

Resolving Intra-National Conflicts: A Strengthened Role for Non-Governmental Actors

The Carter Center

January 1992

Table of Contents

1. Foreword
2. Introduction to the International Negotiation Network
3. Opening Plenary Address-Human Rights: The Real Cost of War Jimmy Carter
4. Opening Plenary Session-Issues of National Sovereignty and their Impact on NGOs Involved in Conflict Resolution
5. Working Sessions
 - Afghanistan
 - Angola
 - Burma/Myanmar
 - Cambodia
 - Cyprus
 - Korean Peninsula
 - Liberia
 - Sudan
 - Psychological Dimensions of Conflict
 - Sustaining the Peace
6. Conversation with Eduard Shevardnadze
7. Closing Plenary Address-Globalism and Meaningful Peace: A New World Order Rooted in International Community
 - Shridath Ramphal
8. Appendix
 - Consultation Program
 - Consultation Participants

Foreword

This report is a summary of the inaugural consultation of the International Negotiation Network (INN), held at The Carter Center of Emory University CCEU), in Atlanta, Georgia, January 14-17, 1992. The consultation brought together over 200 invited guests from 40 countries and more than 150

organizations or governments. It was made possible through the generous support of the Carnegie Corporation of New York, and shaped in part by that foundation's president, David Hamburg, who has served as one of the INN's advisors.

The INN is first and perhaps foremost a network linking individuals, organizations, resources, and parties in conflict throughout the world. One of its most important functions is the ability to convene persons involved in common pursuits who seldom have the opportunity to meet one another. The participants in the consultation, whose names are listed in the appendix, represent a mix of parties engaged in conflicts, as well as a broad cross-section of diplomats, scholars, practitioners of "track-two" diplomacy and representatives of inter-governmental, regional and non-governmental organizations.

One goal of the consultation was to officially launch the INN Council. This group represents some of the world's pre-eminent leaders who value non-violent means to resolve conflicts. Their combined influence will be used by the INN in coming years to convene warring parties, to use quiet diplomatic efforts to influence parties in conflict, and to have the world take notice of issues or conflicts that need attention. The consultation was convened by the 12-member Council and its chair, former U.S. President Jimmy Carter. Council members are drawn from a number of countries and represent diverse political, religious, and cultural perspectives. Additional members of the Council will be named at a later date. Nine of the 12 current members of the Council participated in the event.

We chose as a central focus for the consultation an examination of the role of non-governmental actors in resolving intra-national conflicts. This was premised on the growing consensus that, given the nature of ongoing armed conflicts, there is indeed a constructive and increasingly important role for the non-governmental community to play. The consultation examined eight specific conflicts as well as two thematic areas. By bringing together those individual actors who had the most experience and involvement in the conflict areas under scrutiny, we sought to create a synergy that would elicit strategies that might be

successfully developed, identify resources that might be tapped, and help enumerate specific action steps that the participants and others might implement. In many of the discussions we were able to secure the participation of parties from the conflict area, so that suggested action steps were immediately tested against a very practical audience and refined based on their feedback.

Another objective of the consultation was to identify themes that are not unique to particular conflicts but that cut across political and cultural boundaries. We wanted to encourage discussion of ways that the United Nations, regional organizations, and NGOs might more effectively address some of the recurring themes identified by the participants.

Prior to the consultation, The Carter Center commissioned action memoranda on the eight conflicts and two thematic issues that were to be the focus of the discussions. The paper authors were asked to briefly address the issues underlying the conflict and then be bold and prescriptive in suggesting action steps that the world community could undertake to help resolve the conflict. The action memoranda were designed to be starting points for discussions. They do not necessarily reflect the feelings of the participants in the working sessions, the INN, The Carter Center, or the Carnegie Corporation of New York.

Following presentation of the action memoranda in the ten working sessions, members of the INN Council and Core Group moderated a discussion that briefly addressed the causes of each of the conflicts, and then focused on the following topics:

- barriers to resolution
- strategies for overcoming the barriers
- action steps for the INN and others

The two thematic working sessions addressed the psychological dimension of conflict and sustaining the peace; that is, what to do after the peace is achieved. These discussions benefitted greatly from experts in military demobilization and in the conducting of national elections as a means to resolve a conflict. The

surprise visit of Father Jean-Baptiste Aristide of Haiti added a poignant and immediate dimension to the Sustaining the Peace session.

A rapporteur documented the proceedings of each working session, and at the final gathering of the consultation, a summary list of the recommendations that resulted from the ten working sessions was presented to the 200 participants. Following the consultation, the rapporteurs drafted more complete reports summarizing the discussions in their session.

In addition to the ten working sessions, there was an opening plenary session in which Sir Brian Urquhart moderated a discussion on the issue of national sovereignty and its impact on internal conflicts. Additionally, plenary addresses were given by President Carter and Shridath Ramphal. The consultation concluded with a live-by-satellite address by Eduard Shevardnadze.

We chose the eight conflict areas many months in advance of the consultation. With the benefit of hindsight we might have included Yugoslavia or the former Soviet Republics. Some were chosen because they were seemingly intractable (e.g., Cyprus and Burma), others because they had seen recent break-throughs and might need additional support to go the last mile (e.g., Angola and Liberia). In most cases (Cambodia and the Korean peninsula being exceptions), it appeared that perhaps because the conflict was seen as an internal matter, principles of national sovereignty precluded significant constructive involvement by international organizations or governments. In far too many cases, outside involvement, often destructive in the sense of supplying arms or increasing tension, had contributed to the escalation of the problems, (e.g., Afghanistan). In short, the countries chosen represented a sample of conflicts in different phases of evolution/resolution that posed diverse challenges.

The fact that a conflict was chosen for analysis does not mean that the INN plans to undertake a corresponding initiative. To the contrary, one of our fundamental premises is that INN involvement must be invited by the principal parties. We do not impose our services on reluctant parties, nor do we solicit invitations.

In addition to the support provided to the INN by The Carnegie Corporation of New York, CCEU's Conflict Resolution Program is grateful for the generous financial assistance of the John D. and Catherine T. MacArthur Foundation. An undertaking such as the INN consultation would not be possible without the hard work and dedication of a number of individuals. The INN Secretariat expresses its gratitude to Eric Bord and INN and Conflict Resolution Program staff members Susan Palmer, Charlotte Simpson, and Honggang Yang, and the many volunteers and interns whose effort was indispensable. We are grateful as well to the new associate director of the Conflict Resolution Program, Joyce Neu, who edited this conference report.

Sincerely,

The INN Secretariat

Dayle E. Spencer

William J. Spencer

William L. Ury

Introduction to the International Negotiation Network (INN)

The International Negotiation Network (INN) is a flexible, informal network of world leaders, international organizations, universities, foundations, experts, professionals, and others. By coordinating third party assistance, expert analysis and advice, media attention, and other appropriate means, the INN seeks to facilitate the constructive resolution of intranational or civil conflicts.

Recent INN initiatives have included mediation sessions between the Ethiopian government and the Eritrean People's Liberation Front (EPLF) representatives, between the Sudanese government and the Sudanese Peoples Liberation Army (SPLA), and between the National Patriotic Front of Liberia and the interim government of Liberia. Additionally, the INN has offered process advice to a variety of disputing parties and has recently been invited to monitor upcoming elections in Liberia.

Intra-national wars are the most common and destructive armed conflicts on the planet, resulting in millions of deaths and incalculable human suffering. During

1991, Sweden's Uppsala University classified 35 wars as major armed conflicts, with each resulting in more than 1,000 battle-related deaths that year. Most of these major armed conflicts are civil wars. Yet until now there has been no organization with the primary purpose of coordinating efforts to resolve internal disputes. Though recent efforts by the United Nations are welcome, the United Nations' means are limited and too many of these conflicts remain unaddressed. The INN seeks to fill the mediation gap that exists in resolving these conflicts. **The INN Council consists of a small group of eminent persons who offer their skills and services to parties embroiled in intra-national conflicts.** The Council is evolving and new members will be added.

INN Council Members

Jimmy Carter, Chair of the INN Council; 39th President of the United States

Oscar Arias Sánchez, former President of Costa Rica and Nobel Peace Prize laureate

Olusegun Obasanjo, former President of Nigeria

Lisbet Palme, Swedish Committee for UNICEF

Javier Pérez de Cuáellar, former Secretary-General of the United Nations

Shridath Ramphal, former Secretary-General of the Commonwealth of Nations

Marie-Angélique Savané, Office of the U.N. High Commissioner for Refugees

Eduard Shevardnadze, former Foreign Minister of the Soviet Union

Desmond Tutu, Archbishop of Capetown and Nobel Peace Prize laureate

Cyrus Vance, former U.S. Secretary of State

Elie Wiesel, Elie Wiesel Foundation for Humanity and Nobel Peace Prize laureate

Andrew Young, former U.S. Ambassador to the United Nations

The INN was developed, in consultation with former President Carter, by the INN Secretariat:

Dayle E. Spencer, a former federal prosecutor, has served as director of the Conflict Resolution Program at The Carter Center of Emory University (CCEU) since 1984. She has been active in negotiations between the Ethiopian

government and the Eritrean People's Liberation Front, between the Sudanese government and the Sudanese Peoples Liberation Army, and between the National Patriotic Front of Liberia and the interim government of Liberia. Ms. Spencer serves on the Emory University Law School faculty, where she is advisor to the *International Law Review*. She has lectured internationally on conflict resolution and has published numerous articles.

William J. Spencer is the managing director of Pangaea, an evolving transnational network of leaders and organizations concerned with conflict resolution, economic cooperation, and the increase and diffusion of new ideas relating to social change. Pangaea assists in facilitating the formulation of strategy, problem solving, and conflict resolution.

William L. Ury, co-founder and associate director of Harvard University's Program on Negotiation, is co-author (with Roger Fisher) of *Getting to Yes: Negotiating Agreement without Giving In* and has recently published *Getting Past No: Negotiating with Difficult People*.

The INN Council is assisted in its work by a Core Group of distinguished scholars and practitioners in conflict resolution. Members of the INN Core Group are:

Robert Pastor, professor of political science at Emory University and director of the Latin American and Caribbean Program at CCEU. He served as the director of Latin American and Caribbean Affairs on the National Security Council from 1977 through 1981.

Kumar Rupesinghe, director and permanent member of the International Peace Research Institute in Oslo, will soon assume the duties of secretary-general of International Alert in London. Dr. Rupesinghe is the coordinator of a United Nations University program to develop a global perspective on internal conflicts and governance, and chairperson of Human Rights Information and Documentation Systems, International (HURIDOCS).

Harold H. Saunders, of the Kettering Foundation, served on the National Security Council from 1961 through 1974 and worked at the State Department from 1974 through 1981. He served as assistant secretary of state for Near Eastern and

South Asian Affairs, and was involved in the Kissinger shuttle agreements, the Camp David accords, the Egyptian-Israeli peace treaty, and the release of U.S. hostages from Tehran in 1981.

Brian Urquhart, former under secretary-general for Peacekeeping of the United Nations, has been scholar-in-residence of the International Affairs Program at the Ford Foundation since 1985. He served as executive secretary of the First and Second United Nations International Conference on the Peaceful Uses of Atomic Energy in 1955 and 1958. He took an active part in the organization and direction of the first United Nations Emergency Force in the Middle East.

Vamik Volkan, a psychiatrist, has participated in various American Psychiatric Association meetings on foreign affairs since 1971. In 1988 he became a consultant to the American Psychiatric Association's Committee on Nuclear Issues and since 1989 has been a member of the committee. In 1988 he helped establish the Center for the Study of Mind and Human Interaction and is director of its Division of Psychopolitical Studies at the University of Virginia.

Opening Plenary Address

Human Rights: The Real Cost of War

Former President Jimmy Carter

*Jimmy Carter was the 39th president of the United States and is chair of the INN Council. President Carter has received numerous awards and honorary degrees from around the world, including the Albert Schweitzer Prize for Humanitarianism and the Martin Luther King, Jr. Non-violent Peace Prize. He has written several books, including **Keeping Faith: Memoirs of a President**, **The Blood of Abraham**, and **Negotiation: The Alternative to Hostility**. The following is the text of the opening plenary address of the consultation.*

As a newly inaugurated president dealing with human rights problems and the world's conflicts, I was committed to making human rights concerns a fundamental element of our nation's foreign policy. I designated every ambassador who represented me in a foreign country to be my personal human rights representative. Every American embassy was designated by me

personally to be a haven for those who suffered the abuses of human rights in their own countries and by their own leaders. Since being elected president, I have become increasingly familiar with the complexity of human rights issues and have continued working closely with the major human rights organizations in the world, such as Amnesty International. In particular, I have learned that if we rely exclusively on the media or our political leaders to identify or address human rights violations, we get a distorted picture.

We see a heavy concentration of attention given when one lawyer is arrested in Nigeria, or when a human rights activist is put under restraint, or when a Palestinian activist is put into exile. These are very disturbing events. But what we fail to recognize, including those of us who are involved in the human rights field, is the enormity of the human rights violations that occur in wartime. Wars multiply human rights violations a thousandfold, or ten thousandfold. The suffering and oppression fall primarily upon the poor, the politically weak, the defenseless, and the inarticulate. One problem is that when we know a nation is involved in a war, usually a civil war, we tend to forgive or ignore the tremendous human rights violations that take place.

War is bestial. It is inhuman. It violates basic human values and ignores laws designed over centuries, even millennia, that protect the rights of one person living adjacent to another. In a war, those who speak out are silenced by death. Tens of thousands of people are killed, almost without a murmur in the Western news media, either by direct result of weapons or by the deliberate withholding of food or medicine. The world tends to agree with oppressive governments that this is strictly an internal matter: a nation is at war, ten thousand people died last week, the combatants say that this is a part of conflict, and unfortunately, the rest of the world does too. The horrendous deprivation of basic human rights and the suffering of anonymous civilians persists.

Since the seventeenth century the number of wars has grown every year, accompanied by an increase in the technological capability of weapons to inflict devastation. At the same time a very disturbing but sometimes unrecognized fact

is that those who suffer are not soldiers in combat, as was the case in our country's civil war and in Europe in World War I. Increasingly, it is not the soldiers and leaders who die, and certainly not the generals. The victims are civilians trying to protect themselves, their families, and what they have from a conflict they often do not understand. The 1980s witnessed the greatest incidence of war in the history of human beings, and the percentage of casualties among civilians approached a horrifying 80 percent. Applying the standard established by Uppsala University in Sweden, an institution with which we work very closely in monitoring current wars, there are approximately 110 armed conflicts going on now, 30 of which are defined as major wars with battlefield casualties in excess of 1,000 people. Imagine, then, the enormity of the civilian carnage.

The disturbing thing is that in too many instances, governments themselves and international institutions are prohibited from dealing with these wars. Those of you who have been involved with the United Nations know how difficult it is to get through the General Assembly and the Security Council-with all the other priorities that are pressing upon that institution-a resolution authorizing the secretary-general to go to a country and become involved in a dispute between an existing government and its people. It is totally inappropriate without an invitation from the government itself for a U.N. official, or an American ambassador, even to communicate with revolutionaries who are trying to change or overthrow a government that is a member of the United Nations or to which an American ambassador is accredited. This leaves a horrible vacuum, and some of these wars are horrendous in scope. The war in Ethiopia, now in a tenuous peaceful stage that we hope will result in the call for internationally supervised elections, has cost a million lives over a 30-year period.

In the Sudan, hundreds of thousands of people have died in one year-not because of bullets, but because of the withholding of food and foreign aid.

What are the costs of war? In the 1980s, the average annual worldwide expenditure for defense was one trillion U.S. dollars. That is a thousand million dollars-two million dollars every minute. Two million dollars a minute is spent on

war or the preparation for war 1. At the same time, there is a sense of hopelessness around the world that we do not have the financial resources to deal with basic problems of human beings.

Clearly we do. The problem is one of priorities and setting common goals. As an example, a couple of months ago, I went with William Foege, executive director of The Carter Center of Emory University, to the United Nations to commemorate the achievements of the Task Force for Child Survival and Development, which is headquartered at the Center. The Task Force decided to immunize the world's children against basic diseases such as polio, measles, diphtheria, typhoid, and whooping cough. Six years ago only 20 percent of the world's children were immunized. Last December, a little more than a year ago, we passed the 80 percent mark. This happened because people began to work as a team toward a common goal of healing children.

But it is not just a question of uniting around an attractive goal of immunizing children. The more daunting challenge, one that threatens our existence on this planet in innumerable ways, is a discrimination even larger than the racial and religious tensions that cause conflict within nations. It is discrimination among the rich, powerful, influential, prosperous, and fortunate people against those who have none of the advantages that we take for granted—who don't have a home in which to live, who don't have adequate health care, who don't have an adequate diet, who believe that no matter what decisions they make in life, it will not impact their own future. These human beings lack the self-respect that would encourage them to reach for and accomplish things that would give them hope their children will have a better life. This is a devastating reality, and the fact that we are expending our precious resources on war prevents our giving to those most in need.

Deliberately, inadvertently, or conveniently, we look the other way. Quite often we do not even acknowledge the existence of those who are so desperately underprivileged. In developing nations, there are eight soldiers for every medical doctor. It costs about \$30,000 annually, on the average, to support a soldier with

training and weapons and so forth. This is 30 times more than is spent on the education of a child. Speaking of education, you can take one U.S. submarine and pay for twice the cost of educating more than 126 million children in the 18 poorest countries on earth. This tells us something. It puts things in perspective. These are terribly troublesome statistics, and I could go on and on. What can the world do about it? Are we going to sit here until the end of our lives and see another generation come along with an increasing number of wars going on every year? Shall we watch the deprivation of people, our next door neighbors or sometimes those in another country who don't have any of the aspects of a quality life?

