESCO Kuala Lumpur Office  
Pejabat Damansara  
Jl Dungun Damansara Heights  
PO Box 12544  
50782 Kuala Lumpur  
Malaysia  
Tel: (60 3) 255 91 22  
Fax: (60 3) 253 47 91

**Mr Yasuyuki Aoshima**

Senior Programme Specialist in Science,  
Technology and Informatics  
UNESCO Jakarta Office  
Jl MH Thamrin No. 14  
Jakarta  
Indonesia  
Tel: (62 2) 314 00 66  
(62 2) 314 03 82 ext 802  
Fax: (62 2) 315 03 82  
E-mail: y.aoshima@unesco.org

**Ms Minella Alarcon**

Programme Specialist  
UNESCO Jakarta Office  
Jl MH Thamrin No. 14  
Jakarta  
Indonesia  
Tel: (62 2) 314 03 82  
Fax: (62 2) 315 03 82  
E-mail: m.alarcon@unesco.org

**Mr Han Qun Li**

Programme Specialist  
UNESCO Jakarta Office  
Jl MH Thamrin No. 14  
Jakarta  
Indonesia  
Tel: (62 2) 314 03 82  
Fax: (62 2) 315 03 82  
E-mail: q.han@unesco.org

**Ms Ayako Inagaki**

Programme Specialist  
UNESCO Jakarta Office  
Jl MH Thamrin No. 14  
Jakarta  
Indonesia  
Tel: (62 2) 314 00 66  
(62 2) 314 03 82  
Fax: (62 2) 315 03 82  
E-mail: uhina@unesco.org

**(c) UNESCO Secretariat****Mr Leslie Atherley**

Director  
Culture of Peace Programme  
UNESCO  
7, Place de Fontenoy  
75325 Paris 07 SP  
France  
Tel: (33 1) 45 68 08 81  
Fax: (33 1) 45 68 55 55  
E-mail: l.atherley@unesco.org

**Ms Isabelle de Billy**

Programme Specialist  
Culture of Peace Programme  
UNESCO  
7, Place de Fontenoy  
75325 Paris 07 SP  
France  
Tel: (33 1) 45 68 13 52  
Fax: (33 1) 45 68 55 62  
E-mail: i.de-billy@unesco.org

**Mr Sadaïchiro Okajima**

Director  
Asia and Pacific Section  
Bureau for External Relations  
UNESCO  
7, Place de Fontenoy  
75325 Paris 07 SP  
France  
Tel: (33 1) 45 68 17 68  
Fax: (33 1) 45 68 55 55  
E-mail: s.okajima@unesco.org

**Mr Mario Zamorano**

Information and Communication Officer  
for the Director-General  
UNESCO  
7, Place de Fontenoy  
75352 Paris 07 SP  
France  
Tel: (33 1) 45 68 17 91  
Fax: (33 1) 45 68 85 55  
E-mail: m.zamorano@unesco.org

**Mr René Zapata**

Senior Programme Planning Specialist,  
Focal Point for Peace and Security Affairs  
UNESCO  
7, Place de Fontenoy  
75325 Paris 07 SP  
France  
Tel: (33 1) 45 68 12 77  
Fax: (33 1) 45 68 55 55  
E-mail: r.zapata@unesco.org

**UNITED NATIONS****Mr D. Ahmed Iftikhar**

Director  
International Labour Organisation  
UN Building, Jl MH Thamrin No. 14  
PO Box 1075  
Jakarta 10010  
Indonesia  
Tel: (62 21) 314 13 08  
Fax: (62 21) 310 07 66  
E-mail: jakarta@ilojkt.or.id

**Mr Martin Aleida**

Officer in Charge  
 UN Information Center  
 Gedung Dewan Pers, 5th Floor  
 Jakarta  
 Indonesia  
 Tel: (62 21) 380 02 92  
 Fax: (62 21) 380 02 74  
 E-mail: unijak@rad.net.id

**Mr Eric Anton**

World Health Organization  
 Jl Thamrin No. 14  
 Jakarta  
 Indonesia  
 Tel: (62 21) 390 77 27  
 Fax: (62 21) 323 827  
 E-mail: anton@who.or.id

**Mr Syed Asif Hasnain**

Representative  
 UN Industrial Development Organization  
 UN Bldg, Jl MH Thamrin No. 14  
 PO Box 2338  
 Jakarta 10001  
 Indonesia  
 Tel: (62 21) 314 86 89  
 Fax: (62 21) 390 71 26

**Mr Stephen Woodhouse**

Area Representative for Indonesia and  
 Malaysia  
 UNICEF  
 Wisma Metropolitan J1, 10th-11th Floor  
 PO Box 838/JKSMP  
 Jakarta 12083  
 Indonesia  
 kav 31 Ji Jend Sudirman Jakarta 12920  
 Tel: (62 21) 570 58 16  
 Fax: (62 21) 571 13 26  
 E-mail: sjwhouse@rad.net.id

————— OTHER GUESTS —————

**EMBASSIES****AUSTRALIA****Mr Leslie Rowe**

Chargé d'Affaires  
 Australian Embassy  
 Jl HR Rasuna Said Kav C 15-16  
 Jakarta Selatan 12940  
 Indonesia  
 Tel: (62 21) 522 71 11  
 Fax: (62 21) 522 71 01

**CHILE****Mr Hernan Tassara**

Ambassador  
 Embassy of Chile  
 Jl HR Rasuna Said Kav 10  
 Bina Mulia Bldg  
 7th Floor  
 Kuningan  
 Jakarta  
 Indonesia  
 Tel: (62 21) 520 11 31  
 Fax: (62 21) 520 19 55

**CHINA****Mr Fu Ying**

Diplomat Observer  
 Chinese Embassy  
 Jl Mega Kuningan No. 2  
 Jakarta  
 Indonesia  
 Tel: (62 21) 576 10 22  
 Fax: (62 21) 576 10 34

**DEMOCRATIC PEOPLE'S  
REPUBLIC OF KOREA****Mr So Gik Sok**

Attaché  
 Embassy of the DPR of Korea  
 Jl HR Rasuna Said Kav X-5  
 Jakarta  
 Indonesia  
 Tel: (62 21) 521 01 81  
 Fax: (62 21) 526 00 66

**Mr Ri Kang Chol**

Counsellor  
 Embassy of the DPR of Korea  
 Jl HR Rasuna Said Kav X-5  
 Jakarta  
 Indonesia  
 Tel: (62 21) 521 01 81  
 Fax: (62 21) 526 00 66

## **FRANCE**

### **Ms Martine Vaseeur**

Second Secretary  
Embassy of France  
Jl MH Thamrin No. 20  
Jakarta Pusat  
Indonesia  
Tel: (62 21) 314 28 07  
Fax: (62 21) 314 33 88

## **INDIA**

### **Mr Rajesh Nandan Prasad**

Chargé d'Affaires  
Indian Embassy  
Jl HR Rasuna Said  
Jakarta  
Indonesia  
Tel: (62 21) 520 41 53  
Fax: (62 21) 520 41 60

## **JAPAN**

### **Mr Kensuke Tsuzuki**

Counsellor  
Embassy of Japan  
Jl MH Tamrin No. 24  
Jakarta  
Indonesia  
Tel: (62 21) 32 43 08  
Fax: (62 21) 32 54 60

## **LAO PEOPLE'S DEMOCRATIC REPUBLIC**

### **Mr Prasith Sayasith**

Chargé d'Affaires  
Embassy of the Lao PDR  
Jl Kintamani Raya C-15, No. 33, Kuningan  
Jakarta  
Indonesia  
Tel: (62 21) 522 96 02  
Fax: (62 21) 522 96 01

## **MYANMAR**

### **Mr U Nyi Nyi Than**

Ambassador  
Union of Myanmar Embassy  
Jl Agus Salim No. 109 Menteng  
Jakarta  
Indonesia  
Tel: (62 21) 314 04 40  
Fax: (62 21) 327 204

## **NETHERLANDS**

### **Ms Mariette H. Winter**

Second Secretary  
Education, Press and Culture  
Royal Netherlands Embassy  
Jl HR Rasuna Said Kav S-3 Kuningan  
Jakarta  
Indonesia  
Tel: (62 21) 524 10 46  
Fax: (62 21) 527 59 81  
E-mail: winter@jak.minbuza.nl

## **REPUBLIC OF KOREA**

### **Mr Suh Jeong in**

First Secretary  
Korean Embassy  
Jl Gatot Subroto No. 59  
Jakarta  
Indonesia  
Tel: (62 21) 520 19 15  
Fax: (62 21) 525 41 59

### **Mr Kim Woong-Nam**

Minister  
Korean Embassy  
Jl Jendral Gatot Subroto No. 57  
Jakarta  
Indonesia  
Tel: (62 21) 520 19 15  
Fax: (62 21) 525 41 59

## **SPAIN**

### **Mr Antonio Segura Moris**

Ambassador  
Embassy of Spain  
Jl Haji Agus Salim No. 61 Menteng  
Jakarta Pusat  
Indonesia  
Tel: (62 21) 33 59 37  
Fax: (62 21) 32 59 96

## **SRI LANKA**

### **Mr Witjeratne Cahm**

First Secretary  
Embassy of Sri Lanka  
Jl Diponegoro No. 20  
Jakarta Pusat  
Indonesia  
Tel: (62 21) 315 16 86  
Fax: (62 21) 310 79 62

## **THAILAND**

### **Mr Manityakul Chalit**

Minister Counsellor  
Royal Thai Embassy  
Jl Imam Bonjol No. 74  
Jakarta  
Indonesia  
Tel: (62 21) 390 44 52  
Fax: (62 21) 310 74 69

## **TUNISIA**

### **Mr Borhene El Kamel**

Counsellor  
Embassy of the Republic of Tunisia  
Wisma Dharmala Sakti, 11th Floor  
Jl Jend Sudirman No. 32  
Jakarta  
Indonesia  
Tel: (62 21) 570 42 20  
Fax: (62 21) 570 00 16  
E-mail: emltn@uninet.net.id

### **Mr Youssef Louzir**

Counsellor  
Embassy of the Republic of Tunisia  
Wisma Dharmala Sakti, 11th Floor  
Jl Jend Sudirman No. 32  
Jakarta  
Indonesia  
Tel: (62 21) 570 34 32  
Fax: (62 21) 570 00 16

## **VIET NAM**

### **Mr Nguyen Dang Quang**

Ambassador Extraordinary and  
Plenipotentiary  
Embassy of the Socialist Republic  
of Viet Nam  
Jl Teuku Umar No. 25  
Jakarta  
Indonesia  
Tel: (62 21) 310 03 58  
Fax: (62 21) 314 96 15

### **Lt.-Col. Duong Ngoc Thuc**

Deputy Defence Attaché  
Embassy of the Socialist Republic  
of Viet Nam  
Jl Teuku Umar No. 25  
Jakarta  
Indonesia  
Tel: (62 21) 310 03 59  
(62 21) 310 03 58  
Fax: (62 21) 310 03 59

## ————— PRESS —————

### **Ms Astria**

Reporter  
INDOSIAR  
Jl Damai No. 11 Daan Mogot  
Jakarta 11510  
Indonesia  
Tel: (62 21) 841 24 73  
Fax: (62 21) 565 57 33

### **Mr Tambunan Bengawanty**

Journalist  
Berita Buana  
Jl Pulo Lentut No. 12  
Kawasan Industri Pulo  
Gadung  
Jakarta  
Indonesia  
Tel: (62 21) 461 74 81  
Fax: (62 21) 460 97 22

### **Mr Pham Cong Hang**

Journalist  
Vietnam News Agency  
Jl Teuku Umar No. 25  
Jakarta  
Indonesia  
Tel: (62 21) 32 62 61  
Fax: (62 21) 230 60 12

### **Ms Dinda Damarasri**

Journalist  
Fuji News Network  
Wisma KYOEI Prince Lt 14  
Jl Jend Sudirman Kav 3  
Jakarta 10220  
Indonesia  
Tel: (62 21) 572 41 82  
Fax: (62 21) 572 41 86  
E-mail: fnnjkt@indosat.net.id

**Mr M. Adam Nasir**

Journalist  
Kompas  
Jl Palmerah Selatan No. 26-28  
Jakarta  
Indonesia  
Tel: (62 21) 530 22 00  
Fax: (62 21) 58 35 81

**Mr Ridwan**

Journalist  
Jakarta Post  
Gedung Kompas 4th Floor  
Jl Gajah Mada No. 110  
Jakarta  
Indonesia  
Tel: (62 21) 550 04 76

**Mr Rendro**

Journalist  
VOA Indonesia  
Komp. Binamarga, Jl Kangkung  
No. 07RT 012/RW011 Kebayoran Lama  
Jakarta 12220  
Indonesia  
Tel: (62 21) 726 21 87  
Fax: (62 21) 72 79 04 68

**Ms R. S. Melly**

Journalist  
Bisnis Indonesia  
Wisma Bisnis Lt 5 & 6, Jl S Parman Kav 12  
Jakarta 11480  
Indonesia  
Tel: (62 21) 530 40 16  
Fax: (62 21) 530 58 68

**Ms Dian Suita**

Journalist  
Antara  
Wisma Antara Lt 19-20  
Jl Merdeka Selatan No. 17  
Jakarta 10012  
Indonesia  
Tel: (62 21) 384 44 65  
Fax: (62 21) 386 55 77

**Ms Rien Xinaswari**

Journalist  
TVRI  
Jl Gerbang Pemuda Senayan  
Jakarta  
Indonesia  
Tel: (62 21) 570 47 40

———— OTHERS ————

**Mr Pacita Abad**

Painter  
Jl Sumbing No. 15  
Jakarta  
Indonesia  
Tel: (62 21) 829 28 95  
E-mail: pabad@ibm.net

**Mr H. M. Hatta Ahadis**

Secretary  
Director-General Regional Division  
Ministry of Home Affairs  
Jl Taman Makam Pahlawan Kalibata No. 20  
Jakarta Selatan 12750  
Indonesia  
Tel: (62 21) 794 26 32  
Fax: (62 21) 794 26 32  
E-mail: hatta@centrin.net.id

**Ms Hasnah Gazim**

Head  
Sub-Directorate of LMD  
Directorate of Education  
Jl Jend Sudirman Gedung E Lt 6 Senayan  
Jakarta  
Indonesia  
Tel: (62 21) 572 55 07  
Fax: (62 21) 819 34 79

**Mr Paulus Robert Mahulette**

Lawyer  
Lembaga Bantuan Hukum (LBH)  
Jl Diponegoro No. 7  
Jakarta  
Indonesia  
Tel: (62 21) 390 42 26  
Fax: (62 21) 391 23 77  
E-mail: ylbhi@ylbhi.org

**Mr Raïs Mochamad**

Head of Secretariat  
Indonesian National Commission for  
UNESCO  
Jl Jend Sudirman  
Jakarta  
Indonesia  
Tel: (62 21) 573 31 27  
Fax: (62 21) 573 31 27

**Mr Sukasah Ongky**

Representative  
Jakarta City Government  
Jl Merdeka Selatan 8- 9  
Jakarta  
Indonesia  
Tel: (62 21) 381 28 54

**Mr Sarwoto**

Deputy Director for Print Media  
 Ministry of Information  
 Jl Merdeka Barat 9  
 Jakarta  
 Indonesia  
 Tel: (62 21) 380 02 87  
 Fax: (62 21) 380 02 87

**Mr Sutjipto**

Rector  
 IKIP Jakarta  
 Jl Rawamangun Muka  
 Jakarta  
 Indonesia  
 Tel: (62 21) 489 07 72  
 (62 21) 489 79 27  
 E-mail: sutjipto@puskem.ikip-jkt.al.id

**Mr Soedijarto**

Director-General, Youth  
 Ministry of Education and Culture  
 Senayan  
 Jakarta  
 Indonesia  
 Tel: (62 21) 572 50 33

**Mr Tarigan Sibero**

Executive Secretary  
 AIPO  
 DPR-R1 Building Senayan  
 Jakarta  
 Indonesia  
 Tel: (62 21) 571 55 11

**Mr H. Abdullah Sukarta**

Head  
 Directorate of Islamic Institutes  
 Department of Religious Affairs  
 Jl Lap Banteng Barat 3-4 It VII km C-702  
 Jakarta  
 Indonesia  
 Tel: (62 21) 381 15 23  
 Fax: (62 21) 385 91 17

