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Foreword

At mealtimes, there was no safe table. Within moments of finding a seat, I was surrounded and confounded by conversations I could never have anticipated – hair-raising stories about miners in Turkey and Chile; of torture in the Congo and Guantanamo; of struggles against dams in Brazil and India; of anti-nuclear work in France and Japan; alternative communities in Finland; people power in Stuttgart and heroic women in Palestine and the Balkans – all stories so different from my world of ponderous UN conferences and preposterous corporate techno-fixes. It is disturbing and disorienting. I am used to getting up each morning pretty much persuaded that the fate of the known universe rests on my shoulders. But, every breakfast in Bonn taught me about other universes that I did not even know.

There are times when I have thought these Right Livelihood gatherings a distraction. As much as I could admire other people’s work and wonder at their successes and fortitude – it was not my work – and it was eating into my already overwhelmed agenda.

At our 30th anniversary in Bonn, for the first time (for me), it all kind of came together. Though widely – even wildly – different, we now seem to fit together.

It should not have been such a revelation. I have always cringed, in protest marches, at the chant, “the people united will never be defeated” feeling, in my gut, that the people united will always be defeated – but, the people in their diversity can succeed. The amazing diversity of the Right Livelihood laureates is our strength. Our ability to understand other struggles, see the connections, and support one another across vastly different cultures, geography and experiences, give us a perspective and a potential we need to develop much further.

Accompanying our sometimes discombooberating diversity is our common focus on the periphery. One person’s periphery, of course, can be – in fact, always is – someone else’s heartland. But, here, I mean that many of us tend to work on the periphery of the major powers – with those who have been marginalised by them. For all of us, the periphery is also the edge. We often work in strange territory and we often work at the boundary where different cultures or realities touch. Among the Right Livelihood laureates, I think, we share a kind of peripheral vision that attunes us, especially, to the edges and the perspective of the marginalised. History teaches that the great changes sweep in from the periphery; from marginalised communities – be they indigenous, artistic, intentional or whatever.
If you are marginalised and living on the periphery, pattern recognition is desperately important. We have to be good at picking up the clues about what is happening and what is coming. Certainly, for our work and, for some of us not me, our survival depends on this.

So, in Bonn, we came together from our diversities and our peripheries to use our lifetime-forged pattern recognition skills to learn from one another and, perhaps, to identify the ways ahead.

It’s a cliché, I know, but trying to even discern – much less direct – laureates is like trying to herd cats. We were a breakfast smorgasbord of catalysts and catastrophs, demanding action; predicting destruction; as often cantankerous as we were occasionally comedic. Raul Montenegro taught me that there is biodiversity collapse and cultural erosion with or without climate change, Neshan Gunasekara taught me how to use the World Court, Hans Peter Dürr taught me peace (and physics!), Frankie Lappé brought me hope and Anwar Fazal reminded me that there is always humour … and tomorrow. That is important learning and maybe, even some part of a recipe.

But I would like us to go further. Without detracting from – in fact, building from – our diverse local and global struggles, I wish we could collectively describe the long-term pathways to a better future and the urgent immediate strategies needed to gain strength in the periphery in the turbulent decades that are unavoidably ahead. In May 2012, Heads of State will gather in Rio de Janeiro to mark the 20th anniversary of the Earth Summit of 1992. It is a symbolic moment we can use. 2012 is, more accurately, Stockholm +40 – the 40th anniversary of the 1972 UN Conference that launched intergovernmental work on the environment – or, more honestly, Stockholm syndrome – 40 since so little has been accomplished. More philosophically, 2012 is also silent Spring – 50 because it also marks the 50th anniversary of the publication of Rachel Carson’s groundbreaking book. The agenda proposed for the 2012 summit is not just climate and environment nor even agriculture and economy but it must address the whole state of our world. Civil society and social movements will be involved in the 2012 meeting in large numbers and that may give us our best opportunity to launch a new social agenda addressing patriarchy, peace, poverty, environment, economy, justice and democracy. A half century after Rachel Carson, we need to join the Bolivians in calling for a Charter for the Rights of Mother Earth. It is time for Pachamama and to put an end to Machopapa. On the eve of the 100th anniversary of the beginning of World War I (the “War to End All Wars”), we need to demand the beginning of negotiations to create the Peace to End All Wars. We need to negotiate a new global understanding of the Commons that will turn back the ownership of life and life’s resources including the water, seeds, soils and skies.
This, I know, sounds hopelessly naïve. We are in the midst of multiple crises. But, these crises place us at a moment in history when there will be great changes – and, if not our changes, they will be their changes. Many of us will meet again at the World Social Forum and/or at national and regional forums. Let us continue the conversations we began in Bonn.

*Pat Mooney.*

RLA 1985
1. Introduction

In an essay entitled *The Search for a New Human Story*, Jacob von Uexkull, founder of the Right Livelihood Award and the World Future Council, made a grim observation: that “our modern story, which was supposed to usher in the best of all worlds ("the end of history") is increasingly offering the worst; the end of the material securities of pre-modernity without the immaterial securities of pre-modernity” (2010).

Indeed, the 30th Anniversary Conference of the Right Livelihood Award in Bonn occurred at a time when global leaders and governments are failing humanity and the planet on several fronts. Despite the onset of climate change and a clear indication of its catastrophic potential, states largely remain reluctant to take tough decisions and advocate for the change in lifestyles and consumption required to mitigate its impact. Despite a century of immense suffering caused by war to some of the most vulnerable members of civilian populations, the development of a corpus of international humanitarian and human rights law and the creation of several international courts, egregious human rights violations continue on a daily basis and impunity remains a problem. And finally, despite the efforts of governments and international aid, charity and development agencies, over 2.7 billion people, a large chunk of humanity, struggle in misery living on less than two dollars a day, lacking access to education, health and basic services (UN Millennium Project 2010).

Dag Hammarskjold, the illustrious former Secretary General of the United Nations once famously said that the United Nations was “not created in order to bring us to heaven, but in order to save us from hell”. The laureates of the Right Livelihood Award have gone much further than that. At the conference, we heard how *Survival International* (RLA 1989) has, after a long campaign, won a significant battle against the Government of Botswana which allowed the Bushmen in Botswana to return to their ancestral lands from where they had been evicted from by the government. We heard how the *Basic Principles and Guidelines on the Right to Remedy for Victims of Gross Violations of International Human Rights Law and Serious Violations of International Humanitarian Law*, which *Theo Van Boven* (RLA 1985) had a large role in drafting, was in December 2005 finally adopted by the UN General Assembly (UN GA/RES/60/147 2005). This document unambiguously

3. Hereafter referred to as “the conference”.
and for the first time places an obligation on states to not only provide effective access to justice to those who claim to be victims of a human rights or humanitarian law violation, but also commits them to providing victims with effective remedies, including reparations. **SEKEM (RLA 2003)** revealed to us how, by putting the human being as its top priority, its entrepreneurial and innovative approach led to a generation of SEKEM social entrepreneurs successfully conducting organic farming in the Egyptian desert and improving their lives. There are many more examples of laureates whose “out of the box” solutions have not only prevented and rolled back local and global crises but have also shown the way towards a more peaceful and sustainable future for humankind and our planet.

At an internal conference session themed “BANG – The Big Squeeze – Six Converging Trends and Our Uncommon Future”, **Pat Mooney (RLA 1985)** argued that “we are in an unusual moment, where many crises and opportunities are converging together much faster than in the past”. Throughout the conference, participating laureates clearly underlined both the urgency of the crises facing us and the opportunities that can and must be seized not only to avert global catastrophe, but also to allow us the chance to write our own new human story. Topics discussed ranged from finding ways to halt and reverse the growing commodification of the global commons – water and our cultural and biological diversity – to exploring new possibilities of harnessing universities for social transformation. Laureates shared their experiences in making peace and working towards a just post-conflict reconciliation process to allow the hard-won peace to be sustainable. The conference was also, above all, a platform for laureates to make alliances and strategize to find ways to unite and work together in a way that exponentially increases their collective impact. As **Francisco Whitaker (RLA 2006)** rightly stated at the conference, “we 75 laureates can think we are not important, but society does. Together... we can get the attention from our governments”. The power of collective action should never be underestimated. The ideas and proposals put forward at the conference, if adopted, nurtured, multiplied and accelerated have the real potential to shape a change in course in global policies and practices that our world urgently needs.
2. Reversing the Commodification of the Global Commons

Justice Lionel Murphy’s opinion in the famous “Tasmanian Dam case” of 1983 clearly stated that,

“the preservation of the world’s heritage must not be looked at in isolation but as part of the cooperation between nations which is calculated to achieve intellectual and moral solidarity of mankind... the encouragement of people to think internationally, to regard the culture of their own country as part of world culture, to conceive a physical, spiritual and intellectual world heritage, is important in the endeavor to avoid the destruction of humanity.”

- Commonwealth vs. Tasmania 1983, 57-58

When ratified in 1993, the Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD) made a groundbreaking pronouncement by affirming in its preamble that “the conservation of biological diversity is a common concern of humankind”. This was the first time that international law placed a clear obligation on states to be “responsible for conserving their biological diversity and for using their biological resources in a sustainable manner” (Convention on Biological Diversity 1993, preamble). On 28 July 2010, the UN General Assembly adopted a resolution recognising access to clean water and sanitation as a human right, calling on states and international organisations to provide financial resources, build capacity and transfer technology, particularly to developing countries, in scaling up efforts to provide safe, clean, accessible and affordable drinking water and sanitation for all (UN/GA/64/292).

The realisation that protection and promotion of our biological and cultural diversity is important has unfortunately not prevented it from being threatened by a serious and relentless onslaught of commodification unleashed by the forces of globalisation. The tragedy of the global commons posits that these “public goods” belonging to all humanity will be depleted due to persons prioritising short-term incentives over the common good. This tragedy has transformed from a theoretical construct to a worrying reality. At the conference, we heard about laureates’ battles against the proliferation of Genetically Modified Organisms (GMOs), the growing privatisation of water resources and the battle to preserve the rights and cultural heritage of indigenous people. Laureates made it clear that there was a vast chasm between the promises made by states party to treaties such as the CBD and the implementation of these conventions and resolutions at the ground level.
2.1 Protecting our Biological Diversity

Our Fight Against Commodity of Life

Facilitated by the Seikatsu Club (RLA 1989), this internal workshop saw a discussion on the fight to make the world “GMO-free”, and also touched on the topics of species conservation and food security. Oegwara Taeko, representing the Seikatsu Club, began the session with a brief explanation of the situation in Japan vis-à-vis GMOs. According to them, Japan is a net importer of food, and a good proportion of such imports are GMOs. As no specification or information is placed on food labels, Japanese consumers are using high amounts of maize and soya in their regular diet without even noticing that these are GMOs. Ms. Taeko explained that the Seikatsu Club opposes genetically modified food for three main reasons:

- That they were not subjected to adequate safety testing.
- That they constituted an unacceptable risk to the environment.
- To combat ‘corporate control’ over food.

As a consumer cooperative, Ms. Taeko explained that the Seikatsu Club’s work involves creating awareness about GMOs among consumers and creating a stable market for GMO free crops in Japan. The difficulty the Seikatsu Club faces, according to Ms. Taeko, is competing with low priced GMO products whilst non GMO products remain highly priced. The workshop subsequently discussed the question of how GMO crops are being offered at lower prices when they have higher production costs.

Vandana Shiva (RLA 1993) responded to the debate by stating that although GMO farming indeed has higher input costs – the seedlings being considerably more expensive than the traditional ones - producers in developed countries have strong subsidies provided by their governments. As a result, they can offer lower prices in the final markets and prices are largely assigned by powerful corporations, not necessarily related to production costs.

On the issue of biopiracy, Dr. Shiva said that everything in the world is pirated from one thing or the other, and argued that GMOs always go hand in hand with patenting. According to her, corporations claim that they have invented something, but in reality they have only modified what is in nature. Warning of the strong social implications of this sort of corporatism and the rise of prices of agricultural inputs, Dr. Shiva gave the following example to illustrate the difficulty faced by farmers as a result of corporate behaviour vis-à-vis GMOs:
Since 1997, when Monsanto first entered the Indian market, there have been around 200,000 suicides committed by farmers who were in debt. The introduction of BT cotton in the country has devastated the lives of cotton farmers. BT has brought nothing good in the livelihoods of farmers but is pushing them towards suicide. A study conducted by my team has revealed that 84% of the farmer suicides in Maharashtra state were due to a debt trap caused by cultivating BT cotton. Farmers used to spend a meager amount of 4-10 INR/kilo for cotton seeds but now have to invest nearly 3600 INR/kilo for BT cotton seeds. Monsanto argues that BT cotton needs no pesticides, but the amount of pesticides used for cotton cultivation has doubled in the Maharashtra region after the introduction of the BT variety. Corporate power is also bringing pressure on government to amend a law stating that restoring own seed material by farmers is an illegal activity, something Navadhanya is protesting against. Farmers are in a very difficult position and usually they do not find in the market any choice other than GMOs.

Percy Schmeiser (RLA 2007) corroborated Dr. Shiva’s remarks by sharing his experience dealing with the issue of commodification in Canada. Where earlier a farmer used to cultivate traditional corn for 8US$ per kilo, costs today have spiralled to approximately 50US$ per kilo of corn. Tappio Matlar, representing Finnish Village Action (RLA 1992) commented that the situation was very different in Finland, where GMOs were strictly prohibited and said that the Finnish government only supported organic and biological food cultivation. Mohd. Azmi Abdul Hamid, representing Sahabat Alam Malaysia (RLA 1988) said that third world countries’ desire for good trade relations with superpowers put their nations under high threat of being inundated with GMOs as a result of potential trade agreements coming into effect.

Wrapping up the discussion, workshop participants took note of the following evidence that real change is possible in the battle against global commodification of biological resources:

- That the Seikatsu Club is actively working to offer consumers free alternatives to GMOs and preserve local plant and animal varieties,

- That the Indian state of Andhra Pradesh has challenged Monsanto by putting down input prices and is following pesticide-free farming,

- That the Navdanya network in India, founded by Vandana Shiva, has safeguarded above 9,000 varieties of seeds, protecting biodiversity and traditional knowledge,

- That Finland remains an entirely GMO free country, and

- That, in Canada, Percy and Louise Schmeiser have, in a courageous defence of farmers’ rights, challenged Monsanto’s abuses in court.
BANG – The Big Squeeze – Six Converging Trends and Our Uncommon Future

Gustav-Stresemann-Institut e.V.
15 September 2010

Facilitated by Pat Mooney and Niclas Hällström from the What Next Forum, this workshop aimed to bring to discussion issues raised in Mr. Mooney’s book BANG What Next? Collusion, Convergence or Changes in Course? Mr. Mooney presented six major trends that he argued were coming together at a time of crisis to “squeeze” policymakers down a very narrow and dangerous path. In brief, these trends are:

- The loss of diverse peoples, cultures, plants, animals – even whole ecosystems – is accelerating at the very moment when food, fuel, water and climate pressures show how greatly we need diversity.

- The crisis environment is an opportunity for “shock therapy” to control the world’s biomass and major planetary systems by offering geo-engineering as a relatively cheap and painless solution.

- Governments and industry are pushing a suite of technologies – most notably synthetic biology and nanotechnology – in order to avoid more expensive or unpopular changes.

- These extraordinarily powerful and high-risk technologies are also remarkably accessible and create new threats to national security, democracy and dissent.

- As a means of social control, but also for profit, developments in neurosciences and genomics are challenging not only human reproduction but the very definition of a human being through so-called “human performance enhancement”.

- The speed, scope and scale of change encourages corporatisation, an ever tighter convergence between major governments and industries to maintain control in the midst of crisis.

Mr. Mooney elaborated ‘The Shock’ of the condition of the world today (agricultural erosion, ecosystem collapse, cultural extinction, gender disappearance, and cultural wipeout), ‘The Therapies’ suggested by the large corporations (geopiracy, geo-engineering, nano-technology, and synthetic biology), and “The Payoffs” (massively-destructive individuals, mass monitoring, mass markets and “mass-national” corporations). He also presented his idea of “conventional strategies”: the big players try to convince the society that they could provide a solution, but the consequences are such that they end up reclaiming benefits such as ownership over resources through the control of public sector.
Workshop participants extensively discussed the effects of biotechnology and nanotechnology. The case of the seed industry, where more than 700 companies existed in the 1970s compared to hardly 10 companies controlling more than 70% of the seed trade today, was also discussed. This, the participants felt, highlighted how big companies were able to control and restrict the market and people’s access to biodiversity.

At the end of the workshop, Mr. Mooney told the participating laureates that since “Rio +20 is being taken seriously by governments, we should propose a counter proposition, as governments are tending to accept nanotechnology and other problematic solutions”. “What would be our statement?”, he asked.

After some discussion, the participants, led by Francisco Whitaker, committed themselves to the elaboration of a petition to spur the campaign "Hands off Mother Earth-Stop Geo-engineering – our Home is not a Laboratory". Francisco Whitaker, Tony Clarke (RLA 2005) and Mr. Mooney took the responsibility to draft the petition and they hoped to use the remainder of the conference to get the support and signatures of all the other laureates.

Center for Development Research (ZEF) Event: Sustainable Use of Natural Resources and Environmental Conservation

Center for Development Research (ZEF), Walter-Flex-Str. 3. D-53113 Bonn
17 September 2010, 9:00 a.m. – 5:00 p.m.

The session began with Birsel Lemke (RLA 2000) stressing the importance of standing up and facing governments when they are going towards the wrong direction on environmental issues. Ms. Lemke briefly explained how she had, by drafting a declaration and working on a signature campaign, been able to gain the support of 488 members of parliament to enact a new, environmentally friendly mining law in Turkey. Ms. Lemke concluded her remarks by emphasising the importance of knowing the “enemy” and building an efficient communication strategy to promote environmental issues in the media.

Mohd. Azmi Abdul Hamid, representing Sahabat Alam Malaysia affirmed that the media were very important and called for NGOs to craft an intelligent strategy to deal with them. He also affirmed the importance of holding governments accountable with regard to environmental issues. Vijaya Chauhan, representing Narmada Bachao Andolan (RLA ’91) explained that persons in her organisation worked with the native people of Gujarat to make them aware of the problems that the Narmada Dams project would cause to irrigation and the water supply. She questioned the notion of “development”, and wondered who benefited from this type of development. Lamenting the corruption in the Indian government, Ms. Chauhan also pointed out that the World Bank and certain other companies support the Narmada Dams project.
As the floor was opened for discussion, junior scientists of the Right Livelihood College identified the following ways in which they could support the laureates in their efforts:

- **Experiential Learning** – Scientists can live in the communities where laureates are working to understand the local culture and thereafter involve the community in a participatory manner to obtain inputs to solve problems.

- **Research** – Scientists could assist in developing a theoretical framework for the laureates’ issues. They could also assist the laureates with compiling and simplifying documentary evidence on environmental violations.

- **International Networks** – Scientists can use their networks and the media to publicise the laureates’ issues and campaigns. They can also use the alternative media to create further public awareness.

In addition, junior scientists requested the laureates present to give them a chance to volunteer in their projects, strongly affirming that they considered the laureates to be both role models and a source of inspiration for them.