The answer is that the world community can and must do something to break this cycle of death and destruction and deprivation. Our duty is to identify ways to make this happen. That is why this distinguished group has gathered at The Carter Center. This assembly of people, about 200 carefully selected experts from 150 different organizations and 40 countries, knows of this devastation and also knows what might be done to correct the problems. We want to explore this in the most complete way in the brief period of time we have available to us.

What can we do to make sure that this decade and the next decade will see a steady decrease in the incidence of war? The International Negotiation Network (INN) has been exploring this. Four years ago we invited some of the INN Council members and others to The Carter Center. The secretary-general of the United Nations was here, along with the secretaries-general of the Organization of American States and the Commonwealth of Nations, and leaders who have been effective in negotiating peace at the rare times when we have found peace. We analyzed the problem of conflict, and asked, "What can we do?"

After a day or two, these secretaries-general let their hair down and said they could not move more aggressively to address the problems of conflict because of political and institutional impediments. I remember U.N. Secretary-General Javier Pérez de Cuéllar, now a member of the INN Council, explaining how the United Nations suffers from lack of support from the superpowers. He described

arrears in dues by the leading industrial nations, particularly the United States, in the hundreds of millions of dollars, and bemoaned the absence of public acknowledgement from *The New York Times* and other media when the United Nations does something constructive. He explained the tortuous political process of getting authorization just to look at a country that is torn apart by war. Often, he said, countries, sometimes including parties from more than one side of a conflict, would like to find alternatives to U.N. mediation but don't know where to turn.

One such alternative might be the INN Council. The Council, which I chair, consists of a singularly distinguished group of eminent persons who seek to use their combined skill and influence to draw attention to major intra-national wars and bring about peaceful resolution to these conflicts. The Council might be called upon to act in an advisory role, as a third-party intermediary, or in some other constructive way, either publicly or in confidence. Joining me on the INN Council are Oscar Arias Sánchez, Olusegun Obasanjo, Lisbet Palme, Javier Pérez de Cuéllar, Shridath Ramphal, Marie-Angélique Savané, Eduard Shevardnadze, Desmond Tutu, Cyrus Vance, Elie Wiesel, and Andrew Young. Other Council members will be named later this year.

The INN has learned a lot in these last four years. One new principle of conflict resolution that bears great promise for the future is the holding of an internationally supervised election as an alternative to direct talks or direct mediation. People know in their own countries, if they are from war-torn countries, how difficult it is to sit down across the table in the same room with an adversary. Just think about the Israelis negotiating directly with the P.L.O.; this is not a unique situation-it's just better known than most. But it is increasingly likely that adversaries will say, "We cannot negotiate because we despise the other side too much. They have killed our children, they have raped our women, they've devastated our villages. But we can turn to an international body to come in, and if the elections are fair and honest and have integrity, we'll abide by the results."

There is a very good trick to this. I've been in politics. Politicians suffer a kind of self-delusion, because when you run for office, and many of you have run for office, you believe that if it's an honest election, and if people know you and know your adversaries, surely they will vote for you. This opens up an opportunity, as it did in Zambia, as it did in Nicaragua, as it did in other countries, to end wars or prevent wars, as we hope it will do in Liberia, Ethiopia, and Afghanistan. Let an international group, maybe the United Nations, maybe nongovernmental organizations such as the INN Council, come in and supervise the elections. So what is our dream? Our dream is that this assembled body will use the discussion here to learn the generic principles on which we can move forward to a time when wars are not treated as little nuisances or worse, ignored, but are elevated to their proper place as matters of pressing international concern. We know when war breaks out in Palestine. We knew when war broke out in Nicaragua, a war that was orchestrated and financed by my own country and resulted in 35,000 casualties. We knew when the Gulf war took place. But we know very little about Sudan, Somalia, Mozambique or Liberia. We want to make sure that the world knows about the devastation of these wars. We also want to understand how international organizations can be strengthened, how the impediments to their active involvement might be lessened or removed. We also want to look at the problem of what we can do as private citizens, as heads of major organizations with a fresh point of view and with the hope of consistent and persistent dedication-not just in a transient phase of two or three days here in Atlanta at The Carter Center, but maybe as a renewed life commitment to say, "I believe that I can share what I have in life with others. I believe I can address the problems of poverty and deprivation. I hope that I can add some light to the darkness of persistent conflict among brothers and sisters, too often, in the name of God."

These are the challenges that present themselves to us in the next two to three days. I am grateful that you would come and help us learn more than we knew before, more than we know now, so that we can share the knowledge, not just

among ourselves but with others, and work toward a time when we can breathe a sigh of relief and say that our world is now on the way, not to the suffering of war, but to prosperity and peace and happiness.

Opening Plenary Session: Issues of National Sovereignty and their Impact on NGOs Involved in Conflict Resolution

On the afternoon of January 15th, 200 invited participants joined the INN Council, Secretariat, Core Group members, and staff in the opening session of the INN Consultation. Brian Urquhart introduced the topic of national sovereignty by raising the question of a new international institution that would monitor and enforce human rights everywhere. He said that we need to develop the laws and institutions and the codes of behavior of a global community because there are a number of problems that we're now looking at that are not going to wait very long for a solution, and that will be irreversible if they continue to develop. He suggested that as old sovereign nations unravel, national sovereignty issues become more critical. He warned that we are now a global society and that we have to deal with that fact or we're not going to do very well in the future. He then posed the following questions to be addressed by Council and Core Group members and two special guests:

- Do problem situations such as massive violations of human rights, anarchy, lethal civil wars, environmental threats, disasters and humanitarian emergencies, and flow of arms justify overriding national sovereignty?
- What is the basis on which such action can take place?
- Where can NGOs best help?

Shridath Ramphal stated that the concept of sovereignty is a spin-off from the culture of the nation-state. And the nation-state culture was a means of organizing human society. He argued that notions of sovereignty and nation-state now stand in the way of human development. "We have to at least trim the edges of sovereignty. If we are modest in our ambitions, we stand a better chance of achieving them than if we go full-blooded for an abandonment of both concepts," he said. For many countries, Mr. Ramphal said, especially the developing countries who have most recently come to sovereignty, sovereignty is an illusion.

The reality in the developing world is powerlessness. Sovereignty is a tool that is only defensive. Developing nations cannot use sovereignty for their development because they function in a world dominated by power and in that world they are powerless. However, it is important for the developing world to provide intellectual leadership to redefine sovereignty. Industrialized nations will not take this initiative because to them, sovereignty is a tool used to manage the world.

Olusegun Obasanjo asked if we shouldn't redefine sovereignty since we cannot talk about sovereignty in nation-state terms today with all the changes taking place. He suggested that unless effort is made to improve the availability and content of resources and to distribute them more equitably, we will be dealing with the symptoms, not the disease.

Desmond Tutu followed up on Mr. Obasanjo's point that we need a redefinition of national sovereignty by saying that in some countries (such as in Western Europe) there is a voluntary abdication of rights as these countries move toward a common currency, a political unification of sorts that would entail a redefinition of sovereignty. On the other hand, he noted, there is a disintegration of countries that may have been artificial conglomerates-this is the ethnic splitting away that we are seeing in other parts of the world. We need a voluntary review of national boundaries, especially in Africa, where, in such countries as Ghana and Togo, people from the same ethnic group have been divided. Finally, Mr. Tutu urged the world community to make the environment hostile to those who violate human rights. He would like to see a mechanism created for monitoring and responding to the ill-treatment of any group such that all countries understand that there will be international repercussions to any human rights violations, for "injustice destabilizes not just the country where it happens, it destabilizes so many other countries."

Individual and group self-determination and national sovereignty are opposite but also related, according to **Kumar Rupesinghe**. He suggested that the issue at present is self-determination after decolonization and that this is an area that the global community has not dealt with yet but will need to deal with immediately in

the former Soviet Union and the nationalisms that will dominate in that region. New identities will emerge with modernization, and a framework for discussing these identities is crucial. This new situation will give rise to more refugees and to more returning refugees. Mr. Rupesinghe expressed concern about the United Nations' ability to handle both of these situations. Returning refugees will face great difficulties—there will be more and more displaced persons internally and no organization to deal with this internal displacement or to protect these refugees. Mr. Rupesinghe raised the issue of people's sovereignty and asked what the system of protection is for people. He said we need to guarantee security for non-state peoples, and the human rights community and the peace communities could build new coalitions around the issue of peoples' sovereignty. Thus, national sovereignty should be redefined to include accountability for group rights. Mr. Rupesinghe noted that the unitary state may be disappearing and that we have to think in terms of a multiethnic, plural global order.

Salim Ahmed Salim (secretary-general of the Organization of African Unity) reiterated the need to maintain a balance between national sovereignty and international responsibility. His remarks focused on international responsibility. He said that people have deliberately distorted the concept of non-intervention. This concept has been taken to absurd proportions. Mr. Salim asked if it was believable that the doctrine of non-intervention precludes the possibility of accountability on the part of states. He said that what was at issue was to hold countries accountable for their international responsibilities. The world community must respond to violations of these rights and we must equip ourselves to deal with intra-national conflicts, which, Mr. Salim believed, will occur more and more in the years to come. In response to Mr. Tutu's call for a redefinition of boundaries in Africa, Mr. Salim said that this may not be a solution. Most of the conflicts in Africa today have nothing to do with boundaries. He cited the problems in Sudan, Liberia, Rwanda, Mozambique, and Chad and said that redrawing the boundaries in these cases will not solve the problems. Mr. Salim expressed distress at the indifference of the world community to these conflicts.

He said that rather than talk about redefining sovereignty, we should talk about the need for accountability of governments and of their national and international responsibilities. In the process, Mr. Salim argued, we'll be redefining sovereignty. If we start with the premise of the international responsibility of nations, then we will accomplish more. Mr. Salim was encouraged by the recognition, in Africa, of the need for regional organizations to play a greater role in conflicts.

Unfortunately, as welcome as this recognition is, he said, it is not matched by financial or political support. The last point that Mr. Salim made was regarding independent actors and NGOs: he believes that they have vital roles in resolving intra-national conflicts. For despite the good intentions of regional organizations and even the United Nations, these are government organization and have their own limitations. Individuals working quietly and discreetly can make a major difference. Finally, Mr. Salim urged better coordination among organizations so that resources are not wasted.

Continuing this thread, **Robert Pastor** said that a new balance between security and sovereignty should be established. He explained that the United Nations was begun with a built-in contradiction evidenced by the preamble that starts, "We the People," and yet the members of the United Nations are states, not people. A starting point is to redefine a new balance between collective responsibilities and sovereignty. One way to do this is to have citizens elect representatives to the United Nations through their states. Thus, the representatives to the United Nations have people as their constituents, not governments. Second, along with representation should come taxation. People of the world ought to be taxed as part of their participation in a global organization. Third, the charters of the organizations should be changed. The expansion of the European community and of NATO and the request by Eastern European nations to enter those organizations offers those institutions an opportunity to redefine their obligations so as to permit the intergovernmental organizations a right to involve themselves in conflicts such as those occurring in Yugoslavia or the former Soviet Union.

Marie-Angélique Savané said that instead of rethinking either the definition of national sovereignty or borders, we should work toward integration. She said that ethnic problems are more easily solved if economic problems are dealt with first. Mrs. Savané said that in Africa, through grassroots efforts, people have started to work together. She expressed concern that if some people have the right to intervene while others do not, then we still have major problems. Mrs. Savané suggested a new coordination within the United Nations system, but also in direct linkage with regional NGOs, to take care of displaced persons, of whom there are an estimated 40 million in Africa alone.

Harold Saunders addressed Brian Urquhart's question about the foundations from which we might build international law for this global community. He noted that relationships among nations are a political process of continuous interaction among significant elements of whole bodies politic. If we think about relationships among nations as a political process among peoples not just between governments, then the focus is on the processes through which peoples interact. Therefore, the basis for law becomes somewhat different. The principle of non-intervention doesn't apply in a world where there is a constant interaction between peoples. We cannot *not* intervene in an interdependent world. Non-intervention is not possible. What then is the law by which nations can interact preserving each others' identity and integrity? New foundations for laws need to start with people; sovereignty lies with the people.

William Spencer added that while creating new laws may change behaviors, laws cannot legislate attitudes. He noted that the major independent commissions of the 1980s dealt with many of the same issues and made good recommendations that have not been implemented. He suggested that we become advocates for these changes and try to continue to influence their implementation.

Vamik Volkan focused on the role of ethnicity in nationalism. He said that if ethnicity is just a normal human trait—a part of our humanness—then it can be viewed as very positive (e.g., enjoying different ethnic foods and costumes) or as malignant (e.g., people who kill for their identity). Mr. Volkan suggested that we

need a new type of thinking that will include an understanding of the rituals of groups and of political cultures. He said that we need to define ethnicity. Ethnicity is like gasoline-it is not the cause of problems, but when there are real world problems such as poverty, they are the torch that ignites ethnic tensions. If this process continues, Mr. Volkan remarked, we forget about the real problems and people kill each other for ethnic or nationalistic issues. Mr. Volkan suggested we need to think about the human rights of ethnic groups and new ways of developing social and political organizations because the world has become so small.

William Ury, in agreeing that ethnic conflicts are not inevitable, suggested that conflicts might be averted by bringing attention to problem areas before they escalate and by letting people know that if they engage in conflict they will lose international resources through sanctions that would be imposed.

Jimmy Carter stated his belief that both NGOs and private initiatives, with the imprimatur of the United Nations, can be of assistance in problem situations such as those described by Brain Urquhart. Internationally accepted standards are needed to deal with issues such as ethnic conflicts and prisoners of wars within countries. President Carter suggested an update to the Geneva Conventions of 1949 that would employ modern day standards to address crimes that are presently perpetrated inside a country in an environment of civil war. He pointed out the central role of poverty in many of the conflict areas and noted that the United States, for example, designates little of its foreign aid to humanitarian aid-most goes to security and the purchase of weapons-and that we do not have a means of analyzing the long-term effects of poverty. Furthermore, there is no coordination of foreign aid among countries to make it more efficient and effective.

Mahmoud Aboul-Nasr, permanent representative of the League of Arab States to the United Nations, responded by saying that while some countries delay in signing human rights covenants, others do not hesitate to sign such documents but then do not observe them. Both cases present problems. We need to be

cautious in defining "preventive action" for it could be used as a pretext by one country to attack another. Responding to the question of how to deal with human rights violations, Mr. Aboul-Nasr suggests three ways: the country reports on its own problems and achievements, the individual lodges complaints against his own state, and states report against other states (these last have not yet occurred). He further noted that the Geneva Conventions of 1949 were brought up-to-date in the 70s with the protocols although they have not yet been ratified. **Lisbet Palme** added to what Mr. Rupesinghe and President Carter said about victims of wars in saying that civilian victims of wars constitute 90 percent of all victims. The majority of these are children. This is true of the refugee population-half or more are children-as with internally displaced persons. Prior to the outbreak of civil war, NGOs can serve to bring to conflicting parties the awareness of what will happen to their children and to their future if they engage in a violent resolution of the conflict.

Following these remarks by the Council and Core Group members, **Dayle Spencer** reiterated a comment attributed to Mr. Ramphal that we should move toward a political environment where everywhere is everyone's sphere of influence. Members of the audience were then invited to comment on the topic. Nineteen people came to the microphones positioned around the room to voice their questions and concerns. The following is a sample of some of their comments:

Nicholas Hinton of Save the Children, **David Bryer** of Oxfam (United Kingdom and Ireland), **Joel Charny** of Oxfam (Overseas), and **Martin Griffiths** of Action Aid supported comments made by others that poverty is a root cause of civil conflict and that poor civilians are its main victims; that resources must be reallocated from military spending to poverty alleviation; that a strong network of indigenous and popular and community organizations is an essential element in the conflict resolution process; and that NGOs can play a critical role both in easing suffering and in witnessing the consequences of civil conflict in countries denied international recognition.

Stella Cornelius of The Conflict Resolution Network of Australia urged all participants to become involved with teaching conflict resolution skills at a community level, to turn the global community into a conflict resolving community.

Tibor Varady, a member of the Serbian parliament and visiting professor at Emory University's School of Law, said that we might look at Yugoslavia as a bad example of what can happen in cases of ethnic conflicts. He echoed Mr. Volkan's point that while other problems may cause ethnic conflicts to flare, once ignited, they may destroy a country.

Adding to William Ury's suggestion to impose sanctions on nations that violate human rights codes, **Ellen Johnson-Sirleaf** of Equator Bank suggested we might consider developing a set of criteria for civilized state behavior, the violation of which would invoke predetermined, automatic sanctions.

Quadratullah Mojaddidi, founder of an NGO that provides health care for women refugees and education for medical personnel in Peshawar, commented that NGOs in Afghanistan have caused damage rather than helped the situation through inadequate supervision and coordination.

Nyondueh Monkomona, a member of the Liberian Elections Commission, said that because of the policy of non-interference, there has been much violence in Liberia. He added his voice to those suggesting that when a dangerous situation is developing, action be taken immediately, prior to the escalation of those tensions into violence.

Momolu Sirleaf, U.S. representative of the National Patriotic Front of Liberia, commented that he believed that the situation in Liberia was due to external forces. He said that unless people stand up for themselves, they will be oppressed. He urged Africans to unite, saying that right now there is no coordination among Africans in different African countries.

