

High-level Meeting on

GLOBAL INTERDEPENDENCE AND NATIONAL SOVEREIGNTY

Lisbon, Portugal
9-11 March 1990

Obviously I am not speaking for the youth of the world but for the septuagenarians. The subject of this gathering was not the deficiencies in the field of human rights which do exist. It is only part of the subject. The subject was global interdependence and national sovereignty. It seems to me that for the 21st century it is not any longer the question whether and if we need transnational authority or authorities in the plural. Beyond national sovereignty the questions are how can or how ought transnational authority be devised? What ought to be their organs? Should it be one authority, should it be several authorities in several fields? What ought to be the task, the mission of transnational authorities? How should they be defined? How are they delimited? Which tasks and which commissions are to remain under national sovereignty, under the sovereignty of the national state? The questions are who is going to control transnational authorities? To whom have they to respond to? Who is going to judge their behaviour? To whom can I appeal if I feel my rights to be violated? Who is going to be the judge? The question is how do we bring about such transnational authorities? Who can constitute that? What is going to be in their constitution?

I will abstain from trying to answer these questions but I guess we will have to come to them. But it seems to me that today there are problems much more pressing than in the 20th century and in former centuries. There are problems much more pressing in the 21st century which ask for some kind of transnational authority, for instance, the social and economic development of a great number of developing countries — to feed them, to keep them healthy, to provide education and to enable economic growth per capita. Or how do we maintain some financial and monetary order within the hitherto integrated world economy. With regards to the flow of funds, for instance, which is now flowing from the developing countries to the industrial north.

It entails the questions about the regime of the globalized financial markets. We have one globalized stock market nowadays, one globalized bond market, one globalized Las Vegas mentality — from Chicago to Tokyo, Hong Kong, London, Zurich and all the others included. What is going to be the regime over all that? It entails the question of the reliability of exchange rates over periods longer than a fortnight.

The question is how do we provide energy supply in the future? Obviously it cannot be guaranteed by the national sovereignty of Brazil, or of India, or of Bangladesh, or of Germany, or of Portugal. Are we allowing the world to rely on the burning of hydrocarbons whereby it is clear that we are changing the outer atmosphere? Or are we to rely on electricity generated by nuclear fuel? Or is there a third possibility? What do we do in order to explore third possibilities? What do we do in order to bring about greater rationality in using energy?

This leads me to the next question the answer to which goes far beyond that of sovereignty which is after we have understood that we are subject to one and the same ecological fate of mankind. How do we further manage the development of the water in our oceans and more pressing the troposphere and atmosphere? Are we going to let the greenhouse effect happen? Are we allowing the greenhouse effect to make tens of millions in the beginning and hundreds of millions later on to leave the places where they are living today? The people of Bangladesh will have to leave their country once the greenhouse effect leads to an increase in the surface of the oceans. I don't know if this will happen but I am scared of the possibility. To manage such problems goes far beyond the possibility of sovereign states.

The next question is what does mankind do in order to limit the number of people being born? At the end of the 19th century we were 1 1/2 billion people living on the globe, right now we are beyond 5 billion. By the end of this century we will be more than 6 billion people — a quadrupling of the number of people within just one century. If we go on like that we will be more than 20 billion people at the end of the next century. It is absolutely clear that in such an environment of 20 billion people the question of national sovereignty and the possibilities of a sovereign state will not suffice to manage the questions I have mentioned such as development and adequate per capita economic progress in the developing countries, like financial monetary order of the world's economy, like energy supply, like the ecological traits. It is these questions much more than the evergreen question of human rights that have led the InterAction Council to call the high-level meeting on global interdependence and national sovereignty. We are not the 101st assembly to deal with human rights important as they are. And they are important, I do not deny that but these questions are being dealt with in so many bodies today and tomorrow and onwards. We were told that there are 50 international instruments dealing with human rights. And as we have

heard from Mr. Kouchner this is not enough. I agree, but nevertheless this is not the most pressing problem for former heads of state and government who undertake to advise their successors in what to do and what not to do.

