

COUNCIL OF 100 LEADERS (WEST-ISLAMIC WORLD DIALOGUE)

Summary of the Discourse Common Values & Shared Concerns

(at the World Economic Forum in Davos on 26 January 2005)

The second dialogue of discourse within the Council took place in furtherance of the quest for better understanding without trying to define each other's narratives. Two separate sessions, focused on 'Balancing Growth and Equity in the Global Economy' and 'Exploring the Limits of Security and Liberty'. The C-100 participants began to explore what basis there is for a worldwide vision for ethical and responsible corporate and social behaviour. Through looking at particular questions it was intended to help identify shared values, reconcile differing values, and thereby help to develop a shared perspective on political and business behaviour that is acceptable and can be honoured by all and which could become a common foundation for action by business, government, media and other leaders worldwide.

Balancing Growth and Equity in the Global Economy

The world is getting both wealthier and less equal. What are the economic, social and political implications of wealth creation when it goes hand in hand with rising inequality? What do our respective cultural and religious traditions have to say about the tradeoffs and choices societies encounter as they seek to achieve both economic efficiency and social protection? How do these teachings apply to the practical realities of doing business? What are the similarities and differences in how Western and Islamic traditions address these everyday dilemmas?

This session set out to engage the religious and philosophical traditions upon questions focused as practical issues for the business and public figures. The aim was to begin to bring out commonalities in moral insight as well as differences across our traditions.

Professor Lou Marinoff (President, American Philosophical Practitioners Association, USA) opened proceedings and suggested that they would rapidly throw into relief some significant philosophical issues. He cited the words of Trotsky that, "You may not be interested in the dialectic but the dialectic is interested in you." And said that the same was true of globalization. We cannot ignore it and we need to understand how it impacts the world. He introduced the panel of notable business leaders and politicians and invited them to speak, not only to the corporeal dimension, but also to the reality that we, as humans, have transcendent ideals to balance. He also introduced the distinguished challengers who were invited to respond to the opening speakers and concluded by posing the challenge what are the values driving and informing growth and equity issues?

Dr. Youssuf Boutros Ghali (Minister of Finance of Egypt): It is typical of WEF meetings that an obscure mechanic of government like myself is introduced by a philosopher! The issue is age old – In my job I deal with the age old corporeal issue exclusively but it gets worse when you move from text book to world at large. In Egypt we have an economy of about 70m people. Currently, in terms of policy, we are on an 'up swing' and growth is good so aspirations are back. So too therefore is this age old question of the tension between equity and growth. The Faster we grow, the greater the inequity. This is a fact of life, but one we can use policy to mitigate. Yet, by intervening you slow the growth process – do I want to soften the inequity to keep everyone in society aboard or can I leave 5–10 % behind in return for high growth rate that will in the end benefit all?

As Minister of Finance I face this all the time – do I redistribute and forego some growth or close my eyes and perhaps my heart? I put this starkly yet I cannot address this all the time or I would be always depressed! Then there is another dichotomy also. With globalization, aspirations increase ever more. If you bring to a poor community electricity, they want cable. If you bring water they want Perrier. Everyone is tuned in with everyone else so expectations increase faster than we can meet them. So, if I redistribute 5% expectations then simply rise and people want more. Thus we face a

moving goal. What do we do? Ultimately the political process gets exhausted. Does lack of happiness come from a lack of resources or from rising expectations? Then we have the question of what is fair? Is it relative or absolute?

Should I follow fads (for cable, Perrier or whatever) or do I stick to a concept of well-being framed 50 years ago? Does it mean a paved road with nothing more or what? The result of these tensions is that we swing between a policy emphasis on growth at some stages and equity at others. We spend all for growth and then our conscience gets challenged and so we slow down and redistribute to low income groups. But all the while globalization moves apace, raising the stakes of what is necessary for our well being. Where is the fixed point to which I can aim? This is my question for you. Where is the fixed point, so that I can find some sort of coherence in my policy choices? What is the value we are trying to inculcate?

Self-reliance – we need to give this to those at bottom of the heap. Many people lack a sense of self reliance... But it is when we plant these values that we plant what will sustain growth. I bring you my problems and I'm sorry about that, but I value your input too.

Debra Dunn (Senior Vice President, Corporate Affairs and Global Citizenship, HP): I speak from the corporate perspective. Let's discuss the role of the corporation in this balance between equity and growth. Milton Friedman said the primary goal for the corporation was to maximise return to shareholders and nothing else. Shareholders can choose if they want to invest in public works and that is their decision. Many companies in the US do this. But HP has from the start taken a somewhat different and broader view. We exist to contribute to community, but we need to make a profit to do this! You need to grow to sustain yourself as a company.

So what is our responsibility in engaging with governments, NGOs and non-profits? This is an important area in which to establish common ground as part of the broader community engaged in accelerating economic development and poverty alleviation.

We look at our context. We operate in 170 countries. We need to bring more populations into the buying group - that helps us to continue growth and it helps them too. A healthy global context is needed for our ongoing success, so we engage with governments and NGOs on redistribution of wealth. Perhaps 10% of the population of the world can buy our products now, so it is in the interests of all of us to increase wealth.