John McAuliff, of the U.S.-Indochina Reconciliation Project, stated that there is a central misallocation of resources into weapons systems. The use of those resources to address the underlying causes of conflicts rather than to exacerbate

conflicts would make a tremendous difference. He suggested that the INN might play a role in mobilizing people to exert influence in their own political campaigns to have a say in the use of these resources and the kinds of policies that are implemented. He recommended holding national conferences that would elect representatives to attend an international conference of NGOs that would address the underlying policy issues of diversions of resources to military weapons.

David Hoffman of Internews recommended forming task forces whose responsibility would be to act as an early warning system and to pool our resources so that we can do something to solve the practical problems that exist. If the INN is to provide a counterweight to the nation-state system, **Jeremy Stone** of the American Federation of Scientists suggested creating a human rights tribunal to which groups could apply to be heard and which could hear the testimony and provide reports on it. He said that no nation-state will take the lead on such a tribunal for fear that it could some day face charges by the tribunal.

William Zartman, of Johns Hopkins University, added a plea for patience. He recommended that we don't keep tearing up the tree we've planted to see how the roots are doing. He said that we need to look at sovereignty with the idea of responsibility and accountability. Mr. Zartman suggested we look at two aspects of accountability: one internal, another external, and that we move from the concept of accountability and responsibility to the operationalizing of that concept.

In conclusion, the Council and Core Group members agreed that while abuses of the principle of non-interference had occurred in the past and were always a potential threat in the future, in cases such as massive human rights violations, lethal civil wars, disasters, and environmental emergencies, the rights of the group at risk take precedence over national sovereignty. Furthermore, the participants acknowledged the impact that the dissolution of previous national boundaries will have on redefining what is meant by national sovereignty. Because of these dramatic changes, the Council and Core Group members

suggested that an early warning system for intra-national conflicts be devised and that another system be put into place to deal with intra-national conflicts when they arise.

Working Session

On Thursday, the 200 invited participants divided into working groups to discuss eight specific intra-national conflict areas and two thematic issues: the Psychological Dimensions of Conflict and Sustaining the Peace. Of the ten sessions, half met in the morning and half met in the afternoon. Each session was facilitated by an INN Council member and a Core Group member. At the beginning of the consultation, participants were given "Action Memoranda" that had been written for the consultation by experts in these ten areas. Other experts were assigned to take notes and summarize the outcomes of the sessions. During each working session, participants were charged with the responsibility of coming up with action steps that could be taken by the INN and others to resolve the conflicts in those areas. What follow are summaries of the ten working sessions.

Afghanistan

Approximately 25 participants attended this session. Among them were the United Nations Special Representative for Afghanistan, representatives of mujaheddin, international scholars, several of whom have lived in Afghanistan, and representatives of NGOs with activities in the country. There were also representatives from the U.S. Department of State, the government of Turkey, and some Afghani nationals. The Afghani Permanent Representative to the United Nations could not attend because of U.S. travel restrictions.

Barriers

What began as a confrontation between the superpowers has distilled into a protracted civil conflict. To use the consultation time most efficiently, the session participants did not discuss the causes of conflict but rather began directly with identifying the following five major barriers to resolving the conflict:

- a lack of legitimate leadership;

- a lack of accountability for the money and weapons being funneled into the country;
- serious internal divisiveness on both sides and frequent involvement by foreign interests;
- outside powers supplying deadly modern weapons so that many elements of the society are heavily armed; and,
- a sense of distrust among the Afghanistan peoples about the emerging sociopolitical situation.

This last barrier is evident in the emerging tension between the Pushtuns and the non-Pushtuns; sectarian tensions between the Sunnis, who, in the past, dominated public affairs, and the Shiites, who, since the war, have been heavily armed by Iran and are not willing to accept Sunni domination; people living in Kabul who fear reprisals by resistance groups, in case they should come to power; and general anxiety among the Afghanistan peoples. After the Soviet withdrawal, the country has become more fragmented than ever.

Other barriers include land mines, the narcotics industry, and the damage done to the social structure. There has been a staggering human cost: upwards of 2 million people killed, most educated people have left the area, social life has been severely disrupted, and the war has brought forth crucial differences in the conceptions of the nature of government and of the grounds for legitimate power. There are inadequate funds for the reinstatement of order in the country, for the establishment of a viable government, and for reconstruction.

Strategies

Strategies to resolve the conflict were formulated in this working session. The participants urged that attempts to resolve the conflict be undertaken as aggressively as possible. Mechanisms must be established and steps taken for the formation of a legitimate government. This will entail:

- arranging for all the elements in the conflict to be involved in the resolution of the conflict and in the institution of the new government;
- forming an interim institution for organizing and overseeing the establishment of the new government; and,
- demobilizing all the combatants in the war.

The participants stressed that international support for this process and for the new government must be united, wholehearted, and unwavering. Essentially this strategy constitutes an endorsement of the strategy worked out by the United Nations.

Action Steps

The actions that should be taken include the steps outlined in the U.N. "Report of the Secretary-General" of the 46th session, Agenda Item 29:

That all hostilities cease:

- that the shipment of arms and ammunition into the area cease-to which the participants added that all funding of arms shipments must also cease; and,
- that a "credible and impartial transition mechanism [should be formed] with appropriate powers and authority..."

The participants believe that all parties, all states, and other interested groups should assist in the enforcement of this process.

- Every effort should be made to ensure that human rights are protected, to guarantee the rule of law and the exercise of due process in the reconstitution of this society.
- Specific activities need to be undertaken for the demilitarization of the region.
- Arrangements must be made for the speedy repatriation of the Afghan refugees and the return home of displaced persons and for economic and social reconstruction.

These activities can only be accomplished if the member states of the United Nations provide the resources.

Angola

The 30 participants in the session on Angola included representatives of the Angolan government and National Union for the Total Independence of Angola (UNITA), scholars, individuals from the business and financial community, senior representatives from the United Nations, the Organization of African Unity, and the State Department, and numerous representatives of NGOs involved in humanitarian and refugee issues in Angola.

Following an introduction by paper author William Zartman that summarized the status of the conflict in Angola, general discussion by participants led to a list of issues to be addressed. From this list, the representatives of the Angolan government and UNITA chose the five central points around which further discussion should center. The five points were elections, demobilization, retraining, economics, and refugees.

Strategies and Action Steps

- **Elections** (incorporating monitoring, campaign issues, barriers, financing, and the role of the United Nations). The two Angolan representatives stated that their country has four specific needs regarding this issue: technical assistance, voter registration, party building, and voter education. The United Nations at present has not received a request from the Angolan government to become more involved in the democratization process. It is possible for the Organization of African States (OAU) to request that such a proposal be placed on the agenda of the General Assembly. Both the Angolan government and UNITA representatives present stated their desire to have the OAU support a possible future request by the President of Angola for United Nations assistance in the election process, principally through the appointment of a special representative. Archbishop Tutu recommended that OAU Secretary-General Salim Salim, who was in attendance at the Angola session, personally speak with U.N. Secretary-General Boutros Boutros-Ghali and urge that he respond quickly once a request by the president of Angola for the appointment of a special representative is made. It was also urged that Under-Secretary-General of the United Nations James Jonah, also present in the session, promote such an effort with the secretary-general.
- **Demobilization** (incorporating demining, demobilization, and expenses). It is imperative that a comprehensive process of demining be undertaken throughout Angola. It was suggested that a U.N. special representative, such as the one in Afghanistan, coordinate demining efforts. This could assist the joint Popular Movement for the Liberation of Angola (MPLA)-UNITA monitoring teams currently working throughout the country. The United Nations has developed a plan to retrain demobilized soldiers for agricultural work. It was suggested that the INN urge the leaders of the MPLA and UNITA to write letters to Under-Secretary-General Jonah requesting that the United Nations begin implementing this proposal. Another suggestion was to encourage the United Nations to retrain demobilized soldiers for other daily activities.
- **Retraining** (displaced persons, skills building, and costs). The INN can request that the Joint Political Military Commission established in the May 1991 Bicesse Peace Accords create a sub-commission on the retraining of demobilized troops. The funding for such an effort could be coordinated through the United Nations.

Unfortunately, due to time limitations, the participants were unable to discuss the remaining two issues: economics and refugees. The final discussion centered around which countries would be able to assist Angola in case of an emergency. Portugal and the United States were the only two countries mentioned. The challenge to Angolans is to ensure that the process doesn't fall apart.

Burma/Myanmar

The Burma working session consisted of a broad spectrum of concerned parties, including representatives of organized political opposition groups, minority groups, humanitarian relief and refugee NGOs, distinguished academics from the United States and Europe, and others involved in seeking a peaceful transition to democracy in Burma. The State Law and Order Restoration Council (SLORC) was not represented in the discussions.

The difficulties in finding a solution to the problems of the continued internal political and military conflict in Burma/Myanmar were high-lighted in the course of the consultation session. No consensus was reached. While there was some agreement on the nature of the issues involved, there was no unanimity about an obvious solution in which third parties might play a role other than by helping to create a climate that will encourage the authorities in the capital to recognize the necessity of negotiating a political agreement with their opponents. But even that action, to some of the participants, would be unacceptable because the negotiation process implies some degree of legitimacy and right on the part of all the participating parties, including the Burmese military government. While some thought a method had to be found to make the military government see the need for negotiations from the perspective of its own interests-*negotiate or collapse*-others thought the point must be to force the government to negotiate *and* collapse.

Barriers

The existing intransigence of the issues involved is recognized symbolically in the inability of the State Law and Order Restoration Council (SLORC) military

government and its organized opponents to even agree on the official English language name of the country, Myanmar or Burma.

Inasmuch as no representatives from the SLORC were present at the consultation, it was difficult to get a rounded view of the current situation and what might be done. The root causes for the current armed conflicts within Burma were seen to stem in large measure from two different sets of antagonisms that have fueled two different types of conflict. One centers on the opposition of ethnic minority political movements to the centralizing pressures of the national government; the other is the opposition that exists between the civilian pro-democracy demonstrations in 1988 and the establishment of formal cooperation between some of the major longstanding insurgent forces and some members of the political parties that won the national elections in 1990. The two issues have begun to come together and the solution to one, many participants felt, must provide the solution to the other. Others were more skeptical, noting that the ethnic insurgencies began under a democratically elected government during a period of constitutional government.

At present, the majority of participants felt, the core issue in the continuing dispute within the country is the unwillingness of the SLORC to negotiate with the ethnic minority and pro-democracy political groups about the future constitutional order of the country. The Democratic Alliance of Burma (DAB) say that they are willing to do so if talks are held in an international forum outside the country. These are terms that SLORC has indicated it will not accept.

It was a belief of the apparent majority of the participants in the meeting that one of the chief barriers to bringing the SLORC to the negotiating table was its indifference to either internal or external pressures. Some felt that behind the government's indifference to pressure lies the fact that in many ways Burma withdrew from the international community during the past three decades and therefore has an incomplete understanding of recent changes in international politics and the role of human rights and concerns for democracy in Western countries' foreign policies. Moreover, the fact that some governments continue to

provide it with trade and investment, and continue to sell arms, strengthens the SLORC government's sense of independence from other international and domestic political and economic pressures. Other discussants felt that the regime's apparent indifference stemmed from fear at the prospect of retribution against them should there be a change of government, but others thought it was merely their dogged unwillingness either to share or to abandon the powers and fruits of office.

Strategies

A two-track set of strategies evolved in the discussions as to how the regime could be pressured into reaching a negotiated solution and/or stepping down from power with or without leaving the country. The first track was to continue to expand the programs of publicity and pressure that had been developed among various NGOs to get governments not to oppose non-humanitarian aid programs directed to Burma. NGOs could further assist in their work by coordinating their campaigns. The Carter Center might aid this work. Moreover, the media should increasingly bring the situation to public attention.

The second track included using the good offices of President Carter and The Carter Center, as well as other prominent leaders, especially from Asia, to encourage the SLORC to recognize the necessity for negotiation. It was thought by some that perhaps President Carter should approach leaders of the government of China and convince them of the necessity of pressuring the Burmese army to enter into negotiations. Others thought this an unlikely prospect.

An easy resolution of these two alternatives was not readily apparent and the group was unable at the final plenary session to offer an agreed position other than advocacy for reaching a negotiated solution, without specifying what such an agreement might contain.

Cambodia

The working session on Cambodia was attended by some 20 participants, including United Nations officials, members of major North American and British

non-governmental organizations, and scholars from American and European academic institutions.

Barriers

The participants agreed unanimously that the U.N. peace plan for Cambodia, painstakingly brokered by the Permanent Five of the U.N. Security Council and signed, in October 1991, by all parties to the conflict, represented a major political breakthrough. The working group identified three interrelated factors as the main barriers to peace:

- **Distrust among Cambodians:** The extent of mutual distrust between the warring factions of the Cambodian conflict-embedded and exacerbated by external forces-had rendered impossible all earlier attempts by the Cambodians themselves to reach a negotiated settlement, requiring the Big Powers not only to facilitate negotiations but to broker, in its entirety, a complicated and costly U.N. Peace Plan.
- **Funding difficulties for the UN Peace Plan:** The uncertainty of funding the United Nations Transitional Authority for Cambodia (UNTAC) budget expected to amount to over U.S. \$1 billion, raised considerable concern over the feasibility of the U.N. Peace Plan. Whether funded entirely from the assessed contributions of the U.N. member states or a proportion from voluntary contributions, delays in the allocation of funds will make the full mobilization of the UNTAC within the envisaged time frame most unlikely. As consultations between the United Nations and the donor governments multiply on the funding issue, the situation on the ground in Cambodia is deteriorating rapidly.
- **Absence of financing essential national services and the risk of collapse of central and local administrations:** With the withdrawal of Soviet and Eastern European aid that accounted for about 40 percent of the national budget in 1990, and the privatization of state enterprises whose revenues also represented an important proportion of the national budget, the existing administration can no longer finance its essential public services. In the absence of an adequate taxation system, there is no positive correlation for the time being between the "economic boom" of the capital and the neglected countryside. This situation risks returning the country to the conditions of the early 1970s that gave fertile ground to the expansion of the Khmer Rouge. While there was not a consensus on the threat the Khmer Rouge poses today, there was agreement that unless immediate and major efforts were made to sustain the national administration to enable the efficient channeling of international socio-economic development assistance primarily targeted to benefit the rural population, security conditions will deteriorate with increased banditry migration into Phnom Penh of the rural poor, and fuel social unrest in the urban centers. This, in turn, will not only delay the private sector investment in the productive sectors of the economy but ultimately even restrain

the urban-based commercial activities that have re-emerged over the past two years.

Strategies

There was a consensus that despite the short-comings of the U.N. Peace Plan and the unlikelihood-given the nature and limitations of the United Nations-of implementing some of the terms of the Agreement, the U.N. Plan nonetheless offered the best strategy to prevent recurrence of civil war.

The repatriation of refugees and displaced persons from the Thai-Cambodian border areas in accordance with the principles outlined in Annex IV of the Agreement was deemed to be of vital importance to ensure the free and safe return and re-integration of this uprooted population. The international community must support efforts of the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees (UNHCR) by denouncing the forced relocation of the civilian population to zones especially established by the Khmer Rouge and other groups to maintain control of the civilian population. The NGOs need to pay particular attention to ensure that their humanitarian assistance is not manipulated to help maintain these forced relocation sites.

The NGO participants stressed the urgency of the need to mobilize re-integration and rehabilitation assistance foreseen under the U.N. Plan. It was felt that the United Nations has limited capability for timely action. NGOs, however, cannot and should not continue to carry the burden of assisting Cambodia. A large-scale, well-coordinated international aid program is needed, not only to rehabilitate the basic physical infrastructures of the country but especially to develop the human resources of Cambodia to enable the sovereign character of national development. Human resource development through the transfer of knowledge-not only in the technical fields but also in such areas as human rights-was considered to be the most important function of international assistance to Cambodia.

Action Steps

To ensure the full funding of and political support for the U.N. Peace Plan, it was deemed essential that:

- NGOs and eminent persons such as those associated with the INN continue to mobilize public concern for Cambodia and pressure their governments to contribute toward implementation of the peace plan;
- there be active lobbying by NGOs and eminent individuals for the release of emergency funds to prevent the collapse of essential public services in Cambodia;
- a coordination mechanism be established to bring together the various partners of international cooperation working on Cambodia. While lauding the establishment in Phnom Penh of the Coordinating Council of Cambodia (CCC), which works with the main operational NGOs in Cambodia to enhance coordination and provide a forum for joint planning, it was nonetheless considered to be insufficient a mechanism to ensure the optimum use of international funds and to avoid the duplication of efforts. It was suggested that an appropriate coordination mechanism be established in the United States and in Europe, involving not only the NGOs but also the United Nations and other intergovernmental organizations. Given the distinct characteristics of NGOs, U.N. agencies and bilateral aid agencies, it was considered vital that international cooperation with Cambodia involves all such bodies within a well-conceived, well-coordinated masterplan to minimize financial and human resources waste owing to inter-agency rivalries and competition for funds; and,
- eminent members of the INN convince Cable News Network (CNN) to establish a regular television program, perhaps monthly, tentatively called "INN Watch," that would feature issues in conflict resolution through film documentaries, interviews, and debates if appropriate, to keep the international audience informed of issues that are no longer treated in prime time news programs or on the front pages of the daily press. The periodic monitoring of peace in Cambodia by such a program on CNN would make a tremendous contribution in maintaining the interest of international public opinion, including those of the political leaders.

Cyprus

The 23 participants in the Cyprus session consisted of representatives from the Greek and Turkish Cypriot communities, the governments of Greece and Turkey, the United Nations, NGOs, and academic and diplomatic experts on Greek-Turkish relations and Eastern Mediterranean security.