**Mr Kuraisin Sumhadi**

Vice-President  
 Indonesian Women's Congress  
 KOWANI, Jl Imam Bonjol No. 58  
 Jakarta  
 Indonesia  
 Tel: (62 21) 315 27 87  
 Fax: (62 21) 315 27 84

**Mr Soegarda Witjaksana**

Director-General  
 ASEAN Department of Foreign Affairs  
 Jl Taman Pejambon No. 6  
 Jakarta  
 Indonesia  
 Tel: (62 21) 350 90 48

**The Editorial Committee wishes  
 to apologize for any error or omission  
 which may have escaped its attention.**

———— SECRETARIAT ————

**ASEAN****Ms Asti**

Conference officer

**Mr G. Teddy**

Production

**Mr P. Tanto**

Secretariat

**Mr W. Raymond**

Secretariat

**Ms Yuvi**

Secretariat

**Ms Indriasuri**

Photographer

**Ms Sundari**

Librarian

**Ms Yullasmi**

Secretariat

**Ms Lanny**

Secretariat

**Ms Tutut**

Secretary

**UNESCO****Ms Rachida Benschila**

Secretary

**Ms Mona Pattipeilahu**

Secretary

**Mr Dias Badia-hmad**

Computer programmer

**Ms Theresia Oktariany**

Administrative assistant

## APPENDIX II

# AGREEMENT OF COOPERATION BETWEEN THE ASSOCIATION OF SOUTHEAST ASIAN NATIONS (ASEAN) AND THE UNITED NATIONS EDUCATIONAL, SCIENTIFIC AND CULTURAL ORGANIZATION (UNESCO)

The Association of Southeast Asian Nations (hereinafter referred to as ASEAN), and the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (hereinafter referred to as UNESCO),

*Considering* that the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization was created for the purpose of advancing, through the educational, scientific and cultural relations of the peoples of the world, the objective of international peace and the common welfare of mankind for which the United Nations was established and which its Charter proclaims,

*Considering* that the Association of Southeast Asian Nations has been established to promote regional peace, economic development, social progress and cultural development in the region and that these goals can be effectively advanced through cooperation and joint action with other international organizations,

Have agreed as follows:

### ARTICLE I General

1. UNESCO recognizes that ASEAN, by virtue of its character and responsibilities, plays an important role in promoting peace and international cooperation in furtherance of and in conformity with the purposes for which UNESCO was established.
2. ASEAN recognizes the responsibilities and fields of action of UNESCO under its Constitution and undertakes to continue to support the Organization's activities in accordance with the purposes and principles set out therein and the policies established by its governing body.

3. ASEAN and UNESCO agree that strengthening of cooperative relations between them will facilitate the effective exercise of their mutually complementary activities and, therefore, undertake to further relations through the adoption of the practical measures set forth in the following provisions of this Agreement.

### ARTICLE II Consultations

1. The Secretariats of ASEAN and UNESCO shall hold consultations, the dates and forms of which shall be agreed between them, in order to exchange views on matters of common concern, explore mutually-beneficial cooperative activities and review the results of past activities.
2. The governing bodies of ASEAN and UNESCO shall be consulted and informed in accordance with their respective regulations regarding the decisions made and joint activities undertaken under the terms of this Agreement. All members of ASEAN, including those non-UNESCO members, shall be consulted prior to the undertaking of such activities.

### ARTICLE III Joint action for technical cooperation

1. ASEAN and UNESCO shall explore together new areas for cooperation and offer appropriate assistance to each other in support of future joint action. Such action may take the form of specific joint activities agreed upon during the consultative process provided for in Article II of this Agreement,

such as the holding of joint special conferences at appropriate regular intervals on subjects within the competence of UNESCO and of particular relevance to ASEAN's activities. The dates, subjects to be covered, division of responsibilities and other considerations concerning such conferences shall be jointly decided on an ad hoc basis and formalized through letters exchanged between the Secretary-General of ASEAN and the Director-General of UNESCO.

2. Each organization shall follow its own procedures in authorizing and financing the conduct of joint activities.
3. Each organization may request the other to prepare studies, documentation or conference papers or to provide technical advice on subjects within the latter's fields of competence and relevant to conferences or meetings that the former is organizing or activities in which it is engaged.

#### ARTICLE IV Exchange of information

ASEAN and UNESCO shall arrange to the fullest extent possible and so far as is practicable for the exchange of information and documents on matters of common interest. This will include, where appropriate, the exchange of information and documents relating to specific projects, programmes or activities with a view to better complementary action and more effective coordination between the two organizations.

#### ARTICLE V Supplementary arrangements

The Secretary-General of ASEAN and the Director-General of UNESCO may, if necessary, enter into supplementary administrative arrangements, as stipulated, for example, in paragraph 1 of Article III, for the implementation of the present Agreement.

#### ARTICLE VI Dispute resolution

Any dispute between ASEAN and UNESCO concerning the interpretation and implementation of the present Agreement shall be settled amicably through consultation and negotiation between the Secretary-General of ASEAN and the Director-General of UNESCO.

#### ARTICLE VII Entry into force, amendments and duration

1. This Agreement between ASEAN and UNESCO shall enter into force on the date of its signature by the duly authorized representatives of the two organizations.
2. This Agreement may be amended by mutual consent of ASEAN and UNESCO in accordance with their respective rules and regulations. Such amendments shall enter into force one month following notification of consent by both parties.
3. This Agreement may be terminated by either ASEAN or UNESCO with a six months' written notice prior to its termination. The termination of this Agreement shall not affect supplementary administrative arrangements concluded or entered into during the duration of this Agreement which shall be regulated in accordance with the provision of such arrangements. Furthermore, the termination of this Agreement shall not prejudice the completion of ongoing programmes and projects agreed by ASEAN and UNESCO under this Agreement.

In witness whereof, the undersigned, being duly authorized thereto by their respective organizations, have signed this Agreement.

Done at Jakarta this 12th day of September 1998 in two original copies in English.

For ASEAN

For UNESCO



Rodolfo C. Severino Jr.  
Secretary-General



Federico Mayor  
Director-General

# APPENDIX III

## BIO-SKETCHES OF THE PRINCIPAL SPEAKERS

**11 September 1998**

### OPENING CEREMONY

#### **H.E. Mr Rodolfo Certeza SEVERINO Jr. Philippines**

Rodolfo C. Severino Jr. is Secretary-General of ASEAN

1992–97: Undersecretary of Foreign Affairs, Ministry of Foreign Affairs (Republic of the Philippines)

1988–92: Ambassador to Malaysia

1986–88: Assistant Secretary for Asian and Pacific Affairs

1979–86: Philippine Consul-General, Houston, Texas

1976–78: Chargé d'Affaires, Philippine Embassy, Beijing

1974–76: Special Assistant to the Undersecretary of Foreign Affairs, Manila

1967–74: Third, Second and First Secretary, Philippine Embassy, Washington, D.C.

1964–65: Information Assistant, United Nations Information Center, Manila

1961–64: Special assistant, Senator Raul S. Manglapus, Philippine Senate, Manila

1959–61: Operation Brotherhood, Laos

#### **H.E. Mr Federico MAYOR Spain**

Federico Mayor is currently serving his second six-year mandate as Director-General of UNESCO. The General Conference of the Organization first elected him in November 1987, and again in November 1993.

Born in Barcelona, Spain, on 27 January 1934, Mr Mayor was educated at the University of Madrid where he obtained a doctorate in

pharmacology in 1958. He devoted the first part of his career to teaching and research, with special emphasis on prenatal biochemistry and the detection and treatment of children suffering from congenital defects.

In 1967, Mr Mayor launched the 'National Plan for the Prevention of Mental Retardation', aimed at reducing mental handicaps in Spanish children. A year later, he was nominated Rector of the University of Granada.

Mr Mayor's career in politics dates back to 1974 when he was nominated Under-secretary in Spain's Ministry of Education and Science. With the advent of democracy in Spain, Mr Mayor was elected to the Spanish Parliament in 1977 and appointed Minister of Education and Science in 1981. He was elected to the European Parliament in 1987.

The strengthening of international cooperation has always been one of Mr Mayor's principal objectives. His association with UNESCO dates back to 1975 when he became President of the European Consultative Committee for Higher Education, a UNESCO institution based in Bucharest. From 1978 to 1981, he served as UNESCO's Deputy Director-General.

#### **H.E. Mr Ali ALATAS Indonesia**

1988: Minister for Foreign Affairs of the Republic of Indonesia

1982–88: Ambassador, Permanent Representative of Indonesia to the United Nations (UN), New York

1978–82: Executive Secretary to the Vice-President of Indonesia

1976–78: Ambassador, Permanent Representative of Indonesia to the UN, Geneva

1975–76: Chief of the Secretariat of the

Minister for Foreign Affairs and Member of the Advisory Board of the Department of Foreign Affairs

1972–75: Secretary of the Directorate-General of Political Affairs and later Chef de Cabinet of the Minister for Foreign Affairs

1970–72: Director of Information and Cultural Relations and Spokesman, Department of Foreign Affairs

1966–70: Counsellor and later Minister Counsellor, Embassy of Indonesia, Washington, D.C.

1960–66: Director of Information and Cultural Relations, Directorate of Information and Cultural Relations, Department of Foreign Affairs

1956–60: Second Secretary and later First Secretary, Indonesian Embassy, Bangkok

1954–56: Directorate of International Economic Relations, Ministry of Foreign Affairs

President, Amendment Conference of the States Parties to the Treaty banning Nuclear Weapon Tests in the Atmosphere in Outer Space and Under Water (1991–present)

Co-chairman, Paris Conference in Cambodia (1989–91)

Chairman of the First Committee (Political and Security Affairs), 40th United Nations General Assembly (1985)

Chairman of the group of government experts to carry out a comprehensive study on the Naval Arms Race, Naval Forces and Naval Arms Systems (GA Res.38/188G-1983)

Member of Indonesian Delegation to the First, Fourth, Fifth, Sixth, Seventh, Eighth, Ninth and Tenth Conference of Heads of State or Government of Non-Aligned Countries and of Delegations to various Ministerial and Co-ordinating Bureau meetings (since 1971)

Member of Indonesian Delegation to numerous international conferences and meetings, *inter alia* UNCTAD IV, V and VI (Nairobi, Manila), as well as various conferences and meetings of Group 77, the Conference on International Economic Cooperation (CIEC, Paris, 1977), the Conference on Peace in Viet Nam (Paris, 1973)

## FIRST SESSION

### **Mr Tozammel HUQ** **Bangladesh**

1994: Senior Special Adviser to the Director-General of UNESCO for Asia and the Pacific

1991–93: Adviser, Community Education, Department of Education, Birmingham (UK)

1988–90: Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of Bangladesh to France and Permanent Delegate to UNESCO; concurrently accredited as Ambassador of Bangladesh to Spain and Morocco

1981–87: Head teacher of an educational institution in England

### **General José T. ALMONTE** **Philippines**

His Excellency Mr José T. Almonte was the National Security Advisor and Director-General of the National Security Council in the Cabinet of former President Fidel V. Ramos, the Philippines. A graduate of the elite Philippine Military Academy in 1956, he won the Distinguished Conduct Star for gallantry with the Philippine military contingent in Viet Nam from 1966 to 1969 and the Ancient Order of Sikatuna for outstanding government service from 1992 to 1998. He retired as Brigadier-General from the armed forces of the Philippines in 1986.

### **Mr Leslie G. ATHERLEY** **Barbados**

1994: Director of the UNESCO Culture of Peace Programme

1980–94: Senior programme specialist in UNESCO's Division of Educational Policies and Planning Chief of the UNESCO Educational Policies and Management Unit

1975–80: Lecturer, School of Education, University of the West Indies

1969–75: Senior education officer in planning and curriculum in the Ministry of Education, Barbados

Mr Atherley is the author of a number of articles on educational planning and development

### **Dato' Mohamed JAWHAR HASSAN** **Malaysia**

1997: Director-General of ISIS (Malaysia)

1990: Deputy Director-General of ISIS

Among his previous positions in government are that of Director-General, Department of National Unity; Under-secretary, Internal Security Division, Ministry of Home Affairs; Director (Analysis) Research Division, Prime Minister's Department; and Principal Assistant Secretary, National Security Council.

Other positions: Co-Chair of CSCAP (Conference on Security Cooperation in Asia

Pacific) Working Groups on Cooperative Security and Comprehensive Security; Vice-Chairman, Malaysian National Committee, Pacific Economic Cooperation Council (PECC); Member, Malaysian CSCAP; Member, Advisory Panel, Institute of Historical Studies, Malaysia; Member, National Committee for International Affairs, Malaysian Red Crescent Society.

**Ms Anaisabel PRERA FLORES**  
**Guatemala**

1998: Member of the Club of Rome

1997: Coordinator of the strategy for the UNESCO programme 'Towards a Culture of Peace'

1994: Senior Special Adviser to the Director-General of UNESCO for Latin America and the Caribbean

1991-93: Vice-President of the Executive Board of UNESCO

1987-90: Minister of Culture of Guatemala

1986-87: Secretary-General of the Supreme Court of Justice in Guatemala

**Mr Mohamed SAHNOUN**  
**Algeria**

1994: Special Adviser to the Director-General of UNESCO

1997: Special envoy of the Secretary-General of the United Nations in the Great Lakes

1992: Special envoy of the Secretary-General of the United Nations in Somalia

1990-91: Counsellor to the President of Algeria for diplomatic affairs

1975-90: Ambassador to France, to the Federal Republic of Germany, to the UN in New York, to the United States and to Morocco

1964-73: Deputy Secretary-General of the Organization of African Unity (OAU)

**Ms Moufida BEN YAHIA-GOUCHA**  
**Tunisia**

1994: Senior Special Adviser to the Director-General of UNESCO for the Arab Region. In the framework of the transdisciplinary programme 'Towards a Culture of Peace', she is in charge of coordinating UNESCO's activities aimed at promoting a new approach to security in cooperation with institutes of defence, strategic institutes and the armed forces

1992-94: Minister Plenipotentiary, Deputy Permanent Delegate of Tunisia to UNESCO

1992: Vice-President of the 9th National Promotion of the National Institute of Defence (IDN) of Tunisia

1978-92: Professor-researcher at the Faculty of Sciences in Tunis; author of many scientific publications in the field of marine biology

**Mr Vladimir B. LOMEIKO**  
**Russian Federation**

1994: Special Adviser to the Director-General of UNESCO, coordinator of the UNESCO project 'For Peace and Tolerance, for a Dialogue between Cultures'

1991-93: Ambassador, Permanent Delegate of the Russian Federation to UNESCO

1989-91: Ambassador, Permanent Delegate of the USSR to UNESCO

1986-88: Ambassador-at-Large, the USSR Ministry of Foreign Affairs; USSR Representative to the United Nations Commission on Human Rights in Geneva

1984-86: Spokesman for Mikhail Gorbachev and Eduard Shevardnadze

1968-84: Political observer, correspondent, Deputy Editor-in-Chief and Editor-in-Chief of the Novosti (news) Press Agency and correspondent of the *Literatournaia Gazeta* (literary journal)

**12 September 1998**

**SECOND SESSION**

**General Bernard NORLAIN**  
**France**

1996: Five-star General of the French Air Force

1996: President of the Limited Company, Bernard Norlain Conseil, and Vice-President for Development, Deloitte & Touche

1994: Director of the French Institute for Advanced Studies on National Defence of France and of the Center for Advanced Military Studies

1992-94: Commanding Officer of the Tactical Air Force (since 1994, Combat Air Force)

1990-92: Major-General and Head of Air Defence Command

1986-89: Chief military assistant in the office of the Prime Minister of France under Jacques Chirac and Michel Rocard

1960-80: Career in the French Air Force

**Mr Mohamed SAHNOUN** (see above)

## CLOSING SESSION

### **H.E. Mr Makaminan MAKAGIANSAR Indonesia**

1998: Vice-Chairperson of the Executive Board of UNESCO

1989–98: Chairman, Consultative Council on National Education

1991–98: Vice-President, Indonesian Academy of Sciences

1992–97: Member, People's Consultative Assembly of the Republic of Indonesia

1989–98: Senior adviser to the Minister of Research and Technology/Chairman of the

Agency for the Assessment and Application of Technology

1986–89: Assistant Director-General/Director of the UNESCO Principal Regional Office for Asia and the Pacific; subsequently appointed personal representative of the Director-General of UNESCO for Asia and the Pacific

1976–81: Assistant Director-General for Culture and Communication, UNESCO

1973–76: Director-General of Education, Ministry of Education and Culture

1962–67: Deputy Minister of National Research in charge of executive affairs, Ministry of National Research

## APPENDIX IV

# INVENTORY OF ASIA-PACIFIC DIALOGUE CHANNELS\*

The following identifies some of the various programme channels which are multi-country, ongoing series rather than single meetings, and focuses on some element of Asia-Pacific security matters. Two sets of important activities have *not* been included. The first is the host of bilateral exchanges that exist between specific institutes or countries. There are probably more of these bilateral programmes than multilateral ones, even though it is the multilateral that have grown most visibly in the past few years. The second is the dialogue and exchange activities associated with European, Atlantic and global processes such as the Non-Aligned Movement, the Atlantic Council and the Trilateral Commission. One exception to this rule is the inclusion below of some of the United Nations activities that have a special focus on the Asia-Pacific region rather than situating Asia-Pacific concerns in a broader setting. I have added brief sections on some important activities recently completed and others at the advanced proposal stage.

