

UNESCO PRIZE

1990

FOR PEACE
EDUCATION

UNESCO

The ideas and opinions expressed
by the laureate of the UNESCO Prize
for Peace Education 1990
do not necessarily reflect
the views of UNESCO

Published in 1991 by
the United Nations Educational,
Scientific and Cultural Organization
7, place de Fontenoy, 75700 Paris

© UNESCO 1991

Printed in France

PABLO NERUDA

BORN TO BE BORN

We believe in peace and will knock at every door to seek the kingdom of peace. We desire peace among men and will wait for it just as pilgrims wait to find water along their route to recover the strength they have lost. As far as I was concerned, whenever a door was opened to me I went in.

I wanted to talk with everyone. I was not afraid of contamination by an adversary or an enemy. And I shall keep these dialogues going. They are inexhaustible; in all conflict there is a light at the end of the tunnel, and the light of understanding can filter in from both ends.

Extract from a speech delivered on 8 April 1968
at the Municipal Theatre of Santiago
on the occasion of the presentation
of the Frédéric Joliot-Curie medal to Pablo Neruda

CONTENTS

Address by
Mr Bernard Dadié
President of the International Jury
9

Address by
Mr Eduardo Portella
Deputy Director-General
for the Programme of UNESCO
15

Speech by
Mrs Rigoberta Menchú Túm
Lauréate of the UNESCO Prize 1990
for Peace Education
21

Speech by
the Representative
of the World Order Models Project
Laureate of the UNESCO Prize 1990
for Peace Education
27

Brief description
of the work of the laureates
39

APPENDICES
General Rules Governing
the UNESCO Prize for Peace Education
49

List of the members
of the International Jury
55

Laureates of the UNESCO Prize
for Peace Education 1981-1990
57

ADDRESS BY

Mr BERNARD DADIÉ

*President of the International Jury
on the occasion
of the Prize-Giving Ceremony*

Mr Director-General,
Honoured Guests,

FIRST of all, allow me to convey to the laureates the very warm and sincere congratulations of the members of the Jury and the President, and to pay tribute to all the organizations that have dedicated themselves to enforcing respect for human rights and to vigilance in the cause of preserving peace.

Peace is so infinitely precious that there are countries where a dead person cannot be buried until quarrels between members of their family are settled, so that, on arriving in the afterlife—according to our philosophy—he or she may be able to say that there is peace on earth, in that family.

Since I am aware that in the West there is a certain way of delivering a speech, which is different from our own, I say to you Sabyo! Forgive me if by any chance the words that I am about to speak offend you. Sabyo! which means ‘with all due respect’. Here is a word from an African language mingling with the official working languages. Is this not a sign of the peaceful coexistence of languages, and on your part, ladies and gentlemen, a sign of tolerance, a sign of peace?

They say that poets are dreamers, especially in lands where they are kept on the fringes of society unless they agree to be eulogists of dynasties in the making. And rulers on this earth do not want their praises sung? So are poets merely court entertainers? The poet refuses this role, wishing only to serve human beings and human destiny, to give them some hope in life, come hell or high water. For alas! how many rulers whose praises have been sung have turned out to be the enemies of peace beneath their false airs of Merlin the Enchanter?

Some of us who did not have the good fortune to be cradled in an artistic environment in our countries of origin come to bewail our fate on the banks of the Seine or the Thames. Is this not a tribute to all who, even against the so-called overriding interests of their

countries, have succeeded in holding high the torch of human rights, and hence of peace?

Poets are indeed dreamers. They are prophets; everyone says so, and some people are even ready to stake their lives on it. And yet...

At this turning-point in our history, when all our carefully constructed barriers are falling into ruins, at this moment when the human race is finally realizing that it is part of a whole that must be respected, and that violence in all its forms cannot be tolerated as an everyday occurrence, we can sing with the poet:

*You are a thousand flames
a thousand stars
a thousand lights
all the light of the world
all the hope of our hearts*

*Sun
on the piles of corpses
on the mouths of cannons
spitting death
On the limbs of men hanged from the fingers of trees
you will rise no longer*

*Sun
on the sighs of the dying
of troops in position
on countless people cast aside along the roads
on children crushed by hatred*

*Sun
You are all the light of the world
all the hope of our hearts
all the singing and laughter
Sun of peace...!*

Yes! UNESCO by its vocation, and likewise thousands of people of goodwill all over the world, are struggling to help us draw closer together, to understand one another better, to share more equally in

the fruits of the earth, fertilized by rainwater which has no particular colour and falls everywhere. Recent history has taught us that men and women of all shades of opinion have always risen up to put out the fires lit here and there, have formed and are still forming a human chain—often putting their lives in danger—to defend our perpetually threatened peace.

To all these people, these fire-watchers in the night who also work by day, in this temple of UNESCO where prayers whispered in all languages blend into one, I say thank you.

Is not the role of UNESCO to help build peace on firm foundations, and on that basis to create, maintain, support and above all multiply the singing and laughter of our societies finally living in harmony? To allow people to sleep, to move around without anxiety, with no Sword of Damocles hanging over their heads: is this not what peace means?

To be able to come and go in dignity: is this not what peace means?

Ladies and gentlemen, we are gathered here to award a prize, but among the multitude of prizes awarded in France and elsewhere, this prize has, in my eyes, another meaning, another symbolic value, another kind of resonance; its name has a special ring to it: the UNESCO Prize for Peace Education.

Peace... what are the ingredients that combine to create and maintain peace?

For us as individuals there is firstly health, employment, the respect to which we are entitled, harmony within our families and with our neighbours and, above all, the certainty that justice will be done to us at any time and in any place, whatever the interests at stake...

But on the road to peace there are many landslips, ravines, precipices, whose names are: suspicion, injustice, pillage, hunger, scorn, arrogance, sovereignty—the sovereignty that inevitably leads to intolerance, expansionism with all the evils that follow in its wake, peace disrupted within families and within subject countries, the breakdown of normal life, survival of the fittest, who may well be civilized but who still lack culture. And silence, too, for some silences can disturb peace.

Here at UNESCO we must say, and even shout out loud: Peace requires us to break all the strangleholds that keep other peoples in slavery, the straitjackets that suffocate hopes and dreams.