**IFOAM⁵ – Colabra Cluster Event: Inspirations for Living Change**

Gustav-Stresemann-Institut e.V.
16 September 2010, 9:00 a.m. – 5:30 p.m.

**BACKGROUND**

*Agriculture – Ecology – Diversity – Fairness – Sustainability – Food security – Consumption*

Despite the Millennium Development Goals, which aimed at reducing the hunger in the world by half by 2010, the number of starving people grows. At the same time, the diversity of our seeds diminishes because resources are owned by large corporations focused on the sale of genetically modified seeds. Industrial agriculture – widely acclaimed until recently – depends on huge subsidies to survive. As a consequence, market prices are distorted at the expense of people in the “Third World”. In addition, fertilisers and pesticides are based on finite fossil fuels.

Our planet is on the brink of a gigantic agricultural revolution. As demanded by the World Agricultural Report we need a global transformation towards an ecological, regional and sovereign agriculture. This event will bring together pioneers from all over the world and will present viable solutions and successful new models.

---

⁵ International Federation of Organic Agriculture Movements
DISCUSSION

Around two hundred people gathered at this cluster event to exchange ideas with laureates on the important issues of organic agriculture, food security and the rights of farmers and consumers. Participants stressed the need to build a consensus based on a new paradigm of thinking that places organic agriculture at the centre of world food production systems.

Jakob von Uexkull, founder of the Right Livelihood Award, made an opening statement and set the tone of the cluster event by sharing his vision for the Award – to encourage society to embrace and live change. He explained how he initiated the Right Livelihood Award and urged the participants at the cluster event to spread the word of what is discussed at the event. He stressed that it is not necessary to reinvent the wheel. “Often, we can learn from others how to make it better”, he explained.

Helmy Abouliesh, of the SEKEM group, made a speech where he discussed organic cost-competitiveness. He asked the questions: “Are we in the organic movements able to compete with mainstream food systems? Are we offering cheaper or more expensive alternatives? How will these evolve in the future? Are these only dreams?”

He subsequently explained the history of SEKEM and his father’s dream – to turn the desert green by using organic agriculture and to approach all parts of life and development in a sustainable, holistic and harmonic way.

“When I share my thoughts with business leaders or politicians, they do not take me seriously. They show me examples of how organic farming is too expensive or has too low yields. They do not think that organic farming can be mainstream”, explained Mr. Abouliesh.

He, however, disagreed with their analysis and said that the crux of the matter was how costs were measured. If costs took into account the costs for water, energy, fertilisers, ecosystem services, climate change mitigation and the effects of organic food on the environment and the people who eat them, they would look very different. Arguing that the current models of accounting cannot go on for much longer, Mr. Abouliesh remarked that a change in measuring “costs” would clearly show that organic farming would be much cheaper in reality. Nevertheless, Mr. Abouliesh ended his presentation by stating that organic farming, while good, can still get better as it is still not always sustainable. Mr. Abouliesh said that the limiting factor for organic agriculture is finding experienced people to work in the field and claimed that research, innovation and people were important, moving forward.

Pat Mooney made an intervention where he once again emphasised how advances in technology such as biomass control and synthetic biology do not solve the problems of global hunger.
Frances Moore Lappé (RLA 1987), democracy advocate, world food and hunger expert and founder of the Small Planet Institute, made a presentation on the paradigm shift in food policy. Ms. Lappé said that the reason she wrote her book The Myth of Hunger was to create awareness on food politics and to prove that there was an abundance of food for the poor. The problem, according to her, is its distribution and politics that did not allow poor farmers to be able to afford food in most developing countries. “Hunger is not due to a lack of food but rather the inability of hungry people to gain access to the abundant amounts of food that exists” she explained.

She further elaborated how most of the predictions in her book on hunger came to pass as a result of the current food crisis in several developing countries – food prices are increasingly skyrocketing and the UN Millennium Development Goal on the eradication of hunger might not be attained within the stipulated time.

Percy and Louise Schmeiser made a presentation entitled Genetic Engineering Learning and Strategising for a GMO-Free World. They alleged that Monsanto and other big corporations are mounting a campaign to encourage farmers to denounce their neighbours if they noticed that they are using GMOs without paying royalties. This, they felt, is undermining the social fabric of communities.

The Schmeisers subsequently gave the following example which illustrated how corporations were damaging farming in Canada:

In 2004, our farm was contaminated by a Monsanto rapeseed and we sued the company. First, they offered to repair the damage by removing all the rapeseed plants from our plot, but only if we promised not to sue the company again and not make public anything that had happened. Of course, we refused such conditions and together with our neighbours manually removed the plants. Consequently, we sued Monsanto, a billionaire company, for the 640 dollars that we paid our neighbours for our help. After two years, the company was forced to pay this amount.

“All big corporations are interested in making money; unfortunately, to take a corporation to court is usually very expensive and many farmers do not have the means to do it”, stressed the Schmeisers.

When a person in the audience asked him if it is possible to have a GMO free world, Mr. Schmeiser stated that the following important steps must be taken for this to happen:

• Farmers must have the right to use their seeds.

• Farmers should keep on developing varieties of plants.

• Civil society must increase awareness, in order to reduce support for the use of GMOs.
• The role of science is very important: consequences of GMOs on human health are very uncertain, among other reasons, because there are few studies carried out independent of industry. As a result, scientific research is very often biased.

Also addressing the issue of preserving biodiversity, Melaku Worede (RLA 1989) told participants how the Ethiopian seed back he founded is functioning successfully, with farmers being included as expert partners in all its activities – breeding, selection and in-situ conservation.

Vandana Shiva began her presentation at the cluster event by denouncing today’s oil-based and input-dependent agriculture by proclaiming a grim reality. “Despite the increased use of agro chemicals and the promise of industry to tackle hunger, India has actually doubled its hungry population. There is a paradox in India and the world which is that economic growth and hunger growth are both growing”, she remarked. Dr. Shiva further underlined the point that genetic engineering was not yield-increasing but toxin-increasing. Warning that the continued trend of farmers switching to industrial agriculture would lead to the disappearance of smallholders and the rise of corporations, Dr. Shiva argued that people can and must fight for their rights to choose what they eat, what they grow and for food democracy.

Speaking on the issue of climate change, Dr. Shiva said that while the industry had reacted by looking to find technocratic solutions, farmers all over the world have actually developed climate resistant varieties! Dr. Shiva ended her remarks by emphatically stating that organic agriculture is the future.

Maria Selete, representing the Movimento dos Trabalhadores Rurais sem Terra (MST)*, (RLA 1991) discussed the related issue of illegal land grabbing by landlords and multinational corporations, a threat which she pointed out was becoming ever-present in Brazil. On the issue of organic agriculture, Ms. Selete spoke of MST’s successful organic seed enterprise, the BioNatur Network for Agroecological Seeds, launched in 2007. Despite the challenges faced by her movement, Ms. Selete expressed optimism towards the reform programme being undertaken by the Brazilian government, specifically applauding a recent law which imposes a requirement that purchased government food be produced by small family farmers and settled farmers.

This cluster event was notable in that it concluded with the drafting and signing of the IFOAM Declaration for Living Change†, which, among other things demanded “that agriculture and food security policies of communities, governments, private sector and civil society at local, national, regional and global levels (...) aim for sustainability in development, including ecological diversity, social welfare for all and economic viability of systems.”

6. The Landless Workers’ Movement, based in Brazil.
7. Included as Annex II of this report.
BfN Cluster Event: Stop the Loss of Biodiversity

Federal Agency for Nature Conservation, Konstantinstr. 110, 53179 Bonn
16 September 2010, 10:00 a.m. – 2:00 p.m.

BACKGROUND

Environmental protection - Landscape management - Biodiversity - Endangered Species - Ecosystems

The German Federal Agency for Nature Conservation provides the German Environment Ministry with professional and scientific assistance in all nature conservation and landscape management issues and in international cooperation activities.

International agreements like the Convention on International Trade in Endangered Species (CITES) and the risk assessment of genetically modified seeds are also part of the agency's agenda. This event will unite experts, youths, representatives from politics and Right Livelihood Award laureates from all around the world to discuss how we can counter the destruction of ecosystems and how we can strengthen worldwide efforts to preserve our natural heritage.

DISCUSSION

This event united experts, youths, representatives from politics and Right Livelihood Award laureates to discuss ways to counter the destruction of ecosystems and strengthen worldwide efforts to preserve our natural heritage.

Beate Jessel, President of the German Federal Agency for Nature Conservation, commenced the session by defining biodiversity “as the diversity of genes, species and ecosystems”. She said that she considered the decline of biodiversity to be the most pressing environmental problem after to climate change and said that it is mainly caused by habitat loss and degradation, overexploitation, climate change and invasive species.

“In 1992”, she continued, “the international community agreed on the Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD) and set the goal to significantly slow down the rate of loss of biodiversity by 2010”. Unfortunately, monitoring shows that this goal has not been achieved in any country of the world. Implementation gaps, incoherent policies and lack of knowledge and financial resources are the most important reasons for this, she argued. Now, with the next CBD conference of state parties taking place in Nagoya, Japan in October 2010, a new paradigm needs to be developed, to ensure that “biodiversity and ecosystem services are preserved, valued and, insofar as possible, restored for their intrinsic value and so that they can continue to support [humankind]”, she concluded.
Ursula Heinen-Esser, Parliamentary State Secretary for the German Federal Ministry of Environment spoke after Ms. Jessel and made some brief remarks. She analyzed the failure of states to reach the 2010 CBD targets and attributed this to the fact that conservation of biodiversity has not been taken into account in other political sectors. She appreciated the recent formation of a specialist group called Intergovernmental Platform on Biodiversity and Ecosystem Services (IPBS), which is thought to become the biodiversity equivalent to the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC). Finally, she pointed to the importance of the upcoming meetings at the UN General Assembly the following week after the conference and the Nagoya summit, stating that “we are on the right track, but there can be no slowing down”.

Laureates present at the cluster event made important contributions to the discussion and argued that a movement towards organic agriculture would be in the greater interests of preserving biodiversity. Sunderlal Bahuguna, representing The Chipko Movement (RLA 1987) revealed that industrial agriculture results in the addiction of farmers to pesticides and chemical fertilisers. “This means in the world of nutrition, we are eating poison!” he exclaimed. Vandana Shiva reiterated her point that it was “one of the biggest delusions of our time that organic agriculture does not produce an equal amount of food as conventional agriculture”.

Nathan Witkop, environmental editor at Deutsche Welle and session facilitator posed a provocative question to the laureates, “If democracy is the solution, is it also not part of the problem, because politicians are giving people what they want rather than what we need?” Rene Ngongo (RLA 2009) responded, “I believe that democracy is part of the answer, but on the other hand, I strongly fear that international corporations will control most democracies. A clear message that goes out to the consumers is important”. Michael Succow (RLA 1997) agreed that civil society had an important role in educating consumers, adding that “if corporations go global, consumer movements have to go global too”.

The cluster event ended with most of the laureates expressing a gloomy outlook towards the upcoming Nagoya summit. Dr. Shiva hoped that the issues of biopatents, synthetic biology and geoengineering would be discussed there. Mohd. Azmi Abdul Hamid, representing Sahabat Alam Malaysia, expressed his fears that representatives of Southeast Asian countries were liable to be manipulated by international corporations at the summit due to their ignorance and confusion regarding the issues to be discussed.
2.2 The Global Water Crisis

Our Fight Against Commodification of Life

Gustav-Stresemann-Institut e.V.
15 September 2010

Maude Barlow (RLA 2005) made a brief intervention at the workshop, stating that just like what is happening with regards to other public goods, there are ongoing trends of commodification of water worldwide. These trends include:

- Privatisation of public sanitisation services.
- Increased consumption of bottled water.
- Growing water markets.
- Cases of investors buying whole water systems in some countries of Africa and South America.
- Recycling of water.
- Desalination of water.
- Polluted water markets.

The Global Water Crisis and the Movements to Protect the Water Commons

Gustav-Stresemann-Institut e.V.
15 September 2010

Maude Barlow began this workshop by pointing out that the global water crisis is the greatest crisis of our time and it also constitutes part of the greater climate crisis. “The crisis is deepening”, she warned, “and many territories have already physically run out of water”. Dr. Barlow subsequently suggested five principles to overcome the global water crisis:

- Water will teach us how to live (water protection, harvesting, source protection, decreased pollution at all levels of society).
• Water as a common good (No one owns water. Water belongs to the earth, the future and all species. Water use shall be prioritised based on the needs of community).

• Water as a human right (fight against the privatisation of water; it cannot be bought or sold for profit).

• Water as a public trust (water must be protected not for few but for the public based on an ecosystems approach).

• Water itself has rights (water has value and rights outside of its usefulness for human beings).

The discussion which followed centred around a debate on water as private property versus water as a common good. It was observed that the privatisation of water in some countries such as Australia, has led to water pollution and deterioration of water sources.

Participating laureates agreed that there is no water scarcity on a global scale. They acknowledged, however, that every ecosystem has its own capacity and if that is exceeded, a water crisis will erupt. Laureates agreed that a much better portrayal of water problems in the mass media, films and books is needed.

The workshop concluded with laureates agreeing with Dr. Barlow that water was a public good and that privatisation should be carefully checked. They further accepted that a global movement for water needs to be organised and that the media have to be used to spread public awareness on the issue.


2.3 Cultural Diversity and Indigenous People’s Rights

GTZ© Cluster Event: Valued as a Premium? Determining the Importance of Biological and Cultural Diversity

La Redoute Bad Godesberg, Kurfürstenallee 1, 53177 Bonn
16 September 2010, 10:00 a.m. – 3:00 p.m.

BACKGROUND

Biodiversity – Culture – Development – Agents of change

Experts are recognising with increasing clarity the enormous importance of biological diversity for human life. Yet the fundamental role played by functioning ecological habitats in safeguarding future prospects for life, and indeed survival, has so far neither penetrated the public consciousness nor been included in the economic assessment of biodiversity.

On a global scale, non-sustainable use of natural resources is the dominant pattern, leading to a continuous loss of biological diversity. This loss of biodiversity is inextricably linked with a loss of cultural diversity, for example, the knowledge of the properties and uses of plants, together with related traditions.

The event centres on the question of how a change of course can be achieved in the way we approach and assess biological diversity and the importance we attribute to cultural diversity. Four “Alternative Nobel Prize” laureates distinguished for their involvement in social and ecological movements and change processes will meet and enter into a dialogue with experts from the spheres of politics, international cooperation, academia, industry, media and with civil society activists.

DISCUSSION

This cluster event started with participants being asked the question of whether it was just a coincidence that 80% of the world’s areas of high biological diversity are at the same time areas of high cultural diversity. Participating laureates opined that whilst living in harmony with nature is a key factor that prevents loss of both cultural and biological diversity, the commodification of diversity – in biological and cultural terms – is not a proper means to face current global challenges.

Based on his nearly forty years of experience fighting for the rights of indigenous people in the Peruvian Amazon, Evaristo Nugkuag Ikanan (RLA 1986) said that humankind has reached a turning point and that a change in course is more than necessary. “The
powers of the world lead humankind to the edge of suicide!” he exclaimed. Mr. Ikanan voiced his displeasure with the currently proposed measures to mitigate climate change – such as REDD (Reducing of Emissions from Deforestation and Degradation) – as they neglect indigenous people’s rights. Despite an emerging recognition of these rights, Mr. Ikanan said that dialogue between indigenous persons and governments could be further improved. In response to the question of why he still attends UN climate change negotiations, Mr. Ikanan wryly said, “We go, learn and fight”!

Juan Pablo Orrego (RLA 1998) entered the debate by stating that he often wonders “why some people live in harmony with nature and others don’t and therefore destroy it”. He said that humankind has somehow forgotten that it “was part of the biosphere”. Mr. Orrego was optimistic enough to suggest that, “unlike a meteorite, we can change course and avoid major disasters”. On the question of indigenous people, Mr. Orrego highlighted that they are not living in a backward way and that a different conception of what constitutes development needs to be considered.

The discussion subsequently moved from theory to practice with Hannumunappa R Sudarshan (RLA 1994) giving successful examples of how he and his organisation have improved tribal education, used traditional knowledge systems and promoted traditional health practices. His advocacy contributed to the passage of the Tribal Forest Rights Act, 2006, which was a big step forward in ensuring the protection and maintenance of traditional livelihoods in India. Mr. Ikanan voiced his fears on whether legislation will be enough to resolve biopiracy, giving the example of knowledge being used commercially despite intellectual property rights being conferred to communities via agreements. Even as laureates tried to identify ways of effectively transferring the know-how of successful local interventions internationally, they offered to co-operate with the GTZ to develop business plans for small social enterprises that would be helpful in improving local interventions.

**German Commission for UNESCO Cluster Event: Diversity Matters! In Nature and in Society**

16 September 2010, 10:00 a.m. – 1:30 p.m.
Conference hall of the German Commission for UNESCO, Colmantstrasse 15, Bonn

This private cluster event aimed at bringing new momentum to scientific research on the interface of biological and cultural diversity and it also aimed at adding the specific perspective of “resilience” and “vulnerability” to investigating this interface. A special focus was laid on cultural landscapes and cities in industrialised countries as opposed to the well-established research on the nexus of both “diversity regimes” in tropical regions, such as the overlap of hotspots of language diversity with hotspots of biodiversity.
The event intended to connect the international discourses organised in the purview of UNESCO and UNEP with the practical experiences of Right Livelihood laureates (Mr Stephen Corry, Survival International, United Kingdom; Mr Matti Mäkelä and Mr Tapio Mattlar, Finnish Village Action, Finland; and Mr András Biró, Hungary) as well as with the research carried out by leading German scientists, both from natural science and from the humanities. The Right Livelihood Laureates reported on their specific experiences having to do with biodiversity and cultural diversity.

The participants of the workshop agreed that the interlinkages of biodiversity and cultural diversity are not sufficiently well understood yet. “Resilience” and “vulnerability” were acknowledged as potentially suitable heuristic tools to elucidate these interlinkages, although the conceptual usefulness was also called into question by some. It became clear that existing research in this field so far focuses too much on either one or the other “diversity regimes”. Successful research on the interlinkages has to use appropriate concepts from the very beginning. Future research should focus on specific, concrete cases. Follow-up was agreed upon.

16 September 2010, 3:00 p.m. – 5:00 p.m.  
Event hall of the LVR-LandesMuseum Bonn, Colmantstrasse 14-16, Bonn

BACKGROUND

Cultural diversity – Environment – Identity – Biodiversity – Indigenous knowledge

The ensuing public event presented the work and achievements of seven Right Livelihood laureates to the general public of Bonn (open invitation to all citizens) and continued to discuss the connections between cultural diversity and biodiversity. The laureates shared their thoughts on ways to preserve not only biodiversity, but the diversity brought about by many indigenous groups whose languages, traditional knowledge and land use systems are severely being threatened.

DISCUSSION

Taking off from the morning discussions, it was reiterated introductarily that connections between both “diversity regimes” do not only exist as regards questions of maintenance of cultural identity in traditional and indigenous communities, but also how the two diversities are interconnected in a global perspective, in industrial societies as well. It was emphasised that biodiversity and cultural diversity are not only quantitative concepts. Societies are not culturally diverse, if very different human beings or communities co-exist side-by-side – living together requires structures enabling the different parts of society to mutually benefit from each other and from diversity. In nature as well, life is not diverse if many species simply co-exist – biodiversity also refers to functioning ecosystems. The concept of diversity thus comprises the sustainable, positive interaction of separate units
and sustainability as such. Diversity in nature and society increases the resilience against stress factors such as climate change.