Another question, is the role of government in investing in things that provide equity of access to economic opportunity... and this is a raging debate in US especially after last election (divisive as it was). The 5 richest economies within the US, which include Massachusetts, New York, New Jersey and Illinois also, have the highest state spending of all. They invest in education and infrastructure, Research and Development and Education but have relatively high taxes too. The next four economies, Virginia, Texas, Georgia and North Carolina all came out among those lowest in government involvement and taxation but they are doing well. So, should tax be low and should we look to individuals to reach out to those less fortunate and leave government to provide little by way of safety net? Or should taxes be higher so that the government can do more? What are the proper roles in this balance of governments and corporations? And in what roles are they most effective? Countries with high growth have more to spend on the poor but what about the gap between the rich and poor (that is not just an issue for rich countries) it can be just as pressing in poor countries too?

Jan Petersen (Minister of Foreign Affairs of Norway): I listen to the economic issues and I agree that day to day we have to make tough choices. For example, there are limits to how much you can tax employees... But is more a short term than long term dilemma since with sustained growth you do get a bigger cake. In 1815 the majority of the world's population (90%) were below poverty line, by 1980 it was 30%. Now 20% are in poverty (especially because of the growth in China and India) this is historically speaking rather astonishing, so in the long run perhaps there is less of a dilemma than we first think in the supposed dichotomy between equity and growth.

Nonetheless, I agree that sometimes distribution of the fruits is essential to growth. Good examples are education and social security, so that people can make their own free choices and contribute fully to overall economic growth. Distribution is not related just to the state of development but can be important in poor countries as well. Perhaps we need to begin by asking what does economic growth need. Then the question of how we should distribute the fruits arises? We do not want to achieve growth at any cost: consider the case of the environment. Though protecting the environment can be very costly economically (consider the case of greenhouse gases) yet we all agree in principle that it

must be done. But the change in society is another cost of growth – jobs disappear and people may have to move, and products that generated wealth in the past may disappear and cease to be saleable. Change may challenge power structures and other issues may arise such as the very important one of the place of women in society. How can we get growth if leave out half the workforce and how do we give value to their work when it is not paid?

I must also mention the role of the individual and democracy and participation, the rule of law and human rights. All these elements need to be taken into account in the quest for growth. Has the individual been given the proper role in society is another important question. The Norwegians' ability to just "go and do it" is important in the spirit of self-reliance and self-help. Education and the right to private property are essential to growth and we can see this as an issue in Russia where growth threatened on these points.

Then what about international trade? Are we in the West making it more difficult for some lagging economies? I suggest that we must:

- provide development assistance especially to sub Saharan Africa;
- make the Doha round a success and have free trade around world and open our markets as well;
- give access to work in developed world for of the third world for the money sent home is many times the value of the aid we send (but for many in the developed world this is hard to say at home).

Professor Marinoff: We have heard that disparities are inevitable – and we do live in an innately imperfect world... There is to be dichotomy in this equation. Can we balance them? Utilitarianism, that old enlightenment idea, often creates greatest unhappiness for the smallest number as well as happiness for the most and can lead to infringement of the rights of minorities.

We note in the richest countries in world (such as the US) there are still many who are unhappy (e.g. are rich people who are obese partly driven by spiritual void in their lives?) so what about Aristotle's concept of eudemonia?

Then there was the question of how to balance the role of government and companies. What values can we contribute? We have heard an almost explicit appeal to enlightened self-interest on the part of firms, but when does that fall into naked self interest? We have heard it said that fairness is in itself a matter independent of wealth; equity is a challenge for poor nations as well as rich ones. Perhaps I can draw attention to a different and non-western model, the Confucian model where the individual may have to sacrifice for the group... this contrasts with that of Aristotle who was concerned with individual well being and flourishing. But now we may turn to our challengers...

Dr. Heba Raouf Ezzat (Lecturer, Cairo University, Egypt): I am indebted and yet also angered to be put in this position as a challenger but I will try to be constructive! As a political scientist I am annoyed by economics which treats people as figures... These people are real in a slum or whatever and unless one is in the street we do not see what the effects are in day to day life of economic policies.

My first concern is how can we achieve the basic minimum of happiness even, if not of wealth? What we are talking about is a paradox in capitalism and liberalism as economic doctrine as between capitalism and democracy... The forces of the market do not necessarily deliver political liberalism or democracy - people need to be present and not merely represented!

How can we bring together these two purposes? For example, John Rawls engages this area as a classic liberal.... But at end of day, we have a problem and not just a problem of distribution but also of consumption (equity). We live in a society where people think people can realize themselves through consumption, neglecting the ideals of saving and of what has sometimes been called the protestant work ethic... The growth of the great western economies took many decades and now we are told we can shorten this to twenty years where West took 200 years...

We must not turn people only into consumers but rather into empowered citizens.

These are matters of values and culture. What makes one happy – consumption? The religions say no, one can be happy while not consuming and can stand against the market when it threatens their values. Some boycotted US goods over Iraq and we should discuss this and how market can betray people. When we talk about the 5% that will be left behind we usually think of the bottom but what about the top 5%? Let's make them a little unhappy... as the bottom has suffered so much!