Mr Director-General, gathered here around you are the torch-bearers in the false darkness; by them the way will be lighted and the ship of Peace will sail into port... to a frenzy of applause.

So we can say with the poet:

... Gabriel, Harbinger of History:

*Take to our fellows who struggle and die
so that human beings may be worthy of the name
and no longer vile objects
and no longer beasts of burden
Take to them, I say,
the fraternal greetings of Africa
which longs for
Peace!*

The poet did not date his poem because for him peace is not for one time but for all time.

And peace is so infinitely precious that in Africa there are regions where people greet one another with the question: 'Do you have peace?'

Sabyo! With all due respect, if in this august place I have spoken words that I should not have spoken, do not hold it against me, for you all know what a language is like and what liberties it can take, especially on the banks of the Seine.

For your patience and forgiveness, to all of you, Mr Director-General and honoured guests, my very sincere thanks.

ADDRESS BY
MR EDUARDO PORTELLA
*Deputy Director-General
for the Programme
United Nations Educational,
Scientific and Cultural Organization*

Mr President and Members of the Jury,
Distinguished Permanent Delegates and
Members of the Executive Board,
Eminent Prize-Winners,
Excellencies,
Ladies and Gentlemen,

IT gives me great pleasure to welcome you, on behalf of the Director-General, to the ceremony for the presentation of the 1990 UNESCO Prize for Peace Education.

Established in 1980, thanks to the generosity of the Japan Shipbuilding Foundation, the UNESCO Prize for Peace Education rewards a particularly outstanding example of activity designed to alert public opinion and mobilize the conscience of mankind in the cause of peace.

In accordance with Article 5 of the General Rules governing the Prize, the members of the international jury served, at the 10th session, as the International Commission for Peace in the Minds of Men. The Commission considered how UNESCO could play an even more active role in promoting a broader understanding of peace in the new era which is coming into existence. It took note of the measures recently adopted by UNESCO in this regard and discussed what could be done in the future.

In this field, the aim of the Organization is to ensure that education at all levels and in all its forms enables all individuals, children as well as adults, to develop an awareness of the problems of the maintenance and strengthening of peace and of respect for human rights and the rights of peoples to self-determination, independence and freedom.

UNESCO programmes in the field of peace and peace education within the framework of the Third Medium-Term Plan (1990-1995) will continue to promote international understanding and a spirit of tolerance and to expand international teaching and education in accordance with the recommendations of the 1974 and 1983 conferences.

This year, an international conference 'Democratic Culture and Development in Latin America: Towards the Third Millennium' will be held in Montevideo. We are also considering the possibility

of holding an international conference in Prague on the theme 'Culture and democracy'. The aim of these conferences, in accordance with the Constitution of UNESCO and its biennial programme for 1990-1991, is to highlight trends which advance the cause of peace, development, social justice and human rights.

We should also note that the next meeting to implement the conclusions of the International Congress on Peace in the Minds of Men, which met in Yamoussoukro, Côte d'Ivoire, from 26 June to 1 July 1989, will be held in 1991. This Congress stressed that peace meant more than the end of armed conflict and involved a deep adherence by human beings to the principles of freedom, justice, equality and solidarity. The 1986 Seville Statement on Violence further recognized that violence was not the result of biological determinism. The Congress appealed for a contribution to the development of a 'Peace culture', founded on the universal values of respect for life, freedom, justice, solidarity, tolerance, human rights and equality between women and men.

Lastly, the next two publications of the *Yearbook on Peace and Conflict Studies* (X and XI-1991) will be devoted to the themes 'Democratization processes and their implications for international security' and 'The non-military aspects of security' respectively.

It is now my pleasure and privilege to pay tribute to our two prize-winners.

The first is Ms Rigoberta Menchú Túm, a citizen of Guatemala and a Quechua Indian.

Since 1979 she has been involved in the work of the National Co-ordination Commission of the Committee for Peasant Unity, the CUC, founded the year before by Indian and Mestizo peasants from the Guatemalan Altiplano. Then in 1986 she became a member of the National Co-ordination Commission of the CUC.

We may also mention her participation in the 'National dialogue', organized by the National Commission for Reconciliation (CNR) within the framework of Esquipulas II 1987.

Since the 35th session of the Sub-Commission on Prevention of Discrimination and the Protection of Minorities, held in Geneva in 1982, Ms Rigoberta Menchú Túm has regularly participated in United Nations debates on the subject. Also, since 1986 she has been a member of the Bureau of the International Indian Treaty Council.

She has participated in several international conferences and meetings on peace and human rights.

The second prize-winner is the 'World Order Models Project' (WOMP), set up in 1968 under the auspices of Mr Harry B. Hollins of the World Law Fund to examine in detail the values which would underpin a peaceful world order. Eight working groups were formed and the dialogue that followed led to the publication of six works in the series entitled *The Preferred Words for the 1990s*.

The next stage involved the publication of the magazine *Alternatives*, whose head office is in New Delhi. A series of seminars and publications helped to identify the movements working on the ground for a peaceful world order and to facilitate the mobilization of these groups, while increasing their means of action. Parallel with this was the setting up, as part of the International Year of Peace, of the 'Committee for a Just World Peace', whose proceedings were published under the title *Towards a Just World Peace*.

At present, the prize-winner is organizing a series of seminars (the first in Moscow, the second in Yokohama and the third in a city still to be decided) on the rise of world civilization, in order to elaborate policy guidelines for government and non-governmental bodies at the local, national and international levels.

The contributions of the 'World Order Models Project' to peace education stem from a dialogue that has been established between students, specialists and activists from Eastern and Western Europe, America, Africa and Asia.

Several works have been published which today are used as textbooks in universities and schools.

Professor Saul Mendlovitz is the most appropriate person to receive the prize on behalf of WOMP, not only because he is one of the founders of the organization but also because he is an internationally known researcher.

In conclusion I should like, Mr President, to thank the members of the jury sincerely for their valuable contribution.

Ladies and Gentlemen,

I now have the honour of presenting to Ms Rigoberta Menchú Túm and Professor Mendlovitz, who represents WOMP, the statuettes symbolizing peace, by the sculptor Fenosa, together with two cheques for \$30,000 each, representing the UNESCO Prize for Peace Education.

