

SOLIDARITY AND THE DIALOGUE AMONG CIVILIZATIONS

Ioan Voicu

Assumption University of Thailand

1. FOUNDATIONS

We are witnessing planetary convulsions. An imperfect world order is under the risk of being replaced by a more dangerous and unpredictable global disorder. In a recent address at Harvard University Kofi Annan (the United Nations (UN) Secretary-General) stated *inter alia* that: “We are threatened now by a triple crisis... It challenges us both to live up to our best ideals and our best traditions. What does this crisis consist of? First, a crisis of collective security. Second, a crisis of global solidarity. And third, a crisis of cultural division and distrust.”⁽¹⁾

A realistic analysis of the global situation today would conclude that our perplexing world cannot be safe or secure if the divisions within it are not reduced. Solidarity is a universal concept and connotes protection and security for all. Yet, the world community has not been able to establish a globalization process based on solidarity, which might lead to viable solutions. A strong political impetus for promoting global solidarity is still on the waiting list of priorities.

In a diplomatic approach of these issues in the Ministerial Declaration of the Group of 77 adopted in Sao Paulo on 12 June 2004 on the occasion of the 40th anniversary of the Group it is emphasized: “The main strengths of the Group of 77 have been its unity and solidarity, its vision of fair and equitable multilateral relations, the commitment of its member States to the well being of the peoples of the South as well as their commitment to mutually beneficial co-operation.”⁽²⁾

Developing countries are deeply concerned that multilateralism is in a relative crisis. Sensitive to this reality, the French Minister of Foreign Affairs, Dominique de Villepin, advocated in January 2004 the preservation and promotion of cultural diversity as a stimulus for exchange and dialogue, noting, however, that multilateral instruments

were in something of a crisis and that, therefore, it was important to develop an awareness of solidarity among all nations.⁽³⁾

These examples illustrate the topicality of a vital question: are there solid foundations for promoting global solidarity during a permanent dialogue of civilizations in universal contextuality? We will try to offer a partial answer based essentially on multilateral diplomacy and international law. Why? Because international law is a common baseline for globalization, and central to all efforts to build a safer and more prosperous world. Justice must be placed at the heart of multilateral diplomacy, because it is the essential foundation for security, prosperity and sustainable development.

By definition, diplomacy is the area of peaceful contacts between sovereign states. It may never resort to duress. Its action is mainly performed through permanent dialogue. Sometimes the dialogue is considered synonymous with negotiations dedicated to overcoming contradictions in order to reach mutually acceptable solutions. Arriving at win-win situations is the key to successful negotiations which are both an art and a science. In this field there is a strong recommendation according to which while negotiating, genuine finesse is the truth spoken sometimes with force but always with grace.

Negotiations are flexible and effective means for the peaceful settlement of disputes among states and for the creation of new international norms. As a fundamental practical requirement, all negotiations must be conducted in good faith. States should adhere to the mutually agreed framework, maintain a constructive atmosphere and refrain from any conduct which might undermine the negotiations and their progress. Moreover, they should use their best endeavors to continue to work towards mutually acceptable and just solutions even in the event of an impasse in negotiations.

On all continents there is a calling for a new diplomacy that focuses more on the imperatives deriving from the irreversible process of globalization. The practice of diplomacy must adjust to a new and more demanding environment, paying greater attention to the economic, business, cultural and scientific matters.

Dialogue cannot develop in a vacuum. It is necessary to recognize the value of political, cultural, scientific, academic or other types of links

as favoring factors of significant dialogue. Ambassadors alone or diplomats in general are not able by themselves to generate great transactions, without the strong support of the interested communities both in the sending and in the receiving states. Certainly, diplomats may have an important role as catalysts in obtaining such support, by performing the classical functions of diplomacy: negotiation, information and representation to develop bilateral and multilateral cooperation in all fields of human activity.

Although diplomacy is the art of flexibility and adaptation, there are certain basic rules that have been tested by time and cannot be changed at the whim of passing leaders and circumstances. Diplomacy is not an invention of a particular political system, but is an essential and durable component in overall relations between nations. At the same time, in the present turbulent world diplomacy has a vital contribution to keep alive a flame that forces nations as well as the international community out of indifference to settle global problems facing humankind. How it can be done is a challenging story.

The Preamble to the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO) Constitution (November 1945) declares that since wars begin in the minds of men, it is in the minds of men that the defences of peace must be constructed. The founders of UNESCO believed that the wide diffusion of culture, and the education of humanity for justice, liberty and peace were indispensable to the dignity of man and constituted a sacred duty which all the nations must fulfill in a spirit of mutual assistance and concern.

UNESCO's founders clearly expressed their conviction that a peace based exclusively upon the political and economic arrangements of governments would not be a peace which could secure the unanimous, lasting and sincere support of the peoples of the world, and that the peace must therefore be founded, if it is not to fail, upon the intellectual and moral solidarity of mankind.⁽⁴⁾ Diplomacy is an intellectual and political activity which must find strong inspiration in this truth in order to be able to cope successfully with new and unpredictable challenges of the present century.

It is axiomatic that education is one of the essential foundations of both a culture of peace and a dialogue among civilizations. It advocates

for the respect for universal values common to all civilizations, such as solidarity, tolerance, recognition of human rights and fundamental freedoms for all etc. UNESCO is actively involved not only in the promotion of all of these values but also deploys energetic efforts to anchor them within educational practices and in an individual's behavior with a view to promoting peace and dialogue among civilizations.

The UN Charter does not contain specific provisions dedicated to solidarity. However, the UN as a whole embodies institutionalized solidarity. It is the most representative institution that can address the interests of all. Through this universal, indispensable instrument of human progress, states can serve the supreme value of peace and pursue it in solidarity.

By the UNGA resolution 55/2 of 8 September 2000 the UN Millennium Summit approved by consensus the UN Millennium Declaration. Its first section is entitled *Values and principles*. In a separate long paragraph this programmatic document enumerates certain fundamental values considered to be essential to international relations in the twenty-first century. These include inter alia solidarity and tolerance.

On the value of solidarity, the Millennium Declaration introduces a topical characterization: global challenges must be managed in a way that distributes the costs and burdens fairly in accordance with basic principles of equity and social justice. Those who suffer or who benefit least deserve help from those who benefit most.

