



**International Conference on
Dialogue among Civilizations
23 – 26 April 2001
Vilnius, Lithuania**



**Background Information on the United Nations Year for Dialogue among Civilizations
and activities relevant to UNESCO's fields of competence:**

With United Nations Resolution 53/22 dated 4 November 1998, the General Assembly proclaimed the year 2001 United Nations Year of Dialogue among Civilizations. In doing so, it emphasized the importance of tolerance and recognized “the diverse civilizational achievements of mankind, crystallising cultural pluralism and creative human diversity”. The resolution invited “Governments, the United Nations system, including UNESCO to plan and implement appropriate cultural, educational and social programmes, to promote the concept of dialogue among civilizations, including through organizing conferences and seminars and disseminating information, information, and scholarly material on the subject...”.

Subsequently, on 11 January 2001, in its resolution 55/23 the General Assembly stated that “civilizations are not confined to individual nation-states, but rather encompass different cultures within the same civilization...” and that “ globalization brings greater interrelatedness among people and increased interaction among cultures and civilizations”. Moreover, the Assembly noted that “the celebration of the United Nations Year of Dialogue among Civilizations...constitutes a profoundly human challenge that invites us to embrace the interdependence of humankind and its rich cultural diversity. The General Assembly also invited “Governments, the United Nations system, including the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organisation, and other relevant international and non-governmental organizations to continue and further intensify planning and organizing appropriate cultural, educational and social programmes to promote the concept of dialogue among civilizations, *inter alia*, through organizing conferences and seminars and disseminating information and scholarly material on the subject, and to inform the Secretary-General of their activities”.

The UNESCO General Conference resolution 31 of 17 November 1999 endorsed the terms of proclaiming the year 2001 as the United Nations Year of Dialogue among Civilizations, welcoming ‘the collective endeavour of the international community to enhance understanding through constructive dialogue among civilizations on the threshold of the third millennium’. It also recognized “the importance of the values embodied in the resolution, such as the importance in international relations and the significant role of dialogue as a means of reaching understanding, removing threats to peace and strengthening interaction and exchange among civilizations”.

The General Conference further recommended that “UNESCO play a leading role in the organization of activities of a cultural, educational, scientific and social nature, which aim to facilitate and promote dialogue among civilizations, through, for instance, active collaboration in the organization of special events, conferences and colloquia on themes related to intercultural dialogue”; and urged “Member States to give the year 2001, the United Nations year of Dialogue among Civilizations, all due prominence and to support activities aimed at facilitating and promoting dialogue among civilizations”.

PART I

I.1. International Conference on Dialogue among Civilizations, Vilnius, Lithuania (23 – 26 April 2001)

Following the above-mentioned the UN General Assembly resolution on the Dialogue among civilizations, which was drafted and submitted by the Islamic Republic of Iran, the 30th session of the UNESCO General Conference in November 1999, approved that “UNESCO ... gives its patronage to the international conference on the theme of dialogue among civilizations, to take place in Vilnius (Lithuania), in 2001.”

The International Conference on the Dialogue among Civilisations was held in Vilnius, Lithuania, between 24th to 26th April 2001, under the joint auspices of H.E. Mr Valdas Adamkus, President of the Republic of Lithuania, H.E. Mr Alekander Kwasniewski, President of the Republic of Poland, and H.E. Mr Koïchiro Matsuura, Director-General of UNESCO, with the participation of H.E. Mr Leonid Kuchma the President of the Republic of Ukraine, H.E. Mr Boutros Boutros-Ghali, the Secretary-General of the International Organisation of the Francophony, H.E. Mr Brunson McKinley, the Director-General of the International Organisation of Migration, Ms.Penda Mbow, Minister of Culture of Senegal, Ms.Hélène Carrere d’Encausse, Personal Representative of the President of the French Republic, Perpetual Secretary of the French Academy, Mr Giandomenico Picco, Personal Representative of the United Nations Secretary-General for the International Year for Dialogue among Civilizations; Mr. Ataollah Mohajerani (Iran), Personal Representative of the President of Iran, Advisor of the President of Iran, Head of the International Centre of Dialogue among Civilisations. Messages were also read on behalf of H.E. Mr Sayyed Mohammad Khatami, the President of the Islamic Republic of Iran, H.E. Mr Jacques Chirac, the President of the French Republic and H.E. Mr Abdoulaye Wade, the President of the Republic of Senegal. These addresses have been reproduced in Annex II of the present Report.

Several keynote speeches, moderated by H.E. Ambassador Sonia Mendieta de Baderoux, the Chairperson of UNESCO’s Executive Board and Permanent Representative of Honduras to UNESCO, were made by international scholars. These included inter alia: Ms. Hélène Carrère d’Encausse (France); Dr. Rekha Menon (India); Mr. Javier Wimer (Mexico); Mr. Ataollah Mohajerani (Iran); Dr. Yves Plasseraud (France); Ms. Prof. Alphonso Lingis (USA); Prof. Alexander Yakovlev (Russia).

The Conference included several half-day Workshop sessions focussing on the following subjects: reciprocal knowledge and interaction; globalisation and cultural diversity; plural identities and common values; trade, science, and cultural exchange; otherness; and concepts of civilisation for the 21st Century. Summaries of each of these workshops have been reproduced in Part II of the present Report and clearly demonstrate the scope of issues arising from reflections on the subject of Dialogue among Civilisations and also suggested concrete recommendations for UNESCO to consider.

It was deeply symbolic that Vilnius, the capital of Lithuania, hosted the UNESCO Conference devoted to the dialogue among civilisations, as it is famous for its historically formed and time-honoured tradition of religious and political toleration, as well as its reputation as a multi-ethnic, multi-religious, and multi-cultural city. Thus, Lithuania made its contribution to the enhancement of the ethical and spiritual dimensions of human existence, human trust, respect, critical historical awareness and tolerance in the 21st Century world.

At the end of the Conference it was adopted Vilnius Declaration.

I.2. Vilnius Declaration

1. Civilisations are entities of faith, historical memory, moral imagination, and human connection. They contain historically unique and self-asserting cultures, irreplaceable forms of human creativity, and also intellectual and moral sensibilities of large groups of people. Bio-diversity and cultural diversity are closely linked and are instrumental for the ability of humankind to adapt, create, and invent. No civilisation can solely assume the responsibility for the entire humanity; neither can a single civilisation claim exclusive rights to provide an ultimate and universally valid vision of how to be a human being in a complex and multifaceted world of today and tomorrow.

Like human beings, the historically formed and living civilisations can never be interchangeable, since they are all equally unique and valuable. The loss of any single trait of one of civilisations is the loss for the entire humanity.