On behalf of the Director-General, allow me to congratulate you and to encourage you in your noble venture.

ACCEPTANCE SPEECH BY
Ms RIGOBERTA MENCHÚ TÚM
*Laureate of the UNESCO Prize 1990
for Peace Education*

Ladies and Gentlemen,
Dear Friends,

I come from a small village; there were 60 families living there, and it was located in the department of El Quiché, in Guatemala. It was a Maya community where we practised mutual assistance, solidarity and respect for our neighbours. But today Chimel is no more. When I was a little girl, living with my parents in the community, I learned at first hand about hard labour on the land of the high plateau, and especially on the plantations where crops were grown for export, as we scraped a living as best we could in our state of poverty and marginalization. From an early age I longed to go to school and be able to develop my intellectual abilities, for the good of my community, but I never did. The course of recent history in my country, tragic and outrageous as it has been, made me fight for the cause of my people, of Guatemala; more than 10 years of struggle, accusations and demands have brought me before you on this occasion to thank you for this Prize on behalf of the workers of the country and of the Comité de Unidad Campesina de Guatemala (Peasant Unity Committee); and also to speak of the rights that are being claimed today by the Indian people of the continent, all the poor people of America and, I believe I can say without exaggeration, of the whole world.

The first thing that the indigenous American peoples wish to conquer as an acknowledged right is the right to have our voices heard, as peoples and as individuals; to begin to break out of those 500 years of silence and marginalization; to say what we think of our past, of the circumstances of our lives in the present and of the future that we are seeking for our children and grandchildren, without being persecuted and condemned to death for doing so.

We also have a right to our mother the earth, for our livelihood depends on her, and our cultures and our historical memory are rooted in and inspired by her. Fighting for our ancestral lands means

fighting to till the soil and harness our natural resources so as to produce a sufficiency for all the men and women of the earth.

It also means having access to technology so that we can make our fields and forests flower and bear fruit. The malnutrition and illiteracy from which the indigenous peoples of America suffer is an open secret. As Indian peoples we have a right to education, health, development, science and technology, but we do not want them to be imposed on us. Our identity and values must therefore be given due consideration, forestalling any clumsy measures of enforcement.

Our land and mother nature—like our cultures—have suffered in recent decades of development from systematic criminal destruction. Never before has nature—land, forests, seas and skies—suffered such destruction as today! Human beings have a right to lead healthy lives. The struggle to achieve this is the struggle of us all, indigenous peoples, mestizos, blacks, whites—all who are determined to dedicate themselves to the preservation and defence of nature and the environment.

The indigenous peoples of today and tomorrow are thinking of this, and we are preparing to build a more equitable future, based on our cultural past, on the harsh reality of these 500 years of oppression and discrimination, and on that resilience that has allowed us to make our presence felt at the end of the twentieth century, with our ability to struggle to establish a more acceptable way of life for humankind. We cannot agree that knowledge of and admiration for indigenous peoples should be confined to great historical monuments, Tikal, Teotihuacán, Machu Picchu and so forth, but feel that fundamentally they should be a response to our determination and capacity to help in the task of constructing a more humane and more equitable world.

‘A people that is hungry is a people that is not at peace’, runs one of our sayings, but there can be no doubt that justice is needed as well. In other words: equality before the courts; trial and punishment for those who infringe the most elementary human rights; freedom of expression and organization; and the right to full participation by peoples in the construction of their future.

In Guatemala we are at the heart of Indian America, the epicentre of discrimination, massacres, militarization and the ‘scorched earth’ policy which has led to so much suffering and bloodshed in my country in the past decade. The various ways in which our

communities and peoples have fought to defend their lives and cultures are legitimate, and the international community—like the governments—should understand them. The future of Guatemala stands for the future of our Indian peoples, and this is why we need to move forward together in our search for true democracy, to construct a society based on development, respect and peace. You who are present here should not forget this, for in these past years it has been easier for me and for my indigenous brothers and sisters to be heard in international forums and gatherings than in our own countries. It is time for our words to be heard there too!

Thank you very much.

~ACCEPTANCE SPEECH BY
Professor SAUL MENDLOVITZ
Co-Director of World Order Models Project
(WOMP)
Dag Hammarskjöld Professor of Peace
and World Order Studies
at the Rutgers School of Law, Newark

Mr Deputy Director-General,
Fellow Laureate Rigoberta Menchú,
Colleagues and Friends,

IT is a singular honour, privilege, and pleasure to be present at this award ceremony of the 1990 UNESCO Prize for Peace Education and to accept this prize on behalf of the World Order Models Project. My pleasure is all the more enhanced by the fact that our co-recipient is Rigoberta Menchú. Her strength of character, qualities of courage, maturity and serenity, her sensitivities and intelligence honed in daily living with her peoples and in their struggles are exemplary for those of us involved in peace education and the establishment of a just peace.

WOMP is a participatory group of scholars and activists from all regions of the globe. It builds on a conscious methodological practice of using the diversity of intellectual, ideological, cultural, state, national, professional, gender and other life experiences of those involved in the work. Our basic achievement in this regard has been the articulation of a broad consensus about the need for a transnational, interdisciplinary perspective on the contemporary human condition. This broad perspective encompasses a positive vision of the possibilities of peace, economic well-being, social justice (including participation), ecological stability and positive identity. These value-domains of this positive vision inform an interactive matrix of our normative, analytical and policy formulations.

The thinking that went into setting up this prize and of our group share a common belief. This belief is that it is possible to dismantle the war system and establish a peace system. We take seriously the possibility that war, however deeply rooted in social structures and institutional practices of human beings, is not inevitable; that it can be overcome. Furthermore, we believe that the normative framework of militarism within which the war system finds legitimation has become increasingly vulnerable to an alternative value system. We also assume that a peace system requires the

elimination of gross oppression, intolerable poverty, unacceptable inequities as the necessary conditions for dismantling the war bureaucracy and the national security state. We recognize that the causal analysis of, and the development of ethical and political perspectives on, this process pose crucial questions for peace research and education.