Regarding women, many work at home and need part time jobs which are often less available in the third world. I often argue with some Islamists that it is not a matter of working or not but how to have

many choices and options – people need to be free and many in work are not free in their work but slaves to it. Human beings need time and many lack this, so they have no time to look at happiness and how best to gain it.

Diarmuid Martin (Archbishop of Dublin, Ireland): I will speak of Ireland where in terms of GDP we are in the top four world wide. Yet these are mere figures and when the people recently listened to the news they got a different message. Twice recently our health system broke down and that makes them feel something is wrong. People want growth but also security and for their social needs to be met – they think of children and the elderly who need dignity

What is the opposite of equity? Inequality, inequity or even iniquity perhaps? But for me the opposite is exclusion and people being prevented from realizing capacities, such as:

- a sense of ownership;
- security as a person;
- ability to take control of one's own life.

The driving force should not be the market as a mechanism to allow human creativity to be challenged in an appropriate way. As a Christian, I would say that poverty means inability to realize God's given potential and fighting poverty is to invest in potential. Poor people show initiative by surviving.

How do we achieve equity? It is by enhancing capacity, by attending to rights, health and so forth. The Millennium Development Goals are about people. Growth and equity belong together not growth for economists and equity for ethicists. Growth with equity is more sustainable and re-elects politicians but it also enfranchises people and gives people a voice...The stability of democracy is linked to investment in people. Often we have false growth – such as obesity and military expenditure under the idea of security but which may in fact promote insecurity – military expenditures are at amazingly high levels in some countries.

In a world where everything has its price, and where people get what they pay for, we need “gratuity” and to remember a God who loves for what people are without expecting a return. Total equity will need something more than economics...Survival needs non-economic factors, people need active presence and engagement and it is alarming to hear economists talk even of “pernicious” benevolence....

Professor Lou Marinoff next opened up the subject for general discussion but first made a comment. There is perhaps a benign example of the distinction to be made between quantity and quality and between consumers and producers. Consider the case of Music. It used to be social and involved people in social occasion and bonded people as they got together to perform. But now, through technology we have wired people individually and they are no longer producers but consumers and in ways divisive of social fabric. So a key to globalization's success in diverse cultures may be related not just to the economics, but also to the aesthetics of balancing production and consumption.

Ismail Serageldin (Director, Bibliotheca Alexandrina, Egypt): The reason many of us persist in some dichotomies is how we analyze things. States deplete capital and count it as revenue. National income accounts should include stock measurement not just flow! Growth and equity then become more integrated as sustainability becomes wealth and in such accounting natural and social capital can be taken into account. Again regarding women in society it is very important to note that we do not value unremunerated labour. Again, many assume that the cost of pollution is zero but if we internalize the cost then it is much more constructive.

It is also important to look at how we understand society, take three models:

- The “Mother Teresa model” where society equals caring.
- The “World Bank model” where the society is a set of transactions facing obstacles impeding doing them.
- The “Trotsky model” which is about power over distribution of resources...

In fact, surely, we need elements from all of these models?

In regard to the time needed for growth, the UK doubled its economy in 50 years; China has done so in 8 years so it is possible to attain rapid growth.

Minister Boutros-Ghali: What is the role of developed countries? Norway is among few countries that approaches the suggested UN minimum level of aid, but not only that, it is also making its

market available and allowing their people to buy our products - this is very important... There is a real need for Western economies to open up. The Doha round is really about agriculture and it is central to developing countries. It was launched with much pain after 9/11 when all wanted to show solidarity with victims and as the world came together and agreed to negotiate, but then, at Cancun all collapsed. What sort of trade was it that caused this? It was a situation where 25,000 cotton growers in US had influence versus millions in third world...Is that a fair trade off? I led then the African nations on this – and one delegate said that “my dream in life is to be a European cow because there every cow gets three Euros free....for nothing, just as a subsidy”. This is what opening up markets is about...

It was suggested that people in the US try to fill a spiritual vacuum by eating. What I fear is malnutrition fed by too much religious substance as that can lead to religious extremism. If one can substitute food for a spiritual malaise then what about the obverse?

As for labour migration, for many that is simply a taboo topic as developed countries need the labour but fear immigration.

We are presented with two paradigms in the developed world. The European paradigm of high taxes and high government involvement versus the US model of low taxes and low government intervention. In developing economies we need a middle way.

We have missed one element on equity in our discussions, what about intergenerational equity (e.g. debt or pollution paid for by the children of tomorrow). This should make us aware that equity is not just static.

Regarding capitalism leading to democracy: of course not, democracy is an acquired taste little children think only of the self! It needs acceptance of diversity and institutions... Look at Europe - it took centuries. Democracy is a process markets can help but needs a wider infrastructure than just free markets. Democracy may be the least painful mode of government but it may not be the optimal one.

Debra Dunn: Enlightened self-interest is necessary for the effective functioning of a capitalistic society like the US, where I think preserving enlightened thinking is a real issue and we need to deepen it –this is a critical issue for the long term.

