

# **Human Rights: Pathway to Peace**

**Address by Hon. Douglas Roche, O.C.**

**Human Rights Day Anniversary Meeting**

**December 11, 2013, Edmonton**

The world is moving to a more peaceful state. Looking at the headlines of the day, that might seem wishful thinking. But it is true. More people than at any time in history are able to pursue, as the Universal Declaration of Human Rights puts it, their “right to life, liberty and security of person.” I am not saying that we are living in harmony, that violence is ended, that suffering is eliminated. **I am saying that more people are freed from the physical acts of warfare than ever before.** We have not arrived at a destination called “peace,” but our journey toward that destination is picking up speed. Recognizing the journey we are on gives us hope for a future of more peaceful conditions.

That journey began with the adoption in 1948 of the Universal Declaration, a seminal moment in the history of the world. It has led to whole new dimensions of how human beings

treat one another at the very moment when, through globalization, we are learning of the common ground we all walk on.

There are many ramifications of the impact of the Declaration. Here I wish to treat of how the Declaration has immensely strengthened the processes of peace. The core of my presentation is this: **As a result of the developing implementation of human rights, a golden moment in the human journey has arrived making world peace no longer a dream but a realistic prospect.** Huge numbers of people are day-by-day building new institutions for peace and human security that will affect all humanity. Even places like Rwanda, Bosnia and Cambodia, which experienced terrible atrocities, are finding peace. The media miss this important story because they constantly focus on selected violence.

We agonize over the 100,000 deaths so far in the Syrian conflict and criticize the decades-long Israel-Palestine impasse. Zones of conflict and the seeming inability of the international community to bring combatants everywhere to the peace table preoccupy us. But we must not lose sight that the world as a whole – huge areas of Africa, Asia and Latin America -- is entering the most hopeful state of peace in human history. There is no better example of how the world is moving from war to peace than Europe, which suffered through two World Wars in the 20<sup>th</sup>

century and now basks in the glow of the 2012 Nobel Peace Prize to the European Union.

### **Humanity: A Higher State of Existence**

The relationship between human rights and peace can be seen by examining the effort now under way at the UN to adopt a declaration stating that all individuals have the right to live in peace so that they can develop fully all their capacities, physical, intellectual, moral and spiritual, without being the target of violence. The end result of such thinking could well be the outlawing of war. While this would move humanity to a higher state of existence, the idea is not welcomed by those who are convinced that peace comes only through the flexing of military muscle. Arms-makers definitely reject the thought.

The right to peace is not a new idea. In fact, on November 12, 1984, the UN General Assembly adopted a Declaration on the Right of Peoples to Peace, which affirmed, “the peoples of our planet have a sacred right to peace.” The declaration said that this right “constitutes a fundamental obligation of each state,” and the exercise of this right demands “the elimination of the threat of war,” particularly nuclear war. Although the vote was 92 in favour and none opposed, there were 34 abstentions, and the declaration, absent any strategy for implementation, went on the shelf. The

wars in Iraq (the first one), Somalia, Yugoslavia, Rwanda and elsewhere left a sense that the international community had taken a wrong turn after the end of the Cold War and was missing a golden opportunity to build a better foundation for peace.

In 1997, Federico Mayor, the Director-General of the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO), presented a new elaboration with two strategies: first, immediate action on urgent issues such as poverty, environmental destruction, and international justice through strengthening the UN system; and second, a massive education campaign focused on youth and designed to foster an understanding and tolerance of other cultures. The Norwegian Institute of Human Rights followed up with a new draft outlining peace as a human right, peace as a duty, and the development of peace through programs promoting a culture of peace. The right to peace came into better focus as a global ethic of non-violence and reverence for life through identifying the roots of global problems and addressing conflicts early.