Peace Education as Political Practice

What I wish to do on this occasion is to focus on the fact that we who believe that a peace system is possible are a relatively small minority of the human race. The question that needs to be addressed, therefore, is how to increase the numbers of human beings to come to the realization that a peace system is possible; and further to translate this realization into a significant political force, equivalent, let us say, to that which is working to dismantle apartheid; or perhaps, more realistically and more analogous, to develop a movement for a just world peace as significant as that which is calling for an environmental regime for the globe. It is important to note that I understand an environmental regime to be comprehended by the movement for a just world peace.

Different Readings of the Current Situation

Of course, many now claim that such a process is under way. Consider for example the recent statements by President Bush and Secretary of State Baker of the United States who have been proclaiming that a new world order is emerging. If one looks closely and searches for the meanings of the term, a new world order, as used by President Bush and Secretary Baker—and assuming that they have thought through what they mean—and giving the meaning the most benign interpretation as seen from the viewpoint of peace education, this new world order seems to signify a world in which superpower confrontation and perhaps even rivalry is over, and co-operation is beginning. Bilateral and regional agreements are in the offing; and the United Nations will be utilized to carry out some aspects of this new co-operation. Indeed, in the case of Iraq the United States and the Soviet Union appear to be using the United

Nations Charter and co-operating, although it is clear that the organization ratified United States action which then led to monitoring, participation, and some implementation by the organization. It did not involve United Nations initiation, command, and control. Furthermore, there is a continuing process in which the remaining superpower continues to attempt to achieve legitimation for carrying out its activity by simultaneously noting world community interests as well as its own self-defined national security interest.

Another way of reading the situation, of telling the story, is to refer to the extraordinary events of 1989 and the present. You will recall that in December 1988 Secretary-General Gorbachev gave a major address in the United Nations in which he stated the following:

‘...we have entered an era when progress will be shaped by the universal interests. Awareness dictates that world politics, too, should be guided by the primacy of human values...

Could this view be a little too romantic? Are we not over-estimating the potential and maturity of the world’s social consciousness? We have heard such doubts and such questions, both in our country and from some of our western partners.

I am convinced that we are not floating above reality.’

Soviet Union behaviour during the period 1986-1990 could fairly be interpreted as providing a substantial behavioural basis for these lofty ideals; all the more so when one reviews the remarkable set of proposals made within the United Nations environment for enhancing that organization and the rule of law. As part of the story of current happenings, it exemplifies a trend which may actually point to a new and novel world order. Indeed, if the movement for a just world peace coheres this may become a more plausible reading of the situation.

Yet another way of reading contemporary trends would be to focus on the event of June of 1989 when the non-aligned countries met at The Hague to discuss peace and the rule of law in international affairs. In the preamble to the draft document which they presented to the United Nations General Assembly in 1990 they

asked for a commitment to ‘conduct that will lead to the abolition of war...’. When one recalls that well over 50 per cent of the non-aligned countries achieved their independence through the use of violence and espoused ‘wars of liberation’, this is a remarkable phrase to appear in a document drafted and written by them.

I do not mean to pretend that written words always lead to appropriate action. At the same time anyone who has had to fight the battle of words in international organizations and bureaucracies is very much aware that the words stem from embodiment in the real world. They arise from interest, values, and social forces and they may be used to promote significant political change far beyond the original expectations of the authors. The Declaration of Human Rights and Helsinki Accord are two notable examples of documents which have had this impact.

An Alternative Reading of the Present Situation

It is possible to understand these three scenarios, these different narratives, as simply attempts by self-interested nations to gain better access to the world’s political, economic and cultural resources. It is possible to read events as the triumph of pragmatic *realpolitik*. I refuse this somewhat jaded view. For, despite the differences in these readings, a number of profound underlying themes seem to present themselves as lessons of history. These may be stated thus: the growth of an alternative normative order; the presence of a strong transnational peace movement; and non-violence activism. A word about each.

First, the balance of power system based on national interest, national security states, shifting alliances, and ultimately, the willingness to use military systems, has had its own normative framework. This century, however, has witnessed the growth of an alternative normative order in which the validity—in both a pragmatic and ethical sense—of the use of large-scale organized violence has been scrutinized and found wanting not only by authoritative policy officials, but of wide sectors of the world’s population. The Hague Conference at the turn of the twentieth century with their regulations on the rules of warfare are followed on by the Geneva Conventions, the League of Nations, the Pact of

Paris, the United Nations Charter, Article 2(4), the codification of the Nuremberg Judgement, and the many declarations, resolutions and instruments, the special sessions on disarmament. These are all part of that normative movement. Again, as noted above, practice does not always follow words; but words hammered out in negotiations, dialogue, and confrontations do have impact on behaviour.

Second, there has been a strong transnational peace movement in this century. It has called upon religious and traditional belief systems throughout the globe going back to two or three millennia. With some notable exceptions the movement has waxed and waned around particular wars and has yet to provide a coherent alternative framework for resolving disputes and curtailing violence. But its dialogue and practices have questioned the validity of large scale organized violence and is attracting more adherents.

Third, non-violence activism as a method of achieving radical social change is another strand in this de-legitimation of violence. Gandhi, Martin Luther King, Jr., Lech Walesa and early Solidarity, the Filipino peoples' deposing of Marcos, the Chinese students at Tianamen Square, among many others all attest to the growing realization of both the limits and possibilities of non-violence activism. They are another strand in this de-legitimizing process, and contribute to an ethos where the question of how to eliminate war becomes a more credible political project to be looked at seriously by such groups as this one.

The Legacy and Promise of Historical Transformation

Perhaps, most important of all, to read the current situation in this way, is to suggest, at a minimum that a war system and militarism need not be forever with us; they are not inevitable. Indeed, the historical achievements of the past: the de-legitimation of the Divine Right of Kings, of Slavery and of Colonialism attest to the fact that, as Margaret Mead declares, war is a human invention and can be eliminated. As the Declaration of Seville noted, while aggression is part of the human condition, organized warfare need not follow. That the legacy of historical transformation is the possibility of social change, will need to be a part of the story, the narrative, if you will, in order to convince others of the possibility of constructing a peace system.

Within the context of competing alternative interpretations of the contemporary scene, the various strands de-legitimizing war and militarism, as well as the rich historical tradition of dismantling oppressive structures, we would like to suggest three additional propositions about how to overcome the war system. These propositions inform and motivate our praxis. They are: 'a riot is the voices of the unheard'; *Ubi Societas Ibi Lex*, wherever there is society there is law; and, to think, feel and act as a global citizen is essential for the study and struggles for a just world peace.