Barriers

The core obstacles to the resolution of the Cyprus problem are psychological barriers that have kept the two communities apart—barriers that have become embedded by the presence of physical separation of the two ethnic groups. The structure of a future Cyprus state is no longer an issue. A bizonal federation, based on bi-communal principles, was accepted by both sides as early as 1977. However, the Turkish community fears the prospect of being reduced to minority

status with all the inherent risks that entails, while the Greek community feels that its minority status in the larger Eastern Mediterranean context also places it at risk. Fears on both sides must be alleviated by providing credible guarantees to both communities and increasing human contacts. Such guarantees would not only reduce the level of mistrust but eventually would erase misperceptions about each other's intentions that still prevail. Currently, neither side recognizes the existence of the other.

Both communities have feared domination: the Greeks domination by Turkey and the Turks domination by Greeks which, in the past, had its expression in demands for "enosis." But more specifically, the income gap between the two communities has historically been wide and the gap has grown recently. The Greek population has an annual per capita income of \$9,000 while the Turks average barely \$3,000. Economic disparity was pointed out by several participants as an area requiring closer examination and one that should be central in any search for strategies to promote resolution of the conflict.

A strategy to resolve the conflict was offered by President Carter, who visited the session and suggested he travel to Cyprus and provide the disputing parties with advice and his good offices. The trip did not materialize because neither community was prepared to meet with him. The President implored the group to be specific on how to move the problem of Cyprus off dead center.

Strategies

In response to this plea and the goals of the session, specific strategies were recommended by the participants:

- It was the consensus of the group that incentives for intra-national economic development must be given priority. Moreover, bridging the income gap between North and South was seen as an area of concern.
- Ongoing economic projects, as well as projects that promote cooperation and communications, should be enhanced.
- It was agreed by all sides that individuals of high standing, prestige, and trust can play a vital role in reversing negative attitudes. Ways should be found to increase cross-border visits and meetings between respected community leaders and ordinary citizens. Several ideas were offered for places for such meetings to take place, but no agreement was reached. All participants did, however, agree on the importance of such meetings.

- Cooperation in environmental matters (such as the protection of the loggerhead turtles, an endangered species) found support among all participants.
- It was suggested that The Carter Center serve as a place where Greek and Turkish elites could meet and develop understanding of each other's goals, fears, objectives, and aspirations.
- It was recommended and accepted that NGOs undertake qualitative and quantitative analyses of press in Cyprus (North and South), Greece, and Turkey to identify the problems in reporting (i.e., biases) and make all findings public. Ambassador Aktan (Mission of Turkey to the United Nations) pointed to the negative role played by the press and electronic media. Quite often, these essential institutions in democratic systems have exacerbated tensions and contributed to cultural chauvinism.
- As a means of bridging gaps and averting further drifting of the two communities, it was recommended and accepted that teaching of each other's languages in public schools in Cyprus should be pursued with vigor at all levels.
- As a confidence-building measure and for humanitarian reasons, the matter of missing persons, among whom are Greek, Turkish, and even American citizens, should be given high priority.

Action Steps

As a result of these recommendations, six specific action steps were suggested:

- Define all issues to be resolved and priorities to be set with the criterion of whether they represent "win-win" situations.
- Utilize NGOs to bridge gaps and eliminate barriers provided they do not interfere with the ongoing political process and the role of the United Nations.
- Support joint projects that have United Nations Development Program and United Nations High Commission on Refugees endorsement and examine the possibility of their expansion to the entire island.
- Develop projects that encourage mutual respect and cultural integration.
- Take steps to achieve gradual elimination of physical barriers to communications at the citizen level without raising sovereignty or political issues.
- Support U.N. efforts to resolve the Cyprus issue.

Korean Peninsula

The working session on the Korean Peninsula brought together ambassadorial level participants from both the Republic of Korea (ROK) and the Democratic Peoples Republic of Korea (DPRK) together with senior leaders of the opposition party in the ROK, diplomats, NGO representatives, and expatriate Korean scholars from several countries. The surprising conclusion of historic agreements between the two Korean governments during the weeks immediately preceding

the INN consultation gave rise to a mood of optimism regarding the possibility of an end to the 46-year-long armed conflict on the Korean Peninsula.

The discussion of causes of the conflict centered more on the causes for the recent breakthrough than on the causes of the conflict itself. It was accepted as a general consensus that the Korean conflict erupted primarily, if not exclusively, because of the actions of the United States and the Soviet Union. Economic disparities were recognized as both a cause of recent breakthroughs and a continuing difficulty for both parties in finding ways to reunite without undue dislocations or structural changes. The need for economic development, as well as for avoiding massive dislocations in the wake of increased contact between the two parts of Korea, was recognized as one of the driving forces behind the recent progress and a key arena for mutual cooperation. Domestic political agendas of the leadership on both sides of the peninsula also contributed to recent agreements, but this was noted as a possible source of misunderstanding and subsequent failure if those conditions change. If the political climate that generated interest in a breakthrough should degenerate, the will to persist in dialogue could easily be lost in the heat of election campaigns in the South or in political transformations in the North.

Barriers

Four main barriers were highlighted. Professor Kim, the paper author, argued that one of these is the issue of the governments' legitimacy. The legitimacy of the South Korean government is based on the persistence of a "threat from North Korea." Other participants noted that the North Korean government had the same problem: its legitimacy is based in part on a "threat from the South." Overcoming these barriers requires redefinition of the basis of the governments' claim to legitimacy. Another barrier mentioned by Professor Kim is the presence of 40,000 U.S. troops in the South. However, one of the participants from the South noted that opinions vary on this subject. Many in the South worry that with the international situation changing, Japan will be tempted to maintain a more active military role if the U.S. military presence diminishes prematurely. It was agreed

that the large-scale military exercises conducted by the United States and South Korea, and, on a smaller scale, the military exercises conducted by North Korea, have constituted ongoing provocations and barriers. A third barrier is the concern about North Korean nuclear programs, whether the programs are real or not. Finally, the attitude of some in the U.S. military establishment who seek U.N. Security Council authority to force inspections was seen as another barrier. If advocated in such a way as to further inflame the hard right wing in South Korea, it could create new tensions, especially if it is accompanied by talk of "surgical operations," as was suggested recently by the South Korean defense minister.

Strategies

To overcome these barriers, several strategies were suggested. First, the situation today calls for a 2-plus-4 approach with the Korean states taking the initiative. While actions by third parties such as the INN were suggested, it was the consensus of the participants that while the source of the conflict had been external, the solution to the conflict would have to be internal. To this end, the Korean leadership would need to be recognized as key players in resolving the conflict. To deal with the economic barriers, joint economic development plans should be established. To begin to eliminate the antipathy and fear of North and South Koreans about the other side, two suggestions were made: 1) visits by elderly Koreans to their families on the other side; and, 2) development of a joint Olympic team. A strategy to deal with the nuclear issue would be to encourage international and scientific dialogue on identification and resolution of nuclear issues, including scientific and international inspections.

Action Steps

Actions that were recommended to implement these strategies include:

- Encourage the U.S. government to support North-South negotiations and to normalize relations with DPRK.
- Show support for dialogue and highlight issues for U.S. and international audience through INN visit to DPRK and ROK.
- Encourage North-South cultural exchanges between journalists, scientists, church groups, Korean war veterans, etc.
- Share international disarmament expertise.
- End travel restrictions on DPRK diplomats in the U.S.

- Devise proposals for future U.S. military policy in Asia to enable multilateral mutual security.
- Establish open telecommunications.
- Open U.S. Interests Section in Pyongyang.
- Revoke U.S. commercial restrictions on DPRK.

Liberia

The Liberian working session had 35 participants. Among these were the secretary-general of the Organization of African Unity, the under-secretary-general of the United Nations for Political Affairs, the executive secretary of the Economic Community of West African States, the U.S. ambassador to Liberia, members of the Liberian Elections Commission, a representative from the National Patriotic Front of Liberia, representatives from inter-governmental and non-governmental organizations, Liberians currently residing in the United States, and members of the legal and diplomatic communities in Europe and the United States.

General Obasanjo began the session by pointing out that the holding of free and fair elections is important but does not constitute a panacea to civil conflict. The session's first concern was the examination of the myriad factors that precipitated the Liberian civil conflict. The next issue was a briefing on the role and actions of the Economic Community of West African States (ECOWAS).

Barriers

Several problems were identified as obstacles to resolution of the conflict:

- **The leadership problem:** Currently there are two *de facto* governments in Liberia: the Interim Government of National Unity, which is headed by Amos Sawyer, has control of the metro-politan Monrovia area, and the National Patriotic Reconstruction Assembly Government, headed by Charles Taylor, has control over the rest of the country.
- **The security problem:** The participants observed that the disarmament and encampment processes are behind schedule.
- **The repatriation and resettlement problem:** The session participants discussed the refugee problem, particularly the fact that a substantial portion of the population of Liberia is still living outside of the country.
- **The reconciliation problem:** There were still signs of mistrust and apprehension between the leaders of the two governments. The result is that both sides perceive the conflict resolution process as a zero-sum game.

- **The resource problem:** The lack of resources was a central impediment to the implementation of the plans (e.g., the holding of free and fair elections).

Strategies

The working session proceeded to develop strategies that could be used to address the problems of the conflict. The participants agreed that all efforts should be made to implement the disarmament, encampment, and demobilization programs developed by the Economic Community of West African States (ECOWAS). Both the Interim Government of National Unity and the National Patriotic Reconstruction Assembly Government should be encouraged to acknowledge the contributions of each side and to pursue confidence building measures that would assuage mistrust and animosity. Every effort should be made to find resources to support the repatriation and resettlement programs, the Special Elections Commission, and post-civil war reconstruction.

Action Steps

The session formulated a series of steps that could be pursued in resolving the conflict and reconstructing the country. Short- and long-term steps were proposed. The short-term steps are:

- ECOWAS, the Interim Government of National Unity, and the warring factions should work together to accelerate the disarmament and encampment processes within the framework of a new timetable. At this juncture, Momolu Sirleaf, the Special Envoy of the National Patriotic Front of Liberia, told the session that his organization had informed him that it had commenced the disarmament process.
- Immediate appeals should be made to the United Nations, the Organization of African Unity, the European Community, non-governmental organizations, the United States and other donor countries to help provide financial, material, and technical assistance for the processes.
- The Special Elections Commission of Liberia should begin work on a budget and the associated measures that would ensure the holding of free and fair elections.
- An appeal should be made to both the Interim Government of National Unity and the National Patriotic Reconstruction Assembly Government to establish joint commissions that would address various issues.
- The group suggested that efforts should be made to learn from the experiences of other Third World states.
- An appeal should be made to the government of the United States requesting that the Brook Amendment that prohibits the provision of financial assistance to Liberia be waived by the Congress.

Medium and long term steps include:

- Serious attention must be given to the rebuilding of the infrastructure in all sectors of the society.
- Efforts must be made to reconstruct the economy.
- There should be a concerted effort to repatriate and resettle those Liberians who want to return home.
- The issue of the military should be left to the new government that will be elected.

The session formulated a list of specific resources that will be needed for the various processes such as the disarmament and encampment project, the demobilization program, national elections, and national reconstruction.

The working session adjourned on the note that the Liberian situation warrants the support of the international community. The participants maintained that Liberians must play a leading role in shaping the future direction of their country because they know the country's problems better than anyone or any group, and they are therefore in a better position to decide its future.

Sudan

Among the approximately 35 participants were senior officials from the Organization of African Unity, representatives from the U.S. State Department, the European Parliament, and humanitarian and health-related non-governmental organizations. The Sudan government decided not to send any representatives of its own from Khartoum to the consultation; however, a government representative based in London did attend. Opposition leaders from outside of Sudan attended, but opposition leaders based in Sudan were not given permission to attend.

Barriers

Participants in this session discussed some of the barriers that stand in the way of resolving the Sudanese conflict. One is the problem of national identity-is Sudan to be identified as an Islamic state? The Sudan government representative assumed that what he saw as the country's majority aspired to live in an Islamic state while the representative of John Garang's wing of the Sudan People's Liberation Army (SPLA) wanted Sudan recognized as a secular state.

Another problem raised was the issue of external linkages. The main focus of the current problem concerns the present government's relations with Iran and the government's accusations that its opponents are foreign-backed. Yet another barrier to resolution of the Sudanese conflict include tensions within the SPLA and within the North. The representatives of SPLA/Garang placed emphasis on the unity of Sudan and the movement's current position that the country should seek to move toward pluralist democracy. The representative of the breakaway group, SPLA/Akol-Mashar, argued that there had not been an opportunity for a true expression of the views of the people of the South who had largely been excluded from the political process in Sudan since independence. He thought that there should be greater consultation including consideration of secession for the South by means of a referendum.

While the major parties are prepared to participate in negotiations on certain conditions (see below), some discussants were so hostile to the National Islamic Front (NIF) that they felt there could be no negotiations with the existing government. The government representative appeared particularly suspicious of the Northern opposition parties and felt that there was room for negotiation only with the SPLA, while recognizing that it would be negotiating on behalf of the National Democratic Alliance (NDA).

The major opposition Northern parties were prepared to negotiate with the government, though only in circumstances in which all were direct participants in the talks, while the government, as indicated, sought to deal only with the SPLA speaking on behalf of the NDA. The issue of actual representation in negotiations of the Northern parties currently in opposition is therefore an important strategic issue for all involved in possible talks.

Action Steps

The participants in the session proposed three main action steps for resolving the conflict in Sudan:

- **Grass-roots involvement.** In the understanding of most of the participants, the initial steps of peace-making involve essentially elite negotiations and decisions. There is a possible passive role for grass-roots groups in that a ceasefire could be

- swiftly followed by international relief aid, and perhaps assistance in basic administration, which, once underway, could contribute to sustaining the ceasefire.
- **National identity: Outside actors.** The NDA, in particular, appeared very willing to see the involvement of outside actors. The NDA's participation in the INN consultation was itself an indication of that readiness, and it envisages a role for the international community in steps toward peace. However, the government representative was more cautious and informally let it be known that some, at least in the government, favor direct talks with the SPLA with only a minimal role for outside actors. Outside actors, for their part, appeared willing to be involved if desired. In addition to the INN, the Nigerian government has been ready to host talks, while the presence of the secretary-general of the Organization of African Unity (OAU) in the consultation, and the presence of a senior official of the Arab League, showed the level of international concern and preparedness to help.
 - **Peace process.** The three steps discussed and agreed to by participants were:
 - A meeting between the government and the SPLA (on behalf of the NDA) is acceptable to arrange conditions for a ceasefire and thus to pave the way for a round-table conference of all the parties proposed during the course of the INN consultation.
 - The conditions for a ceasefire do not involve a commitment by the government to withdraw its forces from the South. It is not necessary to do so to facilitate relief administration, it had not been a demand of any of the parties hitherto, and it could be interpreted as signalling the partition of the country.
 - As necessary pre-conditions for a ceasefire:
 - the state of emergency should be lifted, at least in the North, if it is not possible for the war-torn South;
 - all political prisoners and detainees should be released under international supervision;
 - freedom of movement and association should be granted to all political parties and civil organizations including the press, also under international supervision.

There was general agreement that a draft invitation by the INN to parties to the conflict with the eventual aim of convening a round-table conference would be a useful step.

The achievement of a ceasefire and subsequent negotiations could open the way for international support for Sudan. As far as the European Community is concerned, Sudan's conditions are such that it does not qualify at present for European Community assistance under Lome IV.

While there has generally been a readiness to continue relief aid, the civil war and the attitudes it engenders in both government and the SPLA has served to

limit the effectiveness of such aid. The representative of the International Committee of the Red Cross stressed the importance of keeping humanitarian aid and politics apart.

Psychological Dimensions of Conflict

(Council Member: Lisbet Palme; Core Group Members: Harold Saunders and Vamik Volkan; Paper Authors: Vamik Volkan, Joseph V. Montville, Harold Saunders; Rapporteur: J. Thomas Bertrand.)

The 75 participants in this session came from a wide spectrum of humanitarian and religious organizations, academic institutions, foundations, and governments.

The paper authors gave brief overviews of their papers and emphasized the importance of the human dimension in efforts at conflict resolution. One way that this can be done is through using the knowledge that we have of human motivation in conflict management. We must also apply our knowledge of large group behaviors and interpersonal relationships to assist diplomats and others engaged in conflict resolution. The participants agreed that while adding to our knowledge of the psychological dimensions of conflict is critical, we must go one step further in translating this knowledge into the operational world of practical diplomacy and politics.

Therefore, the participants recommended the following actions for the INN:

Action Steps

- developing a multidisciplinary global interactive curriculum for the schools;
- advocating implementation of existing UN resolutions;
- nurturing of dissident individuals who face constant pressure to conform;
- developing a means of assessing torture, racism, and terrorism around the globe;
- encouraging the recognition of the concepts of healing and forgiveness into the conduct of international relations;
- establishing an early warning system to monitor pathological behaviors of leaders and degenerating conditions in nations;
- promoting more creative media use in reinforcing positive images of peoples in conflict situations; and,
- recommending that diplomats be trained in conflict resolution and psychology.

This session was very well-attended and the feedback from participants extremely positive. The interest in the psychological dimensions of conflict expressed by those attending the session indicates that this is indeed an area that requires more attention from conflict resolution researchers as well as from practitioners.