At international level, the concept of solidarity has gained some visible prominence. In its most commonly accepted meaning, solidarity expresses itself through assistance given notably in cases of natural or other disasters. Beyond this explanation, it should be noted that solidarity has a strong emotional appeal and is amenable to political leadership. It can be used as a mobilizing force for a number of worthwhile causes. Young people have a particular capacity to experience and practice solidarity, which expresses the joy of giving and the satisfaction of being human with other humans.

The operational message is clear: solidarity must know no race, no hate, no discrimination. In recent documents, the 10 ASEAN members reflected this conception and agreed that their organization should help

hasten the development of a regional identity and solidarity, and pointed out that their political cooperation is aimed chiefly at strengthening solidarity, harmonizing views on political and security issues of common concern, coordinating positions and, wherever necessary, possible and desirable, taking common actions.

Special attention is given by the UN to the value of tolerance. The Millennium Declaration cogently reminds that human beings must respect one another, in all their diversity of belief, culture and language. Differences within and between societies should be neither feared nor repressed, but cherished as a precious asset of humanity. A culture of peace and dialogue among all civilizations should be actively promoted.⁽⁵⁾

In UN conception, tolerance is a keystone of human rights, pluralism and democracy. It stands for openness, dialogue, understanding and respect for others. It is a value that makes peace possible. And without peace, there can be neither progress nor development. Tolerance also means that all people should benefit from economic and social opportunities without discrimination. Exclusion and marginalization can lead to hostility and fanaticism, and are likely to generate intolerance. The promotion of tolerance is thus an important element of the fight against terrorism. It lies at the heart of the noble objective to create a global community built on the shared values of solidarity, social justice and respect for human rights.⁽⁶⁾

2. LESSONS OF A YEAR

It is significant to recall that in 1997 Iran stated: "... we Muslims should rely on two important factors: one, wisdom and reason, and the other, cohesion and solidarity"⁽⁷⁾. The value of tolerance found its reflection in 1998 in an explanatory memorandum submitted by Iran for inscribing an additional item on the agenda of the fifty-third session of the UN General Assembly to designate the year 2001 as the United Nations Year of Dialogue Among Civilizations.⁽⁸⁾

The memorandum emphasizes that dialogue is the essential element and the key to understanding, which opens the gates to progress and prosperity. It is imperative that the international community shows its determination to promote, encourage and facilitate dialogue and

understanding between various cultures and civilizations, thereby promoting peace, tolerance and cooperation. Civilizations have enriched each other through constant interaction, while preserving their respective identities. Diverse civilizational achievements of mankind crystallize cultural pluralism and creative human diversity. Positive and mutually beneficial interaction among civilizations has continued throughout human history despite impediments arising from disputes and wars. The UN, as the center for harmonizing the actions of nations in the attainment of common ends, should have the central role in the promotion of dialogue among civilizations and cultures.

Following an encouraging and large debate, the UN General Assembly proclaimed 2001 as **The Year of Dialogue Among Civilizations**. An important and highly significant part of the process of celebration of this event was the discussion dedicated to it in the plenary of the UN General Assembly in November 2001. From the many ideas and considerations expressed on that occasion we will focus on those dealing specifically with the close correlation between dialogue and solidarity in universal contextuality, the UN being the most legitimate institution embodying universality and the aspirations to global solidarity. We will respect the particularities, vocabulary and nuances of various summarized statements.

While inaugurating the debate, Kofi Annan, stated that if anyone had ever doubted the need for a dialogue among civilizations, the September 11 events made the need for such a dialogue crystal clear. That was why the response of the United Nations must be to bring nations, cultures and civilizations ever closer together through dialogue and cooperation. The dialogue among civilizations is a central pillar of the global response to conflict and violence of every kind, particularly when they are based on bigotry and intolerance. Such a dialogue is based not on the premise that humanity is all the same, or always in agreement, but rather on appreciation of the fact that it represents a diversity of cultures, and that our beliefs reflect that diversity.⁽⁹⁾

The statements dedicated to the event fully illustrate that truth. Wolfgang Schussel, Federal Chancellor of Austria, said that the tragic event of September 11, 2001 underlined the need to think beyond traditional patterns of diplomacy. Faced with an enemy contemptuous of

human values and misusing religion to justify the unjustifiable, it was important to think and act beyond the current efforts to bring the terrorists to justice. It was important to build upon those values a world of tolerance and mutual respect which might bring about peace and security and a genuine human rights culture. In order to reach all segments of society, it was important to put the dialogue on a broader base. In particular, one had to aim for the children, the future. They all — boys and girls alike - needed to be taught **the merits of mutual respect and solidarity**. They must be able to grow up with a profound and respectable understanding of diversity. The efforts must go beyond diplomatic circles and expert meetings and reach out to the hearts and minds of people, particularly young people, all over the world. Using globalization to create a new awareness of togetherness and closeness among people is a real possibility. One of the great advantages of modern information technology is its ability to bridge geographical divides. But it must also bridge the divides of mentality, culture and religion. The process could start with small but concrete steps, moving bottom up rather than top down. One instrument could be cultural dialogue stimulated by the creation of intercultural networks for religious, economic and ecological exchanges. Another tool could be strengthening scientific discourse and organizing forums on perceptions of history.⁽¹⁰⁾

In the opinion of Switzerland, coexistence between different cultures, religions and traditions did not happen on its own, but required constant effort and work. Now, when the world had become what was often called a global village, it was important to realize that what was true within borders was also true on the international level. Standards, values, religions and traditions defined civilizations at the same time creating a collective identity and a sense of belonging to a whole. There is a clear link between the individual and society; hence dialogue among civilizations concerns every human being. However, identity and civilization are not static concepts nor “set in concrete”. Societies emerge, re-emerge and change according to current visions of the world. There are more similarities than differences between various civilizations. One of the priorities to achieve a dialogue among civilizations must therefore be the highlighting of all that humanity and civilizations have in common. The concept of the dialogue is too important to remain a mere concept or

a pious hope. It is vital to use the momentum and ensure that dialogue becomes a reality on the ground.⁽¹¹⁾