The first of these propositions has its origin in the lives and voices of the oppressed. Indeed, it has its initiation in the voices of the unheard. It was Martin Luther King, Jr. who observed, 'a riot is the voices of the unheard'. As peace researchers and educators we have the responsibility to identify where the unheard are located; what are their grievances, needs and claims; what opportunities do they have for hearings let alone satisfying their aspirations; and, yes, we also need to honour their sensibilities and feelings with our own evaluation of the validity of these aspirations; yet surely one of the major matters we will attend to in all of this is the riot, and the use of violence. Since we here are very much aware of structural violence, as well as direct violence which is visited upon the oppressed, our understanding and even empathy for self-defence or counter-conflict violence is appreciable. At the same time we need to be aware that in legitimating this latter kind of violence, we legitimate violence itself. It is a perplexing and vexing dilemma we need to weave into our narratives and practices in peace research and education.

The second proposition is close to my own heart. For I am here, in part, to profess law. It was Machiavelli who noted in *The Prince* that 'there are two methods of fighting, the one by law, the other by force. The first method is that of men, the second of beasts. But, as the first method is often insufficient, one must have recourse to the second'.

We take it that the task of peace education is to assist in the great effort to eliminate recourse to the second. And what we wish here to note is the role of law, the constitutive order, and democratic global constitutionalism in the narratives and practices of peace research and education.

The twentieth century has been witness to two contradictory trends. On the one hand it ranks as one of the bloodiest and

war-ridden periods of human history. World War I, Manchuria, Ethiopia, Hitler's conquest of Europe, World War II, the Holocaust, the use of atomic weapons, the bloody partitioning of India and Pakistan, the Arab-Israeli warfare, Korea, Viet Nam, wars of independence, and more, are testimony enough to horrify any human being.

Simultaneously, and as I tried to suggest earlier, this century has produced a normative history unique in human society, namely, the attempt to control and discourage by law large-scale organized violence. In short, the international community has embarked on a normative journey to outlaw war and crimes against humanity; to make illegal and even criminal, recourse (the Machiavellian term) to aggressive war, and barbarous treatment of citizens by state officials.

Between 1930 and the year 2000 the world's population will have tripled from two billion to more than six billion. These six billion people will be more mutually aware of one another than every prior generation of earthly inhabitants. Furthermore, processes of interdependence, integration and interpenetration are producing transnational forms and structures of economic, social, cultural and political relations that place great stress on the old systems and suggest the urgent need for new forms of governance and polity.

Under these conditions of divergence between the practices of violence and the normative claims for peace, the idea of democratic constitutionalism as the formal and contextual political/legal foundation for global polity grows increasingly attractive. Here the developments around the League of Nations and the United Nations, entrusted with peace work, become more interesting. For as bilateral, regional, functional and transnational treaties and organizational arrangements expand, such developments will refashion the state system, revealing its rigid tendencies and yet suggesting alternative political arrangements within and beyond the state. No doubt this is already happening.

And so let me be very clear that what is being called for here is democratic global constitutionalism. I noted above the maxim in western jurisprudence, *Ubi Societas Ibi Lex*: where there is society, there is law. It is clear that global society has emerged. I dare suggest, moreover, that it is also clear that some form of global law is emerging. Thus, the question that remains is what kind of law, administered by whom, and for what purposes and values?

Our efforts as researchers and educators need to be directed towards exploring and explaining not only the emergence of global society and law, but of community, and how, in the final analysis should we participate in shaping it. Thus, it will be necessary to modify the maxim *Ubi Societas Ibi Lex* to read *Ubi Communitas Ibi Justa Lex*: where there is community, there is just law.

Finally, to think of society, community and law, and especially at this moment of history with its emphasis upon participation and democracy of people is to point directly to the notion of the civil society and to the role of the citizen in it. This is where the third proposition finds its place, namely, to think, feel and act as a global citizen is essential for peace research and education, and the struggles for a just world peace. This proposition, not unlike the other two, obviously calls for much broader, deeper and wider discussion. Suffice it to say for the moment that the notion of citizenship will have to be extended beyond its present statist, ethnic and gender limitations.

It should be clear by now that in my view some form of global polity is taking shape. No doubt there are competing predictions: muddling through, a concert of the globe, Lebanonization, a modern mediaeval period, some version of an Orwellian world, regional blocs, bio-regional units, and forms of decentralization including 'small is beautiful'. Nevertheless, it is my personal belief (not shared by all members of WOMP) that there is an overwhelming surge in the direction of global polity and that a world state is emerging. Indeed, some of the policy élite are beginning to discuss a single world central bank and a single currency. For those of us who are committed to a just community it behooves us to participate in the discussions, formulations and political processes that will attend this emergence. My fear is that we will be put off by notions of centralization and legal form and attempt to realize values 'at a local level', thus permitting the centralizing forces of the dominant states and classes to maintain control of both the transition and governance of the global polity.

What I believe is called for then is the liberating from within ourselves the idea of *specie identity*. That is, to cultivate that capacity in each of us to identify, empathize and act with and on behalf of the human specie, and in the end for the planet we inhabit.

In calling for this specie identity I do not mean to place it at the centre, the foundation, or apex of all our other identities. Rather,

our identity with the species will intertwine and enrich the mix of other identities we now possess. More importantly, this identity will be a bridge that allows our particularities to be shared beyond our presently designated constituencies and communities. Peace researchers, educators and activists should see this expansion of specie identity as enhancing the vocation to which we have been called, namely, the creation of civil society for a just and peaceful global polity.

WOMP's Commitment

We have been attempting to address the perplexing question of how to persuade individuals, groups, organizations and states throughout the globe that a peace system is possible. I have sketched some of the alternative interpretations and programmes of action that the global policy élites are promoting in their efforts to construct a new world order. WOMP believes that there is a movement for a just world peace which has its own narrative, interpretation and programme of action. The coming together today of Rigoberta Menchú and WOMP within UNESCO are part of the praxis promoting a just world peace. UNESCO—one of the six major organs of the United Nations with the full complement of the states of the world, non-governmental organizations, citizens' associations, struggle groups, as well as a scientific and intellectual community—remains an important vehicle and resource for movement, thought, and action. Rigoberta Menchú highlights our commitment and solidarity with the oppressed throughout the world, and WOMP, with its transnational linkages of concerned intelligentsia, are emblematic of the many other actors and participants in the movement. A peace education focus on democratic global constitutionalism will in my judgement provide a forceful, forthright programme for inquiry, teaching and action.