Sustaining the Peace

(Council Member: Olusegun Obasanjo; Core Group Members: Robert Pastor and Harold Saunders; Paper Authors: Robert Pastor, J. Brian Atwood, David Hoffman, James L. Woods; Rapporteur: J. Thomas Bertrand.)

The focus of this session was on peacemaking as a process that is complex, long term, non-linear, and consensual, that links issues of security, stability, development, and cooperation. The approximately 70 participants included President Jean Bertrand Aristide of Haiti, U.N. Special Representative Benon Sevan, senior representatives from the United Nations, the Organization of African Unity, the League of Arab States, UNESCO, the U.S. Department of State, European governments, NGOs, academic and research institutions, and all of the members of the elections commission of Liberia.

Critical elements for sustaining the peace are as follows:

- all parties must have a sense of ownership in the process and the outcome;
- the rules for the electoral process must ensure that losers don't lose everything and that winners don't win everything;
- the sustained and active presence of observers in elections is necessary;
- the habit of compromise both pre- and post-elections must be nurtured; and,
- consolidating democracy, shoring up the economy, and professionalizing the military are vital.

The role of the military in sustaining the peace is crucial. The non-official sector can influence the character of the future military establishment through involvement in the encampment, re-education, demobilization, and vocational training of soldiers.

Participants also agreed that the media can play a key role. Peacemakers can use the media to:

- demystify the enemy in pre-conflict stages;
- publicize and prevent wide-scale human rights abuses;
- build confidence in the electoral process;
- defend and empower minorities; and,
- provide education in democracy.

Action Steps

Specific action steps for sustaining the peace were suggested for NGOs and for the INN, in particular.

Action Steps for NGOs

These included:

- to support and strengthen the U.N. Human Rights Commission;
- to place a higher priority on educating for democracy;
- to develop direct partnerships with indigenous NGOs in conflict areas;
- to undertake programs for rehabilitation of youth caught up in fighting; and,
- to train all NGO field staff in techniques of conflict resolution.

Action Steps for the INN

Participants suggested the following be undertaken by the INN:

- continuation of role in convening and networking agencies and NGOs involved in peace work, that they continue to "put the puzzle together;"
- inclusion of a media evaluation and proactive media strategy in every analysis of conflict;
- insistence on free access to media in every INN intervention;
- creation of an annual television special, paralleling the annual *State of the World Conflict Report*;
- special advocacy for programs that relieve poverty in areas of conflict;
- special analysis of potential for large-scale violence in the Commonwealth of Independent States;
- development of a broad set of principles that must be accepted by states utilizing the INN;
- special report to be published on how to utilize the "peace dividend;"
- creation of a development component to assess issues involved in sustaining the peace;
- publication of a roster of international agencies and NGOs and assessing and monitoring their relative capacities;
- use of resources from the international corporate world to contribute to conflict resolution ("if they aren't part of the solution, they are part of the problem"); and,
- formation of an INN planning committee on military issues with ad hoc participation by public and private international organizations and with advice from governments' defense and foreign affairs departments.

Several participants stressed that peace cannot be sustained unless certain fundamental societal changes take place. These include poverty and the accompanying need for a reallocation of resources from military spending to poverty alleviation; the development of a strong network of indigenous community organizations; and more effective NGO involvement in easing suffering and in witnessing the consequences of civil conflict in countries denied international recognition.

Conversation with Eduard Shevardnadze

Editor's Note: Eduard Shevardnadze, former foreign minister of the Soviet Union and an INN Council member, was to have co-chaired the consultation with Jimmy Carter. Unfortunately, sudden political developments in his home republic of Georgia forced Mr. Shevardnadze to change plans on the eve of the consultation. Nonetheless, he was able to join the consultation live, via satellite, from Moscow. The following conversation took place during the closing plenary session of the consultation and was conducted through interpreters. Though the Atlanta audience could hear and see Mr. Shevardnadze on a giant screen television, Mr. Shevardnadze could not see his Atlanta audience and relied solely on the audio provided by his interpreter. President Carter moderated the discussion and relayed questions from the plenary session audience to Mr. Shevardnadze. The text of that conversation, with Mr. Shevardnadze's words as interpreted from Russian to English, appears below in its original and unedited form.

CARTER: *I presume they are listening in Moscow, and if so I want Mr. Shevardnadze to know that his granddaughter Tamuna is here with her husband David. [To Tamuna] Would you please stand up? Now we will hear his address.*

SHEVARDNADZE: Mr. President, ladies and gentlemen, esteemed participants of the conference. Let me wish all the best to the participants of the forum, and all the best to you, Mr. President. I must express my regret that I could not participate and be present and take part in the interesting discussions which are

taking place at the consultation. Thank you very much for your attention, and I wish you success, creative success, for the conference and all the participants. I think we have to acknowledge the important role for something like the International Negotiation Network, an organization headed by you, Mr. President, that is enjoying great authority in the world and a great deal of influence. The issues and problems that are being addressed within the framework of your organization are becoming the most critical problems facing the world community and the planet.

Conflicts emerge throughout the world and, unfortunately, the situation is not becoming simpler, but to a certain extent, has a trend of worsening and becoming more acute. Despite the fact that a large scale success has been accomplished in regulating certain conflicts, specifically those in Cambodia, South Africa, Central America, and certain other regions, new conflicts are emerging, new fires. It seems to me that the fact that we assembled, you assembled, at such an authoritative level and the fact that you are going to discuss the most pressing problems of the world and try to find ways of solving them has a great deal of importance.

I must also say that today the most acute issue, the most acute problem of modern times is the situation in my country which, from the angle of its political situation and economic situation has become almost catastrophic, a crisis. Inter-ethnic conflicts are taking place as well as conflicts within ethnic groups. The conflicts are becoming more dangerous and the scale of them is becoming dangerous too. That is what is happening in almost all regions of our large vast country, of our Commonwealth. On the territory of the former Soviet Union, in Trans-Caucasia, North Caucasia, in the European part of the country, in Asia, people are dying.

It is a complex situation, and the developments that are taking place in policy and the economy show that it is very hard to find optimal solutions to all these problems. I think the experience that has been accumulated by your organization, by your Center (which I was lucky enough to get familiar with and to

visit with you personally, Mr. President, to get familiar with your experience), the experience is a unique one for our Commonwealth for the Commonwealth of Independent States, and the materials which I am sure that will be published and delivered will absolutely be studied here very fundamentally, and whatever is good for the specifics of our country, our region, we will have to bear in mind. I can inform you that lately democratic movement in the U.S.S.R., and I have been taking a very active part in that and the Foreign Policy Association which was established exactly one year ago, which I am head of, systematically and actively takes interest in the problems between different ethnic groups, and the links that were established between our organizations have great importance. I know and I realize that your attention, dear participants of the conference, is concentrated on the former Soviet Union and the processes and developments that are taking place here. We are going through really hard times.

It is really hard, almost impossible now, to foresee which course developments will take. Bearing in mind the cataclysms in the economy, political, and social spheres, we can expect very serious deteriorations and complications. And I also mean large scale conflicts, very large scale ones. I must also say that democratic victories that we accomplished, I would say historic ones that took place in the years of *perestroika* in certain regions in certain states, have a big question mark over them now. But I would not like to fail to say that democratic forces, democratic parties, and democratic movements which in the last years have been formed very intensively are being systemized. They are consolidating since they realized the danger of the threat which is facing us.

Whether we succeed in solving all of the problems that are lying ahead of us is still very hard to say. But I would like to use this chance and express my deep gratitude and deep gratefulness, speaking in the name of all my compatriots, and citizens of this former Soviet Union, of the Commonwealth of Independent States, deep gratitude for the solidarity, the support that we are feeling from the side of Americans, from the administration of the United States of America, from

political statesmen. I am addressing every single one of you with sincere gratefulness.

I know that in a few days a big authoritative conference will be taking place, a conference that will be taking place because of the initiative of President Bush, Secretary of State Baker, the conference of different heads of states, and I know that 6 of 10 participants already agreed to take part in the conference. And I think it is a very good chance to deal with the issues of providing aid and support to sovereign states of our Commonwealth. I think it is the greatest accomplishment. Even several years ago it would be very hard to imagine that something like that would be possible-when we talked about military confrontation and mutual destruction. And now there are gigantic changes in our relations, relations between the states. Heads of states will be gathering to discuss the problems of our nations, and our citizens, one-sixth of the planet earth. One more time I would like to express the sincere gratefulness for the solidarity and support. Thanks for your attention.

CARTER: Mr. Foreign Minister, we have here representatives from 158 organizations and nearly forty countries who have listened with great attention to your words. First of all we want to thank you sincerely for being part of this forum and for being one of the members of our International Negotiation Network Council. In addition to these thanks I would like to inform you that your granddaughter Tamuna is here with her husband and she also sends her best regards. Can you hear me alright?

SHEVARDNADZE: Yes, fine.

CARTER: Can you tell us what the present situation is in the Republic of Georgia?

SHEVARDNADZE: [Inaudible due to satellite difficulties]... all the events led the people to go against it and dramatic developments took place based on the conflict. The president fled. Now he has come and is on Georgian territory and I must say that there is a very realistic threat of a civil war, of great bloodshed. As for us, the Georgians, we are taking all possible measures and all our friends in

the Commonwealth are helping us, as well as our friends throughout the world. So we are taking measures to provide peace in my motherland. That is the main thing: to learn to be kind, and to find ways for mutual understanding and providing for principles of national reconciliation. I think my people, which is now going through the hardest days in its history, the hardest days, I think it will have enough courage and enough wisdom to overcome the obstacles, the hardships, the complications, and have peace between Georgians and other peoples. It is not a big country but it has a lot of ethnic groups. There are over a hundred nationalities, so I wish there were peace between different nationalities and that is the issue of great importance. So I have a great deal of optimism looking at the future of my homeland.

CARTER: Mr. Foreign Minister, your republic also shares a great name and we fellow Georgians are very interested in peace there. Do you see any role in bringing peace to Georgians by the United Nations, or by non-governmental organizations in the near future?

SHEVARDNADZE: I think in the near future, everything will become a lot more clear. If it gets to a global confrontation, which is possible, I think we should turn to the United Nations, and the United Nations should turn to us. We should also turn to other non-governmental and non-official organizations and personalities. I put a great deal of hope in your organization. I think with your authority, and your supporters and colleagues, you could play a great role, could have much influence, and could provide peace in my homeland.

To be more specific about the issue you touched, I would need more time, maybe ten to 15 days, and after that, we could probably correspond or get in touch with each other on the telephone and discuss all the problems which concern us.

CARTER: Mr. Foreign Minister, we will send you as rapidly...

SHEVARDNADZE: One more thing...

CARTER: Mr. Foreign Minister, we will send you as rapidly as possible, the basic recommendations and conclusions of this conference...

SHEVARDNADZE: Our broadcast is not really good. You are seeing me, but I cannot see you.

***CARTER:** In the near future, Mr. Foreign Minister, we will send you a report of the deliberations of our conference, and in a couple of weeks, as you suggest, I will give you a call to discuss some of the recommendations that might apply, not only to the Republic of Georgia, but to others in the former Soviet Union. My next question is, how do you respond to the present policies of the U.S. government in dealing with the rapidly changing circumstances that affect not only your own republic, but others in the former Soviet Union. How do you assess U.S. government policies?*

SHEVARDNADZE: Well I did have a chance, and more than once, to meet President Bush and my friend Secretary of State Mr. Baker, other statesmen, political statesmen, and discuss the problems which we are presently confronting in our Commonwealth. I think the policies which are being pursued by the U.S. administration are reasonable, and they enjoy a certain support, I would say even popularity in the member states of the Commonwealth. The principles that were formulated in a very well known speech of Mr. Baker's, I think they are unquestionably reasonable, I would say justified, and I think we should follow these principles. All the members of the Commonwealth should follow the principles to develop civilized normal relationships, with the United States and other countries and nations. So therefore, I must say that the role of the United States, bearing in mind the collapse of the Soviet Union and merging of the Commonwealth, is definitely very important, I would say stabilizing, and we have to pay tribute to the wisdom and concentration of the administration and political statesmen of the United States.

I would like to say one more time whatever is taking place between our two countries, I would still like to speak about our two countries, is the result of the deep and large scale change that took place in our relations for the past years, beginning in 1985.

CARTER: Mr. Foreign Minister, all of us have been discussing the war zones that still prevail in countries in which the United States and the Soviet Union were deeply involved, notably Afghanistan and Cambodia. What role do you see being played in the future by Russia and the other republics, emerging nations, in helping to resolve those kinds of problems, particularly Afghanistan, and do you have any thoughts about what solution might be possible in Afghanistan?

SHEVARDNADZE: I think Russia could take part in regulating regional conflicts faster than other republics. You mention Cambodia, Afghanistan. I think Russia, since it got, it sort of inherited diplomatic services, they can directly take part in regulating certain regional conflicts, specifically the problem in Afghanistan. Well gradually, as soon as diplomatic services are established in other countries like Ukraine, Belarus, Kazakhstan, the other central Asian states, etc. I think they will find their own place in the complex historic process of regulating regional conflicts. Insofar as Afghanistan goes, I think that, bearing in mind the latest decisions of stopping arms supplies from both sides, we have a good chance for a just solution of the problem in Afghanistan. Republics like Tajikistan, Turkmenistan, Uzbekistan could play also a great role in solving that complicated problem of modern times. Of course the Afghans have priority in saying their word, but Russia and other states can definitely help create normal conditions for national reconciliation in Afghanistan.

There is a certain perspective in solving other conflicts, and I think it is important that in the Middle East, Russia and other states of the former Soviet Union, as well as the United States [inaudible] so that we could switch from confrontation to partnership and cooperation in the Middle East. I think it is a great victory, the fact that we, combining our efforts, we began the process of negotiations. That was probably the hardest, the most complicated decision, especially psychologically. So that barrier, even despite the not very big results, the barrier has been overcome, and we should see it as a very substantial success of our common policies in the Middle East region. So I see great prospects for the future, for cooperation, partnership between our two countries-I mean the United

States, Russia and other states, which gradually step by step will be equal full scale members of the world community. Also Georgia.

CARTER: Mr. Foreign Minister, how aggressively do you believe the leaders of Russia and other republics that possess nuclear weapons will pursue the goal of drastic and dramatic reductions in nuclear arsenals, and what prospect to you see for an agreement in these reductions in dealing with the United States and other nuclear powers?

SHEVARDNADZE: I must say that we have just begun a historic process. It is a unique process, the process of reducing the number of arms and the likelihood of military confrontation. It is really a historic process and we have accomplished great results, huge results. So it is a unique development in the history of mankind. I think the process will continue. I know very well the opinions of the leadership of Russia, President Yeltsin, and other representatives of sovereign states in Ukraine, Kazakhstan, and therefore, I think that the process of reducing military confrontation and cutting military expenditures is an irreversible process. There may be obstacles and complications, but those would be temporary ones and the historic process will continue. I deeply believe in that.

CARTER: Mr. Foreign Minister, one of the great and persistent questions the last few days here in Atlanta has been about the problems of ethnicity and the struggles of minorities who live adjacent to citizens of a different persuasion. What kind of steps are being taken in the former Soviet Union to guarantee the human rights of these minority groups and to heal the apparently rising conflicts that exist within individual republics among the ethnic groups?

SHEVARDNADZE: This is the most complicated problem facing almost all the state members of the Commonwealth. The problem is in Russia, in Ukraine, in the trans-caucasian republics. It is also a very sensitive issue for the Baltic states, Central Asia, Kazakhstan, etc. If we do not find reasonable solutions in that sphere, reasonable solutions in inter-ethnic conflicts, we may face very bad consequences that could lead to military conflicts.

There is a lot of controversy between the former members of the Union, including territorial issues, inter-ethnic relations, economic issues, and a lot of other ones. For instance look what is going on with dividing the Black Sea fleet, and other problems including the borders. All that causes a great deal of alarm and concern in our Commonwealth. I think the time will come when in the states, in the sovereign states, and within the Commonwealth, there will be certain bodies, governmental/nongovernmental, but there would be a single body, which based on the achievements in different areas of our country, would bear in mind the experience and the developments and would be under control. If we do not do that, if we do not accomplish that, then we would have to live with the idea that throughout this vast territory, awful cataclysms will be taking place. But I still think that we have a good chance and opportunities to find solutions.

As for our Association and the movement of democratic reform, I would like to inform you that within the framework of our Association we have a special center which now is considering the reasons of inter-ethnic national conflicts--the historic aspects, legal aspects, etc. A similar center is being formed within the framework of the movement of democratic reform and there is a special committee in Russia which regulates inter-ethnic relations. Similar developments are taking place in other states and other republics.

So we are entering a phase of very serious movement and the best minds, the best sons of their peoples, of the former Soviet Union, our very well known scientists, social scientists, I think we are beginning to have a great arena for international cooperation. I would like to emphasize that point one more time, bearing in mind the change in relations between the states, including the change in relations between the former Soviet Union and the United States.

CARTER: Thank you, Mr. Foreign Minister. We have one very specific question that has been asked by a member of a large delegation here from Afghanistan. It concerns a prerequisite for the return of many refugees, and that is the millions of land mines in the country of Afghanistan, many of them planted there by Soviet troops, and the presumption is that Soviet commanders still living might know

where the location is of many of these mines. The question of the Afghan representative here is, what is being taken, or what action can be taken to get Soviet military officials to help locate and remove the land mines?