2. The ideas of tolerance and of the dialogue among civilisations rest on a clear awareness of human incompleteness. This is particularly true of the concept of “the polylogue of civilisations” elaborated by Vytautas Kavolis, a great Lithuanian scholar.
3. Up to now the political exploitation of the concept of civilisation has been among the most problematic traits of the modern social sciences and humanities. Regrettably, the theoretically exhausted and morally dubious inclination to employ or even exceedingly exploit the concept of civilisation for sheer political and ideological purposes is still the case.
4. Simplistic, monologue-based, or otherwise politically convenient notions of civilisation should not be applied. Contrary to a firm conviction that Western civilisation was the only civilisation nurtured by dialogue-based individualism, liberty and toleration, scholars have stressed the importance of each civilisation and the dialogue among them as an inescapable part of the concept of civilisation itself.
5. Civilisations are symbolic designs within which people raise core questions concerning their being in the world, and also search for key concepts and frames of meaning to interpret themselves and the world around them. No civilisation can be regarded as a theory-emanating entity solely capable of interpreting the world and therefore framing the rest of the world as its empirical evidence. Genuine dialogue allows no room for absolute otherness, for it occurs among morally committed human individuals.
6. No civilisation can assume or represent complete humanity. The comparative approach therefore brings us to a proper understanding of the complementarity of civilisations. It powerfully stands against bias, clichés, demonisation of the Other, and the sense of superiority over other societies and cultures. The complementarity of civilisations would be unthinkable without constant interplay and exchange of such faculties of human thought and creativity as science, art, and philosophy; nor would it be possible without the ethical and spiritual dimension. Women and young people can play a crucial part in the process of bridging and uniting the world.
7. As a crucial attempt to uphold mutual respect, sympathetic understanding, and tolerance, the dialogue among civilisations is the only means to build a world of human dignity, solidarity, and hope. Such a dialogue of multiple, pluralistic, and communicating identities would result in a multi-civilisational universe of discourse. No civilisation could be demonised, and references to all of them, their intellectual traditions and masterpieces of art would come to the contemporary individual as easily and naturally as references to his or her own civilisation. A particular civilisation can experience itself or critically examine its core values only through a dialogue with other civilisations.
8. All governments and civil societies are enjoined, as an integrated part of their cultural policies, to take the initiative to further a dialogue among civilisations, in such a way that it can become an instrument of transformation, a yardstick for peace and tolerance, a vehicle for diversity and pluralism, especially in culture, with the ultimate aim of furthering the common good.

PART II

Summaries of Workshop Discussions

II.1 “Reciprocal knowledge and interaction”

Wednesday 25 April 2001, Vilnius University Senate Hall

Moderator: Dr Yves Plasseraud, (France)
 Participants: Mr Jerzy Kloczowski, (Pologne)
 Mr Byong Ik Koh, (Corée du Sud)
 Mr Xin Ru, (Chine)
 Mr Kaveh L Afrasiabi, (Iran)
 Mr Anatoli Mikhailov, (Biélorussie)
 Mr Mohamed Sayed Ahmed, (Egypte)
 Rapporteur: Ms Olga Weber, UNESCO Secretariat

Mr Jerzy Kloczowski, Director, Institute of Central and Eastern Europe; Chairman, Polish National Commission for UNESCO, *Pologne*. L’histoire est indispensable pour comprendre les situations et les conflits du passé. Une lecture critique de l’histoire est nécessaire, les expériences du passé doivent être connues pour établir un dialogue dans le futur. Il semble nécessaire de développer un programme de dialogue entre les civilisations, à l’intérieur de chaque pays et avec son voisin.

L’intervenant a procédé à un rappel des faits historiques en Europe du Centre-Est du XIV^e au XX^{ème} siècle afin d’illustrer ce propos, et a cité également un exemple de collaboration entre la Lituanie et la Pologne.

Il a enfin souligné l’apport des oppositions intellectuelles face aux barbaries du XX^{ème} siècle.

Mr Byong Ik Koh, Member of the Korean National Academy of Sciences, Chairman of the Korean National Cultural Properties Committee, *Corée du Sud*. Deux idées principales ont été abordées. La question de la haine et quels sont les efforts qui doivent être déployés afin de faire disparaître cette haine.

Dans le contexte de la mondialisation les opportunités de dialogue que peut susciter le rapport intercivilisationnel sont nombreuses et la compréhension mutuelle est fondamentale mais une approche encore plus constructive est nécessaire et celle-ci ne peut venir que des politiques.

Afin de dépasser les situations de conflits et les phénomènes négatifs de l’histoire, il faut des efforts mondiaux au niveau politique. L’intervenant a souligné le rôle des élites politiques dans la facilitation du dialogue. Mais il a également souligné l’importance des forums internationaux comme lieu de dialogue et lieu de discussion pour aborder les situations de conflits.

Mr Xin Ru, Chairman of the Academic Committee at the Chinese Academy of Social Sciences, Professor of Philosophy, *Chine*, Afin de faire face aux défis du XXI^{ème} siècle une éthique et une déontologie du dialogue doivent être reconnues et respectées, car le dialogue sera d’une grande aide pour éviter des nouveaux conflits. Cette nouvelle éthique implique notamment :

- ?? Un changement nécessaire des mentalités
- ?? Une reconnaissance de la diversité de l’humanité
- ?? La nécessité de créer une atmosphère de compréhension mutuelle par le dialogue
- ?? Le respect de la diversité des civilisations et la tolérance

Mr Kaveh L Afrasiabi, Fernand Braudel Center, Binghamton University, USA, *Iran*, Le but du dialogue entre les civilisations est de créer un schéma positif basé sur la tolérance et la compréhension mutuelle.

Deux aspects sont importants dans cette optique. L’unicité de chaque civilisation et la diversité dans cette unicité pour une coexistence commune.

L'intervenant a également développé le cas de l'Iran et souligné l'impact positif que cette année du Dialogue entre les Civilisations a eu sur son pays.

Mr Anatoli Mikhailov, Philosophe, Culturologue, Recteur, European Humanities University, *Biélorussie*
Le dialogue comporte de nombreux pièges surtout si on dissocie la théorie de la pratique

La nature humaine a tendance à réagir trop tard face aux différents problèmes qu'elle peut rencontrer, ce qui donne tout son sens au dialogue afin de faciliter la capacité de réaction de l'homme « averti ».

Trop souvent il s'agit par ailleurs de monologue d'où l'importance des langues et du sens vrai de la parole. L'homme est un être linguistique, l'homme est prisonnier de son mode de vie et cela a un impact très fort sur son langage. A travers le langage on trouve parfois le danger de l'influence sur l'autre.

Par ailleurs, la mondialisation et la culture de masse sont des menaces qui pèsent sur la diversité des langues. Dans cette optique il devient urgent de procéder à un changement des comportements. Les aptitudes et les savoirs sont très importants dans cette démarche.

Mr Mohamed Sayed Ahmed, Journalist and Writer for Al Ahram, *Egypte* Réflexion géopolitique sur le monde actuel.

On parle généralement maintenant d'un monde unipolaire menée par une seule légitimité qui se trouverait à l'Ouest. Mais en fait le monde d'aujourd'hui se présente plutôt comme un monde bipolaire caché. La face cachée est constituée par toutes les formes d'expressions violentes qui vont de la revendication classique au terrorisme. Il est nécessaire de canaliser ces expressions pour éviter la violence et aboutir au dialogue.

