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International Conference “Alliance of Civilizations, Interculturalism and Human Rights”

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Manuel Manonelles
Foundation for a Culture of Peace

Day 1, December 8, 2007

On December 8-10 the International Conference “Alliance of Civilizations, Interculturalism and Human Rights” was held in Rio de Janeiro, Brazil, organized by the Foundation for a Culture of Peace, the Ibero-American General Secretariat (SEGIB) and the Academy of Latinity/University Candido Mendes, with the support of the Alexande de Gusmao Foundation and the Ministries of Foreign Affairs of Brazil and Spain.

Opening Session

The conference commenced on the afternoon of December 8 with an opening session held at the Itamaraty Palace, the current seat of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of Brazil in Rio. Participants included Candido Mendes, Secretary-General of the Academy of Latinity, Rector of the Candido Mendes University and a former member of the United Nations High Level Group for the Alliance of Civilizations (HLG); Enrique Iglesias, Ibero-American Secretary-General and also a former member of the HLG; Federico Mayor, President of the Foundation for a Culture of Peace and former co-chair of the HLG; Samuel Pinheiro Guimaraes, Secretary-General of Foreign Affairs of Brazil; Jorge Sampaio, United Nations High Representative for the Alliance of Civilizations; Jesus Caldera, Minister of Labor and Social Affairs of Spain; and Tarso Genro, Minister of Justice of Brazil.

As one of the principal promoters of the conference, Candido Mendes served as moderator, giving the floor to the first speaker Federico Mayor, at his express request, who focused his comments on the need for action, underscoring that the time for analyses and reports has passed, and that precisely the nature of the process and the matters undertaken by the Alliance of Civilizations is its clear dimension of initiatives for action. He likewise stressed the need for participation on the part of the genuine democracies as a key to the solution, in the context of many protected and exploited democracies “in which only the privileged have access to power”. And he concluded his intervention quoting J. F. Kennedy who in July, 1963 said “Let no one think peace is impossible …because no challenge is beyond the creative capacity of human beings”.

Federico Mayor was followed by Enrique Iglesias who underscored that Latin America’s greatest asset is precisely its profound mestizo character, and the contribution that this may make to the process of the Alliance. From an Ibero-American perspective he likewise stressed not only the need to reduce poverty but also to promote greater social cohesion, to create civic education, and the urgency of establishing relations between Latin America and Europe with respect to migrations, based on the principles of human rights.

Samuel P. Guimaraes greeted and welcomed all participants on behalf of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of Brazil. He also expressed his point of view with respect to the fact that it is precisely the theories that support the alleged superiority of some civilizations over others that have served as a basis during the last 500 years for imperialism and all types of colonization. He expressed his profound condemnation of the present model of dominance on which international relations are based, and undersco-
red Brazil’s strong support for the process of the Alliance, which is precisely a reflection of Brazil as a melting pot of cultures, as well as its coinciding with the principles of Brazilian foreign policy in defense of human rights and multilateralism. In that regard he announced Brazil’s candidacy to host the III World Forum of the Alliance of Civilizations, once the first has been held in Madrid in 2008 and the second in Istanbul in 2009, which was received with applause by all of those present.

Jesús Caldera greeted the participants on behalf of the Government of Spain and focused his presentation on two major aspects. The first was the Alliance at the global level, especially with respect to migrations –one of the four principal areas for action recommended by the Alliance– along with the brain drain and the need to meet these great challenges that already affect hundreds of millions of persons, in the context of human rights, responsibility and solidarity. Caldera then focused on what he identified as the “Alliance of Civilizations at the internal level”, expressing the Spanish government’s desire to broaden its policies in areas related to the full exercise of civic rights.

Tarso Genro welcomed the participants on behalf of the Brazilian government and people and offered his observations concerning the situation of the Latin American context in the face of serious political, social, economic and cultural challenges, whose solutions reside not in populism, but rather in increased democracy. He also insisted that, in order to be relevant, initiatives such as the Alliance must be related to and rooted in the everyday problems of the people.

Jorge Sampaio’s final speech of the session also centered on two major areas, the first being of a more theoretical nature in which he set forth five theses concerning civilizations, cultures and religions; the “clash of civilizations”; dialogue among civilizations; human rights; and cultural pluralism. The second part of his speech focused on what he considers the three great challenges for the future of the process of the Alliance, the first being the danger of irrelevance in the face of an initiative that has generated so many expectations. The second made reference to the states’ key role in supporting the process if it is to succeed, not only in their facet as international actors, but especially with regard to the daily acts of their governments in areas related to the Alliance, from local to global levels.
And, finally, the third underscored the equally key role of civil society in the broadest sense, without which the success of the Alliance cannot be ensured.

The inaugural session was followed by a cocktail offered by the Government of Brazil.

Day 2, December 9, 2007

The second day of the conference commenced with the first plenary session, held in the Hotel Sofitel Copacabana in Rio. Before opening the session Minister Patrus Ananias read a message from the President of the Republic of Brazil to the conference and its participants. In his message President Lula welcomed those present on behalf of the Brazilian people, while offering strong support for “dialogue instead of force, and the pen instead of the sword”, international law and the Alliance, and a fierce condemnation of those who “respond to brutality with brutality”, that is, those who in response to terrorism ignore international law and violate human rights.

First Plenary Session: Crisis of Representation, Identities and Democracy: the Case of Latin America

The President’s message, which was received with enthusiasm on the part of the participants and general public present in the room, was followed by the First Plenary Session entitled “Crisis of Representation, Identities and Democracy: The Case of Latin America”, with Enrique Iglesias as chair.

The first person to intervene was Nestor Garcia Canclini who spoke on the topic “Beyond Multiculturalism”, delving beyond the 1990’s debate between McDonaldization and “praise of multiculturalism”, now considered too “black and white”, to address matters concerning the management of multiculturalism, globalized reorganization of diversity and the questions raised by post-relativism.

He was followed by Beatriz Paredes who in another brilliant speech gave a very clear perspective of “Democracy and National Identities in Mexico”. She commenced with a quote from Alfonso Reyes concerning Brazil, which was very well received, to continue to reflect on the different levels of crisis existing in the model of representative democracy throughout Latin America. She underscored these different levels which, on the one hand are conditioned by the weight of indigenous populations in each country, explaining the profound indigenous dimension of the situation in Bolivia versus the Venezuelan process, or the regional tensions in Mexico. On the other hand, she likewise examined the systemic crisis of the representative liberal perspective which, having been incapable of responding to many of the social needs of a great part of the Latin American population, has prompted demands in certain cases with respect to models of participative democracy –which must still be clearly defined- and in others with respect to populist or mixed models.
This first session was closed by Enrique Larreta who in his presentation on “Rethinking Cultural Recognition” outlined his theory that we live in an era of radical pluralism, of “a la carte” cultures and religions whose identities are constantly changing, something unthinkable not only centuries ago, but even years ago. This is compounded by an identity crisis for many, especially those in the so-called western world, which together with the crisis of representativity present in many parts of the globe prompts a great risk of social, cultural and national division. As a result it is essential to rethink the processes of creating collective identities which are, paradoxically, both in crisis and in a period of emergence.

Second Plenary Session: Human Rights and Dialogue among Cultures, Two Driving Forces of the Alliance

After a certain delay, the second plenary session devoted to “Human Rights and Dialogue among Cultures, Two Driving Forces of the Alliance” commenced, being chaired by Federico Mayor.

The first speech was delivered by Mireille Delmas-Marty who addressed the complex subject of “Universal Elements of Human Rights and the Dialogue among Cultures: The Enigma of Communities without Previous Foundations”. Here she offered very interesting observations concerning the progressive and in a certain sense organic creation of new realities within international law, which are gradually establishing universal paradigms in a world that is increasingly characterized by difference and diversity.

She was followed by Bronislaw Geremek who made a moving defense of the intrinsic and necessary interrelations between the right to individual collective memory and respect for human rights.

Within the framework of “Institutional and Diplomatic Contributions” Luis Alfonso de Alba offered a detailed view of the political, institutional, etc. experiences involved in the process of creating the Human Rights Council, as well as the first year of its activities, which he judged as chiefly positive. In that regard, among other questions he addressed the need to ensure that the regional structures of states do not become the hostages of some of their members who use them as shields for their national interests and as permanent instruments for blocking initiatives. As Ambassador of Mexico he insisted upon the need to strengthen the Alliance’s work with migratory processes, given that in certain areas—including Ibero-America—there is much reluctance to address this subject from a perspective of human rights, as is his country’s perspective.

Minister Patrus Ananias outlined his country’s position within the framework of “Alienation, Social Development and Human Rights”, giving an illustrative overview of the Government of Brazil’s activities in these areas, which it considers as priorities. In addition he clearly warned of the great reluctance among both local and international legal entities to recognize the right to food as a fundamental right. He likewise underscored the significant economic impact of social programs, citing results of research that indicates that the premise that growth is conditioned on inclusion no longer holds, since there is evidence that it is
also possible to work with models in which inclusion is the basis or one of the aspects promoting growth.

Third Plenary Session: Modernity and Cultural Diversity

After lunch the third plenary session “Modernity and Cultural Diversity” was held, being chaired by Anunciana da Fernandez de Cordova.

The first speech by Candido Mendes entitled “The Alliance of Civilizations and Impasse in the Dialogue among Cultures” presented an interesting reflection on the impasse that has been reached in processes of true dialogue among cultures as a result of transnational terrorism and the dominant intolerant response to it, which has intensified conflicts and brought us to the brink of a model based on a “civilization of fear”. In this context of fundamentalisms that exclude and seek to annihilate the “others”, the Alliance emerges as a promising alternative which, faced with this “irrational collective”, is claiming as its own the principles of human rights and those based on common and universal elements of a global multipolar reality.

Closely related to this previous speech, in “Global Management of Diversity and Multipolarity” Pan Guang underscored the necessity of affording greater visibility to the multipolar reality of the world and its implications, in order to counteract those who present a scenario dominated by a supposed conflict between Islam and the western world. In that regard he reflected on the dual aspects of multipolarity, the positive aspects represented in its wealth of cultural diversity versus the dangers or the complex problems involved in the management of multipolarity.

