
UNIVERSITY FOR PEACE

Model United Nations Conference 2009
8th UPMUNC

Key note address by

DR. CORNELIO SOMMARUGA, Geneva

former President of the International Committee
of the Red Cross

**GLOBALIZING RESPONSIBILITIES
TOWARDS
A CULTURE OF SECURITY AND PEACE**

San José de Costa Rica

February 12th, 2009

It is a real pleasure for me to be at the University for Peace today in this lovely country of Costa Rica, which is transformed today in the centre of the world by your Model United Nations Conference, with the participation of so many delegations from the whole of the Planet. Congratulations to the Rector and Faculty, as well as to the UPMUNC Board, for this original and very timely initiative under the guiding theme « *Pathways towards a Culture of Peace* » and best wishes to you all participants as extraordinary envoys and diplomats for this circumstances.

Mr. Vice-Rector, Madam President of the UMUNC Board, Ambassadors, Dear Participants, Ladies and Gentlemen,

When considering today's Security Challenges, I always recall what the philosopher Hans Jonas was writing in his book « *Das Prinzip Verantwortung* », where he speaks about the **responsibilities** falling to today's men and women. He reminds us that, as a result in particular of the phenomenal progress made in service and technology in the past century, our acts can have unprecedented repercussions in time and in space. In time because some of the things we do today affect not just those alive now, but also future generations ; in space, because some of the things we do, have consequences not just locally or regionally, but worldwide. Globalization is indeed confirming the warning of Hans Jonas.

In other words, nothing of what happens on this planet can leave us entirely indifferent, especially that which makes every man our kin and which is called **suffering**. I believe in the oneness of man. I believe that the struggle for respect for human dignity is universal and that cultural relativism has no place in that struggle. I say that out of neither arrogance nor ethnocentricity; I am stating an observed fact. Even though different cultures express pain differently, suffering is universal and is caused everywhere by same ills : murder, torture, mutilation, rape, inhuman and degrading treatment and other atrocities that man inflicts upon his fellow man on a variety of pretexts and yet which are prohibited even in time of war, by virtue of International Humanitarian Law.

Is all that directly related to security ? – may be the question of the one or the other of you participants in this Model United Nations Conference ! Should that not be the concern and responsibility of the *Humanitarian World* ?

Let me clearly state that **humanitarian action is indispensable and irreplaceable**, but its only objective is to deal with consequences related to the suffering of victims and for their protection. There is work to be done beforehand, by those wielding political power, but also by those holding economic power – if we admit that there is still today in 2009 such a power ! Their ambitions seemed to be global and their responsibilities should have followed. It is to be hoped that there would still be businessmen that do not hesitate to say, that they would rather lose a market than infringe on their code of ethics.

We have indeed all to take responsibility of **creating a hate-free, fear-free and greed-free world. This is the path away towards a Culture of Peace !** We have to be

convinced that the world cannot afford to continue living with two-fifth in abject poverty knowing that global military budgets of UN Member States were, in 2007, 1.200 billion \$. And now the financial crisis is affecting always more the poorest among the poor.

In the 2001 Report « **The Responsibility to Protect** » of the **International Commission on Intervention and State Sovereignty** – of which I was a member – there is an important chapter on the **Responsibility to Prevent**. Conflict prevention – and this is also valid for terrorism – is not merely a local or national affair. The failure of prevention can have wide international consequences and costs. Moreover, for prevention to succeed, strong support from the international community is often needed and in many cases may be indispensable. In the Report, the Commission has stated that « there remains a gap between rhetoric and financial and political support for prevention... Encouraging more serious and sustained efforts to address the root cause of the problems that put populations at risk, as well as more effective use of direct prevention measures » remains crucial.

This is why I am calling for **Globalizing Responsibilities**. If we wish to ensure peace, we have to promote **Human Security**, the security of individual persons, their physical safety, their economic and social wellbeing, respect for their dignity and worth as human beings. Let me emphasize in this connection the respect of human rights and fundamental freedoms, namely those of religious choices. The debate with focus on human security has to shift from the traditional military, territorial security and security through arms, to security as an all encompassing concept, covering security from hunger and thirst, disease and environmental degradation. This means that human security has to address all aspects of sustained human development, as it has been underlined in the Millenium Development Goals.

As a Red Cross man I have tried to understand the beginning of its fantastic utopian history in the fifties of the XIX century. I once happened to read a play called “Solferino” (presented 1985 in the Bohemian Club in San Francisco), where there is a song by **Henry Dunant**, the founder of the Red Cross, that seems quite appropriate to the challenge expressed in the title of this lecture

“One man can make a difference

One man whose cause is just

Reason calls me to do it

Humanity says I must !

....

This man will make a difference

While guns are still

Reason tells me to do it

For humanity I will !”

