



Sławomir REDO

Senior Adviser

Academic Council on the United Nations System

Vienna, Austria



International Leadership Conference

Seoul, The Republic of Korea, 18-22 February 2018

Statement

Peace and Sustainable Development Goal 16



Dr hab. Slawomir Redo, Senior Adviser, Academic Council on the United Nations System

ACUNS Liaison Office, Vienna, Austria

Peace and Sustainable Development Goal 16

Statement at the International Leadership Conference

Universal Peace Federation, Seoul, The Republic of Korea, 18-22 February 2018

Check against delivery

Madame Chair,

Excellencies,

Distinguished Participants,

Ladies and Gentlemen,

A few minutes for stating my case on religion and crime gives me no chance to speak about it exhaustively and comprehensively. The areas that have been covered over these couple of days has been extensive. Luckily, I should limit myself to reflections on the “benefits and outcomes of the International Leadership Conference”, as well as on the “recommendations” for the ongoing work of the Universal Peace Federation, so my case to make is a little bit easier.

As a social scientist and criminologist, member of the Academic Council on the United Nations System, I see many benefits of this interparliamentary/interreligious conference of international leaders. Among them, is that this conference has clearly demonstrated its relevance to the United Nations’ major objective in its Charter: to save the succeeding generations from the scourge of wars.

Time and over again through this hall resounded one common message “Do not do to others as you would have them do unto you” which is not only a nearly universal canon in world religions and philosophies, but also written on the walls of the United Nations.

As an academic I will now go further and reflect on the United Nations’ relevance of this International Leadership Conference, as a retired member of UN staff whose last Chief was His Excellency Ban Ki-moon.

Before I come back to this eminent personality, I would like to refresh your memory concerning the pre-Second and First World War times, indeed when global wars were not thought of even in the dreams of most spearheading architects of governance, like, for example, Italian Niccolo Machiavelli – the father of modern political science who lived in Florence at the turn of XV/XVIth century and published in 1513 his renowned book “*The Prince*”, and like Baron Charles Luis de Montesquieu of France, another modern political scientists and lawyer who in 1750 published his famous book “*The Spirit of Laws*”. At this International Leadership Conference I do not have to say anything about the contents of these two books, save only recalling that “Machiavellism” has become the symbol of cunning conservative governance, while Montesquieu has been heralded for progressive humanistic good/benevolent governance, like that, for example, of Confucius, and that of the United Nations.

Universal Peace Federation
Seoul, The Republic of Korea, 18-22 February 2018

Ladies and Gentlemen, I came across one book about both Machiavelli and Montesquieu entitled “*The Dialogue in Hell between Machiavelli and Montesquieu*” by the French attorney-at-law Maurice Joly¹, first published in France in 1864 and translated into English in 2002.

Because of the mandate of this conference, I thought it may be opportune to reflect on that dialogue in hell between these two modern political scientists. By all means I do this not in contrast with the “Little Angels” we admired the other day in the Korean parliament, but because this conference gathers parliamentarians, interfaith actors and others who do or may believe, like me, in hell and paradise.

In a series of 26 dialogues “Machiavelli” gradually breaks the arguments of “Montesquieu” on superiority of democracy over tyranny, let alone authoritarian rule. For democracy to successfully establish itself, one needs to re-orchestrate carefully step-by-step several essential political and civil rights, now enshrined in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights. “Machiavelli” gives examples and justifications to pervert and effectively curtail them with regard to judicial independence, legal review, role of parliamentary deputies, senate, the right to assemble, press freedom, foreign critique, scapegoating enemies, softening the regime’s image, etc. “Machiavelli” plainly and clearly guides a reader through them, while showing how to achieve the goal of a constitutional *coup d’etat*. At the end of the last dialogue, exasperated “Montesquieu” gives up and in the following words calls on God: “Eternal God, what have you permitted!”- quite a poignant exclamation relevant to this interparliamentary/interreligious event.