Une troisième voie pour lutter contre cette nouvelle forme de conflits implique:

- ?? La nécessité de faire une place à la réflexion
- ?? Un recours aux nouvelles technologies de la communication et de l'information ainsi que les découvertes scientifiques
- ?? La nécessité de changer les mentalités, il semble vital de dialoguer entre les civilisations sinon la civilisation même risque de disparaître
- ?? La nécessité d'une approche globale et prise de conscience de la relativité de la connaissance.

Le rôle de l'UNESCO dans cette optique est d'éduquer le monde afin de réintroduire le réseau d'expression violente dans un créneau plus pacifique.

L'intervenant a ensuite développé la situation au Moyen Orient, une illustration de la nécessité de dépasser les blocages que comportent certaines situations.

Mr Ehsan Naraghi, Journalist, *Iran*, En développant deux cas concrets, l'intervenant a souligné l'utilité d'un dialogue confidentiel et non médiatisé dans certains cas.

Cas concrets :

- ?? Dialogue avec la jeunesse en 1969 avec des dirigeants de l'UNESCO
- ?? Dialogue entre éminentes personnalités du monde islamique et occidental afin de résoudre le conflit né de la publication de Salman Rushdie.

Débat : points et idées soulevés

- ?? Importance du sport dans le développement du dialogue
- ?? L'UNESCO doit appuyer les efforts et reconnaître l'importance des ONG, de l'opinion publique et du monde intellectuel dans leur effort de dialogue
- ?? Seule la liberté permet la confiance qui elle seule à son tour permet ensuite le dialogue
- ?? Problème très important de l'intégration
- ?? Nécessité de développer l'autocritique ce qui permet ensuite d'être crédible face à son adversaire.
- ?? Problème de la manipulation de l'histoire

Intervention du Ministre de la Culture du Sénégal, Mme Perda M'Bow.

- ?? Dimension économique du dialogue ou l'échange inégal. Les ressources naturelles et les conflits.

- ?? Notion de violence et violence urbaine
- ?? Situation de la femme qui devient l'enjeu d'un débat à partir du moment où on juge l'état d'avancement d'une civilisation à la situation de la femme dans cette civilisation. La femme est trop souvent l'otage de l'incompréhension entre les cultures.
- ?? Nécessité d'être attentif aux crises internes des sociétés face à l'immigration et à la montée de l'extrême droite.

Intervention de Mr Doudou Diene, UNESCO

- ?? Le facteur historique comme lieu et espace de rencontre des civilisations, importance de l'enseignement de l'histoire pour contrer les manipulations des nationalistes.
- ?? Notion de dynamique culturelle interne
- ?? Question de l'universalité
- ?? Question de la violence culturelle avec l'imposition de valeurs culturelles

Intervention de Ms Andree Suzy Romamonjisoa, Madagascar

- ?? Nécessité d'identifier les cultures en péril
- ?? Créer une citoyenneté universelle responsable au niveau culturel
- ?? Partenariat nécessaire pour le patrimoine culturel universel en péril
- ?? Elaboration d'une éthique commune pour les cultures en péril

Intervention de Mr Rasolofondraosolo, Madagascar

L'intervenant a insisté sur la nécessité que les artistes puissent contribuer aux forums internationaux afin d'apporter leur contribution au dialogue. En effet les émotions constituent une valeur commune à tous les hommes que les artistes peuvent susciter d'où l'importance qu'ils soient associés au processus de dialogue.

Propositions concrètes à implémenter par l'UNESCO :

1. Promouvoir la diversité des langues et protéger les langues en péril face à la mondialisation et la culture de masse.
2. Education de la population mondiale afin de développer une culture de la paix et de la non-violence à travers le monde.
3. Promouvoir le sport comme facteur de dialogue entre les peuples.
4. Reconnaître l'importance et appuyer les efforts des ONG, de l'opinion publique et du monde intellectuel dans leur effort de dialogue.
5. Promouvoir l'enseignement de l'histoire au niveau national et international ainsi que la diffusion de manuels d'histoire afin de parer aux manipulations de l'histoire, aux stéréotypes et aux préjugés historiques.
6. Appuyer les efforts des artistes dans leur participation à la vie politique internationale.

II.2 “Globalization and Cultural Plurality”

Wednesday 25 April 2001, Vilnius University Little Aula Hall

Moderator: Mr. Steve Austen, (Netherlands)
 Panelists: Ms. Halina Kobeckaite, (Lithuania)
 Mr. Rein Raud, (Estonia)
 Rapporteur: Ms. A.B. Preis, UNESCO Secretariat

Mr Steve Austen, Director of the European Centre for Arts and Science, *Holland*, acted as the moderator and opened the debate by emphasizing the importance of the audience’s direct participation in order to ensure constructive dialogue throughout. He therefore proposed that the panelists would present key words and concepts, but refrain from long presentations. This proposal was welcomed, and the moderator then gave the floor to Ms Kobeckaite:

Ms Halina Kobeckaite, Ambassador of Lithuania to Turkey and former Director-General of the Department of Nationalities, *Lithuania*, said that the topic of dialogue among civilizations is far from ‘foreign’ to Lithuanians, previous Lithuanian debates have turned on the capacity of civilizations to dialogue, something which is discernable in their own histories. She also argued for a notion of ‘circles of personal identity’. Ethnic identity is the first stage of the more broader category of cultural identity, which combines well with national identity understood as being based on citizenship.

Mr Rein Raud, Professor of Japanese Studies at the University of Helsinki; Professor of Asian and Cultural studies, Estonian Institute of Humanities; Translator and Essayist, *Estonia*, said that dialogue was easier to define than civilization; the latter could be defined in the plural (Huntington) or in the singular as civilizational levels or stages. He argued for the notion of culture rather than civilization, since there is no value judgement inherent in the notion of culture. In accordance with James Clifford, Raud proposed that culture means relationships and meanings. Within such a perspective, Lithuanians can participate in local culture, European culture, and global culture, although not without a certain amount of tension.

The moderator subsequently invited the audience to participate in the debate by sharing their views on the constructive nature of a national culture, which is a key issue in newly democratic societies. In the ensuing debate, which focussed mainly on cultural plurality, the following points were made:

- ?? There are new dialogues emerging in Eastern and Central Europe due to globalization. Globalization allows people to choose self-identity,
- ?? There may perhaps be two Lithuanian identities coming up at present; one turns towards Western Europe, the other ‘remains’ locally rooted/oriented. Personal success is an important criteria underlying choices,
- ?? The question of ‘an European’ culture is complex. Is it desirable? The European Union puts new emphasis on European values, but countries like Sweden, for instance, maintain that culture should be a free and independent force,
- ?? During the post-communist period, Eastern and Central European countries have first tried to invent a ‘third way’ which failed, then a West European way which also failed, and now a new regional Eastern and Central European identity is emerging (special networks, publications, etc.),
- ?? Culture should be defined as certain forms of communication in, and between, groups,
- ?? Multiple or multi-layered identities are important; the modernity debate is about plural identities. This should become increasingly acceptable in the search for global communication - unfortunately it does not happen without tensions.
- ?? Identity is a permanent challenge
- ?? Language is a carrier of values; languages do not ‘treat’ problems in the same way.