At non-governmental level, Hans Küng (Switzerland), Professor of Ecumenical Theology and President of the Foundation for a Global Ethic, said that as a scholar, he had for decades striven to promote world peace through dialogue among civilizations and religion. His group proposed a new paradigm of international relations. The world's religions had rediscovered that their own fundamental ethical teachings supported and deepened some secular ethical values enshrined in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights (1948). At the 1993 Parliament of World Religions at Chicago, more than 200 representatives of all world religions had expressed their consensus on a set of shared ethical values, standards and attitudes, as a basis for a global ethic. The basis for such an ethic was first the principle of humanity: every human being must be treated humanely, or more explicitly: what you do not wish done to yourself, do not do to others. In light of those principles, the Swiss professor called for **a culture of solidarity** and a just economic order; for a culture of tolerance and a life in truthfulness; and for a culture of equal rights and partnership between men and women. The globalization of economy, technology and communication should be supported by a globalization of ethics. While some political analysts had predicted a “clash of civilizations” for the twenty-first century, he shared an alternative vision of hope: the religions and civilizations of the world in a coalition of all people of good will could help to avoid such a clash, provided they realized that there could be no peace among the nations without peace among the religions, no peace among the religions without dialogue among the religions, no dialogue among religions without global ethical standards, no survival of our globe without peace and justice and without a new paradigm on international relations based on global ethics.⁽¹²⁾

An instructive statement on the issue was made by Ambassador John D. Negroponte, United States Permanent Representative to the United Nations, on November 9, 2001. Quite cogently, he started by reminding the sad fact that the indiscriminate brutality of the September 11 terrorist attacks represented the antithesis of all that people would hope to achieve in a dialogue of civilizations. That was neither dialogue, nor was it civilization. A fundamental question asked by the speaker

was: how can we harmonize differing perceptions of the world's glorious diversity, how can we ensure that the savage impulse to negate the very existence of another people is consigned to humanity's past?

In this respect the American diplomat reminded a sad truth. The greater danger confronting us in the world today is not that we speak in different languages, but that we don't always listen in any language. The art of hearing one another, the commitment to respond to what one is told, these are the fundamental dynamics of dialogue. And dialogue - two-way communication - is of supreme importance in attempting to address the vast complexity of civilizations that have evolved over the course of centuries, and, indeed, millennia. For civilization is not static. Civilization is alive; it is the basis upon which dialogue with others is possible. Our civilizations are our voice and meaning; they are our capacity for harmonious exchange; they are our capacity for mutual understanding.⁽¹³⁾

The US message on the issue is realistic. Indeed, religion-based and communitarian conflict clouds the dawn of the 21st century. Some people might believe they can manipulate national and cultural values as if their actions took place behind a wall, but they delude themselves if they think their deeds are not seen and their words not heard. In the present globalizing world, no civilization, no culture, no religion can live in isolation on our planet.

A remarkable fact was the similarity of ideas expressed by the representatives of various cultures. A good example is offered by the statement of Ambassador Shen Guofang, Deputy Permanent Representative of China to the United Nations. The speaker reminded first of all that due to the differences in historical background, geographical conditions and cultural traditions, human civilizations have demonstrated much diversity and dissimilarity through their development. The diversity and dissimilarity have in return made their exchanges and blending an inexorable historical trend as well as a necessity for their self-improvement and continued development. In the history of mankind, there have been circumstances where one civilization would repel and attempt to force one set of values upon others. However, such attempts have all ended up in failure because they are against the historical trend of human development.

History has demonstrated that there is nothing to be worried about the differences and disputes among civilizations. Rather, we should adopt a proper attitude towards them. There are no superior or inferior civilizations in this world. On the contrary, they are equal. The peaceful coexistence and common development of different civilizations can only be achieved through their learning and benefiting from each other on the basis of equality and mutual respect. The Chinese diplomat emphasized that the September 11 terrorist attack on the United States was a barbarous destruction of human lives and a serious threat to international peace and security. It has nothing in common with human civilization. Fighting terrorism is not a conflict among different races, religions or cultures but a fight between justice and evil, civilization and barbarism.⁽¹⁴⁾

Lourdes Arzipe, professor at the University of Mexico and former Assistant Director-General for Culture at UNESCO, said the world was one but that many had not yet found their place in it. Our nature as human beings made us forever look at the world from a specific place, a specific time. And the horizon of our eyes was always transformed into the boundary of “our world”. In this new millennium could it not be possible to extend that horizon to a sphere with no boundaries, an imagination with no barriers, *solidarity with no limits*? In his opinion, it could certainly be aspired to, but the more the basic needs of so many people were not met, the more resentment grew, and the more conflicts would erupt into wars.⁽¹⁵⁾

The Philippines reminded that the UN continued to be the bedrock upon which the dialogue among civilizations should take place. It has the potential to demonstrate how dialogue could bring together, rather than polarize communities. Some had noted that since the September 11 attacks the world faced a more uncertain future. That need not necessarily be true. The temptation for exclusionism and mistrust, however, remains strong. That temptation must be resisted, by working vigorously to heal real and perceived differences. The “us” versus “them” syndrome must be eliminated, as must the stereotyping of peoples and cultures. Drawing from a pool of different cultures and civilizations, the world community is bound together by the urgent need to address its shared burdens — the deprivation and indignity of poverty, the vast pockets of underdevelopment, the degradation of the environment, the existence of

terrorism and conflict and the silent cry of the victims of famine and disease. Now is not the time to falter in working constructively through dialogue. The various peoples of the world may hold different beliefs, and traditions, but they remain part of the same global village.⁽¹⁶⁾

In a joint declaration Philippines-Iran it is emphasized that the two parties commit themselves to initiate the implementation of concrete activities such as conferences, educational exchanges, dissemination of publications and other sources of information, and the strengthening of social, national, and global institutions, with a view towards nurturing a human society that upholds peace, non-violence, solidarity, and development.⁽¹⁷⁾ This commitment is very significant, as the value of solidarity should be assessed in relation with the actual attitude and behavior of those who are, individually and collectively, partners in solidarity. Solidarity is, in practical terms, a firm and persevering determination to commit oneself to the common good. It cannot be reduced to vague promises of support or feelings of compassion. It has a spiritual dimension which must be deeply rooted in a responsible approach to global issues.⁽¹⁸⁾

3. GLOBAL AGENDA

At the end of the general debate, on November 9, 2001 the plenary forum of the United Nations adopted by consensus a resolution entitled **Global Agenda for Dialogue among Civilizations**. The draft resolution was sponsored by 108 countries representing all continents, including Thailand as an initial co-sponsor.

The presentation of the content of the full text of this resolution may prove quite instructive for the item under consideration. Indeed, in the preambular part of its resolution 56/6, the General Assembly reaffirms the purposes and principles embodied in the UN Charter, which are, inter alia, to develop friendly relations among nations based on respect for the principle of equal rights and self-determination of peoples, to take other appropriate measures to strengthen universal peace, and to achieve international cooperation in solving international problems of an economic, social, cultural or humanitarian character, and in promoting

and encouraging respect for human rights and for fundamental freedoms for all without distinction as to race, sex, language or religion.