We in WOMP accept this prize then as a responsibility for the coming decade to ensure that peace, economic well-being, social justice, ecological balance, and positive identity are made accessible to all of human society. WOMP pledges its efforts to achieve this necessary and noble purpose.

BRIEF DESCRIPTION
OF THE WORK OF THE LAUREATES

Ms RIGOBERTA MENCHÚ TÚM

RIGOBERTA Menchú Túm was born on 9 January 1959 in Chimel (municipality of Uspantá, Department of Quiché, Guatemala). Her parents, Vicente Menchú and Juana Túm, were Quiché Indians.

She started working while still a little girl, helping her parents harvest the coffee, cotton and sugar cane crops on the estates on Guatemala's southern coast. She also worked as a servant in Guatemala City for two years. From the age of 10 she took part in pastoral work in her home village alongside her parents, who were Christians and leaders of the Indians in the region. She is self-educated.

In 1979, Rigoberta joined the Comité de Unidad Campesina (CUC) (Committee for Peasant Unity), which had been founded a year before by Indian peasants and poor Ladinos (half-castes) from the Guatemala highlands. It was the driving force behind the struggle to win recognition for the peasants' economic, social, political and ethnic demands, and consisted for the most part of Indians. In 1986, she was elected a member of the CUC National Co-ordinating Committee, having been in charge of the organization's international activities since the end of 1981.

In 1983, she helped to form the Representación Unitaria de la Oposición Guatemalteca (RUOG) (Unified Guatemalan Opposition Movement), which has been engaged in the extremely important task of reporting violations of human rights, and has been one of the organizations working for peace at the national and regional levels.

Rigoberta's activities on behalf of peace have involved her in work with the United Nations, as representative of the Comité de Unidad Campesina.

She is also a member of the Working Group on Indigenous Populations, which was established by the United Nations. She has

been attending its sessions since August 1982, the first Guatemalan Indian to do so. Since then, as a member of CUC and of the International Indian Treaty Council, which made her a member of its Steering Committee in 1986, she has been working to defend the rights of Latin American Indians as a whole. Ever since the thirty-fifth session of the Sub-Commission on Prevention of Discrimination and Protection of Minorities which was held in Geneva in August and September 1982, she has followed the discussions at the United Nations on that subject every year. During these sessions she defended specific causes such as the right of Indian peoples to freedom of expression, regardless of their political affiliations, and the drawing up of an international convention on the rights of Indian peoples both as groups and as individuals. She has spoken out against social and cultural discrimination, and in favour of the conservation of reserves set aside for Indian cultures.

Since 1982 she has attended a large number of conferences and symposia on human rights, the rights of Indians and peace at the international level, of which the most noteworthy are:

– Conference on Guatemala organized by the Tribuna Permanente de los Pueblos, Madrid, January 1983.

– Conference of Socialist International Women, Albufeiras, March 1983.

– Conference on the Decade for Women organized by the United Nations, Nairobi, 1985.

– International Covenant on the occasion of the Fifth Centenary of the Discovery of America, Milan, December 1987.

– Conference of American Non-Governmental Organizations, Toronto, February 1988.

– Second Ibero-American Congress of Human Rights Organizations, Badajoz, December 1988 (Guest of Honour).

– Forty-Fifth Congress of the Italian Socialist Party, Milan, May 1989 (Guest of Honour).

– États généraux des droits de l'homme, organized by the Danielle Mitterrand Foundation, the French League of Human Rights and the International Federation of Human Rights (FIDH), Paris, June 1989 (Guest of Honour).

She has been awarded the following international prizes:

– For her book *Rigoberta Menchú: an Indian Woman in Guatemala* she received the Casa de las Américas Prize for autobiographical works in Havana, January 1983.

– Along with the South African leader Nelson Mandela she was made Member of Honour of the Belgian Committee of Non-Governmental Organizations in September 1985.

– Special award of the Premio Nonino 1988, Milan, January 1988.

– Prize of the Left-Wing Christian Parliamentarians, Rimini, April 1988.

– Monsignor Leonidas Proaño Prize from the Latin American Association for Human Rights, Montevideo, Uruguay, 8 February 1990.

– Awarded an Honorary Diploma by the Mayor of San Francisco, San Francisco, California, October 1988.

The French and Spanish editions of her book *Rigoberta Menchú: an Indian Woman in Guatemala* were published in 1983 and it has now been translated into nine languages.

This autobiographical work and her worldwide activities on behalf of peace, human rights and the rights of Latin American Indians have attracted such attention that several documentary films have been made of her life and work.

THE WORLD ORDER MODELS PROJECT (WOMP)

THE World Order Models Project (WOMP) is an association of scholars and political figures from various regions of the globe who are engaged in ongoing cross-cultural multidisciplinary research, education, dialogue and action aimed at promoting a just world peace. Founded by individuals concerned with transformative education, the specific audiences for its work are the academic community, grassroots activists and selected policy makers.

Since it first met in New Delhi in 1968, WOMP has evolved a mix of perspectives on academic inquiry and political action that has come to be its identifying mark in, and distinct contribution to, the discipline of world order studies, in particular, and of normative social research, in general. World order studies is understood as 'the study of international relations and world affairs which focuses primarily on the questions of how to reduce significantly the likelihood of international violence and to create tolerable conditions for worldwide economic welfare, social justice and ecological stability'.

Throughout its almost 25-year existence, participants in WOMP have argued that the world is facing a set of interrelated problems and challenges—war, poverty, social injustice, ecological instability, and alienation. These problems arise from the organizational vulnerability of the modern statist world system, its inability to prevent economic and ecological deterioration as well as a drift to war. They also express the system's normative contradictions, especially those forms of ideological and cultural self-righteousness that militate against a more co-operative and humane approach to global problems.