François L’Yvonnet then made a passionate defense of the alternative proposed by the concept of Latinity, deconstructing certain myths that link it to religious or territorial origins in a geographic context, which he considers excessively overelaborate. He offered Edgar Morin’s definition of Latinity as “the south and the universal”, supporting growing diversity and rejecting certain perspectives based on a consensus that, from his viewpoint, endanger the essence of democracy, which is precisely the management of disagreements, the capacity for discussing and confronting radically different ideas, with all of the wealth and challenges that this represents. He likewise rejected the concept of the conflict between civilizations as being trivial, but he also warned against the processes of conceptual mimicry that this concept has generated and that may result in clearly erroneous suppositions with truly tragic consequences.

Debate

Given the time available, this session gave rise to an intense debate. On the one hand Ismail Serageldin insisted upon the necessity of clarifying that the solution to terrorism lies in human rights, increased civil liberties and improved living conditions, since any other action to the contrary merely reinforces the basis for terrorism; a position that was seconded by Moustapha Niasse.

Katerina Stenou defended the principle that a civilization that does not accept its dialectic reality—that is, lively exchange and interaction at both the interior and exterior levels—is destined to die. She likewise condemned the perverse use that some violent groups make of their cultural differences—and those who even underscore their cultural diversity- as a “refuge for criminals of culture”.

Mendes added to the definition of Latinity offered by L’Yvonnet, describing it as a “super-Esperanto”, Latinity as a demand for a public space and a state, for pluralism, for the organic collective versus the Anglo-American atomization of the individual.

Third Day, December 10, 2007

Fourth Plenary Session: Interculturalism, Common Values and the Democratic Imperative

The third day of the conference was devoted to the fourth and last plenary session chaired by Candido Mendes, followed by a long and intense debate and the presentation and subsequent discussion of the Rio Declaration, as one of the results of the debates of this international conference.

The first speech by Ismail Serageldin on “The Challenges of Cultural Diversity” offered an interesting reflection concerning the different challenges that the subject suggests. On the one hand he underscored the necessity of working at the international level to ensure that after the signing and ratification of the Declaration on Cultural Diversity, its precepts are actually implemented in the policies of all governments, particularly the most powerful. On the other hand, he reviewed the challenges that the subject suggests, both in positive terms and with regard to problems of management, underscoring that its reflection and resolution in positive terms are key for the future and will have not only profound social impact, but will also impact the areas of security and the economy as well.

Katerina Stenou followed by underscoring the role of UNESCO’s Declaration on Tolerance as a proposal for
reconciliation in all institutional dimensions –political, economic, religious- with human reality in all its diversity. She also reflected on the fact that relations between cultural diversity and political stability present challenges that, although foremost among the concerns of UNESCO, are likewise the responsibility of other entities. Finally, she addressed the question of cultural hybridization and the position “in between”, in the sense that in truly intercultural processes the starting point or hypothetical final position are sometimes not as important as the value of the commitment or attitude adopted during the process.

In “Development and Management of Interculturalism” Moustapha Niasse underscored the essential role of development as a condition sine qua non for the success of a truly intercultural model, as well as peace and its dialectic relation. This development, coupled with the defense of human rights principles, must be genuine and must commence by correcting some of the mistakes which the north-south relations have generated, even in development policies.

At this time Ambassador Moscardo spoke on behalf of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of Brazil to express his appreciation for several of speeches delivered at the conference and to pay tribute to Professors Eduardo Jaguaribe and Candido Mendes –both of whom were present at the meeting- as the founders of what he termed “intellectual diplomacy” in Brazil. He likewise shared with the participants the discussions underway in Itamaraty concerning the necessity of creating an ECLAC for culture, that is, a regional United Nations organization in Latin America focusing on cultural matters and thought.

In the final speech entitled “Democratic Principles, the Future and the Gender Dimension”, Minister Nilcea Freire expressed pleasure at the fact that this debate was taking place precisely on International Human Rights Day. She then underscored the duty of public authorities to defend and promote daily the rights of persons, of each individual citizen, especially those most in need of protection. In that regard the gender question is particularly relevant, and it is essential to assume that any violation of the fundamental rights of people in their countries represents a breakdown of the rule of law and of the very existence of the state and its function to protect all rights, at any price, in any place, and at all times.

**Debate**

The debate was extremely enriching, with contributions of the highest level. Eduardo Jaguaribe spoke of the “new world culture (…) that expresses Franco-Germanic concepts in English and that is characterized by its extre-
me syncretism”. Others mentioned Bronislaw Geremek’s observations the previous day concerning the different perspectives of history and memory, when narrated by the winners or the losers. Also discussed were neopopulist experiences in the region, in contrast to Brazil where for the first time the country is not being governed by the traditional elites, prompting a need to rethink democratic categories from a radically democratic perspective.

Beatriz Paredes observed that part of the reasons why some hybrid cultures evolve into countercultures is due to a process of alienation and even criminalization to which they are sometimes subjected, especially marginalized minorities and migrant groups. Also to be taken into account are changes in the new and complex world of the digital or digitalized society, and the vacuum created in certain societies by the loss of any ethical references, other than merely commercial ones. In that regard she insisted on the fact that historically all social and cultural models have had moral and ethical references, which today are quite blurred, the only reference being commercial ones, with the social polarization that this entails.

Canclini underscored the process of disintegration which we are experiencing, not so much as a process of civilizing transition but rather as the very definition of the new model. The progressive informality of the economy and of society along with the process in Latin America of minimalizing the state during the 1990s and early 2000s have resulted in extreme social atomization and disintegration which, in the new information society, have cut to the very heart of the nuclear family, which has ceased to be a reference and has become insignificant. All of this has resulted in a situation that is still not quite clear, of evident social uncertainty that is preparing the terrain for political solutions based on oversimplification and promises of easy truths, often at the exclusion of others.

Prior to the closing session, Cándido Mendes presented the proposed Rio Declaration which, after a short but intense debate, was reflected in its final form.
MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE REPUBLIC FOR THE INTERNATIONAL CONFERENCE ON THE ALLIANCE OF CIVILIZATIONS, INTERCULTURALISM AND HUMAN RIGHTS
Brasília, December 2007

Ladies and Gentlemen,

It is an honour for Brazil, and especially the city of Rio de Janeiro, to be the venue for the International Conference on the Alliance of Civilizations, Interculturalism and Human Rights. Owing to prior commitments, I am unable to accept Rector Candido Mendes’ kind invitation to attend today.

On behalf of our government and the people of Brazil, I welcome our illustrious visitors, who have come from different parts of the world to take part in this event. I hope they will have a most enjoyable time in our country and enjoy our traditional Brazilian hospitality.

I would also like to highlight the importance of events of this kind, in which different cultures, from West and East, engage in dialogue. They provide opportunities for understanding, for a world at peace, without wars, where there is respect for cultural differences. There are no superior or inferior cultures, superior or inferior visions of the world. Those concepts became obsolete at least a century ago.

The foreign policy of our administration has been taking a new direction since the beginning of the first term in 2003 towards bringing Brazil closer to Africa and the East. Proof of this is the trip we made to the Middle East in 2003 and other visits to African countries, with whose governments we have strengthened ties of friendship and cooperation.

The Brazilian government has taken a clear and firm stand in favour of dialogue over force, the pen and not the sword. We are staunch supporters of the self-determination of peoples, the principle of non-intervention and international arbitration to settle disputes which nations cannot resolve by themselves.

Our government champions the observance of the treaties and rules of International Law. We roundly condemn responding to barbarity with barbarity, for what is the difference between terrorist attacks that cut
short innocent lives and blindfolded prisoners in chains who do not even know what they are accused of and have no right to a defence?

Humanity has already lived through thousands of clashes between nations as a result of intolerance, misunderstanding, greed, arrogance and a lack of regard for the weakest. We are in the 21st century, a new millennium. It is time to sit down, as we are doing today, and talk, discuss and even debate those issues that affect us, and resolve bilateral or multilateral problems. That way we shall get to know each other better and learn to respect one another. That approach will give us an opportunity to think about the slogan ‘Liberty, Equality, Fraternity’.

I hope that ideas will emerge from the work done today that will contribute to a greater international dialogue and the consolidation of the Alliance of Civilizations.

My very best wishes to you all.
Spechees and Communications
Dear Ministers,
dear Secretary General,
dear High Representative of the United Nations Secretary General for the Alliance of Civilizations

It is time for action.
It is time to build bridges to unite distant and hostile shores.
It is time to create ties.
It is time for outstretched hands.

It is time to share with others, as an ethical requirement, as shared security...
The material poverty of a great part of humanity is due to a large extent to the spiritual poverty of many of the wealthy.
The civilization of welfare cannot be allowed to overshadow the civilization of duty and responsibility.

It is time to say: “That’s enough!” to those who continue to occupy positions of immense power in the military, economic, technological and media sectors, to those who continue to proclaim, “if you want peace, prepare for war”, profiting from the colossal war machine industry at the expense of so many human lives, to those who continue to a prevent force from being replaced by the word, and imposition by dialogue.
As a rule, interculturality has been invasive, cruel, dominant. We must now make it sensitive, “human”.

We can no longer tolerate spending 3,000 million dollars daily on weapons while 60,000 die of hunger, and while the scandalous profits of wars based on lies, greed and arbitrariness continue to increase, and will increase even further with antimissile shields.

It is thus time for rebellion, for change, for resistance.

In “An Inconvenient Truth” Al Gore has graphically demonstrated -“out of sight, out of mind”– the state of the environment.

We must more urgently reveal this “even more inconvenient truth”: the state of the people, how the majority of people live and die. It is urgent that we become involved in this project. People seeing other people, those who are the most needy to take an “new look”, a new view of the world as a whole. We have seen –in Rwanda, Bosnia, Cambodia, Vietnam…- and we are unable to focus our eyes on these images that move us, that prompt us to take action and to get involved.

“We, the peoples”…. We must reform the United Nations system to, step by step, build the house of peoples and not just a few.

It is time to make the transition from a culture of force, imposition and violence to a culture of dialogue, alliance and peace. El Salvador, Guatemala,… so worthily represented here, know all too well -¡how many lives paid the ultimate price!- the crucial importance of peace processes, that require so much serenity and capacity for reconciliation.