For the understanding of the general philosophy of the event celebrated in 2001, the resolution contains a remarkable assertion according to which all civilizations celebrate the unity and diversity of humankind and are enriched and have evolved through dialogue with other civilizations and that, despite obstacles of intolerance and aggression, there has been constructive interaction throughout history among various civilizations.

There is also an emphasis that a common humanity unites all civilizations and allows for the celebration of the variegated splendor of the highest attainments of this civilizational diversity, and civilizational achievements constitute the collective heritage of humankind. The operative part of the resolution contains two sections. Section A is composed of 9 articles grouped under the title **A. Objectives, principles and participants.**

Article 1 is a kind of definition and states that “Dialogue among civilizations is a process between and within civilizations, founded on inclusion, and a collective desire to learn, uncover and examine assumptions, unfold shared meaning and core values and integrate multiple perspectives through dialogue.” The notion of civilization refers to a mode of communal existence that expresses a people’s finest qualities and greatest gifts and blessings. Consequently, Article 2 gives more substance to the definition just reproduced and states that “Dialogue among civilizations constitutes a process to attain, inter alia, the following objectives:

- Promotion of inclusion, equity, equality, justice and tolerance in human interactions;
- Enhancement of mutual understanding and respect through interaction among civilizations;
- Mutual enrichment and advancement of knowledge and appreciation of the richness and wisdom found in all civilizations;
- Identification and promotion of common ground among civilizations in order to address common challenges

threatening shared values, universal human rights and achievements of human society in various fields;

- Promotion and protection of all human rights and fundamental freedoms and enrichment of common understanding of human rights;
- Development of a better understanding of common ethical standards and universal human values;
- Enhancement of respect for cultural diversity and cultural heritage.”

Article 3 is dedicated to the presentation of principles of the dialogue among civilizations. It includes the following:

- Faith in fundamental human rights, in the dignity and worth of the human person, in the equal rights of men and women and of nations large and small;
- Fulfilment in good faith of the obligations under the Charter of the United Nations and the Universal Declaration of Human Rights;
- Respect for fundamental principles of justice and international law;
- Recognition of diversified sources of knowledge and cultural diversity as fundamental features of human society and as indispensable and cherished assets for the advancement and material and spiritual welfare of humanity at large;
- Recognition of the right of members of all civilizations to preserve and develop their cultural heritage within their own societies;
- Commitment to inclusion, cooperation and the search for understanding as the mechanisms for the promotion of common values;
- Enhancement of participation by all individuals, peoples and nations in local, national and international decision-making processes.

Article 4 has a great importance from the operational point of view. It demonstrates that the resolution is really action-oriented. It says: “Dialogue among civilizations provides important contributions to progress in the following areas:

- Promotion of confidence-building at local, national, regional and international levels;
- Enhancing mutual understanding and knowledge among different social groups, cultures and civilizations in various areas, including culture, religion, education, information, science and technology;
- Addressing threats to peace and security;
- Promotion and protection of human rights;
- Elaboration of common ethical standards.

Article 5 offers a clear image of the universal contextuality in which the dialogue has to be promoted. It clearly states that participation in dialogue among civilizations shall be global in scope and shall be open to all, including:

- People from all civilizations;
- Scholars, thinkers, intellectuals, writers, scientists, people of arts, culture and media and the youth, who play an instrumental role in initiation and sustainment of dialogue among civilizations;
- Individuals from civil society and representatives of non-governmental organizations, as instrumental partners in promoting dialogue among civilizations.”

As mentioned earlier, the whole resolution is action-oriented and contains a number of pragmatic recommendations arranged as section B entitled **Programme of Action**. The 6 paragraphs of this section are rich by their content and refer inter alia to facilitating and encouraging interaction and exchange among all individuals, including intellectuals, thinkers and artists of various societies and civilizations.⁽¹⁹⁾

In 2005, 191 countries will assess the results of the implementation of this Global Agenda and Programme of Action. This very fact will show that dialogue among civilizations should not be just an expedient measure, but a long-term process. The UN activities in the field must strengthen the interest of the international community in dialogue among civilizations and give a new impetus for such dialogue.

We will consider now some individual approaches to the permanent dialogue among civilizations from different philosophical perspectives.

4. COGENT VIEWS

In a speech delivered in 2003 at the first panel of the Prague International Conference “Europe in the 21st century: a crossroads of civilizations”, the Indian thinker Pran Chopra recalled the fertile interactions between Greece and Rome, between Christian and pre-Christian Europe, between Orthodox and Catholic churches, between Islamic and pre-Islamic North Africa and the Middle East, and between each and all of these forces which have shaped the history of the world. The word culture is used by Pran Chopra in accordance with the conception of a great interpreter of Hinduism, Dr. Sarvapalli Radhakrishnan, who said: “After centuries of existence a little history is born. After centuries of history a little civilization is born. After centuries of civilization a little culture is born.”

Pran Chopra notes there is an apprehension that what ought to be a dialogue among civilizations is not only turning into, or is being turned into a clash between civilizations, but it is threatening to lead us into a **crash of all civilizations**. Wars between countries are becoming wars between peoples, their faiths, their civilizations and societies. These wars are spreading aversion to reconciliation, and because of such aversion all systems of social order, all constructive interactions within and between countries, communities, societies, civilizations are becoming dysfunctional.

When the preachers of one faith quote the founding texts of their faith to claim how tolerant, accommodative, peaceable, benign are the institutions of their gods, their churches, their books, they are not able to carry conviction with the followers of another faith because their professions are contradicted by the practices of the practitioners of their faith. The actions of the fanatics in the ranks of all faiths reduce the professions of the preachers to the level of intentional or unintentional lies. Competition between the fanatics on the two sides follows, and hopes of peaceful co-existence between faiths vanish in clouds of accusations and counter-accusations.

The conclusion formulated by the Indian thinker is very cautious. In his opinion, unless we face up to these questions, we will not be able to figure out whether a “clash of civilizations” is going on, or is in the

offing, or with what motives, if any, was this theory of a clash propounded and propagated, and how it should be countered by those who are not a party to these motivations.⁽²⁰⁾

The speech pronounced by Dr. Abdelouahed Belkeziz, Secretary General of the OIC, at the 31st Islamic Conference of Foreign Ministers in Istanbul on June 14, 2004 is an authoritative presentation of a collective Muslim conception about the dialogue among civilizations, coming from an organization based on solidarity, in conformity with its constitutive act.