It seems to me that at the end of the 20th century we see in many regions of the world, not only within some countries, a new upswing of the idea of national identity and the principle of national sovereignty. You see this in the eastern part of Europe and in Central Europe, you see it in Hungary, Poland, Romania, Bulgaria and Yugoslavia, you see it inside the Soviet Union — 50 nationalities now under glasnost striving for the possibility to, first, express their national identity and probably at least a couple of them striving for national sovereignty which is already tangible. You see it in the Indian subcontinent, you see it at the fringes of the People's Republic of China. You see it in almost all of Africa where many of the black African leaders have been advocating nation-building for a quarter of a century.

For me the question is that in the face of this new upswing of nationalism — and I use this word not in a derogatory sense, I have full understanding and sympathy for these people who wish to express their cultural, national, language identity, who believe that national sovereignty is a solution to all their troubles, which it is not but they believe it is — how can we cope with the questions I have posed in the fields of development, energy, ecology and population explosion. Can one, or ought one to back and to develop the existence of transnational authorities as they are at the United Nations, the GATT, the World Bank, the FAO or whatever? Ought one to build on them or are we to propose the creation of other bodies, new bodies, how do we define them, what ought to be their organs etc.? If we rely on existing authorities what then? Are they able to solve the energy problem, the ecological problems, are they able to do anything about the population explosion? This is what we should talk about including the problem of insufficiency of hitherto existing authorities as regards human rights. But it is by far not the overriding problem of mankind.

I have asked questions rather than give a single answer. I wanted to redirect the discussion towards global questions, and human rights is a part of that not the one overriding one.

Out of my own experience in Government I have felt the pressure of trade unions much stronger than that of organized industry or banks. For example, when I started work after World War II, we worked 56 hours a week. Then it got down to 52 and 48. Nowadays trade unions are striving for 35 hours a week in my country, the average being 38 right now. I have nothing against this struggle and the force on

industry the rationalization of their production. The lesser the working hours the higher is the degree of rationalization, automatization, electronization in order to remain competitive.

What I am saying is that the more you confine the development of more modern, more productive developments in the economy, the smaller the growth of real income per capita will be all over the globe. Canada is a large country and you are thinking in terms of a country where you have a few inhabitants per square mile and there are other countries such as India or Egypt. Egypt is a very narrow oasis plus the delta plus the capital of Cairo. If they don't learn to produce better and more with the same number of people employed I don't know how they will ever get out of their poverty unless they export their people by the tens of millions. Once upon a time a Turkish Prime Minister told me that before the end of the century he was sure that Turkey was going to export another 20 million Turks to West Germany. I told him that he was mad and that we would prevent this from happening. But still they try. And if they don't get into Germany they may get into Belgium, Bulgaria or Yugoslavia. I foresee a great number of regional and local wars in the next century due to the fact that they are not taking this Indian example and limiting growth of population. We will see to it by development aid and other means that the infant mortality is kept at low rates and therefore the overall population will grow and grow. If you do not allow for quick economic development which has to include rationalization and striving for profit, then you are lost. I will be happy not to live on in the next century. Canada is not in any way influenced by a great number of people coming into Canada. The United States is getting a Latin California, Latin Florida, maybe later on a Latin Texas and Louisiana, and makes a great mistake not to develop the economy of their nearest Latin neighbour, Mexico. They should concentrate on making this country a socially and economically viable entity. They don't do this and therefore they will get the influx from these countries. They do of course try to defend themselves against this. This kind of thing is happening and going to happen in the next century, not necessarily as far as Canada is concerned although already you find Chinese in the Canadian Rockies, you meet English, French and Chinese characters which can be read by the Japanese. These will not be the only ones. You will get people from Korea, Viet Nam, Indonesia. They have to find some place, if not they are organizing their own industry in order to be able to feed these people and to give them a decent way of living.