Regarding the question of measurement – we are driven by quarterly reports and use measures to drive employees with bonuses but exactly what we should be measuring is an issue. I so much agree with importance of looking at what governments measure and not just the income statement. Fixating on GDP can be a mistake, some have tried to calculate a gross national happiness figure and look at who comes out top, look at the gross national happiness in Bhutan! The spiritual side of life is fundamental but how do we capture this if we cannot measure it? In relation to what developed countries need to do regarding opening up employment: I see an opening here for outsourcing. Even many professional jobs are being outsourced as we can now move information around the world instantly and that is what professionals need to do their work regardless of where they do it. In HP, we work out very carefully where the most efficient place to get work done is – it creates an opportunity to level the playing field for those countries that need it more. Creating such work also means we can then demand that human rights and other standards be honoured.

Minister Jan Petersen: Regarding Heba Ezzat’s comments, I agree that the main point is the freedom to choose, but what do we mean by that? Social conventions can weigh on individuals and can restrict real freedom. Look at Afghanistan, some courageous women tried to break out from the Taliban but many of the others submitted. Was it a free decision?

Many stereotypes are out there and yet it is possible to be a consumer with deeper thoughts! Though I have to confess in regard to the case of music that was cited, I am an unapologetic and happy music consumer! I spend money on music and could not have attained what this gives me by playing my guitar on my own (for example Wagner).

Sub-Saharan Africa really does need to be a priority and is lagging behind. We need to improve basic standards in hospitals and education. But have underdeveloped countries asked “what does it take to enjoy real economic growth?”. This is a real issue and I think it is right for us to challenge them upon their reforms and institutions, as donors we have a responsibility to do this and if governments wilfully turn away from needed reform we may not be able to help.

Katherine Marshall (Director and Counsellor, World Bank, Washington DC): It is useful to look at issues between poverty and equity. Despite the Millennium Goals, we are NOT on track to meet many of them and we need a complete revitalization. There is quite a consensus on the floor concept for

escaping poverty but much disagreement about how to get there – is development assistance the way to go for example? Moreover, many NGOs point out that the goals are minimal, what about secondary education, since they only refer to primary education? In other words, we have a sense of there being a floor but it begs the issue of equity. Then on the other side, how much is too much? Some have suggested that we should have as a mirror of the poverty line some sort of “greed” line – but you can imagine how hard it is to agree on what that might be.

Is there more in the global consensus? The World Bank Development Report this year is on equity. The consensus is that growth is necessary to poverty alleviation but that the issue of equality of access and the level playing field is important.

Regarding points arising from my past experience of dialogue: in looking at the millennium development goals I would like to ask what stands out for the Islamic world as special issues? Or, is there no common denominator? Is the gender issue a special one?

Even though economists and politicians agree largely that growth is essential, there are large communities who do not agree so this needs to be explored further. It is useful to pull apart areas of economic agreement and disagreement. In our dialogue at the World Bank with the World Council of Churches for example, it took two years to unpack their idea of what they kept calling the “Liberal Model” that they felt the Bank was imposing actually was.

But, we need to recognize that there is much consensus – for example there is broad agreement that an economy cannot run an indefinite deficit. But on trade there is much more debate, as there is also on the optimal role of the state.

Finally, are different economic models possible? Porto Allegre, talks about that, but what are they? We all would like there to be a diversity of models as that would be enriching, we want a diverse world, but how can we identify the different models and how do they jibe with common values?

Dr. Farhan Nizami (Director, Oxford Centre for Islamic Studies, United Kingdom): What are some further questions we might raise? Could we look further at basic issues? We talk about the market as free and highly efficient as a means of determining the price of things, yet religious people look rather to the value of things. How can we do both of these? This leads on to the significance of the distinction between asking what is the purpose of life rather than what are the concerns of life, these differences affect how we approach things.

How do we establish the relative rights of the group and the individual? To what extent are we controlled by anonymous but pervasive forces? The role of women and their freedom to choose are important issues as are those of justice issues about the movements of goods and of people.

Intergenerational inequality is a big issue as is the debt burden. And who regulates debt and who controls the world’s main international institutions?

Inability to realize potential is a great definition of poverty that is really interesting (cf. Archbishop Martin) and it would be good to explore that further.

While it is true that we are not all the same and people are different, it is not acceptable to have an unequal playing field and inequality regarding access and opportunity - that is the real challenge.

Regarding the issues surrounding consumption – what determines your identity: what you own or what you do, or what?

Thomas Pickering (Senior Vice President, International Relations, The Boeing Company, USA): Pure capitalism can use the market to produce maximum efficiency but with little care for justice, so then we look to government as a regulating factor, but can NGOs make a contribution to that regulative role? Government plays a role on the efficiency side, it is the least efficient producer perhaps but it can be a powerful regulator.

Off-shoring has many attractions for many reasons – building markets and so forth. But we have to respect local economies also, as it can dramatically affect local people and communities if they are hit by consequent unemployment, and that can feed into the response of politicians in ways that can inhibit the opening up of economies and global growth so these issues need careful handling.