WOMP's response to these problems and challenges has been to envision prospects of enhanced coherence and legitimacy based on the shaping of shared values. It calls for forms of inquiry, public

policies and political practices organized around aspirations of peace, economic well-being, social justice, ecological stability, positive identity and meaningful participation. In its earliest formulation, WOMP's approach involved (1) a diagnostic/prognostic task of describing present world order conditions and trends, (2) a modelling task of designing preferred futures, and (3) a prescriptive task of mapping a transition process, including concrete steps and an overall strategy.

In order to establish a more active basis for its cross-cultural, multidisciplinary efforts underscored by these earlier formulations, WOMP sought to emphasize a struggle theory of history, affirming the normative significance of the voices of the 'oppressed' in defining world order values and in orienting the transition processes it sought to articulate. This new phase of WOMP acknowledged its own preoccupation with formal authoritative institutions and the insufficient attention given to social movements and grassroots initiatives arising out of the 'public' sector. By emphasizing the 'oppressed', that is, those persons in the world who receive the smallest benefit from the 'fruits of world civilization', this new phase moved from the somewhat narrow preoccupations of WOMP's originators to a more all encompassing and universally relevant field of thought and practice.

Most recently, WOMP has sought to articulate its alternatives within the framework of hypotheses about, on the one hand, a world evolving from an international 'society of states' to a 'global civilization'. That is, about processes of interdependence and integration at a global level, and a growing awareness that the peoples of the planet share a converging destiny; and, on the other hand, about a world discovering the normative significance of plurality, locality, and particularity embodied by peoples and movements throughout the globe. In this context, the notion of the role of law and the constitutive order, under the rubric of 'global constitutionalism' is coming into focus as an area of significance for the realization of shared values.

Over the next few years, WOMP will be involved in five major programmes:

The Global Civilization Project: Challenges for Sovereignty, Democracy and Security. Initiated in 1987 following discussions between members of WOMP and Academicians and senior policy personnel in the USSR, this five-year project, collaborated in by

research institutes in India, Chile, Sweden, Japan, the United States, and the USSR, is a cross-cultural and multidisciplinary project concerned with the public policy implications of: (a) collective challenges to human survival, security and well-being; (b) emerging global structures of power; (c) new forms of political identity and authority; and (d) the significance of legal processes for emerging forms of polity and governance.

The ultimate objective of the project is the writing, dissemination, and insinuating into public dialogue, of a public report on these concerns. This report, to be published in 1992, is intended to contribute to the debates about the interconnected character of contemporary policy problems within the perceived context of an emerging global civilization. Specifically, the report will offer a concrete diagnosis, a prescriptive image of global society, and a portrayal of initiatives necessary for survival and human dignity for this moment of history.

The project is consciously designed to have an impact on both scholarly research and public policy formation, contributing hopefully to a chain reaction of thought, inquiry, public debate and action which in time might alter academic study and the practice of politics around international issues.

The Institute of World Economy and International Relations (USSR) hosted the initial workshop on Sovereignty, held in October 1988. The second workshop on Deepening and Globalizing Democracy was held in Yokohama, Japan in March 1990 under the sponsorship of the International Peace Research Institute Meigaku (PRIME) and the Kanagawa Prefecture. A third workshop on Security is being planned for 1991 under the sponsorship of the Department of Peace and Conflict Research of Uppsala University, Uppsala, Sweden. Research from these workshops have been published.

Transnational Academic Programme. The central activity of WOMP in this area is the publication of instructional materials made available to universities throughout the globe. During the past 25 years, many of the personnel of WOMP have been associated with the World Policy Institute (formerly the Institute for World Order). It has produced a significant core of peace and world order studies materials for all levels of education. To date there have been four multi-volume series: *The Strategy of World Order*, *Preferred Worlds for the 1990s*, *Studies on a Just World* and *Explorations in*

Peace and Justice: New Perspectives in World Order. In 1990-1991 WOMP will be publishing a number of volumes including *United Nations and a Just World Order*.

Assisting the Activities of the Committee for a Just World Peace (CJWP). The Committee, organized in 1985 in support of the United Nations International Year of Peace, has published a series of papers and statements in various journals on the major global problems facing the peoples of the planet. In May 1987, it brought out a volume of the most salient papers under the title, *Towards a Just World Peace: Perspectives from Social Movements*. These papers and volume provided the basic research for a second volume, authored by Professor R.B.J. Walker and sponsored by the Committee, published in March 1988, entitled *One World, Many Worlds: Struggles for a Just World Peace*. The volume discusses the significance of critical social movements for global transformation and explores appropriate action to promote the kinds of social transformation needed to establish a just peace system. The volume focuses on local initiatives, transnational linkages, and relevant global activities. UNESCO, through its general activities and global futures programme, supported part of the work of the Committee.

Carrying out the work of the Grass-Roots Activism: Global Implications (GRAGI) Project. GRAGI has been established to encourage dialogue between grass-roots activists working on local issues and those individuals working on global problems. In the United States, GRAGI is co-directed by Professor Chadwick Alger of the Mershon Foundation at Ohio State University, and Professor Saul H. Mendlovitz. Over the past four years, there have been interview/dialogues with some 75 United States grass-roots activists. The result of these activities have been reported in two major articles. GRAGI is in close contact with similar efforts in Australia, India, Japan, Philippines, Portugal and the USSR. Joint projects are likely to emerge during the period 1989 through 1991.

Publication of Alternatives: A Journal for Social Transformation and Humane Governance. WOMP is co-publisher of this journal, now in the fifteenth year of publication, with the Centre for the Study of Developing Societies in New Delhi and the International Peace Research Institute Meigaku in Yokohama. The journal, founded in 1976 by Rajni Kothari and Saul Mendlovitz, was intended to provide a forum for continuing and enriching the world order inquiry. It has established itself as a unique, innovative

publication, which generates dialogue on, and encourages commitment to, social transformation, humane governance and world order from a wide variety of authors expressing differing cultural and ideological perspectives. Publication of a number of issues of *Alternatives*, in particular, on the occasion of the 40th Anniversary of the United Nations, was done with the support of the United Nations University, with whom many of the WOMP members are professionally affiliated.