It all boils down either to limiting the growth of population or if you can't do that for religious, ethical, philosophic reasons the alternative is to let them become more productive and this can only be brought about by the profit of the corporation. I hope they will then have trade unions and workers councils who will see to it that the workers are not getting under the wheels of such a development. But you cannot have it both ways. If we do not limit this population explosion, there will be four times as many people within just one century or we see that production is quickly enlarged. It

will not be done by state only. It can only be done if those who manage the enterprise have the goals of engrossing profits or their own prestige or whatever it is. If you leave it to governments you end up with the situation of USSR, Poland, Hungary etc. All these ridiculous economies where the people are highly educated but remain poor due to the silly bureaucrats in governments — and all bureaucrats are silly and ought to be. Otherwise they would not stay in the bureaucracy, with the exception of university professors of course.

It seems to me that it would be a misleading word to ask the West for perestroika. Perestroika has a certain economic meaning in the Soviet Union. If we use that word for some other context it will be most misunderstood. I understand that you Dr. Santos and others asked for something different. There are some words which one has to avoid because the contents more or less are clear for the listeners and readers including all the connotations that they add to it even if you don't mean them. Perestroika is one such word and glasnost is another. Socialism and capitalism are also such words.

There is an enormous difference between capitalism in Finland and in Texas, for instance. It is ridiculous to put them into one and the same category. We should bring about a new phase of enlightenment about the complex problems of the globe the solution to which goes beyond the capacities of the single sovereign state. I would like a much less abstract discussion. We have heard a number of moral appeals so far. Any of us could have his own personal moral appeal too — a long list of moral appeals and some good examples from one or the other country.

What I would rather like to see is in concreto, one, listing those problems in the field of global interdependence which we think ought to be dealt with. We have heard about one thing — namely spreading the gospel of human rights and making it better understood and better obeyed by governments in many countries. I was one of those who prepared the basket III for Helsinki and the final act and I put my signature to the final act of Helsinki so I don't need any further education as regards human rights. There are many people in the world who we could reach who need not be told about human rights but still to spread the gospel is one concrete necessity and goes beyond the capabilities of the nation state. Be concrete and not talk about a new spirit and no education and all that. You expect changes in the world to be brought about

by politicians. In order to make yourself understood by these people you have to be concrete and not abstract. Abstract talk is for universities at philosophical seminars. If you want to make an effect on politicians or public opinion you have to be concrete. I would like to see a list of those concrete problems of today, or the 1990s or the 21st century which we see as problems of international or global interdependence that clearly go beyond the capacity of the nation state to solve. Second, I would like a list of proposals that we make. What our successors in government ought to do by our own judgement. We may be arrogant and ask more of them than they could bring about maybe but if you want to make an impact on your successors in government one has to clearly define the problem and hopefully put one or two proposals to it and not tell them that they ought to be more moralistic than they are hitherto and that they ought to be better educated than they are hitherto. Politicians are opportunists. Particularly so in democracies. They may change to some degree their mind if they see that what you say also makes an impact on their constituencies on those whose votes they are looking for and the man in the street also does not read abstract philosophies. For him it is necessary to be concrete. What I want to hear is what do I think Chancellor Kohl or Maggie Thatcher or the Prime Minister of India or of Japan or the President of Nigeria, Brazil etc. ought to do. What are we asking of them? What are we asking of the international institutions such as GATT or WHO or IMF etc.?

I would like to put a very personal footnote. Personally in all my political and international experience I have had grave doubts as to the usefulness or adequacy of the European-North American concept of democracy in relation to Asia and Africa. I have also some doubts as regards Latin America. I have grave doubts as regards India or China or the 700 or 800 million muslims in Asia, the Middle East or Africa. The cultural heritage of India or of China is some thousand years older than European-North American civilization. The European civilization at best goes back 1500 years, if you include the ancient Greek philosophers, scientists, political authors etc.. Civilization in India or China is 3 or 4000 years and the cultural heritage is much more deeply embedded there than the newly imported concept of democracy. It seems to me that the way to govern does necessarily have to differ from Europe in all these great parts of mankind. Democracy and Confucianism for instance will not fit into each other.

Much more recently, the communist idea of the dictatorship of the proletariat and democracy will not fit into each other. I have always seen this European idea of spreading democracy over the globe to be as ridiculous as the Christian idea to spread christendom with the cross in the one hand and the sword in the other.

On the other hand I do believe that human rights can be and ought to be a universal concept. The right of the individual and the dignity of the individual person is to my view reconcilable with the very different cultural heritages, can be and ought to be applied to all of mankind.