Emphasizing that the discussion had thus far been very European and that there were no obvious replies to the question of cultural plurality, the moderator invited the participants to direct their attention towards the subject of globalization. He raised the question of how globalization affects civilizational processes, self-identity, and modes of discourse. Can we add an important aspect/dimension to globalization and cultural plurality? The following points were made:

- ?? Global culture is everything that can be measured. Values and other important meanings do not fall within this scope. Globalization is an enemy of cultural diversity (mass productions, the Hollywood gaze, etc.) this equals the lowest common denominator.
- ?? Globalization also has another, more positive, modality which is 'internationalization', e.g. translation of literary work into different languages, thus enhancing increased inter-cultural communication this equals the highest common denominator,
- ?? In globalization there is no free competition of ideas, but only between organizations who back them up financially,
- ?? It is crucial that elite cultures be reformed also to include other (local) cultures,
- ?? Europe comprised many different cultures and identities. Can the role of European culture in global culture be defined? Can positive European values be promoted in a global context?
- ?? Identity is constantly changing; could this be true for global culture as well? Can we afford to be more relativistic in our understanding of globalization?,
- ?? Multiple and mobile identities were also present in the past; what is really new? Globalization is a constructed enemy; much about nothing, a self-appointment,
- ?? The real danger of globalization are the faceless bureaucracies, the simulations,
- ?? Globalization is a reality in WTO; countries are fighting to retain their own cultural heritage this equals the defence of cultural values within Free Trade Agreements,
- ?? Globalization allows for an intersection of world civilizations if cultures are brought into contact and communication, but not if it becomes a replacement of local cultural forms.
- ?? Civilizations can now make themselves heard in very effective ways. Globalization opens up opportunities, which were not there before,
- ?? National ideologies have oppressed local identities; globalization represents an escape out of that,
- ?? There is a lot of anxiety and uncertainty in the world. How to replace defense with something more constructive to feed into international organizations?
- ?? The importance of constantly re-inventing the world.

Actions for UNESCO and other International Organisations to consider:

The moderator concluded that there is a certain amount of optimism with regard to the capacity of human beings to orient themselves, find a place, in all the on-going transitions in the world. In future a more pluralist environment will have to be created and a new concept for this is urgently needed. National culture is important; it is being supported in different ways in most countries. However, national culture should include access to international organizations, to the global, etc. This implies a new definition of national cultural policies; a definition which would be based on the second denominator of globalization – the one that allows us to communicate.

II.3. Plural Identities and Common Values

Wednesday, 25 April 2001, Vilnius University Little Aula Hall

- Moderator: Mr. Yersu Kim (Korea)
- Participants: Mr. Siarhej Shupa (Belarussia)
Mr. Benvienido Agueta (Guatemala)
Mr. Aleksander Yakolev (Russia)
- Rapporteur: Mr. FW (Russ) Russell, UNESCO Secretariat

Mr Kim, Professor of Philosophy; Secretary-General of the Korean National Commission for UNESCO, *Korea*, during his opening remarks, provided the intellectual framework for the ensuing discussions and stated that the task at hand was to provide concrete substance for the idea of the dialogue among civilizations. He stated that ethics stands at the front of all dialogue among civilizations. He said that dialogue was no longer a choice, but rather a necessity in this day and age. The ethical values and principles relating to such concepts as poverty, the environment and religious and ethnic degradation can only be taken up at the global level. However, there is a need to clarify the basis of discord hindering this dialogue: The question of historical perspective was the most important of such hindrances. To rid ourselves of these hindrances would lead to true inter-cultural and inter-civilizational dialogue. The Moderator also raised the

issue of the notion of “universality” – we ought to come up with a concept that is inclusive and not hegemonic. Coming to terms with the concept of plural identities and common values can only be accommodated through an evolutionary or incremental process based on lessons learned, experienced and lived.

Mr. Shupa, Editor-in-Chief of the Lithuanian radio programme, "Baltic Waves", *Lithuania*, chose an historical examination of the evolution of the city of Vilnius. There is hardly another European city, he states, which demonstrates the unique nature of the multi-culturality and cosmopolitan flavour as that of Vilnius. Peaceful co-existence between several cultures has occurred during the past centuries, despite several occupations and administrations – 11 in the past century alone! However, this reality is becoming an historical one, current movements and processes are threatening the idyllic picture which the presenter paints. These movements and processes include a rise in nationalism and greater homogeneity of society. To slow these nefarious processes, the presenter proposes the establishment of a book project, entitled “The Golden Book of Vilnius”. It is envisaged that this book would take the form of an encyclopaedia, drawing on authors from the city representing the various communities of Vilnius to provide their perspectives of life there. Collectively, these works could beautifully demonstrate the mosaic which makes up Vilnius. The project could be considered as a logical next-step from this conference and could break down the barriers of differing communities that make up present-day Vilnius.

Mr. Argueta, Professor of Cultural Studies, Rafael Lanvivar University, *Guatemala*, began by stating that differences and civilizations tend to be viewed through Western political enlightenment – national identities and cultural differences have been inadequately taken into consideration. A paradox of nation states in Latin America exists where states were created to be independent from the colonisers, however each state is always trying to catch up to those more developed. The presenter posits that creativity and flexibility are needed when thinking of the concept of civilizations. How could one frame common values in legislation? Should we only take into consideration the Western democratic perspective? Is it possible to trace common components for all universal values? In the presenter’s opinion, one should not only need to understand the ‘other’ but ought also to understand one’s self. The process through which we proceed to find common values must also include the capability of tracing and accepting difference. Globalisation should be challenged. If not, differences will be destroyed. We ought not be so obsessive in our search for common values, rather, it would be better to think of co-existence among different systems without attempting greater homogenisation which has historically proven to lead to war. This type of globalisation weakens cultural identities he concludes.

Mr Yakolev, Director of the Presidential Commission for the Rehabilitation of Victims of Political Repression; Chairman of the Public Advisory Board, *Kultura* newspaper; Honorary Chairman of the Board of Directors of the Russian Public Television Ltd, *Russia*, chose to provide two or three remarks following up on his talk of the previous day. He stated that the Round Table, held in New York in September 2000, and this Conference have almost exhausted the general concepts of Dialogue among Civilizations. He said that we are still struggling to understand what the term 'civilization' means – is it referring to a civilization of behaviour? Or labour? Or of language? – Does not every citizen have lots of civilization within him? We ought to be able to define what major values we are attempting to discuss. The United Nations and UNESCO should establish the priorities as to where we should begin in this process.

Following the presentations, the Moderator opened the floor for discussion.

Salient points ensuing from the rich debate may be summarised as follows:

?? Prior to discussing ‘common values’, we must identify the sources of a “ Global Ethical Code”. These sources could include:

i) The three monotheistic religions;

- ii) The ethical traditions of humanity such as Buddhism, Confucianism; and,
- iii) A Civic culture based on democracy, pluralism and respect of human rights.

?? The quest for common values is actually the dilemma of attempting to reconcile the differences within common values.