We will summarize the relevant ideas with due respect for the terminology used by Dr. Abdelouahed Belkeziz. In his view, the Islamic world today stands unquestionably at a crossroads where it must embark upon a civilizational self-examination. What is meant by that? Dr. Abdelouahed Belkeziz has in mind a systematic and balanced, rational assessment of its present reality aimed at working an internal reform by transforming the negative facets of that reality, renewing its democratic, political, social, and economic institutions, and strengthening its external relations and interaction with the outside world. It has become abundantly clear that the Islamic world cannot remain stuck in a stance of defensive apology for certain positions, nor can it live outside the confines of its own age as a pariah of history. On the contrary, it is duty-bound to be one of the pioneers and shapers of this era by working to command the basic components of autonomous efficiency, competence, and ability to perform on a proactive, competitive basis.

That is an effort where hesitancy and procrastination must have no place. The approach proposed by the Secretary-General of the OIC is quite realistic. In his own words, just a quick glance at the political, economic, informational, technological, ideological, or civilizational position of the Islamic world is sufficient to fill some with an overwhelming feeling of bitterness. Therefore, it is evidently high time for the Islamic world to take a decisive position on democracy.

To succeed in conquering the tools of modernization so as to keep abreast of modern times does not mean that the Islamic world would or should lose its identity and values, nor does reaching these goals imply that it would or should have to follow a reform path fashioned by others

or forcibly imposed on it. The Islamic world of today is in no way wanting for an ideological interpretation of Islam.

What Islamic countries need is an innovative interpretation, not an imitative interpretation, which is an endeavor requiring an act of self-criticism. OIC is considering with UNESCO the initiative of convening an international conference for an interactive, inter-civilizational dialogue, which will be a leap beyond the level of theoretical debates on dialogue to a practical, tangible level that highlights common grounds and rapprochement of views.⁽²¹⁾

The need for dialogue among civilizations is the topic analyzed by the Iranian thinker Mohammad Mehdi Movahedi from a more philosophical perspective. In his opinion Muslim thinkers are in favour of solidarity and seem to share a consensus view that a dialogue with the West is absolutely necessary. The need of the hour is that Islam should learn from the West and then take part in its achievements as part of a global human enterprise. Knowledge should be acquired regardless of its source. A truth is a truth regardless of whether it is discovered by an American, a Chinese, a European or an African. This is in line with Prophet Muhammad's saying, "Seek knowledge even if you have to go to China."⁽²²⁾

For the French philosopher and sociologist Edgar Morin, dialogue is only possible between individuals who recognize each other as subjects with the same dignity and the same rights. That is why he is pessimistic about our era, which he describes as being marked by Manichaeism and a breakdown in understanding.

When we speak of dialogue between civilizations in its ordinary meaning, we think in a simplified way of Western civilization, of Chinese, Islamic, Christian, Iranian, African and so on. Civilizations or cultures do not dialogue. Only individuals can engage in dialogue. There are periods, such as ours, in which very little dialogue is possible. Edgar Morin thinks we are entering a dark period.⁽²³⁾

To prevent entering such a dark period, if we really aspire to an authentic globalization, we should accept that solidarity, as a universal value, is an imperative prerequisite for a globalization with a human face.

However, in practical terms, solidarity will remain a distant ideal if the dialectics of unity in diversity are not accepted. The Asia-Europe Meeting (ASEM) is an original forum of multilateral diplomacy which unifies more than two billion people from different cultures. It specifically advocates “unity in diversity.” The literal presence of this expression in the carefully negotiated ASEM documents is very significant. It is common knowledge that the roots of the phrase are to be found in the ancient Greek and Roman civilization as well as in Taoist and Buddhist teachings. German philosopher Hegel asserted that the diversity of philosophical systems is the progressive evolution of truth. Asian and European diplomacy may find inspiration in that topical idea.

Global and regional cooperation may be efficiently served by a catalytic diplomacy enlightened by values transcending cultural and national differences. During a period of international tension, ASEM documents have the great merit of inviting us to meditate more profoundly about the cogency of unity in diversity.⁽²⁴⁾ As many peoples celebrate their independence from tyranny, the whole international community should stand in solidarity against tyranny everywhere.

5. PERSPECTIVES

A dialogue based on solidarity is a mandatory path to the building of a reconciled world, able to look with serenity to its own future. As indicated by the UN Secretary-General: “A dialogue among civilizations is not only a necessary answer to terrorism - it is in many ways its nemesis”⁽²⁴⁾ and the very presence of the UN is a permanent invitation to dialogue.

All cultures must bear some relationship to freedom and truth. As strongly emphasized by the Holy See, fanaticism and fundamentalism cannot be equated with the search for truth itself. A true dialogue between cultures requires a respect for differences. Much too often, both in history and present times, ethnic and religious differences have been used as a justification for brutal conflict, genocide, and persecution. There have also been problems where one religious group has sought to expel members of another religion from a country, often with threats and actual violence. Authentic culture cannot be built upon the practice of religious

persecution. Such a so-called culture stands diametrically opposed to the human person and will eventually lead to the disintegration of society. Meaningful dialogue among civilizations cannot take place in the absence of religious freedom. The cultures of the world, with all of their rich diversity of gifts, have much to contribute to the building up of a civilization of love. What is required is a mutual respect for differences among cultures - a respect inspired by the desire to uphold the right of all individuals to seek the truth in accord with the dictates of their conscience and in continuity with their cultural heritage.

No authentic dialogue can take place if it fails to respect life. There can be no peace or dialogue among civilizations when this fundamental right is not protected. There have been many examples of generosity, dedication, even heroism in the service of life in our time. Yet the world is still plagued by a number of attacks on life. When the human dignity of the weakest and most vulnerable members of society is not duly recognized, respected and protected, all civilizations suffer.

Yet again, despite these terrible practices and the recent crises, mankind must not be discouraged. The very idea of dialogue presupposes our ability to reason and understand, and especially to change and make anew. The Holy See has full confidence that a true dialogue among civilizations will serve to benefit all.⁽²⁵⁾

That assessment is shared to a great extent by UNESCO. In its view this may well be the time of globalization, but it is also the time of the rediscovery of individual identity. As the discovery of individuality brings the appreciation of uniqueness, globalization also broadens our awareness of dissimilarities. Consequently, the two opposing trends, globalization and diversity, are two faces of the current reality. It is important also for a profound understanding of the relation between authenticity and modernity.