In its action report the United Nations Alliance of Civilizations Group that I had the honor to preside offered an important series of political measures: peace processes:

• Migrations
• Education
• Youth
• Media

It is time to put this into practice. And it is feasible: peace is so much cheaper than war. It builds homes, schools, hospitals… and facilitates harmonious coexistence.

There will no longer be conflicts among civilizations.

We cannot accept further delays, new excuses.
It is time for political determination, the time to eradicate poverty, to move forward **together** -¿who else, if not all **of us**? - with the “intellectual and moral solidarity” of the UNESCO Constitution, guided by human rights … “May all of those who are able to join in this call”. Then we will indeed be taken into account instead of only being counted. Then we will indeed be capable of changing current tendencies, of illuminating darkened horizons. We will be capable of overcoming inertia.

And then we will indeed know that we have not lived in vain. Then we will have indeed thought of the **generations to come**, and in our common future.

I want to conclude by paying tribute to President Lula for his unflagging work for the needy. Likewise, a tribute to Professor Cândido Méndes, whose efforts to promote human rights are never ceasing.

And to President José Luís Rodríguez Zapatero who proposed the Alliance as a result of dialogue advocated by President Khatami. And recognition and congratulations are also due to Enrique Iglesias and Jorge Sampaio.

To all of them, to all of the participants, all of those who are still waiting, especially to our **young people**, I would like to dedicate the brilliant words spoken by President Kennedy in July, 1963: “Let no one think peace is impossible …because no challenge is beyond the creative capacity of human beings”.

**Each life, the most precious moment to be safeguarded.** Each human being endowed with the capacity for creation, our highest commitment. History has already been written. We must learn from its lessons… but we cannot change the past. Our descendents must be free to write the future. It is our responsibility, our legacy to them. And their opportunity.

It is time for all of us who are all different, to look together toward the future.

It is time, from our infinite diversity, to strive together for human rights, to forge alliances that will enable us to live in peace. The majority of **diagnoses** have already been made. **It is now time for action**, above all for those who are well-off, those of us to whom Albert Camus referred as “those who could have done so much, but dared to do so little!”.

And we can do so much.

**It is time for action!!**

Federico Mayor
With the end of the bipolarity of the Cold War and the emergence of financial markets as privileged regulators of social relations, the traditional model of the representative state fell into crisis. In consequence, traditional social and community ties were weakened and critical situations of institutional insecurity and instability multiplied.

The political heritage of the crises of the 20th century—the end of the Soviet blockade, the financial crisis of the welfare state, liberal “reforms” incapable of providing social cohesion, wars to conquer energy sources—generated in the countries outside of the nucleus of the government of global capitalism serious political insecurity coupled with an increase in crises in representative democracies.

The experience of modern history has demonstrated that there are no real possibilities outside of centralized political representation. This, for the moment, and in its exclusive form, no longer generates the political stability that it did previously. In all representative regimes in the most advanced countries the need for direct participation on the part of citizens and pressure groups in all stages of deliberation on public policies has been recognized.

Stable and predictable political representation, combined with the direct participation of citizens through legal means that enjoy broad social support, is the most evolved form of a democratic republic. It is likewise “more democracy” without weakening centralized representation. The best way to afford additional legitimacy and strength to political representation is to organize institutional channels for direct citizen participation, so that citizens can acquire a sense of responsibility for public affairs.

The effects of the new post-Cold War international order were negative for both developed countries and for those on the fringe: in the former, due to the weakening of the welfare state, which reduced capacity for social resistance, especially of the most vulnerable groups; and in the rest of the countries due to replacing “developmental” models with speculative loans which, although now in retreat, still maintain their coercive capacity over those governments through the pressure of their foreign debt.

What is clear on the one hand is that old-time populism has lost its modernizing force. It occasionally reappears as a symptom of original imbalances in the crisis of the dominance of neoliberalism, in the face of problems that were never resolved and were even worsened by its “reforms”. That Latin American populism that once opened the doors of citizenship to workers in a cycle of late industrial development is today incapable of integrating millions within the confines of the law, nor can it formulate new national projects.

The human rights agenda is at the same time both a local and national matter, as well as a global one, since it is actual democratic culture and modernity in action. But for the human rights agenda to be taken seriously in global terms it must be acclaimed in agreements among nations, combined with commitments to internal political security, based on the three pillars of: legal security; economic security; public security.

Political security is thus the basis on which, through predictable and stable mechanisms, legal, economic and public security may be achieved, with the direct par-
participation of the communities most closely involved in these matters. Unilateral military intervention, although formally done to preserve democracy and human rights, only radicalizes shame and insecurity, since sovereignty is the only foundation of political security that is indispensable.

Economic and financial stability in a country is a prerequisite for society to feel itself integrated and in order, and to then be able to reasonably address other problems: a safe and stable “lifestyle” has become an essential element in generating esteem for democracy in societies that are increasingly fraught with fragmentation.

Instability of the currency and violence against individuals and crime are the principal factors underlying the sensation of insecurity felt by all classes. We must recognize the consequences of these “instabilities”, which are common in the so-called “emerging” countries. When political action is developed without a stable institutional framework, the space for decision-making becomes a space for economic pragmatism. Without this framework, politicians do not make policy, but rather they merely resolve problems of the financial system, and the space for policy-making is reduced by the intervention of the media in common sense decisions.

This intervention, which in other instances may be positive, can become arbitrary with time, if the political powers that be do not respond with appropriate reforms to restore the confidence of the citizens in public life. If this is not done, the media may become a specific form of perverse private social control: although they may often be moralist or moralizing, the never give themselves similar critical coverage.

From this perspective, public security without political security is perceived as superficial and ephemeral. It becomes an institutional space where the desire for vengeance through incarceration becomes a fundamental ingredient of the concept of justice. Thus, the stereotype black/poor/marginal as the source of the sensation of insecurity.

The construction of a new paradigm of political security, as a guiding element of public security (understood as the security of individuals and as collective security for social groups) is the primary foundation on which a fair human rights policy can be developed.
Mr. Tarso Genro, Minister of Justice;

Mr. Jesús Caldera, Minister of Employment and Social Affairs of Spain;

Mr. Enrique Iglesias, Iber-American General Secretariat;

Mr. Federico Mayor, President of the Foundation for a Culture of Peace;

Professor Cândido Mendes, Honourable Dean of the Academy of Latinity at the University of Cândido Mendes;

Excellencies;

Distinguished ladies and gentlemen:

It is a great honour and pleasure to attend and speak at the inaugural session of this important International Conference on the “Alliance of Civilizations, interculturism and human rights”.
Allow me to warmly congratulate Professor Cândido Mendes on this handsome initiative, so meaningful, interesting and useful, especially at a time when, due to existing tensions, it is our duty to persevere in opening the channels of dialogue and hope.

The subjects to be debated, the reflections to be made and the guests that have agreed to participate in this Conference give a good idea of its importance and meaning while reflecting the exigency and pluralism with which a subject as complicated as this one must be treated.

Excellencies:

Since I am addressing this assembly as the High Representative for the Alliance of Civilizations, I would like to take advantage of this occasion to share with you all a few reflections derived from the experience I have acquired in the nine months that I have held this position.

Consequently, I will formulate five theses and three questions: the first will deal with the subjects to be debated at this Conference; the following will deal with the Alliance of Civilizations.

Part A - Theses

1. Civilizations, cultures and religions

- As it is well-known, the word “civilization” was coined during the second half of the 18th century. At that time, this term was inseparable from the idea of progress. During the 19th century, the concept continued to evolve until it was confronted with the idea of culture. In this way, before the beginning of the new century it occupied a distinguished position in European culture. Hegel, Nietzsche, Spengler, Toynbee and Valéry, among many others, reflected upon it. In the 20th century, this reflection grew from the idea that civilizations are mortal, as well as the conviction and the fear that western civilization was in decline.

- We must not forget—in fact, we must keep this lesson in the front of our minds—that the fear of this decline was not isolated from the irritation of the totalitarian regimes that suffocated Europe, with their intention of moulding it and finally driving it to the catastrophe of WW II and the horror of the holocaust.

- Such concepts were sustained by a determinist, fatalist and finalist vision of history.

- However, against this we must pose the idea that there are no declines against which we cannot fight and that the future always remains inconclusive. The possibility and liberty to build are in our hands, allowing us to even avoid that which seems inevitable. This is precisely what the defeat of the totalitarian regimes shows us.

- Although present in our culture during the last century and a half, the subject of civilizations and their decline is ambiguous, of different connotations and requires an immediate clarification because the concept of civilization is never free of strong ideological content.

- When, for example, we associate the characterisation of a civilization to a dominant religion, we are making a questionable choice from the onset. Thus, it becomes questionable that we should speak of Afghanistan, Iran, Indonesia, Saudi Arabia, Iraq or Morocco as if there were no fundamental differences between these countries, their histories and cultures; as it would also be questionable for us to do the same with the United States, Russia, France, Poland, Mexico, Brazil or Portugal.

- We agree to speak of civilizations, but should always keep the archaeology of this concept and the history of this word in mind. We do not give it a fragmentary use, nor do we employ it to build dividing walls of conflict. We know—or we should know—that for every difference there is a similarity, and for every division an alliance.

2. The clash of civilizations

- In recent years, much has been said about the clash of civilizations: a millenarian idea which attempts to divine or define the future. It is the fruit of a mixture of medieval prophesy and contemporary prospecting which saw in this conflict of civilizations the characterising trait of the century which we have just begun. Consequently, it should not surprise us that some have interpreted the terrorist attacks of 11 September as the confirmation of this prophesy.

- The very author of the hypothesis, Samuel Huntington, who attributed to it a more profound and complex meaning than that with which it was popularised, was quick to deny its use in explaining the attack against New York and Washington. It was fortunate that he did so because the terrorist attacks and the military actions in response to them cannot be attributed, under any circumstances, to a conflict between civilizations, cultures, religions or “worlds”.
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• The attacks represented an atrocious violation of fundamental principles common to countries and peoples of different continents, cultures and religions. The response to them is a response which is given, not against, but in the name of dialogue between civilizations.