- ?? There is a dichotomy between universal values and local values or realities – this is our ability to see things from differing perspectives, or through plurality. One has the tendency to call common values ‘western’. However, there are cultures other than the western one. More empirical research is needed in this area.
- ?? The notion of ‘common-problems’ was raised as a possible basis for the approach to common values – However, it was posited that while civilisations may experience common problems, the approaches to these problems may differ in differing societies.
- ?? The notion of exclusion should be rejected. One has the tendency to list universal values, which instantly becomes an exclusive concept for all other elements that have not been listed as universal values. However, this approach is actually a context-specific approach to looking at the notion of ‘universality’: it would be wrong to define “common universal values” as immutable over time – these values evolve in a step-by-step, evolutionary approach. There is a need to approach common universal values from a slightly longer time perspective. Equally, there is a need to contextualise these values.
- ?? Finally, if one could come up with a “Global Ethical Code”, who would implement this code? Also, within which forum could the rules of establishing common values be debated?

What could UNESCO’s role be in this process?

UNESCO and the UN at large should establish priority areas within which to concentrate on the vast concept of dialogue among civilisations.

UNESCO should provide the forum within which dialogue could take place. The rules of debate on such a subject would emerge naturally and over time.

UNESCO should make its ethical weight more prominent, providing greater understanding of historical events so that understanding the past does not present an obstacle for current or future co-operation between societies.

The sources of common values ought to be explored in greater detail.

Concrete proposals:

1. A future Conference organised by UNESCO ought to discuss young people’s role in society and their perception of the future as well as their understanding of “dialogue among civilisations”.
2. UNESCO should sponsor a satellite TV music channel diffusing ‘world music’ for a greater understanding of others and bringing others closer together.
3. UNESCO should establish the priorities as to where to begin in the process of understanding the term ‘civilization’.

II.4. “Trade, Science and Cultural Exchange ” Wednesday 25 April 2001, Vilnius University Senate Hall

Moderator: Mr Peter Curman, (Sweden)
 Participants: Ms Andree Suzy Romamonjisoa, (Madagascar)
 Mr Mahmoud Doulatatabadi, (Iran)
 Mr Arnold Mikhnevich, (Belarus)
 Rapporteur: Ms Olga Weber, UNESCO Secretariat

Ms Andree Suzy Romamonjisoa, Psycho-sociologist, researcher and teacher at the Civilizations Department of the Faculty of Literature and Humanities, Antananarivo University; General Secretary of the Centre for the Architectural Heritage of Antananarivo, *Madagascar*. La mondialisation présente de nombreux risques et notamment celui de mettre les cultures en péril, or la culture est l'élément essentiel du dialogue. La solidarité pour un dialogue entre les cultures dominantes et les cultures en péril demande un effort particulier, non seulement au niveau des échanges de discours mais aussi dans l'organisation de la production et la diffusion des œuvres artistiques et scientifiques afin qu'elles circulent dans un marché plus équitable.

L'intervenant a fait une présentation historique et économique de Madagascar afin d'illustrer comment ce pays s'est nourri de différents apports culturels.

Afin de lutter contre le processus de cultures en péril et permettre la diffusion de leur œuvres artistiques, Ms Andree Suzy Romamonjisoa présente une série de recommandations :

- ?? Analyser les tendances, les menaces et les opportunités actuelles pour le commerce des productions artistiques
- ?? Mener une recherche scientifique axée sur les besoins d'un développement humain durable
- ?? Créer des dynamiques irréversibles pour la création et le renforcement des initiatives en cours dans le souci d'organiser des marchés équitables pour les producteurs
- ?? Valoriser les industries culturelles pour créer des revenus dans le cadre de la pauvreté et pour renforcer les stratégies identitaires en matière technologique
- ?? Renforcer la mise en réseaux pour la circulation des informations

Ces recommandations reposent sur l'idée que sans développement durable le dialogue ne peut exister. La communauté internationale doit s'attaquer à la définition de nouveaux comportements commerciaux et à l'éthique nouvelle qui devra en découler.

Mr Mahmoud Doulatatabadi, Novelist, *Iran* Historical presentation of Iran as well as its evolution and a number of general comments:

- ?? UNESCO should be a motor to advance dialogue and peace.
- ?? Lessons learned from the past century ought to be highlighted so as to avoid new obscurantism.
- ?? The importance of the roles of intellectuals in breaking stereotypes
- ?? Before dialoguing with the outside world, an internal dialogue is sometimes necessary, notably with minorities.

Mr Arnold Mikhnevich, Philosopher, Director of the Institute of Cultural Problems, *Byelorussia*. When a national culture gets on the track of sovereignty, it faces a problem of the development of contacts with other cultures. The desired intensification of cultural contacts presupposes the existence of a multitude of languages which are instruments of interaction.

Culture taken as a variety of forms and manifestations may be presented as an integral tonality of various signs systems. So it would be interesting to work on a national semiological program. This theme is related to the notion of language and linguistic barrier.

The basic goal of a national semiological program would be to answer the following question: How many and what semiological systems a nation needs to provide for its most adequate integration in the world culture, and in the process of international cultural interaction, and what languages an individual personality needs to achieve the highest level of socialization?

It seems important to devise a national semiological program, because it is a premise of cultural polylingualism, which, in its turn, is essential and necessary to intensify and to advance the dialogue of cultures, to achieve a rich inner and outer communication of a nation.

Debate:

?? Conflict between commercial and cultural interest.

Examples: copyright problems for authors and composers are often very difficult to defend and can not be considered as merchandise.

?? Problems with exchanges of cultural goods - within which framework are negotiation and free exchange agreements adequate.

?? One has also to speak about the new technologies, in a world where technology is growing every day, one must not forget to protect local know how and local heritage

?? Problems concerning globalisation and international commerce are not favourable to small industries. An example includes the discovery of medicinal plants by developing countries who do not have the ability for further development of the product. There is a great need to protect the local production but also advocate an active endogenous development and search for markets for local products.

Propositions concrètes à implémenter par l'UNESCO :

1. Développer le rôle de l'UNESCO et son implication comme lieu de discussion et comme forum international de dialogue entre les civilisations.
2. Protéger les cultures en péril et les artisans locaux et promouvoir le savoir faire traditionnel. Promouvoir dans ce cadre :
 - a) une mobilisation sociale en profondeur accompagnée de moyens permettant aux producteurs de se structurer plus fortement afin d'assurer une stratégie d'habilitation de la culture nationale et inspirer des actions de gestion patrimoniale des acquis artistiques et scientifiques
 - b) des programmes d'éducation à la citoyenneté afin de favoriser l'acquisition d'une culture participative et de tolérance à partir de l'organisation d'échanges commerciaux
 - c) la création de revenus locaux par la transformation des ressources de l'environnement physique et naturel.

II.5. “Otherness”

Wednesday 25 April 2001, Vilnius University Little Aula Hall

Moderator: Mr. Arthur Cromwell, (United States of America)

Panelists: Mr. Cherif Khazanadar, (France)
 Mr. Mohiaddin S. Mesbahi, (Iran)
 Mr. Hahmad Jalali, (Iran)
 Ms Irena Vaisvilaite, (Lithuania)
 Mr. Ingemar Lindahl, (Sweden)
 Mr. Uwe Friesel, (Germany)
 Mr. Zafimahaleo Rasolofrontraosolo, (Madagascar).