Dialogue may offer a way to look at the UN from a different angle: its universality and its inclusiveness of all diversities may be the fertile forum where a global social contract is successfully consummated. It is in this spirit that a lesser-known document, the **Vilnius Declaration** (2001) envisages the future. The document was circulated at the UN but it is seldom quoted in governmental statements. The probable reason is the predominantly philosophical content of the document. Fortunately, it

is in harmony with the philosophical foundations identified in the basic UN and UNESCO documents on the matter and therefore deserves to be summarized in this presentation.

There is no doubt that civilizations are entities of faith, historical memory, moral imagination and human connection. They contain historically unique and self-asserting cultures, irreplaceable forms of human creativity, and also the intellectual and moral sensibilities of large groups of people. Biodiversity and cultural diversity are closely linked and are instrumental for the ability of humankind to adapt, create and invent.

A topical warning is formulated: simplistic, monologue-based or otherwise politically convenient notions of civilization should not be applied. Contrary to a firm conviction that Western civilization was the only civilization nurtured by dialogue-based individualism, liberty and toleration, scholars have stressed the importance of each civilization and the dialogue among them as an inescapable part of the concept of civilization itself.

In a practical assessment, civilizations appear as symbolic designs within which people raise core questions concerning their being in the world, and also search for key concepts and frames of meaning to interpret themselves and the world around them.

The main conclusions of the Vilnius Declaration are realistic. No civilization can assume or represent complete humanity. The comparative approach therefore brings us to a proper understanding of the complementarity of civilizations. It powerfully stands against bias, demonization of the other and the sense of superiority over other societies and cultures. The complementarity of civilizations would be unthinkable without the constant interplay and exchange of such faculties of human thought and creativity as science, art and philosophy; nor would it be possible without the ethical and spiritual dimension.

A dialogue of multiple, pluralistic and communicating identities would result in a multi-civilizational universe of discourse. No civilization could be demonized, and references to all of them, their intellectual traditions and masterpieces of art would come to the contemporary individual as easily and naturally as references to his or her own civilization.

Finally, the Vilnius Declaration contains a pathetic appeal. All Governments and civil societies are enjoined, as an integrated part of their cultural policies, to take the initiative to further a dialogue among civilizations in such a way that it can become an instrument of transformation, a yardstick for peace and tolerance and a vehicle for diversity and pluralism, especially in culture, with the ultimate aim of furthering the common good.⁽²⁶⁾

Another document adopted in Lichtenstein in 2002 contains a provision reading as follows: “Stress the concept of human co-operation based on mutual respect to strengthen civilizational exchange and solidarity between nations within the respect for the cultural specificities and the political and social options of states and peoples in accordance with the principles of international law.”⁽²⁷⁾

This appeal has a special resonance today. The Turkish Foreign Minister and Deputy Prime Minister Abdullah Gul said on June 14, 2004: “as the Islamic countries, we must take strength from our common heritage which offers a rational and humanistic understanding of the world.” Speaking at the 31st session of Islamic Conference of Foreign Ministers in Istanbul, Gul emphasized: “we meet again at a very crucial time. The Arab-Israeli conflict with the question of Palestine at its core is bleeding hopes away. Iraq has yet to show a genuine sign towards stability. Africa’s problems remain to be solved. Terrorism is expanding its scope and intensifying in ferocity. The sense of security is fast diminishing. The continuing political, social and economic deprivation is bringing greater instability. Those preaching a clash of civilizations are winning more attentive ears. Prejudices, fanaticism and discrimination are everywhere. And, insecurity is now threatening a global economic downturn.”⁽²⁸⁾

WHAT SHOULD BE DONE?

A proposal was advanced by Abdoulay Wade, President of Senegal, to organize a world conference for Islamic-Christian dialogue.⁽²⁹⁾ Senegal is offering to host this event, which has had favorable reactions from religious leaders and heads of state in the G-8 and the Muslim world. A meeting of this sort at the highest level, with messages from the world’s

most influential leaders, would be an exceptional opportunity for the establishment of a new understanding between the followers of the two major monotheistic religions, whose relations have unfortunately become strained.

It is a most topical proposal. Favourable conditions exist for establishing a dialogue among civilizations. Religions can become an important unifying factor in this dialogue. The great potential of universal humanistic ideals must be recognized by all members of the international community, without any exception. This would contribute to the promotion of peace as a supreme value in the third millennium.

The Bangkok Declaration: Global Dialogue and Dynamic Engagement adopted by consensus by UNCTAD X on 19 February 2000 emphasizes that solidarity and a strong sense of moral responsibility must be the guiding light of national and international policy. They are not only ethical imperatives, but also prerequisites for a prosperous, peaceful and secure world based on true partnership.⁽³⁰⁾ The same message was refreshed on July 16, 2004 at the conclusion of the **15th International AIDS Conference** which wound up its week of work in Bangkok with ringing calls from UN officials for solidarity in the battle against the pandemic. The Director-General of the World Health Organization (WHO), Lee Jong-wook, **echoed** this call for action. "I know that voices have been raised, I know that fingers have been pointed, but it is through our solidarity that we will finally defeat this menace," he said.⁽³¹⁾

These are very topical words. We live now during the International Decade for a Culture of Peace and Non-violence for the Children of the World, 2001-2010. On November 5, 2001, the UN General Assembly stated that the objective of the Decade is to further strengthen the global movement for a culture of peace (resolution 56/5). It invited States to expand their activities promoting such a culture. Proclaiming the Decade in 1998 (resolution 53/25 of 10 November), the Assembly invited non-governmental organizations, religious bodies and groups, educational institutions, artists and the media to support the Decade for the benefit of every child of the world.

For that a permanent dialogue is needed. International understanding and consensus do not happen overnight. It takes time to reduce misunderstanding and build trust across the divides caused by

cultural diversity, competing interests and different languages. This is a business for marathon runners, not sprinters. Literature can be helpful in this regard. In 1971, accepting the Nobel Prize in Literature, Pablo Neruda said, "I believe that poetry is an action, ephemeral or solemn, in which there enter as equal partners solitude and solidarity, emotion and action, the nearness to oneself, the nearness to mankind and to the secret manifestations of nature." The message: read the world and recite its hopes and struggles out loud.⁽³²⁾

Values must not be underestimated. On September 12, 2001 all members of the United Nations unanimously adopted a resolution expressing solidarity with the people and Government of the United States of America. Such expressions of universal solidarity represent a rare international opportunity. The United States was the object of an unprecedented global outpouring of support and sympathy. In the epic fight against terrorism, ***solidarity is not an option, but an imperative***. As a fundamental democratic value, it is a decisive prerequisite for a prosperous, peaceful and secure world.