This words are an extraordinary call on responsibility ! But we should ask ourselves: are guns really still now ? My answer is, that indeed humanity needs and expects **winning the peace rather than winning the war. Going to war, any war, is always a step back.** A failure for democracy and development: a defeat for the whole of humanity. We have to be for life and against violence; we have said it loudly also after Nine Eleven. We have to repeat it again and again. The belligerent attitude of individual world powers had threaten the foundations of world coexistence and international law. These are foundations that were laid down after two world wars and under the leadership of the present permanent members of the UN Security Council, with the proclamation: *never again war!*

I was reflecting at all that when witnessing, powerless, the disastrous 22 days in and around **Gaza**. The same preoccupation occurs for the evolution of the conflict situation in **Sri Lanka, Democratic Republic of Congo** and **Darfur** and indeed in several other places. The call *never again war* was not enough powerful to stop the fighting for power, even confronted with so many innocent victims.

Looking at the global threat of terrorism, it is important to underline at this juncture that **no reasons can justify terrorism**, and there can be no neutrality in the fight against terrorism, also because it is a fight of humanity to defend its liberal principles, one in which there can be no middle ground. Let us remember again and again the victims of all the dreadful wanton acts of senseless murder and reiterate our sentiment of compassion and solidarity. The perpetrators of terrorist acts and those having directed them **have to be brought to justice**, recalling however that criminal laws do not contemplate collective punishment.

But indeed should we not as a priority, ask ourselves **what we did miss to do in the past**. An answer to this question comes in the fall of 2001 in the following statement of thirteen countries “These terrorist attacks are a further, horrifying indication of the pervasiveness of threats to people’s safety, rights and lives. As the international community faces the implications of these tragic events, we must recognize that innovative approaches are needed to address growing sources of global insecurity, remedy its symptoms and prevent the recurrence of threats that affect the daily lives of millions of peoples.” These are words of the Human Security Network, created by like-minded countries on the initiative of Canada and Norway. This statement was not a call to arms, neither a call for retaliation or revenge, it was much more **a call for responsibility**, putting the threat to people, the risk to individuals, as the central issue.

No single country can act as the policeman or the benefactor of the entire world. This is the sense of globalizing responsibilities. International multilateral cooperation – as the one you will search in this UPMUNC - is a must for all states in the world, without any exception. Even the so-called “superpower” must be willing to abide by the rules it tried to impose on the world, accept its share of the costs and indeed accept that others participants are bound to have other opinions, and other states other national interests.

A new start in World History has taken place in the past weeks, with the inauguration of the **new President in Washington**. Let us share the expectations of so many in the world for more justice, security and real peace .

In the already mentioned Report by the **International Commission on Intervention and State Sovereignty** , with the title the “Responsibility to Protect”, we were indeed already in December 2001 saying : « The traditional, narrow perception of security leaves out the most elementary and legitimate concerns of ordinary people regarding security in their daily lives. It also diverts enormous amounts of national wealth and human resources into armaments and armed forces, while countries fail to protect their citizens from chronic insecurities of hunger, disease, inadequate shelter, crime, unemployment, social conflict and environmental hazard. When rape is used as an instrument of war and ethnic cleansing, when thousands are killed by floods resulting from a ravaged countryside and when citizens are killed by their own security forces, then it is just insufficient to think of security in terms of national or territorial security alone. The concept of human security can and does embrace such diverse circumstances. »

But indeed the human security approach – I wish to emphasize it - is not aimed at replacing the security of the State, but at broadening the area of concern in order to improve the security of all, of the State and the people. The security of a State needs the security of the individual. **The prevention of conflict begins and ends with the promotion of human security and human development**. Let me underline that ultimately the security agenda and the development agenda are different sides of the same coin.

May I, at this juncture, interject that spiritual and human values have not always been given even consideration. **Human values** should be maintained in the centre of preoccupations recalling that politics also implies ethics. It is therefore fundamental to emphasize the essential role of Universities as yours, that will – no doubt - insist on values and on individual responsibility, as well as on the constant need to scrutinize the credibility of the mass of information.

Oscar Arias Sanchez, the President (for a second time) of this great country Costa Rica, said in Oslo – when receiving the Nobel Peace Prize 1987 – “Hope is the strongest driving force for a people. Hope which brings about change, which produces new realities, is what opens man’s road to freedom. Once hope has taken hold, courage must unite with wisdom. That is the only way of avoiding violence, the only way of maintaining the calm one needs to respond peacefully to offences.”

Why do I so much insist on the **Globalization of Responsibilities** ?