### I. Annual and biannual meetings

1. The ISIS Malaysia/ASEAN ISIS **Asia-Pacific Roundtable**. It originated in 1987, has been held annually in Kuala Lumpur, and has developed into the largest annual event in Asia, with more than 350 attending the Roundtable in June 1993. Area coverage includes the broader Asia-Pacific region, with attention to both Northeast and Southeast Asia, the latter predominating. Invitations are relatively open, though South Asia is not included as part of the region. Participants include academics, researchers, journalists and diplomats. After the 1993 Roundtable there occurred a separate, by invitation only, meeting of military officials from a selection of Asia-Pacific countries as arranged by the Malaysian Ministry of Defence. It is likely that this military gathering will convene on an annual basis in future.
2. The **Pacific Symposium** hosted by the United States National Defense University. Annual meeting with a combination of academic and governmental (civilian and military) participants. It alternates between the NDU in Washington, D.C., and CINCPAC in Honolulu.
3. The **Asian Peace Research Association** meets on a regular basis and includes as participants academics, journalists, and government officials. The most recent meetings were held in Wellington, New Zealand, in January 1992, attracting 170 people from 23 countries, and in Penang in November 1993. The meetings are open to all who wish to attend.
4. The **Western Pacific Naval Symposium**. A conference held in alternate years. The first was in Sydney in 1988; the second in Bangkok in 1990; the third took place in 1992 in the United States; Malaysia will host the fourth in 1994. Most of the participants are naval officers at the CNO level from 13 'like-minded' countries, though some academics attend.
5. The **Pacific Armies Management Seminar**. Annual meetings of senior officers (colonels to brigadier-generals) from

\* This inventory covers activities carried out up to 1994. For the calendar of activities since then, please consult the Web site <http://www.coombs.anu.edu/Depts/RSPAS/SDSC/APSSecurityTop.html> (Calendar of Asia-Pacific events concerning regional security dialogue).

several countries in Asia with counterparts from Australia, New Zealand, the United States and Canada. No communist or post-communist countries are included (excepting Laos). The last was in January 1993 in Delhi, co-hosted by India and the United States, with 36 nations invited.

6. The North Pacific Region Advanced Research Center in Sapporo, with support from the National Institute for Research Advancement, has organized an annual meeting since 1989. Participants have been non-officials from the United States, South Korea, North Korea, the Soviet Union/Russia, Canada and China. Now known as the **Hokkaido Conference on North Pacific Issues**, it hosts an annual conference which brings together by invitation about twenty academics and other researchers from seven North Pacific countries.
7. Since 1987 the Japanese Ministry of Foreign Affairs has sponsored an annual **International Security Forum** in Japan. The seventh was held in Tokyo in March 1994, with participants invited from universities and research institutes around the Pacific.

## II. Multiple-meeting workshop and conference series

1. Since its inception in 1977, the **ASEAN-Japan Dialogue** organized by the Japan Center for International Exchange (JCIE) in cooperation with the Institute of Southeast Asian Studies (ISEAS) and other institutions in ASEAN has progressed through five stages. Phases I and II looked at the broad dimensions of the relationship; Phase III (1983–84) examined trade and investment, mutual perceptions and security issues, and Phases IV and V have also included mention of security-related issues. Some of the discussions at the meetings in Phase VI (1991–93) also included security issues. Participants have principally been from universities and research institutes in Japan, ASEAN, with occasional participants from North America, Australia, South Korea, China and Hong Kong.
2. Since 1978 an international steering committee has organized eight conferences on **The Sea Lanes of Communication**. The most recent was hosted by the Center for Strategic and International Studies (CSIS) in Jakarta and the Indonesian Navy in January

1993. It is a non-governmental forum but involves serving officials and officers present in their private capacities. The participants initially included the United States, Japan, Korea and Indonesia. In the 1980s, participation was widened to include the ASEAN countries, Australia and New Zealand. The ninth conference is scheduled for Kuala Lumpur in 1994 as hosted by the Malaysian Institute of Maritime Affairs.

3. The regional security conferences organized by the United Nations. They began in 1989 with a series of annual meetings under the auspices of the **Kathmandu Regional Center for Peace Disarmament in Asia-Pacific** together with related regional conferences sponsored by the United Nations and selected countries, including bicentennial meetings in Kyoto beginning in 1991 and Shanghai in August of 1992. The most recent Kathmandu meeting took place in January 1994. Participants in both series include academics, journalists and diplomats, the latter in their personal capacity. The United Nations **Center for Disarmament Affairs** (prior to January 1992 titled the Department of Disarmament Affairs, then the Office of Disarmament Affairs within the Department of Political Affairs) has also sponsored a series of regional meetings of senior officials to promote the United States Register of Conventional Arms. Representatives from 17 Asia-Pacific countries (not including North Korea, which declined an invitation to attend, and those from the eastern side of the Pacific, among them the United States and Canada) attended a meeting in January 1993 in Tokyo.
4. **Yomiuri Shimbun** and the **Gaston Sigur Center for East Asian Studies** at George Washington University have organized a series of annual seminars, alternating between Tokyo and Washington. Participants have come from Japan, South Korea, North Korea, China, the United States and two Southeast Asian countries. The ninth meeting in the series was held in May 1993 in Tokyo and included participants from South Korea, Japan, China, Taiwan, Russia, Singapore and the United States. The Korean peninsula has been a principal theme with a focus on domestic politics, economics, foreign policy and security issues. George Washington University and Keio University, in cooperation with

*Mainichi Shimbun*, have organized two conferences on the Korean peninsula, the first in Osaka in November 1992 and the second in Tokyo in August 1993.

5. The Institute for Global Security Studies in Seattle has organized a series of meetings, **The Asia-Pacific Dialogues on Maritime Security**. The meetings are designed to bring together experts in the general area of maritime security to discuss informally the Asia-Pacific region. The first meeting was held in Vancouver in November 1991, in conjunction with Simon Fraser University, and the second in Seattle in September 1992, in conjunction with the School of Marine Affairs at the University of Washington. The first meeting focused on 'Naval Arms Control After the Cold War'; and the second on maritime confidence-building measures, the naval build-up in the region, and the possible contribution on regional naval cooperation. The third dialogue was held in Bandung, Indonesia, in June 1993 and hosted by the Center for Archipelago, Law and Development Studies. It dealt very broadly with broader security issues, including the Korean peninsula. Participants have been both officials and academic researchers from Australia, the United States, China, Canada, Indonesia, Japan, Korea, Malaysia, Singapore, Russia, Taiwan, Thailand, and Vietnam. A fourth dialogue is tentatively scheduled for the Institute of Security and International Studies in Bangkok in the summer of 1994 and a fifth for 1995, tentatively at the Malaysian Institute for Maritime Affairs in Kuala Lumpur.
6. The Australian National University through the Peace Research Centre and the Centre for Strategic and Defence Studies has hosted several meetings as part of a three-year project on **Regional Approaches to Defense and Security Building in Asia Pacific**. One example is the July 1991 workshop on 'Naval Confidence and Security Building Measures in the Asia Pacific Region'.
7. Since the mid-1970s, **The Center for International Security and Arms Control** (CISAC) at Stanford University has hosted several dozen fellows from China, Russia and Korea and conducted arms control discussions with Chinese, Japanese and Korean experts. Recently CISAC has concentrated on questions related to United States-China military ties and developing a dialogue among the navies of the North Pacific. In October 1991 it brought together a group of Japanese, Russian and American naval officers and, in the summer of 1993, senior Chinese, Russian and American naval officers.
8. Since 1990, a series of meetings and workshops on **Managing Potential Conflicts in the South China Sea** have been held in Indonesia (and later in Manila) under the auspices of the Research and Development Agency of the Indonesian Department of Foreign Affairs. Workshops have been held in Bali in January 1990, in Bandung in June 1991, and in Yogyakarta in June 1992. Several more technical and focused working groups began work in May 1993, with the first in Manila in May 1993. The objective of the meetings is to explore methods for enhancing cooperation in the region. The meetings are technically non-governmental, although government officials are in attendance and participate actively. Participation has been from across maritime Southeast Asia and has also included Chinese officials and academics. A principal source of financial support has been the Canadian International Development Agency.
9. The **Asia-Pacific Forum**. The first meeting was held in Karuziawa, Japan, in 1990 and was arranged by ASEAN-ISIS with participation from the Japan Institute of International Affairs and Columbia University. At the second meeting in Manila, organized by the Institute for Strategic and Development Studies, in January 1993, the list of participants was expanded to include Canadians and South Koreans. The conference in 1994 will also include Australians. Participants include academics, journalists and government officials present in their private capacities.
10. The Institute on Global Conflict and Cooperation at the University of California, San Diego, is organizing a series of meetings, **IGCC Northeast Asian Cooperation Dialogue**. The objective is to examine possibilities for building trust and cooperation among six countries in the region – Russia, China, North Korea, South Korea, Japan and the United States. Participants include both policy officials (normally one from the military and one from the foreign ministry) plus two private individuals from each country. A planning session was held in July 1993 and

- the first meeting was held in San Diego on 8 and 9 October 1993. The second meeting is scheduled for Tokyo in April 1994. Sponsorship is coming from both American and Japanese sources.
11. The Asia Society in New York and the Japan Institute of International Affairs are co-sponsoring a collaborative project, **Prospects for International Cooperation in Northeast Asia: A Multilateral Dialogue** to explore current economic, political-security and transnational issues in Northeast Asia and to explore possible structures for managing future cooperation. Participants will come from Canada, China, Japan, Mongolia, North Korea, Russia, South Korea, Taiwan and the United States. The first meeting focusing on economic issues was held in New York in January 1994. Subsequent conferences on political and security issues are scheduled for summer 1994 and spring 1995.
  12. The National Bureau of Asian Research in Seattle has organized a series of meetings on **The New Russia in Asia** to create new channels for dialogue with Russian scholars, journalists, business leaders, legislators and government leaders engaged in relations with Asia. Supported by the Rockefeller Brothers Fund, a planning meeting was held in Seattle in December 1992 and a first conference in Moscow in June 1993. Future conferences will be held in Alma Ata, Beijing, Seoul, Tokyo, and Washington. Participants are from Russia, the United States, China, Japan, Korea and the Central Asian republics.
  13. The **International Institute of Strategic Studies** (IISS, London) has been organizing an occasional series of meetings on Asia-Pacific security issues. It held its annual conference in Seoul in November 1992 and will hold its 1994 annual conference in Vancouver in September 1994. It is planning to sponsor at least one conference a year in Asia-Pacific. It has recently organized conferences in Hong Kong in June 1993 and Washington in October 1993 on the security and foreign policy dimensions of Chinese regionalism. It is planning an additional conference in Hong Kong in July 1994 on Chinese economic reforms and defence policy. Participants at IISS conferences include academics, researchers and officials present in their personal capacities.
  14. The Ministry of Foreign Affairs in Thailand and the United Nations have taken the lead in organizing three **ASEAN-United Nations Workshops on Cooperation for Peace and Preventive Diplomacy**. The first workshop was held in Bangkok, 22-23 March 1993, and examined the role of multilateralism in Southeast Asia, the parameters of preventive diplomacy as a function of multilateralism in Southeast Asia, and issues for preventive diplomacy in Southeast Asia. The second in Singapore on 6 and 7 July examined Cambodia, natural resource competition, territorial and boundary disputes, the Treaty of Amity and Cooperation, the role of regional groupings and bodies in cooperation with the United Nations and mechanisms for preventive diplomacy. The third in Bangkok on 17 and 18 February 1994 examined fora and measures for preventive diplomacy, issues in preventive diplomacy and ASEAN-United Nations relations. The meetings involve academic and governmental participants from 16 Asia-Pacific countries, officials from the United Nations (including ESCAP) and the Ford Foundation.
  15. The Research Institute for Peace and Security (RIPS) in Tokyo and the Korea Institute for Defense Analysis sponsor the **Five Countries Security Forum**. The focus is security cooperation in Northeast Asia with a focus on arms races, nuclear proliferation, arms sales and territorial disputes. Participants are from the United States, Russia, China, South Korea and Japan. The first meeting was held in Seoul, 3-5 November 1993, and the second is scheduled for Tokyo in May 1995. RIPS also arranges regular bilateral dialogues with the China Institute for International Strategic Studies and the Institute for Strategic Studies (Mongolia).
  16. The Japan Center for International Exchange (JCIE) in cooperation with the American Assembly of Columbia University has begun a four-part series on **The United States and Japan in Asia**. It is an extension of the Shimoda Conference which was a bilateral exchange involving principally American and Japanese participants. Beginning with the meeting at Arden House in New York on 'Challenges for U.S. Policy' in November 1993, the series also includes participants from several other Asia-Pacific countries including Canada, Australia, Singapore,

Malaysia, Indonesia, the Philippines, Taiwan, and China. Topics included political, security, economic, environmental and other issues. Three additional meetings are scheduled, the first in Japan in April 1994 on 'Japan's International Identity'; the second in Singapore at the Institute of Southeast Asian Studies in September 1994; and the third, a smaller group discussion at the end of 1994, possibly in Hawaii. They involve officials present in their private capacities, academics, journalists and business people.

17. The East-West Center and the Pacific Forum/CSIS have created the **Asia Pacific Senior Seminar** intended to discuss new ideas about East Asian security and to create new links among regional decision-makers. Expected to be an annual event, the first Seminar took place in Hawaii, 4–10 December 1993. Participants for the first seminar included academics, civilian officials at the assistant or deputy assistant secretary level or above and military officers with the rank of brigadier or colonel or above, drawn from the United States, Canada, Australia, China, France, Japan, South Korea, Malaysia, New Zealand, the Philippines, Russia, Singapore, Taiwan, Thailand, and the United Kingdom.
18. Within ASEAN there are several interconnected sets of meetings in which security issues are addressed, all of a track two nature and all involving principally but not exclusively ASEAN participants:
  - (a) The **ASEAN-ISIS Workshop on Enhancing Security Cooperation in ASEAN**. The first meeting was held in Kuala Lumpur in June 1993 and the second in Kuala Lumpur in October 1993.
  - (b) The **Southeast Asia Forum**: an annual meeting begun in 1989. The most recent was held in Kuala Lumpur in October 1993.
  - (c) The **ASEAN Colloquium on Human Rights** hosted by the Institute for Strategic and Development Studies, held its first meeting in Manila in January 1994 and is expected to develop into a regular series.
  - (d) Several administratively independent but thematically linked forthcoming conferences include: **ASEAN into the 21st Century: Dealing with Unresolved Issues**, held at the ISDS in Manila in January 1994 as part of the ASEAN-ISIS programme; **Workshop on the Spradly Islands – A Potential Regional Conflict**, held at ISEAS in Singapore in December 1993, the Institute for Security and International Studies (Bangkok) is planning a conference in Chiang Mai in November 1994 on **ASEAN-China Relations**; the Singapore Institute for International Affairs organized a meeting on **ASEAN-Korean Relations** in Singapore in March 1994.
  - (e) The **International Symposium on Interaction for Progress: ASEAN-Vietnam All Round Cooperation** held its third meeting in Manila in December 1993. The symposium series is hosted by institutions in Singapore, Vietnam, the Philippines, Malaysia and Canada.
  - (f) The **Roundtable on Economic Development** organized by ISIS Malaysia and the ASEAN-ISIS has held three meetings. The focus is normally economic issues, though matters broadly conceived have been part of the discussion. The fourth roundtable was held in Kuala Lumpur in January 1994.
19. The East-West Center in Honolulu is initiating a three-year project, **Building Asia-Pacific Regional Institutions for the Post-Cold-War Era**. It will examine the prospects and instruments for regional institution-building in the areas of politico-security relations, management of economic interdependence, and regional values.
20. The newly created **ASEAN Regional Forum** is a formal governmental process for ministerial-level discussion on regional security issues. Its membership includes the six members of ASEAN, the dialogue partners, Russia, China, Papua New Guinea, Laos and Vietnam. It builds upon the ASEAN-PMC process and the attendant Senior Officials Meetings (SOMs) held in advance of the PMC and held on an inter-sessional basis. The first SOM was held in Singapore, 20–21 May 1993. Currently, four position papers are being prepared on non-proliferation, preventive diplomacy and conflict management, Northeast Asian security cooperation, and confidence-building measures.
21. Also at the formal governmental level, though somewhat longer in profile and less visible are the **Quintilaterals**, five-way

- consultations among policy-planners from foreign ministries in the United States, Japan, Australia, Canada and South Korea. The most recent took place in Korea in October 1993.
22. In the realm of speculation, it is possible that the **Asia-Pacific Leaders Conference** held in Seattle in November 1993 will develop into an annual meeting. Security matters might be a future topic of conversation.