Andras Biro (RLA 1995) discussed the issues of the Roma minority community in the context of cultural diversity. He related how the Roma have frequently been forced to change their lifestyle, occupation and cultural habits. He spoke briefly on how he in 1990 established the Hungarian Foundation for Self-Reliace to advocate for the agricultural and entrepreneurial self development of the Roma and offer income generating opportunities to them at the local level. Mr. Biro indicated that what makes his organisation different is that they never impose a particular solution but merely help the Roma to come forward and find solutions for their own problems. For him, as for all laureates present, cultural diversity refers to an enormously important concept: the right of groups, communities, villages or individuals to choose to be different. Essentially, his organisation provides an opportunity for change, and it is up to the Roma to decide how they want to change. Mr. Biro explained that his organisation also provides zero interest loans to the Roma, of which nearly 75% is successfully repaid.

Tapio Mattlar and Matti Makela, representing Finnish Village Action, described how large-scale rural depopulation occurred in Finland in the 1960s. “In 1974, Finnish Village Action came into the picture and began the process of rural regeneration and decentralisation in Finnish villages”, said Mr. Mattlar. According to Mr. Makela, Finnish Village Action has been successful because it not only guards the local community's culture, traditions and natural environment, but also helps in adopting modern technology for the betterment of village society. Working on the principle of “development from the bottom up”, it provides basic facilities like healthcare, postal and transport services to villages to halt urban migration. Making a point that cultural diversity and biodiversity were connected, Mr. Mattlar described how he has reintroduced endangered species and new plants to places where they used to grow two hundred years ago.

Mr. Stephen Corry, representing Survival International (RLA 1989) spoke briefly about how Survival International works for the rights and interests of eighty different “tribal” communities in the world. Through campaigns, education and dissemination of publications, Survival International has helped numerous communities to regain their land and secure their future. Mr. Corry gave an example of how Survival International has waged a twenty year campaign to secure 10 million hectares of rainforest for a community in Brazil. “Tribal people are different from us. They have different cultures, languages and needs but are nevertheless happy with their lives. We don’t force them to live like us, but instead protect their rights to live as they choose” explained Mr. Corry. Criticising companies and governments for only thinking about profits and not understanding tribal people, Mr. Corry alleged that even certain NGOs have fallen prey to government influence.
Mohd. Azmi Abdul Hamid, representing Sahabat Alam Malaysia gave the audience a brief history of the situation in the Malaysian state of Sarawak, where the destruction of the rainforest with the involvement of foreign corporations reached its peak in the 1970s. Making the link between biological and cultural diversity, Mr. Azmi said that it was only when the indigenous community of the region started to take initiative that the rainforest movement to halt deforestation was born in 1978. Mr. Azmi concluded his intervention by offering a few thoughts on how biological and cultural diversity could be safeguarded. “Public awareness should be created, and people should raise their voice against deforestation. The bottom up approach is crucial – local communities instead of government and NGOs should take the lead in protecting forest biodiversity”, he said.

Michael Succow reported on his experiences in establishing national parks and biosphere reserves, together with UNESCO, from 1990 onwards. Then a deputy minister in the former German Democratic Republic, he was central in using the golden opportunity of German reunification to preserve the rich natural heritage of this country for future generations. He continued this work in countries emerging from former socialist regimes, such as Turkmenistan, Azerbaidjan or Mongolia. He underlined key concepts of modern approaches to nature conservation that always take into account the economic and social needs of local communities, conservation of cultural landscapes through sustainable use as well as involving communities in planning and governance. UNESCO’s biosphere reserves have been a central innovation in this regard as they offer a high-level set of general rules of management and conservation standards whose substance is created locally.

The cluster event ended with the participating laureates and participants reaching consensus on the following points:

• Diversity is a concept that needs better explanation. Proper concepts of diversity do not stop at counting differences and they should avoid, at all costs, to create artificial boundaries between alleged “cultures” or “races”. Diversity is about positive sustainable interaction and about the freedom of choice. There is much more need of building appropriate public awareness on diversity, both in the field of inter-human relations as well as regards nature.

• Approaches starting from the concept of diversity will not favour top-down government or big-NGO intervention, but will favour bottom-up approaches as well as diversity in institutional regimes. Biodiversity conservation without local communities is not achievable.

The German Commission for UNESCO also presented on this occasion of this event the German Executive Summary of UNESCO’s World Report on Cultural Diversity of 2009.
3. Changing Course, Redefining Progress: Towards People Centred Development

When the Millennium Development Goals (MDGs) were announced in 2000, the initiative was largely greeted with optimism as world leaders “convincingly expressed a global determination to end some of the most challenging and vexing problems inherited from the twentieth century (and) conveyed the hope that extreme poverty, disease, and environmental degradation could be alleviated with the wealth, the new technologies and the global awareness with which we had entered the twenty-first century” (Sachs 2005, 211). Statesmen placed sustainable development at the heart of the global agenda by adopting the MDGs, and setting clear targets for reducing poverty, hunger, disease, illiteracy, environmental degradation, and discrimination against women by 2015.

Ten years later, it is clear that, despite some progress, most nations will not be meeting all or even some of the MDGs by 2015. At a conference panel session organised by the Bonn International Conversion Center (BICC), Rene Ngongo bemoaned the continued ‘paradox of inequality’ which saw ordinary people in several developing countries remaining poor despite the presence of abundant natural resources in those countries. He suggested five elements to break out of this paradox:

- Reinforcement of the capacity of civil society to bring transparency in attracting investment and good governance.
- Minimise social impacts of natural resource exploitation.
- Bring the above measures to reality.
- Establish a national debate about resource distribution.
- Create and strengthen efficient public institutions.

Mr. Ngongo’s concerns were shared by many other laureates throughout the conference. Despite promulgation of the MDGs and myriad global strategies, campaigns and
intervention, civil society has struggled to make lasting inroads into the endemic problems of poverty and hunger. At the conference, laureates called for a redefinition of what constituted “progress” and a rethink in global development strategy. Laureates demanded that politicians and corporations move beyond the erroneous idea that environmental protection is in conflict with economic development, arguing instead that economic development is dependent on the environment. Finally, laureates emphasised that future development strategies and programmes should be as participatory as possible in order to succeed and provide long-term solutions.

Global Policy Changes

Gustav-Stresemann-Institut e.V.
15 September 010

This internal workshop, facilitated by RLA founder Jakob von Uexkull, focused on the perceived conflict between economic development and the environment. Importantly, participating laureates not only criticised a political failure but also a failure of civil society to change the direction of development or provide genuine solutions.

Participants agreed that rivalries, different values, goals and the lack of a common agenda of various global civil society organizations have prevented them from uniting and working together on certain issues. Laureates felt that there is a need to re-think civil society strategies to exert power and influence changes in economic models. Laureates were of the opinion that the time for drastic changes has come and stated that the entire economic model of development needs to be urgently transformed. It was thought that, as many problems at the community level are identical across jurisdictions, strategic alliances between laureates could make an enormous impact on social transformation globally.

The workshop concluded with participants calling for the following policies to be advocated and adopted:

- Shifting of the tax burden from labour to resources. Global common goods should be placed in trusts, with sustainable usage caps and fees distributed as “common rent” to all citizens.
- Reduction of corporate liability limits and giving strong incentives for corporations to pursue goals other than maximising profits. Public corporations must be mandated to work for the common good. There are already millions of organisations earning enough to live, whilst pursuing goals other than making profits.
- Creation of non-inflationary “new money” to be issued only against performance. The concept of “new money”, as proposed by the World Future Council, suggests
that existing mechanisms of International Monetary Fund (IMF) Special Drawing Rights be converted to create new interest-free money to fund the global renewable energy transition with currently unused productive capacities. Mr. von Uexkull felt that introduction of new money would change power relationships and “has a huge potential to restore planetary health and save human lives sacrificed by ostensible funding shortages” (2010).

**Participation and Collective Creativity**

Gustav-Stresemann-Institut e.V.
15 September 2010

This internal workshop was hosted by Ponna Wignaraja, representing Participatory Institute for Development Alternatives (PIDA-RLA 1982). Its objectives were to focus on participatory methodological approaches, share experiences, debate if true empowerment was economic or psychological and discuss ways to prevent the “microcredit overburden” of the poor. Mr. Wignaraja began the session by stating that scientists have two major challenges: to bring peace to conflicts and to eradicate the worst manifestations of poverty. The facts, he said, show that the number of poor people in the world today is unacceptably high and also indicated that conflict is not conducive for good governance and democracy.

Speaking on the issue of hunger, Frances Moore Lappé argued that there is more than enough food in the world and that food scarcity has been artificially created. Ms. Lappé called for power to be restored to the people and said that the current system, where power has been given to autocratic systems and leaders, has led to both the scarcity of food and a sense of powerlessness. To break this vicious cycle, Ms. Lappé said that people and civil society need to break with the current language used to describe democracy. “In the United States, democracy should be called “privately held power” and not a democracy for its citizens”, she remarked. Ms. Lappe suggested several strategies to build a grassroots movement to restore democracy including:

- Moving towards “participatory budgets”. In some places in Brazil, the people can allocate amounts of money from the government’s funds towards helping sectors that they consider need it the most. This helps reduce corruption.

- Using videos as empowering tools. In India, Delhi women are trained in video making and they produce films and radio programmes about issues affecting them.

Ledum Mittee, representing Movement of the Survival of the Ogoni People (RLA 1994) agreed with Ms. Lappe on the lack of people’s empowerment and said that power in his
country (Nigeria) is seen as something reserved for a king or leader. Mr. Mittee spoke about the problems of “oil without democracy” and said that this situation often leads to money being limited to a few persons who then become dependent on the oil to keep their power.

Mr. Mittee described the activities of his organisation, which works with disadvantaged groups inside the villages, including women and youth to break corruption patterns. By locating the struggle against corruption in the language of the people, his movement has been able to spread awareness and understanding on the issues of oil pollution and empower them to influence a change in course. “Social movements have developed a voice; however, there are still challenges to our work. People are needed to create democracy”, he concluded.

“Solving the fundamental question of who owns the land is relevant in poverty eradication. This will help in determining the structure of power. The people, and not the government, have to own the land”, argued Swami Agnivesh (RLA 2004). He also called for the eradication of poverty to be seen from a spiritual standpoint.

On the issue of microcredit, “we can only help the poor through dialogue where they are provided with loans, not grants, for them to take their own decisions” remarked András Biró. However, Dipal Barua, representing Grameen Shakti (RLA 2007) warned that the poor sometimes take out more than one microcredit loan from different NGOs which then become a burden for them to service.

At the end of the workshop, the laureates present agreed on the following points to move forward:

• That the Right Livelihood Award Foundation should encourage “Cross Cutting Common Projects” by laureates.

• That the poor cannot always solve their problems individually. There may be the need for a trusted and trained external facilitator to first assist the group and then step back to allow the internal facilitator to sustain the group. The external facilitator could subsequently assist in areas where the group lacks capacity, e.g. Administration and accounting.

• That laureates consider how their work can be of benefit to neighbouring countries.

• That the Right Livelihood College encourages young scientists to conduct research that touch upon or improve the work of a collection of laureates.
German Development Institute (DIE) Cluster Event: Changing Course – Towards a Sustainable World Economy

DIE, Tulpenfeld 6, 53113 Bonn
16 September 2010, 10:00 a.m. – 5:00 p.m.

BACKGROUND

Global economic governance – Globalisation – Development – Sustainability – Growth – Co-operation

This cluster-event will bring together Right Livelihood Award laureates with experts of the German Development Institute to discuss issues of globalisation, sustainable economic development and global economic governance with the aim to identify possible pathways towards a sustainable world economy.

The following questions will be raised:

• Bottom up or top down: how to ensure a transition to a sustainable world economy.

• The future of global economic governance.

• National strategies for sustainable development and the world economy.

• South-south cooperation – new perspectives for sustainable development.

• The contribution of social entrepreneurs to a sustainable world economy.

DISCUSSION

At the first panel, titled *De-Globalisation: The Way Forward*, participating laureates discussed the different attitudes and perceptions of what constitutes growth and development, focusing on sustainable and alternative means towards economic development. Laureates on the panel, including Tony Clarke, Manfred Max-Neef (RLA 1983) and Alice Tepper Marlin (RLA 1990) agreed that the current global financial crisis is the clearest indication that existing economic models have failed and called for new models of development economics that encompass ecological and environmental issues as well as cultural economics.
Laureates on the panel expressed concern about the “triple Es” which are at the core of the global crisis:

- **Economy** – the current financial meltdown and its impact.

- **Environment** – climate change, greenhouse gas emissions – these problems are not going away.

- **Energy** – the looming end of conventional fossil fuel extraction and the need for unconventional fuel extraction.

Laureates stated that the global financial crisis is a result of free movement of capital travelling around the world with less government regulation and the rise of “global economic governance” led by the IMF, G-20 and World Bank, all of which lack political legitimacy.

Following the first panel, Helmy Abouleish of the SEKEM group gave a keynote address entitled *Social Entrepreneurship – A New Business Model for Corporations*. Explaining how the prevailing model of economic production has failed to address the issues of population growth, education, water, biodiversity loss, climate change, food security, poverty and health, Mr. Abouleish suggested that the SEKEM model of social entrepreneurship can be looked into as an alternative model for development. According to Mr. Abouleish, SEKEM has been incredibly successful in promoting all sorts of agribusiness that grow products which many believed never could grow in Egypt.

Following Mr. Abouleish’s address, the cluster event split into several working groups. A group entitled *Civil Society – Shaping Globalisation* debated the relationships between the state, market and civil society. Nicanor Perlas (RLA 2003) highlighted the need for civil society organisations to gain legitimacy within the communities/society which they set out to serve. He called for more capacity building for activists and trainings that would increase their critical analysis skills, make them more aware of participatory methodologies and help them be more culturally sensitive in their work.

Another working group discussed *The Challenge of Corporate Social Responsibility*. Ms. Tepper Marlin discussed issues of how big companies could promote programmes or initiatives that create a win-win solution and network with NGOs and government in order to improve the community. She stated that for most companies, there had to be an economic argument why a corporation should not spend money on an advertisement instead of investing it on corporate social responsibility (CSR) programmes. She also introduced participants to the SA8000 standard for certification of CSR activities, remarking that Brazil, India and Italy have done the most to use these standards. A mixture of government initiatives and incentives and a big company taking the lead and acting as
a “national champion” of the cause, has led to impressive results in these countries, Ms. Marlin explained.

**Friedrich-Ebert-Stiftung Global Policy Forum Europe Cluster Event: Global Civil Society, Democracy and Global Governance**

Friedrich-Ebert-Stiftung, Godesberger Allee 149, 53175 Bonn
16 September 2010, 11:00 a.m. – 3:00 p.m.

**BACKGROUND**

**Civil society – Global governance – Campaigning – Social change**

At the beginning of the millennium, critical debate about globalisation gave birth to the World Social Forum (WSF). With the case of the WSF in mind, the Workshop aims to bring together experts from academia, politics, civil society and social leaders around the world to discuss ways in which global civil society could gain influence in public policy and play a major role in implementing alternative policies.

How can global civil society build an enduring space in support of social change and a social dimension of globalisation?

How can “spaces for reflection”, like the Word Social Fora help to translate ideas into public policy?

How can civil society gain influence in international decision-making at state and international institution levels? Are concrete outcomes best reached by single-issue advocacy networks?

How can a bridge be built between the discourses of Porto Alegre and global policy making in Washington (IMF and World Bank) and New York (UN)?

**DISCUSSION**

This cluster event was held with the twin objectives of facilitating a critical discussion regarding the role of civil society in tackling urgent problems and strategising ways to increase civil society’s effectiveness in addressing those problems.

Prof. Jan Aart Scholte opened the workshop by a theoretical introduction on the topic **Global Governance and Civil Society**. Prof. Scholte began by arguing that national governments are victims of their own success stories as the interconnected processes that result from globalisation lead to catastrophes such as the financial crises. He stated that
the critical challenge that civil society faces today relates to their role in contributing and influencing the global governance process. Prof. Scholte pointed out that one should be cognizant of the reality that global governance not only includes governmental networks but also the private governance that takes place through civil society actors and private networks.

Prof. Scholte further argued that current global governance is not democratic and went so far as to suggest that it is impossible to democratise the process of governance at the global level. While acknowledging that civil society had made significant contributions towards the democratisation process, especially in terms of acting as a "watchdog", he underlined the point that these achievements were very modest. He explained that civil society suffered from the tendency to serve some groups more than others and also because it often adopts the same hierarchy that already exists within society which makes certain groups dominant.

In addition, Prof. Scholte stressed the following limitations which constrain the democratisation of global governance: (a) an inability to include those who are traditionally not participating in the process and (b) a difficulty in gaining more influence for those who do not have the influence. He nevertheless agreed that the World Social Forum (WSF) can be a good forum for those who want to reinforce their passions, visions and ideas.

Francisco Whitaker shared his experience looking back on 10 years of WSFs as space for civil society to coordinate actions and articulate shared visions for change toward global social justice. With regard to urgent problems today, he discussed the problem of global warming and criticised the way it is handled as he felt it had become yet another way of making money for corporations. Further, he criticised the traditional approach of civil society for not engaging in the political process and not entering politics. Dr. Whitaker’s vision was for civil society to transform itself into an active political actor that could influence the decision-making process and put governments under pressure. He claimed that it is an enormous challenge for civil society, a diverse group of actors with diverse knowledge, to come together. Dr. Whitaker advocated that civil society should be consensus oriented, horizontally structured and absent of hierarchies.

Anwar Fazal (RLA 1982 and Director, Right Livelihood College) argued that the struggle of civil society for change is a long struggle and intergenerational. He mentioned "seven chakras” that could help increase the effectiveness of civil society in addressing the problems it faces:

- Understanding and engaging power and politics.
- Multiplying leadership, creating leaders and not just followers.
• Flat and open organisations: thinking everywhere to make sure everyone is given space.

• Creative ideas and tools for thinking of concrete action and remembering the days of action.

• Thinking structurally, not just expressing symptoms.

• Thinking long term – ways of keeping up the energy even after a success.

• Establishing a mechanism to continue the progress made.

Marcos Arana, representing the International Baby Food Action Network (IBFAN) (RLA 1998) observed that, in his experience with the breastfeeding movement, the WHO and UNICEF responded by creating and adopting an international breastfeeding code only as a result of public protests led by civil society.

“Hunger in the world is not due to a scarcity of food but a scarcity of democracy. Democracy is the right of people to have a voice and if people have a voice, hunger would not exist. Therefore, countries which suffer from hunger lack democracy”, argued Frances Moore Lappé. Ms. Lappé further elaborated that government, free markets and civil society are the three pillars of democracy and civil society is the keeper of values. She further underlined the need for all people to understand concepts such as the freedom of speech and what constitutes a free market, and warned of the private sector’s power overtaking the state power.

