

# Pathways to Reconciliation Summit

## Human Security through Community Engagement

Across the world, increasing and often desperate attention is being paid to enhancing regimes of security and supplying short-term material aid. In the context of a globalizing world, despite this attention, political violence and other overt manifestations of deep insecurity continue—often becoming more intractable.

The Pathways to Reconciliation Summit is intended to explore pathways to peace by working from the ground up while at the same time generating the conditions for local-global collaboration. It will build upon existing work that is being done on issues such as humanitarian intervention, aid, post-war reconstruction, governance, and the enhancement of human security and spiritual wellbeing. However, it will frame this primarily by drawing out the implications of a series of core questions ‘What is to be done?’, and ‘How can we most adequately begin to do it now?’

The Summit will work towards concrete outcomes, which include identifying and extending support to exemplary projects, and setting up an ongoing global structure of collaboration to support those projects.

We aim for four major practical outcomes from this Summit:

1. The inauguration or extension of support for a number of selected exemplary reconciliation projects around the world;
2. The inauguration of a Global Reconciliation Forum with a Secretariat (possibly in Amman), a Global Advisory Board, and a series of interconnected centres across the globe. These centres would have delegated responsibility for targeted enquiries into questions of reconciliation and to provide support for different reconciliation projects. (See Appendix 2);
3. The development of a reconciliation website that records the developments, strengths and weaknesses of different reconciliation projects around the world.
4. The publication of major book on reconciliation based on the Summit that explores questions of reconciliation in relation to continuing reconciliation projects.<sup>1</sup>

### Approach

The Summit begins from the premise that reconciliation is a complex process that requires more than apologies and mutual recognition, more than state-organized forums for truth-telling. Reconciliation needs to be built from the ground up, and supported from the top down, by practice that includes but goes beyond dialogue. While most theory and practice focuses on nationally-based ‘Truth and Reconciliation’ we want to go much further. A broader practice of reconciliation, we suggest, should also involve mutual local projects that bring estranged and suspicious peoples together to do something that is socially beneficial across the boundaries of their pain and enmity. This kind of process will not occur either spontaneously or through politician’s road maps. It will require some form of institutionalization. If that institutionalization simply mirrors a national Truth and

---

1. This would build upon an earlier summit in Sarajevo and the subsequent book, *Pathways to Reconciliation: Between Theory and Practice*, edited by Philipa Rothfield, Cleo Fleming and Paul Komesaroff, (Ashgate 2008).

Reconciliation forum across the different levels of the local and the global it will probably fail, but there many other models to explore.

One way of achieving reconciliation is to concentrate on various life-world themes in zones of tension—that is, everyday things that people respond to and enact in their own lives—and to bring people together across the boundaries of pain to enact them together. The themes that the Summit will focus on include the following:

- health-care and medicine
- learning and education
- arts and symbolism
- spirituality and ritual
- place and environment
- governance and law
- sport and leisure

### **Venue**

Amman, Jordan, hosted by HRH Prince Hassan of Jordan and the Regional Centre for Health and Security, Amman.

### **Dates**

14–17 December 2009

### **Convening Institutions**

Globalism Research Centre, RMIT  
Centre for the Study of Ethics, Monash University

### **Supporting Institutions**

Australian Alliance for Reconciliation through Medicine  
Co-existence International, Brandeis University (TBC)  
Global Cities Research Institute, RMIT  
Global Reconciliation Network  
Globalization Studies Network  
Health and Development Alliance, Australia  
Human Security Centre, La Trobe University  
International Physicians for the Prevention of Nuclear War (TBC)  
Regional Centre for Health and Security, Amman  
Steinmetz Centre for Peace Research, Tel Aviv  
United Nations Global Compact, Cities Programme

### **Organizing Committee**

Paul James, Academic Director of the Globalism Research Centre, RMIT  
Paul Komesaroff, Director, Centre for the Study of Ethics in Medicine & Society, Monash University  
David Lurie, B2B Lawyers  
Peter Murdoch, QC  
Elizabeth Kath, Research Fellow, Globalism Research Centre, RMIT

### **International Advisory Board**

Dennis Altman, Politics, La Trobe University, Australia

Ian Campbell, Affirm Associates, England  
Toni Erskine, International Relations, Aberystwith University, Wales  
Jacob Finci, Bosnia **TBC**  
Daphne Gollan, Israel **TBC**  
Ronnie Kaufman, Social Work, Ben-Gurion University, Israel  
Peter Mandaville, Co-Director of Center for Global Studies, George Mason University, USA  
Elizabeth Porter, School of International Studies, University of South Australia  
Philipa Rothfield, Philosophy, La Trobe University, Australia  
Modjtaba Sadria, Philosophy, Aga Khan University, England **TBC**  
Oren Yiftachel, Geography, Ben-Gurion University, Israel