### III. Recently completed

1. **Security Cooperation in the Asia-Pacific Region**, a four-way collaborative project involving the Pacific Forum/CSIS, ASEAN-ISIS, the Japan Institute of International Affairs, and the Seoul Forum. It sponsored three international meetings with participation from a broad range of Asia-Pacific countries. The first conference was in Hawaii in 1991; the second in Bali in April 1992; and the third in Seoul in November 1992. The final meeting produced the Seoul Statement signed by the directors of ten institutes in the region.
2. **Pacific Security After the Cold War**, a four-part series organized by the Institute on Global Conflict and Cooperation, at the University of California at San Diego. It involved institutes in Moscow, Tokyo, Beijing and the United States, with additional participation from several other Asia-Pacific countries. The final meeting in the series was held in La Jolla in May 1993.
3. **The North Pacific Cooperative Security Dialogue**. It arranged a major conference (Victoria, April 1991), four workshops ('Unconventional Security Issues in the North Pacific', Hawaii, December 1991, co-hosted by the East-West Institute; 'Arms Control and CSBMs in the North Pacific', Ottawa, May

1992, co-hosted by the Canadian Institute for International Peace and Security; 'History, Culture and the Prospects of Multilateralism', Beijing, June 1992, co-hosted by Peking University; 'Changing National Military Security Perceptions', Yokohama, August 1992, co-hosted by the Research Institute for Peace and Security) and a final conference in Vancouver in March 1993. Participants came from universities, research institutes and government departments in Canada, China, Japan, North and South Korea, Russia, the United States, Mongolia, Southeast Asia, Australia, Hong Kong and the United Kingdom.

### IV. Currently proposed

1. The Center for International Affairs at Harvard University is planning to create a three-year programme bringing together leading intellectuals and institutes for purposes of an annual conference. Tentatively titled the **North Pacific Forum**, it is scheduled to hold its first meeting in early 1994.
2. The Social Science Research Council in New York is developing a major Council project on the broadly defined topic of **Asia-Pacific Security**. As currently conceived, it will involve a multi-year series, of inter-related activities, coordinated by an international steering group and undertaken by collaborative working groups focusing on three themes: 'Reconceptualizing Asia-Pacific Security'; 'The Domestic Politics of National Security Policy Making'; and 'The Political Economy of Regional Security'. The objective is to create a more systematic programme of basic research that can support the policy process and informed public discussion in the United States and Asia.

## APPENDIX V

# HOW TO ACHIEVE SUSTAINABLE PEACE

*Working paper submitted  
by Ms Sathitya Lengthaisong,\*  
Member of the Thai National Commission for UNESCO*

Peace is supreme happiness,<sup>1</sup> desired by all humanity. To attain this state requires a number of creative factors. This paper examines only the major disquieting problems we are now confronting, their causes, their effects and their possible solutions. Allow me to touch on these problems one by one.

### 1. Ecology

Our ecological heritage has been continually exploited by the hand of man, through the ignorance of local inhabitants, particularly in developing countries. If we take a look at the present situation, we can see that in almost all developing countries, Asia, Africa, and/or South America, local ecologies are being destroyed at a very rapid rate. In Thailand itself, people put a torch to everything combustible, in all seasons. Forests have been encroached upon and burned down everywhere, either for leisure pursuits or for agricultural reasons; millions of trees have been cut down by selfish tycoons. Many species have become extinct. Mountains and hills have been demolished. We will have no more mountains to maintain the sources of water in the future if we remain unaware of the seriousness of the situation. One of the most deplorable examples is that some people in developing countries think that to uproot the grass to lay bare the soil is a form of development. Some of them do not even understand that to burn forests produces more cloud cover, which leads to higher rainfall.

To resolve all of these problems, we must resort to two main methods. First of all, we have to educate both children and adults to realize the imminent danger resulting from their wrongdoing and urge them to change

their behaviour; we have to denounce those who encroach on the forests, in particular selfish tycoons and politicians who are wilfully destroying global ecology. Second, we have to solicit the cooperation of the public to solve these problems in concert and in earnest, and we also have to convince them that all environments belong to them and contribute to their well-being.

Let me give you an example from 1967 when I was a law graduate in the United States. One day the Smith family took me out in their car for a picnic in the woods of Virginia. While in the car, Mrs Smith gave each of us a piece of candy. I, like all other easy-going Thai people, unwrapped the candy and then wound down the car window to throw out the very small piece of wrapping paper. But I could not do it because Ashrin, a three-year-old girl sitting beside me, took hold of my arm, saying, 'No, Sathit, you must put it here', pointing her small finger at a garbage can in the car. I was amazed and, as a result, I have never thrown away litter since then. We must do the same, to achieve a similar effect.

One good thing that the Thai government is now doing is encouraging people to grow trees on their own land with financial subsidies from the government. If we are able to control the number of wild fires, we hope to achieve an increase in forest growth in a few decades.

\* UNESCO National Commission Member, Law Professor and Director, Center of Human Rights and Peace Education, School of Law, Sukhothai Tharumathirat Open University, Pakkred, Nonthaburi, Thailand, former justice of the Supreme Court.

1. Lord Buddha said: 'There is no happiness beyond peace.'

People are now being urged to excavate a mountainside instead of dynamiting it, in order to preserve the mountains and their vegetation and hence to preserve sources of water. Do teach people how to love trees, forests and animals, and teach them not to spread litter, both by words and by deeds, at all schools, universities and other educational institutes of all levels. Non-governmental organizations can play an even more important role in this respect.

## 2. Hygiene and nutrition

Hygiene and nutrition should be among the most important concerns for all developing peoples. Some peoples, such as the Thais, may have plenty to eat but they do not know what to eat and how to prepare it. Recently you may have heard of some Thai labourers dying in their sleep in Singapore and elsewhere, presumably because of malnutrition. The fact was that they ate only white rice, for example. Governments of many developing countries have been relegating malnutrition to the same level as other problems, instead of regarding it as urgent or of first priority. They should have been campaigning for correct eating habits, including all five groups of nutrients: carbohydrates, proteins, minerals, vitamins, and fat, in appropriate proportions, and particularly unpolished rice and whole wheat.

Food offered for sale, uncovered, at dusty roadsides, as can be found everywhere in Thailand, contaminated by tons of dust carrying many kinds of disease, harms the consumers as much as an atomic bomb. Because of such unhygienic practices, Thai people have to go to hospital at 5 a.m. in the morning to throng with hundreds of other patients for a place in the queue to see their doctor. Patients arriving later may fail to see their doctor, a very different situation from that in a developed country such as the United States, where a limited number of patients see their doctor at an appointed time.

In Thailand, people can eat anything they wish, while in some developed countries or even in more developed Asian countries, people will be punished if they eat a forbidden kind of food or sell their food in an unhygienic way.

The solution to this problem could be approached in two related ways. Alongside nationwide and continuous campaigns for better and proper food consumption, knowledge of nutrition must be made part of the curriculum in every educational institution and taught

in many different ways that have immediate impact, such as by printing slogans on drinks bottles, cigarette boxes, match boxes, calendars, school notebooks, etc.

## 3. Discipline and ethics

The two words 'discipline' and 'ethics' mean more or less the same: the first implies orderliness while the second represents all properties. Together they mean to live one's own life in a useful, disciplined and unharmed way, towards oneself or towards the public. They should take precedence over all other words because they are designed more for the whole society than for individuals, and they are even more important than one's own life. As I have said elsewhere: 'It is better to die of shortage of food than to live an unethical life.'<sup>1</sup> But the real situation is different. National discipline on cleanliness, for example, has for decades been campaigned for in some Asian countries including Thailand and some neighbouring countries, but the situation is little better than it was a hundred years ago: garbage is still found all over the place, causing disease and a burden on society; drugs, particularly amphetamines, are prevalent, resulting in more deaths from accidents than any other cause; crossing the road at random is common and even the police do it with no feeling of guilt. At road junctions, a green traffic light is taken to mean drive at normal speed while an amber light means go faster instead of stopping, causing accident after accident; vote buying has been rampant for decades, resulting in the recruitment of unethical politicians into the National Assembly. We have a joke that says, If you cannot do any other profession, politics will do. The current economic depression was due to concerted corruption with the collaboration of financial executives and politicians, resulting in the collapse of more than fifty stocks and securities companies and two banks.

The solution to this problem must be three-fold: first, strict enforcement of the law, which in fact has been done; second, checking and reviewing impropriety in public life, particularly

1. Sathitya Lengthaisong, *Legal Ethics*, 2nd ed., Bangkok, Thammasam, 1998, p. 2, Introduction.

by the mass media and educational institutions, professors and students alike; and third, campaigning for ethics in a committed and fruitful way, not only as a formality as is the case today. Thoughtful statements posted in different and easily discernible places are necessary, such as: 'A dishonest person is the most disgraced; let's condemn him'. Scrutinize the behaviour of others, particularly those in public positions, just as the Americans are prepared to impeach their presidents. To live a moderate life, as did the former Prime Minister of Thailand, General Prem, or Mr Jawaharlal Nehru and Mahatma Gandhi of India, for example, should be regarded as an ethical practice.

#### **4. Democracy**

Though democracy is not the cure for all social ills, it is thought to be the best system of governance, particularly for the maintenance of peace. At least under a democratic system there are two necessary components that contribute to peace: (a) respect for other people's rights; and (b) justice, including the upkeep of equality for which minorities in all parts of the world have been fighting. If these two factors are duly maintained, we are sure that peace will consequently be upheld.

I was impressed while in America when a gentleman walking past me said, 'Excuse me; I'm in a hurry.' The person thought to have trespassed upon my rights by overtaking me. Developed people would feel more ashamed to jump a queue than to strip off their garments. They dare not harm others, unlike underdeveloped or developing peoples. They do everything with due reason for the benefit of the majority and the public.

The major problem within the democratic system, which is prevalent in Thailand and probably in other developing countries, is that of vote buying. This leads to all kinds of corruption, more than ever before, both political and non-political. If you can buy a vote, you can buy everything else, including justice. How does the country stand then? Disadvantaged people will rise up, of course, against those with greater advantages, as they have done in America, South Africa and elsewhere.

Doing one's duty in the public interest, such as going to the poll and choosing appropriate candidates for the Assembly, helping one another to preserve public property as carefully as one's own, showing gratitude to one's society, keeping an eye on wrongdoing against the public and denouncing the wrongdoers, paying taxes to the national treasury, all these are within the precinct of democracy and solutions that people can bring to social problems, as well as being factors contributing directly to peace.

#### **Conclusion**

Ladies and Gentlemen, may I conclude my text with an earnest appeal to all participants to help one another to make these concepts a reality, to suppress the bad and uplift the good and to guide others, particularly our younger generation, with good examples. Do respect other people's rights. Do not be lax and break society's rules. Do everything for the benefit of the public. Do not be selfish and common property for your own interest. I hope that all these suggestions, if earnestly put into practice, will contribute to the sustainable peace we desire.

## APPENDIX VI

# ASEAN IN THE TWENTY-FIRST CENTURY: ASEAN YOUTH DEVELOPMENT IN THE NEXT MILLENNIUM

*Working paper submitted  
by the Committee for ASEAN Youth Cooperation (CAYC)*

### Overview

Regionalization, globalization and a 'borderless' world characterizes the new, modern, world order. Developments in science in the post-Second-World-War era have made the world 'smaller' and broken down national boundaries. This has resulted in the formation of regional groupings such as the Association of Southeast Asian Nations (ASEAN), the Arab League, the European Community (EC) and the South Asian Cooperation for Regional Cooperation (SMRC).

Nations which choose to stand alone are being isolated and losing out on development. Nations which choose to open up are thriving and prosperous through rapid economic and social growth.

Nations which unite through regional cooperation become strong and resilient. Regional unity involves understanding in various fields such as politics, economy, social and culture. Unity together with economic prosperity wards off external threats. According to Kenichi Ohama, this is the era of the 'borderless' world.

### ASEAN

Southeast Asia encountered a turbulent time in the 1960s with the rise of Cold War rivalry between the superpowers, the rise of military power in the Soviet Union and the People's Republic of China, and the war in Indochina. The people then saw an urgent need for a form of cooperative grouping to promote peace and stability in the region which will work towards mutual benefit.

The first attempts at regional cooperative grouping were, for example, the Association of Southeast Asia (ASA) in 1961, Maphilindo in

1963, and the Asia and Pacific Council (ASPAC). Finally, ASEAN emerged in 1967 at an historic meeting in Bangkok of foreign ministers from Indonesia, Malaysia, the Philippines, Singapore and Thailand. This meeting culminated in the signing of the ASEAN Declaration on 8 August 1967.

ASEAN was formed with three main objectives, as follows:

- to promote the economic, social and cultural development of the region through cooperative programmes;
- to safeguard the political and economic stability of the region against major-power rivalry; and
- to serve as a forum for the resolution of intra-regional differences.

To reaffirm ASEAN's commitment towards peace and stability in Southeast Asia, ASEAN foreign ministers signed the Zone of Peace, Freedom and Neutrality (ZOPFAN) Declaration in Kuala Lumpur on 27 November 1971.

The first ASEAN Summit Meeting of Heads of Government in Bali, Indonesia, in 1976 saw the signing of three key documents:

- the Declaration of ASEAN Concord;
- the Treaty of Amity and Cooperation in Southeast Asia;
- the Agreement on the Establishment of the ASEAN Secretariat.

These three documents set the objectives and principles for regional political stability, the programme of action for cooperation in various spheres and the machinery of cooperation.

The ASEAN machinery also includes the ASEAN Summit Meeting of heads of government, the Annual ASEAN Ministerial Meeting (AMM) of foreign ministers, ASEAN Sub-Committee on Youth, various standing

committees, ad hoc committees, permanent committees and sub-committees.

ASEAN's excellent track record is the result of the adherence to the basic precepts on which ASEAN regional cooperation has been nurtured over the past twenty-six years – equality, common interest, mutual benefit, solidarity and consensus. These precepts will continue to be the ingredients that will see ASEAN grow from strength to strength in the coming years.

## **Youth**

Youth is an integral part of all human societies and youth development is also an integral part of social and national development of all countries.

The young generation generally comprise no less than 30 per cent of the total population in any country. Their development is vital because they are our future leaders. If they are properly guided, they would bring peace, prosperity and harmony to our world. If they are not, our future civilization will be threatened.