3. Dialogue of civilizations

• Civilizations are pitted against two extremist theories. There is the theory of those who consider dialogue to be impossible, useless or even undesirable. For them, what characterises a civilization and gives it strength is its fundamental solitude, isolation and incommunicability. This is the only way it may affirm itself and survive. For the defenders of this theory, the clash of civilizations is inevitable: dominate or be dominated.

• Another theory to be contrasted is that which sees in globalisation the dissolution of identities and differences, the desirable or inevitable path toward the homogenisation and overcrowding of the planet, reduced to a mere global market. Those who subscribe to this theory will never understand that the opening of a North American chain of restaurants or soft-drinks in Moscow or Beijing does not mean the abolition of millenary symbols of identity and reference which are expressed in the imaginations and symbolic systems of the communities. For them, dialogue can be reduced to a monologue of uniformity.

• Both of these extremist concepts are dangerous and unrealistic and reveal, in the end, a totalitarian desire.

• For this reason, apart from philosophical, anthropological or other considerations, it can be said that to speak of a dialogue of civilizations implies speaking of a cultural, political and religious dialogue. It also implies speaking of the framework within which such a dialogue should take place, as well as the important principles by which it should be governed. In the end, it implies speaking of the challenges that we must take on when we face the responsibility—our responsibility—of founding the future on the present.

• The experience of centuries and the wisdom of different peoples show us that dialogue between civilizations and peoples, forged in diversity and mutual respect, is necessary, possible and fruitful.

• It is evident that it is not an easy dialogue, situating itself on an unstable point where we find the various particularities and universals, similarities and differences, affinities and antagonisms, recognition and distancing, trust and mistrust, autonomy and dependence, compre-
hension and conflict. We know that dialogue always demands a willingness for dialogue.

• Moreover, all religions, all cultures and all human groups have a defensive tendency towards isolation and confrontation. Nevertheless, it is also possible to foment in them an attitude of openness, tolerance and respect for the Other. For this reason it is necessary for each civilization, religion and culture to be able to practice tolerance in its own heart, recognising the liberty of conscience and the right to differ.

• History teaches us that, at a certain period, intolerance of a culture or religion towards other cultures or religions is proportional to the intolerance existing in its own heart. History also shows us that intolerance of one culture or religion is unstable and has changed though time.

• The century which has just ended (it is difficult to say “the last century” because we still feel its presence) saw the most terrible horrors: genocides, massacres and extermination. Some of them were done in the name of the same thing which, in practice, was rejected and scorned.

• But the 20th century was also capable of making extraordinary advances in the recognition of existing principles, values and fundamental rights that are universal and valid for all human beings independent of their race, religion, sex or nationality. This is a fundamental achievement for all civilizations. It is upon this set of principles, values and rights—which establish the very concept of humanity—that dialogue between civilizations can and should take place.

4. Human rights

• Human rights, written into the Universal Declaration and which form the basis of the community of nations upon which the UN’s activity is founded, are irrevocable. Among them are religious liberty, liberty of conscience and expression, and separation between the public and private sphere.

• Let us remember, however, that it cost 55 million dead, 35 million wounded, 3 million disappeared, a continent devastated and the horrors of Hiroshima and Nagasaki for the supremacy of Law and rights to occupy the central stage of international peace and security, at whose service the International Community is found through its main organisations with the UN, naturally, on the front lines.

• To Human Rights we must also add Democracy and the Rule of Law: three points of a virtuous triangle in whose virtues the 20th century saw the promise of the reconstruction of the international order after the great world conflicts.

• In summary, the 20th century saw two great advances. On the one hand, there is the recognition of the value and the universal reach of human rights. On the other hand, there is its placement at the centre of the international system, not only as a regulating principle of the relations between peoples, possessing a function of structuring communities and international society, but also as a configuring element of the essence of imperative international law.

• Consequently, we can affirm that human rights currently form part of humanity’s heritage, codifying the parameters of human dignity.

• This affirmation does not prevent a series of questions and doubts from coming up, however.

• For example: Is the fact that human rights are currently considered sacred in positive law the reason why they have lost their political and ideological dimension?

• You may wonder what I consider to be the political and ideological dimension. In particular, I am referring to the fact that human rights are founded on a system of ideas, representations and values; on a certain conception of humankind, society and power; to the fact that they rest on a series of postulates such as equality among people, the existence of subjective rights opposable to power and the primacy of individual rights in relation to those of the group. Finally, I am referring to the fact that the relations between the individual and the State but also between power and law—and this is political dimension in its purest sense—are analysed in a certain way.

• In my opinion, it is essential that we do not lose sight of this multifaceted dimension, this multiplicity of analytical approaches, if we want to avoid the effects of different types of threats to the treatment of human rights.

• A second group of questions are related precisely to the subject of the universality of human rights.

• In the paradigm—let us say, classic paradigm—of human rights, its universal nature prevailed not only on the philosophical level but also in terms of its assertion, which came to have a planetary character and was in reality the fruit of a process to internationalise human rights.
• But the globalisation that finally radicalised the conflict between the diversity of cultures plants a new and surprising question: will the universality of human rights be opposed to cultural pluralism?

5. Cultural pluralism

• In contemporary times, what used to be a virtuous triangle composed of democracy, the Rule of Law and human rights, has been submitted to disproportionate pressure.

• For example, let us look at Iraq. Clearly, democracy cannot be imposed by force. The Rule of Law cannot be built without broad popular consensus. Neither peace nor a democratic Rule of Law can be guaranteed for the long term without respect for human rights. Take the polemic of wearing a veil by some Islamic women in the so-called western societies. Take the case of the Muhammad cartoons. There are many such examples.

• We should highlight the extreme difficulties that face us in our globalised world. In recent years, the process of cultural diversification in our societies has increased considerably and globalisation, as well as the revolutions in telecommunications, the media and transport have made national cultural systems more and more permeable.

• These transformations have placed the problem of the universality of human rights at the centre of the democratic management of cultural diversity, which could also be called the challenge of cultural pluralism.

• So in my opinion, there is no contradiction between either, but rather it is quite the contrary, and for a twofold reason:

• First, it was through the invocation of human rights that the world’s dictatorial and totalitarian regimes (based on cultural relativism, regionalism, or particularities of another type) were opposed.
• Second, the best way to preserve cultural identities is the universality of human rights because only within that context are they recognised as rights.

• Nevertheless, this does not eliminate the tension that prevails between the relativists who defend the formulation of human rights under diverse cultural, ethnic or religious traditions on one hand, and those who try to impose a body of rules on a worldwide scale, making a tabula rasa of the conditions on the other.

• In my point view, these are two obstacles that must be dealt with. For this reason, it behoves us to begin by reaffirming that human rights are valid for all peoples and that no specific cultural characteristic may ever justify slavery, torture or any other attack upon human dignity or integrity, nor even the maintenance of unjust regimes, based on discriminations of sex, skin colour, religion or origin.

• However, we must accept the idea that the perception of human rights is conditioned by history and by economic, social or political factors. If we do not accept this, we run the risk of turning the universality of rights into a merely theoretical or abstract reality.

• For this reason, it is essential that we conceive of way to articulate universal and particular notions without compromising what refers to the existence of a heritage of fundamental principles –a type of common law for humanity– and without precluding that principles with a universal vocation be applied with flexibility and variability, and with respect for plural cultural identities.

Part B - Three questions on the Alliance of Civilizations

Now I will get to the final part and move on to formulate three questions on the challenges of the Alliance of Civilizations.

• First, as regards the initiative of the United Nations, the Alliance of Civilizations, as can be gleaned from the excellent Report of the High Level Group, drafted by some of those present –and whom, by the way, I would like to take this opportunity to congratulate for the work they have done– is patently a political instrument for peace building in the broadest sense of the word.

• Nevertheless, taking the complexity of the world into account, the functioning of this instrument for action requires a vast task of preparation for the Alliance. This, by the way, is being carried out but still suffers from great indecisiveness. In spite of being very stimulating, this noted inconclusiveness also carries a series of risks. As High Representative, I will not stand with my hands in my pockets nor will I skimp on efforts, but I am fully conscious of the danger of irrelevance.

• Until now, the Alliance has passed through a type of grace period that, I confess, sometimes leaves me perplexed. In nine months, the number of members of the Group of Friends has doubled and the requests and demonstrations of willingness and availability to cooperate with the Alliance coming from civil society have been absolutely extraordinary.

• In other words the expectations are very high but not meeting them would be the beginning of the end.

• Second, against the ambition and extensive breadth of the objectives pursued by the Alliance, we find its modesty of means and relative indecisiveness.

• Nevertheless, I have sought to extract some positive guidelines from this limitation. The first is that at all costs, the Alliance should not only avoid competing with international organisations that work in the same field but also duplicating their work. To speak in positive terms, the Alliance should cooperate with such organisations and provide them with something. The Alliance should be a catalyst of associations between organisations and institutions working on specific joint projects. The Alliance has to function as a kind of vitalising energy of joint initiatives that have an impact on the terrain, dependant upon a series of clearly political priorities.

• The second is that, without the support of the States, the Alliance will never be a credible or sustainable initiative. In my opinion, the questions and problems of management of cultural diversity are foremostly political and, as such, require active policies in the area of education, youth, the media and migrations as they have been clearly defined by the Report of the High Level Group. These questions require intervention by the public powers, on a national as well as regional, local and, of course, international scale. For this reason, we cannot relegate the question of the “dialogue between cultures or between civilizations” to the well-meaning terrain of goodwill, nor to the ethical or moral forum, nor, in my opinion, to exclusively interreligious dialogue. For this reason I suggested –and will continue insisting– that the States create national strategies for intercultural dialogue because all these problems are, above all, of an internal order, more than questions of international politics. This point is fundamental for the success of the Alliance given that, independently of the good intentions of its proposals and the determina-
tion of the co-sponsors, if the States do not become true co-owners of the initiative, this will be no more than an ephemeral Alliance.

- Third, the participation of civil society is indispensable. No policy can be believable or sustainable without it since, in the end, it is the field where everything is played out. This is the third pillar of the Alliance, which I recognise is still rather incipient, but the first Annual Forum of the Alliance, which will be held in Madrid next January and whose host will be the Spanish Government, will represent an important contribution. I am convinced that the Forum will provide valid and interesting guidelines so we can root the Alliance in the realities of this sphere in order to dedicate a platform for dialogue and the exchange of good practices to civil society organisations.