Regarding values, should we not reflect further on their source? Many may seem obvious. Much of what we talk about has to do with attitudes to human life and how life should be fulfilled which is also informed by a religious background. Most approaches ultimately derive from a religious based

influence over the history of our own thinking. We need to explore this further. This means too that as we look for commonalities, we need to be careful of having too much of a western framework.

Gunner Stalsett (Bishop of the Church of Norway (Lutheran), Norway): Positions are consequent upon a faith. One of our challenges is to bring together traditions. Both political and religious perspectives all relate to the human condition. We often think about figures and not persons and we need to put figures and faces together. For the Christian, incarnation is a statement that God and the human belong together, let us therefore not be pushed into purely economic or political categories.

The Tsunami has had a big effect and the Foreign minister has done much to interpret this to the Norwegians, but they at least have jobs to come back to. But for many out there among those who were effected, they had no jobs to come back to, they have nothing at all....Then again regarding HIV/AIDS, it has been harder to provoke the same universal engagement although the fatality figures are far beyond those of the Tsunami.

We need a revival of values and to bring them to bear on the great issues and have to do this also with the changing face of democracy. In its historic homelands democracy is under decline, but we are also presented with it in new forms elsewhere in networks and in diffuse forms – intercultural and inter-religious and communitarian...

HRH Prince Turki Al Faisal Al Saud: What are the similarities in how Western and Islamic traditions address the key dilemmas? We need to look at this. Regarding globalization – for many Muslims there is much hesitancy or even rejection of the very concept, yet perhaps they forget Islam is a global tradition...

The issue of *zaqat* in Islam has a lot to do with business practice and it should be more studied from the Saudi income 180 Bn it would be 4.5 Bn for the poor. We also need to recall money spent on endowment of schools and roads...All this needs to be recognized as part and parcel of Islamic tradition.

Foreign labour is important in Arabia: 15 Bn a year goes back to home countries and aids development in those countries.

The issue of practical differences between Muslims and non-Muslims is important and its impact on doing business needs to be looked at. For example, many Muslims do not like to pay or receive interest, but the West sees this as not up for debate – now we see Islamic banking develop that will provide an alternative.

Again the important point was mentioned of the way major global economic decisions are made, yet these are decided upon by eight people's countries - this is iniquitous and there should be wider participation.

A General discussion concluded the session in which the following points were made:

A book that is highly relevant to Dr. Boutros Ghali's emphasis upon self-reliance is called *Culture Matters* on some of these issues. It looks at how values and opportunities interact. In increasing equity, small businesses are a major factor and micro enterprise loans can be key. How can you have tax policies that favour risk taking and offer rewards? How can one ease business start-ups? Then again there is the importance of fair laws applied without privilege. What can be done to foster volunteerism? How can we promote these things within religious traditions?

Just as the growth and equity disconnect creates extremism, sometimes extremism can create growth and equity problems: consider for example that problem of the flight of funds. When Islam came into being it responded to needs and this is important, mere ideologies are of limited use. What answers to problems of inequities? We have to address these issues, lest religious extremists come back!

Exploring the Limits of Security and Liberty

Security concerns are leading governments and businesses to make decisions that have the potential to infringe on civil liberties. Does global terrorism mean that the usual safeguards no longer apply? Similarly, events in Iraq, Kosovo, Darfur, and Rwanda among others have stirred debate on the proper balance in the international system between the rights to self-determination and self-defence. What guidance do our religious traditions offer in these respects?

This session set out to show how security considerations increasingly affect the decision-making process and how our various cultural and religious value systems can provide guidance in an increasingly complex world where dialectic between culture and politics lie at the core of the gulf between one side and the other.

Imam Feisal Abdul Rauf (Imam of Masjid al-Farah; Founder and Chief Executive Officer, ASMA Society, USA) opened the proceedings and introduced the contributors and challengers and made short opening remarks.

Surely we are called to be value driven individuals? Religion is always involved in freedom and liberty issues and in framing our values. The anchor of all Abrahamic religions is the two great commandments: To love God with mind, heart and soul and to love our fellow human beings. This defines the human community and the context of the Abrahamic social contract... All religious traditions speak of man's needs in terms of body, mind and soul, yet the question in detailed terms of "how shall we live?" remains perennially in need of answer.

The US has disproved the old Marxist maxim that religion is the opiate of the masses as it is not just the masses that are religious: the rich too need God. What should the role of religion be then in an ideal society? The notion of secular humanism has not been sufficient and this afternoon, we are going to continue our reflections on the theme of common values by looking at issues of state, security and freedom and bring to bear the perspectives of religion.

Mowaffak Al Rubaie (National Security Advisor, Iraq):

First, do not believe the media – despite what they are saying, there is much good news in Iraq...After we got rid of one of the most despotic regimes in the Middle East... we have started a major political process in Iraq. Civil Society and the media enjoy freedom of speech, and on human rights there is no comparison. No matter what you hear and no matter the occasional incidents we have heard about, they are the exception.

In regard to the economy, the average Iraqi is now earning seven times more than before. People feel proud for the first time, but they have paid heavily to get out from tyranny to freedom and the people are prepared to pay more to sustain this freedom. We are building democracy though it is an expensive commodity. We are going through a paradigm shift not only in Iraq but in whole of Middle East.