At the time when globalization is on all minds, responsibility – shared responsibility – means that each individual person must be actively involved in the evolution of the Society, where moral principles have to prevail. Among these principles let me underline solidarity, tolerance, compassion, forgiveness and respect for human dignity. **The challenge lies in the ability to work for a change**. It is important to insist on human

rights education because it will be fostering open societies, strengthening democracy, promoting the rule of law, reinforcing the independence of justice, fighting against corruption and ensuring access to spiritual fulfillment. All that is part of the Human Security puzzle!

We have to recognize that in this first decade of the XXI Century the world has become a dangerous place, with terrorism, bloody local conflicts and illegal and unjust military interventions. Furthermore, in the last year irresponsible behavior of few wealthy individuals, favored by weak surveillance authorities, have caused an enormous **financial and economic crisis**, with a tremendous negative worldwide effect. **Social inequality, inside States and among States, will be increasing and poverty may be deepening dramatically.**

Increased competition for scarce resources contributes to unstable political structures and favors eruption of conflicts. Fluctuations in world commodity prices can trigger dangerous destitution and civil strife. Indeed many of the apparently senseless violent conflicts and acts of terrorism in the world become markedly more transparent when such roots are explored. **Aid budgets have regrettably shrunk**, up to very recently, despite all commitments for the UN Millennium Goals and in other High Level gatherings.

Let me recall that, according to the Millennium Project, the reallocation of approximately 10% of the global military spending (i.e. 121 billion \$) would be sufficient to achieve the Millennium Development Goals. In other words, enough money would be available to ensure the access of all human beings to the fundamentals of life: water, food, health care and quality education.

One could mention other factors of human insecurity that create a climate of fear and hate. There is indeed an increasing human insecurity generated by neo-liberal market practices. Despite the positive aspects of globalization, that has certainly also benefited people in developing countries, **market fundamentalism has created a large exclusion of people from the global mega-competition.** The financial crisis has exacerbated this phenomenon.

But let us recognize that a large security preoccupation in a middle and long term perspective is indeed the **climate change**. We have to congratulate the Oslo Nobel Peace Price Committee for their choice for the 2007 Price. This was the right moment to enhance efforts of all those who work since years to convince responsible political and industrial leaders of the need of reducing mankind's atmospheric imprint. And we must recall in this connection that most vulnerable nations will have to bear the particularly heavy burdens for a situation they did not create.

Why a Peace Price in this context ? Simply because climate change does and will present an enormous humanitarian challenge: more frequent and intense droughts and floods, changing monsoon seasons, new forms of heat waves and violent tropical storms have as **consequence shortages to be expected in food and water supplies and intense environmental influenced migration within and across national borders.** All these

events are threats to peace. **We are at the core of globalizing responsibilities for human security !**

And indeed in such circumstances **the comprehensive approach is the only sensible approach to take.** There can be no security without economic development, nor without energetic environmental policy, nor without effective agencies of law enforcement and border security, nor in the absence of a democratic state abiding by the rule of law. All these aspects of a culture of security rely on a framework of laws which protect property and human rights, and which are properly and justly implemented by a well-functioning judiciary. **There must be a good system of governance** operating in a transparent manner, enabling civil society to participate fully in political life – including holding peaceful public protests-, and to select their government in free and fair election. Should any of these conditions not be fulfilled, a threat to security will become a real setback in the establishment of a culture of peace.

It is encouraging to witness the first decisions of President **Barak Obama, who has shown where priorities lie:** in addition to the serious consequences of the financial and economic crisis – with evident language, as to the missing moral responsibility by bank managers - a clear signal has been given as to respect of human rights (read Guantanamo) and the problem of global warming.

Let me also mention in this context how important is a **better integration of members of Parliaments in international deliberations, as part of civil society,** because it could indeed improve one of the clear weaknesses of today's political world : the substance of politics is always more an international one, while political proceedings (the way in which one reaches decisions) remains essentially national.

In conclusion, I would like to mention how dangerous it is to tolerate that the Almighty God is called to justify violence and conflicts. This is why, I joined, already 1999, the High Commissioners for Human Rights and the One for Refugees, as well as all religions and denominations present in Geneva, to launch the **Geneva Spiritual Appeal**, that I shall now read out to you, with the auspice that it will inspire you in your work as a fundamental contribution to a culture of security and peace:

Because our personal convictions or the religions to which we owe allegiance have in common a respect for the integrity of humankind, a rejection of hatred and violence, as well as the hope for a better and more just world,

Representing religious communities and civil society we appeal to the leaders of this world, whatever their field of influence, to strictly adhere to the following three principles;

- ° a refusal to invoke a religious or spiritual power to justify violence of any kind;*
- ° a refusal to invoke a religious or spiritual source to justify discrimination and exclusion;*
- ° a refusal to exploit or dominate others by means of strength, intellectual capacity or spiritual persuasion, wealth or social status.*

BEST WISHES FOR THE MODEL UNITED NATIONS CONFERENCE 2009 and thank you for your patient attention !