Rapporteur: Ms. A.B. Preis, UNESCO Secretariat

Mr. Cherif Khazanadar, Director of the Maison des cultures du Monde, *France*, argued that every individual has multiple identities and that it is the very consciousness of this multiplicity which allows him/her to understand others. All our efforts must be oriented towards the necessity of this consciousness. We should not forget that racism is born in the belief in one unique identity. Mr. Khazanadar listed different forms of racism (the social, anti-minority, sexual, colonial, ‘nationalism’ or “Nazism”), and proposed that many present-day conflicts are primarily linked to questions of identity.

Referring to the work of the French sociologist George Balandier, Khazanadar argued that the question of identity is presently unfolding itself on a double scene: that of countries who have the initiatives in globalization and those who are being submerged by it. The identity crisis of these two universes leads to a search for cultural roots, cultural relations and cultural values which may contribute to its resolution.

Mr. Khazanadar concluded that when wanting to affirm one’s difference, a difference without which there is no possibility for dialogue and exchange, there is a risk to fall into indifference and globalization to carry out its worst error which is to produce a false dialogue among cultures and civilizations.

Mr. Mohiaddin S. Messbahi, Professor, Department of International Relations, Chair, Asian Studies, Florida International University, *USA*, informed the audience that he would regard being labeled and stereotyped as a matter linked to security questions. Before embarking upon this task, he emphasized that it is wrong – intellectually and politically – to equalize globalization with Americanization, as it often done, even at this Conference. It is very damaging to the whole project.

Mr. Messbahi went on to say that securization is whenever a group or an individual elevate a political question to the use of force - often politicians, state leaders, etc. All civilizations engage in this to mobilize their own public and to ensure internal security. They engage in the demonization of the other and the illusion is that the process is controllable. It is not. It applies a life of its own as evidence in post Cold War scenarios, in the crisis of the 1980’s or in the very recent political struggles. Labeling is what he would call ‘the national trapping’ – the trapping of the words. It has a dialectical mutual reinforcing mechanism and public labeling has material consequences for one’s own populations.

Mr. Messbahi concluded that we need a new code of international public conduct. This may not be a purely UNESCO matter – although the Organization could work at the societal level in the long-term - but must be handled by the UN system and at the level of political leaders.

Mr. Ahmad Jalali, Ambassador and Permanent Representative of the Islamic Republic of Iran to UNESCO, Iran, presented a more theoretical approach in addressing the question of ‘we’ and ‘the other’. Each individual has a pluralistic set of identities, otherwise dialogue would not be possible. Because each identity is composite, absolute otherness does not exist either. However, we need history to see this. While Iranian and Western culture have been portrayed in this oppositional way, a closer look at the history reveals that in the Middle Ages, philosophers from both civilizations were concerned with the same questions through their Greek and Hellenistic common identities.

In order to overcome the stereotyping of the Other, Mr. Jalali therefore suggested two changes: 1) An attempt to rewrite history as the history of dialogue and not of conflictual encounters, and 2) To use the metaphor of civilization in the sense of an organic, open-ended entity.

Ms Irena Vaisvilaite, Journalist at the Radio Free Europe, Prague; Scholar, University of Vilnius, *Lithuania*, argued that when we deal with otherness, we most often ‘walk around’ religions. This is surprising, even more so as the greatest Other is God himself and that the philosophical traditions of monotheistic religions posit the ‘guest’ as the ‘stranger’. Religion is relevant in contemporary crisis in the Balkans, Ireland, Sudan, Indonesia, but the contemporary secularized dialogue is not capable of replying to the question of whether these conflicts are religious. The Dialogue among Religions is going on parallel to the Dialogue among Civilizations, but these two never meet at the international level.

Mr. Ingemar Lindahl, Ambassador, Ministry of Foreign Affairs; Professor, Uppsals University, *Sweden* said that in order for true dialogue to take place, there must be a positive attitude to the other. He argued that there are collective dialogues, in which different political and social entities participate, and which produce certain results. However, real dialogue can only take place between persons who are products, not representatives of a given civilization. It must be based on a certain amount of self-knowledge. Dialogue requires that one looks into one’s self first. Poetry is a very good avenue for this, because, in poetry, one does not encounter definitional problems, etc.

Mr. Lindahl subsequently proposed that UNESCO, which is already involved in work on Dialogue among Civilizations, could encourage this more genuine dialogue through such examples as the exchange of poems in schools, exhibitions of art work (the aesthetic experience is prior to language) and by emphasizing the importance of cultural transfer stations. Immigrants, writers, sailors etc. can be cultural agents, and UNESCO could reinforce the de-demonization through the revision of school textbooks and through the use of the new technologies to enhance intercultural dialogue.

Mr. Uwe Friesel, Translator, writer, Member of P.E.N. and VS (German Writers’ Union), *Germany*, presented a series of provocative proposals on the definition of the other, which could be used to pre-shape and influence politics. Among the many examples presented by him were: the other is the individual as opposed to the group; from the point of view of the group the individual is dangerous; religions tend to demonize otherness; political dictatorship tends to define art as a denouncement of the state; sometimes otherness is regarded as something positive, but this does not protect people, etc. (This has to be developed on the basis of Mr. Friesel’s paper).

Mr. Zafimahaleo Rasolofrondraosolo, Sociologist, Madagascar University, Professional Musician, Member of Parliament, *Madagascar*, opened up his traditional musical instrument from Madagascar and played a beautiful song, which the audience was requested to interpret despite the obvious language barrier. Mr. Zafimahaleo told the audience that in Malagashi philosophy there is the identity of the body, of reason and of the soul. The ‘food’ of the soul is emotion, and the audience has just gone through that experience. He therefore concluded by proposing that UNESCO increases its effort to promote art and artists.

In the ensuing discussion issues linked to the question of securization were taken up again, and the forcefulness of the Huntington argument was analyzed. Attention was drawn to the fact to the Dialogue among Civilizations has ensured that there are now a least two narratives, not only one. It was repeated that globalization is not Americanization, large parts of the American population are worried about globalization as well.

Concrete proposals for UNESCO to consider included:

1. An emphasis of the fundamental importance of alternative broadcasting, with the recommendation that an International Media Conference be held soon to address issues such as the new technologies, the digital divide, distance learning – memory and the transference thereof. There may be a need for an alternative news agency; a third channel to go to for ‘objective’ information. UNESCO may be the most appropriate forum to do this.
2. UNESCO, which is already involved in work on Dialogue among Civilizations, could encourage more genuine dialogue through such actions as the exchange of poems in schools, exhibitions of art work (the aesthetic experience is prior to language) and by emphasizing the importance of cultural transfer stations. Immigrants, writers, sailors etc. can be cultural agents, and UNESCO could reinforce the de-demonization through the revision of school textbooks and through the use of the new technologies to enhance intercultural dialogue.
3. UNESCO should also increase its efforts to promote the art and artists.