It is a positive sign that youth movements in Southeast Asia are well-organized and structured. The majority of them are recognized by their respective governments. Moreover, there are also government agencies in all ASEAN member countries to oversee and direct youth development programmes and youth movements as part and parcel of national development programmes. Some government youth agencies come directly under the department of their heads of government. Others have their own youth ministries. All of them have government recognition and are coordinated with set youth policies and programmes.

Working towards these common aims and objectives, the central and national youth councils have come together to form the Committee for ASEAN Youth Cooperation (CAYC) as a coordinating body for all national youth organizations and youth programmes in the region.

Youth development covers a wide field. It encompasses a whole spectrum of human resource development: formal, informal and non-formal education; vocational training; personal development; cultural development; social-skills development; moral and ethical development; healthy-lifestyle development; managerial and entrepreneurial development. It eventually reaches out to regional and international development.

## **ASEAN youth development**

ASEAN youth-development programmes are implemented by the ASEAN Sub-Committee on Youth (ASY), one of the sub-committees under the ASEAN Committee on Social Development (COSD), one of ASEAN's permanent committees. Programmes under COSD are in the areas of population, labour, education, health and nutrition, human resource development, social welfare and social studies, and programmes for youth and women.

Concerning development programmes for young people, in June 1983 ASEAN foreign ministers signed the ASEAN Declaration of Principles to Strengthen ASEAN Collaboration on Youth. The declaration resulted in the establishment of the ASEAN Youth Forum (AYF) – later renamed the ASEAN Sub-Committee on Youth – to direct and recommend projects for implementation under the ASEAN Youth Programme.

Several activities were undertaken to encourage the active participation of young people. The International Youth Year in 1985 saw the implementation of several programmes in member countries, such as a youth productivity festival, a youth and scout jamboree, a photographic competition and exhibition, a youth handicraft exhibition, an essay competition, and a youth work camp. Later programmes included 'Development of HRD Programmes for ASEAN Youth in Drug Prevention', training of trainers for youth, management of youth organizations, advanced youth-leadership training programmes, a directory of accommodation facilities for youths, seminar on urban youth work, workshops on youth cooperatives, workshops on youth handicrafts, an ASEAN Volunteer Corps, an ASEAN Youth Computer Camp, training for programme managers, training in environment and natural resources and conservation, entrepreneurial development for youth, ASEAN Youth Leadership Training Workshop.

However, the most significant development for ASEAN youth initiated through ASY was the Declaration of ASEAN Youth Day (AYD) on 8 August each year, and the ASEAN Ministerial Meetings on Youth (AMMY). These two programmes were initiated in 1992 in Jakarta. The commemoration of ASEAN Youth Day also includes an ASEAN Youth Day Meeting (AYDM) which provides a forum for leaders of youth NGOs to recommend ideas to the AMMY. The first AMMY resulted in the 'Declaration of the

ASEAN Ministerial Meeting on Youth'. A development of the first AMMY is the declaration for an ASEAN Youth Policy which is in the process of formulation. The second AYD in Bandar Seri Begawan, Brunei Darussalam, in 1993, saw the launch of the ASEAN Youth Logo and ASEAN Youth Song, both of which were initiated by CAYC.

## **Regional youth NGO**

The Committee for ASEAN Youth Cooperation (CAYC) is the sole regional youth non-governmental organization (NGO) affiliated to ASEAN. CAYC was formed in Jakarta on 15–19 September 1975 at a meeting of youth leaders and government representatives of the ASEAN member countries, reflecting the strong determination on the part of ASEAN youth to contribute to the task of building up ASEAN.

It was envisaged that CAYC would play a leading role in establishing a firm foundation for common action to promote regional cooperation and understanding, active participation and involvement in the affairs of the countries of the region, a sense of belonging to ASEAN society, equality and justice among youth and youth organizations. CAYC is complementary to the spirits and ideals of ASEAN as stipulated in the ASEAN Declaration of Bangkok, 8 August 1967, and other Declarations made by ASEAN.

CAYC plays a coordinating role for all national youth committees or councils from each of the ASEAN member countries. All these are recognized as national umbrella bodies for youth organizations and youth movements in their respective countries. The current affiliates of CAYC are:

- the Brunei Youth Council (MBB);
- the Indonesian National Youth Committee (KNPI);
- the Malaysian Youth Council (MBM);
- the National Youth Commission (NYC)/ Philippines;
- the National Youth Council (NYC)/ Singapore;
- the National Council For Child and Youth Development of Thailand (NCYD).

The main organ of CAYC is the Management Committee, comprising the Chairman, Secretary-General, Treasurer and a National Secretary from each of the affiliated youth NGOs.

On 19 September 1983, a meeting of the ASEAN Standing Committee approved CAYC's

application to be affiliated with ASEAN. This affiliation meant that CAYC, as a youth NGO, can establish a working link with an ASEAN functional committee through the ASEAN Secretariat. Currently, CAYC attends ASY Meetings with 'Observer with speaking right' status. CAYC was also accorded the same status at the ASEAN Youth Day Meetings.

## **Purpose**

The main purpose of ASEAN youth development programmes is to promote ASEAN youth solidarity and strengthen intra-regional relationships among the youth of ASEAN. Regional youth development is directed at the future development of the region, in which young people are the catalysts.

The youth development programmes are also aimed at developing a new generation of future ASEAN leaders who are mature, responsible, visionary, committed, morally and spiritually strong, sincere and disciplined. They are expected to lead the region towards greater prosperity, peace, harmony and security in the next century.

The Tenth Meeting of the ASY in Bali, 1993, recommended a mission statement to guide the leaders in their work:

'To prepare the ASEAN youth as future leaders, to enhance youth contribution to world peace, progress and prosperity and to promote and strengthen ASEAN youth cooperation and solidarity through policies and programmes.'

## **Future development**

The nine member countries of ASEAN are rich in resources – both in commodities and human resources. Furthermore, most of its members have already become or are becoming newly industrialized economies (NIEs). Two member countries, that is, Brunei Darussalam and Singapore, have per capita incomes among the world's highest. Indonesia, Malaysia and Thailand are expected to become NIEs by the turn of the century, as are Viet Nam, Myanmar and the Lao People's Democratic Republic. All the member countries are competing for foreign investment.

Most of these countries are politically stable. They also have a rich variety of local cultures. Religion has a strong foothold in all of these countries, making them among the most ethical and moral in the world.

However, what are the challenges that await the next millennium for ASEAN leaders? They come from youth itself. The Cold War among the superpowers is over. The Berlin Wall has collapsed, so has the Soviet Union. The countries of the world are uniting into regional groupings, creating a global village. Economies in the Asia-Pacific region, of which ASEAN is part, are growing rapidly. New innovations, discoveries and inventions in science and technology are rapidly changing the face of the world. A revolution is taking place throughout the world. However, there are also regions in the world sliding into greater hardships as a result of dictatorship, greed for power, lack of resources, non-respect for human rights, and political instability.

### **Two challenging tasks await the new leaders of ASEAN**

1. Strengthening and uniting intra-regional ties and cooperation towards common interests and mutual benefits.
2. Influencing and helping to create a new world order in which equality, harmony, fellowship and solidarity prevail.

Despite being united for thirty years, there are still some differences among the member countries of ASEAN because of their multifarious cultures, economies and political structures. These are delicate differences that need time to resolve. It may therefore require new leadership to help resolve these matters. The ideal for ASEAN is to be able to work in unison and concord in all issues relating to the world order. This is illustrated in many of the precepts of ASEAN, such as decisions by consensus, forming the basis of ASEAN's unity in diversity.

There are also some countries within the geographical fold of Southeast Asia that could become new members of ASEAN. Their present circumstances may not permit them to be members of ASEAN yet, but the new ASEAN leadership should strive to bring them into the ASEAN family.

With the world moving towards being borderless, a global village, intra-ASEAN regional unity is insufficient for the region to progress and prosper. This is where its extra-regional cooperation with its dialogue partners play an important role. However, ASEAN should consider new dialogue partners from other regions, such as Africa, Latin America and the Pacific Rim countries. Enhancing closer understanding and relationships with various dialogue partners

from other regions would enable ASEAN to help create a new world order that makes this world a better place to live in, as well as ensuring the survival of human civilization.

The United Nations commemorated the year 1985 as the International Year of Youth (IYY) with the themes of Participation, Development, Peace. The UN has now called upon youth again to commemorate the Tenth Anniversary of IYY and reaffirm and reinforce its IYY themes with young people, as well as the planned World Youth Programme of Action for the year 2000 and Beyond. The principle objective of the World Youth Programme of Action is to provide a practical and effective guide, in a global framework, for national and regional actions on a long-term basis, bearing in mind the broad goals and objectives of the International Development Strategy for the Fourth United Nations Decade. The focus should be on identifying and elaborating emerging issues of direct concern to young people, and to provide practical guidelines for national regional and international actions as part of a sustained long-term effort to improve the quality of life. The world youth programme of action should acknowledge existing problems, social, economic and political, and include suggested actions at all levels.

ASEAN youth development for the new century covers areas of concern which are proclaimed in the Declaration of the First ASEAN Ministerial Meeting on Youth, such as population, education and training, unemployment, housing, the environment, social security, crime and drug abuse, AIDS, and youth participation.

In these respects, efforts in ASEAN youth development would cover programmes in strengthening ASEAN awareness; human resource development; attainment of total sustainable development; and youth-related research and information-sharing through effective networking.

### **Conclusion**

ASEAN youth development is not the responsibility of young people themselves, but is a multipartite affair. The governments of ASEAN member countries, NGOs, youth and all echelons of society are involved. It is a social concern of all parties. Everybody has to participate. It is the integration of the many facets of human and societal development.

The world is evolving rapidly and by the turn of the new century, dramatic changes will make the world a very different place. There will be a new order. Whether the world will be a better place or not is difficult to predict. However, destiny for a better world can be determined if everybody thought and worked positively and constructively towards putting an end to all hatred, conflict, greed, violence and individualism.

ASEAN and the world would be blossoming with happiness and prosperity if present and future leaders strive in the direction of equality, diligence, commonality of interest, integrity, sincerity, responsibility and peace.

This is the great challenge that confronts leaders of ASEAN youth development in the new era.

CAYC Secretariat  
Kuala Lumpur

## APPENDIX VII

### ASEAN VISION 2020

*Adopted by the Heads of State and Government  
of ASEAN at the Fifth ASEAN Summit,  
Kuala Lumpur, 15 December 1997*

We, the Heads of State and Government of the Association of Southeast Asian Nations, gather today in Kuala Lumpur to reaffirm our commitment to the aims and purposes of the Association as set forth in the Bangkok Declaration of 8 August 1967, in particular to promote regional cooperation in Southeast Asia in the spirit of equality and partnership and thereby contribute towards peace, progress and prosperity in the region.

We in ASEAN have created a community of Southeast Asian nations at peace with one another and at peace with the world, rapidly achieving prosperity for our peoples and steadily improving their lives. Our rich diversity has provided the strength and inspiration to us to help one another foster a strong sense of community.

We are now a market of around 500 million people with a combined gross domestic product of US \$600 billion. We have achieved considerable results in the economic field, such as high economic growth, stability and significant poverty alleviation over the past few years. Members have enjoyed substantial trade and investment flows from significant liberalization measures.

We resolve to build upon these achievements.

Now, as we approach the twenty-first century, thirty years after the birth of ASEAN, we gather to chart a vision for ASEAN on the basis of today's realities and prospects in the decades leading to the year 2020.

That vision is of ASEAN as a concert of Southeast Asian nations, outward-looking, living in peace, stability and prosperity, bonded together in partnership in dynamic development and in a community of caring societies.

#### **A concert of Southeast Asian nations**

We envision the ASEAN region to be, in 2020, in full reality, a Zone of Peace, Freedom and Neutrality, as envisaged in the Kuala Lumpur Declaration of 1971.

ASEAN shall have, by the year 2020, established a peaceful and stable Southeast Asia where each nation is at peace with itself and where the causes for conflict have been eliminated, through abiding respect for justice and the rule of law and through the strengthening of national and regional resilience.

We envision a Southeast Asia where territorial and other disputes are resolved by peaceful means.

We envision the Treaty of Amity and Cooperation in Southeast Asia functioning fully as a binding code of conduct for our governments and peoples, to which other states with interests in the region adhere.

We envision a Southeast Asia free from nuclear weapons, with all the nuclear weapon states committed to the purposes of the Southeast Asia Nuclear Weapon-Free Zone Treaty through their adherence to its Protocol. We also envision our region free from all other weapons of mass destruction.

We envision our rich human and natural resources contributing to our development and shared prosperity.

We envision the ASEAN Regional Forum as an established means for confidence-building and preventive diplomacy and for promoting conflict-resolution.

We envision a Southeast Asia where our mountains, rivers and seas no longer divide us but link us together in friendship, cooperation and commerce.

We see ASEAN as an effective force for peace, justice and moderation in the Asia-Pacific region and in the world.

### **A partnership in dynamic development**

We resolve to chart a new direction towards the year 2020, called 'ASEAN 2020: Partnership in Dynamic Development', which will forge closer economic integration within ASEAN.

We reiterate our resolve to enhance ASEAN economic cooperation through economic development strategies, which are in line with the aspiration of our respective peoples, which put emphasis on sustainable and equitable growth, and enhance national as well as regional resilience.

We pledge to sustain ASEAN's high economic performance by building upon the foundation of our existing cooperation efforts, consolidating our achievements, expanding our collective efforts and enhancing mutual assistance.

We commit ourselves to moving towards closer cohesion and economic integration, narrowing the gap in the level of development among Member Countries, ensuring that the multilateral trading system remains fair and open, and achieving global competitiveness.

We will create a stable, prosperous and highly competitive ASEAN Economic Region in which there is a free flow of goods, services and investments, a freer flow of capital, equitable economic development and reduced poverty and socio-economic disparities.

We resolve, *inter alia*, to undertake the following:

- maintain regional macro-economic and financial stability by promoting closer consultations in macro-economic and financial policies.
- advance economic integration and cooperation by undertaking the following general strategies: fully implement the ASEAN Free Trade Area and accelerate liberalization of trade in services, realize the ASEAN Investment Area by 2010 and free flow of investments by 2020; intensify and expand sub-regional cooperation in existing and new subregional growth areas; further consolidate and expand extra-ASEAN regional linkages for mutual benefit, cooperate to strengthen the multilateral trading system, and reinforce the role of the business sector as the engine of growth.

- promote a modern and competitive small and medium enterprises (SME) sector in ASEAN which will contribute to the industrial development and efficiency of the region.
- accelerate the free flow of professional and other services in the region.
- promote financial sector liberalization and closer cooperation in money and capital market, tax, insurance and customs matters as well as closer consultations in macro-economic and financial policies.
- accelerate the development of science and technology including information technology by establishing a regional information technology network and centres of excellence for dissemination of and easy access to data and information.
- establish interconnecting arrangements in the field of energy and utilities for electricity, natural gas and water within ASEAN through the ASEAN Power Grid and a Trans-ASEAN Gas Pipeline and Water Pipeline, and promote cooperation in energy efficiency and conservation, as well as the development of new and renewable energy resources.
- enhance food security and international competitiveness of food, agricultural and forest products, to make ASEAN a leading producer of these products, and promote the forestry sector as a model in forest management, conservation and sustainable development.
- meet the ever-increasing demand for improved infrastructure and communications by developing an integrated and harmonized trans-ASEAN transportation network and harnessing technology advances in telecommunications and information technology, especially in linking the planned information highways/multimedia corridors in ASEAN, promoting open-sky policy, developing multi-modal transport, facilitating goods in transit and integrating telecommunications networks through greater interconnectivity, coordination of frequencies and mutual recognition of equipment-type approval procedures.
- enhance human resource development in all sectors of the economy through quality education, upgrading of skills and capabilities and training.
- work towards a world-class standards and conformance system that will provide a harmonized system to facilitate the free flow of ASEAN trade while meeting health, safety and environmental needs.

- use the ASEAN Foundation as one of the instruments to address issues of unequal economic development, poverty and socio-economic disparities.
- promote an ASEAN customs partnership for world-class standards and excellence in efficiency, professionalism and service, and uniformity through harmonized procedures, to promote trade and investment and to protect the health and well-being of the ASEAN community.
- enhance intra-ASEAN trade and investment in the mineral sector and contribute towards a technologically competent ASEAN through closer networking and sharing of information on mineral and geosciences as well as enhance cooperation and partnership with dialogue partners to facilitate the development and transfer of technology in the mineral sector, particularly in the downstream research and the geosciences and to develop appropriate mechanisms for these.