As WOMP looks to the twenty-first century, it reaffirms the conviction of its participants that education must serve the human interest for the creation and nurture of a more just and humane future. The WOMP process, if one may call it that, has been premised on the conviction that political action proceeds from moral imperatives and practical necessity rather than either realist assumptions about what is possible or idealist claims about disembodied emancipatory interests. WOMP looks to the unparalleled historical transformations of the last ten years as presenting both dangers and opportunities for critical and creative thinking, feeling and acting, on behalf of a just world peace. Receiving the 1990 UNESCO Prize for Peace Education is, for WOMP, an affirmation that, indeed, such a future is necessary and desirable.

APPENDICES

General Rules Governing the UNESCO Prize for Peace Education¹

Article 1 - Aim

The aim of the UNESCO Prize for Peace Education is to promote all forms of action designed to 'construct the defences of peace in the minds of men' by rewarding a particularly outstanding example of activity designed to alert public opinion and mobilize the conscience of mankind in the cause of peace, in accordance with the spirit of the Constitution of the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization and the United Nations Charter.

Article 2 - Prize

- (a) The Prize, which shall not be divided save in exceptional circumstances, shall be awarded to an individual, a group of individuals or an organization.
- (b) The Prize shall be awarded annually.
- (c) The Prize shall be worth approximately \$60,000, the exact amount to be decided each year on the basis of the interest accruing from the fund.
- (d) A Prize not awarded in any given year may be awarded the following year to a second laureate.
- (e) The Prize shall be awarded for an indeterminate duration. Should UNESCO decide to cease awarding the Prize, the balance of the fund shall be returned to the Foundation.

Article 3 - Fund

The sum of US \$1 million donated by the Japan Shipbuilding Industry Foundation has been placed in a UNESCO special account and only the annual interest shall be used to finance the Prize and the activities of the Jury responsible for awarding it.

Article 4 - Designation of laureates

The laureates shall be designated by the Director-General of UNESCO on the basis of proposals submitted by an international jury.

1. Adopted by the Executive Board of UNESCO at its 110th session (September-October 1980).

Article 5 - Jury

The Jury shall consist of nine personalities from different regions of the world chosen from the participants or guests at the Peace Forum held in 1979, or other meetings or events devoted to peace organized by UNESCO, or from representatives of the major information networks and specialists in peace education.

The members of the Jury, who shall be appointed by the Director-General for a period of three years, shall serve as the International Commission for Peace in the Minds of Men; the Commission may undertake any other form of activity in the way of study, research and the promotion of public awareness within the field of peace education as defined in Article 1 of the present rules.

Article 6 - Criteria for the awarding of the Prize

- (a) The laureate shall not be subject to any kind of discrimination on the grounds of nationality, religion, race, sex or age. He shall have distinguished himself through outstanding and internationally recognized action extending over several years in the fields of:
 - the mobilization of consciences in the cause of peace;
 - the implementation, at international or regional level, of programmes of activity designed to strengthen peace education by enlisting the support of public opinion;
 - the launching of important activities contributing to the strengthening of peace;
 - educational action to promote human rights and international understanding;
 - the promotion of public awareness of the problems of peace through the media and other effective channels;
 - any other activity recognized as essential to the construction of the defences of peace in the minds of men.
- (b) The laureate shall be chosen for activities carried out in accordance with the spirit of UNESCO and the United Nations Charter.

Article 7 - Nomination of candidates

- (a) Member States of UNESCO, intergovernmental organizations, non-governmental organizations granted consultative status with UNESCO, and persons whom the Director-General deems qualified in the field of peace may nominate an individual, a group of individuals, or an organization considered to merit the distinction of this Prize by virtue of their activities.
- (b) The closing date for the submission of nominations shall be fixed by the Director-General each year.

Article 8 - Selection of the laureate and date for the awarding of the Prize

The Jury shall meet during the three months following the closing date for the submission of nominations to make its recommendations to the Director-General concerning the selection of the laureate for that year. The date for the awarding of the Prize shall be fixed by the Director-General in consultation with the laureate during the year in question.

Article 9 - Official ceremony

A prize-giving ceremony shall be organized. The address delivered by the laureate on that occasion shall be published by UNESCO.

MEMBERS
of the International Jury
1990

Dr Walid AL-CHAHID (Syria)
Director-General
Centre for Studies and Scientific Research

Professor Carlos CHAGAS (Brazil)
Biophysicist
Former Permanent Delegate of Brazil to UNESCO and
Former Member of the Executive Board of UNESCO
Former Vice-President of the International Council of Scientific Unions
(ICSU)

Mr Bernard DADIÉ (Ivory Coast)
Director, Houphouët-Boigny Foundation
Writer
Former Minister of Culture of Ivory Coast
Former Member of the Executive Board of UNESCO

Professor Betty REARDON (United States of America)
Director, Peace Education Programme
Teachers College
Columbia University, New York

Mr Ungku Abdel AZIZ (Malaysia)
Royal Professor
University of Malaya, Kuala Lumpur

Mr Valentin LIPATTI (Romania)
Ambassador
Former Permanent Delegate of Romania to UNESCO
Former Member of the Executive Board of UNESCO

Mr Kinhide MUSHAKOJI
Professor of International Relations
Vice-Rector
United Nations University, Tokyo

Mr Hylke TROMP (Netherlands)
Director of the Polemological Institute
University of Groningen

H.E. Mr Olu ADENIJI
Ambassador of Nigeria to France

LAUREATES OF THE UNESCO PRIZE
FOR PEACE EDUCATION
1981-1990

- 1981 Ms Helena Kekkonen (Finland) and the World Organization of the Scout Movement
- 1982 Stockholm International Peace Research Institute (SIPRI)
- 1983 Pax Christi International
- 1984 International Physicians for the Prevention of Nuclear War (IPPNW)
- 1985 General Indarjit Rikhye (India) and the Georg Eckert Institute for International Textbook Research (Federal Republic of Germany)
- 1986 Professor Paulo Freire (Brazil)
- 1987 Ms Laurence Deonna (Switzerland) and 'Servicio Paz y Justicia en América Latina'
- 1988 Brother Roger of Taizé (France)
- 1989 International Peace Research Association (IPRA)
Dr Robert Muller (France)
- 1990 Ms Rigoberta Menchú Túm (Guatemala)
The World Order Models Project (WOMP)