## **Host**

HRH Prince Hassan bin Talal of Jordan

## **Patrons**

### ***The Reverend Desmond Tutu***

Desmond Mpilo Tutu of South Africa is Anglican Archbishop Emeritus, activist and winner of the Nobel Prize for Peace (1984), the Albert Schweitzer Prize for Humanitarianism (1986) and the Ghandi Peace Prize (2007). He has been especially vocal in campaigning for improvements in human rights, poverty, racism and AIDS. In particular, he gained worldwide recognition for his anti-apartheid work in the 1980s. Tutu was the first black South African Archbishop of Cape Town and Primate of the Anglican Church of South Africa and headed South Africa's Truth and Reconciliation Commission.

### ***Aung San Suu Kyi***

Aung San Suu Kyi is a pro-democracy activist and leader of Burma's National League for Democracy. She is a widely known as a prisoner of conscience and is currently being held in detention in relation to her opposition to Burma's military dictatorship. This detention by the military junta has prevented her from assuming her position as democratically elected Prime Minister of Burma. Suu Kyi was awarded the Nobel Peace Prize in 1991, the Rafto Prize and Sakharov Prize for Freedom of Thought in 1990, and the Jawaharlal Peace Prize by the Government of India in 1992.

### ***The Honourable Sir William Deane, AC KBE***

Sir William Deane served as Australia's Governor-General for six years during the period 1995–2001. He has consistently spoken out in support of social justice, in defence of disadvantaged groups, and in support of meaningful reconciliation between Indigenous and non-Indigenous Australians. Deane was appointed a Knight Commander of the Order of the British Empire in 1982, Companion of the Order of Australia in 2001, and in the same year was awarded the Sydney Peace prize.

### ***HRH Prince Hassan bin Talal***

His Royal Highness was officially invested as Crown Prince to the Hashemite Throne of Jordan, in 1965. Until the changes in succession brought about by His late Majesty King Hussein, he served as the King's confidant and deputy. He co-founded the International Cultures Foundation in 2002 and the Parliament of Cultures in 2004. In 2003, HRH launched Partners in Humanity as a joint initiative with Search for Common Ground, which aims to promote dialogue between the Muslim and Western worlds. Prince Hassan is a founder and now President of the Foundation for Inter-religious and Intercultural Research and Dialogue (FIIRD) which was established in Geneva in 1999.

### ***Dr Bernard Lown, MD***

Dr Bernard Lown is an internationally renowned peace activist and a Professor of Cardiology at Harvard School of Public Health. He co-founded Physicians for Social Responsibility and later International Physicians for the Prevention of Nuclear War. His work against nuclear proliferation led him to receive a Nobel Prize for Peace in 1985. Lown was born in Lithuania and immigrated to the USA at the age of thirteen.

***Dr Lowtija O'Donoghue, AC, CBE, FRCNA***

Lowitja O'Donoghue is a Professorial Fellow at Flinders University, the founding chairperson for the now dissolved Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Commission (ATSIC) and was the first Australian woman to be awarded the Order of Australia. In 1983 she was appointed a commander of the Order of the British Empire. She was made an Honorary Fellow of the Royal Australian College of Physicians in 1998, and the Royal College of Nursing. In 1984 she was named Australian of the Year. Among her honorary roles, she holds an Honorary Doctorate of Law from Notre Dame University and the Australian National University.

***Dr Jose Ramos-Horta***

Dr Jose Ramos-Horta is President of East Timor; he is the country's second president since its independence. During the country's occupation by Indonesia, Ramos-Horta served in exile as the spokesperson for the East Timorese resistance. After independence, he became East Timor's first Foreign Minister, before resigning in June 2006 and later being appointed Prime Minister by President Xanana Gusmão. Ramos-Horta was a co-recipient of the Nobel Prize for Peace (along with East Timorese Bishop Carlos Belo) in 1996.

**Participants**

Aside from our distinguished keynote speakers (the list can be found on the summit's website, where keynote speakers' names are being added as they confirm), estimated 200–300 delegates will attend the conference-summit, including a proportion from the region. Registration will be structured to encourage participation from the Global South and beyond Europe and the United States. We aim to involve delegates from NGOs, activist organizations and bodies such as the United Nations and the International Criminal Court, in addition to academics, people from the media, as well as high-profile public figures, scholars and leaders.