II.6. “Concepts of Civilisation for the 21st Century”

Wednesday 25 April 2001, Vilnius University Little Aula Hall

- Moderator: Mr. Leonidas Donskis, (Lithuania)
 Participants: Mr. Algis Mickunas, (United States of America)
 Ms. Sonia Mendieta de Badaroux, (Honduras)
 Mr. Tamotsu Aoki (Japan)
 Mr. El-Sayed Mohamed Yassin, (Egypt)
 Mr. Armen Darbinian, (Armenia)
 Rapporteur: Mr. FW (Russ) Russell, UNESCO Secretariat

Mr. Leonidas Donskis, Scholar, Cultural Studies and Philosophy, *Lithuania*, opened by discussing the concept of civilization through the ages. He stated that far from including non-European societies and cultures in the discursive universe of civilisation, West European scholars and politicians went so far as to divide Europe itself on the ground of the polarity “civilisation vs. barbarity.” Civilisation and the resulting civilising mission were ascribed to Western Europe, whereas Eastern Europe was inscribed on the map of civilisation — and on the mind of the Enlightenment — as the vast land of barbarity, ambiguity, ambivalence, chaos, and uncertainty. He mentioned that there remained a persistent dichotomy of the civilisations of East and West, both conceived as moral categories, rather than sheer geographical terms or historical references. Donskis continued by stating that the philosophy of history and culture cannot cover a large expanse of human experience, of intellectual and moral sensibilities, of thought, and of sympathetic understanding of otherness that we ascribe to the contemporary comparative studies. The current exponents of civilisation analysis and of the history of consciousness, hold two predominant methodologies in the context of the comparative study of civilisations and are perfectly aware of the fact that the concept of civilisation can serve as a means of symbolic and even actual exclusion, not only inclusion. This is why it significantly enhances our intellectual responsibility and attentiveness to the political and moral implications of the ways of our understanding of ourselves and others.

The following problematical foci were presented by Donskis and represent the conceptual frame within which current exponents of civilisation analysis tend to describe civilisations as:

- /// consisting of social structure and symbolic organisation;
- /// symbolic designs (authority, power, configuration of values and ideas, etc.);
- /// explanatory and interpretative frameworks within which people search for concepts and frames of meaning to explain themselves and the world around them;
- /// world religions/great spiritual traditions;
- /// links bridging the realms of the secular and the sacred;
- /// theories dealing with world history and with the phenomena of consciousness and culture in terms of coherence;
- /// mentalities/histories of mentalities;
- /// relationships between theories and practices;
- /// ensembles of interrelated and complementary cultures in terms of style and common values;
- /// controlling principles of social/political action and of creative

He concluded by stating that much remains to be done to foster the comparative study of western and non-western concepts of civilisation, as well as a continuous civilisational dialogue of scholars. The miracle of dialogue occurs when we recognise the Other not as a threat, but as the only way to understand ourselves and the world around us.

Mr. Algis Mickunas, Professor, Department of Philosophy, Ohio University, *USA*, presented a provocative perspective of the concept of nomadic civilization referring to this modern trend to lifestyle as almost criminal behaviour where one moves about, in this day and age, from country to country whilst neither accepting the other’s culture not imposing his/her culture in the new environment. The idea that discussions about dialogue among civilizations centre around the concept of globalisation is aberrant, he states, and one ought to be discussing the human being as an individual and not within the globalised context.

Ms. Sonia Mendieta de Badaroux, Chairperson of UNESCO's Executive Board and Ambassador and Permanent Representative of Honduras to UNESCO, *Honduras*, spoke about the different routes (The Silk Roads, the Slave Routes, and the Iron Roads...) that have helped to develop our collective civilizations. The people who moved along these routes have all contributed to our civilizations. Cultural diversity had developed at that time. Transferring this historical example to today, one could look to the internet and the information highway as an example of a modern route for diversity.

Mr. Tamotsu Aoki, Former President of the Japan Ethnological Society, Anthropologist, Member of the Japanese National Commission for UNESCO, *Japan*, presented a paper on the foreign character of the term 'civilization'. For most Japanese, this term refers to 'Western Civilization'. 'Civilization', for the Japanese, is defined in very secular, technical and scientific terms. 'Culture', on the other hand, is a very inward, reflexive or traditional concept. Westernization as he has defined it, should be framed in terms of modernization. Culture is very personal whereas civilization is very materialistic. There can be a global civilization, but not a global culture. He posits that we should reflect on '*glocalization*' – globalization and local cultures working together.

Mr. El-Sayed Mohamed Yassin, Counsellor, Centre for Strategic Studies, Al Ahram, *Egypt*, stated that it was inappropriate to talk about the concepts of civilization without having first dealt with some of the indicators presently surrounding us. He referred to the fact that we are currently witnessing a crisis, or paradigm shift where old paradigms are falling and new ones are being created. Globalization is just a part of the historical process we are currently in – shifting from industrialization towards the global information society.

Mr. Armen Darbinian, Former Prime Minister, the *Republic of Armenia*, stated that the objective within this workshop should be to provide a way out of the crisis as Mr Yassin was referring to. He said that dialogue should emphasise values rather than self interests. Post-modernity, he continued, lends itself well to this concept of dialogue based on values: pluralism, horizontal relationships and co-operation between societies, leading towards a world of dialogue, tolerance and plurality. He said world leaders ought to defend projects that help in democracy building and regional development. One should pay closer attention to cultural and educational reforms demonstrating these reforms in sizeable changes within national budgets. Equal access to information technologies should be made available as well as greater infrastructure so as to ensure that all can receive these information technologies equally.

The Moderator opened the floor to discussion. The following salient points were raised:

- ?? Any discussion on civilisation should not be reduced to a semantic approach to the term – one should avoid concept of the "white mans' burden" and should not demonise other societies or cultures. Equally, classifying humanity in arbitrary categories ought to be avoided.
- ?? The spiritual dimension of life – its ethics – ought to be considered, this rising trend may be seen as a backlash to the materialistic trend of the past 50 years.
- ?? There is a risk in this rise of religion today – we could consider today's religions as sects or '*fastfoodization*' processes which ought to be avoided.
- ?? The forces of genetics and the advances of genome mapping are shaping the way we are now thinking of the human being – these forces could profoundly change the way we look at dialogue in the future.
- ?? Perhaps a human being can participate in many civilisations and cultures at the same time – it is not possible to separate civilisations into isolated units – dialogue implies the ability of a person to question one's self and situate one's self within a civilisation or parts of several civilisations.
- ?? We could consider cultures to be hybrids of many cultures. We ought to avoid stereotypes of "Eastern" versus "Western" cultures – perhaps the concept of hybridisation could be incorporated into the final Declaration.
- ?? A definition of civilisation that was promoted was one which refers to a conscious way of understanding one's self which involves human sensibilities and a capacity of understand our relationship with others. Civilisations are symbolic designs in which people attempt to understand themselves.