### **A community of caring societies**

We envision the entire Southeast Asia to be, by 2020, an ASEAN community conscious of its ties of history, aware of its cultural heritage and bound by a common regional identity.

We see vibrant and open ASEAN societies consistent with their respective national identities, where all people enjoy equitable access to opportunities for total human development regardless of gender, race, religion, language, or social and cultural background.

We envision a socially cohesive and caring ASEAN where hunger, malnutrition, deprivation and poverty are no longer basic problems, where strong families as the basic units of society tend to their members, particularly the children, youth, women and elderly; and where the civil society is empowered and gives special attention to the disadvantaged, disabled and marginalized and where social justice and the rule of law reign.

We see well before 2020 a Southeast Asia free of illicit drugs, free of their production, processing, trafficking and use.

We envision a technologically competitive ASEAN competent in strategic and enabling technologies, with an adequate pool of technologically qualified and trained manpower, and strong networks of scientific and technological institutions and centres of excellence.

We envision a clean and green ASEAN with fully established mechanisms for sustainable development to ensure the protection of the region's environment, the sustainability of its natural resources, and the high quality of life of its peoples.

We envision the evolution in Southeast Asia of agreed rules of behaviour and cooperative measures to deal with problems that can be met only on a regional scale, including environmental pollution and degradation, drug trafficking, trafficking in women and children, and other transnational crimes.

We envision our nations being governed with the consent and greater participation of the people with its focus on the welfare and dignity of the human person and the good of the community.

We resolve to develop and strengthen ASEAN's institutions and mechanisms to enable ASEAN to realize the vision and respond to the challenges of the coming century. We also see the need for a strengthened ASEAN Secretariat with an enhanced role to support the realization of our vision.

### **An outward-looking ASEAN**

We see an outward-looking ASEAN playing a pivotal role in international fora, and advancing ASEAN's common interests. We envision ASEAN having an intensified relationship with its dialogue partners and other regional organizations based on equal partnership and mutual respect.

## **Conclusion**

We pledge to our peoples our determination and commitment to bringing this ASEAN VISION for the Year 2020 into reality.

## APPENDIX VIII

### HANOI DECLARATION

*Adopted by the Heads of State and Government of ASEAN  
at the Sixth ASEAN Summit, Hanoi, 16 December 1998*

We, the Heads of State and Government of the Association of Southeast Asian Nations (ASEAN) gathered in Hanoi for the Sixth ASEAN Summit,

*Emphasizing* the theme of this gathering 'Unity and Cooperation for an ASEAN of Peace, Stability and Equitable Development' and recalling the Vision 2020 of ASEAN as 'a concert of Southeast Asian nations, outward-looking, living in peace, stability and prosperity, bonded together in partnership in dynamic development and in a community of caring societies';

*Aware* of the opportunities for renewed growth, peace and prosperity as well as the challenges posed especially by the economic crisis, as ASEAN approaches the new millennium;

*Confident* of our national and regional resilience, the fundamental strengths of our economies, and the ability and will of our people to overcome the difficulties that currently confront our nations and region;

#### **Hereby declare:**

1. We reaffirm our view of ASEAN as indispensable to regional peace and prosperity, an association with a history of demonstrated dynamism and close cooperation, a force for peace and stability in our part of the world.
2. We have decided to admit the Kingdom of Cambodia as the tenth member of ASEAN and instructed the Foreign Ministers to organize special ceremonies of admission in Hanoi.
3. We note ASEAN's success in promoting regional peace and stability, based on the cardinal principles of mutual respect, non-interference, consensus, dialogue and consultation. This has contributed substantially to many years of rapid economic growth and social development for our nations. We will not be complacent in the maintenance of regional peace but will seek to constantly reinforce the ties among us.
4. We recognize that the economic and financial upheaval that currently afflicts our economies and societies has severely set back many of the gains that our nations and our Association have achieved. We shall overcome those economic and social difficulties by working together in ever closer cooperation and ever stronger solidarity.
5. We shall move ASEAN on to a higher plane of regional cooperation in order to strengthen ASEAN's effectiveness in dealing with the challenges of growing interdependence within ASEAN and of its integration into the global economy. In doing so, we commit ourselves to intensifying our dialogue on current and emerging issues, further consolidating our unity in diversity, our cohesiveness and harmony.
6. We are committed to accelerating economic and financial reforms to strengthen our respective economies. We believe that reform efforts at the national level must be reinforced by corresponding reforms at the global level to address weaknesses in the international financial architecture and welcome the contribution of the G-22 in this area. We strongly urge that further work be done within the G-22 or an expanded version of it. ASEAN will continue to play an active role in the international community to expedite the development and implementation of these reforms.

7. The international community also has a responsibility to continue to support our reform efforts through bilateral and multi-lateral assistance, including new and innovative approaches to catalyse the return of private capital flows to the region. In this context, we welcome the Miyazawa Plan, and the Asian Growth and Recovery Initiative to revitalize private sector growth in Asia. We look forward to their quick implementation.
8. We recognize that the financial crisis has a social dimension, with the poor and vulnerable segments of our societies being the most adversely affected. In this regard, we will ensure that efforts to safeguard the interests of the poor form an integral part of our reform efforts. We also urge the international community to step up their technical and financial assistance in this area as well as ensure that the reforms in the international financial architecture include a social dimension to protect the poor.
9. We reaffirm our commitment to the greater integration of our economies as a primary expression of our cooperation and solidarity.
10. To this end, we shall spare no efforts to quickly restore financial and macro-economic stability, bring about early economic recovery and maintain sustained growth. In this regard, ASEAN has put in place an ASEAN Surveillance Process, based on peer review, to highlight emerging risks, recommend appropriate policy responses, and encourage early action to avoid such risks.
11. ASEAN will keep its markets open as it recognizes that the key to strengthening and stabilizing the region's currencies and economies is to attract long-term investments. ASEAN reaffirms its commitment to trade and investment liberalization and facilitation, at the multilateral and regional levels, and will continue to undertake concrete measures towards these objectives.
12. We resolve to implement, as scheduled, the ASEAN Free Trade Area (AFTA) and all approved programmes and projects. In addition, we seek to further accelerate AFTA and expedite the implementation of the ASEAN Industrial Cooperation Scheme (AICO). We shall open up our investment regimes through the launching of the ASEAN Investment Area (AIA), which will enhance the attractiveness of the region as an investment destination through the application of consistent investment laws and policies.
13. We encourage wider use of ASEAN currencies in intra-ASEAN trade settlements.
14. We shall develop and strengthen the ASEAN regional infrastructure by developing networks of electricity grids, gas and water pipelines, and expanding transport and telecommunications links. Efficient and quality infrastructure will enhance ASEAN's competitiveness.
15. We shall endeavour to narrow the gap in the levels of development among the Member Countries and reduce poverty and socio-economic disparities through greater subregional cooperation.
16. We shall ensure food security in the region and enhance the competitiveness of our food, agriculture and forestry sectors by increasing productivity, promoting intra and extra ASEAN trade, and greater private sector investment.
17. We shall encourage the active participation and effective contribution of the business sector to assist in the shaping of ASEAN's policies and initiatives to overcome the crisis. A close partnership between the ASEAN governments and the private sector would be crucial in paving the way to sustained recovery and prosperity of the region.
18. Accordingly, ASEAN calls upon the concerned countries and international financial institutions to continue to assist the affected countries in their economic recovery through development assistance, increased private investment flows, greater market access of goods originating from the ASEAN region, increased technology transfer and cooperation in human resource development.
19. The maintenance and creation of employment shall be a primary consideration in our strategies for economic recovery and growth. An essential part of this shall be a concerted and cooperative effort to foster SMEs and to train our people for the demands and opportunities of the industries of today and tomorrow.
20. We shall continue to cooperate and strengthen ASEAN's capacity in science and technology, particularly in the field of Information Technology. Towards this end, we shall develop the ASEAN Information Infrastructure.

21. We recognize that the ultimate objective of economic development is to raise standards of living and to promote human development in all its dimensions, so as to enable the people of ASEAN to have the fullest opportunity to realize their potential.
22. The eradication of poverty shall be the ultimate goal of our strategies for recovery and growth, and the development of our rural areas a principal means for attaining it. We shall work closely together to eradicate poverty in and develop rural and remote areas as well as the less developed inter-state areas.
23. We shall strengthen and promote linkages among ASEAN institutional mechanisms in fighting against drug abuse and trafficking in order to eradicate drug production, processing, trafficking and use by the year 2020.
24. We shall, together, make sure that our people are assured of adequate medical care and access to essential medicines. We shall step up our cooperation in the control and prevention of communicable diseases, including HIV/AIDS.
25. So as to ensure the sustainability of our nations' development, the protection of the environment shall be an essential part of our economic activities. We shall consolidate and expand our gains in the control and prevention of transboundary pollution, especially the haze arising from land and forest fires.
26. We shall intensify individual and collective efforts to address transnational crimes such as drug trafficking, money laundering, terrorism, piracy, arms smuggling and trafficking in persons.
27. We shall fortify confidence in our nations by continuing to maintain friendly relations among us and fostering the security of our region.
28. Towards this end, we shall expedite the ratification of the Second Protocol to the Treaty of Amity and Cooperation in Southeast Asia so as to enable non-regional states to accede to the Treaty at the earliest possible time. We shall intensify the consultations with the Nuclear-Weapon States with a view to their accession to the Protocol to the Treaty on the Southeast Asia Nuclear Weapon-Free Zone.
29. We shall endeavour to resolve outstanding problems and prevent the emergence of disputes in the ASEAN way and in accordance with international law and practice.
30. We shall promote efforts to settle disputes in the South China Sea by peaceful means in accordance with international law, including the 1982 United Nations Convention on the Law of the Sea, and in the spirit of the 1992 ASEAN Declaration on the South China Sea. We call on all parties concerned to exercise restraint and to refrain from taking actions that are inimical to the peace, security and stability of Southeast Asia and the Asia-Pacific region.
31. We welcome efforts to develop long-term constructive relationships among the major powers. ASEAN shall enhance its dialogue partnership and cooperation with other countries as well as with other regional and international organizations, on the basis of equality, non-interference, mutual respect and mutual benefit.
32. We shall strengthen the ASEAN Regional Forum as a forum for political and security dialogue and cooperation in the Asia-Pacific region, ASEAN leadership of ARF shall continue to be exercised and enhanced, while ASEAN solidarity and coordination in ARF shall be intensified.
33. As a step to enhance ASEAN's investment and trade environment, a package of bold measures and privileges will be granted to traders and investors. In this regard, we ask our Ministers to commence implementation of the package of bold measures starting from 1 January 1999.
34. We hereby adopt the Hanoi Plan of Action and charge our Ministers and Senior Officials to begin its implementation. We agree to conduct a review of the progress in 2001, three years after the adoption of the Hanoi Plan of Action.

Done at Hanoi on the Sixteenth Day of December, Nineteen Hundred and Ninety Eight.

## APPENDIX IX

# PREAMBLE AND ARTICLE 1 OF THE CONSTITUTION OF THE UNITED NATIONS EDUCATIONAL, SCIENTIFIC AND CULTURAL ORGANIZATION

The Governments of the States Parties to this Constitution on behalf of their peoples declare:

That since wars begin in the minds of men, it is in the minds of men that the defences of peace must be constructed;

That ignorance of each other's ways and lives has been a common cause, throughout the history of mankind, of that suspicion and mistrust between the peoples of the world through which their differences have all too often broken into war;

That the great and terrible war which has now ended was a war made possible by the denial of the democratic principles of the dignity, equality and mutual respect of men, and by the propagation, in their place, through ignorance and prejudice, of the doctrine of the inequality of men and races;

That the wide diffusion of culture, and the education of humanity for justice and liberty and peace are indispensable to the dignity of man and constitute a sacred duty which all the nations must fulfil in a spirit of mutual assistance and concern;

That a peace based exclusively upon the political and economic arrangements of governments would not be a peace which could secure the unanimous, lasting and sincere support of the peoples of the world, and that the peace must therefore be founded, if it is not to fail, upon the intellectual and moral solidarity of mankind.

For these reasons, the States Parties to this Constitution, believing in full and equal opportunities for education for all, in the unrestricted pursuit of objective truth, and in the free exchange of ideas and knowledge, are agreed and determined to develop and to increase the means of communication between their peoples and to

employ these means for the purposes of mutual understanding and a truer and more perfect knowledge of each other's lives;

In consequence whereof they do hereby create the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization for the purpose of advancing, through the educational and scientific and cultural relations of the peoples of the world, the objectives of international peace and of the common welfare of mankind for which the United Nations Organization was established and which its Charter proclaims.

### ARTICLE I.

#### Purposes and functions

1. The purpose of the Organization is to contribute to peace and security by promoting collaboration among the nations through education, science and culture in order to further universal respect for justice, for the rule of law and for the human rights and fundamental freedoms which are affirmed for the peoples of the world, without distinction of race, sex, language or religion, by the Charter of the United Nations.
2. To realize this purpose the Organization will:
  - (a) Collaborate in the work of advancing the mutual knowledge and understanding of peoples, through all means of mass communication and to that end recommend such international agreements as may be necessary to promote the free flow of ideas by word and image;
  - (b) Give fresh impulse to popular education and to the spread of culture:  
By collaborating with Members, at their request, in the development of educational activities;

By instituting collaboration among the nations to advance the ideal of equality of educational opportunity without regard to race, sex or any distinctions, economic or social;

By suggesting educational methods best suited to prepare the children of the world for the responsibilities of freedom;

(c) Maintain, increase and diffuse knowledge:

By assuring the conservation and protection of the world's inheritance of books, works of art and monuments of history and science, and recommending to the nations concerned the necessary international conventions;

By encouraging co-operation among the nations in all branches of intellectual

activity, including the international exchange of persons active in the fields of education, science and culture and the exchange of publications, objects of artistic and scientific interest and other materials of information;

By initiating methods of international co-operation calculated to give the people of all countries access to the printed and published materials produced by any of them.

3. With a view to preserving the independence, integrity and fruitful diversity of the cultures and educational systems of the States Members of the Organization, the Organization is prohibited from intervening in matters which are essentially within their domestic jurisdiction.

## APPENDIX X

# RESOLUTIONS CONCERNING THE CULTURE OF PEACE AND THE INTERNATIONAL YEAR FOR THE CULTURE OF PEACE

### A.

#### *Resolution 52/13 on the Culture of Peace adopted by the United Nations General Assembly*

The General Assembly,

*Recalling* the preamble to the Charter of the United Nations and the purposes and principles of the United Nations, and recalling also that the creation of the United Nations system itself, based upon universally shared values and goals, has been a major act towards transformation from a culture of war and violence to a culture of peace and non-violence,

*Aware* that the task of the United Nations to save future generations from the scourge of war requires transformation towards a culture of peace, which consists of values, attitudes and behaviours that reflect and inspire social interaction and sharing based on the principles of freedom, justice and democracy, all human rights, tolerance and solidarity, that reject violence and endeavour to prevent conflicts by tackling their root causes to solve problems through dialogue and negotiation and that guarantee the full exercise of all rights and the means to participate fully in the development process of their society,

*Recalling* its resolutions 50/173 of 22 December 1995 and 51/101 of 12 December 1996 on a culture of peace and 51/104 of 12 December 1996 on the United Nations Decade for Human Rights Education and public information activities in the field of human rights,

*Noting* that the report of the Director-General of the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization on educational activities under the project entitled 'Towards a culture of peace' with elements for a draft provisional declaration and programme of action on a culture of peace,<sup>1</sup> indicates that the transition from the culture of war to a

culture of peace has been taken up as a priority by the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization and is also being promoted at many levels by the United Nations system as it enters the twenty-first century,

1. *Takes note* of the report of the Director-General of the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization,<sup>2</sup> as transmitted by the Secretary-General and submitted in accordance with General Assembly resolution 51/101, which is set within the framework of United Nations actions for peace-building, including the United Nations Decade for Human Rights Education, 1995-2004, and the United Nations Year for Tolerance, as well as the programmes of action of recent United Nations world conferences;
2. *Calls* for the promotion of a culture of peace based on the principles established in the Charter of the United Nations and on respect for human rights, democracy and tolerance, the promotion of development, education for peace, the free flow of information and the wider participation of women as an integral approach to preventing violence and conflicts, and efforts aimed at the creation of conditions for peace and its consolidation;
3. *Notes* that the report includes:
  - (a) Elements for a draft United Nations declaration on a culture of peace, including the historical basis, the meaning and significance of a culture of peace and the major fields and main actors for its promotion;

1. A/52/292, Annex.

2. Fiftieth plenary meeting, 20 November 1997.

- (b) Elements for a programme of action, including the relevant aims as well as the strategies and actions needed to implement each of those aims;
  - (c) A presentation of the progress of projects within the framework of the transdisciplinary project entitled 'Towards a culture of peace';
4. *Requests* the Secretary-General, in coordination with the Director-General of the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization and taking into account the debate in the General Assembly, the specific suggestions of Member States and the comments, if any, of member States in the General Conference of the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization at its twenty-ninth session, to submit a consolidated report containing a draft declaration and programme of action on a culture of peace to the General Assembly at its fifty-third session;
  5. *Decides* to include in the provisional agenda of its fifty-third session an item entitled 'Culture of peace'.