Take security and human rights: it is easy to say you must uphold human rights but we deal with professional mass killers using sophisticated technology. Sometimes we must resort to a-symmetrical reactions and are tempted to teach others a lesson to protect society... But on every level, security needs not just a security based response but also an economic, religious, social and even tribal and cultural response — and also political. We have to remember there has been much change and not everyone feels they are better off since some people have lost privilege. But overall, the most important underlying factor and the one most overlooked is religion.

Compassion and religion are two major factors. For me, Islam is a product of God available to be used by human beings. Anything else (such as Islam as culture, history or literature) are all human products. This is a problem with Western civilization, where everything has a Judeo-Christian background yet all revolves around the human being. Whereas, in classical Islam, everything is for the sake of Allah and man. Islam too revolves around the human but not *just* the human.

Nonetheless, religion for me should have an advisory rather than supervisory role in the State. State, civil society and religion should not cross. In a sense, I wish the word "secular" did not exist, as it means "godless" in my culture, whereas I see civil society and religion as complimentary in their roles. Religion will always play a major role in morals....

If the Iraqi experiment fails, it will have deep ramifications around the world. The West will say, let's go for the next best option of a strong liberal regime ramming liberalism down people's throats. So we need to look after this experience of emerging democracy within an Islamic context.

Thomas Pickering (Senior Vice President, International Relations, The Boeing Company, USA): The challenging questions ARE challenging! I accept that strong religious teaching in the States is a major source of our guiding principles but I also uphold a sharp separation between religion and the state.

I am a strict constructionist vis-à-vis the use of violence on the part of the state and in regard to its citizens (though I realize this is antithetical to current administration policy) and I feel it will in the long term threaten the state. I doubt the usefulness of torture. I was ambassador in Israel when the Supreme Court there approved excessive violence as justified against a person when information could be got from an individual that could save life, a decision which was later reversed in the light of experience. Abu Ghraib and Guantanamo are episodes causing concern to many in America. Justice has seemed at times a low level of priority. All this raises major accountability issues.

The international community is faced with large problems about war and peace on a regular basis. We find in the Middle East the common origin of our religious beliefs, but it is a region frequently assailed by conflict: Israel, Palestine, Iraq and Iran. My concern in regard to the Arab-Israeli issue is that violence has been a hugely debilitating aspect of the search for peace and has set back the sense of progress. There are now new possibilities, but much help to get the parties involved to move will be needed. The terms for the ultimate peace settlement are now broadly understood among the parties to about eighty or ninety per cent. Crown Prince Abdullah and President Clinton have set a framework that will persist. Normalization of relations between Israel and the Arab states in return for territorial concessions; a solution regarding the Jerusalem issue and the sorting out of the right of return issues, and above all security will all be essential elements. The international community needs to take a role in the Israel-Palestine problem. The shyness of the US government to take its opportunities hitherto has been unfortunate.

In Iraq, the election is a huge challenge and great opportunity. People have been sceptical, yet in El Salvador a series of elections did much to change the situation. Iran is very difficult with a seemingly indivertible heading towards nuclear weapons a potentially serious tragedy. A possibility of a real solution is going to be hard, but all should try.

All these issues involve or threaten violence.

With the current administration however, a new US doctrine saw pre-emptive action become apparent. War is always abhorrent but can be necessary. For a strict constructionist, such as I am, the UN charter is the last word, and the only appropriate justification for violence is therefore self-defence.

But how that is defined is important and it probably was too narrow in being defined in terms of armed attack. 9/11 did show this to be a problem, but this was then used to open a barn door of interpretation. What is the basis for when we can use preventive war? We need to remember that the greatest advocate of preventive intervention was Hitler and no one wants to return to that kind of anarchy. But we do need a tighter definition of self defence in UN article 51. A definition in terms of what represents a clear and present danger rather than someone's imagination about some potential threat.

Second, permitted use of force is at present only permitted upon a positive vote of the Security Council and that is a challenge because of the veto. All the permanent members want the veto unchallenged but I would welcome a rethink. The conundrum was illustrated by the Secretary General when, after Kosovo, the question arose, do we accept strict construction of the charter and say that any intervention even in face of genocide is not permitted? The High Level Panel recommended that somehow an opportunity be created to vote no but without exercising a veto. This idea may seem precious at first, but it actually opens the door for a negative vote without absolutely blocking a resolution. So that, perhaps, in the contexts of genocide, or nuclear weapon proliferation by states, or in state to state aggression, it might be that a permanent member country would not use the veto unless a majority (or at least a grouping sufficiently large to be more than the will of one state) is involved. This would need states not required to abjure the veto in face of high level and defined strategic issues. Some permanent members act on the principle that the Security Council can never be allowed to authorize violence, as it may threaten them eventually. But how these and other issues can be resolved is an increasingly pressing concern.

Gareth Evans (President, International Crisis Group (ICG), Belgium):

In the area of security and liberty the greatest intrusion is the use of military force. It is always ugly and the innocent always suffer. This is therefore one of the most important areas in which to have our moral bearing clear and specifically to know when war is permitted. It is bad that after a hopeful period we are now so far from consensus about use of force. And it is important that we avoid bypassing Security Council. This is now the subject of acute anxiety and that is why Kofi Annan said we are at fork in road in terms of this question.