Now as regards the third great concept, namely the market-oriented economy - within brackets: market-oriented economy to be corrected and supplemented by factors of participation and the welfare state element, as I would hope being a Social Democrat — I cannot help believe that any country which wishes to participate in the world's economy and thereby participate in the growth or real income of the masses, the growth of real standard of living of its masses. If such a country acknowledges such a desire, it will inevitably have to embrace the concept of market economy which is not a European concept. You have seen bazaars and markets in many other parts of the world much earlier than Adam Smith and David Ricardo and other classical market economy writers in Europe. This universal applicability of the market economic concept has even been understood in the meantime by Deng Xiao Ping and by Gorbachev.

The fourth principle —sovereignty— is older in China than in Europe. It has obviously become an accepted principle almost all over the globe. We are among those who have begun to understand that the principle of national sovereignty does not any longer suffice.

If I talk about energy I don't like the phrase alternative sources of energy because it sounds as if you are talking of windmills, which in many places are useful such as Holland, but in general, windmills are not a concept for replacing oil, coal, lignite etc. What I think of as an enormous collective effort, I am talking of billions of dollars to be invested into research of both the possibilities of fusion, and also into the possibilities of really on a broad scale economically and efficiently using solar energy by what is called nowadays photovoltaics — of course both of these possibilities may fail. So far we use solar energy by heating up water on our rooftops, that will never be able to do more than provide the household with hot water. We may be able to direct it and translate solar energy into electricity. If this can be brought about then it needs means to store that kind of electricity because it will be generated in the hot areas of the world and not in Europe or North America, and also the means to transport it which entails probably hydrogen technology which is very expensive and complex. I would like to see a group of states or an agency to invest billions of dollars into scientific and engineering research in such kinds of projects, in a way as expensive as was the Manhattan project in WWII which led to the Atom Bomb.

As a person, I am utterly reluctant to put my name to a proposal which says that one should have the right to intervene in other states. These are causes for suppression and war.

As long as mankind consisted of 300 million people on earth in the medieval ages there was almost no interdependence at all. Although we had movements 450 or 500 years AD of tribes and peoples in Europe —the Gothic people and later the Slavic and Germanic people, yes in a way this foreshadowed inter-dependence. The ice ages 2000 years earlier made people migrate— this in a way was interdependent. But the word interdependent as we use it nowadays is hinting to quite different phenomena. Phenomena which did not exist in the medieval ages and before that. They have to do with the fact that the surface of the earth has not been enlarged whereas the number of people on the earth has multiplied a hundredfold. The reasoning for any of our proposals ought to deal with the main point of population explosion, we ought to say something about this. Of course, it is difficult for a white European to talk about it to the colored people in Asia, Africa and elsewhere where the population explosion happens. If we talk about the necessity to go beyond national sovereignty, it has been part formally of the concept of national sovereignty to produce bigger numbers of population within my own sovereign state. Not so long ago it was part of the French concept.

In former centuries we have seen a few collective efforts between states which at the time still thought of themselves as being totally sovereign, nevertheless they did agree between themselves and to some degree created an order which went beyond sovereignty. One of the examples is the Peace of Muenster 300 years ago, the Westphalien Peace I think it is called in English. Another example would be the Vienna Congress of 1814-1815 after the Napoleonic wars. Anyway the 19th century in my view has seen the peak of the power of the sovereignty of the nation state. The 20th century due to its two awful wars and due to two global economic crises has seen the beginning of voluntary limitations of national sovereignty. For instance, arms reduction could not have been brought about by a single sovereign national state, unilateral arms reduction has never taken place. It was necessary that one had bilateral negotiations such as the SALT talks or IMF or multilateral negotiations and conferences such as the Non-Proliferation Treat and on the other end of the spectrum the aforementioned Helsinki Conference which embraced 35 states. These things went beyond the action of one national sovereign state and the future obviously, also the future CSCE process in particular does necessitate prolongation of such efforts that go beyond national sovereignty. I think the future may necessitate global participation. Peace-keeping in general also needed collective effort as was seen after WWI with the creation of the League of Nations and after WWII and the creation of the UN and the Security Council. As was seen in the two big alliances. The Eastern Alliance as well as the Western Alliance did imply quite a sacrifice of national sovereignty. The Western Alliance had two purposes namely to contain the Russians on the one hand and the Germans on the other. Only the latter purpose, by the way, will remain for the next ten years. It implies not only for the Germans but for the British and French some sacrifice of national sovereignty. So there are starts of going beyond national sovereignty.