20 November 1997

## **B.**

### *Resolution 52/15 on the Proclamation of the year 2000 as the International Year for the Culture of Peace adopted by the United Nations General Assembly*

The General Assembly,  
*Recalling* Economic and Social Council resolution 1997/47 of 22 July 1997,  
*Proclaims* the year 2000 as the International Year for the Culture of Peace.

20 November 1997

## **C.**

### *Resolution E/1997/47 on the International Year for the Culture of Peace, 2000 of the United Nations Economic and Social Council*

*Recalling* General Assembly resolution 50/173 of 22 December 1995, entitled 'United Nations Decade for Human Rights Education: towards a culture of peace', in which it expressed satisfaction with the transdisciplinary project adopted by the General Conference of the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization entitled 'Towards a culture of peace',

*Recalling* also General Assembly resolution 51/101 of 12 December 1996 on a culture of peace, in which it called for the promotion of a culture of peace based on the preamble to the Charter of the United Nations and the purposes and principles of the United Nations,

*Expressing its deep concern* about the persistence and proliferation of violence and conflicts of a diverse nature in various parts of the world,

*Emphasizing* the link between peace and development and the need for a culture of peace that can lead, through education, science and communication, to respect for all human rights and the promotion of democracy, tolerance, dialogue, reconciliation and solidarity, as well as to international cooperation and economic development, and thus to sustainable human development,

*Aware* of the need to mobilize public opinion at the national and international levels for the purpose of establishing and promoting

a culture of peace and the central role that the United Nations system could play in this regard,

*Bearing in mind* the memorandum of understanding between the Director-General of the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization and the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights, signed in Paris on 19 October 1995,

*Convinced* that an international year for the culture of peace at the turn of the millennium would provide the opportunity to boost the efforts of the international community to establish and promote an everlasting culture of peace,

1. *Recommends* that the General Assembly, at its fifty-second session, proclaim the year 2000 as International Year for the Culture of Peace;
2. *Also recommends* that the programme of activities and the scope of the Year should focus on respect for cultural diversity and promotion of tolerance, solidarity, coopera-

tion, dialogue and reconciliation and should be based on activities at the national and international levels;

3. *Further recommends* that the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization should be designated as the focal point for the Year and should bear the responsibility for coordinating the inter-organizational aspects of the programmes and activities of the other bodies within the United Nations system and other organizations concerned and for mobilizing resources to meet the budgetary requirements for the Year;
4. *Requests* the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization to submit to the Council, at its substantive session of 1998, a report on the state of preparations for the Year to enable it to make appropriate proposals to the General Assembly at its fifty-third session.

22 July 1997

## D.

### *Resolution 53/25 on the International Decade for a Culture of Peace and Non-Violence for the Children of the World (2001–2010) adopted by the United Nations General Assembly*

The General Assembly,

*Recalling* its resolution 52/15 of 20 November 1997 and Economic and Social Council resolution 1997/47 of 22 July 1997 proclaiming the year 2000 as the International Year for the Culture of Peace,<sup>1</sup> as well as its resolution 52/13 of 20 November 1997 on a culture of peace,

*Taking into account* Commission on Human Rights resolution 1998/54 of 17 April 1998 entitled 'Towards a culture of peace',<sup>2</sup>

*Recalling* the relevant resolutions of the General Assembly and the Commission on Human Rights concerning the United Nations Decade for Human Rights Education (1995-2004),

*Taking into account* the project of the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization entitled 'Towards a culture of peace',

*Aware* that the task of the United Nations to save future generations from the scourge of war requires transformation towards a

culture of peace, which consists of values, attitudes and behaviours that reflect and inspire social interaction and sharing based on the principles of freedom, justice and democracy, all human rights, tolerance and solidarity, that reject violence and endeavour to prevent conflicts by tackling their root causes to solve problems through dialogue and negotiation and that guarantee the full exercise of all rights and the means to participate fully in the development process of their society,

*Recognizing* that enormous harm and suffering are caused to children through different forms of violence at every level of society throughout the world and that a culture of peace and non-violence promotes respect

1. *Official Records of the Economic and Social Council*, Supplement No. 1 (E/1997/97), 1997.

2. *Ibid.*, Supplement No. 3 (E/1998/23), Chapter II, Section A, 1998.

for the life and dignity of every human being without prejudice or discrimination of any kind,

*Recognizing* also the role of education in constructing a culture of peace and non-violence, in particular the teaching of the practice of peace and non-violence to children, which will promote the purposes and principles embodied in the Charter of the United Nations,

*Emphasizing* that the promotion of a culture of peace and non-violence, by which children learn to live together in peace and harmony that will contribute to the strengthening of international peace and cooperation, should emanate from adults and be instilled in children,

*Underlining* that the proposed international decade for a culture of peace and non-violence for the children of the world will contribute to the promotion of a culture of peace based on the principles embodied in the Charter and on respect for human rights, democracy and tolerance, the promotion of development, education for peace, the free flow of information and the wider participation of women as an integral approach to preventing violence and conflicts, and efforts aimed at the creation of conditions for peace and its consolidation,

*Convinced* that such a decade, at the beginning of the new millennium, would greatly assist the efforts of the international community to foster peace, harmony, all human rights, democracy and development throughout the world,

1. *Proclaims* the period 2001–2010 as the International Decade for a Culture of Peace and Non-Violence for the Children of the World;
2. *Invites* the Secretary-General to submit, in consultation with Member States, relevant United Nations bodies and non-governmental organizations, a report to the General Assembly at its fifty-fifth session and a draft programme of action to promote the implementation of the Decade at local, national, regional and international levels, and to coordinate the activities of the Decade;
3. *Invites* Member States to take the necessary steps to ensure that the practice of peace and non-violence is taught at all levels in their respective societies, including in educational institutions;
4. *Calls upon* the relevant United Nations bodies, in particular the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization and the United Nations Children's Fund, and invites non-governmental organizations, religious bodies and groups, educational institutions, artists and the media actively to support the Decade for the benefit of every child of the world;
5. *Decides* to consider, at its fifty-fifth session, the question of the International Decade for a Culture of Peace and Non-Violence for the Children of the World (2001–2010), under the agenda item entitled 'Culture of peace'.

10 November 1998

## APPENDIX XI

### OTHER UNESCO PUBLICATIONS OF INTEREST

#### I. Publications on the culture of peace and the new approach to security

- *The New Page*, by Federico Mayor. 1995. Co-published by Dartmouth University Press and UNESCO Publishing, 180 pp.
- *Non-military aspects of international security*. 1995. UNESCO Publishing. 260 pp.
- *Peace!* by the Nobel Peace Prize winners. 1995. UNESCO Publishing. 570 pp.
- *Peace and war: social and cultural aspects*, by Hakan Wiberg. 1995. Bel Corp Publishers, Warsaw. 125 pp.
- *UNESCO and a culture of peace. Promoting a global movement*. 1996. CAB-95/WS/1. UNESCO. 206 pp.
- *The Venice Deliberations – Transformations in the meaning of ‘security’: practical steps toward a new security culture*. The Venice Papers 1. 1996. CAB-96 WS/1. UNESCO. 125 pp.
- *Final Report of the Second International Forum on the Culture of Peace* (The Manila Forum) ‘Transformation Towards a Culture of Peace’, 23–30 November 1995. Office of the Presidential Adviser on the Peace Process, Manila, Philippines. 1996. 103 pp.
- *Security for peace – a synopsis of the inter-American symposium on peace-building and peacekeeping* (organized jointly by the Organization of American States and UNESCO). The Venice Papers 2. 1996. CAB-96 WS/2. UNESCO. 32 pp.
- *Actes du colloque international sur le droit à l’assistance humanitaire* (Paris, 25–27 January 1995). 1996. SHS-96/WS/9. UNESCO. 218 pp.
- *From a culture of violence to a culture of peace*. 1996. UNESCO Publishing. 276 pp.
- *UNESCO: an ideal in action*, by Federico Mayor. 1996. UNESCO Publishing. 131 pp.
- *What kind of security?* 1997. CAB-97/WS/3. UNESCO. 156 pp. (French, English)
- *Proceedings of the International Symposium on ‘From Partial Insecurity to Global Security’* (organized jointly by UNESCO, IHEDN, CASD, CESEDEN and the Institute for Security Studies of the WEU). 1997. CAB-97/WS/1. UNESCO. 208 pp. (French, English)
- *Actas del Primer Foro Militar Centroamericano para la Cultura de la Paz* (San Salvador, 26–27 June 1996). UNESCO Office, El Salvador. 1997. 151 pp.
- *Professional Peacebuilding*. A preliminary guide developed in an International Workshop and Simulation. The Venice Papers 3. 1998. CAB-98/WS/04. UNESCO.
- *Peace, security and conflict prevention*. SIPRI-UNESCO Handbook. 1998. Oxford University Press. 230 pp.
- *Cultura de paz y gestión de conflictos* by Vicenc Fisas, Introduction by Federico Mayor. 1998. UNESCO Publications and Icaria Antrazyt, Barcelona. 406 pp.

#### II. Publications on science and peace

- *Science and power*, by Federico Mayor and Augusto Forti. 1995. UNESCO. 230 pp. (English, French, Italian)
- *Peace in the oceans – Ocean governance and the Agenda for Peace*. 1997. (SC-97/WS/30). UNESCO. 266 pp.
- *Genoa Forum of UNESCO on Science and Society – Genoa Declaration on Science and Society*, First Reflection Meeting: International Symposium on Science and Power, Genoa,

Italy. V. Kouzminov, S. Biggin and R. Santesso (eds.). 1995. 183 pp.\*

### **Science for Peace Series**

**Volume 1** Proceedings of the International Meeting on Military Conversion and Science: Utilisation/Disposal of the Excess Weapon Plutonium: Scientific, Technological and Socio-Economic Aspects, Como, Italy. V. Kouzminov, M. Martellini and R. Santesso (eds.). 1996. 469 pp.\*

**Volume 2** Forum 'Science for Peace' – Session of the Genoa Forum of UNESCO on Science and Society 'Science Ethics' – Workshop 'Science, Technology and National Systems of Innovation', Como, Italy. V. Kouzminov, M. Martellini and R. Santesso (eds.). 1997. 181 pp.\*

**Volume 3** International Symposia on Science for Peace (First Symposium 11 December 1995; Second Symposium 20–23 January 1997, Jerusalem, Israel. Y. Becker,

V. Kouzminov and R. Santesso (eds.). 1997. 306 pp.\*

**Volume 4** Illegal Nuclear Traffic: Risks, Safeguards and Countermeasures, Como, Italy. V. Kouzminov, M. Martellini and R. Santesso (eds.). 1998. 159 pp.\*

**Volume 5** Nuclear and Biological Decommissioning: Management of Global Security Threats. G. Aslanian, V. Kouzminov, M. Martellini and R. Santesso (eds.). 1998. 276 pp.\*

**Volume 6** Inauguration of the UNESCO International School of Science for Peace, First Forum of the International Scientific Panel on the Possible Consequences of the Misuse of Biological Sciences. Y. Becker, A. Falaschi, V. Kouzminov, M. Martellini and R. Santesso (eds.). [In press]\*

**Volume 7** Energy Security in the Third Millennium: Scientific and Technological Issues. G. Aslanian, U. Farinelli, V. Kouzminov, M. Martellini and R. Santesso (eds.). [In press]\*

---

\* Published by the UNESCO Venice Office.

## APPENDIX XII

### WEB SITES OF INTEREST

1. *ASEAN*
  - <http://www.asean.or.id>
2. *UNESCO*
  - <http://www.unesco.org>
  - <http://www.unesco.org/cpp/>  
Transdisciplinary project 'Towards a Culture of Peace'
3. *UNESCO offices in Southeast Asia:*
  - Bangkok Office* • <http://www.education.unesco.org:80/orealc/index.html>
  - Jakarta Office* • <http://www.un.or.id/unesco/>
4. *ASEAN Regional Forum (ARF)*
  - <http://www.asean.or.id>  
(click Political and Security. Then click ASEAN Regional Forum for ARF's Chairman's Statements)
  - <http://www.dfat.gov.au/arf/arfhome.html>
5. *Southeast Asia, ASEAN and the ASEAN Regional Forum (ARF): Defence and Security Issues*
  - <http://www.lib.adfa.oz.au/web/military/infogd17.html>  
For monographs, monograph chapters, conference papers and journal articles (from 1992)
6. *Council for Security Cooperation in the Asia Pacific (CSCAP)*
  - <http://www.anu.edu.au/Depts/RSPAS/AUSCSCAP/Auscscap.html>  
For information about the CSCAP, the CSCAP Working Groups and Publications, the AUS-CSCAP Newsletter and related links.
7. *Calendar of Asia-Pacific events concerning regional security dialogue*
  - <http://www.coombs.anu.edu/Depts/RSPAS/SDSC/APSSecurityTop.html>
8. *Related links*
  - <http://www.jaring.my/isis>  
Institute of Strategic and International Studies (ISIS – Malaysia)
  - <http://www.lib.adfa.oz.au/web/military/infogd23.html>  
Asia Pacific Web pages useful to security analysts

## APPENDIX XIII

# AGENDA OF UNESCO'S ACTIVITIES CONCERNING THE PROMOTION OF A NEW APPROACH TO SECURITY 1994–1999

1994

**12–14 May** Seminar on peacekeeping and peace-building at the Institute of Science, Literature and Art. (Venice, Italy)<sup>1</sup>

1995

**25–27 January** International colloquium on the right to humanitarian assistance, organized by UNESCO. (Paris, UNESCO Headquarters)<sup>1</sup>

**3–4 April** Inter-American symposium on 'Security for Peace: peace-building and peace-keeping' organized by UNESCO, the Organization of American States and the Inter-American Defense College. (Washington, D.C., USA)<sup>1</sup>

**10 June** The Director-General of UNESCO delivered the closing address at the 47th National Session of the French Institut des Hautes Études de Défense Nationale (IHEDN) on the theme 'A new approach to security'. (Paris, École Militaire)

**13 June** African and Malagasy International Session of IHEDN hosted by UNESCO. (Paris, UNESCO Headquarters)

**25–29 September** Regional seminar for the countries of Central Asia on international humanitarian law and the law on protection of cultural property, organized in cooperation with the International Committee of the Red Cross (ICRC). (Tashkent, Uzbekistan)

**October** Establishment in UNESCO of an informal group to consider the new approach to security, whose work was published in 1997 under the title 'What kind of security?'<sup>1</sup>

**7 October** European Session of IHEDN hosted by UNESCO. (Paris, UNESCO Headquarters)

**18–19 December** Colloquium on 'Wars and peace in the twenty-first century', organized by the French Fondation pour les Études de Défense as part of the UNESCO fiftieth anniversary celebrations. The opening speech by the Director-General of UNESCO was published in April 1996 in the journal *Défense nationale*. (Paris, UNESCO Headquarters)

1. See Appendix XI: Other UNESCO publications of interest.

## 1996

- 10 January** The Director-General of UNESCO gave a lecture at Italy's Centro di Alti Studi per la Difesa (CASD) on 'UNESCO and the Culture of Peace'. Signature of a protocol of intent with CASD concerning collaboration between the armed forces of the northern and southern Mediterranean in the fields of telemedicine, civil defence and safeguarding the environment and the cultural heritage. (CASD Headquarters, Rome, Italy)
- May** UNESCO participation in three national seminars organized by the ICRC on 'International Humanitarian Law and the Law on Protection of Cultural Property'. (Azerbaijan (6–7 May), Armenia (9–10 May) and Georgia (13–14 May))
- 12–14 June** International symposium on the theme 'From Partial Insecurity to Global Security', organized jointly by UNESCO and IHEDN, in cooperation with Italy's Centro di Alti Studi per la Difesa (CASD), Spain's Centro Superior de Estudios de la Defensa Nacional (CESEDEN) and the Institute for Security Studies of the Western European Union (WEU). (Paris, UNESCO Headquarters)<sup>1</sup>
- 26–27 June** First Central American Military Forum on the Culture of Peace. Adoption of a Declaration signed by the Ministers of Defence and the Commanders-in-Chief of the Armed Forces of El Salvador, Guatemala, Honduras and Nicaragua.<sup>1</sup> (San Salvador, El Salvador)
- 16–27 September** Participation of UNESCO in a seminar organized by the Institute for Security Studies of the WEU and CASD on the theme 'Europe and its neighbours: reflections on a common security policy'. (Rome, Italy)
- 28 October–1 November** Participation of UNESCO in the first Ibero-American Conference on Peace and Conflict Management. (Santa Fé de Bogota, Colombia)
- December** Declaration of the Director-General of UNESCO on the human right to peace.