Regarding prevention, there is always a dilemma in responding to what *might* happen rather than what people have actually done. In the past, this was resolved largely by saying self-defence is permissible where attack is imminent and not just actually happening. But this previous understanding was blown apart in recent times by the argument of Washington that in case of a non-imminent attack, where there is nonetheless real perceived danger, a preventive attack is justified. This is a major sticking point and the High Level Panel of which I was a member for Kofi Annan, has decided that there is a line to be drawn:—Yes, self-defence is permissible in the case of an actual attack or imminent attack preventively where real evidence of immediate threat, but that is the *only* situation, otherwise a state must seek international consent. Otherwise what is to stop any country saying threat and attacking another?

What about protective intervention within a sovereign country, where government lacks either the capacity or the will to stop threats to human life or may even be the perpetrator? In the past, the UN charter was largely silent and the position was understood to be that the internal affairs of a country were matters for sovereign countries themselves. In the 90's many situations were handled badly ranging from Somalia and Rwanda, through Srebrenica and Kosovo down to Darfur now. In terms of an answer to this problem, we have begun to get there but the key is getting to consensus. For this, it is helpful to change the emphasis away from some sort of "right" to intervene, in favour of a "responsibility to protect". This latter context provides a much better basis on which to debate and the High Level Panel has endorsed this. A response to protect the citizen is primarily a matter for the state but where a state is incapable or has abdicated that responsibility, then in an extreme situation, that responsibility might extend to coercive force being used from outside. There is now some consensus but it is not clear it will hold... Many are deeply worried by the use of this sort of argument now that the intervention in Iraq was about protecting the Iraqis (obviously a different argument from one used originally).

Finally there is the issue of the principles governing use of force generally. Here, the High level panel suggested five criteria of legitimacy before the use of force could be endorsed.

- the existence of a serious and credible threat;
- that the primary purpose must be to halt the threat in question;
- that it is truly a last resort after all other available measures have been tried and lesser measures than force must be likely to fail;
- there must be proportionality to the threat;
- the balance of consequences is that it the use of force is likely to do more good than harm.

The background here is just war theory in the Christian tradition, but other traditions while they may not be as explicit are not contrary to these principles. They are principles of common sense, and should appeal and not be at odds with other traditions and it of interest to ask is this true?

Abdullah Zainal Alireza (Minister of State of Saudi Arabia): I am offering a divergent point of view. I see a world changed. The great fear that has been mentioned — that 9/11, horrific as it was, has brought about a change in strategy, putting the U.S. at odds with the rest of the world, be it in Iraq or by not allowing the Palestinian-Israeli question to be acted upon and resolved.

When President Bush talks about freedom what is meant? Freedom to treat of the world and what is predicated on freedom of other people? I think it is fair to turn back some of the Presidents rhetoric: if there is not security in other places then the US will not have freedom inside itself.

In the past the US was a beacon to us in regard to freedom, but now we are rethinking this. When you have Daniel Pipes saying they should re-visit Japanese internment for Muslims in US... what are we to think?

Look at immigration policy in Europe: for example in Holland and in the Conservative party in UK (which may lead there to competition with Blair in the run up to the election about who can be the most stringent). There are many others who would like to emulate the US and its restrictions, all in the name of fighting terror. Are they all to get involved in establishing an ever larger security

apparatus? Sooner or later we will get a totalitarian state and will need the US to intervene to remove them!

To someone like Dr. Gareth Evans, freedom is an article of faith and if thrown out then it will result in a totalitarian state. To us freedom is to be nurtured, we do not have democracy but that is at the end of the road through a process and not an instant result.

Imam Feisal next invited the challengers to respond:

Mustafa Ceric (Grand Mufti of Bosnia, Bosnia and Herzegovina): I come from a small country and I fear to challenge these large countries.... I come directly from Hajj. I will share an experience of some of what I have learned...

In the Qur'an, the 106th surah says, as it were, you Arabs should remember when you were going in summer to the north and in winter south and why all roads lead north-south: Remember these blessings that came upon you and worship God who made you not hungry and made you secure.... I don't know if Roosevelt read this, but he mentioned four freedoms: of speech, religion, want and fear.

We do have freedom of speech and religion, but all communities are challenged by the need for freedom from want and fear. Yet we have people dying not only from starvation but also from overeating...

We cannot explain the Tsunami, but we may ask, is nature nervous of us? In the light of Noah — the Tsunami is a message of some kind surely? We are endangering nature and it is responding... leading to the fear of natural disaster and then from the evil that men do.

My message here, on the day of the 60th anniversary of the liberation of Auschwitz and as a survivor of genocide in Srebrenica is that I am in sympathy... They said of the holocaust 'never again' but with my individual experience of Bosnia (after the time in 1995 were told by UN "lay down your arms and we will protect you" and 10,000 young men were then killed) so I know it is possible it will happen again so I am concerned as all are not speaking about freedom but security.... While again we should all fear poverty and its consequences....