No power or superpower can make tabula rasa of the duty of solidarity as an imperative prerequisite of the irreversible process of globalization. Without solidarity the current and future (improved) world system cannot properly function. The draft of the Constitution of the European Union which emphasizes in an exemplary way the concepts of mutual solidarity and loyal cooperation may serve as a good source of inspiration for promoting some common fundamental values. Building trust and forging solidarity is a vital task. Without trust there are no right answers to fundamental questions.⁽³³⁾ Solidarity may lead to building alliances capable for making the international community better prepared to face unprecedented challenges. It should be emphasized that at crucial times, global solidarity can only be accomplished on the grounds of firmly entrenched and universally recognized values. Solidarity is considered to be the path to peace as well as to development. Peace is inconceivable without dialogue capable to diffuse and finally eliminate mutual distrust. The Holy See had solid reasons to phrase this truth as *Opus Solidaritatis Pax*: Peace is the fruit of solidarity. In practical terms, solidarity provides a new model of the unity of the humankind beyond the bonds of nature and offers a new moral criterion for interpreting the world.⁽³⁴⁾

As a general conclusion we may assert that an authentic dialogue among civilizations must be permanent and pro-active to be a success. It needs a generous humanistic framework at the level of the entire Earth. Indeed, only in universal contextuality, a dialogue among civilizations may be an instrumental process to uphold mutual respect, to promote global understanding and tolerance, and to contribute to building a world of human dignity, genuine solidarity and hope. This might be the only viable survival strategy for our shrinking planet. The call for solidarity must not be considered incantatory or obsolete during the present age of global vulnerability. There is a growing conviction that tomorrow's world cannot be built on the current patterns. Enhancing the value of solidarity today is not clinging to the past; it is working for a better future.

ENDNOTES

¹Commencement address at Harvard University entitled *Three crises and the need for American leadership*, in Cambridge, Massachusetts, on 10 June 2004. The full text of the address of the UN Secretary-General is available at <http://www.un.org/News/press/docs/2004/sgsm6620040610.sgsm6620040610.doc> visited on July 5, 2004. For the most comprehensive collection of studies on solidarity see Kurt Bayertz (editor), *Solidarity*, Kluwer Academic Publishers, Dordrecht/Boston/London, 1999. For a well-documented study on the crisis of security and related aspects see Nicolae Ecobescu: A new phase in fighting terrorism, *Romanian Journal of International Affairs*, vol. VIII, No. 1-2, 2002, pp. 170-198.

²See <http://www.g77.org/40/declaration.htm> visited on July 5, 2004. See also **Andrey Grachev**, *The meeting of civilizations: reflections based on the results of the International Forum 'For Solidarity against Intolerance, for a Dialogue between Cultures'*, UNESCO, January 1996.

³See *The Clash of Civilizations Will Not Take Place. Report from Paris*, Culturelink review, no. 42/April 2004, available at <http://www.culturelink.org/review/42/cl42rpt.html>. On January 30, 2004, the French minister stated: "Today the world demands our attention and commitment. The quest for a new world order, the ongoing construction of Europe, and more active solidarity with the developing countries: we must work together on these tasks. Persistent crises and new threats bursting upon the scene are a reminder of our common duty to work for the general interest." See www.iiea.com/keynotes/20040130-villepin.html visited on July 5, 2004.

⁴The text of the Constitution of UNESCO is available at <http://unesdoc.unesco.org/ulis/index.html> visited on July 5, 2004.

⁵The full text of the UN Millennium Declaration is available at [www.un.org](http://www.un.org/millennium/declaration/2000/ga_55_2000.html) in various sections containing official documents. The Association of Tunisian Parliamentarians organized on 25-26 September 2002 an International Colloquium on Dialogue among Civilizations and International Solidarity. See <http://www.afkaronline.org/colloque/english/introduction.html>

⁶See the text of the message from the UN Secretary-General Kofi Annan on the occasion of the International Day of Tolerance being observed on 16 November. http://www.unescap.org/unis/press/1_44_01.htm

⁷See *The Islamic World and Modern Challenges* at <http://al-islam.org/civilsociety/4.htm>. For a relevant analysis of this issue see Marlene Kurz: Islam and the World Today, in *Prajna Vihara, Journal of Philosophy and Religion*, vol. 4, No.1, January—June 2003, pp. 1-14.

⁸See Doc. A/53/233. Request for Inclusion of Item "Dialogue Among Civilizations". Letter dated 5 October 1998 from the Representative of the Islamic Republic of Iran at www.un.org/documents/ga/docs/53/plenary/a53-233.htm

⁹See the address of the UN Secretary-General available at <http://www.un.org/News/oss/sg/index.shtml> visited on July 5, 2004.

¹⁰The summary of the debates about the dialogue among civilizations is reproduced on the basis of the documentation available at <http://www.unis.unvienna.org/unis/pressrels/2001/ga9952.html> visited on July 6, 2004.

¹¹See note 10. Bucharest hosted on 6-7 June 2000 a Seminar on “The Dialogue among Civilizations.” On that occasion professor Virgil Candea stated inter alia: “No matter how different, civilizations get closer, get acquainted, they value each other and collaborate through the dialogue they have, which reveals common ideals, forms of life and a common love for Truth, for the Good and the Beautiful.” Cf. *Romanian Journal of International Affairs*, vol. VI, No. 3-4, 2000, p. 284. See also Virgil Candea: *The Peace Vocation of the Great Religions, Millennium III*, Issue No. 8-9, 2002.

¹²See note 10. The critical remarks about the clash of civilizations refer essentially to Samuel P. Huntington who wrote in 1993 the second-most-popular article in the history of *Foreign Affairs* under the controversial title “The Clash of Civilizations”. After this article, in 1998, Huntington published *The Clash of Civilizations and the Remaking of World Order* which is a provocative analysis of the state of world politics. Huntington’s thesis is that the post-Cold War world is no longer bipolar but “multipolar” and “multicivilizational”. The centers of gravity in this new world order are various “civilizations”, defined on the basis of religious, cultural and linguistic lines: Western Civilization, Latin American, African, Islamic, Sinic (Chinese), Hindu, Orthodox, Buddhist, Japanese. Huntington argues that this map of civilizations will help us to understand current and future conflicts, which increasingly are “fault-line” conflicts in which states or peoples belonging to different civilizations clash.