Jürgen Stetten, of the Friedrich Ebert Stiftung (FES), shared his experience as former New York director working with civil society organisations on UN debates. He argued that many civil society groups have chosen to protest against the WTO and the Bretton-Woods Institutions and hence under-utilised the UN with regard to lobbying their issues. Mr. Stetten concluded the cluster event by suggesting that civil society can overcome challenges facing it by undertaking the following activities:

• Addressing symmetries that address the link between power and civil society groups.

• Engage more strongly with parliaments.

• “Lobby” international organisations via the “capitals”, i.e. the member states’ governments and engage the governments of “rising powers” on global policy issues.
4. Building Peace, Strengthening Justice and Advancing Human Rights

The preamble of the Charter of the United Nations begins with two important observations: that the UN was created “to save succeeding generations from the scourge of war, which twice in our lifetime has brought untold sorrow to mankind, and to reaffirm faith in fundamental human rights, in the dignity and worth of the human person...”. The tragedy today is not only that international humanitarian law and fundamental human rights have been repeatedly violated in the most egregious manner from Cambodia to Rwanda and from Bosnia to Palestine, but that both the UN and the international community have been largely ineffective in preventing war. War, a daily reality for many in the world, continues to bring “untold sorrow” many times over to mankind. Despite repeated pledges that the world would “never again” allow genocide to occur after the Holocaust, the international community failed to stop the murder of close to 800,000 Tutsis in Rwanda in 1994 (Gourevitch 1996, 166) and continues to be unable to bring an end to the violence and killings in Darfur.

Amidst the din of self-congratulatory proclamations of the continuing advancement of science and human civilisation, there have also been alarming “advances” in weapons, technology and techniques used to increase human suffering. The most vulnerable members of society – the elderly, women and children – are often the victims of these ‘advances’. As Inge Genefke (RLA 1998) observes with respect to torture, “the depths to which a torturer will go can no longer surprise me. There is no limit. Sexual atrocities, psychological horror” (Larsen 2010, 20). Furthermore, the continued development and proliferation of nuclear weapons has led to humanity having to live uneasily with “a possibility of their life snuffed out in an instant, or their health destroyed, along with all they cherish, in a war to which their nation may not even be a party” (Weeramantry 1996, 470).

At the conference, laureates came together to share experiences on their successful campaigns for peace, justice and the promotion and protection of human rights. Their experiences revealed that it is possible to move from violence to peace, from hatred to reconciliation, and that international law can have a tangible impact against impunity. Laureates discussed strategies to ensure that victims of human rights abuses gain reparations
and debated the role of the media in promotion of human rights. They revisited and questioned whether existing efforts towards nuclear disarmament were going in the right direction. Finally, they strategised on ways to bring more women into peace negotiations and resolved some of the most intractable issues, including the Palestinian question.

History has shown that states often lack courageous leaders willing to invest their political capital in the defense of human rights. At the conference in Bonn, however, laureates made it clear that we cannot afford to wait for states to take action. Laureates have shown how civil society and individuals can actively contribute to building a peace based on justice and reconciliation, and effectively advocate and campaign against human rights violations and illegal wars. As former UN Secretary General Kofi Annan observed with regards to human rights violations and acts of aggression, only “if states bent on criminal behaviour know that frontiers are not the absolute defense... will they not embark on such a course of action in expectation of sovereign immunity” (Franck 2001, 194).
4.1 Towards a Nuclear Weapons Free World

Bonn International Conversion Center (BICC) Cluster Event: Peace on Earth – Initiatives for Disarmament, Non Violence and Dialogue

Uniclub Bonn, Konvikstr. 9, 53113 Bonn
16 September 2010, 10:00 a.m.-5pm

BACKGROUND

Peace – Conflict healing – Disarmament – Human rights

The aim of this cluster event is the implementation of dialogue and networking between international and national peace and conflict researchers, on the one hand, and laureates of the Right Livelihood Award, on the other hand, in order to find a basis for common activities in the future.

Panel discussions focused on the following topics:

- Nuclear non-proliferation: on the way to global zero – where are we now?
- Ethnic conflicts – solutions from theory and practical experience.
- Victims of war – a challenge for peace and conflict resolution.
- Resources for a fairer world.

DISCUSSION

Neshan Gunasekara, representing Christopher Weeramantry (RLA 2007), made a speech at the first panel of this cluster event where he indicated that the use of nuclear weapons violate every principle of international law including the Geneva Conventions, Environmental Law and the Laws of War. Arguing that their use is a crime against humanity, Mr. Gunasekara affirmed that the illegality of nuclear weapons “is a matter beyond all sensible argument”. He elaborated on the nuclear weapons’ impact on the past (all that humanity has ever created), the present and future generations. Subsequently, he strongly refuted the argument that the weapons could be used based on a “doctrine of necessity” and explained that efforts are underway with international lawyers attempting to take the question of the legality of the use of nuclear weapons in any circumstance back to the International Court of Justice. He hoped that the Court would issue a new opinion to clarify the issue once and for all.
4.2 Women’s Rights in War and Peace

Women’s War

Facilitated by Christina Hagner, representing Kvinna till Kvinna (RLA 2002), this session saw a discussion on the issues of violence and sexual abuse against women, as well a consideration of the means to enable victims to get back to their normal lives. Workshop participants considered ways to identify perpetrators of crimes against women and bring them to justice, improve the self-organization of women to voice these issues and increase women’s representation in peace negotiations.

Ms. Hagner began the workshop by introducing Kvinna till Kvinna (KrK) as a Swedish organisation founded in 1993 with the aim of empowering and promoting women’s self-reliance and self-esteem. “Our work focuses on creating meeting places for women to discuss problems and find solutions”, she explained.

Subsequently, the facilitator presented the documentary Women’s War which tells the story of sexual violence in conflict areas – Bosnia and the Democratic Republic of Congo (DRC). The film displayed the unique exchange of experiences and knowledge between women’s organisations in the Balkans and the DRC. Women from Bosnia shared their thoughts with Congolese women who are currently affected by sexual abuse and violence. Possible ways to cope with the traumatic experiences were contrasted.

After the documentary was shown, participants were asked to express their impressions in small groups. In the plenary session which followed, Joanna Forbes (daughter of Patrick van Rensburg, RLA 1981) praised the exchange initiative. She emphasised that “sharing is good”. Ms. Hagner pointed out that “there are so few responsible people that have been convicted for these crimes against women”. Cathy Epstein (wife of Samuel Epstein, RLA 1998) stated that “women are usually left out of the table in peace agreements”. This point was affirmed by Ms. Hagner who told participants that only 7% of peace negotiators are women. Ruth Manorama (RLA 2006) argued that “violence against women happens everywhere” and provided examples from India where many women belonging to the Dalit community across the country had been subject to violence and atrocities at peacetime.

“When women are organised and voice their concerns, things can change”, said Ms. Hagner. Samuel Epstein suggested that a nomination for the Nobel Peace Prize would be helpful to make people more aware of the issue of sexual violence in conflicts. Dr. Epstein also provided the idea of using movies as a means of raising awareness and promoting solutions.
Participants concluded from the workshop that four main approaches needed to be taken to address the problem:

- **Exchanging views among victims:** The participants agreed that sharing experiences is important. By sharing, victims can exchange views and experiences on how to deal with individual situations. In addition, they can lend support to each other. Institutions such as KtK act as facilitators for this process.

- **Identifying perpetrators and bringing them to justice:** In order to help the victims to get back to their normal lives, participants felt that it was important to take suitable action against the perpetrators (identification and punishment). So far, only a few of those responsible have been convicted.

- **Self-organisation of women to voice the issue:** Participants emphasised that self-organisation of women is the best way to ensure women’s security. They expressed a belief that this is key to “changing things”.

- **Increasing women’s representation in peace negotiations:** Participants affirmed that women are currently underrepresented in peace negotiations. They highlighted that in some cases, women, are the first to start peace talks after ceasefires. As such, participants considered women as key peace actors and encouraged their empowerment.

In her concluding remarks, Ms. Hagner said that in the UN resolution on women, peace and security (S/RES/1325), the international community acknowledged that sexual violence against women in conflicts is an important issue. “However, resolutions and acknowledgements alone are not sufficient. The numbers of victims of such crimes have been massive. In Bosnia, the number of victims is estimated at 20,000-25,000; in Congo around 500,000 since the war in 1996 – and still counting”, she explained. Participants agreed that further actions need to be taken and that there should be no room for pessimism.

**Medica Mondiale, IFZ (International Women’s Centre Bonn) and German Society for Technical Cooperation (GTZ) Cluster Event: Changing Course – With Women into the Future**

Room ‘K1’ at Wissenschaftszentrum Bonn, Ahrstraße 45, 53175 Bonn-Bad Godesberg.
16 September 2010, 2:00 p.m. – 6:00 p.m.

**BACKGROUND**

*Women rights – Conflict healing – Peace – Health – Security – Civil society*
Despite constitutionally acknowledged equality before the law and despite several UN resolutions, we are still far from having reached true equality, effective protection and real participation. In fact, we have to recognise that politics, media and societal decision-makers fail to adequately acknowledge the achievements of women activists in the fields of security, conflict prevention, rebuilding society, economy and the implementation of conventions on human rights – achievements, which are proven to have led to more equality and social justice and to less poverty.

During recent wars sexualised violence against women was common and has traumatised whole generations. Women suffer from discrimination and gender-based stereotypes, from destruction and direct violence. Female immigrants or illegally working labourers are exposed to persecution and harassment everywhere. Sexualised violence and bad health care for women lead to severe handicaps and social isolation.

“Changing course – with women towards the future”: Under this leitmotif, this cluster event aims to mirror the diversity of female initiatives for peace and to emphasise the fact that there will be no peace in the world without peace between the genders.

DISCUSSION

The objectives of this cluster event were as follows:

• Raise awareness for women’s self-organisation, self-help and solidarity in areas as diverse as support of survivors of sexual violence in post-conflict societies and social and economic marginalisation.

• Share the achievements, commitment, energy and confidence amongst women’s organisations.

• Connect the work of the RLA laureates to women’s issues on the agenda in Germany.

• Stress that women are still widely marginalised and that women’s issues are not treated with adequate intensity at the national and international level.

• Stress the need/chance to display women’s capacities in order to make a change towards more successful peace negotiations, and social cooperation in general.

• Address currently pressing concerns for women.
Participants stressed the capacities of women (the ability to listen, patience and empathy) which can be used in political, economic and social contexts and their endeavours to fight against marginalisation, victimisation and exclusion of women. Ruth Manorama described her work as a struggle for “dignity, equity and justice”. All participants agreed that women are being marginalised and are suffering from sexual violence, and experience extra difficulty struggling for social and economic self-organisation. Participants described how the self-organisation of women, focusing on the two areas of support for survivors of violent conflicts (ranging from medical, psychological treatment to political demands for rights) and of securing livelihoods, contributes to a “changing course”.

Participating laureates examined the case of peace negotiations at the international level, particularly the cases of Bosnia, the Democratic Republic Republic of Congo and Afghanistan and noted that women were grossly underrepresented at these peace negotiations notwithstanding the fact that they not only constituted more than half of the surviving population but also usually suffered the most due conflict related atrocities. Laureates Monika Hauser (RLA 2008), Vesna Terselic (RLA 1998) and Christina Hagner of Kvinna till Kvinna criticised the unwillingness of international actors to press for the incorporation of women into peace negotiations and accept women’s organizations demands to set up truth commissions. Participants emphasized that the difference between supporting and politicizing the suffering of women is a thin but important line to walk.

In addressing the power of self-organisation and creation of livelihoods for women, Ruth Manorama and Namrata Bali, representing the Self-Employed Women’s Association shared their experiences from India, detailed how the improvement of the economic situation of women serves as a facilitator for an increased power share in social and political terms for women. Ms. Bali and Dr. Manorama avowed that women who create a voice for themselves by organising themselves and making a living are often able to overcome structural barriers of class, gender and caste.

At the close of the event, the issue of how women activists relate to men was discussed, with participants wondering why virtually no men were present at the cluster event. Although no definitive answers were arrived at, there seemed to be a consensus that more dialogue needs to take place, with recognition of the need to change required from the men’s side.

Participants criticised the lack of efforts of state actors to give women’s issues their due attention. Janosch Prinz, rapporteur of the event, observed that the energetic interaction between the panelists and the audience underlined the salience of the topics discussed and the laureates’ commitment to these issues.
Center for Development Research (ZEF) Event: Conflict, Social Justice and Gender

Center for Development Research (ZEF), Walter-Flex-Str. 3. D-53113 Bonn
17 September 2010, 9:00 a.m. – 5:00 p.m.

At this workshop, participants were treated to inspiring presentations by Dekha Ibrahim Abdi (RLA 2007) and Ruth Manorama, who presented their work and the challenges that they are currently facing.

Ms. Abdi began the workshop by giving a short introduction of Kenya’s conflicts, in order to clarify the context of her work. On her peace building work, Ms. Abdi said “it started in the private sphere, mostly focusing on women. At the very beginning, it was important to convince women that they are also part of the problem and that they should not see themselves as victims of the system. Women should work together with men to bring and construct the peace”.

Later, Ms. Abdi explained how she tried to create a broader movement for peace, bringing in the whole community. She revealed how it was important for her not to be intimidated in her quest for peace, arguing that it was “not (about) fearing, but changing people”. “I am not against my government; I am doing something for my community, for my country”, she affirmed, whilst admitting that some groups are more difficult to change, such as politicians, who have very short-term goals.

Ms. Abdi credited regime change in Kenya for opening the window of opportunity for peace. Yet, she emphasised that she had, before that, managed to root her ideas of peace in her community, through a lot of patience and motivation.

Touching on her successful use of alternative dispute resolution mechanisms, Ms. Abdi explained how she worked successfully with mediators to settle many conflicts on the border with Kenya, Somalia and Ethiopia. “The mediators deal with many issues, from water to market based ones, in order to ensure security in this region. Supported by the Ministry of Development, these mediators are presented as an alternative formal power structures, but included in the decision process”, she added.

Ms. Abdi described how, with the development of her work, she established a centre to spread and institutionalise her peace ideas. With CEPAR (Center for Peace and Applied Research), her aim is to provide education for many different people, linking peace with other related issues. Nevertheless, she mentioned that she still faces many challenges to institutionalise her activist knowledge at a peace university and transfer all her practical knowledge in peace building to theory.
Ms. Abdi initiated a discussion on how she could mobilise support and build her university. Participants identified legal, practical and physical issues and also discussed questions of human resources. They stressed that it was a necessity to move step by step and suggested that CEPAR partner with established universities and institutions such as the DAAD, GTZ, Right Livelihood College, United Nations, Universiti Sains Malaysia, Addis Ababa University or the African Union. Finally, participants suggested that Ms. Abdi should seek international support for the project through the media and social networks.

As an immediate outcome of the workshop, Universiti Sains Malaysia and the University of Addis Ababa representatives both committed themselves to collaborate and assist with Ms. Abdi’s work wherever possible.

Ruth Manorama began her presentation by giving a brief introduction to participants on the social stratification that the caste system has created in Indian society. She explained that persons are divided by birth into these social positions, with no chance of change. Even though there are many affirmative action policies designed to break down these divisions, Dr. Manorama argued that discriminatory practices remain common as the enforcement of these laws is very poor.

Dr. Manorama elaborated that her work focuses on violence against Dalit women. “The discrimination between castes needs to be addressed. It is an issue not only in India, but also in Sri Lanka, Bangladesh and many African countries”, she stated. Dr. Manorama also mentioned that the United Nations has already drafted a document of principles and guidelines for the elimination of discrimination on the basis of caste. However, she said that the Indian Government is blocking its adoption.

Opening the floor for discussion, Dr. Manorama called on participants to provide strategies to overcome caste discrimination. Participants suggested intensive education of judges, dialogue and mediation processes between the upper castes and the Dalits and the use of international journals to expose the issue. Dr. Manorama called for a ‘deseducation’ of the present educational curriculum in India, which she felt merely reaffirmed the existing social structure. She concluded by reminding participants that Dalits could not succeed in ending caste based discrimination without the support of everyone. Participants echoed this viewpoint by endorsing the concept of “unity in diversity”.
Facilitated by Felicia Langer (RLA 1990), participants at this workshop discussed possibilities for peace in the Middle East and focused on identifying ways to mobilize international public opinion and put pressure on Israel to end its violations of international law. Abdulhadi Alija and David Meurers, who rapporteured the event made the following observations on the proceedings of this workshop:

The Middle East conflict has been of concern to the world for many years and we are still far from solving it. Instead of waiting for governments and responsible officials to find a way out, participants of the Right Livelihood Award Anniversary Conference decided to get involved themselves. Here in Bonn, they came together and – after reminding themselves of the most important milestones in the history of the Middle Eastern conflict – discussed unconventional concepts of taking the peace process forward using the credibility of the Right Livelihood Awardees.

Ms. Langer gave a brief overview of the Israeli occupation of the West Bank and Gaza Strip, which she alleged is “accompanied with countless crimes such as deportations and evictions”. She recounted how, as an immigrant to Israel in 1950, she witnessed the terrible situation of the Palestinians there. This, she said, had a great impact on her life.

“Until today, the West Bank and the Gaza Strip are colonised and houses are demolished. Israeli checkpoints divide the land and make life in the West Bank unbearable. Israel maintains a wall that disrespects borders both sides formerly agreed on. Gaza is the biggest open air prison on the world. In 2008–09, Israel bombed Gaza for 22 days and caused the death of 960 civilians”, explained Ms. Langer. Nevertheless, she emphasised that the recent efforts of civil society, such as the “Gaza Freedom Flotilla” in May, have brought international attention to the situation in the Gaza Strip. Ms. Langer said that, as a result of the flotilla and the Israeli armed forces’ brutal response, the German Bundestag voted unanimously against the blockade, which was a remarkable occurrence.

Mohd. Azmi Abdul Hamid, representing Sahabat Alam Malaysia, affirmed that civic activism is necessary to accelerate the process of finding a solution to the Israeli-Palestinian conflict. “People are ready to be engaged, but just don’t know what they can do. So I tell them which products to boycott and what is worth protesting against. The feedback is overwhelming”, he said. Mr. Azmi also described how he had recently convinced forty four activists to visit Gaza, where they both met with local NGOs and witnessed the destruction
of the Gaza war. “Through activism, we can attract the attention of our government and make it more difficult for them to ignore this issue”, concluded Mr. Azmi.

In her closing remarks, Ms. Langer observed that a pre-requisite for a durable peace was unity between Fatah and Hamas, and called for the Arab world to intensify its efforts to encourage both sides to reconcile. Abdulhadi Alija, one of the rapporteurs who happened to be from Palestine, concurred with Ms. Langer and argued that national reconciliation between the two factions should be the top priority. Mr. Azmi said that he would be very happy to involve other laureates in his future Palestinian projects, including a peace march to Gaza that he is planning in December. This march, he explained, would involve many NGOs approaching the Gaza barrier from different sides to keep the Palestinian issue in the minds of the people. “All laureates are invited to participate and help this project to succeed”, concluded Mr. Azmi.