A remarkable debate then took place at UNESCO's general conference in 1997. One European country after another either attacked or expressed reservations about the right to peace. Countries from the South struck back, accusing the North of wanting to protect their arms industries. Paraguay jabbed at the

North: “Perhaps peace is a greater concern in the South where scarce resources are being diverted to war.” Seeing that prospects for a consensus were hopeless, Mayor pulled back. During the next two years, the debate shifted to a somewhat less contentious topic, a culture of peace, which is not seen as a “right,” but an “approach” to peace that seeks to transform the cultural tendencies toward war and violence into a culture where dialogue, respect, and fairness govern social relations. In this way, violence can be prevented through a more tolerant common global ethic. Mayor formulated a Declaration and Programme of Action on a Culture of Peace, and rounds of debate at UNESCO followed. At one point, the US delegate, probably unwittingly, put his finger precisely on why a human right to peace is needed: “Peace should not be elevated to the category of a human right, otherwise, it will be very difficult to start a war.”

While certainly more digestible than the right to peace, a culture of peace should not be seen as an anodyne substitute. For, if society became less bellicose and more supportive of even elementary social justice in a world of intense competition over resources, recourse to war would decline as the years pass. Codification of the right to peace might then be more easily obtained.

A culture of peace is not just a collection of amorphous paeans to harmony on a good day. It is rooted in a new understanding that human beings are not genetically programmed for war. There is no inherent biological component of our nature that produces violence. This was the conclusion of the Seville Statement on Violence drafted in 1986 by 20 leading biological and social scientists under the auspices of the International Society for Research on Aggression. After examining arguments based on evolution, genetics, animal behavior, brain research, and social psychology, the scientists drew the conclusion that biology does not predestine us to war and violence. “We conclude that biology does not condemn humanity to war, and that humanity can be freed from the bondage of biological pessimism.” War, the scientists said, is a product of culture.

Throughout the 20<sup>th</sup> century, wars were the first choice of most governments in dealing with conflict. It seemed “natural” to go to war against a perceived evil. But that does not mean that humanity cannot get out of the sociological trap of the culture of war. There is no denying the presence of evil in the world, which all too often manifests itself in violence. But war in response to violence is no longer the only option. **The point here is that humanity has achieved a level in its maturation where aggression can be controlled and dealt with by new**

**mechanisms, such as the International Criminal Court and internationally-sponsored peace-keeping operations.** Humanity is slowly climbing out of the pitiless hole of warfare that has claimed so many lives. We now know that it is possible to put war behind us, even if political practitioners are not yet ready to dismantle the war machinery.

Using the Seville Statement as a guide, UNESCO outlined a culture of peace embracing a set of ethical and aesthetic values, habits, customs, attitudes toward others, forms of behaviour, and ways of life that would reject violence and respect the life, dignity and human rights of all individuals. In a culture of peace, the old enemy images of the culture of war would give way to understanding, tolerance and solidarity; democratic participation would replace authoritarian governance; sustainable economic and social development would replace exploitation of the weak and of the environment.

This work led to the UN General Assembly's adoption, September 13, 1999, of a Declaration and Programme of Action on a Culture of Peace, regarded at the time as the most comprehensive program for peace ever taken up by the UN. It set out a route to ending violence through education, dialogue and cooperation, commitment to peaceful settlement of conflicts, promotion of the right to development, equal rights and opportunities for women

and men, freedom of expression, opinion, and information. A group of Nobel Peace Laureates drew up guidelines, which were translated into more than 50 languages: respect all life, reject violence, share with others, listen to understand, preserve the planet, rediscover solidarity. Programs and petitions were organized by 180 international organizations around the world to mark the International Year for the Culture of Peace in 2000. An International Decade for a Culture of Peace and Non-Violence for the Children of the World was designated for 2001-10. Then 9/11 struck.

Some analysts have written that the terrorist attacks on the World Trade Center and the Pentagon were the real opening of the 21<sup>st</sup> century and that the “war on terror” defines how we will live as the century progresses. I disagree. It is true that a sense of fear pervaded the general populace and security systems upended to head off future attacks. There will always be individuals willing to give their lives to attack an enemy. But terrorism is an aberration, not a system of change in people’s lives and attitudes toward one another. There are not civil society groups by the thousands coalescing around terrorism, rather there are civil society groups by the tens of thousands implementing at ground level, in one way or another, the values of a culture of peace. This huge and often unsung movement, which rejects war, provides a transformative

moment for humanity. It is still overshadowed by the immense news coverage the media gives the existing intra-state wars and other forms of strife. The movement to a culture of peace, however “soft” it may appear on the surface compared to the “hard” decisions of warfare still lingering in the militarists’ offices, is the real power of the 21<sup>st</sup> century. The momentum of history, buttressed by new life-enhancing technologies, is on the side of the culture of peace.