## 1997

- 4–6 February** Keynote speech by the Director-General on 'The armed forces, democracy and human rights on the threshold of the twenty-first century', at the Second Conference on Human Rights, organized jointly by the United States Southern Command and the Inter-American Institute of Human Rights (IIHR). (Miami, USA)
- 12–14 March** Participation of UNESCO in a meeting on 'NATO in the International Security System' organized by the Académie de la Paix et de la Sécurité Internationale. (Monte Carlo, Monaco)
- 14 March** Conference of Ms M. Goucha on 'The Contribution of Culture and Education as Factors of Peace in the Peace Process'. (École Normale Supérieure de la rue d'Ulm, Paris, France)
- 14–15 April** Participation of UNESCO in the meeting on 'The Mediterranean, a challenge for Europe' organized jointly by the Centre d'Étude et de Prospective Stratégique (France), the Centre d'Étude de Relations Internationales et Stratégiques (Belgium) and the Military Strategic Studies Centre (Italy). (Paris, France)
- 24–26 April** Participation of UNESCO in the meeting of Chiefs of Staff of the armed forces of member countries of the Non-Aggression and Defence Assistance Agreement (ANAD). (Niamey, Niger)
- 12–13 May** Participation of UNESCO in the Second Annual Strategic Meeting organized by the French Institut de Relations Internationales et Stratégiques (IRIS). (Enghien-les-Bains, France)

1. See Appendix XI: Other UNESCO publications of interest.

- 11–13 June** Information mission to UN Headquarters on UNESCO's activities concerning the promotion of a new approach to security. (New York, USA)
- 2–4 July** Participation of UNESCO in the regional seminar organized by the Groupe d'Étude et de Recherches sur la Démocratie et le Développement Économique et Social (GERDDES-Africa) on the role of the armed forces in the democratic process. (Ouagadougou, Burkina Faso)
- 2–4 September** Participation of UNESCO at the Third International Conference on new or re-established democracies organized by the Minister of Foreign Affairs of Romania and the United Nations Development Programme. (Bucharest, Romania)
- 16–29 September** Participation of UNESCO in the Regional Session of the Institut des Hautes Études de Défense Nationale (IHEDN) on 'Defence and Security Issues'. (First session)
- 26–27 September** Participation of UNESCO at the seminar organized by the Secrétariat Général de la Défense Nationale (SGDN) and the IHEDN on 'Defence and the Governance of Nations' (Paris, France)
- 3–10 October** Participation of UNESCO in the Regional Session of the Institut des Hautes Études de Défense Nationale (IHEDN) on 'Defence and Security Issues'. (Second session)
- 5–6 November** Participation of UNESCO in the Regional Session of the Institut des Hautes Études de Défense Nationale (IHEDN) on 'Defence and Security Issues'. (Final session)
- 18 November** Participation of UNESCO in the First Strategic Franco-Turkish Meeting organized by the French Institut de Relations Internationales et Stratégiques (IRIS). (Paris, France)
- 29 November** Conferences on the democratic security of populations at the round table on the culture of peace held in the framework of the National Conference of Pacifists on the theme 'Towards the year 2000: prepare war or impose peace'. (Gennevilliers, France)
- December** Declaration of the Director-General of UNESCO on a code of conduct for the sale of weapons.
- 17 December** Participation of UNESCO in a meeting on the 'Management of the Way out of Crisis' organized by the Institut des Hautes Études de Défense Nationale (IHEDN). (Paris, France)
- 1998**
- 14 January** Conference of the Director-General of UNESCO on the theme 'The sharing of knowledge' at the École Polytechnique. (Palaiseau, France)
- 23–27 February** Participation of UNESCO in the conference 'Towards collaborative peace: the control of small arms and the reversal of violence'. (Bellagio, Italy)
- 19–21 March** Participation of UNESCO in a meeting on 'Relations between Globalization and International Security' organized by the Académie de la Paix et de la Sécurité Internationale. (Monte Carlo, Monaco)
- 15–18 April** Participation of UNESCO in the Conference 'Reducing violence and controlling light weapons proliferation in Africa and the Indian Ocean'. (Saint-Denis de la Réunion, La Réunion)
- 16–17 April** Participation of UNESCO in the Second Central American Military Forum on Culture of Peace and Non-Violence. (Guatemala City, Guatemala)
- 29 April** Conferences on the theme 'Which security architecture should be promoted today?' at the round table organized by the Department of Political Affairs of the French Communist Party. (Paris, France)

1. See Appendix XI: Other UNESCO publications of interest.

- 5 May** Conference on 'Human rights and the new approach to security' on the occasion of the Third European Symposium on the Ethics of the Police in Europe. (Parvis des droits de l'homme, Paris, France)
- 11–12 May** Participation of UNESCO in the Third Annual Strategic Meeting organized by the French Institut de Relations Internationales et Stratégiques (IRIS). (Enghien-les-Bains, France)
- 29 May** Conference of the Director-General of UNESCO on the 'New approach to security and the role of the armed forces in the building of peace' at the Military Academy of Zaragoza. (Zaragoza, Spain)
- 30 May** Participation of UNESCO in the seminar on the code of conduct of the armed forces of the Republic of Mali. (Bamako, Mali)
- 5–6 June** Participation of UNESCO in the Fiftieth Anniversary Meeting of the French Institut des Hautes Études de Défense Nationale (IHEDN). (Paris, France)
- 20 June** Conference on human rights and the democratic security of populations in the seminar on 'Human rights in movement', organized by the International Association of Educators for Peace. (Paris, France)
- 10–11 September** 'Regional Symposium on Cooperative Peace in Southeast Asia', co-organized by UNESCO and ASEAN. (ASEAN Headquarters, Jakarta, Indonesia)
- 6–7 November** Participation of UNESCO in the 'Forum on the New Dimensions of Security' organized by *El País* and *Le Monde*. (Madrid, Spain)
- 2 December** Participation of UNESCO in the First Franco-Hungarian Strategic Meeting organized by the French Institut de Relations Internationales et Stratégiques (IRIS). (Paris, France)
- 11 December** Conference on 'The democratic security of populations' at the colloquium organized by the Department of Policy and International Relations of the French Communist Party on 'Year 2000: which security for Europe?' (Saint Ouen, France)

1999

### Scheduled publications

1. *Information document on UNESCO's activities concerning the promotion of a new approach to security.*
2. *Training manual on human rights, democracy and development for members of the armed forces.*
3. *The democratic security of populations, a challenge for the twenty-first century.*

### Scheduled meetings

- 22 February** Signing of the Agreement of Cooperation between UNESCO and the Institute of Security Studies of South Africa.
- 23 March** Participation of UNESCO in the meeting on 'Prevention of violence and human rights' organized by Police et Humanisme. (Paris, France)
- 21–23 April** Participation of UNESCO at the all-Russian Conference on the problems of the culture of peace, human rights and democracy in the armed forces, the structure of the Ministry of the Interior and of the special security forces. (Moscow, Russian Federation)
- 25–26 September** Regional conference on the culture of peace in the Arab region, co-organized by UNESCO and the Arab League. (Arab League Headquarters, Cairo, Egypt)

1. See Appendix XI: Other UNESCO publications of interest.

## APPENDIX XIV

# INFORMATION DOCUMENT ON THE INTERNATIONAL YEAR FOR THE CULTURE OF PEACE DISSEMINATED BY UNESCO IN 1998

## International Year for the Culture of Peace For a new departure!

Values • Attitudes • Behaviour

### Why an International Year for the Culture of Peace in the year 2000?

The year 2000 has become an essential and necessary landmark for all humanity, ushering in not only a new century, but also a new millennium.

As well as taking stock of the achievements and failures of the past, we must seize the unique opportunity offered us by the year 2000 to give renewed impetus to the **work of building the future.**

However, if we wish to build the future we must take immediate and concerted action, **making peace and non-violence part of daily life for all human beings.**

For each one of us it will be a time to make a **new start** so as to speed up the transition from a culture of war and violence to the **culture of peace, for without peace in every life nothing can be built.**

To help make this new start, the United Nations General Assembly has proclaimed the year 2000 as the **International Year for the Culture of Peace.**

The International Year for the Culture of Peace must live up to the ideals which inspired it, but it is especially important that it should live up to the aspirations of each people and each human being to live in peace.

Objectives:

### What is the culture of peace?

**The culture of peace is all the values, attitudes and forms of behaviour that reflect respect for life, for human beings and their dignity and for all human rights, the rejection of violence in all its forms and commitment to the principles of freedom, justice, solidarity, tolerance and understanding among peoples and between groups and individuals.**

To enable ourselves and future generations to reap the rewards of this culture of peace, **we can act here and now.**

We must:

- encourage education for peace, human rights and democracy, tolerance and international understanding;
- protect and respect all human rights, without exception, and combat all forms of discrimination;
- promote democratic principles at all levels of society;
- live in tolerance and solidarity;
- combat poverty and ensure endogenous and sustainable development for the good of all, capable of providing everyone with the quality of life that is consistent with human dignity;
- protect and respect our environment.

*'We the peoples of the United Nations, determined to save succeeding generations from the scourge of war ...'*  
Charter of the United Nations,  
1945

**Peace**

**Non-violence**

**Respect for all human rights**

**Respect for cultural diversity**

**Promotion of democracy**

**Justice**

**Liberty**

**Tolerance**

**Dialogue**

**Reconciliation**

**Solidarity**

**Development**

*'Since wars begin in the minds of men, it is in the minds of men that the defences of peace must be constructed ...'*  
Constitution of UNESCO, 1945

*'The General Assembly, Recalling Economic and Social Council resolution 1997/47 of 22 July 1997, Proclaims the year 2000 as the International Year for the Culture of Peace'*  
50th plenary meeting of the General Assembly, 1997

### **Preparations:**

Since 20 November 1997, when the year 2000 was proclaimed International Year for the Culture of Peace, the United Nations system has been preparing for its celebration, **led by the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO).**

At the same time, in all the world's regions, **a broad range of organizations, associations, groups and individuals working for peace, non-violence and tolerance have undertaken to take an active part in preparations for the International Year.**

The year is thus already beginning to offer a unique opportunity to join with renewed vigour in the task of building a lasting peace between countries and within each society.

The United Nations General Assembly also has before it a draft provisional declaration and programme of action on a culture of peace, whose implementation, once approved, will require efforts **going well beyond the year 2000.**

### **Action:**

**Everyone is involved, everyone can contribute to establishing a culture of peace.**

The culture of peace is thus seen now as a **long-term endeavour** that must be guided by a coherent set of objectives, priorities and approaches reflecting the historical, political, economic, social and cultural context in which each individual lives.

And it is indeed up to **every individual** to put into practice the values, attitudes and forms of behaviour which inspire the culture of peace. For **each one of us can act** to that end in our family, our community, town, region and country by practising and promoting non-violence, tolerance, dialogue, reconciliation, justice and solidarity in our everyday life.

**You too can take action!  
Let us act together!**

If you would like more information on ways in which you personally, or the institution you represent, could participate actively in celebrating the International Year for the Culture of Peace, please contact your country's National Commission for UNESCO or the UNESCO Office for your country or region.



This leaflet is distributed by  
UNESCO  
United Nations system focal point  
for the International Year  
for the Culture of Peace  
Internet address: <http://www.unesco.org>

## ORDER FORM

To be returned to the office of Mr René Zapata, Focal Point for Peace and Security Affairs  
UNESCO, Office 5035, 7, place de Fontenoy, F-75352 Paris 07 SP, France

Family name ..... Forename .....

Profession .....

Telephone/Fax .....

Address .....

Postal code ..... Town ..... Country .....

Please supply ..... copies of the Proceedings of the 'Regional Symposium on Cooperative Peace  
in Southeast Asia'.

Date .....

Signature .....



## ORDER FORM

To be returned to the office of Mr René Zapata, Focal Point for Peace and Security Affairs  
UNESCO, Office 5035, 7, place de Fontenoy, F-75352 Paris 07 SP, France

Family name ..... Forename .....

Profession .....

Telephone/Fax .....

Address .....

Postal code ..... Town ..... Country .....

Please supply ..... copies of the Proceedings of the 'Regional Symposium on Cooperative Peace  
in Southeast Asia'.

Date .....

Signature .....

*The maintenance of peace and stability depends very much on the community at large as well as on the social norms which are conducive to the social support needed.*

*In line with this, UNESCO has actively popularized what is referred to as a 'culture of peace'. In this connection, I am sure that Southeast Asian countries and ASEAN play a significant role and provide a substantial contribution.*

[Extract from the inaugural address of H.E. Mr Bacharuddin Jusuf Habibie,  
President of the Republic of Indonesia]

*The issue is not whether such processes as the 'culture of peace' and 'cooperative peace' are new approaches to promoting peace or simply new expressions of the same ideals long cherished by peace-loving nations and communities. Instead, the task before us is to dwell on ways of fulfilling their common aspirations.*

[Extract from the opening speech of H.E. Mr Rodolfo C. Severino Jr.,  
Secretary-General of ASEAN]

*Southeast Asia has a unique opportunity – an opportunity born of crisis – to set in motion a new approach to recovery, a new approach to development, one which averts the risks of conflict and which, at every stage and at every level, reinforces peace, development, human rights and democracy. The region already has strong foundations for such an approach: its own tradition of cooperative peace, its extraordinarily rich history, values, culture and heritage, its wealth of resources and skills.*

[Extract from the opening speech of H.E. Mr Federico Mayor,  
Director-General of UNESCO]

*It will be a community that has embraced the values that reject violence and inspire mutual tolerance and sharing. In such a community, encompassing a wealth of many cultures, there will be one transcending culture – the culture of peace.*

[Extract from the keynote address by H.E. Mr Ali Alatas,  
Minister for Foreign Affairs of Indonesia]

In the framework of the preparations for the celebration in the year 2000 of the International Year for the Culture of Peace, the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO) and the Association of Southeast Asian Nations (ASEAN) jointly organized a Regional Symposium on Cooperative Peace in Southeast Asia, which was held at the ASEAN Secretariat Headquarters in Jakarta, Indonesia, on 11 and 12 September 1998. During the symposium, which aimed at bringing together cooperative peace as promoted by ASEAN and the culture of peace which UNESCO is striving to transform into a worldwide movement, over one hundred participants from all ten ASEAN Member States and observers from various other countries reflected on the shared values which lie at the foundations of both cooperative peace and the culture of peace, as well as on the ways and means of furthering the cause of peace in Southeast Asia at a critical moment in its history. The conclusions of their reflections and debates, published in these Proceedings, are clearly reflected in the Statement on Peace in Southeast Asia on the Eve of the Third Millennium which was adopted by acclamation by all the participants.