This is even true in the economic and financial management where you see a lot of collective cooperation, not only the IMF, GATT, or Lome agreement, or the annual summits of the 7 etc. For instance, the World Bank if it gives credit does imply some sacrifice of sovereignty by the receiving country. Now it is necessary to bring this into the conscience of people. We have already started in many ways and in many fields to sacrifice parts of our national sovereignty. Now at the threshold of the 21st century we understand that we need additional sacrifices of national sovereignty in favour of transnational authority or in favour of collective efforts overriding national interest. The present ones do not seem to suffice for the 21st century partially because the present efforts are insufficient in efficacy but much more so because of a much higher degree of inter-dependence of mankind than we had hitherto realized in former centuries. This higher degree in the main stems from the fact of the multiplication of the number of people living on this limited surface of the earth. Our final paper should embed these concrete points in a more global, historical or sociological, legal framework of historical legal aspects in order to make people understand that we are not just one of those who favour windmills instead of nuclear reactors and not just one of those who repeat one and the same subject since 1945.

Earlier, I gave examples instead of just talking of alternative sources of energy. I mentioned photovoltaics, hydrogen technology, fusion. I have no idea whether in these three fields scientists and engineers might reach a breakthrough but I am convinced that what is necessary there is an enormous effort of educated manpower on the one hand and money on the other. As an illustrative example I used the Manhattan project of the USA during World War II in order to make it clear that an enormous effort is needed which cannot be undertaken by private corporations because it may never be profitable. It may be that after 10 years we have wasted our money. But I would urge governments to undertake such a thing, for example, the European Community should do that. If I was the President in the place of Jacques Delors in Brussels, I would launch a programme certainly larger than the European Space Agency experiment in order to find out whether there is or is not a future in photovoltaics and hydrogen technology. To mention such things would give a little more specific touch. Merely mentioning co-operative research and alternative resources can mean anything and nothing.

I am missing a word about nuclear waste. You have an inevitable consequence if you create electricity by nuclear reactors, which is nuclear waste. If I am not mistaken no government in the world yet knows what to do with nuclear waste — except a few

who are nuclear weapons states that use the nuclear waste in order to make the next 1000 nuclear bombs. Otherwise the nuclear waste problem is unsolved. It can be in 10 years time we come to the conclusion that nuclear fuel should not be used as we don't know how to dispose of nuclear waste. I don't know. But I would like to see an international effort undertaken, maybe under the auspices of the International Energy Agency in Vienna, maybe under somebody else's auspices to look into the future of the piling up of nuclear waste. It will be irradiating for generations and generations. I once talked about Kosygin about it. In my country we did not know where to put our nuclear waste. I asked Kosygin what he did with it —the astonishing response was— well that's not a problem we just put it onto the surface of the earth beside the nuclear reactor. I haven't any doubt as yet that they are still doing that. They have always been rather careless about nuclear energy and that's why Chernobyl happened. So I would like to draw the attention of policy makers and our successors to that problem. They cannot solve it on a national basis. It may be that countries with big expanses of wasteland such as Siberia or the North West Territories of Canada or even USA may be able to put it somewhere on the surface of the earth for some time to come. The rest of the countries have no such possibilities and cannot solve the problem on a national, sovereign basis. It may become solvable on the basis of international cooperation, I do not know. The whole effort of this group here is to educate our successors. I said yesterday jokingly that we were fully satisfied that the world was run better in our day than today — I don't believe this was true. But I still do believe that the world is not being run adequately today. The proposals we make to our successors ought to be made in a way that they can read it and understand it and read it out to third parties. This is why I ask for us to be concrete and to give examples rather than talking in the abstract way.