Rabbi David Rosen (International President, World Conference of Religions for Peace, Israel): Objects of security and liberty are not easily defined and one man's liberty may be opposed to another man's security. We have heard of international criteria for justifying violence (And I may add that Maimonides referred to a 6th criterion — as a sort of sub-text on the 5 above where he adds, based on Deuteronomy 20 v.19, that one has to take into consideration the effect of war on the environment.)

Today is an important anniversary, namely of the release of those left in the camps and that should remind us of the limitations of Gareth's criteria. For example, regarding the criterion of imminent threat of attack: Upholding that would have let the holocaust happen without intervention, so such technical criteria are not enough. What about individuals as well as states? What restraints can we impose on them? We need to recognize that the vast majority of perpetrators of violence — especially when such is done in the name of Religion — believe that they are acting in the name of self-defence. It is easy to preach self-defence to the secure, but in my part of the world, for example, we all see ourselves as insecure and vulnerable to another. So we can surely see that the nicely balanced action can be naïve in the face of reality.

Religions provide rationalizations for peoples' actions.... This means that they can be part of the problem. Let us be self-critical here. Within my tradition and community there are those who rationalize the unacceptable such as, for example, pre-emptive strikes or things like targeted assassinations. How then can we play a role in addressing these abuses of religion?

Dr Al Rubaie referred to the argument that there is a dichotomy between a theocentric and anthropocentric worldview and that we betray our religion when we are not theocentric. I would argue that it is only when we are truly anthropocentric that we are true to our religion. Inevitably what we face here is not so much a struggle between religious traditions/cultures, but within them; and all of us here and throughout the civilized world, have a stake in this struggle, which is in fact a battle for the soul of religion. I believe this relates to the essence of what the C-100 is all about.

We have an existential interest and obligation to strengthen the voice and impact of the moderates. We need to engage and promote what Bergson calls dynamic rather than static religion; i.e. religion that is expansive rather than particular.

Because religion is all too often abused, there has been a tendency on the part of those who have pursued a political agenda of reconciliation, to avoid religious institutions and their representatives.

This has been, I believe, a tragic mistake that has actually compounded the problem. Religion is inextricably bound up with human identities and especially in the Middle East. The only way to prevent it from becoming more and more of a problem, is to make it part of the solution.

This, I believe, was part and parcel of the failure of the Peace Process, evident during and in the wake of the Oslo accords. In a simplistic metaphor, one might say that the obvious absence of any identifiable Israeli Jewish or Palestinian Muslim religious figure on the lawn of the White House when the famous handshakes took place in September '93, conveyed an implicit message to the most fervently religious communities amongst both Palestinians and Israelis; namely, that the Peace Process was inimical to their interests, and thus, something to struggle against! Indeed, each of these communities, *mutatis mutandis*, made its significant contribution to the collapse of the process.

It was growing awareness of the need to take Religion seriously in addressing and preventing potential threats that led both Israeli and Palestinian as well as Egyptian political leadership, to support the idea of bringing official leaders and representatives of the three Faiths of the Holy Land together in Alexandria, to produce the historic declaration that condemned violence against innocents in the name of Religion as a desecration of Religion itself; and also called for mutual respect for the religious attachments of the others and to work for peace and reconciliation. Without the psycho-spiritual glue provided by the voice of Religion that is inextricably bound up with local identities, no political peace process will succeed in holding together!

Imam Feisal then drew attention to themes that had come up in the presentations:

- Religion cannot be ignored;
- War is always ugly;
- We should see opportunity in every problem;
- Explore use of religion to solve problems (as an engineer I remember well being taught that often the solution to a technical problem lay in the problem itself);
- Religion should inform but not instruct politics being advisory not supervisory;
- We recalled the lesson from the Jordan dialogue (on religion, secularism and modernity) that the concepts of faith and security in Arabic and to the Muslim mind are all linked;
- The importance of finding a resolution of Palestine-Israeli conflict as it will do the most to address the Muslim-West tensions;
- Religion is important to the democratic process as will be seen in Iraq;
- Secularism heard as anti-religious in Muslim world where secularism is seen as a guarantor of religious freedom;
- And as a final aside, he pointed out that that Islam does have a just war theory....

Further points made in the subsequent discussion included the following:

West-Islamic issues are vital and we need to make sure that our discussions and dialogue have both depth and impact that leads to action. It is important that we all talk about points of difference as well as convergence so that we can address the issues impeding cooperation. We need to think of common values on which to build and how best to express these so that they are applied. We are action oriented but we need to discuss the impact of prevailing religion on people and justice as well growth and equity. We need to find the values that are at work and which we share and want to encourage so that they can be affirmed. The spirit of self-criticism among religious leaders was welcomed together with acknowledgment of breaches of tradition. There is a huge chasm between ethics and the actual practice of our religions, so we need the religious leaders and scholars as part of the discourse. One of our problems in the Middle East is the ignorance about the reality and nature of these problems. The role of women was stressed as needing more attention and it was also urged that the C-100 should be represented and engaged in other related events and meetings such as the one forthcoming soon in Madrid.