- In summary, my goal consists of avoiding the duplication of means and structures, banking on a full use of the resources made available by the States, international organisations and civil society so we can establish the Alliance in a solid and compact space of interactions and functional associations. In the end, this deals with inscribing the Alliance in a line of continuity of what has been the spirit of the reform of the United Nations, making it more effective in its results and more modern in its means. Whether we achieve it or not, the future will judge.

- The third reflection is related to the place reserved for the Alliance within the United Nations’ system. Here, we undoubtedly have several questions to deal with. Nevertheless, I will only remark on one that seems to me to be decisive: that of the Alliance’s role in the area of conflict resolution as an instrument of preventative diplomacy, or in post-conflict scenarios in the area of peace consolidation.

**Excellencies:**

I do not wish to drag on any further. In sharing these reflections with you my only hope is to contribute to the debate with the certainty on my part that I will always be thankful for any indication or suggestion that you wish to give me to help guide my work.

In conclusion, allow me to reiterate how much the Alliance owes to some of the participants at this Conference, for their knowledge, experience and vision. And let me underline, for reasons that would be subject enough for another speech—but I am sure that all those present would agree— the extraordinary contribution of Professor Cândido Mendes, a personality who, for his human qualities, availability and generosity, his unending knowledge, universalistic spirit and profound cosmopolitan sense, constitutes a true paradigm of Ambassador for the Alliance.

Dear Professor, my most sincere and grateful thanks, as well as the recognition shared by all for having united us in this marvellous place to debate the questions in which nothing less than our future is at stake.

Many thanks to all.
Mr. Chairman,

Ladies and Gentlemen,

I have been asked to address Cultural diversity. But before I sketch out some of these challenges and suggest some questions for our consideration, I want to bring in a viewpoint that has not been sufficiently heard in these proceedings to this moment. It is the viewpoint of the enlightened Muslim and humanist Arab, who finds the foundations for that attitude in the tradition that is presently identified as the source of instability and the fount of intolerance, not to say terror.

I. The Muslim and Arab Heritage:

Prof. Gremeck asked for a scientific historical analysis. Well let me give you factual information about the Muslim heritage, that heritage that created Andalusia, that promoted science and learning during the dark ages of Europe, and that allowed such brilliant non-Muslim thinkers as Maimonides to flourish.

Andalusia was a marvelous mix of different communities, where Jews, Christians and Muslims consorted together and produced great poetry, architecture, science, philosophy and literature. This contrasts with the conditions imposed by the Catholics after the defeat of the Arabs in Cordoba (1492), not to mention the infamous inquisition that followed (The Spanish Inquisition set up by King Ferdinand and Queen Isabella of Castile in 1478 with the approval of Pope Sixtus IV). The Roman Inquisition, set up by Pope Paul III in 1542, supervised all the inquisitions against heretics, and the most famous trial was that of Galileo in 1633.

Contrast this with Arabs and Muslims meeting Greek and Hellenistic philosophy and science: They did not declare them heretics and burn their books. They translated them into Arabic and wrote exegetes about their theses. They referred to Plato and Aristotle as Al-Hakimain, the two wise men. Al-Farabi took what suited him from the legacy of Hellenism and founded the early constructs of the Muslim philosophical tradition. This open attitude to knowledge and learning, this respect for other cultures is perhaps best exemplified by Al-Ma'amun, the son of the great Abbasid Caliph Harun Al-Rashid, who founded in Baghdad Beit Al-Hikma, the House of Wisdom, where old manuscripts when translated into Arabic, earned their translators their weight in gold. They recreated the great tradition of openness that prevailed in the ancient Library of Alexandria, and helped the intermingling of cultures. They laid the foundation for the renaissance, and helped bring numerals and the zero from India to Europe (where they were called Arabic numerals).

Indeed, contrary to general perception, it was the Arabs and Muslims, who defined the modern scientific method, and who created the climate of openness and tolerance that allowed science to flourish during the middle ages. Names like El Khawarezmi, El Razi, Ibn Al-Nafis, Ibn Al-Haytham, Ibn Sina. Ibn Rushd, are forever engraved in the honor roll of humanity’s benefactors through their efforts at advancing knowledge and rejecting superstition. Listen to their powerful, modern voices as it speaks to us through the centuries.
Listen to the modern voice of Ibn Al-Haytham (965-C.1040), known in the West as Al Hazen:

“He who searches for truth is not he who reviews the works of the ancients... It is the duty of he who reads science books, if he wants to learn truths, that he should set himself up as an opponent to all he looks at., [accepting only what is supported by evidence and argument].”

-Ibn Al-Haytham, *Al Shuknk Fi Batlaymous*

Furthermore, Ibn Al-Haytham did lay down the rules of the modern scientific method centuries before the appearance of Bacon, Descartes or Galileo. Listen to his description of how the scientific method should operate, through observation, measurement, experiment and conclusion:

“We start by observing reality ... we try to select solid (unchanging) observations that are not affected by how we perceive (measure) them. We then proceed by increasing our research and measurement, subjecting premises to criticism, and being cautious in drawing conclusions... In all we do, our purpose should be balanced not arbitrary, the search for truth, not support of opinions”.


This is a truly amazing description of the modern scientific method, which was way ahead of its time!

Likewise, listen to the voice of Ibn Al-Nafis on accepting the contrarian view, subject to the test of evidence and rational analysis.

“When hearing something unusual, do not preemptively reject it, for that would be folly. Indeed, horrible things may be true, and familiar and praised things may prove to be lies. Truth is truth unto itself, not because [many] people say it is.”

-Ibn Al-Nafis, Sharh ‘Ma ’na Al Qartun.

These are stellar lights in the history of science and in the advance of knowledge. They are our forbearers and we, the Muslims and Arabs of today, should be their proud disciples. We need to recapture that great tradition. It is our tradition, our history, our legacy.
Worthy of note is that the tolerance in society is general; it is not just related to the scientific work. Contemporary to Ibn Al-Haythm in Egypt, Abul Alaa' Al-Ma’ari (973-1057) lived in Syria. Al-Ma’ari, a giant of Arabic literature, wrote poetry attacking religion, God and the prophets, and he was not punished for it, even though it generated a certain amount of opprobrium attached to his name. His work was not only published and known in his own time, it has arrived down to us, now in the 21st century without loss. Even more, he was appreciated for his talent as a poet and a linguist even by those who totally rejected his heretical writings.

This to me is the tradition that Muslims and Arabs should be proud of. They took the torch and carried it for centuries, and if today the torch has passed to the west, we should be proud that we have done our share and more in earlier times, and should strive to take our place, by dint of hard work and innovation, alongside our western colleagues at the forefront of the global endeavor to create a knowledge based, just and tolerant society.

II. The Muslim world Today

Why was this possible a thousand years ago and is not even imaginable in the Muslim World of today?

Why did the Muslim World produce such havens of cosmopolitanism as Andalusia, yet today societies go on a rampage for some cartoons (offensive s they may have been) and cannot even tolerate some children naming a teddy bear “Mohamed”? 

We all belong to multiple groups, to multiple realities, which were referred to as a “variable geometry” or the complexity of the society which is simultaneously local, regional, national and transnational, and even transcendental, across time and space. Yet today in many of these societies people are not feeling secure and want to find security in asserting their identity interpreted in the most narrow and exclusionary ways. It is a return to what Amin Maalouf called “Les Identites Meurtrieres” which are those who try to reduce the definition of complex reality in terms of only a single dimension. In addition, they feel victimized and are excessively concerned with defending that identity against any and all threats, real or perceived. So now let us come back to the sad state of the Muslim societies of today. Today, the Muslim world is driven with strife. The murderous killing fields in Iraq are fanning the flames of old sectarian disputes. Muslims are killing Muslims in Iraq, in Lebanon, in Darfur, in Afghanistan and in many other places. Intolerance rules.

So what happened? Clearly the Muslim and Arab worlds we see today do not reflect that glorious past... Why?

Because that world feels dominated and victimized by a hegemonic west, resentful of its leaders and insecure in its self-image.

Indeed tolerance requires security...

III. Security, Terrorism and Globalisation

• The problem of security:

Only when people feel secure are they tolerant...

Look at the USA... they have long prided themselves on their profound commitment to the bill or rights. Yet... Lincoln suspended Habeas corpus during the civil war. After Pearl Harbor, FDR issued the infamous Executive order 1099 which put into concentration camps about 100,000 American citizens of Japanese descent, none of whom ever turned out to be a traitor. Now. after the horror of 9/11, America has suspended due process, held people in jail without recourse, justified torture, promoted “rendition”, undertaken wholesale warrant-less eavesdropping on citizens, and legislated to make all this permanent.

Luckily, some forces in America, such as the ACLU, are taking the government to task and mounting legal challenges to this loss of fundamental human rights which were guaranteed under the constitution through the bill of rights (amendments 1-10 and other amendments).

• Terrorism:

Yesterday, I discussed the reasons why technology and globalization and other forces will make terrorism an issue to contend with in the future as well as in the past... Terrorism is not new. But the increasing damage that can be done by terrorists today is being enhanced by a number of objective reasons, including:

- The conditions of failed states or conditions of widespread anarchy (Somalia. Afghanistan, for example).
· The increasing density of human settlements.

· The increasing value of property, makes that comparable catastrophes a generation or two ago would cause much greater losses in monetary terms today.

· The availability of modern mass transport, both nationally and internationally, means that terrorists can move around much more easily and that the vehicles of such transport — planes, trains and underground rail — are themselves potent targets of terrorist attacks.

· The specific vulnerability of certain extremely important industries to disruption by terrorist acts.

· Globalization and the information and communication revolution make it very easy for terrorists to plan their activities halfway around the globe, finance it from another part of the planet, assemble to strike somewhere and be gone to the four corners of the world within hours.

· The widespread availability of enormous amounts of weapons and explosives of all types for clandestine sale.

· The extreme effectiveness of small light weapons.

· New forms of terrorism such as cyber attacks and radiological attacks.

· Nuclear proliferation.

· Bioterrorism.

· But above all, there is the ideological fervor of the suicide bomber. It is far harder to guard against the danger of a killer who kills himself with his victims than it is to guard against one who is planning to escape the scene of the crime.