SHEVARDNADZE: I understand such a question. The question was discussed a year and a half, two years ago. It was probably discussed within the course of negotiations in Geneva, and then after the Soviet troops were withdrawn from Afghanistan I also took part in such talks. As far as I can recall, the maps of mine fields were given to the Afghan leadership. We also did not keep it a secret from anyone else, including the so-called opposition, which was called differently then. And if the issues remain, the issues that have not been solved yet, I think it would not be too hard to find a common language. If there are mine fields, and roads that have mines, and if the Ministry of Defense of the former Union, which is now the Commonwealth, if they are capable of doing anything useful, I can guarantee the representatives of Afghanistan that the military leadership will do everything possible to solve this problem finally, if it can be solved.

***CARTER:** Mr. Foreign Minister, we have two other questions to ask. One is I noticed that you as the leader of the Foreign Policy Association will retain an interest not only in global affairs but matters concerning the entire breadth of republics formerly in the Soviet Union. Does this mean that you are likely to concentrate your efforts for the immediate future in Moscow, or do you have plans to return to your native republic of Georgia?*

SHEVARDNADZE: You know in principle, I deal with the problems of forecasting with certain persistence. I also try to make forecasts about the situation in our country and different possible ways of development. As for my future fate, I have no forecasts about that. I am ready to take an active part in forming the Commonwealth. I think it is a great historic feat. And the fate of the world to a large extent depends on the successful solution of that problem. I would also help the democratic movement in Georgia, since there is no other alternative. I am ready, as far as my efforts go, to take part in different, other different developments, that is all have to say.

CARTER: Mr. Foreign Minister, we have deeply appreciated your relationship with us, and your answering the questions. The people of Emory University with which we are associated still remember with great pleasure and honor your own presentation of the graduation address, and your personal visit to The Carter Center. We want you to feel that you are an integral part of, a full member of our INN Council, and also that your own Foreign Policy Association is one of the NGOs to which the entire world will be looking for leadership. We have a number of politicians here, Mr. Foreign Minister. I know you have not sought public office but since the President of your home republic seems to be quite unpopular, would you think that one possibility in your uncertain future might be to seek the office of President through democratic elections?

SHEVARDNADZE: At this stage, I think the main thing, the main task for me and any other representative of my nation, of my people, is to help establish national peace. And whoever is elected President is another issue. And it all depends on the will of my people. I can even think there is a possibility that after the new round of elections, after the new Supreme Soviet of the State has been elected, the post of the president will be abolished. There are certain currents that make me think that. If the institution of the presidency is kept and if the people want and suggest that I run for president, I cannot rule out the idea that I would agree. Of course I will be ruled by the principles which have always been with me, and I will pursue the policies that I used to believe in and still believe in.

Since you touch the issue of Georgia one more time, and asked me the question about my republic, I cannot fail to mention the beautiful traditions of friendship, cooperation, and mutual understanding that have formed between Tblisi, between Georgia and Atlanta. It is a unique phenomenon, and judging by that example, we could feel what really happened in the modern world, what kind of changes took place in the relations between the Soviet Union and the United States and how they are reflected in the fates of single citizens, whole cities and the countries. So the big policy changes that have taken place, we have been feeling, judging by the example of friendship between Atlanta and Georgia, as

well as other regions. I would like to wish all of you all the best, and let me express my gratitude.

CARTER: Mr. Foreign Minister, we again want to express our deep thanks to you. Some of the audience here may not know that there have been hundreds or even thousands of citizens of this state of Georgia, just because of a similarity of name at first, but later because of a finding of common ground with the people of Tblisi and other cities in your Georgia have found a chance to go back and forth and visit through the Friendship Force and other means. So we feel closely bound with you and your state, now republic, and the people of my country feel closely bound with the people of what has been the Soviet Union. I might say as a politician myself, not seeking a future public office, that your comment, although quite cautious, seemed to be almost a possible future declaration of candidacy. And if you decide to run for president you would have many volunteers from the state of Georgia and Atlanta to come and help you with your own campaign. Thank you very much again. We really appreciate it.

SHEVARDNADZE: Mr. President I would rather not agree if I do not have a 100 percent guarantee I am elected [laughter].

CARTER: I think all of you can see that the prospect of a political campaign was what lit his face up with a big smile. But I notice that he wants 100 percent of the votes before he can run. He will learn, he'll learn. I think all of us recognize him as one of the great statesmen of our lifetime and we are particularly grateful that his granddaughter would come here with her husband to join us. It has been a delight to us to have you here.

Closing Plenary Address: Globalism and Meaningful Peace: A New World Order Rooted in International Community

The Rt. Honorable Shridath Ramphal

Shridath ("Sonny") Ramphal served three terms as Commonwealth secretary-general. During the 1980s he served on each of the five Independent International Commissions that considered global issues: the "Brandt" Independent Commission on International Development Issues; the "Palme"

*Independent Commission on Disarmament and Security Issues; the "Brundtland" World Commission on Environment and Development; the Independent Commission on International Humanitarian Issues; and the South Commission. He is currently chair of the West Indian Commission, executive president of the Willy Brandt International Foundation, president of the World Conservation Union, and an INN Council member. He is the author of the recently published **Our Country, the Planet**, in which some of the ideas expressed in this article are more fully discussed.*

I commence this presentation with a tribute to Javier Pérez de Cuéllar, the recently retired secretary-general of the United Nations, for his service to our world community, and I should like to begin by recalling our last meeting for its relevance to our work in inaugurating the International Negotiation Network (INN). It was April 1991 and the world had already changed in significant ways. We were not to know just how much more change lay ahead. I was calling on the secretary-general with the former German chancellor, Willy Brandt, to give him the first copy of what we called the Stockholm Initiative on Global Security and Governance, titled simply "Common Responsibility." It was a statement endorsed by several heads and former heads of governments, current and former foreign and finance ministers, and very many eminent internationalists the world over. Some of us on the INN Council, President Carter and Eduard Shevardnadze in particular, were among them.

For me, that visit to the 38th floor was a rerun. Twelve years earlier, Willy Brandt, already a veteran world statesman, had called on then U.N. Secretary-General Kurt Waldheim to present the report of the Independent Commission on International Development Issues—a Commission Willy Brandt had established and chaired at the urging of Robert McNamara, then president of the World Bank—and I was with him as a member of the commission.

The Brandt Report was a challenging document calling for urgent international action to avert economic decline in much of the developing world—in the interest of rich and poor countries alike. It was called "North-South: A Programme for

Survival." There followed a year later from the Brandt Commission "Common Crisis," updating that first report and warning of a debt crisis in the making that would threaten economic disaster for much of the developing world and eventually the world economy as a whole.

Many were moved to concern, a few to action. But Western governments did not want to hear. Monetarism, market forces, and a culture of greed were ascendant. The Third World's call for a new economic order had been decisively rejected in the seventies and the North-South dialogue effectively closed. They did not listen to Brandt.

Nor, three years later, did they listen to Olof Palme when his Independent Commission on International Security Issues published its report "Common Security," calling for a major push on disarmament and new approaches to collective security through strengthened peacekeeping arrangements centered on the United Nations. Palme's Commission called for precisely the kind of preventive peacekeeping in advance of conflict that would have tripped Saddam Hussein on his first aggressive moves against Kuwait.

On that visit to the U.N. secretary-general last year, was I more certain that the world in 1991 was ready to follow the path we were urging than the world had been in the 1980s? In truth, I was not; yet something was different-and is.

We had lived through the '80s and entered the '90s with a record that is tangled and disquieting. Rich countries, and the rich in all countries, have grown richer, but the poor everywhere have grown poorer. Communism has collapsed in economic and political ruin, and the Cold War has ended with some gains for nuclear disarmament. But as the post-war era closes, the adjustment from centrally planned to market economies is pointing up a crisis of uneven development in Eastern Europe, and new freedoms are unleashing new tribal tensions: ethnic, linguistic, religious. And the Gulf crisis, despite the spirit of triumphalism in some quarters, has been anything but a glorious experience for the world, and rather especially for the United Nations, which was neither able to avert the crisis nor to resolve it in a peaceful manner.

The Cold War is over. So is the post-war era. The challenge for us is to ensure that the era that succeeds is not an era of dominion but of democracy in our global state. At the moment, despite all the emphasis on democracy within nations, there is not much sign of democratic instincts prevailing among the power brokers of our world society. More and more the G7 looks-and acts-like a self-anointed presidium. We have to convince these leaders of major Western democracies that the democratic ideal has a longer reach than national frontiers. Democracy at the national level but authoritarianism in the global homeland are contradictions in terms. Espousing the former is right; making it a masquerade for sustaining the latter is massively wrong.

One of the most dangerous of the new realities is that in the 1990s the democracies of the West have learned that there are large political gains in military and ideological "triumphs." Serious dangers arise from this. The West may easily assume that its ideological, political, and economic victories over its Cold War adversaries give it the right to police the entire world. The temptation to do so will be heady, and there will be many supremacists to urge "the democracies" on. But the strength of democracy lies in its values and in staying true to them, and any attempt to embark on a new imperialism would present massive contradictions. Resistance from within Western societies themselves can therefore be expected to be vigorous; but an arrogation of authority by some governments cannot be ruled out, and resistance from the weakened societies of the developing world can hardly be relied on.

We do need a new order, but the newness has to start within. It must not be new wine skins for old wine. If the new world order looks much like an old order with a new name, we would need to recall that Pax Britannica, when it held sway, was a highly selective peace: the Crimea, the Chinese opium wars, the Boer War all were allowable because they were all winnable by the custodian of peace. And the prevailing mood was not the peace of the world; it was the glory of an ordered world-one ordered by the prevailing superpower. The answer is inescapable. The reality of the human neighborhood requires us urgently to seek

a compact on establishing a strengthened system of global governance. The old order is passing and a new world order must be established. Either we allow that new order to be determined by the fortunes of power, or we help to shape it in a conscious way responsive to human needs.

To that end we must repose faith in the U.N. system, but a system strengthened and streamlined and adjusted to the newness of the end years of this century and the first years of the next, succeeding the post war period that was ushered in at San Francisco in 1945. Yet the remarkable thing is not how out of date is the charter agreed to in 1945, but how relevant. Some change is necessary, but not dismantling and redesigning. What is called for are new approaches to partitioning—a more open plan that allows space for all people and all issues (increasingly interrelated) and enables the United Nations truly to become the headquarters of global governance.

It is very much in that context that we meet here at The Carter Center, reflecting on the end not just of the Cold War but of the post war era—looking ahead to a new era of common responsibility. In doing so we have been conscious that if we are to establish structures and programs of international peace and security, we have to lay the foundation in ethics and build on it the structures of law. As we move to a more democratic world society, it must be one governed by the rule of law: international law under which all are equal, countries and people alike, large and small, rich and poor. Such equality is the mark of a civilized national society; it can be no different in a civilized world.

Although still largely untrodden, this is in fact the path we have been trying to chart, however haphazardly, for most of this century. Certainly since the 1920s we have been groping for a working internationalism, first through the League of Nations and later, after its failure and the disaster that followed, through the United Nations. That our efforts have been haphazard is testimony to human frailty in sustaining enlightened change once the crisis that inspires it seems to recede. It is easily disparaged as utopian thinking, more recently as "the vision thing." But it was the shared vision of President Roosevelt and Prime Minister

Churchill that led to the United Nations: the vision that President Roosevelt did not live to put into words himself but left President Truman to convey to the founding conference at San Francisco. "We still have a choice between the alternatives: the continuation of international chaos...or the establishment of a world organization for the enforcement of peace."

They were, of course, correct in 1945. We could not have developed civilized national societies unless we had put in place a collective security system under which the whole society accepted the responsibility for securing the safety of every person and the security of all property. In most countries that is the basis on which people are persuaded that they do not have to carry a gun or sleep with one under the pillow. We have law enforcement agencies to protect us and to deter bullies and burglars. In our world society we call them aggressors; but we have not civilized our world society by accepting a collective responsibility to deter them.

The result is national armies and weapons and a military culture that rests on the fashion (which passes for patriotism) of each country bearing arms (and tanks and warships and bombs and missiles and standing armies) or relying on the arms of allies whose interests are seldom noble or altruistic. We cannot stop the resulting militarization-which in poor countries is obscene expenditure in the face of human need-unless we develop global law enforcement arrangements backed and, in a sense, symbolized, by a global emergency system. If we had such a system in place, as the Palme Commission had recommended nearly a decade ago, Kuwait could have appealed to the U.N. secretary-general for help in those two weeks when Iraq was threatening aggression. And an international fact-finding mission and military observers could have been in Kuwait in 24 hours. No massive movement of troops, no tortuous Security Council debates and resolutions. Rather, swift international preventive action: a trip-wire for would-be aggression. Saddam Hussein might have moved nonetheless. Burglars in our national societies still venture. But he would have tripped, and the likelihood is he would not have chanced it.

Without either the ethic of collective security as part of our internationalism, or the rudiments of a law enforcement system in our global society, we virtually leave it to the strong to restrain themselves; of course, from time to time they do not.

In the new era ahead, therefore, all countries need to be zealous and energetic in truly restoring the United Nations to a place of primacy in the enforcement of peace. "Interventionism" must be undertaken only on the basis of a regime through which the peace and security of the world is in the keeping of no one state, but reflects directly and genuinely the authority of our whole world society. In the absence of collective authority and control by the United Nations, any act of peace enforcement reflects not the emergence of a new enlightened internationalist order but the ascendancy of militarism in a more ordered world. But we must be mindful as well of another aspect of this new era and another feature of security. Tacitus long ago reflected that with war we make a solitude which we then call peace. But that is not the only kind of solitude we make on earth or the only one relevant to peace. What of the deepening silence of the world's millions overborne by poverty: people for whom life is survival until tomorrow-always only tomorrow, millions who simply pass away from want without ever knowing the reason why, over one thousand million of the world's absolute poor trapped in a vicious cycle of deprivation? Are they at peace, living as they do within the shadow of the solitude of the grave? Do we dare to speak of peace in our time while they endure the ravages of poverty's aggression against their basic humanity? When we talk of "preserving" peace, what do we preserve for them?

We recognize that a national society cannot be at peace if power, privilege, and prosperity are the prerogatives of only a few, with deprivation, degradation, and despair the lot of many. How can our world society be at peace when such disparities prevail within it, such yawning disparities between a few who prosper and the great majority trapped in poverty?

Today, the developed countries of East and West, which account for a quarter of the world's population, consume around 80 percent of the world's commercial energy and metals, 85 percent of its paper, and over half of the intake of foods. Is it any wonder that poor and hungry people eat next year's seed corn to stay alive, that they overexploit thin soils, overgraze fragile grasslands, and cut down disappearing forest stocks for firewood? For several billion people in the paddy fields of Asia, in the scorched grasslands of Africa, in the urban slums of Latin America, life (if it can be called living) is one of degradation and hopelessness in the midst of plenty.

We have to act now to adapt our attitudes and institutions to these new perceptions. I would like to see the Security Council, for example, accept "development" as an integral part of its mandate of ensuring peace and security. As with the establishment of an effective regime of collective security, no Charter amendment is involved in the acknowledgement of the scourge of economic insecurity. The structures of 1945 (though they may need changing for other purposes) will accommodate the conceptual adjustment once we make it. It is in freeing ourselves from the illusions that peace means the absence of war-illusions resonant of a more indulgent, somewhat feudal, era of international life-that the main difficulty lies.

As we pass from a world of separate worlds to one inseparable humanity, to one world for which we cannot afford not to be ready any longer, the major bridge we have to cross is in our minds. It would help if we took on to the agenda of peace and security those issues now inescapably linked to the peace of the world and the security of its people: absolute and endemic poverty, climate change and global warming, ecological and economic refugees, the plight of women and children. These are all issues of security, and they cannot be left entirely to their specialized and largely compartmentalized forums and agencies while the world lives with the illusion that peace and security are only about the absence of war between nation states. Put another way, it is time we recognized that for the

world's most disadvantaged it is always war time and that the ethics of human survival demand that we bring them peace.

But there is another element of ethics that commands our attention here. It is that conflict is sharpened and legitimated in the minds of the contestants by their each other as "the other."

At each stage in human evolution, the impulse to mark out and possess turf has been as irresistible to humans as to several other species. It was perhaps inevitable, therefore, that we evolved into a world of states separated by frontiers, and perhaps equally inevitable that virtuous attributes like loyalty and solidarity, which we developed in the process of our evolution, came to be expressed mainly within the bounds of our separate national communities-or ethnic, tribal, or religious groups within nation states.

The obverse of "separateness" is "otherness." The other side of "us" is "them": over the long ages of human existence, this counterpoint has been baneful. It has produced a record of human behavior that is shameful and unworthy.

Otherness nourishes the dark side of humanity: insularity, intolerance, greed, prejudice, bigotry, and, above all, a desire for dominance. Many elements of otherness have powered this drive for primacy. Race, religion, ideology, for example, have all fed the urge for power and superiority. Hence those pages of world history that chronicle our inhumanity: a catalogue of genocide and subjugation, of exploitation and dispossession, of human bondage and degradation. Abysmal wrongs justified, sometimes even glorified, in the name of us and them. Human relations have been dominated by division: marked by national frontiers on the ground and by barricades of otherness in our minds. Even now, this dark side of humanity tends to overwhelm our more civilized qualities. The predilection to otherness endures, frustrating progress along enlightened pathways. Our social and political structures and values have not adjusted to the globalization that has made our boundaries increasingly irrelevant or to the threats to our existence whose amplitude demands a global response.

Otherness has many accomplices. Extreme nationalism is one: the division of the world into we and they, our side and the others: a ritual patriotism that blocks dispassionate judgment and hardens division. In the end it thwarts internationalism, and we enter the danger zone in which our global village threatens to turn into a global jungle. The ferocity of ethnic tensions and conflicts in Central and Eastern Europe as old structures crumble and old enmities erupt tells a grim tale of otherness in these end years of the twentieth century. What a terrible price otherness has exacted from the people of Yugoslavia.