¹³See the full text of the statement in USUN PRESS RELEASE # 161 (01) November 9, 2001. http://www.un.int/usa/01_161.htm from which we have reproduced the most important paragraphs.

¹⁴See <http://www.china-un.org/eng/smhwj/2001/t29167.htm> a site at which the full text of the Chinese statement is available.

¹⁵See <http://www.unis.unvienna.org/unis/pressrels/2001/ga9952.html> visited on July 6, 2004.

¹⁶See note 15.

¹⁷Declaration of the Philippines-Iran Bilateral Conference on the Dialogue Among Civilizations held in Makati City, Philippines, from 4 to 6 August 2003 at <http://www.dfa.gov.ph/news/pr/pr2003/aug/makatidec.htm>. See also the materials of the International seminar on Globalization, a Challenge for Peace: Solidarity or Exclusion?, organized in Milan, in October 1999, by the International Jacques Maritain Institute. In a recent interview President Gloria Macapagal-Arroyo stated: “We treasure the virtue of solidarity with others. At the core of solidarity are the virtue of justice and the pursuit of peace. Moreover, our solidarity is not just with fellow Filipinos, no matter what their ideologies. In a shrinking world our

solidarity must have a global dimension.” See <http://www.abs-cbnnews.com/NewsStory.aspx?section=Opinion&OID=54130> visited on July 17, 2004.

¹⁸See the materials dedicated to solidarity at www.um.dk/da/service/menu/English/ visited on July 9, 2004. The participants of the International Conference of Peace and Accord held in Almaty, Kazakhstan, on the 13th February 2003, adopted a declaration in which they stressed the importance of the realization of the principles of freedom, equality, solidarity and tolerance proclaimed in the United Nations Millennium Declaration.

¹⁹The text of the resolution is available at <http://www.un.org/Depts/dhl/resguide/r56.htm> visited on July 7, 2004. See also *Crossing the Divide: Dialogue among Civilizations*. The report of the “Group of Eminent Persons” for the U.N. Dialogue among Civilizations, published by School of Diplomacy and International Relations, Seton Hall University, 2001.

²⁰See Pran Chopra, *Clash, Crash or Dialogue Of Civilisations?* available at www.wpfdc.com/eng/news visited on July 8, 2004. This presentation has the merit of being focused on practice which is the ultimate criterion of truth. On this aspect Asst. Prof. Dr. Warayuth Sriwarakuel cogently pointed out: “Truth is implausible without both knowledge and praxis. In the pursuit of Truth, knowledge without praxis is emptiness, and praxis without knowledge is blindness.” See Editorial note, *Prajna Vihara, Journal of Philosophy and Religion*, vol. 3, No. 1, January-June 2002, p. v.

²¹The **Organization of Islamic Conference** is an association of 56 Islamic states promoting Muslim solidarity in economic, social, and political affairs. The speech of its Secretary-General is available at www.oic-oci.org/ visited on July 10, 2004. See also <http://www.oicistanbul2004.org.tr>

²²See Mohammad Mehdi Movahedi, *The significance extent of, and the need for “Dialogue among Civilizations”* available at <http://www.dialoguecentre.org/magarchive4.html> visited on June 20, 2004. See also note 10 supra.

²³See *Philosopher of complexity*. Interview by Sophie Boukhari available at <http://unesdoc.unesco.org/ulis/index.htm>. Philosopher and sociologist Edgar Morin is presented as one of France’s leading contemporary thinkers. He is also the President of UNESCO European Agency of Culture.

²⁴For the statement of the UN Secretary-General see <http://www.un.org/News/ossg/sg/index.shtml> visited on July 5, 2004.

²⁵For the opinions expressed by the Holy See on the matter see <http://www.holyseemission.org/26>. At UNCTAD XI (Sao Paulo, Brazil, June 13-18, 2004) the Holy See stated inter alia: “Globalization, a priori, is neither good nor bad. It will be what people make of it. No system is an end in itself, and it is necessary to insist that globalization, like any other system, must be at the service of the human person; it must serve solidarity and the common good.” For the full text of the statement see <http://www.zenit.org/english/visualizza.phtml?sid=55740> visited on July 17, 2004.

²⁶For the full text of the Vilnius Declaration see www.unesco.org/dialogue/2001/vilnius/vilnius_declaration.htm visited on June 20, 2004.

²⁷Communique of Liechtenstein (2002) *On Dialogue among Civilizations and Cultures: Comprehension and Mutual Understanding*, document available at <http://www.isesco.org.ma/English/Dialogue/lish.html> visited on June 12, 2004.

²⁸For the statement by Deputy Prime Minister and Minister of Foreign Affairs of the Republic of Turkey, Abdullah Gül, at the Thirty-First Session of the Islamic Conference of Foreign Ministers (Istanbul, 14 June 2004) see <http://www.mfa.gov.tr/> visited on June 20, 2004.

²⁹How the G-8 can make a real difference, *International Herald Tribune*, June 10, 2004.

³⁰The text of the UNCTAD X Bangkok Declaration is available at http://www.unctad.org/sections/about/docs/bangkokdeclaration_en.pdf

³¹The full text of the statement of Lee Jong-wook is available at http://www.who.int/dg/lee/speeches/2004/hivaids_summitbangkok/en/ visited on July 17, 2004. UN Secretary General Kofi Annan made an outspoken attack on a worldwide lack of commitment to fighting Aids. In an exclusive interview with the BBC, he said the fight against terrorism was overshadowing the HIV/Aids epidemic. At a time when millions of dollars are being put into the fight against international terrorism, where, he asked, is the “international solidarity” on Aids. See <http://www.newsdotcom.com/viewtopic.asp?forumid=2&id=224> visited on July 17, 2004.

³²Pablo Neruda, *The Boston Globe*, Tuesday, July 13, 2004. Reprinted in *International Herald Tribune*, July 14, 2004.

³³Thomas L. Friedman, *Only human values can repair civilization*, *The New York Times*, Wednesday, September 11, 2002.

³⁴See <http://lilt.ilstu.edu/jguegu/social.htm> visited on July 17, 2004. Assumption University, Bangkok, July 18, 2004.