It is the ultimate act, what Candido Mendes referred to as « une logique sociale du sacrifice... Le contenu du geste de destitution radicale...L’irrationnel absolu ».

So what can be done?

We need to have a strategy to ensure that the march towards inclusion, the commitment to IIR and the advance of democracy are not jeopardized by the presence of terrorism.

We have had examples of democratic governments coping with terrorism without losing sight of their obligations to their citizens: The red brigades in Italy (who murdered PM Aldo Moro), the Baader-Meinhof gang in Germany, the ETA in Spain, the Corsicans and the OAS in France, and the IRA in the UK.

But many of these same governments behaved differently before the Second World War. What we need is to
have a proper theory of societal interaction that defines the parameters of state action, the public space and the role of the civil society...

Long after the enlightenment, slavery continued, and so did colonization. Entire people were subjected to genocide and others to the systematic destruction of their cultural identity, by these same western cultures that had produced the values of the modern enlightenment. Recognizing past mistakes does not diminish the intellectual achievement of the enlightenment… Les lumieres...

But why does immigration make racism rear its ugly head again in Europe today? Why this insecurity in most of the Muslim and Arab world?

Some would blame the uncertainty of globalization...

**Globalization:**

To some the current uncertainty is due largely to the problems of globalization and the dislocation that it brings to the nations of the world...

The various countries today are indeed undergoing enormous transformations, at an unprecedented rate and thus their tolerance level is being tested, and their fear finds in immigration an easy target. Terrorism having reared its ugly head, promotes suspicion of all who are different. The enormous tsunami of globalization, seemingly unstoppable, unobtainable, uncontrollable has frightened people as their familiar moorings are being torn loose.... Listen to this powerful indictment:

“...exploitation of the world market [has] given a cosmopolitan character to production and consumption in every country. To the great chagrin of reactionaries, it has drawn from under the feet of industry the national ground on which it stood. All old-fashioned industries have been destroyed. They are dislodged by new industries, whose introduction becomes a life and death question for all civilized nations....In place of old wants, we find new wants, requiring for their satisfaction the products of distant lands and climes. In place of the old local and national seclusion and self-sufficiency, we have intercourse in every direction, universal inter-dependence of nations.”

Contemporary as they sound, these words do not come from the present. They are from Karl Marx's The Communist Manifesto of 1848. The pangs we are feeling today are remarkably similar to those felt in the industrial revolution two centuries ago. The question before us is whether we have learned from that experience to design a more humane way of dealing with the inevitable wrenching that accompanies such processes.

Globalization grows, fueled by the integration of the world economies, a revolution in telecommunications and the non-stop activities of capital markets that transact over 2.4 trillion dollars a day — enough to buy and sell the whole GDP of the USA in a week! Indeed, the political boundaries of the nation states have become permeable to the ethereal commerce of ideas and capital as never before.

**IV. Suggestions and questions:**

- **The social, economic and institutional Management of Interculturalism in Current societies**

The general principle of representative democracy, a federal system, whether in the USA or in Brazil, provides the possibilities of recognition general laws to protect the minorities being enacted at the federal level, that can thus prevent the oppression of the minorities at the local level. This formulation ultimately helped the blacks in the USA.

Moving from egalitarianism to recognizing differences will make a big difference in the policy of the integration. It underlines the problem of exclusion, but in many societies, the ethnic or sectarian lines of cleavage are the primary ones. We have to look at recognizing differences as the motivators of exclusion, which they frequently are, not just as elements of value. Of these differences, the most profound problems are those that emerge where lines of religious sectarianism are defining the camps. Each sect claims to have the absolute truth, and promises its adherents salvation. It seeks to convert others and even claims the right to fight them as different because it is open to receive them as adherents. Each sect wants to impose its vision of the state, without accepting a discussion of an alternative. There is much to commend an approach that value individual HR and underlines the notion of citizenship.

- **On individual rights and the rights of minority groups:**

HR are generally defined as negative and positive rights, translated by a bill of rights for the citizen, the individual citizen, against the power of the state. A democratic system is one where the rights of the minorities are not being trampled by the power of majority.

But does that protection rest on the rights of individuals -independent of any group - or the rights of groups?
To the extent that each group is defined by some cultural output, such as a language specific literature, or other art forms such as painting, sculpture, dance, music, architecture - these forms of cultural products can be appreciated as an enrichment of the general culture without getting into a notion of particular protection or rights for the group rather than the individuals concerned. Almost any definition of a group is exclusionary as well as divisive.

We must retain the four dimensions: the individual, the community (a matter of scale), the sovereign nation (where the authority for the rule of law is vested) and finally, humanity, which defines transcendental responsibilities including future generations as was explained by Mireille Delmas-Marty.

National law must conform to international law.

- **International law and the HR dimension:**

There is a view among many in the Arab and Muslim worlds that the major powers use double standards in defending human rights, and that, for example, while we condemn, fully and unconditionally, the killing of Israeli civilians, this should not be a reason for Israel to get away with sustained military occupation, annexation of territory by force, refusing the Palestinian right to self-determination, collective punishment, extended curfews, mass arrests without trial, targeted murders, killing of civilians and destroying Lebanon to cite a few examples.

What do you say to those who doubt the effectiveness of international law, of humanitarian principles and multilateral action? How do we convince them of the value of dialogue? How do we engage them in the search for a sustained peace in the region?

To the extent that we are calling for inclusion and diversity, those who suffered in the past, those who must be included in that diverse community, with a broader recognition of their human rights and an enhanced participation in the pluralistic enlarged community must somehow get over their grievances...

Here we confront the problem of what Wole Soyinka called “the burden of memory and the muse of forgiveness”...

*Is it better to think in terms of a political process such as the South African Truth and Reconciliation Commission rather than judicial redress?*
V. In Closing: A call to action

All rights to all people in all places at all times.

Therein, lies the challenge before us. The time is for actions, not words. Together, let us create a united front of the caring. Let us think of the unborn, remember the forgotten, give hope to the forlorn, and reach out to the unreached, and by wise actions today lay the foundation for better tomorrows.

For myself, I am unambiguous. I state my credo loud and clear:

The world is my home

Humanity is my family

Non-violence is my creed

Peace, justice, equality and dignity for all is my purpose

Engagement, rationality, tolerance, dialogue, learning and understanding are my means.

With outstretched hands we welcome all those who share these beliefs...

And in closing, I remember, half a world away, half a lifetime ago, President John F. Kennedy-spoke of world peace, he said:

“For, in the final analysis, our most basic common link is that we all inhabit this small planet. We all breathe the same air. We all cherish our children’s future. And we are all mortal.”

Those words are as pertinent today as they were half a century ago. In the post 9/11 world, it is important that we all remember that common humanity, and build a new basis for common understanding and mutual respect. This will not be easy to achieve given the enormous engagement of the US in its “war on terror” and the profound changes occurring at an ever faster pace in the Arab and Muslim worlds. But do it we must... And we will!

Together, we will move on to that world promised by Tagore in his Gitanjali:

Where the mind is without fear and the head is held high

Where knowledge is free;

Where the world has not been broken into fragments by narrow domestic walls;

Where words come from the depth of truth;

Where tireless striving stretches its arms towards perfection;

Where the clear stream of reason has not lost its way into the desert sand of dead habit;

Where the mind is led by thee into ever-widening thought and action

Into that heaven of freedom, my father, let my country awake.

Tagore The GITANJALI
REAFIRMING HUMAN RIGHTS

Candido Mendes*

This week end it is taking place, in Rio de Janeiro, the first event of the second phase of the United Nations’ Alliance of Civilizations, under the coordination of the new High Representative, Jorge Sampaio, former President of Portugal.

The meeting deals about the fundamental issues of interculturalism and human rights. This is how to achieve real dialogue, when in some dimensions of Islamic cultures the same notion of human rights is considered a Western ideology. On the other side ¿Which are the effective limits through which we can get to a “culture of peace” bearing in mind the current development of terrorism?

The suicide bombers are not only an exclusive phenomenon of fanatics, like the Al-Qaeda ones, but something which is born in the in-depth reality of the unconscious collective of the Islamic world, which has been extremely jeopardised. How are we going to avoid a “civilization of fear” supported by a fundamentalist understanding of religions?

The fundamental question is how to know up to which extend human rights do constitute a minimal platform of international agreement. The impasse about the right to freedom of expression continues, since the Danish cartoons crisis of the prophet Mohammed; and there is still a lack of a joint front against torture, even when it is justified as an action of State security.

* Publisher the 7th of December 2007 at the Brazilian Jornal do Commercio,
La Alliance is challenged by this new reality, in which globalization has become hegemony, which forces the basic question on the support to collective difference in a universe endangered by uniformity of believes and models. Being for the first time in Latin America, this meeting is centred in the natural counterpart of democracy, as social space of freedoms and of the “Rule of Law”.

In this aspect, the example of current Brazil outstands, in the framework that today was exposed, internationally, by Minister Tarso Genro. Our commitment is of special significance in a moment in which Latin America, specially the Andean one, is driving towards the confrontation between representative and plebiscitary democracy.

The surprising last minute result of the referendum in Venezuela shows the residual resistance of the temptations of the authoritarian State, especially if armed by millionaire populism. At the same time, an unexpected post-Chávez imposes an ambiguous front between a status quo overcame and the reinforcement of the authentic emancipator nationalism.

The phenomenon of the last 2nd of December in Venezuela shows the strength of the new pluralism in front of the temptation of the models based on uniformity; and its profound support of democracy. The general will always require difference, as the dialogue among civilizations, the coexistence with the other, and not the dictatorships disguised as radical movements.

In its second phase, the Alliance shows how natural temptations can be overcame, especially in what refers to the peripheries of the West, in the regime of freedoms that answers as antidote against universes of rigorous utopians, and of the non-sense terrorisms.
DECLARATION OF RIO DE JANEIRO
ALLIANCE OF CIVILIZATIONS
INTERCULTURALITY AND HUMAN RIGHTS

The Alliance of Civilizations of the United Nations held the first meeting of its second phase in Rio de Janeiro between December 8th and 10th 2007, at the initiative of the Foundation for a Culture of Peace, the Ibero-American General Secretariat and the Academy of the Latinity/Candido Mendes University. This encounter will be followed by the Madrid Forum on January 15th next, as recommended by the High Level Group Report in Istanbul in November 2006. The Conference, chaired by the High Representative Jorge Sampaio, addressed the theme in which the intercultural encounters its point of discussion: recognition of the universality of Human Rights as a necessary route to restoring a culture of peace. The debate also coincides with the anniversary of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights.