As we prepare to enter this new era for humanity, I invite you to reflect how momentous is this time in our time; how fragile are the blooms of peace and prosperity as well; how vast the wasteland of our human society where they wither on the vine.

I invite you to ponder the state of our human neighborhood in which the strong are growing stronger, the rich richer, and establishments everywhere more powerful, while the weak grow weaker, the poor poorer (in rich countries and in poor), and the world's masses more marginalized.

I invite you to recall that amidst the great gains for democracy within societies, our wider human society grows not more but less democratic; the promise of a new world order speaks to so many of a newness made not by the world but for the world, not so much of a new world order as of a more ordered world.

I invite you to consider how we stand poised between a new globalism heralding a more civilized human society governed by the rule of enforceable law worldwide and a new militarism enforcing selective solitudes we are expected to mistake for peace—just when we thought we were closing the chapter on the militarism of our times.

I invite you to consider how we face again the age-old truth that has so often challenged our humanity, that while undoing wrong is a vital thing, undoing it for the right reason and in the right way is no less important.

Above all, I invite you to share the conviction that we can rise to the great moral challenges that confront us, that there is a spirit of human solidarity stirring in the

world, that many are ready to show by example that they care about their neighbor and recognize that their neighbor now is everyone on earth, that a younger generation in particular demands to be heard in the cause of their inheritance of a peaceful, just, and habitable world.

In all these areas, in all these ways, guided by all these instincts, the International Negotiation Network (INN) at The Carter Center offers its help to augment the institutional effort of the United Nations to help serve the high purpose of easing conflict and tension through good offices and dialogue, through working at negotiation at the rockface of potential conflict. The INN pursues no interest, national or sectoral, or of any kind other than that of conflict resolution and the enlargement of peace and security in the full meaning of those concepts for all the world's people.

We owe President Carter and The Carter Center a large debt in developing this institution for helping to make the world of the '90s and the twenty-first century more worthy of our high opinion of our civilization.

Appendix

Consultation Program

RESOLVING INTRA-NATIONAL CONFLICTS:

A STRENGTHENED ROLE FOR NON-GOVERNMENTAL ACTORS

A CONSULTATION

OF THE INTERNATIONAL NEGOTIATION NETWORK

PRESENTED BY:

The Program on Conflict Resolution

The Carter Center of Emory University

January 14-17, 1992

Atlanta, Georgia

PUBLIC SESSIONS

1:30 pm

FIRST PLENARY SESSION

Council, Core Group, Participants

(Press Event: No Questions)

Location: Cyprus Room
OPENING OF CONSULTATION
Dayle Spencer, Fellow and Director, Conflict Resolution Programs
Introduction: Council, Core Group, Secretariat
1:45
WELCOME REMARKS
William Foege, Executive Director, CCEU
2:00
ADDRESS
Jimmy Carter
2:30
BREAK
(Press Departs)
2:45
RESUME FIRST PLENARY SESSION
Discussion: State of World Conflicts Report
Discussion: Issues of National Sovereignty and their Impact on Non-Governmental Organizations Involved in Conflict Resolution
4:00
BREAK
4:15
RESUME FIRST PLENARY SESSION
Discussion (continued)
5:30
RECEPTION
Council, Core Group, Participants
Location: Upper and Lower Commons
6:15
RECEPTION ENDS
Council returns to hotel for private evening
Working Dinner: President and Mrs. Carter, Core Group, INN Staff
THURSDAY, JANUARY 16
8:00 am
MORNING SESSIONS (concurrent)
Session: Angola (Zaban Room)
Session: Burma (J.C. Library Conference Room)
Session: Cyprus (Presidential Conference Room)

Session: Korea (Executive Dining Room)

Session: Sustaining the Peace (Cyprus Room)

Welcome 8:00 am

Introductions

INN Council, Core Group, Memo Author,

Rapporteur, Participants

Review Objectives and Agenda

Review Highlights of Action Memorandum 8:15 - 8:30

Causes of Conflict - Problems 8:30 - 9:15

Barriers to Resolution 9:15 - 10:00

Break 10:00 - 10:15

Strategies 10:15 - 11:00

Resources 11:00 - 11:30

Action Steps 11:30 - 11:50

Summary and Preparation for Report Out 11:50 - Noon

NOON

LUNCH

Location: Upper and Lower Commons

1:15 pm

AFTERNOON SESSIONS (concurrent)

Session: Afghanistan (Presidential Conference Room)

Session: Cambodia (J.C. Library Conference Room)

Session: Liberia (Zaban Room)

Session: Sudan (Executive Dining Room)

Session: Psychological Dimension of Conflict (Cyprus Room)

Welcome 1:15 pm

Introductions

INN Council, Core Group, Memo Author,

Rapporteur, Participants

Review Objectives and Agenda

Review Highlights of Action Memorandum 1:30 - 1:45

Causes of Conflict - Problems 1:45 - 2:30

Barriers to Resolution 2:30 - 3:15
Break 3:15 - 3:30
Strategies 3:30 - 4:15
Resources 4:15 - 4:45
Action Steps 4:45 - 5:05
Summary and Preparation for Report Out 5:05 - 5:15
5:15
AFTERNOON SESSIONS ADJOURN
All participants return to Cyprus Room
5:30
SECOND PLENARY SESSION (Cyprus Room)
Summaries of Working Sessions; Preliminary Report Out
6:45
PLENARY SESSION ADJOURNS
7:00
WORKING DINNER
FRIDAY, JANUARY 17
9:00 am
THIRD PLENARY SESSION
Report Out to Assembly (Fifteen minutes per working session)
Discussion
Location: Cyprus Room
12:15
LUNCH
1:30
ADDRESS
Shridath Ramphal
Location: Cyprus Room
(Press Event-No Questions)
2:00
ADDRESS
Eduard Shevardnadze
Live via satellite from Moscow
Location: Cyprus Room
(Press Event-No Questions)
3:00
PRESS CONFERENCE

Location: Cyprus Room

3:30

PRESS CONFERENCE AND CONSULTATION ADJOURN

Consultation Participants

INN Council Members

Hon. Oscar Arias Sánchez

President

Arias Foundation for Peace and Human Progress

Apartado 8-6410-1000

San José

COSTA RICA

President Jimmy Carter

Carter Presidential Center

One Copenhill

Atlanta, Georgia 30307

USA

General Olusegun Obasanjo

President

Africa Leadership Forum

821 United Nations Plaza

New York, NY 10017

USA

Mrs. Lisbet Palme

Director

Swedish Committee for UNICEF

Box 111-14

100-61 Stockholm

SWEDEN

The Rt. Honorable Shridath Ramphal

Flat One, The Sutherlands

188 Sutherland Avenue

London W91HR

ENGLAND

Mrs. Marie-Angélique Savané

Special Advisor

UN High Commissioner for Refugees

Case Postale 2500

CH-1211 Geneva 2 Depot

SWITZERLAND

Hon. Eduard Shevardnadze

Foreign Policy Association

103064 ul. Elizaravoy

10 Moscow

RUSSIA

The Most Reverend Desmond Tutu

Archbishop of Capetown

Bishopscourt

Bishopscourt Lane

Claremont

Capetown

SOUTH AFRICA

Hon. Andrew Young

Chairman

Law Companies International Group, Inc.

1000 Abernathy Road, NE

Atlanta, GA 30328

USA

INN Secretariat

Ms. Dayle Spencer

Fellow and Director

Conflict Resolution Programs

The Carter Center of Emory University
One Copenhill
Atlanta, GA 30307
USA

Mr. William Spencer
Pangaea International
2616 Delridge Drive
Lilburn, GA 30247
USA

Dr. William L. Ury
Route 4, Box 248 A
Tano Road
Santa Fe, NM 87501
USA

INN Core Group Members

Dr. Robert Pastor
Director, Latin American and Caribbean Program
The Carter Center of Emory University
One Copenhill
Atlanta, GA 30307
USA

Dr. Kumar Rupesinghe
Fellow
International Peace Research Institute
Fuglehauggata 11
N-0260 Oslo 2
NORWAY

Dr. Harold Saunders
The Kettering Foundation
444 North Capitol Street, N.W.

Washington, DC 20001

USA

Sir Brian Urquhart

Scholar-in-Residence

International Affairs Program

Ford Foundation

320 East 43rd Street

New York, NY 10017

USA

Dr. Vamik Volkan

Director

Center for the Study of Mind and Human Interaction

Blue Ridge Hospital

Drawer A

Charlottesville, VA 22901

USA

Paper Authors and Rapporteurs

Afghanistan

Dr. Barnett R. Rubin

Associate Professor of Political Science

Columbia University

Southern Asia Institute

Room 1129

420 W. 118th Street

New York, NY 10027

USA

Dr. Robert L. Canfield

Professor of Anthropology

Washington University

Box 1114

1 Brookings Drive
Saint Louis, MO 63130
USA

Angola

Dr. I. William Zartman
Director, African Studies and Conflict Management Studies
Johns Hopkins University - SAIS
1740 Massachusetts Avenue, NW
Washington, DC 20036
USA

Mr. Shawn McCormick
Director, Angola Study Group
CSIS, African Studies Program
1800 K Street, NW
Suite 400
Washington, DC 20006
USA

Burma

Dr. Josef Silverstein
Professor of Political Science
Rutgers University
Hickman Hall, Room 603
New Brunswick, NJ 08903
USA

Dr. Robert Taylor
Department of Political Studies
School of Oriental and African Studies
Thornhaugh Street
Russell Square

London WC1H 0XG

ENGLAND

Cambodia

Mr. David Hawk

Director

Cambodian Documentation Commission

251 West 87th Street

New York, NY 10024

USA

Ms. Minja Yang

Head, Task Force on Cambodia

UNESCO

7, Place de Fontenoy

F-75007 Paris

FRANCE

Cyprus

Dr. James H. Wolfe

Department of Political Science

The University of Southern Mississippi

Southern Station, Box 8261

Hattiesburg, MS 39406-8261

USA

Dr. Nikolaos Stavrou

Professor - Editor

Mediterranean Quarterly

National Press Building, Suite 984

14th and F Streets, NW

Washington, DC 20045

USA

Korean Peninsula

Dr. Roy U.T. Kim
Professor of Political Science
Drexel University
131 Waterloo Avenue
Berwyn, PA 19312-1732
USA

Mr. Pharis J. Harvey
Executive Director
International Labor Rights Education and Research Fund
110 Maryland Avenue, NE
Box 74
Washington, DC 20002
USA

Liberia

Dr. Ellen Johnson Sirleaf
Vice President
Equator Bank Ltd.
1850 K Street, NW
Suite 390
Washington, DC 20006
USA

Dr. D. Elwood Dunn
Professor of Political Science
University of the South
Sewanee, TN 37375
USA

Dr. George K. Kieh, Jr.
Director, International Studies Program
Illinois Wesleyan University
Box 2900

Bloomington, IL 61702

USA

Sudan

Dr. Francis Deng

Senior Fellow

The Brookings Institution

1775 Massachusetts Avenue, NW

Washington, DC 20036

USA

Dr. Peter Woodward

Professor of Politics

University of Reading

White Knights

Post Office Box 218

Reading, Berkshire RG6 2AA

ENGLAND

Sustaining the Peace

Mr. J. Brian Atwood

President

National Democratic Institute for International Affairs (NDI)

Suite 503

1717 Massachusetts Avenue, NW

Washington, DC 20036

USA

Mr. David Hoffman

President

INTERNEWS

POB 4448

Arcata, CA 95521

USA

Dr. Robert Pastor
Director, Latin American and Caribbean Program
The Carter Center of Emory University
One Copenhill
Atlanta, GA 30307
USA

Hon. James L. Woods
Deputy Assistant Secretary for African Affairs
Department of Defense
9903 La Duke Drive
Kensington, MD 20895
USA

Mr. J. Thomas Bertrand
Fellow
National Peace Foundation
Office of the President
Emory University
Atlanta, GA 30322
USA

Psychological Dimensions of Conflict

Mr. Joseph V. Montville
Senior Consultant, Conflict Resolution
Center for the Study of Foreign Affairs
1400 Key Boulevard
Arlington, VA 22209
USA

Dr. Harold Saunders
The Kettering Foundation
444 North Capitol Street, N.W.

Washington, DC 20001

USA

Dr. Vamik Volkan

Director

Center for the Study of Mind and Human Interaction

Blue Ridge Hospital

Drawer A

Charlottesville, VA 22901

USA

Mr. J. Thomas Bertrand

Fellow

National Peace Foundation

Office of the President

Emory University

Atlanta, GA 30322

USA

Invited Participants

Hon. Gunduz Aktan

Permanent Representative to the United Nations, Geneva Offices

Mission of Turkey to the UN, Geneva

28 B, Chemin du Petit-Saconnex

Case Postale 2071

1211 Geneva 19

SWITZERLAND

Father Jean Bertrand Aristide

President of Haiti

Embassy of Haiti

2311 Massachusetts Avenue, NW

Washington, DC 20008

USA

Dr. Anthony Arnold
The Hoover Institute
19 Hayes Street
Novato, CA 94947
USA

Dr. Hizkias Assefa
Director
Nairobi Peace Initiative
Waumini House
Post Office Box 14894
Nairobi
KENYA

Mr. H. Brandt Ayers
Editor
Anniston Star
PO Box 189
Anniston, Alabama 36202
USA

Mr. Tijani al Tayeb Babiker
13 Ittihad al Momohegn al Arab
Garden City
Cairo
EGYPT

Mr. Orla Bakdal
Ministry of Foreign Affairs
Government of Denmark
2 Asiatisk Plads
Ministry of Foreign Affairs, S5
DK 1448

Copenhagen K
DENMARK
Dr. Edward Baker
Associate Director
Harvard-Yenching Institute
Room 122
2 Divinity Drive
Cambridge, MA 02138
USA

Mr. Hrair Balian
Representative of Archbishop Keshishian
World Council of Churches
Covcas Center for Law and Conflict Resolution
86 Pre de Planche (La Chenaie)
01280 Prevessin

FRANCE
Mr. U Bathaung
Chairman
United Front for Democracy and Human Rights in Burma
15113 Joshua Tree Road
North Potomac, MD 20878
USA

Dr. Michael Baumann
Mommssenstrasse 125
5000 Koln 41

GERMANY
Dr. Gerald J. Bender
Professor of International Relations
University of Southern California
Department of International Relations

University Park
Los Angeles, CA 90089-0043
USA

Ms. Louisa Benson
American Karen Association
708 Kingman Avenue
Santa Monica, CA 90402
USA

Hon. Elsa Boccheciampe
Ambassador of Venezuela to Haiti
c/o Minister Beatrice Rangel
Secretariat of the Presidency
Palacio de Miraflores
Caracas 1010
VENEZUELA

Mr. Eric S. Bord
Senior Consultant
Conflict Resolution Programs
The Carter Center of Emory University
One Copenhill
Atlanta, GA 30307
USA

Mr. Liviu Bota
Chief of Cabinet
Office of the Director General
United Nations Offices in Geneva
Palais de Nations
Geneva
SWITZERLAND

Dr. David Bryer
Director
Oxfam (UK and Ireland)
274 Banbury Road
Oxford OX2 7DZ
ENGLAND

Hon. Abass Bundu
Executive Secretary
Economic Community of West African States (ECOWAS)
6 King George Road
Lagos
NIGERIA

Ms. Pia Bungarten
Director, New York Office
Friedrich Ebert Foundation
950 3rd Avenue
28th Floor
New York, NY 10022
USA

Mr. Daniel Buttry
Manager, Peace Programs
American Baptist Churches
POB 851
Valley Forge, PA 19482-0851
USA

Ms. Dawn Calabria
Migration and Refugee Services
US Catholic Bishops Conference
3211 4th Street, NE

Washington, DC 20017-1194

USA

Dr. Herb Calhoun

2423 Nottingham Drive

Falls Church, VA 22043

USA

Mr. Vedat Celik

President

Chamber of Industry

POB 88

Lefkosa, via Mersin 10

TURKEY

Mr. Ian Chambers

Director, UN Liaison Office

International Labor Organization

United Nations

New York, New York 10017

USA

Dr. David C. Champagne

Senior Middle East Analyst

US Army - Ft. Bragg

POB 310

Lemon Springs, NC 28355-0310

USA

Mr. Joel R. Charny

Overseas Director

Oxfam America

115 Broadway

Boston, MA 02116

USA

Hon. Glafcos Clerides
President
Democratic Rally Party of Cyprus
Parliament Building
Homer Avenue
Nicosia
CYPRUS

Professor A. Morgan Cloud, III
Professor of Law
Emory University School of Law
Gambrell Hall
Atlanta, Georgia 30322
USA

Dr. Michael Clough
Senior Fellow for Africa
Council on Foreign Relations
58 E. 68th Street
New York, NY 10021
USA

Hon. David Colvin
Head, Southeast Asia Department
Foreign and Commonwealth Office
King Charles Street
London SW1A 2AH
ENGLAND

Mrs. Stella Cornelius
The Conflict Resolution Network
P.O.Box 1016
Chatswood, New South Wales
AUSTRALIA

Dr. Albie Davis
Director of Mediation
Massachusetts District Court
Administrative Office
Holyoke Square
Salem, MA 01970
USA

Hon. Lellos Demetriades
Mayor of Nicosia
Town Hall
Eleftheria Square
POB 1015
Nicosia
CYPRUS