## Appendix 1. Background

The world today is beset by fundamental human insecurity. Many lives have been lost, many communities live in chaos, and many billions of dollars have been spent on failing projects and interventions by both government and non-government agencies. It is an uneven process that seems to evade understanding. Some new manifestations of global-local conflict and insecurity are managed without extended political violence and social crisis, and others are not. Understanding this issue of ‘what works?’ and ‘what makes a difference?’ drives the agenda of this conference, and has important implications for global human security and wellbeing in general.

In summary, we suggest that developing a meaningful social engagement program entails going beyond identifying the immediate threats. It involves exploring the interconnections between local-global change, conflict and threats to human security and wellbeing. It leads to examining the deeper sources of insecurity—political, cultural, legal, and economic—in order to provide a stronger basis for mitigating violence and other forms of insecurity in the world today.

In the context of the ‘War on Terror’ these issues have tended to be glossed over and rarely addressed in terms of the grounding conditions of conflict and social disintegration, or how those conditions might be managed and ameliorated over the long-term. A key objective of the proposed summit thus, is to explore, firstly, the ground of the burgeoning local-global conflicts; and secondly, the theme of alternative pathways to peace with an emphasis on informal processes and projects beneath the radar of conventional international relations and security regimes. Our emphasis is on the second theme.

### *Human Security*

- appropriate intervention in conditions of crisis
- dialogue and reconciliation after violence and social disintegration
- reconstruction after social and environmental crisis
- negotiation over identity politics, including national, religious and ethnic difference

### *Community Sustainability*

- enhancing community well-being and social health
- building relations between communities and polities
- strengthening indigenous ways of life in the context of modernizing pressures
- maintaining deep cultural diversity while supporting social cohesion
- contributing to ‘sense of place’ in the context of environmental and social disruption

## Background Questions

In this world of violence and upheaval, one of our tasks is to work systematically through the terms of the local-global problems that we all, in different ways, confront. The following *questions* provide a summary of the comprehensiveness of the task that we face, and a way of addressing the *themes* introduced above.

### *1. What are the sources of human insecurity in the contemporary globalizing world?*

Our key focus here involves examining the local, regional and global context of a range of polities and communities under threat. They range from the so-called ‘failing states’ and polities-communities in the aftermath of widespread violence or war to those polities-communities in the Global South either experiencing increasing human insecurity, despite the absence of the immediate pressures of violence or war, or seeking to ameliorate emerging conditions before they take hold.

#### *Subsidiary questions:*

- What are the dominant patterns of human insecurity and conflict in the world today, and to what extent do they relate to processes of globalization?
- How do states come to be defined as ‘failed’ or

‘failing’ states? • Are there forms of structural insecurity and violence that go unrecognized by the current emphasis on military security? • How important are political, legal, military, economic, cultural, psychological, and environmental factors in generating conditions of insecurity and conflict? • What are the new conflicts, inequalities, and exclusions generated by the processes of economic globalization and economic reform? • How do the interests of organized crime, corruption and gangsterism relate to the emergence or accentuation of new forms of violence? • To what extent are the conditions of contemporary insecurity and conflict framed culturally?

2. *What are the foundations for ongoing human security and sustainable communities?*

As the other side of the first concern about the sources of insecurity, we will develop the interpretative bases for more adequately debating how in practical terms the conditions of human security and community wellbeing might best be sustained or revitalized under different circumstances, including when countries are depicted as being governed by ‘failing states’. We want to explore how effective local projects can be under different circumstances.

*Subsidiary questions:*

- What kinds of co-operation are possible across the various arenas from the local to the global and how might they most productively enhance human security and peace? • How should these various levels of co-operation be best related? • Would a Global Reconciliation Forum contribute to the process of learning and dialogue? What are the most efficacious means of post-violence reconstruction? • How effective are the various means of post-violence reconciliation such as international criminal courts, truth commissions, legal tribunals, bureaus of missing persons and economic reconstruction initiatives? • How might local projects best work to effect reconciliation outcomes in ways that complement and go beyond other forms of reconciliation work?

3. *What are the principles of sustainable human security and community wellbeing?*

Here the emphasis will be on developing an interpretative-ethical framework to interrogate the dominant understandings of security, community, sustainability, resilience, wellbeing, development, etc., and to develop the ethical principles upon which sustainable practices can be built. We are interested in *critically* exploring alternative ethical philosophies such as cosmopolitanism, liberalism, various forms of spiritualism, transnational justice, and communitarianism. Here the key issue is how to ground cosmopolitanism in the complexities of lived communities—that is, both engaged locally and globally connected.