**Conflict Transformation in General and Afghanistan in Particular**

Gustav-Stresemann-Institut e.V.
15 September 2010

Facilitated by Johan Galtung (RLA 1987), this session focused on conflict resolution, specifically focusing on the case of Afghanistan. Prof. Galtung indicated to participants how to comprehend a conflict and move towards resolving it by using a three step process described as follows:

- **Mapping the conflict**, where a sorting map is used to examine different actors’ perceptions about the ideal state, the present state, the state that scares them the most and a point in history they would want to return to.

- **Looking at the legitimacy of the goals and means of the parties** involved in the conflict.

- **Transcending the conflict using legitimate goals and means**.

According to Prof. Galtung, the major actors in Afghanistan include the Taliban, warlords and women. Whereas the Taliban demand complete withdrawal of all foreign troops from Afghan soil and renounce all efforts aimed at secularisation of the country, Afghan women demand equal rights and treatment within their society and warlords insist on decentralisation and greater regional autonomy.

Prof. Galtung also touched on the role of the important external actors, namely, the USA, central Asian countries, Iran, Pakistan and China. He stated that the USA explicitly legitimises its presence in Afghanistan by claiming to promote democracy, human rights
and women’s rights whilst also having a strategic interest in controlling natural resources such as oil. “However noble the goals of promotion of democracy, human rights and women’s rights are, they are being channelled through illegitimate means”, argued Prof. Galtung. He also criticised the Western powers for their ignorance, in particular, for their very limited understanding of Islam, the local culture and the social order directed by Islamic values.

Prof. Galtung strongly affirmed that any intervention in Afghanistan needs to be compatible with Islamic values and operationalised in partnership with other Islamic countries to be effective. He suggested that the current conflict in Afghanistan can be resolved through detailed understanding of the local culture and called for the withdrawal of “infidel” troops as a necessary first step. In his view, an eventual solution would involve including certain Taliban elements as a watchdog over Islamic values within a loose federal state with strong regional autonomy. He called for Afghanistan in the future to be strongly integrated as part of a larger confederation with its neighbours in Central and East Asia, including Iran, Pakistan and Turkey.

Angie Zelter, representing Trident Ploughshares (RLA 2001) asked Prof. Galtung to elaborate on the methodology he followed to extract perceptions from different actors. Prof. Galtung responded that it is very important in the conflict resolution process to ask questions and then try to transcend the views of actors by suggesting options.

Christina Hagner, representing Kvinna till Kvinna, spoke briefly about the exemplary role played by women’s organisations during the Balkan wars, and asked Prof. Galtung if he saw any role for women organisations acting as peace facilitators in Afghanistan in the near future. Prof. Galtung responded by stating that, given the right opportunities, Afghan women can be very vocal. He also asserted that women from progressive Islamic countries, such as Tunisia and Turkey, will be able to play a much more effective role in this regard as compared with American feminists. Reiterating the need for the West to understand basic Islamic values to engage in fruitful dialogue with the Afghans, Prof. Galtung stressed that one of the reasons why mediating the Afghan conflict is so difficult is because the United States will never accept that it had committed mistakes in the past. Getting all parties to admit that they have committed mistakes in the past is an essential pre-requisite for a peaceful resolution, stated Prof. Galtung.

Juan Garces (RLA 1999) questioned Prof. Galtung on whether the United States felt threatened by a rising China and if it wanted to have a presence in Afghanistan to put pressure on China. Whilst Prof. Galtung agreed partially to the proposition, to the extent of conceding that one of the latent goals of the USA in its “Afghan campaign” is to have a presence in close proximity to China, he disagreed that China will threaten the American empire in the near future. As the discourse within the workshop turned from Afghanistan to China, Prof. Galtung commented that having lifted some 400 million Chinese from out of poverty, the Chinese leadership feels that it can now play a positive role in assisting the poverty stricken global south.
Advocating Reparations for all War Victims

Gustav-Stresemann-Institut e.V.
September 15, 2010

This workshop was facilitated by Vesna Terselic and Katarina Kruhonja (RLA 1998) and centred on sharing of experiences and discussion of strategies on how to successfully advocate for reparations for war victims. In her opening remarks, Ms. Terselic briefly explained her work in the former Yugoslavia and said that, in the Balkans, the problem is that there was very poor documentation of war crimes. “All victims have the right to truth, justice and reparations” she affirmed.

Ms. Terselic touched on the problems of bringing war criminals to justice, elaborating how very few of the many cases have been taken up by the local courts, despite the increasing efforts of prosecutors. “Family members of the victims expect reparations but legislation and the formal justice system favour the majority”, she alleged. Ms. Terselic said that her organisation not only provides psychological support for victims, but also advocates strongly for reparations for them. She stated that Croatia is already providing reparations and expressed hope that Bosnia and Herzegovina will enact legislation guaranteeing reparation for victims soon. Dr. Kruhonja echoed Ms. Terselic’s comments and also emphasised the importance of monitoring war crimes which is crucial as evidence in facilitating reparations for victims.

Elena Zhemova, representing Memorial (RLA 2004) explained how her organisation focuses its work on historical research and the present day human rights situation in Russia. She stated that her organisation advocates for the victims of World War II, a task made difficult due to the lack of documentation of victims. “How can we go to courts for victims of many years ago?”, she asked workshop participants. Commenting on the present day situation in Russia, Ms. Zhemova stated that war is still ongoing in Chechnya.

Theo van Boven gave a brief introduction of his work as UN Special Rapporteur in drafting the Basic Principles and Guidelines on the Right to Remedy and Reparation for Victims of Gross Violations of International Humanitarian Law, and expressed his surprise that the document was finally adopted by the United Nations after twelve years.

Dr. van Boven said that in his experience, he found that many victims and their family did not necessarily want money but wanted the truth to be known and acknowledged. “Reparation to all war victims should be inclusive, not exclusive. Monuments for victims, as symbols, are sometimes important for reconciliation as well”, he argued. Dr. van Boven also made the observation that, in many cases, victims had no access to reparations as they had no power.
Susanne Kjaer, representing Inge Genefke and the International Rehabilitation Council for Torture Victims (IRCT), explained that her organization, the ICRT, worked to provide medical documentation of the torture undergone by victims and guidelines on how to document the victims of torture. In addition, they provided victims medical as well as psychological support.

Subsequently, the workshop focused on identifying challenges faced by participants in their work. Ms. Terselic spoke about a problem in finding funds for documentation of victims, stating that prospective funders are more interested in providing funds for activities which promote reconciliation. In response, she made the argument to funders that documentation of victims is the foundation for meaningful peace and reconciliation.

Dr. van Boven expressed satisfaction that, at the global level, the international community has accepted the right of individuals to reparations, but admitted that there are problems at the implementation level. “It is a problem as well that certain countries simply ignore and deny that torture ever took place”, lamented Dr. van Boven. He affirmed Ms. Terselic’s point that it is a difficult task finding funding for documentation activities and pointed out that the European Union has stopped funding rehabilitation activities.

Ms. Zhemova agreed that progress has been made on the documentation issue, but argued that it is critical that every victim is named and that it remains very important to continue raising public awareness. She provided the example of Germany, where a space has been established for discussions amongst elderly people regarding World War II. “This is simple but important”, she concluded. Dr. van Boven agreed with Ms. Zhemova that there is a need to continue working on ways to find the identities of deceased victims of war. “People are not numbers”, he said emphatically.

Ms. Kjaer emphasised the importance of prevention and proposed that victims should be provided training so that they can become active campaigners against war and torture in the future. She also raised the issue of protection. “In many cases, victims are afraid to speak up, and so are doctors and nurses. This is still a challenge. Who will protect the victims?” she asked.

At the close of the workshop, all participants agreed that it is imperative to focus efforts on acknowledging every victim as this both contributes to the prevention of future war and torture and also de-legitimises the war itself. “It is important to use every opportunity to demand more justice!” concluded Ms. Terselic.
Bonn International Conversion Center (BICC) Cluster Event: Peace on Earth – Initiatives for Disarmament, Non Violence and Dialogue

Uni Club Bonn, Konviktstr. 9, 53113 Bonn
16 September 2010, 10:00 a.m. - 5:00 p.m.

At the second panel session of this cluster event, Dekha Ibrahim Abdi examined ethnic conflict, its resolution and the transformation from theory to practice. She explained how ethnic conflict is not a standalone issue and expressed her vision of harnessing the collective wisdom of society and transforming the victims and perpetrators of violence into a resource for peace as societal mediators and negotiators.

At the third panel session, Katharina Kruhonja spoke on the victims of war, arguing that organisations should not wait until the war is over to begin the treatment of victims. Similarly, she opined that peace building in the middle of a conflict and dealing with the past are important elements of reconciliation. Dr. Kruhonja also called for international law to be rigorously implemented and for perpetrators of war crimes to face justice. She mentioned that she is working on an initiative to create a new truth commission for all the ex-Yugoslav states. In response to a question asked by a participant on the need for international courts, Dr. Kruhonja affirmed that they were needed in the former Yugoslavia because the local judiciary that existed in the immediate aftermath of the wars was too biased towards one ethnic group.

Subsequently, Susanne Kjaer read an address by Inge Genefke to participants which affirmed that victims should have full access to justice and rehabilitation. Describing torture as “an instrument of power of repressive regimes with the aim to extract information, break down individuals and create fear in communities”, Dr. Genefke argued that torture is damaging not only through the trauma it inflicts but also by instilling awareness that basic human rights are neither guaranteed nor respected “Torture is in this way a threat to reconciliation and democratic development”, she argued, whilst stressing the urgent need for punishment of torturers.

Theo Van Boven submitted to participants that the focus should be on reparations for war victims to pave the way for reconciliation and peace building. Arguing that UN resolutions should be respected, Dr. van Boven stated that there are four key pillars for successful conflict resolution: justice, reparation, the right to know, and establishing the facts.
Deutsche Welle Cluster Event: Human Rights, Civil Society, Globalisation and the Role of the Media

Deutsche Welle
16 September 2010, 10:00 a.m. – 5:00 p.m.

BACKGROUND

Human rights – Media – Civil Society – Globalisation

The event will start with a press conference at Deutsche Welle (DW). Afterwards, there will be a round table discussion between the Right Livelihood Award laureates and DW-experts about the role and responsibilities of the media with regard to human rights, civil society and globalisation – which will also be the thematical focus of the Deutsche Welle Global Media Forum in 2011. The event will conclude with interviews and talks with editors.

DISCUSSION

Participants came together at this cluster event to discuss the challenges faced by the media in safeguarding and promoting human rights in their respective countries and internationally. Several media practitioners from Deutsche Welle were present at the event.

Zafrullah Chowdhury stressed that because of the visibility given by the media, many laureates are able to survive and continue their work. “Many times, local newspapers are ignored by the government, but when international media reports on the situation, there is bigger visibility”, explained Dr. Chowdhury. At the same time, Dr. Chowdhury discussed how during times of war, the international media often focus on foreign soldiers rather than the local people, leading locals to feel abandoned.

Ledum Mittee, representing the Movement of the Survival of the Ogoni People, affirmed that the media have a tremendous role to play in safeguarding human rights, but warned that the media today faces the challenge of neutrality. Mr. Mittee opened an interesting debate by questioning whether media neutrality at all times is desirable. “Governments sometimes try to drive the media and influence their reports and impressions. As far as human rights are concerned, the media should be able to recognise the good and the bad”, he argued. Despite these concerns, however, Mr. Mittee reiterated that as developing countries remains very sensitive as to what is reported about them in the international media, media pressure could in many cases lead to action and positive results.
Alla Yaroshinskaya (RLA 1992) discussed the example of the Chernobyl disaster as an illustrative case study. “The government determined what could or could not be published. Even after the collapse of the Soviet Union, media were not given access to several documents” she revealed. Ms. Yaroshinskaya added that in some countries, journalists have to practise self-censorship despite there not being official censorship. “If one criticizes some important politicians, one can get in real trouble”, she claimed.

A short discussion ensued on the ability of computers and the internet to have an impact on media reporting on human rights issues. Mr. Mittee said that problems of inadequate electricity and affordability ensure that the electronic medium does not play the role it should be playing in Africa. According to Mr. Mittee, as computer access is still a big issue in Africa, the formal press – written newspapers and radio – still plays the most important role. Ms. Yaroshinskaya responded by stating that the situation in Russia is very different as hard copy newspapers are dying. “Regarding political issues, the internet has a big role, and social networks like Facebook are doing a great job in spreading awareness”, she said. Nevertheless, Ms. Yaroshinskaya conceded that in Russia too many people could not afford to access the internet or afford computers. Dr. Chowdhury expressed scepticism about the effectiveness of online social networks to break down barriers, arguing “Facebook is for young people who are not interested in politics but in business”. Furthermore, he added that the Bangladesh government frequently threatened to ban access to Facebook because of its use by opposition movements and groups critical of the government and its policies.
5.

Re-orienting Education, Harnessing Universities for Social Transformation

As laureates strategised on tools and platforms they could use to accelerate, replicate and multiply their collective impact, several felt that educational institutions, universities in particular, could play a key role in social transformation. Many universities around the world, of late, have started moving towards a more holistic vision for the university’s role in society. Professor Tan Sri Dzulkifli Abdul Razak, the Vice Chancellor of Universiti Sains Malaysia (USM), Penang, Malaysia articulated such a vision for his university in a publication *Transforming Higher Education for a Sustainable Tomorrow 2009: Laying the Foundation*:

For the goal of transforming higher education for a sustainable tomorrow, USM believes that it will be more assertive in moving forward the sustainability agenda by reinvigorating and transforming its teaching and learning programmes...and various services to provide more meaningful quality outcomes that embrace the values of equity, accessibility, availability, appropriateness and affordability. Ultimately, it aims to support the drive to improve the well-being of humanity, the bottom billion, in particular. In other words, these efforts are geared to contribute towards the attainment of global visions as endorsed universally since the Rio Summit in 1992 (2010, x)

One of the most concrete outcomes of the 25th Anniversary Conference of the Right Livelihood Award was the creation of the Right Livelihood College (RLC) which for the first time, provided for a systemic platform linking academics in universities with activists, winners of the Right Livelihood Award. It is perhaps no surprise that USM, in line with its vision statement, agreed to host the global secretariat of the RLC. At the time of writing, Lund University’s Centre for Sustainable Studies (LUCSUS) in Sweden, Addis Ababa University in Ethiopia and the Center for Development Studies (ZEF) at the University of Bonn, Germany have become RLC partner campuses. As the various RLC campuses begin involving laureates through requesting them to supervise fellows and interns doing research in their fields and hosting them for lecture series, seminars and workshops, the potential of universities becoming effective hubs, incubators, catalysts, multipliers and accelerators of the laureates’ work will be realised.
At several sessions in the conference, laureates discussed and debated ways on how to make their engagement with universities most effective. The RLC and several other mechanisms of laureate-university engagement were explored, and several laureates shared their different perspectives on how best to go about strengthening the academic-activist link.

Harnessing Universities for Social Transformation: Floating Ideas

Gustav-Stresemann-Institut e.V
15 September 2010

This workshop was facilitated by Anwar Fazal, Martin Almada (RLA 2002) and Ibrahim Abouleish. It began with a number of presentations by laureates and their representatives.

Sharan Srinivas, representing the Right Livelihood College (RLC), described the RLC as a model for harnessing universities for social transformation. The idea, he said, was to involve the younger generation of academics in meaningful research related to the work of the laureates so that the laureates’ work was strengthened and so that their movements did not die with them. Mr. Srinivas gave a brief history of the RLC and the ways in which it was working. He mentioned that there were eight work areas that the RLC wanted to focus on:

• Lectures by laureates.
• Postgraduate fellowships – USM was providing up to five fellowships a year for doctoral researchers working on topics related to a laureate’s work.
• Internships – allowing interested students to intern with laureates. This built capacity for laureates who required it and allowed students to gain valuable skills and experience.
• International seminars and workshops led by laureates.
• Publications – scientific work to help laureates get their achievements published in academia.
• Films.
• Days of Action series – using UN Days of Action to mobilise students and the university community around laureates’ causes and issues.
• **Upscaling** – expanding and cooperating on projects and laureates’ issues with other universities and like minded institutions around the world.

Subsequently, Mr. Srinivas discussed some of the challenges and constraints faced by the RLC, including the intrinsically bureaucratic nature of universities, the funding challenges such novel ideas faced and scepticism in universities as to what benefits hosting the RLC brought for them. Nevertheless, he argued that there were many opportunities. “The RLC could be a mobiliser for a new wave of student activism and could be a hub of collective action”, he said.

Martin Almada’s presentation revolved around another novel, innovative idea: the idea of having a floating university on a ship where human rights and ecology are taught. Martin Alamada said that he worked at the UNESCO in Paris for 15 years, where he suffered because human rights and ecology went in opposite directions. He wondered if they cannot go hand in hand.

The floating university, Dr. Almada stated, will be installed in a ship called the Esmeralda that belongs to the Chilean army. “The Esmeralda only uses wind and solar energy, and can therefore be called a “green ship”. Martin Green (RLA 2002) has agreed to install photovoltaic cells at the ship”, remarked Dr. Almada. Dr. Almada expected that the floating university would be launched in five years time.

Ibrahim Abouleish of SEKEM made a presentation about Heliopolis University for Sustainable Development, a university he described as being transformational, transcultural, transdisciplinary, transpersonal, transsectoral and integral. With the core value of sustainable development, Dr. Abouleish made an in-depth presentation about the activities of his university and the social innovation labs it housed that aimed to spur innovation.

A guest to the conference, **Arnaud Delebarre** from the **Université de Henri Poincaré at Nancy University** presented a course that will take place at **Ecole supérieure des Sciences et Technologies de l'Ingénieur (ESSTIN) de Nancy** on the week following the conference. The objective of the course is to train engineers in finding non-scientific, socially acceptable solutions. Dr. Delebarre explained the AIR (atelier pour inventer un avenir responsable) workshop to be held with three RLA laureates and 150 students at ESSTIN.

Neshan Gunasekara, representing Christopher Weeramantry screened a short documentary describing the “Training for Trusteeship” (TFT) programme which Justice Weeramantry’s Weeramantry International Centre for Peace Education and Research (WICPER) has been conducting. TFT involves gathering student leaders from different religions and backgrounds from across Sri Lanka and showing them through lectures and activities what every individual could do for the betterment of their community and country.
Naakow Grant Hayford, representing Johan Galtung, made a presentation on the work of the Transcend Peace University (TPU) founded by Dr. Galtung. TPU, according to Mr. Hayford, has a digital campus and on-site activities. It offers 12 week online courses based on the experience of its members. Mr. Hayford stated that there are presently 350 members from 80 different countries in the network.

The final presentation of the workshop was made by Zafrullah Chowdhury (RLA 1992) who spoke about the International People’s Health University in Bangladesh, born out of the idea that universities are often educating students in a wrong manner and not encouraging them to seek solutions to practical problems. “Entry barriers are becoming higher and higher. When I went to university, poor students had the opportunity to go to university; now, this is no longer the case because of the privatisation of universities. Because of this, the idea of a People’s University was born in the late eighties”, explained Dr. Chowdhury.

At this point, the floor was opened for discussion. Namrata Bali, representing the Self Employed Women’s Association (SEWA) (RLA 1984) spoke of the problem faced by grassroots organisations such as SEWA in having their courses accredited. One of the solutions, Ms. Bali suggested, could be for such organisations to link up with established universities. On Mr. Srinivas’s suggestion that universities become centres of student activism, Lennart Olsson, Director of the Lund University Centre for Sustainability Studies (LUCSUS) said “Mainstream education is done at most universities, but there are islands of progressive universities that might be able to transfer their ideas to the mainstream world. Universities are usually not good at activism. Activists are good at activism. In my view, universities’ role is to investigate activism to make it better”.