Ladies and Gentlemen, 53 km away from here there is the 38th parallel which for Montesquieu was a climatic demarcation line between freedom and the rest of the world. According to him, because of prohibitive temperatures – inclement weather, every country below the 38th parallel was doomed to fail in governance. By contrast, every country above the 38th parallel may be prosperous because climate is more generous for human development and governance. Looking at the Republic of Korea as we see it now, Montesquieu was wrong about the impact of climate on democracy in the South Korea. The evidence speaks for itself.

I am not so sure, though, of the other consequences of Machiavellism so dramatically exclaimed by “Montesquieu” who only in hell learned from “Machiavelli” about the French 1847-1864 political developments, which contravened his idealistic linear vision of progress of democracy in his country. However, as of that time, neither of the two phantomic partakers nor any real actor could have foreseen the First and Second World War that even further complicated our understanding of global developments.

¹ Maurice Joly, *Dialogue in Hell between Machiavelli and Montesquieu or the Politics of Machiavelli in the 19th Century*, by a Contemporary, <http://robscholtemuseum.nl/wp-content/uploads/2016/02/Dialogue-in-Hell-between-Machiavelli-and-Montesquieu.pdf>, transl. by “NOT BORED” (Anonymous). For commentaries on the Joly’s book see, e.g. John S. Waggoner with his own translation and commentary (*The Dialogue in Hell between Machiavelli and Montesquieu. Humanitarian Despotism and the Conditions of Modern Tyranny*, Lexington Books, Lanham-Boulder-New York-Toronto-Oxford 2002). *Wikipedia* holds that Joly has partly plagiarized his book from *Les Mystères du peuple* by Eugene Sue. In 1890, twelve years after Joly’s death, his son shared his father’s book with Matvei Golovinski, a Russian secret police agent and propagandist stationed in Paris, writer of pro-Czarist articles for *Le Figaro*. Then the book has become the source of the most infamous literary anti-Semitic forgery of the *Dialogue’s* ideas in *The Protocols of the Elders of Zion*, https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/The_Dialogue_in_Hell_Between_Machiavelli_and_Montesquieu.

After the Second World War, the United Nations Charter decreed a rather naïve linear vision of progress. Apparently, the San Francisco framers of the Charter were still so shocked by the war's atrocities that they could not step aside and reflect calmly and fully on all the inner workings of development. It is now very clear that the Montesquieu-like paradigm alone is not sufficient to explain away what happened and what is still going on. Moreover, the Charter must be implemented in good faith. Hence the Machiavellian paradigm may not apply. Therefore the implementers must draw their strength from the relevant other political and life philosophies. However, aware what "Machiavelli" would have said that "[i]n statics, the displacement of a fulcrum can change the direction of force; in mechanics, the displacement of a spring can change movement", the UN has now such a "spring" - the 2030 Sustainable Development Agenda. This is an entirely new script adopted by the General Assembly resolution 70/1, "holy" for Member States.

In that resolution "peace" is mentioned more than ten times – a word the Universal Peace Federation has in its name. In Sustainable Development Goal 16, the UN calls to "Promote peaceful and inclusive societies for sustainable development, provide access to justice for all and build effective, accountable and inclusive institutions at all levels". Paradoxically, "family" - another word invoked so often by the ILC has no nominal place in the Agenda. But the fundamental role of family by name is mentioned in another UN declaration of the Fourth World Conference on Women (Beijing, P.R. China, 1995): "Equal rights, opportunities and access to resources, equal sharing of responsibilities for the family by men and women, and a harmonious partnership between them are critical to their well-being and that of their families as well as to the consolidation of democracy" (para. 15). "Family" now permeates indirectly the Agenda, especially when it comes to education, gender and family planning. The formulation of the SDG 16 shows, that "peace" is inextricably linked with "justice". As the Beijing Declaration documents, the most elementary, organic and eventual sense of justice starts with the equality of men and women. Hence "gender mainstreaming" is one of the most powerful civic ideas to advance "peace" through SDG 16.