The Conference focused on reinforcing the international structure of this platform in an effort to establish a public space to promote emerging regulatory jurisdictions in the new global dimension. At the same time, this progress of human consciousness, in the benefit of cultural reciprocity, has been threatened by the 9/11 attacks and their consequences to the extent of creating mistrust between the peoples or even a « civilization of fear ».

The need for priority in understanding Human Rights is the objective of the Alliance of Civilizations, as recognized by the United Nations, on the long road from the Declaration of 1948, the Cairo Declaration in 1990 and now towards the increasing development of human dignity.

The Rio meeting, in the scope of its discussions, was able to envisage the risks of an ideological perspective of such rights, while a dominating western view prevails, or the need to regard those imperatives as a result of international generosity and not of the universal establishment of a Rule of Law.

The complexity of this problem, as discussed in Mallorca, Doha, Dakar or Istanbul, acknowledged at the same time the crucial importance of this statute of cultures, wherein the peoples grow more mature through their national enterprise and collective improvement. Such a requirement leads to the restoration of a culture of peace that shall stand out from
the hegemonic behaviours of a civilization that can protect the near future.

Terrorism, always intolerable, is lived in a collective unconsciousness, conveyed to another’s radical denial, clashing with the intrinsic difference of cultures, whose source is the pluralism of world views and life styles. In the same way, the reception of the civilizing process and spontaneous or forced migrations that it confirms, arouses, in the context of miscegenation, the expression of hybrids and subalternities, in the clamour of contemporary collective identities. The rise of fundamentalisms now expresses a defensive condition against this hegemony, likely to lead to the verge of « religious wars ».

Stability, necessary for renewed worldwide trust, does not mature under systematic threat, but rather through conditions of dialogue, which again escape the arrogance or mere good will of a society as complex as it is divided nowadays.

The new recognitions between cultures claim, beyond States, the dynamism of civil society and affirmative actions, to strengthen community solidarity towards the right to life and well-being. And at the same time, the rights of humanity are imposed, namely the protection of social memory, access to in-depth, participative and representative democracy.

Increasing action of the United Nations Human Rights Council is surely the instrument of a citizenship for a world on the verge of ideological uniformities and to damage the pluralism that is essential for the adventure of freedom.

Brazil’s contribution - in the message from President Luis Inacio Lula da Silva in Rio de Janeiro - to the initiative of the Alliance, founded by Spain and Turkey, reaffirms the quest for cultures, conscious of their self-determination within the scope of humanism required for this budding century.
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Lula critica poltica norte-americana de combate ao terror

Por Redacao - do Rio de Janeiro

O combate ao terrorismo não pode ser feito com a supressão de coisas civilizatórias relacionadas com os direitos humanos, especificamente com os direitos humanos de pessoas prese, e não se pode combatê-la babarredo outra babarredo, em uma obra referente à políticas norte-americanas. Esta foi a principal recado dado pela mensagem enviada pelo presidente Lula. O embate foi veiculado nos dias 7 e 5 de sessões de trabalho da Conferência Internacional Aliança das Civilizações, Interculturalismo e Direitos Humanos, que ocorre até a terceira-feira, na Zona Sul do Rio.

- Condenamos veementemente a resposta à babarredo com a babarredo, que diferença há entre atacados terroristas que cobram vidas inocentes e predadores manufatureados em drogas. Não.

A mensagem foi lida durante a sessão de abertura dos trabalhos pelo ministro do Desenvolvimento Social e Combate à Fome, Patrus Araújo. Para o ministro, o encontro se insere no contexto de outras iniciativas voltadas para o diálogo entre culturas, religiões, povos e países, na perspectiva de uma paz fundada no desenvolvimento e justiça social.

- É um espaço onde intelectuais e políticos refletem os grande desafios que se colocam hoje para a humanidade, principalmente no campo social, disse Patrus Araújo.

Na mensagem, o presidente disse que avanços como esse, em que dialogam diferentes culturas - o Ocidente e o Oriente - propiciam oportunidades para o entendimento, para um mundo em paz, sem guerras, um que haja respeito às diferenças culturais.

- Não existem culturas superiores e inferiores, religiões superiores e inferiores, visões de mundo superiores e inferiores. Estes conceitos foram apunhalados há pelo menos um século, afirmou o presidente. Ele lembra a linha adotada pela política externa do seu governo de maior aproximação com a África e com o Oriente e reitera o posicionamento “claro e firme” do país em favor do diálogo em vez de força e pela prevenção do terrorismo.

Jorge Sampaio advierte que la Alianza de Civilizaciones es "un proceso de décadas"

(El País, 2 de diciembre de 2007)

El presidente portugués Jorge Sampaio hizo un llamamiento a la "solidaridad, fraternidad y cooperación" en el marco de la Alianza de Civilizaciones, durante su intervención en la Conferencia Internacional sobre la "Alianza de Civilizaciones, Interculturalismo e Derechos Humanos" en el Centro Cultural de专项整治, en la ciudad de Río de Janeiro, Brasil.

"La Alianza de Civilizaciones es un proceso de décadas que necesita la participación fraterna y la cooperación internacional", dijo Sampaio.

Por medio de pronunciamientos, Sampaio destacó el papel de la Unión Europea en el diálogo intercultural e integración de exclusiones, apuntando a los valores de la cultura y la diversidad que caracterizan el continente.

"La Alianza de Civilizaciones es un proceso que requiere el diálogo intercultural y la cooperación internacional para superar los desafíos del mundo actual", expresó.

Después de su discurso, Sampaio se disculpó de no poder asistir a la conferencia en su totalidad.

"Lamento no poder asistir a la conferencia en su totalidad, pero la Alianza de Civilizaciones es un proceso que requiere la participación de todos", manifestó.

Además, Sampaio destacó el papel de la Unión Europea en el diálogo intercultural e integración de exclusiones, apuntando a los valores de la cultura y la diversidad que caracterizan el continente.

"La Alianza de Civilizaciones es un proceso que requiere el diálogo intercultural y la cooperación internacional para superar los desafíos del mundo actual", expresó.

Después de su discurso, Sampaio se disculpó de no poder asistir a la conferencia en su totalidad.

"Lamento no poder asistir a la conferencia en su totalidad, pero la Alianza de Civilizaciones es un proceso que requiere la participación de todos", manifestó.

Además, Sampaio destacó el papel de la Unión Europea en el diálogo intercultural e integración de exclusiones, apuntando a los valores de la cultura y la diversidad que caracterizan el continente.

"La Alianza de Civilizaciones es un proceso que requiere el diálogo intercultural y la cooperación internacional para superar los desafíos del mundo actual", expresó.

Después de su discurso, Sampaio se disculpó de no poder asistir a la conferencia en su totalidad.

"Lamento no poder asistir a la conferencia en su totalidad, pero la Alianza de Civilizaciones es un proceso que requiere la participación de todos", manifestó.

Además, Sampaio destacó el papel de la Unión Europea en el diálogo intercultural e integración de exclusiones, apuntando a los valores de la cultura y la diversidad que caracterizan el continente.

"La Alianza de Civilizaciones es un proceso que requiere el diálogo intercultural y la cooperación internacional para superar los desafíos del mundo actual", expresó.

Después de su discurso, Sampaio se disculpó de no poder asistir a la conferencia en su totalidad.

"Lamento no poder asistir a la conferencia en su totalidad, pero la Alianza de Civilizaciones es un proceso que requiere la participación de todos", manifestó.

Además, Sampaio destacó el papel de la Unión Europea en el diálogo intercultural e integración de exclusiones, apuntando a los valores de la cultura y la diversidad que caracterizan el continente.

"La Alianza de Civilizaciones es un proceso que requiere el diálogo intercultural y la cooperación internacional para superar los desafíos del mundo actual", expresó.

Después de su discurso, Sampaio se disculpó de no poder asistir a la conferencia en su totalidad.

"Lamento no poder asistir a la conferencia en su totalidad, pero la Alianza de Civilizaciones es un proceso que requiere la participación de todos", manifestó.

Además, Sampaio destacó el papel de la Unión Europea en el diálogo intercultural e integración de exclusiones, apuntando a los valores de la cultura y la diversidad que caracterizan el continente.

"La Alianza de Civilizaciones es un proceso que requiere el diálogo intercultural y la cooperación internacional para superar los desafíos del mundo actual", expresó.

Después de su discurso, Sampaio se disculpó de no poder asistir a la conferencia en su totalidad.

"Lamento no poder asistir a la conferencia en su totalidad, pero la Alianza de Civilizaciones es un proceso que requiere la participación de todos", manifes...
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Third plenary session. From left to right: François L’Yvonnet, Pan Guang, Anunciada Fernández de Córdoba and Candido Mendes.
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Programme
INTERNATIONAL CONFERENCE

Alliance of Civilizations, Interculturalism, and Human Rights

Río de Janeiro, Brazil 8-10 December, 2007

Organised by:

With the support of:
DAY 1 – 8th December
Itamaraty Palace, Rio de Janeiro

17:00 Opening session and ceremony

Candido Mendes, Academy of the Latinity/University Candido Mendes
Enrique Iglesias, Ibero-American Secretary General
Federico Mayor, President of the Foundation for a Culture of Peace
Samuel Pinheiro Guimaraes, Secretary General of Foreign Affairs, Brazil
Jorge Sampaio, UN High Representative for the AoC
Jesús Caldera, Minister of Minster of Labour and Social Affairs of Spain
Tarso Genro, Minister of Justice of Brazil

Cocktail offered by the Brazilian government

DAY 2 – 9th December
Hotel Sofitel Copacabana, Rio de Janeiro

09:00-10:30 1st plenary: Crisis of Representation, Identities and Democracy, the case of Latin America

Main topics: - Complementarity of identity, representation and democracy
- Multiculturalism and the crisis of representation: the nation state and its emergent reductionism
- Common democratic values and principles as a step forward

Chair: Enrique Iglesias

Speakers: Néstor García Canclini. Beyond Multiculturalism
Beatriz Paredes. Democracy and National Identities in Mexico
Enrique Larreta. Rethinking Cultural Recognition

10:30-11:00 Coffee break

11:00-13:30 2nd plenary: Human Rights and Dialogue among Cultures, two driving forces of the Alliance

Main topics: - Human Rights, its universal and its cultural context
- Interlinking the core fields of the Alliance through action
- The civil society involvement

Chair: Federico Mayor

Speakers: Mireille Delmas-Marty. The universal of Human Rights and the dialogue of cultures: The enigma of a community without previous foundations
Bronislaw Geremek. Human Rights and collective memory
Luis Alfonso de Alba. The institutional and democratic contributions
Patrus Ananias. Marginality, Social Promotion and Human Rights
13:30-15:30  Working lunch (free)

15:30-17:30  3rd plenary: Modernity and Cultural Difference

Main topics:  - The social, economic and institutional management of diversity in current societies
             - The challenge of cultural difference in modernity
             - Diversity vs. uniformity and the role of the Alliance of Civilizations initiative.