Brook Lemma Marmaru, representing Addis Ababa University explained how there was a recent realisation at his university that its programmes were not empowering the community and that its research was not benefiting society despite tremendous investments. As a result, Dr. Marmaru said that the university is now looking to partner with universities all over the world in search for new ideas and initiatives. Hirut Woldemariam, Vice President for External Affairs, Strategic Planning and Partnerships at Addis Ababa University corroborated Dr. Marmaru’s points, indicating that her university was undergoing “a tremendous transformation process and initiating better policies for the betterment of society”.

Rashidah Shuib, Director of USM’s Women’s Development Research Centre (KANITA) argued that several new modalities for transforming universities are needed, not only in terms of teaching but for the generation of new, effective and timely knowledge designed to make an impact on the community. “Academics should strive to be activists and be more responsible for their own societies!” said Professor Rashidah.
Mycle Schneider (RLA 1997) challenged workshop participants by stating “We are facing fundamental challenges with radical ruptures very different from what we are used to. We need a radical new change that is phenomenally speedy to address community problems”. Mr. Schneider gave the examples of the “excess winter death” crisis faced by Europe and the global energy crisis to illustrate his point that there needs to be an urgent change in thinking and action. Prof. Fazal agreed, stating that there is a need for radical structural changes. Prof. Fazal called on activists, academics and universities to be ever ready for the opportunities for the rapture that may arise at any time. “We are too often not ready for the great opportunities created by challenges and crises” he argued.

Laureates and participants reached broad consensus on the following points at the close of the workshop:

- A possible solution for accreditation/certification problems faced by grassroots organisations would be to partner with established institutions.
- Universities which want to become social transformers need to use their comparative advantage in order to get acceptance and funding.
- Two steps forward for the future would be to look at existing structures and try to transform them and create new structures in order to achieve the more radical changes required.

**Alanus Hochschule Cluster Event: Re-orienting Modern Education: Values, Meanings and Strategies**

AU, Villestr. 3, 53347 Alfter
16 September 2010, 10:00 a.m. – 5:00 p.m.

**BACKGROUND**

**Education – Responsibility – Engagement – Creativity**

Within the context of globalisation, collective responsibility has arisen for humanity to sustain both natural and social ecologies. In contributing to this task, education needs to not only foster scientific and technological forms of knowledge but also nourish human capabilities such as critical insight, moral maturity and social engagement. Although the modern education paradigm often fails to adequately respond to this second need, fascinating and viable alternatives exist beyond this paradigm which communities around the world seek to preserve, revitalise and transform.
DISCUSSION

This cluster event, organised by the Alanus University of Arts and Social Sciences, began with comments by Sulak Sivaraksa (RLA 1995). Dr. Sivaraksa began by calling for a rethinking of education. “There is a need for requestioning of “old style” education. Do we educate ourself to get a better job?” he questioned the audience. “This,” he argued, “is a reductionist type of education. There is a need to redefine our education”.

Raul Montenegro (RLA 2004) presented his thoughts based on his empirical work with local people. He argued that there is a danger to our society nowadays, as human contact with nature has been replaced by contact with the artificial world. “One of our biggest stupidity nowadays is our acceptance of the idea that human and nature belong to two different systems. There is a need to change this paradigm”, he explained.

Dr. Montenegro also raised the issue of the danger of certain groups controlling society by colonising the behaviour of people. He alleged that religion, military education, civic education and the mass media are responsible for this phenomenon. Dr. Montenegro coined the notion of “factories of homogenisation” to describe the above mentioned different types of education which successfully colonised minds. “Education today is like a factory producing clones!” he argued.

To correct these trends, Dr. Montenegro called for adoption of a “transeducation” mechanism to replace the old-fashioned education system. He explained the notion of ‘transeducation’ as follows:

“Transeducation” is related to the transcultural processes to develop sustainable patterns of living. Universities are part of the problem as they produce elites. The problem nowadays is that most human minds have borders, and the challenge is to remove these borders. It is not the purpose of education to produce people with long CVs, but to have people who are able to find the right answers for the right questions.

Participating in the debate, Nicanor Perlas agreed that “there has been an extreme commodification of our education system”. He gave the example of genetic engineering, nanotechnology, artificial intelligence and endeavours that engineer thoughts and “commodified consciousness”, and said that it is interesting that our modern educational system prepare us to accept these as natural. Mr. Perlas further cited the example of IQ measurement, which he regarded symptomatic of the desire to equate human biological processes with a numeric system, so that it can be measured and commodified.
“The struggle is to create a society which questions the whole process. Since civil society has the cultural power, it should take the lead to reframe the whole process of development. I have been trying to convince people globally as well as in The Philippines to create a society which acts as a strong counter force by examining and even challenging detrimental national policies or corporate practices”, said Mr. Perlas in his closing remarks.
Identifying ways to move forward on seemingly intractable issues and conflicts drove much of the conference proceedings throughout the week. One internal workshop, facilitated by Raul Montenegro focused specifically on how to ameliorate techniques of ‘producing changes’ through laureates’ organisations and institutions.

**How to Ameliorate Our Techniques of “Producing Changes” Through Our Organisations and Institutions**

Gustav-Stresemann-Institut e.V.
15 September 2010

Facilitated by Raul Montenegro, the workshop originally aimed to assess and review the variety of non-violent tactics that have been used successfully by non-governmental organisations to accomplish specific goals.

After discussing several examples of non-violent action, the importance of garnering media attention to these actions was emphasised. “The issues of the poor are usually marginalised and kept under the carpet worldwide”, noted Ruth Manorama. Stephen Corry, representing Survival International said that he felt that the media is “reporting on issues which they think the audience is interested in, such as the activities of celebrities”.

**Hans-Peter Durr** (RLA 1987) spoke on the importance of “new media”. “The internet offers cheap and easy ways of distributing information to numerous recipients, thus having the possibility of becoming a “weapon of mass transformation””, he noted. Other laureates, however, raised the question of the short attention span of modern media as well as the danger of information overflow which leads to desensitisation and reduced effectiveness of messages. “People stop reading bad news. The media’s attention span is a short one. So one has to develop a strategy to keep issues visible”, argued Marcos Arana, representing IBFAN.
Dr. Arana subsequently spoke about the need to promote information that provides a feeling of belonging and stated that slogans and symbols can accomplish this and thus communicate issues efficiently. “Information needs to stimulate people to see problems and talk about it to each other, otherwise it will become a virtual struggle with virtual results”, he remarked.

Several laureates discussed the failure of academics and scientists to work with the people, with some complaining of an ivory tower mentality which prevented direct linkages between scientists and the poor. Dr. Montenegro suggested that written experiences of successful civil society movements may be able to facilitate successes in other organisations, and called for an “open book on fighting”.

As a concrete outcome of the workshop, participants agreed to launch a Wiki page on various activism strategies/methods and agreed that this would contribute to the improved functioning of global civil society movements. It was also agreed that creation of this tool would be an open process and that anyone could contribute. Dr. Montenegro concluded that information about successful activities from different parts of the world will not only increase knowledge on how to resolve these issues but also contribute to a positive point of view on the capability of individuals and communities to produce change.

World Café Discussions

On the final day of the conference, laureates gathered together amongst themselves and discussed strategies of “joint action” to take their work forward.

The conference organisers used the “World Café” format for the final day’s proceedings. Laureates sat in different round tables, each table headed by a host laureate, and discussed the questions of “Where do we stand in our work today?”, “What connects us?” and ‘What can we do together?’ After a specified amount of time, all the laureates at the table, barring the host, would leave and find a new table. This innovative approach saw much circulation and mingling of laureates, intimate discussion and the building of new synergies, alliances and friendships among laureates. At the end of the session, table hosts made presentations to the entire conference body on the conclusions the table had come to on the questions posed. Laureates agreed to form working groups on specific issues, gave feedback and suggestions to the Right Livelihood Award Foundation and called for unity, solidarity and regular communication among themselves, specifically focusing on assisting laureates whose lives and liberty were under threat.

It was clear at the close of the session that, by uniting around specific issues in a concerted manner, laureates have the potential to take each other’s work onwards and upwards and create a massive collective impact.
WORLD CAFÉ TABLE 1

Host: Rosaline Bertell (RLA 1986)

Session 1: Where do we stand in our work today?

This table declared that the overarching goal of their work is ensuring a better world by putting human faces to human and environmental problems. Human voices are heart-moving stories that do two things: (1) they foster a healing of past misdeeds and (2) they form the first steps toward charting the course for moving into a better future.

The table declared that their work was to:

• Educate the heart and the head.

• Strive to change public opinion by providing information about the degradation of the earth and the suffering in the world.

• Mobilise the world to focus on the Palestinian problem.

• Give voice to the suffering of oppressed people.

• Highlight how the environment is destroying ecological species (e.g. trees, seals) and humanity.

• Prevent future weather wars.

• Advocate for enforcement of laws on crimes against humanity and the earth.

Session 2: What connects us?

Participating laureates at the table summarized that the following actions connected them:

• Actions toward creating a compassionate world by inspiring current and future generations.

• Showcasing best practices to inspire youths for a better future.

• Removing obstacles to a better and beautiful future.
Session 3: What can we do together?

Participants at the table resolved to do the following:

- Support one another’s causes.
- Draft a new charter on global management for the United Nations.
- Make the Earth Charter accepted and adopted by the United Nations.
- Have precise target groups to / for / on whom issues are to be implemented.
- Use individual emails to send messages meant for individual laureates and use listservs for dissemination of general information.

WORLD CAFÉ TABLE 2

Host: Martin Pacheco, representing SERVOL (Service Volunteered for All)
(RLA 1994)

Session 1: Where do we stand in our work today?

At this table, laureates recognized each other’s achievements at the local, national and international level and stated that each of their projects have a long way to go. After hearing from each other, laureates agreed that all their projects had a lot to do with working at the community level on “holistic human development”.

Session 2: What connects us?

Laureates identified that they shared a strong solidarity with human beings and the earth. The participants stressed that injustice was unacceptable and that they must unite to fight its various manifestations, whether directed against humankind or against the earth and its organisms.

Session 3: What can we do together?

Participating laureates agreed that there needs to be a strengthening of the position of laureates as an international pressure group and collective actor. There was a suggestion that laureates collaborate with the Right Livelihood College to create a mechanism which they could use to rapidly express their responses to critical current issues. Mr. Pacheco, spokesperson at the table, argued for rapporteurs from the Right Livelihood Award Foundation or Right Livelihood College to be sent to monitor situations wherever they arise to assist in this regard.
Laureates at the table called for more regular and frequent “in-group” communication. Further, they suggested that the Right Livelihood College serve as a facilitator for research on the core themes of the RLA. They noted that getting the human resources and funding to do this research would be the greatest challenge.

WORLD CAFÉ TABLE 3

Host: Ponna Wignaraja, representing PIDA (Participatory Institute for Development Alternatives)

Session 1: Where do we stand in our work today?

Laureates were unequivocal in condemning world development for going in the wrong direction and stated that many years of their struggle have brought very little results. It was observed that new projects and new methodologies are needed to change reality. The participants called for the development of democracy at the country level as a starting point.

Session 2: What connects us?

Participants agreed that what connects them is commitment, but admitted that this was also what characterises corporations and other “enemies”. Laureates also stated that what distinguished them from others is that they see people as their focal point and that they work for the marginalised.

Session 3: What can we do together?

Laureates called for wider dissemination of their work. Further, they expressed a hope that deeper co-operation at the regional level will be planned and realised. Finally, those present at the table argued that the current paradigm of materialistic development should be substituted with a model of development grounded in spiritual and ethical values.

WORLD CAFÉ TABLE 4

Host: Alyn Ware (RLA 2009)

Session 1: Where do we stand in our work today?

Laureates focused on challenges and opportunities facing their work. They identified four critical challenges that need to be overcome:

• Violence, especially violence against women, is still an important issue to fight against.
• **Human rights** are yet to be guaranteed to all.

• The “**Democracy Deficit**” needs to be overcome in NGOs and grassroots organisations and the very poor ought to be included in the discourse.

• The integration of spiritual values in decision making should be promoted.

**Session 2: What connects us?**

At the conclusion of a fruitful dialogue, the table agreed that they were connected by Passion, Action, Issues and Vision (PAIV). In this sense, they hoped to “PAIV” the way to the future. Despite this, participants claimed that the laureates are only “pre-connected” and have to make an effort to transform this into a real connection. It was suggested that the laureates actively connect with each other and work in small groups on specific issues.

**Session 3: What can we do together?**

Laureates made several suggestions for future collaboration, including:

• Creation of a mailing list with important and condensed information as well as an archive of existing achievements.

• Creation of an emergency network to assist fellow laureates in crucial matters such as court trials, arrests, etc.

• Creation of a task force to support fellow laureates in urgent need by, inter alia, signing a petition or sending a delegation to the respective region.

• Drafting ethical standards for multinational corporations, in collaboration with the Right Livelihood College.

**WORLD CAFÉ TABLE 5**

---

Host: Dr. Rashidah Shuib (Director, Women’s Research Action Centre (KANITA) and Member, RLC Steering Committee)

Session 1: Where do we stand in our work today?

Laureates expressed a belief that they are empowering people by reaching out to the grassroots and building valuable networks around the globe. They noted that they have helped to create a list of alternatives to existing political, economic and leadership
structures but conceded that there is a need for further reflection to identify how to make these alternatives widely accepted.

Session 2: What connects us?

Laureates affirmed that their dedication to help the poor and promote social justice and human rights in the world builds a strong connection between them despite existing geographic and social disparities. However, participants also underlined that this connection in itself is not enough and observed an urgent need for more unity among them. They called for an organisation to build, maintain and promote the network among them as well as the need for a “big bang”.

Session 3: What can we do together?

Participating laureates at the table made the following suggestions:

• That there needs to be a change in the Right Livelihood Award Foundation’s procedure that includes establishing a more interactive mechanism for consultation with the laureates, particularly when their name is used in the promotion of the Foundation. Dr. Rashidah, spokesperson of the table, described the concern of members present at the table that persons serving at the various Right Livelihood College campuses should have values that do not contradict the values and spirit of the Right Livelihood Award Foundation.

• That there should be a focus on increasing the capacity and quality of both the Right Livelihood Award Foundation and the Right Livelihood College. The future is in the RLC where research is conducted.

• That Right Lifestyle Convention introducing an alternative lifestyle should be initiated.

• That laureates “raise their voice” by acting together.

WORLD CAFÉ TABLE 6

Host: Katharina Kruhonja

Session 1: Where do we stand in our work today?

Participants at this table narrated their achievements, which included documenting violence, supporting survivors, promoting human rights and improving awareness of these issues in society. They critiqued existing international mechanisms and called for reflection to think about how these could be reformed.
Session 2: What connects us?

Laureates concluded that each of them first achieved a change of social norms and then later reformed legislation. They accepted that many of them do not have strong connections at the international level and also face difficulties in communicating with each other due to lack of a common language. Affirming that they do not use their “collective weight” often enough in the five year period between RLA conferences, participants stated that what unites them is their struggle to make the world a better place.

Session 3: What can we do together?

Laureates reiterated a call made in 2005 for the Foundation to translate all important documents into common languages. The table also suggested that the RLC facilitate meetings between laureates working on similar issues in order for them to learn what each other has done.

The laureates underscored the point that they need to draft a written declaration which specifies a common topic they could all contribute to in the coming five years. To enable this, participants suggested that working groups should be formed to resolve specific issues together and report back on progress made at the next conference in five years time. Echoing calls made in other tables, there was a call for the formation of a working group to support laureates whose lives are in danger.

Laureates also provided some feedback to the organisers of the conference. They felt that, at the next conference, they would prefer more time among themselves for exchange, including a full first day to get to know each other, as well as a full final day together.

WORLD CAFÉ TABLE 7

Host: Anwar Fazal

Session 1: Where do we stand in our work today?

Participating laureates at this table reached consensus that a lot of progress on their issues had been achieved following their receipt of the Right Livelihood Award. They highlighted how the Award has created a basis for deepening efforts of the existing work, moving forward with new and innovative solutions to other pressing problems whilst building greater alliances with both local and regional institutions. While acknowledging that considerable challenges still persist, participants felt that the RLA platform gives hope and inspiration to forge ahead.
Session 2: What connects us?

Participants felt that the Right Livelihood Award is the key connecting factor. Moreover, they noted that a shared feeling of anger and dismay at the ills they see in their respective surroundings is something that connected them. Participants felt that they shared a sense of global citizenship and recognised the opportunity to connect with the scientific/academic community through the Right Livelihood College. They affirmed that this would give further legitimacy to their work and deepen the bonds they share.

Session 3: What can we do together?

Laureates identified the documentation and global dissemination of their work through audiovisual media as an important project that they could work on together, in co-operation with the various campuses of the Right Livelihood College. Participants affirmed that the youth initiative and the engagement of graduate students with the work of the laureates are excellent means of deepening the impact and broadening the work of the laureates. They affirmed the RLC’s vision to achieve this through mediums such as internships and graduate research.

WORLD CAFÉ TABLE 8

Host: Christina Hagner (representing Kvinna till Kvinna)

Session 1: Where do we stand in our work today?

Laureates expressed a certain degree of frustration with the decision making process of the RLA and the RLC, considering that their names were being used by these organisations. There was a consensus that there is a need to redesign and revise the work of the RLA Foundation to make it more effective. Participants also bemoaned the lack of information-sharing and networking between the laureates and affirmed the need to contribute more to the Foundation’s work.

Session 2: What connects us?

Laureates reiterated the need for solidarity among themselves and expressed a feeling of helplessness that they cannot do more when one of them is under threat or being persecuted. The case of Mordechai Vanunu (RLA 1987), who has been harassed and incarcerated by the Israeli government was extensively discussed. Participants agreed to build a strategy to work together in an efficient manner. They suggested working together on topical issues that are interdisciplinary in nature.
Session 3: What can we do together?

Laureates suggested the following ways to work together:

- Show solidarity with each other and help each other during difficult times.
- Create a network (not an organisation) for experience sharing.
- Try to set up a “FOCUS” meeting every year which aims to find a way to work together on specific topics.
- Set up working groups among laureates to resolve specific issues.

In addition, participants affirmed the need to engage junior scientists in their work and called on the Right Livelihood Award Foundation to take up a more participatory approach in its work, involving as many laureates as possible in the formulation of its programmes. Ms. Hagner, spokesperson for the table, reiterated the point that laureates should really use the strength they brought together to fight for threatened laureates. She concluded her remarks by saying “nothing is impossible. The impossible only takes a little bit longer to achieve. That is for everybody to think about”.

WORLD CAFÉ TABLE 9

Host: Peter Schweitzer (representing Plenty International, RLA 1980)
Session 1: Where do we stand in our work today?

Participants at this table highlighted the need for the laureates to become more proactive, rather than just reacting to emergencies that occurred. They also called on laureates to unite around three or four issues for greater impact. Many at the table also pointed out a need for more sharing of experiences among laureates, with host Mr. Schweitzer saying, “We all want to know what everyone’s been doing. And we want a way to share that”.