One of the reasons for the lack of the word "family" throughout the Agenda may be the same as for the lack of "dignity" pillar in its preambular part, earlier planned by the Agenda's drafters. Namely, both "family" and "dignity" are not defined in other UN legal instruments. In fact, regarding "dignity", that is inherent to humans, this was done on purpose, to avoid confusion what this word and value means in different legal cultures.

And yet, especially in the Global North countries, home ceases to be the bedrock of civic education. There are too few full-family households (couples with a child/ren) to support an intergenerational transmission of civic and religious values that yield large pro-social outcomes. For example, according to *Eurostat*, in 2016, in Sweden, over 50 % of its households were made up of one person – that's probably one of the highest numbers in the world. Somewhat less dramatic number of households - over 40 % (in a descending order) were in Lithuania, Denmark, Finland, and Germany. This means that still in 60 % of households there were at least two adult people living together. The situation is much better in Estonia, the Netherlands, Austria, France, the United Kingdom, Greece and the Czech Republic where 70% of households had two people and in Spain, Poland, Slovakia and Portugal with over 80%. In general, in the EU the most common type of household was composed of one person (33% of the total number of households), followed by households consisting of couples without children (25%) and couples with children (20%). Exactly 4% of households were made up of single

adults with children. The remaining 18% consisted of other types of households with or without children.

The one-person household average for the EU is pretty high, in comparison with 15% for the world. Outside the EU, the rates of one-person households range between Japan (32%), the United States (28%), Canada (28%), The Republic of Korea (27%), Australia (24%) and New Zealand (24%), while in Russia only 19%. The Japan/Russia average suggests that in the Global North countries there are, roughly, 25% of one-person households, while the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development informs that there are some 50% households with childless couples in almost all OECD countries. In sum, the Global South countries have lower proportions of one-person households than in the Global North countries. Some of the lowest rates are below 10% in India, Indonesia, Iran, Mexico, Pakistan, the Philippines and Vietnam. Other developing countries are closer to the global average of 15% of one-person households. They include China (15%) and Turkey (13%). Several of these countries are source countries of migration.

The above prompts the following recommendation: in the Global North countries civic education in schools and other public institutions must be much more prominent than before, because the “home”, in countries with a decreasing proportion of full-family dwellers, no longer is the place to educate succeeding generations, as it was before the now-experienced demographic depression. For the Global South countries, especially those which become overpopulated, new avenues for civic and interfaith dialogue in the name of sustainable development are needed, include modern progressive education. Breaking away from the self-sustaining cycle of ignorance and poverty cannot be successful without teaching about sustainable development as a civic and religious commitment to Mother Earth and ourselves. As the Beijing Declaration underlines, equality in the family enables harmonious partnership between men and women. It is critical to their well-being, as well as to the consolidation of democracy, now under siege.

Nobody wants in this century the repetition of the world wars of the XXth century. This is why let me recall that H.E. Ban Ki-moon on his visit to Poland was photographed against the background of the barbed wire of the German Nazi death camp Auschwitz. This symbolic photograph speaks for itself.

We should continue interfaith and interparliamentary dialogue to advance the 2030 United Nations Sustainable Developments Goals, which the Universal Peace Federation also itself started in 2015 with its “*Dialogue & Alliance*” issue devoted to “Interreligious Dialogue and the Sustainable Development Goals”. Therefore, I would have one final recommendation: in international parliamentary and interfaith work there should be more attention paid to sensitize educational stakeholders across different legal cultures and religions to war atrocities, among which the Holocaust experience should have an outstanding place in the name of a new global Culture of Lawfulness. That culture should not break away from this extremely mournful experience, but break away from the unhelpful clichés of the past. In their stead, this new global Culture of Lawfulness should fill the emerging vacuum in household education with interregional civic and religious ideas of a new sustainable development paradigm. SDG 16 starts in the bedroom, at home, in the nursery and in the kindergarten.