We should support the efforts now under way at the UN Human Rights Council to have the General Assembly adopt in 2014 or 2015 a new Declaration on the Right to Peace. It is somewhat surprising that, just when human rights in their many manifestations have become lodged in most governments’ consciousness, the idea that I, and every other human being, have a right to be free from the ravages of war is so controversial – at least among the policy-makers in the West.

The road ahead to agreement on a new declaration, even if shorn of its most controversial points, will be a rocky one. But that is what the exercise of diplomacy is for. The international community must build on the existing consensus that human rights, peace and development are interdependent and mutually reinforcing, and that any efforts to solidify the peace process should be guided by the UN Charter in addition to a vast

jurisprudence inspired by international law. In applying the Charter, however, the problems mount.

Article 2(4) of the Charter says: “All Members shall refrain in their international relations from the threat or use of force against the territorial integrity or political independence of any state...” The opponents of codifying peace say that’s enough to ensure a peaceful atmosphere. But, of course, it isn’t because it does not constrain corrupt regimes from warring on their own people.

The proponents of a right to peace further argue that the flagrant mis-use of Article 51 is an additional reason for new action. Article 51 says: “Nothing in the present Charter shall impair the inherent right of individual or collective self-defence if an armed attack occurs against a Member of the United Nations, until the Security Council has taken measures necessary to maintain international peace and security...” The US used Article 51 in its pre-emptive attack on Iraq, claiming that it was acting in self-defence against Iraq’s suspected weapons of mass destruction (a suspicion later proved fallacious). So it seems that, just as the Charter is deficient in not banning nuclear weapons (which were not invented when the Charter was written), the Charter by itself cannot fully resolve the claimed inherent right to peace.

A favourable resolution may be obtained by putting greater reliance on **Article 28 of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights: “Everyone is entitled to a social and international order in which the rights and freedoms set forth in this Declaration can be fully realized.”** When this article is viewed in the context of the values of non-violence contained in the culture of peace documents, a more positive environment for discourse is produced. The debate can then build on the agreement already reached by world leaders who, at the 2005 summit marking the 60<sup>th</sup> anniversary of the UN, said: “We...reaffirm our commitment to work towards a security consensus based on the recognition that many threats are interlinked, that development, peace, security and humans rights are mutually reinforcing...and that all states need an effective and efficient collective security system pursuant to the purposes and principles of the Charter.”

The proponents of a right to peace, however, don't want generalities, at least they want the declaration to pronounce on specifics, such as the immediate elimination of nuclear weapons. But these specific demands are still being debated in a range of other fora. By trying to codify the right to peace at a very early stage in the budding culture of peace, the proponents run the risk of deepening divisions in the international community. Still, they are not wrong to press their case now. The strategy of timing is a

judgment call. If people who want peace – a defined peace – do not speak up, the militarists will continue to dominate the public debates. **We must find the right course and speed of action to balance the urgent need for the world community to come together in a common understanding of what needs to be done to achieve peace with the orderly construction of the legal mechanisms to guarantee it.**

We may not have reached sufficient maturity of civilization to enforce the right to peace. Governments, at least some of them, are still too strong and are able to overcome the wishes of those who have turned against war. But this situation will not prevail forever. It will give way to those who demand the right to peace, just as the forces of slavery, colonialism and apartheid gave way when the opposition became strong enough. That is why developing the elements of a culture of peace – education, sustainable development, respect for all human rights, equality between men and women, democratic participation, understanding and tolerance, free flow of information, and human security for all -- is so important.

A culture of peace will not only make the world a more human place, it will inexorably lead to the acquisition of the right to peace. A system of global governance for the common good of

humanity must be our goal. Future generations, when they have tasted the fruit of a culture of peace, will recognize almost intuitively that peace is their right. They will demand it. Our role, in setting the 21st century agenda, is to nourish the seeds of peace so that the blossom appears.