Session 2: What connects us?

Mr. Schweitzer said “one of the things that we’re all in business of is miracles. And I can't count the number of miracles that I have seen and experienced over the course of my doing this kind of work, and I know we all have had miracles. Let’s share those. Miracles give us hope”. Laureates at the table also called for the Right Livelihood Award Foundation to share personal email addresses of the laureates with the entire group for better communication.
Session 3: What can we do together?

Laureates at the table called for “the hat” to be passed around to support initiatives started by the laureates and the Right Livelihood Award Foundation. In particular, Mr. Schweitzer called for the World Future Council to be supported as he considered it to be very important.

WORLD CAFÉ TABLE 10

Host: Frances Moore Lappé

Session 1: Where do we stand in our work today?

According to Ms. Lappé, table host, participating laureates felt that there should be a reflection on what the Award has achieved, with a projection for the future. “One way of thinking about that is perhaps the need to cast the Right Livelihood laureates not just as the doers of good things, but as really an early warning system for Planet Earth” she stated.

Session 2: What connects us?

Laureates at the table expressed a sense of unity and suggested that this could be used to spearhead joint action at a national or regional level.

Session 3: What can we do together?

Laureates expressed the need to capitalise on new technologies such as Skype to have regular meetings to know and learn from one another. They also suggested that the collective identity of the laureates be strengthened by having a rotating representation of laureates on the board of the Right Livelihood Award Foundation itself.
7. Conclusion

As the above chapters indicate, the threats to all that we cherish and indeed, the continued existence of humankind itself, constitute a clear and present danger. At the 30th Anniversary Conference of the Right Livelihood Award in Bonn, laureates made impassioned presentations that revealed how the livelihoods of many farming communities have become endangered due to the proliferation of GMO seeds. They shattered myths by clearly pointing out how and why global hunger is a result not of a lack of food but of true democracy. They exposed how hard won and established treaty based and customary international laws protecting the environment, victims of war and the human rights of all have been systematically eroded by politicians who have not only failed to respect them, but have actively reneged on their implementation. All these developments remain overshadowed by the undeniable fact that our generation remains under “the shadow of the mushroom cloud...(a) fear which has hung like a blanket of doom over the thoughts of children in particular...an evil in itself (which) will last so long as nuclear weapons remain” (Weeramantry 1996).

Equally important was the consensus emerging from the conference that we should not be lured into accepting easy solutions and “quick fixes” to mitigate these threats. Laureates forcefully argued against solutions such as geo-engineering and debunked the false assertion that technological advances in, and of, themselves can alleviate the threats of climate change and the depletion of conventional sources of energy. Laureates warned that civil society should treat these “solutions” with utmost scrutiny as their proposers were often aligned with the very persons and groups that had caused the problem and now wanted to profit from the tragedy they had caused. Laureates were united in calling for world leaders to make tough choices and explain to the public the inevitable changes in consumption patterns and indeed, in the way of life that need to be made to roll back the harmful effects of climate change and environmental degradation.

All these sobering doses of reality are not to say that the atmosphere at the conference was one of pessimism. Change-making and “walking the talk” will never be easy, and one should take heart from the inspiring words of Nelson Mandela who said “there is no easy walk to freedom anywhere, and many of us will have to pass through the valley of the shadow of death again and again before we reach the mountaintop of our desires”. Let us remember that activists and change-makers throughout history have been successful
in achieving monumental change against all odds. The enfranchisement of women, the abolition of slavery in most jurisdictions, and the end of apartheid in South Africa are just a few examples of this, and Right Livelihood Award laureates have achieved and are achieving sustainable change and the “impossible” every day. The recent UN General Assembly declaration that enshrined water as a human right is just one example of the palpable change in course RLA laureates have brought about which has shaken the global world order.

At the RLA Bonn conference, RLA laureates expressed solidarity for each other’s causes, and shared experiences and “best practices” which could be used by other laureates facing similar issues and challenges. Looking at the bigger picture, there was also broad agreement among the laureates that the younger generation needs to be linked into their work for it to be sustainable and so that the hard-won gains made by the laureates are not frittered away over time. Several laureates noted that the Right Livelihood College, itself an initiative of the 2005 RLA conference in Salzburg, could serve as an incubator of laureates’ ideas and a vehicle for the transmission of laureates’ knowledge and skills to the next generation.

There was also, above all, recognition in the conference that there needs to be broader alliances and unity within civil society for progress to be made. Laureates expressed the need to think beyond the narrow confines of their work and look at how several of their issues were inextricably linked. The rights of indigenous communities are threatened whenever the environment they live in comes under attack by commercial enterprises. Climate change has a direct impact on poverty and is already causing an influx of refugees in several parts of the world. Several of the inter-state and intra-state wars over the last few decades and the human rights violations that have occurred during the course of these wars have been directly motivated by a desire to control and exploit the resources of the dwindling “global commons”. Several petitions were drafted, a few working groups of laureates were formed and many alliances were cemented in Bonn which have the potential to multiply and accelerate the collective impact of the RLA laureates on a host of causes they are fighting for.

The RLA laureates amount to a beacon of hope, a lighthouse in a stormy sea. The RLA Bonn Conference saw their flame sustained and renewed. For the many tireless activists who toil in isolation in faraway lands and sometimes question their ability to succeed in the face of powerful adversaries and deep seated resistance, take heart from the stories encapsulated in this report and know that your good work will pay dividends. In the words of Jimmy Carter “it would be naïve to think that peace and justice can be achieved easily. However, with faith and perseverance, complex problems in the past have been resolved in our search for justice and peace”.

The conference saw a re-emphasis on the true meaning of democracy. Today, too much power has been surrendered to unaccountable actors who claim to know what is best for us. These actors have clearly failed. As we reach a crucial period in the history of civilisation, we as concerned citizens must stand up and stand united to advocate for and chart a radical change in course to reclaim our common future.
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ANNEX I
CONFERENCE PROGRAMME OVERVIEW

30 Years Right Livelihood Award
Changing Course – Reclaiming Our Future
Programme

Tuesday, 14 September

All day Arrival, Check in, Registration at Gustav-Stresemann-Institute (GSI)
Gustav-Stresemann-Institut e.V.
Langer Grabenweg 68
D-53175 Bonn-Bad Godesberg
Phone: +49 (0) 228 / 8107-0
18:00 Welcome Dinner (Laureates & organisers) in the Gustav Stresemann
Institute
Welcome by Jakob v. Uexküll (RLAF), Ms. Hohn-Berghorn
(City of Bonn)

Wednesday, 15 September

7:30 – 9:00 Breakfast
9:00 Touch-down for Organisational Matters of the day
Presentation Right Livelihood College (Anwar Fazal)
10:00 Departure from GSI to Museum Koenig
10:30 Official festive welcome and opening at the Museum Alexander Koenig
• Speeches by the Mayor of Bonn and Jakob von Uexkull
• Signing of the Golden Book of Bonn

Zoologisches Forschungsmuseum Alexander Koenig
Museumsmeile Bonn
Adenauerallee 160
53113 Bonn
Phone: +49 (0)228 / 9122 0

11:45 Reception and lunch
13:00 Return to GSI
14:00 – 16:00 Internal working groups
16:00 – 16:20 Coffee break
16:20 – 17:30 Internal working groups
18:30 Departure from GSI:
Boat Cruise on the River Rhine with Buffet
Some laureates to leave for events in city centre (Panel discussion, film event)
Rest can continue on the boat, later return to GSI

Thursday, 16 September

7:30 – 9:00  Breakfast
9:00  Touch-down for Organisational Matters of the day
9:30  Departure from GSI:
   12 thematically clustered events/workshops with several laureates and local experts, organised by high-profile institutions in Bonn, including workshops with youth conference participants
17:30  Return to Gustav Stresemann Institut (GSI)
18:30  Departure from GSI:
   Dinner hosted by the City of Bonn at the Petersberg, the former Guest House of the Federal Republic of Germany

Friday, 17 September

7:30 – 9:00:  Breakfast
9:00  Touch-down for Organisational Matters of the day
From 9:30 onw. Departure:
   Day of meetings in North-Rhine Westfalia: interacting with NGOS, schools, institutions, etc in Bonn and the state of North Rhine Westphalia, ca 25 events, incl. workshops with youth conference participants, RLA workshop
18:00  Dinner in GSI

Saturday, 18 September

7:30 – 9:00:  Breakfast
9:00  Touch-down for Organisational Matters of the day
9:30 – 12:30  Internal working groups
12:30 – 14:00  Lunch in GSI
14:00 – 16:00  Final internal session at GSI
18:30  Departure from GSI:
19:00  Goodbye-Dinner: Laureates, friends and conference organisers

Sunday, 19 September

Departure day
ANNEX II
IFOAM DECLARATION FOR LIVING CHANGE

IFOAM DECLARATION FOR LIVING CHANGE
ORGANIC AGRICULTURE OFFERS SOLUTIONS FOR GLOBAL CHALLENGES

We, Laureates of the Alternative Nobel Prize (Right Livelihood Award), Vandana Shiva (India), Percy & Louise Schmeiser (Canada), Ibrahim & Helmy Abouleish (Egypt), Frances Moore Lappé (USA), Taeko Ogiwara & Ikuko Sasaki (Japan), Melaku Worede (Ethiopia), Maria Salete Campigotto (Brazil) and Pat Mooney (Canada);

COMING TOGETHER

To meet, at the invitation of the International Federation of the Organic Agriculture Movements (IFOAM), COLABORA, concerned citizens and advocates for change;

EXPRESS

Our deepest concerns about prevailing agriculture policies, research and development agenda, and private sector strategies favoring short-term individual profits, to the detriment of the long-term sustainable use of natural resources for the benefits of all, causing unnecessary and unacceptable hunger, poverty, climate change and destruction of habitats and biodiversity for human beings and Nature;

DECLARE OUR CONVICTION

1. That we believe in the capacity of Nature to decently and healthily feed a growing human population, provided human beings honor the value of nature and establish strategies based on the intensification of naturally occurring ecological processes.

2. That respect for human beings and for all forms of domesticated and wild life has the power to establish a new culture of dialogue and progress, thus creating unprecedented synergies between ecology and economy for the benefit of all.

3. That only farming that nourishes Nature and supports biological activities, efficient use of water, climate, seeds, breeds and naturally developed soils –
rather than industrial agricultural that creates deserted monotonous landscapes and relies on external energy – can guarantee food for all, now and in the future.

4. That positive development requires a legal framework that prioritises the right of rural communities and their people, regardless of their race, culture, religion, gender and age, to access their own local natural resources in order to provide for their needs and access relevant knowledge of traditional and science based ecological farming practices.

5. That the power of consumers in rural and urban areas worldwide can put the world on a path to sustainability, provided they have access to fully transparent information about the implications of food production for the health of their families and for the health of all people and natural environment involved in the supply chain.

AND DEMAND

1. That agriculture and food security policies of communities, governments, private sector and civil society at local, national, regional and global levels implement the comprehensive IAASTD recommendations and that they aim for sustainability in development, including ecological biodiversity, social welfare for all and economic viability of systems.

2. That threats to Nature and society, posed by high risk technologies such as synthetic agriculture inputs, biotechnology, agro-fuels and nanotechnology, are made transparent to all and that the interest of Nature, of smallholders and landless rural populations, of domesticated species and of consumers are prioritised over profits of their proponents.

3. That the principles of Organic Agriculture (Ecology, Health, Fairness, Care) guide power holders on thoughtful decision making and disseminators of information on significant messaging.

4. That the potentials of organic approaches are increasingly adopted by farmers, processors and marketers of agriculture products, so as to achieve sustainable natural environments and societies throughout the world.

Bonn, Germany 16 September 2010
THE DECLARATION IS ENDORSED BY:

PARTNERS: Katherine DiMatteo (IFOAM, USA); Markus Arbenz (IFOAM, Germany); Bernward Geier (COLABORA, Germany); Willy Douma (Hivos, Netherlands); Benjamin Gräub (Biovision, Switzerland); Kerstin Lanje (Misereor, Germany); Martien Lankester (Avalon Foundation, Netherlands); Claus Rättich (Biofach, Germany); Jörg Schallehn (Vermögensakademie, Germany); Andreas Schriber (Biovision); Jakob von Uexküll (Right Livelihood Award, Sweden).

DIALOGUE PARTNERS: Elizabeth Cruzada (MASIPAG, Philippines); Thomas Dosch (Bioland/IFOAM EU, Germany); Rupert Ebner (Slow Food, Germany); Ulrich Gundert (brot für die Welt, Germany); Hans Herren (Biovision/ Millennium Institute/IAASTD, USA/Switzerland); Bärbel Höhn (Federal Parliament, Germany); Barbara Keller (Frauen für die Vielfalt, Germany); André Leu (IFOAM, Australia); Beatrix Tappeser (Vereinigung deutscher Wissenschaftler, Germany); Melanie Weber-Moritz (Verbraucher-Initiative e.V. VI, Germany); Hubert Weiger (BUND, Germany).

SUPPORTERS: Georg Abel (Verbraucher-Initiative e.V. VI); Nora Bruggermann (Center on Sustainable Consumption and Production, CSCP); Udo Censkowksy (Organic Services); Alexander Gerber (Bund Ökologische Lebensmittelwirtschaft e.V., BÖLW); Sigrid Grossmann (ECOVIN); Susanne Gura (Verein zur Erhaltung der Nutzpflanzenvielfalt, VEN); Ines Hensler (IMO); Robert Hermanski (Forschungsinstitute für biologischen Landbau, FIBL Deutschland); Michael Kuhndt (Center on Sustainable Consumption and Production, CSCP); Dieter Overath (Transfair); Marion Rhein (Demeter e.v.); Elke Roeder (Bundesverband Naturkost Naturwaren Herstellung und Handel e.V.); Helmut Röscheisen (Deutscher Naturschutzerzgering); Gerhard Roth (Ökosoziales Forum Deutschland); Jörg Sommer (Deutsche Umwelstitstiftung); Christa Thomas (Schweisfurth Stiftung); Edith van Walsum (ILEIA); Angela von Besteen (Ökologischer Ärztebund e.V.); Alexander Wandel (World Future Council); Uli Zerger (Stiftung Ökologie & Landbau).

And the 300 participants of the IFOAM Inspiration for Living Change conference in Bonn and worldwide, through the internet.
Open Letter by Right Livelihood College Rapporteurs to the Laureates

On the occasion of the Conference on the 30th Anniversary of the Right Livelihood Award in the City of Bonn, Germany at 18 September 2010.

We, the young minds of science and research, declare that we can contribute effectively to the work of the laureates through a holistic approach on research and development in which the laureates serve as role models of inspiration.

This holistic approach should incorporate new perspectives in academic research that take into account socioeconomic, political and ecological dimensions. The engagement in academic activism and taking responsibility of the existing challenges and actions for solution should also be encouraged. In addition, the paradigm-shift on research in gender issues should be emphasised.

This new approach should also take into account the necessity on the legislation and relevant constitutional provisions for criminal charges, not only against companies and government bodies but also against individuals who are responsible positions of these agencies.

This new approach should consider the importance of public education and awareness as well as experiential learning with the aim to build a closer link between the society and the work of the laureates.

Local-context orientation and problem-based documentation should be at the forefront of Right Livelihood College strategy. In addition, international networking, alliance building, and experience sharing are critical points on which the cooperation between the laureates and academia should be based.

In addition to activism, theoretical frameworks should be utilised for explaining local issues. Nevertheless, the adaptation of this theoretical framework at the local level is also crucial. The self-reflexive education as a complement to institutionalised education should be further promoted.

Finally, we have to remember to promote the concept that unity in diversity is one of the most fundamental principles for changing course and reclaiming our future.
ANNEX IV
LIST OF PARTICIPATING LAUREATES

1. Abdi, Dekha Ibrahim, Kenya.
2. Agnivesh, Swami, India.
3. Almada, Martín Dr., Paraguay.
5. Barlow, Maude Dr., Canada.
6. Bertell, Rosalie Dr., Canada.
8. Centre Jeunes Kamenge (Representative: Guillaume Harushimana), Burundi.
9. Chipko Movement (Representatives: Sunderlal Bahuguna and his wife Vimla), India.
10. Clarke, Tony Dr., Canada.
11. CSMR – Committee of Soldiers’ Mothers of Russia (Representative: Dr. Ida Kuklina), Russia.
12. Duna Kör (Representative: Dr. Judit Vasarhelyi), Hungary.
13. Dürr, Hans-Peter Prof. Dr., Germany.
14. Epstein, Samuel Prof. Dr., USA.
15. Fazal, Anwar Prof. Dr., Malaysia.
16. Galtung, Johan Prof. Dr., Norway.
17. Garcés, Juan Dr., Spain.
18. Gonoshastaya Kendra/Dr. Zafrullah Chowdhury, Bangladesh.
19. Goodman, Amy, Democracy Now!, USA.
20. Grameen Shakti (Representative: Dipal Barua), Bangladesh.
21. Hauser, Monika Dr., Germany.
23. International Rehabilitation and Research Centre for Torture Victims (ICRT) Representative: Susanne Kjaer, Denmark.
24. KSSP – Kerala Sastra Sahithya Parishat (Representative: Dr. Pallath Kumaran Ravveendran), India.
25. Kruhonja, Katarina Dr., Croatia.
27. Kylätoiminta (Representatives: Tapio Mattlar and Matti Mäkelä of the Village Action Association of Finland), Finland.
29. LEDEG – Ladakh Ecological Development Group (Representative: Mohd. Hasnain), India.
30. Lemke, Birsel, Turkey.
31. Marlin, Alice T. President and Founder of Social Accountability International.
32. Max-Neef, Manfred Prof. Dr., Chile.
33. Manorama, Ruth Dr., India.
34. Memorial (Representative: Dr. Elena Zhemkova), Russland.
35. Montenegro, Raúl Prof. Dr., Argentina.
36. Mooney, Pat, Canada.
37. Moore-Lappé, Frances Dr., USA.
38. MOSOP – Movement for the Survival of the Ogoni People (Representative: Ledum Mitee), Nigeria.
39. MST – Movimento dos Trabalhadores Rurais sem Terra, Brazil.
40. Ngongo, René, Democratic Republic of Congo.
41. Nugkuag Ikanan, Evaristo, Peru.
42. Orrego, Juan Pablo, Chile.
43. Narmada Bachao Andolan, (Representative: Chauhan, Vijaya), India.
44. Perlas, Nicanor, Philippines.
45. PIDA – Participatory Institute for Development Alternatives (Representative: Dr. Ponna Wignaraja), Sri Lanka.
46. Plenty International (Representative: Peter Schweitzer), USA.
47. SAM – Sahabat Alam Malaysia (Representative: Mohd. Azmi Abdul Hamid), Malaysia.
48. Scheer, Hermann Dr., Germany.
49. Schmeiser, Percy & Louise, Canada.
50. Schneider, Mycle, France.
52. SEKEM/Dr. Ibrahim Abouleish and Helmy Abouleish, Egypt.
53. SERVOL – Service Volunteered for All (Representative: Martin Pacheco), Trinidad & Tobago.
54. SEWA – Self-Employed Women’s Association (Representative: Namrata Bali), India.
55. Shiva, Vandana Dr., India.
56. Sivaraksa, Sulak Dr., Thailand.
57. Succow, Michael Prof. Dr., Germany.
59. Sudarshan, Hanumappa, Dr. / Vivekananda Girijana Kalyana Kendra (VGKK), India.
60. Survival International (Representatives: Stephen Corry & Linda Poppe), UK.
61. Terselic, Vesna, Croatia.
62. Trident Ploughshares (Representative: Angie Zelter), UK.
63. Turner, John F. Charlewood, UK.
64. van Boven, Theo Prof. Dr., Netherlands.
65. van Rensburg, Patrick, Botswana, South Africa.
66. Ware, Alyn, New Zealand-Aotearoa.
67. Weeramantry, Christopher Judge, Sri Lanka (Representative: Gunasekera, Neshan)
68. Whitaker Ferreira, Francisco, Brazil.
69. Woreda, Melaku Dr., Ethiopia.
70. Wolde-Yohannes, Legesse Dr., Ethiopia.
71. Yaroshinskaja, Alla, Ukraine.
Annex V
Partner Organisations