*Subsidiary questions:*

- What is our responsibility to others? What makes a community good? What are the key ethical underpinnings of human security? • When do outsiders have a responsibility to protect or support insecure others? • When do outsiders have a right to intervene, and what are the limits on that intervention?

Engaging such questions entails standing back from the exigencies of practice to take a critical stance on what it means.

4. *How are the conditions of human security and community wellbeing to be secured both under conditions of immediate pressure and in the long run?*

In other words, we want to ask ‘what is to be done?’ What can be done at the local level to set up exemplary projects based on forging local-to-local and local-to-global relations? What are the implications for practice of a more thorough understanding of the sources of insecurity and the conditions and principles of sustainable security and community wellbeing? This dimension of our work is intended to go beyond the general to the particular, to instances of clear and present danger, as well as to long-term challenges.

*Subsidiary questions:*

- How should governments, international organizations and NGOs be responding now given the patterned signs of social, political, cultural and bio-medical breakdown in a particular polity-communities such as Israel-Palestine, Papua New Guinea, East Timor, the Solomon Islands, Iraq,

Afghanistan, to name a few? • On what activities and support processes should the emphasis of intervening bodies be placed in these circumstances? • What kinds of relations should be developed between levels of governance—global, regional, national and local—in dealing with contemporary situations where postwar reconstruction is under pressure and threatening to break-down?

## Appendix 2. A Global Reconciliation Forum

One way of providing an institutional *concilium* that brings together relations from embodied to the mediated and disembodied would be to develop a Global Reconciliation Forum. This would build upon and go beyond the approach of the Permanent Court of Arbitration in The Hague, formed in 1899 to adjudicate on international problems between nations, corporations and organizations. Institutional funding might take a similar form to the Permanent Court with its activities supported by an annual payment from institutional members. However, in other respects the Forum's way of operating would cut across the dominance of modern juridical concerns to become an institution of social dialogue in the global public sphere.

It could be set up with the following aims:

1. To provide a place for registering, learning about, and supporting exemplary grass-roots reconciliation projects.
2. To provide the conditions for a global learning process about the effects and consequences of conduct during past international crises. The aim would be to learn from the past by investigations of the causes of crises, conduct during those episodes and the consequences of the particular way in which the global community responded. In this process the aim would not be criminal prosecution or to bring particular regimes, institutions or corporations to legal task, but rather to provide an institutional base for thinking through how international practice might have been conducted otherwise.
3. To provide for an institutionalization of ethical authority about the need for deep consideration of the relationship across different levels of extension—global, regional, national and local—and to provide ways of approaching the articulation of practices of truth, reconciliation and justice.
4. To provide a meeting place (or places), witnessed by the world, in which issues that sit behind contemporary grievances and pain, could be brought by civil society groups for public documentation, debate, dialogue, and deliberation. At the end of that four-dimensional process there would not be a definitive deliberation on guilt or otherwise, but a voicing of 'majority' and 'minority' judgements by learned arbiters based on both supported testimony and expert research.
5. To provide a clearinghouse for collecting material on current international crises.
6. To provide information, considered social and legal frameworks, critical reflections on past tribunals, and moral support for local and national truth and reconciliation tribunals currently in process, or being set up or discussed, in many places around the world. This dimension would have to include critical reflection on its own long-term effects.

Such a Forum need not be just located in a single centralized venue, and could be a co-ordinated with a central Secretariat, a Global Board of Management and as a series of interconnected centres with delegated responsibility for particular enquiries into agreed questions of reconciliation. We propose that Amman Jordan become the home of the Secretariat.

The Reconciliation Forum could be asked to conduct a series of enquiries into past breaches of the principles of good international citizenship, particularly in relation to massacres, genocide, the death of civilians in military conflict, the state-sanctioned or institutionally-perpetrated use of terror, including torture, violent regime-change including coups, and invasions of national sovereignty. This could include acts of intentional harm, acts that unintentionally contributed to harm others, and inaction that allowed harm to escalate in dangerous ways. Working on the basis that most nation-states do not release sensitive state documents for a thirty-year period, the Commission could investigate those events with ongoing, unresolved, and intense international symbolic importance. For example: the fire-bombing of Germany, the timing of the D-Day invasion, the bombing of Hiroshima, the Cuban Missile Crisis, the 1965 massacre in Indonesia; 1972 coup in Chile; the systematic killings in Kampuchea, and so on.



In relation to current events, it could also develop an ongoing auditing of the recent history of international responses to global crisis. This would entail an ongoing auditing department, coordinated with delegated secretariats such as in university research centres that are given the task of documenting and setting up the conditions for seeking the 'truth' on what actually happens during contemporary or recent crises that involve extended violence or systematic harm to a significant population.