Chair:  Anunciada Fernández de Córdoba

Speakers:  Candido Mendes. The Alliance of Civilizations and the impasse of the Dialogue among Cultures.
           Pan Guang. The global management of diversity and multipolarity
           François L’Yvonnet. Modernity, the West and Latinity

DAY 3 – 10th December
Hotel Sofitel Copacabana, Rio de Janeiro

09:30-11:00  4th plenary: Interculturalism, Common Values and the Democratic Imperative

Main topics:  - Democracy, Identities and Beyond
             - The social, economic and institutional management of interculturalism in current societies
             - Common values and respect of diversity

Chair:  Candido Mendes

Speakers:  Ismael Serageldin. The challenges of cultural diversity
           Katerina Stenou. Common values and the respect for modernity
           Moustafa Niasse. Development and management of interculturalism
           Nilcéa Freire. The democratic principles, the future and the gender dimension

11:00-11:30  Coffee break

11:30-12:30  Debate and closure
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List of Speakers
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Title and Affiliation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Luís Alfonso de Alba</td>
<td>Ambassador and Permanent Representative of Mexico to the United Nations and the International Organizations in Geneva. He was the first President of the United Nations Human Rights Council.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patrus Ananias</td>
<td>Minister of Social Development and Hunger Alleviation of Brazil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jesús Caldera</td>
<td>Minister of Labour and Social Affairs of Spain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mireille Delmas-Marty</td>
<td>French penalist, Professor of Comparative Legal Studies and Law Internationalization in the Collège de France</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Néstor García Canclini</td>
<td>Argentine anthropologist. Director of the Program of Cultural Studies of the Universidad Nacional Autónoma of Mexico</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anunciada Fernández de Córdoba</td>
<td>Director General for Ibero-American Multilateral Organisations. Ministry of Foreign Affairs and Cooperation of Spain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nilcécá Freire</td>
<td>Special Secretary (Minister) for Women’s Policies, Brazil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tarso Genro</td>
<td>Minister of Justice of Brazil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bronislaw Geremek</td>
<td>Polish social historian. Professor of European Civilization in the Collège d’Europe headquarters in Warsaw. Member of the European Parliament</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pan Guang</td>
<td>Member of the Shanghai Academy of Science. Former member of the United Nations High Level Group for the Alliance of Civilizations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enrique Iglesias</td>
<td>Ibero-American Secretary General, former member of the United Nations High Level Group for the Alliance of Civilizations, as well as, former President of the Inter-American Development Bank</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enrique Larreta</td>
<td>Executive Director of the Institute of Cultural Pluralism of the University Candido Mendes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>François L’Yvonnet</td>
<td>French philosopher, writer and journalist. Member of the Academy of the Latinity.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federico Mayor</td>
<td>President of the Foundation for a Culture of Peace. Former Co-chair of the United Nations High Level Group for the Alliance of Civilizations, as well as former Director-General of UNESCO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Candido Mendes</td>
<td>Secretary-General of the Académie de la Latinité. Rector of Universidade Candido Mendes. Former member of the United Nations High Level Group for the Alliance of Civilizations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moustafa Niasse</td>
<td>Former Prime Minister of Senegal. Former member of the United Nations High Level Group for the Alliance of Civilizations</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

International Conference Alliance of Civilizations, Interculturalsm and Human Rights
Rio de Janeiro, Brazil 8-10 December, 2007
Beatriz Paredes  Sociologist, President of the Institutional Revolutionary Party, she has been the Governor of the State of Tlaxcala, as well as Speaker of the Chamber of Deputies of Mexico, and leader of the National Peasants Confederation.

Samuel Pinheiro Guimaraes  Secretary General for Foreign Affairs of Brazil

Jorge Sampaio  United Nations High Representative for the Alliance of Civilizations. Former President of Portugal and Mayor of Lisbon.

Ismael Serageldin  Director of the Bibliotheca Alexandrina. Former member of the United Nations High Level Group for the Alliance of Civilizations

Katerina Stenou  Director of the Division of Political Cultures and Intercultural Dialogue, UNESCO

Katerina Stenou speaking at the fourth session. From right to left: Beatriz Paredes, Nestor Gracía Canclini, Luís Alfonso de Alba, Katerina Stenou, Ismail Serageldin and Moustapha Niasse.

Secretariat of the Conference:

Foundation for a Culture of Peace:  Manuel Manonelles
Ibero-American General Secretariat:  Germán García da Rosa
UCM/Academy of the Latinity:  Rita Torres

With the support of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of Brazil and Spain
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List of Participants
List of confirmed participants at the International Conference
“Alliance of Civilizations, Interculturalism and Human Rights”

1. Alberto Guani Amarilla – Consul General de Uruguay en Río de Janeiro
2. Alessandra Maciel Ramundo Barbosa - Professora da Escola de Comando e Estado-Maior do Exército
3. Alexander Barreto Estephanio - Coordenador da UCAM/Méier
4. Alexandre Cardoso – Secretário de Estado de Ciência e Tecnologia
5. Alexandre Gaze - Pró-Reitor de Expansão – UCAM
6. Amanda Pereira Morais
7. Ana Maria Barroso – Secretária do fórum de Reitores do Estado do RJ
8. Ana Paula Delpretti – Professora da UCAM
9. Andrés Ordóñez – Consul General de México en Río de Janeiro (en representación del gobierno mexicano)
10. Ângela Behenck Ceron
11. Ângela Maria Cataldo dos Reis - Professora da UCAM
12. Angélica Behenck Ceron
13. Antonella Grespan Albertini
14. António Almeida Lima – Cônsul-Geral de Portugal no RJ
15. Antônio Carlos Mendes – Coord. Relações Institucionais - Sociedade Beneficente Muçulmana
16. Áurea Beushele Vieira – Esposa do Prof. José Maria Rossani Garçiz da UCAM
17. Bianca Santana Ciqueira
18. Blanca Vargas – Fundación Cultura de Paz
20. Carlos Alberto Gallo – Professor da UCAM
21. Carlos Heitor Cony – Acadêmico da Academia Brasileira de Letras
22. Carlos Henrique Cardim – Embaixador e Presidente do Instituto de Pesquisa de Relações Internacionais
23. Carlos Nejar – Acadêmico da Academia Brasileira de Letras
24. Carlos Sérgio Sobral Duarte – Ministro / Diretor do Depto. de Organismos Internacionais – Ministério das Relações Exteriores
25. Carmen Batres Rodrigues – Consejera de Prensa de la Embajada España
26. Carolina de Oliveira Hernandes Machado
27. Carolina Vootty
28. Cintya Cristina dos Santos Suly
29. Cláudia Botelho de Almeida
30. Clóvis Brigagão – Diretor Adjunto - CEAs/UCAM
31. Christiane Keity Maria
32. Cristiano Cardoso
33. Cristiano Dias Tebaldi - Diretor – UCAM/Méier
34. Cristina Allak – Diretora Administrativa/UCAM – Jacarepaguá
35. Dalva Beltrão – Professora da UniverCidade
36. Daniel Antonio Ferreira Rosas
37. Daniel Ribeiro Silvestre
38. Danielle Nobre de Almeida – Diretora do Projeto Arte Manequim
39. Danielle Theodoro Canécio
40. Denise Carrascosa
41. Diana Araújo Pereira
42. Diego Ferreira Rosas
43. Eduardo Lisker
44. Édson Xavier – Niterói, UCAM
45. Eliane Borges – Fundação Palmares – Representante do Rio
46. Elisabete Nascimento – Professora da UCAM
47. Elton Mozzer Brandão
48. Esperança da Cunha
49. Felice Valentino Gaio Filardi – Professor da UCAM
50. Félix Costales – Sub-director General de Política Exterior, Ministerio de Asuntos Exteriores y Cooperación de España
51. Fernando Quintana – Professor da UNI-RIO e UNIGRANRIO
52. Fodé Seck – Ambassadeur du Sénégal au Brésil
53. Francisco Corral – Director del Instituto Cervantes en Río de Janeiro
54. Francisco José Andrade Ramalho – Assessor da Reitoria/UCAM
55. Francisco José Viqueira Niel – Consul General de España en RJ
56. Franklin R. Hoyer – Divisao das Nações Unidas, Ministerio das Relações Exteriores
57. Gabriela Macedo da Silva – Estagiária da FIOCRUZ
58. Geane da Silva Mariano Lessa – Professora da UFRJ
59. Geni Fernandes – Coordenadora Acadêmica - FCPERJ/UCAM
60. George B. Doyle Maia – Reitor da Universidade Santa Úrsula
61. Germán García da Rosa – Secretária General Iberoamericana/Secretariado de la Conferencia
62. Getúlio Brago Júnior – Professor da UCAM
63. Giancarlo Summa – Director UN Information Center, Brazil
64. Glória Maria Fabrízzi Sampaio Fernandes – Presidente eleita do Diretório acadêmico Dascam UCAM
65. Guaracy Salles de Oliveira – Professor da UCAM
66. Guilherme Lopes da Cunha
67. Helena Barroco – Assessora Especial Alto Representante da Aliança das Civilizações
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