Mrs. Olga Demetriades
Nicosia
CYPRUS

Dr. Vivian Derryck
Director
The African-American Institute
833 United Nations Plaza
New York, NY 10017
USA

Hon. Ahmed I. Diraige
Former Governor of Darfur (Sudan)
95 Avenue Road
Flat No. 6
London NW8 6HY
ENGLAND

Mr. Kim Mun Dok
Second Secretary
Permanent Mission to the UN
Democratic People's Republic of Korea
225 East 86th Street
New York, NY 10028
USA

Mr. Michel Doo Kingue
Under-Secretary-General
United Nations Institute for Training and Research
801 United Nations Plaza
New York, NY 10017
USA

Mr. Farouk Abu Eissa
Secretary-General
Arab Lawyers Union
13 Arab Lawyers' Union Street
Garden City
Cairo
EGYPT

Mr. Eltom Mohamed Eltom
Official Spokesman
Democratic Union Party (Sudan)
Cairo
EGYPT

Hon. Miltiades A. Evert
Member of Greek Parliament
7 Kanari Street
106-71 Athens
GREECE

Ms. Shoshana Faire
The Conflict Resolution Network
POB 1016
Chatswood, New South Wales
AUSTRALIA

Mr. Jean F. Freymond
Director
Center for Applied Studies in International Negotiations
11 A, avenue de la Paix
CH-1202 Geneva
SWITZERLAND

Mr. Dennis Gallagher
Executive Director
Refugee Policy Group
1424 16th Street, NW
Suite 401
Washington, DC 20036
USA

Mr. Sultan Ghazi
5500 Holmes Run Parkway
Alexandria, VA 22304
USA

Ms. Jan Goodwin
Journalist/Author
300 East 40th Street, No 28R
New York, NY 10016
USA

Mr. Rodney Goodwin
Senior Vice President
Equator Bank

111 Charter Oak Avenue

Hartford, CN 06106

USA

Ms. Nancy Gordon

Director of Public Programs

Canadian Institute for International Peace and Security

360 Albert

Suite 900

Ottawa, Ontario K1R 7X7

CANADA

Mr. Ronald A. Gould

Assistant Chief Electoral Officer

Elections Canada

1595 Telestat Court

4th Floor

Ottawa K1A 0M6, Ontario

CANADA

Dr. Thomas Gouttierre, Dean

International Studies and Programs

University of Nebraska at Omaha

University of Nebraska Medical Center

Omaha, Nebraska 68182-0227

USA

Mr. Martin Griffiths

Chief Executive

Actionaid

Hamlyn House

MacDonald Road

Archway

London N19 5PG

ENGLAND

Mr. Paul Guah

Member

Liberian Elections Commission

Monrovia

LIBERIA

Mr. David Hamburg

President

The Carnegie Corporation of New York

437 Madison Avenue

New York, NY 10022

USA

Dr. Mitchell R. Hammer

Professor of Intercultural Communication

American University

School of International Service

4400 Massachusetts Avenue, NW

Washington, DC 20016

USA

Mr. David Harris

Member

Liberia Elections Commission

Monrovia

LIBERIA

Hon. Akira Hayashi

Consul General of Japan

Suite 2000

100 Colony Square

Atlanta, GA 30361

USA

Ms. Linda Hazou

Political Officer

Office of Humanitarian Affairs,

Southeast Asia

2 United Nations Plaza

New York, NY 10017

USA

Ms. Linda Helms

Assistant Director of Programs

Carter Center of Emory University

One Copenhill

Atlanta, GA 30307

USA

Rev. Lawrence W. Henderson

1510 Blount Street

Durham, NC 27707

USA

Mrs. Muriel Henderson

1510 Blount Street

Durham, NC 27704

USA

Dr. James Henry

President

Center for Public Resources

366 Madison Avenue

New York, New York 10017

USA

Lt. Col. Robert W. Hess
Political-Military Advisor
Africa Bureau/Regional Affairs
US Department of State
2201 C Street, NW
Room 5232
Washington, DC 20520
USA

Dr. Roger Heyns
President
William and Flora Hewlett Foundation
525 Middlefield Road
Suite 200
Menlo Park, CA 94025
USA

Mr. Nicholas Hinton
Director General
Save the Children Fund
Mary Datchelor House
17 Grove Lane
Camberwell
London SE5 8RD
ENGLAND

Mr. Richard Hoagland
Deputy Special Envoy for the Afghan Resistance
U.S. Department of State
1232 C Street, SE
Washington, DC 20003
USA

Hon. James Holder
1014 Camelot Drive
College Park, GA 30349
USA

Dr. Henry Holley
Director, Asia Programs
Billy Graham Association
1300 Harmon Place
Minneapolis, MN 55440
USA

Mr. Lester Hyman
Swidler & Berlin
3000 K Street, N.W.
Suite 300
Washington, D.C. 20007-3841
USA

Dr. James O.C. Jonah
Under-Secretary-General for Special Political Questions
United Nations
New York, NY 10017
USA

Hon. Ho Jong
Democratic People's Republic of Korea
Permanent Mission to the United Nations
225 E. 86th Street
New York, NY 10028
USA

Dr. Richard Joseph
Fellow and Director
Africa Governance Program

The Carter Center of Emory University
One Copenhill
Atlanta, GA 30307
USA

Reverend Saboi Jum
Chairman
Baptist Peace Conference
4400 Castlewood, No. 2
Ames, Iowa 50010
USA

Dr. Nake Kamrany
Department of Economics
University of Southern California
University Park
Los Angeles, CA 90089-0035
USA

Reverend Dr. Edwin E. Kang
Associate for Korean Ministries
National Capital Presbytery
4915 45th Street, NW
Washington, DC 20016-4080
USA

Dr. Kemal H. Karpat
Distinguished Professor of History
University of Wisconsin, Madison
4121 Humanities Building
Madison, WI 53706
USA

Hon. Mansour Khalid

London

ENGLAND

Mr. Mohamed Ibrahim Khalil

U.S. Institute of Peace

1550 M Street, NW

Washington, DC 20005

USA

Hon. Hyun-Gon Kim

Consul General in Atlanta

Consulate of the Republic of Korea

Atlanta, GA

USA

Mr. Bill Kovach

Curator

Nieman Foundation

Harvard University

1 Francis Avenue

Cambridge, MA 02138

USA

Dr. James H. Laue

Lynch Professor of Conflict Resolution

George Mason University

Fairfax, VA 22030

USA

Dr. Stephen Linton

Research Associate

Center for Korean Research

Columbia University

140 Claremont Avenue, Apt. 6A

New York, NY 10027

USA

Mr. Robert Lipshutz

Partner

Lipshutz, Greenblatt & King

2300 Harris Tower

Peachtree Center

Atlanta, GA

USA

Dr. John P. Loiello

President

Gowran International

1200 New Hampshire Avenue, NW

Suite 230

Washington, DC 20036

USA

Mr. David Lowe

Principal Advisor

Committee on Development and Cooperation

European Parliament

Plateau de Kirchberg

Luxembourg L-2929

LUXEMBOURG

Mr. Palmari H. de Lucena

Regional Director

Catholic Relief Services

Southern Africa Regional Office

POB 8202

Causeway

Harare

ZIMBABWE

Hon. Kishore Mahbubani

Fellow

Harvard University

Center for International Affairs

45 Coolidge Road

Medford, MA 02155

USA

Hon. Mubarak al Mahdi

Umma Party

London

ENGLAND

Mr. Bona Malwal

Representative of Dr. John Garang

6 The Firs

Hermes Road

Oxford 27QN

ENGLAND

Ms. Geraldine Mannion

Carnegie Corporation of New York

437 Madison Avenue

New York, NY 10022

USA

Dr. Jane Martin

Senior Program Officer

The African-American Institute

833 United Nations Plaza

New York, NY 10017

USA

Mr. Farouk Mawlawi
Chief, NGO and Institutional Relations
Department of Public Information
United Nations Room S-1037D
United Nations Plaza
New York, NY 10017
USA

Mr. John McAuliff
Executive Director
US-Indochina Reconciliation Project
220 W. 42nd Street
Suite 1801
New York, NY 10036
USA

Mr. Joel McClellan
Director
Quaker United Nations Office
13, avenue du Mervelet
1209 Geneva
SWITZERLAND

Mr. Edmond McGovern
19B Elm Grove Road
Topsham, Exeter EX3 0EH
ENGLAND

Mr. Alan McKee
Bureau of African Affairs
US Department of State
Washington, D.C. 20520
USA

Hon. Amin Mekki Medani

Cairo

EGYPT

Dr. Kyriakos M. Michaelides

Honorary Consul

The Republic of Cyprus

395 Somerset Drive

Atlanta, GA 30327

USA

Dr. Ellen Mickiewicz

Fellow

Program on Soviet Media Studies

One Copenhill

Atlanta, GA 30307

USA

Professor Alfred Comlan Mondjanagni

Secretary-General

Panafrican Institute for Development

P.O. Box 4056

Douala

CAMEROON

Dr. Nyondueh Monkomona

Member

Liberia Elections Commission

Monrovia

LIBERIA

Dr. Felix G.N. Masha

Director

Africa Leadership Forum

821 United Nations Plaza

Seventh Floor
New York, NY 10017
USA

Dr. Qudratullah Mujaddidi
58 West 8th Street
Suite 7009
Jacksonville, FL 32209
USA

Mr. Younous Mukhtar
Sudan Communist Party
Cairo
EGYPT

Dr. Mahmoud Aboul-Nasr
Director, New York Office
League of Arab States
New York, NY
USA

Dr. Joyce Neu
Associate Director
Conflict Resolution Program
The Carter Center of Emory University
One Copenhill
Atlanta, GA 30307
USA

Dr. Richard Newell
University of Northern Iowa
1617 Hacienda Court
Cedar Falls, IA 50613
USA

Ms. Binaifer Nowrojee
Director, Africa Program
Lawyers Committee for Human Rights
330 Seventh Avenue, Tenth Floor North
New York, NY 10001
USA

Dr. J. Dan Nyhart
Sloan School of Management
Massachusetts Institute of Technology
E52-542
50 Memorial Drive
Cambridge, MA 02139
USA

Mr. Mustafa Ergun Olgun
Consultant
81, Mehmet Akif Caddesi
Lefkosa, Via Mersin 10
TURKEY

Dr. Abdelwahab Ahmed M. Osman
Information Officer, London Embassy
Foreign Ministry of Sudan
Embassy of Sudan
London
ENGLAND

Dr. Olara Otunnu
President
International Peace Academy
777 United Nations Plaza
New York, NY 10017
USA

Ms. Susan Palmer
Program Coordinator, Conflict Resolution
The Carter Center of Emory University
One Copenhill
Atlanta, GA 30307
USA

Dr. Han Park
Professor of Political Science
University of Georgia, Athens
Athens, GA
USA

Mr. Andre Pasquier
Special Representative of the President
International Committee of the Red Cross
19, Avenue de la Paix
CH-1202 Geneva
SWITZERLAND

Hon. Sven-Olof Peterson
Minister and Deputy Chief of Mission
Embassy of Sweden
600 New Hampshire Ave., N.W.
Suite 1200
Washington, D.C. 20037
USA

Dr. Edward Ragan
Program Director
Canadian Public Health Association
1565 Carling Avenue
Suite 400

Ottawa, Ontario K1Z 8R1

CANADA

Lt. General A. Rahman

Chief of Staff for Operations

Legitimate Command

Sudanese Armed Forces

Cairo

EGYPT

Mr. Richard Rathbun

President

Foundation for Global Community

222 High Street

Palo Alto, CA 94301-1097

USA

The Rt. Reverend Sir Paul Reeves

Anglican Observer to the United Nations

Episcopal Church Center

815 Second Avenue

New York, NY 10017

USA

Ms. Victoria A. Reffell

Media Consultant

International Promoters & Associates

1202 Irving Street, NW

Washington, DC 20010

USA

Mr. Paul S. Reichler

Attorney

Reichler & Soble

1747 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW

Washington, DC 20006

USA

Reverend Dr. Syngman Rhee

President

National Council of Christian Churches

100 Witherspoon Street

Louisville, KY 40202-1396

USA

Dr. Patricia L. Rosenfield

Chair, Program on Strengthening Human Resources in Developing Countries

Carnegie Corporation of New York

437 Madison Avenue

New York, NY 10022

USA

Mr. James D. Ross

Asia Program Director

Lawyers Committee for Human Rights

330 Seventh Avenue, 10th Floor

New York, NY 10001

USA

Mr. Taha El Roubi

Chairman

Roubi Industries

Khartoum

SUDAN

Mr. Hassib Sabbagh

Consolidated Contractors International

62 Polic Center, Building No. II

Post Office Box 61092

Amaroussion 15110, Athens

GREECE

Hon. Salim Ahmed Salim

Secretary-General

Organization of African Unity

POB 3243

Addis Ababa

ETHIOPIA

Hon. Alfredo Salvaterra

Ambassador

Observer Mission of Angola to the OAS c/o Jill Schuker

Hill & Knowlton, Inc.

901 31st Street, NW

Washington, DC 20007-3838

USA

Mr. Stephen I. Schlossberg

Director, Washington Branch

International Labor Organization

1828 L Street, NW

Suite 801

Washington, DC 20036

USA

Mr. John Searles

Diplomatic Escort

Liberian Electoral Commission

Washington, DC

USA

Mr. Benon Sevan

Representative of the Secretary

General in Afghanistan and Pakistan

United Nations, Room S3070A

POB 20

New York, NY 10017

USA

Dr. Patrick Seyon

Member

Elections Commission of Liberia

Monrovia

LIBERIA

Hon. Michael E. Sherifis

Ambassador of the Republic of Cyprus

2211 R Street, NW

Washington, DC 20008

USA

Hon. Ki-Bok Shin

Ambassador

Permanent Mission of the Republic of Korea to the United Nations

United Nations

New York, NY 10017

USA

Mr. Momolu Sirleaf

United States Representative

National Patriotic Front of Liberia

115 Dekaven Drive, No. 308

Yonkers, NY 10703

USA

Mr. Charles Snyder

Senior Political-Military Advisor

Bureau of African Affairs

U.S. Department of State

Washington, DC 20520

USA

Mr. Stephen M. Soble

Attorney at Law

Reichler & Soble

Suite 1200

1747 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW

Washington, DC 20006

USA

Dr. Cho Soon-Sung

Member

National Assembly, Republic of Korea

Seoul

KOREA

Mr. Gunnar Staalsett

Secretary-General

Lutheran World Federation

150, route de Ferney

Boîte Postale 2100

CH-1211 Geneva 2

SWITZERLAND

Hon. Monteagle Stearns

Ambassador (Retired)

71 Harrington Road

Framington, MA 01701

USA

Dr. Kenneth Stein

Fellow, Middle East Programs

The Carter Center of Emory University

One Copenhill

Atlanta, GA 30307

USA

Dr. Cosselia Stewart

Member

Elections Commission of Liberia

Monrovia

LIBERIA

Dr. Jeremy J. Stone

President

Federation of American Scientists

307 Massachusetts Avenue, NE

Washington, DC 20002

USA

Dr. Mark Sullivan

Director, Afghanistan Project

The International Center

731 Eighth Street, SE

Washington, DC 20003

USA

Hon. Ibrahima Sy

Executive Secretary, UN Offices

Organization of African Unity

United Nations

New York, NY 10017

USA

Mr. Joaquin Tacsan

Center for Peace and Reconciliation

Arias Foundation

San José

COSTA RICA

Hon. Jay Taylor
Diplomat in Residence
The Carter Center of Emory University
One Copenhill
Atlanta, GA 30307
USA

Dr. Myo Thant
Assistant to the Prime Minister
National Coalition Government of Burma
2103 Harmony Woods Road
Owings Mills, MD 21117
USA

Professor Tibor Varady
Visiting Professor of International Law
Emory University School of Law
Gambrell Hall
Atlanta, GA 30322
USA

Dr. William Vendley
Secretary-General
World Conference on Religion and Peace
777 United Nations Plaza
New York, NY 10017
USA

Hon. Peter J. de Vos
Ambassador to Liberia
Embassy of the United States
111 United Nations Drive
POB 98

Monrovia

LIBERIA

Mr. Mark Walton

CNN Special Reports

One CNN Center

Atlanta, GA 30303

USA

Mr. Howard Roy Williams

Deputy Director

International Rescue Committee

386 Park Avenue South

New York, NY 10016

USA

Dr. Honggang Yang

Research Associate

Conflict Resolution Program

The Carter Center of Emory University

One Copenhill

Atlanta, GA 30307

USA

Dr. Kwan Ha Yim

Department of Political Science

Manhattanville College

549 Westfield Drive

Valley Cottage, NY 10989

USA

Mrs. Gisèle Yitamben

President

Association for Support of Women Entrepreneurs

BP 5213

Douala
CAMEROON
Professor Suk Bum Yoon
Director
Asian and Pacific Development Centre
Pesiaran Duta
P.O. Box 12224
50770 Kuala Lumpur

MALAYSIA
Mr. Myung-Hwan Yu
Counselor for Political Affairs
Embassy of the Republic of Korea
2370 Massachusetts Avenue, NW
Washington, DC 20008

USA
Mr. Maxime L. Zollner de Medeiros
Director
Regional Representative, West Africa
UNHCR
BP 3125

Dakar
SENGAL
Major Cuni Zongo
Assistant to the Secretary-General
Organization of African Unity
Addis Ababa
ETHIOPIA

Note 1: Sivard, R. L. (1991), *World Military and Social Expenditures 1991*.
Washington, DC: World Priorities.