Organisers

The Right Livelihood Award Foundation was established in 1980 to honour and support those “offering practical and exemplary answers to the most urgent challenges facing us today”. It has now become widely known as the “Alternative Nobel Prize” and there are now 141 laureates from 59 countries. Presented annually in Stockholm at a ceremony in the Swedish Parliament, the Right Livelihood Award is usually shared by four Recipients. Besides the financial support, it enables its Recipients to reach out to an international audience that otherwise might not have heard of them. Often, the Award also gives crucial protection against repression. For more information, please visit www.rightlivelihood.org

The City of Bonn, Germany’s United Nations City, provides new platforms to constructive dialogue on the national, international and supranational levels. Time and again, fresh momentum goes out from Bonn and its actors on the road towards worldwide sustainable development. Whether climate, desertification, water, soil, biodiversity, or early warning – Bonn has developed into the German competence centre for environment, development and health. This synergy networks of politics, organisations, industry, science, culture and by more than 150 NGOs. Among the latter are not only German organisations engaging in international issues and activities but also approximately 20 international non-governmental organisations which have established their headquarters in Bonn since 1990. For more information, please visit www.bonn.de
Co-Organisers

The Foundation for Environment and Development, North Rhine Westphalia’s mission is to protect natural resources, fight poverty and promote global justice, a One World philosophy and human dignity. The foundation assists non-profit environment and development organisations by providing project consultancy and financial resources. Projects must be geared towards people in North Rhine-Westphalia. For more information, please visit www.sue-nrw.de

The Foundation for International Dialogue of the Savings Bank in Bonn supports the international dialogue and cooperation in the Federal and United Nations City of Bonn. Bonn is an international and cosmopolitan city and holds a unique position amongst other German cities. The city and the region of Bonn therefore have the best potential to become a hub for international dialogue. The Foundation’s aims are to promote international understanding, development cooperation, European integration and study and research in the fields of international politics and history. For more information, please visit www.sparkasse-koelnbonn-stiftungen.de
The Deutsche Bundesstiftung Umwelt (DBU) is one of Europe’s largest foundations. It promotes innovative and exemplary environmental projects relating to topics of environmental technology, environmental provision and research, nature protection and environmental communication. The three main criteria for obtaining a subsidy are innovation, the exemplary and model character and the environmentally beneficial result of an initiative. For more information, please visit www.dbu.de

The German Academic Exchange Service (DAAD) is the largest funding organisation in the world supporting the international exchange among students and scholars. Its activities go far beyond simply awarding grants and scholarships. DAAD supports the internationalisation of German universities, promotes German studies and the German language abroad, assists developing countries in establishing universities and advises decision-makers on matters of cultural, education and development policy. For more information, please visit www.daad.de

Stiftung Mercator is one of Germany’s largest foundations. It initiates and funds projects that promote better educational opportunities in schools and universities. In the spirit of Gerhard Mercator, it supports initiatives that embody the idea of open-mindedness and tolerance through intercultural encounters, encouraging the sharing of knowledge and culture. The foundation provides a platform for new ideas to enable people – regardless of their national, cultural and social background – to develop their personality, become involved in society and make the most of the opportunities available to them.
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Natur+kosmos magazine focuses on nature, environment and sustainable lifestyle and offers an in-depth view of the global correlations between man, nature and technology. natur+kosmos gives a voice for those who are ahead of their times and who actively promote new ideas. Over the years, natur+kosmos has presented scores of Right Livelihood Award and their projects to its readers. For a selection of these articles, please refer to www.natur.de/rla

Oekom publishing is the leading specialist publisher of ecology and sustainability in Germany. The kind of books oekom publishers – from renowned authors such as Hans-Peter Dürr, Donella Meadows and Josef Reichhoff – have ways to a better future and open up new prospects for environment and society. For more information, please visit www.oekom.de
medica mondiale is a German-based non-governmental organisation standing up for women and girls in war and crisis zones throughout the world. medica mondiale supports women and girls having experienced sexualised violence, regardless of political, ethnic or religious affiliation. Together with women from around the world, medica mondiale is committed to helping women to lead a dignified and self-determined life. The Bonn International Women’s Center – ifz – evolved in 1999 from efforts to put into practice the goals of the Local Agenda 21. It was founded by women actively dedicated to work for the then Foreign Residents’ Advisory Council (Ausländerbeirat) of the City of Bonn and the Agenda Working Group “Women One World”. The ifz has approximately 170 members, coming from Europe, Asia, Africa and America as well as organisations dedicated to work for peace, refugees and women. It supports the cause of peace and human rights and works to achieve more justice between men and women.

The Deutsche Gesellschaft für Technische Zusammenarbeit (GTZ) is a federally owned organisation. It works worldwide in the field of international cooperation for sustainable development. Its mandate is to support the German Government in achieving its development objectives. It provide viable, forward-looking solutions for political, economic, ecological and social development in a globalised world.

Denkwerk Zukunft – Stiftung kulturelle Erneuerung (Denkwerk Zukunft – Foundation for Cultural Renewal) was founded on 6 October 2007. The most important aim of the Foundation is a renewal of Western culture in order to qualify it for the future and make it generally applicable. This requires a basic change in the understanding of culture. Denkwerk Zukunft wants to contribute to this changed understanding and at the same time furnish new ideas for a cultural renewal.
Friedrich–Ebert–Stiftung maintains its own representations in 70 countries of Africa, Asia, the Middle East and Latin America. Its staff are engaged in projects in the fields of socio-political development and economic and social promotion. In addition, it maintains offices in the West, where it fosters dialogue between democratic forces with the aim of bringing about a balance of interests, resolving conflicts and drawing up policy options.

Global Policy Forum is an independent policy watchdog that monitors the work of the United Nations and scrutinises global policymaking. GPF works particularly on the UN Security Council, the food and hunger crisis, and the global economy. It promotes accountability and citizen participation in decisions on peace and security, social justice and international law.

Deutsche Welle is Germany’s international broadcaster: online, on-screen and over the air. It provides a European perspective to audiences around the world and promotes intercultural dialogue.

The German Federal Agency for Nature Conservation (Bundesamt für Naturschutz, BfN) is the central scientific authority of the German federal government for both national and international nature conservation.

IFOAM’s mission is leading, uniting and assisting the organic movement in its full diversity. Its goal is the worldwide adoption of ecologically, socially and economically sound systems that are based on the principles of Organic Agriculture.

COLABORA is active in the areas of ecological agri-and food culture, and promotes sustainability. It mainly works – also at the international level – in the following sectors: communications, events, consultancy and fundraising.
The German Commission for UNESCO (DUK), based in Bonn, is a National Commission established under Article VII of the UNESCO Constitution, and is thus the link between Germany and UNESCO. It acts as an intermediary of foreign cultural and educational policy, and is supported by the Foreign Office.

The LVR-LandesMuseum, Bonn, hosted this cluster event.

The German Development Institute / Deutsches Institut für Entwicklungspolitik (DIE) is one of the leading research institutions and think tanks for global development and international development policy worldwide. The DIE’s unique research profile combines research, consulting and professional training. DIE builds bridges between theory and practice and works within international research networks.

Alanus University is a state-approved private University of Arts and Social Sciences. It is a place of arts-based education and academic research. The University offers a wide range of courses covering both artistic and academic disciplines.

The Development and Peace Foundation (SEF) aims to shape policy responses to globalisation through an interdisciplinary and international approach. SEF events and publications represent a contribution to the promotion of worldwide peace and sustainable development.

As an independent, non-profit organization, BICC (Bonn International Center for Conversion) is dedicated to promoting and facilitating peace and development.

Following the motto “Observing, Analysing, Acting”, Germanwatch has been actively promoting global equity and the preservation of livelihoods since 1991.
ANNEX VI
ABOUT THE YOUTH FUTURE PROJECT
Take Action – Change the World

Human Rights, empowering the poor, peaceful conflict solution, religious tolerance, protecting nature and the environment, developing alternative economic systems, arms reduction, conserving resources, establishing spirituality and ethics in politics and business. These are the great challenges of our time. The idea for the Youth Future Project was born out of the ambition to bring young people together with laureates of the Right Livelihood Award to discuss ideas and concepts for a peaceful and environmentally sustainable future.

According to the organisers of the conference, “Our future concerns everyone. Laureates of the Right Livelihood Award not only developed innovative theoretical approaches to developing solutions, but also practice what they preach. They turn their thoughts into practical initiatives. We aim to inform young people about their ideas and enable them to take action.”

The Youth Future Project aims to create a worldwide community in cooperation with the laureates and many international supporters, striving to raise awareness of sustainability among our generation. To implement some of the laureate’s solutions in a sustainable way, young people’s involvement is vital for progress. All over the world, young people will be the pioneers and decision makers of tomorrow. They are eager to learn about what kind of new approaches to economics, ecology, education, and consumer behaviour can be realised.

For this reason, a conference for students between ages 18 and 26 took place in Bonn from 14th–19th September, 2010 in close cooperation with the Right Livelihood Award conference.

During the conference about 120 young people from some ten countries had the opportunity to enter into dialogue with Award recipients, meet them in person, and participate in lectures, panel discussions, workshops, and activities promoting inspiring projects. Events involving our partner NGOs and youth initiatives complemented the program. The Youth Future Project hopes to continue to serve as a platform for solution-oriented analysis as well as for the development and support of projects taking on today’s great challenges.

For more information, visit www.youthfutureproject.org
ANNEX VII
YOUTH FUTURE MANIFESTO (1ST VERSION)
18 September 2010

Preamble
In the past days, 120 young people from all continents have reflected upon the current state of our planet and realized that the basis of our future livelihoods continues to be destroyed. Our Youth Conference is an event on the occasion of the 30th anniversary of the Right Livelihood Award that brought Alternative Nobel Laureates together here in Bonn. More than 30 Right Livelihood laureates have shared their knowledge and experience in workshops with young people. As participants of the Youth Conference, we took a broad look at the current global situation. We asked ourselves what we could do to stop or even reverse current destructive developments. We also discussed what we as the young generation expect from today’s decision makers in politics, society, and business. Divided into seven main topics, the group of 120 participants has agreed upon the following Youth Future Manifesto. Furthermore, German youth delegates delivered an extended version of this manifesto to the UN Millennium Goals Conference in New York:

1. Peace, Disarmament, Conflict Resolution

What has to be achieved?
• A global understanding of respect and benevolence as well as the realisation that all things are interconnected.
• The inner peace of every human being is the starting point in the struggle for a peaceful world.
• Instead of expecting security from international military treaties, security needs to be established on a local and human level.

What do we do about it?
• To promote peace, we encourage intercultural education and dialogue.
• We create neutral spaces, in which conflict parties can enter into a dialogue and achieve change.
• We condemn institutions and corporations that profit from war and exploitation.

What Politics, Business, and others need to do?
• The international community needs to outlaw weapons of war and finally enter into negotiations to condemn the production and proliferation of weapons.
• We appeal to the media and politicians to expose the true intentions behind wars and conflicts.
2. Climate, Environment, Health

What has to be achieved?
• Anthropogenic climate change has to be minimized. Humanity is adjusting and mitigating effects of climate change. We become independent from fossil fuels and nuclear energy.
• Environmental protection, especially the protection of biodiversity, is regarded as the protection of humanity. Society, culture, and the economy flourish on the basis of sustainability.
• People lead a healthy lifestyle. Preventive care, as well as medical treatment, is given a higher priority.

What do we do about it?
• We need to educate those surrounding us about processes of climate change.
• We buy local and seasonal products that are fairly traded and organically produced.
• We strive to minimize our carbon-dioxide footprint in our everyday lives.

What Politics, Business, and others need to do?
• Decision makers need to combine traditional knowledge with modern research and make it publicly accessible.
• Complete transition to renewable energies.
• Preserve the diversity of life by avoiding monoculture and genetically manipulated corps in agriculture.

3. Human Rights, International Conventions, Cultural Diversity

What do we do about it?
• Conscious Consumption: We make a conscious effort not to consume products that were produced under circumstances violating human rights.
• We educate ourselves about production standards, especially about production methods violating human rights. We actively inform others about these issues.
• We influence decision-makers in politics and business by petitions and campaigns to implement fair trade policies.

What Politics, Business, and others need to do?
• Decision makers in politics and business need to sanction trade with nations that violate human rights.
• All nations of the world guarantee human rights.
• Educational institutions raise awareness for issues of human rights and international law.
4. Poverty, Hunger, Development Aid

What has to be achieved?
• Nobody on this planet has to starve.
• Regionalisation of the economy: Profits need to benefit the region where production takes place.
• Establish a strong organic agriculture worldwide.
• Small farmers will be supported and included in decision processes of agriculture policy.

What do we do about it?
• Conscious consumption: We decide to buy seasonal produce, eat more vegetables and less meat, as well as fair trade products.
• We raise our awareness for global contexts and draw the necessary conclusions for the local level.
• We do everything to convince the people around us to act accordingly.

What Politics, Business, and others need to do?
• Business for the people and not just for profit.
• Decision makers in politics and business strive to mobilise farmers all over the world to promote organic agriculture, to ensure long-term sustainability.
• Create incentives for local industries to process local resources.

5. Alternative Approaches to Economics

What has to be achieved?
• Decentralisation of the economy.
• A fair international framework of rules for the global economy.
• International and responsible sharing of knowledge.

What do we do about it?
• Reflect upon our own consumer behaviour and act accordingly.
• Create think tanks, social enterprises, and social ventures.
• We buy local and seasonal products.

What Politics, Business, and others need to do?
• Entrepreneurs all over the world enter into a binding pledge for social responsibility of business.
• Create fair rules for the global economy.
• Companies have the obligation to cover the costs of the social and environmental effects of their activities.
6. Civil Society, Alternative Politics, Globalisation

What has to be achieved?
• An empowered Civil Society has the legitimate means to directly influence policies, such as a basic income and open-source intellectual property.
• Political decision-making needs to be completely transparent
• Citizens use the existing means of direct democratic participation.

What do we do about it?
• We include friends in the debate.
• We create local and global networks.
• We reflect on our worldview.
• We learn about the world and its cultures and gather inspiration.

What Politics, Business, and others need to do?
• Political decision-making processes are made transparent.
• Educational and cultural institutions initiate and foster debates about current issues and possible solutions.

7. Values, Religion, Spirituality

What has to be achieved?
• People have a healthy space to develop and reflect on their own values.
• Society is oriented toward a ethics and morale that encourages life.
• More openness to spirituality in all spheres of life.

What do we do about it?
• We want to respect and love all people, creatures, and life.
• We always want to act mindfully and fill our acts with meaning.
• I am conscious of my own free will and take responsibility for my actions.

What Politics, Business, and others need to do?
• The sciences and spirituality open up for a mutual exchange of perspectives.
• It is generally acknowledged that thinking constructs realities.
• The religions of the world enter into a dialogue and open up to enable the solution of current problems of humanity.
ANNEX VIII
ABOUT THE RIGHT LIVELIHOOD COLLEGE

The Right Livelihood College (RLC) is a global capacity building initiative of the Right Livelihood Award Foundation. It aims to harness and spread the knowledge and experience of laureates of the Right Livelihood Award, popularly known as the “Alternative Nobel Prize”. It does this through promotion of education, research, public understanding and practical activities which:

• Contribute to a global ecological balance.
• Are aimed at eliminating material and spiritual poverty.
• Contribute to lasting peace and justice in the world.

Founded in 1969 in Penang, Malaysia, Universiti Sains Malaysia (USM) offers 800 courses at undergraduate and postgraduate levels to approximately 20,000 students. The university has currently 24 schools conducting academic programmes and more than 20 centres of excellence specialising in research activities.

In 2008, USM was chosen as Malaysia’s APEX University – Accelerated Programme for Excellence. As the chosen APEX University, USM will be accelerated for excellence and nurtured for world class standing amongst the world’s universities. USM also has its commitment to “Transforming Higher Education for a Sustainable Tomorrow”.

The Right Livelihood College (RLC)’s global secretariat is hosted by the USM’s Centre for Policy Research and International Studies (CenPRIS). CenPRIS is a research hub, serving as the focus of USM’s efforts in consultancy services, research and graduate supervision related to public policy and international studies.

Website: www.usm.my/cenpris
Lund University Centre for Sustainability Studies, LUCSUS is a platform for education, research and cooperation inside and outside academia on questions related to sustainable development. LUCSUS is a faculty independent centre at Lund University that currently has about 30 employees, of whom about half are graduate students in sustainability science.

The education consists primarily of our international master’s programmes, LUMES (Lund University Masters Programme in Environmental Studies and Sustainability Science). Research is conducted often in international cooperation, for example, under the EU framework programmes.

Since 2008, it has covered the Linnaeus program LUCID (Lund University Centre of Excellence for Integration of Social and Natural Dimensions of Sustainability).

Website: [http://www.lucsus.lu.se/](http://www.lucsus.lu.se/)

In 1950, Emperor Haile Selassie I declared the foundation of the University College of Addis Ababa. It was renamed Haile Selassie I University in 1962 and then Addis Ababa University in 1975. At the time, there were only 33 students enrolled compared to the current number of more than 40,000 students.

Starting from only one diploma and certificate granting department, namely biology, the University today comprises more than 25 faculties. In 2010, Addis Ababa University became the RLC’s first partner campus in Africa.

Website: [http://www.aau.edu.et](http://www.aau.edu.et)
The **University of Bonn** is a research and education centre with 200 years of tradition and about 30,000 students from more than 100 countries. The **Center for Development Research (ZEF)**, an independent research institute at the University of Bonn, became RLC’s partner campus in 2010. ZEF conducts interdisciplinary and applied research on crosscutting socio-political, economic and environmental problems in Africa, Asia and Latin America with the overall goal to contribute to sustainable development.

Since 1997, ZEF runs the “Bonn Interdisciplinary Graduate School for Development Research” PhD programme which is unique in terms of its interdisciplinary set-up, internationality and size (around 140 PhD students from more than 70 countries). Particular focus is given to strengthen the capacity of highly qualified scientific staff, advisers, and managers from partner countries.

ZEF ranks among the worldwide Top 10 of science and technology think tanks.

**Website:** [www.zef.de](http://www.zef.de)