Concrete proposals that UNESCO could consider:

- ?? The relationship between genetics/genome-mapping and dialogue among civilizations could be explored.
- ?? The notion of the hybridisation of cultures could be further studied.
- ?? Provide advice to Member States concerning educational and cultural reforms where dialogue among civilizations is concerned.

**List of Participants
International Conference on
Dialogue among Civilizations
23 – 26 April 2001
Vilnius, Lithuania**

- 1. Mr. Kaveh L. Afrasiabi (Iran, residing in USA)**
Scholar
- 2. Mr. Tamotsu Aoki (Japan)**
Ex-President of Japan Ethnological Society, anthropologist, member of Japanese National Commission for UNESCO
- 3. Mr. Benvienido Argueta (Guatemala)**
Professor at Rafael Lanvivar University, cultural studies
- 4. Mr. Steve Austen (Netherlands)**
Scholar, director of Felix Meritis Foundation
- 5. Mr. Roland Bernecker (Germany)**
Representative of the German National Commission for UNESCO, University scholar
- 6. Mr. Byong-Ik Koh (Korea)**
Member of the Korean National Academy of Sciences, Chairman of the Korean National Cultural Properties Committee
- 7. Ms. Helene Carrere D'Encausse (France)**
Perpetual Secretary of the French Academy
- 8. Mr. Arthur Cromwell (USA)**
Documentary-TV-radio producer, Ohio University Columbus teacher, member of National Communication Association, African-American Communication and Culture, American Studies Communication, Ethnography Division
- 9. Mr. Peter Curman (Sweden)**
Writer, poet
- 10. Mr. Armen Darbinian (Armenia)**
Ex-Prime Minister of the Republic of Armenia
- 11. Mr. Doudou Diene (Senegal)**
Director of the Division of Intercultural Dialogue, UNESCO
- 12. Mr. Sello Dithebe (South Africa)**
Member of Parliament, member of parliamentarian committees: Arts, Culture, Science and Technology, Joint Monitoring Committee on the Status and Improvement of the Quality of Life: Children, Youth and Disabled Persons
- 13. Mr. Leonidas Donskis (Lithuania)**
Scholar, cultural studies and philosophy
- 14. Mr. Mahmoud Doulatbadi (Iran)**
Novelist
- 15. Mr. Wojciech Falkowski (Poland)**
Secretary General of Polish national Commission for UNESCO, Professor of Warsaw University
- 16. Mr. Uwe Friesel (Germany, residing in Sweden)**
Translator, writer, member of P.E.N. and VS (German Writers' Union)
- 17. Mr. Ahmad Jalali (Iran)**
University professor of philosophy, Permanent Delegate to UNESCO
- 18. Ms. Ugne Karvelis (Lithuania)**
Writer, translator, ambassador, Permanent Delegate of Lithuania to UNESCO
- 19. Mr. Cherif Khaznadar (France)**
President of the Culture Committee at the French National Commission for UNESCO, Director of House of the Cultures of the World, director of "Festival de l'Imaginaire", researcher
- 20. Mr. Yersu Kim (Korea)**
Professor of philosophy, Secretary General of the Korean National Commission for UNESCO

21. Mr. Jerzy Kloczowski (Poland)

Director of the Institute of Central and Eastern Europe, Chairman of the Polish Committee for UNESCO, Professor of the Catholic University of Lublin, Head of the Chair of the History of Polish Culture

22. Ms. Halina Kobeckaitė (Lithuania)

Ambassador of Lithuania to Turkey, scholar, Representative of Caraim Community of Lithuania

23. Mr. Serge Lazarev (Russia)

Director of Tolerance and Non-violence Unit, UNESCO

24. Mr. Ingemar Lindahl (Sweden)

Writer, ambassador, Ministry of Foreign Affairs

25. Mr. Alphonso Lingis (USA)

Professor of philosophy and cultural studies at the Pennsylvania State University

26. Ms. Penda Mbow (Senegal)

Minister of Culture

27. Ms. Sonia Mendieta de Badaroux (Honduras)

Chairperson of the Executive Board of UNESCO

28. Ms. Rekha Menon (India, residing in USA)

Philosopher, artist, art historian, dance choreographer

29. Mr. Mohiaddin Messbahi (Iran)

Scholar at the Florida International University

30. Mr. Algis Mickunas (USA)

Professor of philosophy, researcher at the Ohio University Columbus

31. Mr. Anatoli Mikhailov (Belarus)

Philosopher, culturologist, Rector of the European Humanitarian University

32. Mr. Arnold Mikhnevich (Belarus)

Philosopher, culturologist, Director of the Institute of Cultural Problems of Byelorussia

33. Mr. Ataollah Mohajerani (Iran)

Advisor of the President of the Republic of Iran, Head of the International Centre of Dialogue among Civilisations

34. Mr. Essan Naraghi (Iran)

Scholar, journalist

35. Ms. Ana Maria de Oliveira (Angola)

Member of Parliament, ex-minister of culture, member of the Bureau for the Slave Route Project,

36. Mr. Yves Plasseraud (France)

Chairman of Groupement of Minorities Rights

37. Mr. Zafimahaleo Rasolofondraosolo (Madagascar)

Sociologist, musician, writer, singer, member of Parliament

38. Mr. Rein Raud (Estonia)

Professor of Japanese studies at the University of Helsinki, professor of Asian and cultural studies at the Estonian Institute of Humanities, translator, essayist

39. Ms. Andree Suzy Romamonjisoa (Madagascar)

Psycho-sociologist researcher and teacher at the Civilisations department of the Literature and Human Sciences Faculty of Antananarivo University, General Secretary of the Centre for the Architectural Patrimony in Antananarivo

40. Mr. Xin Ru (China)

Chairman of Academic Committee at the Chinese Academy of Social Sciences, professor of philosophy

41. Mr. Mohamed Sayed Ahmed (Egypt)

Journalist and writer at Al Ahram

42. Mr. El-Sayed Mohamed Yassin (Egypt)

Counsellor at the Centre of Strategic Studies at Al-Ahram

43. Mr. Siarhej Shupa (Belarus)

Journalist, translator

44. Ms. Irena Vaišvilaite (Lithuania)

Scholar, journalist of radio Free Europe, Prague

45. Mr. Javier Wimer (Mexico)

Writer

46. Mr. Aleksandr Yakovlev (Russia)

Director of Presidential Commission for Rehabilitation of Victims of Political Repression, Honorary Chairman of the Board of Directors of the Russian Public Television Ltd, President of International Democracy Foundation, member of Writers' Union of Russia

**Addresses and Messages of
Heads of State and
Heads of International Organisations**

**International Conference on
Dialogue among Civilizations
23 – 26 April 2001
Vilnius, Lithuania**

Annex II.1. Address by H.E. Mr. Valdas Adamkus, President of the Republic of Lithuania

Highly Esteemed Presidents,
Director-General of UNESCO,
Your Excellences,
Ladies and Gentlemen,

It is my pleasure to welcome you in Vilnius, at the International Conference “Dialogue among Civilisations”.

Today, we have gathered to discuss once again the directions in which our world is heading, so that we could enrich it with greater mutual understanding, enhanced confidence, partnership and hope.

I am grateful to UNESCO for supporting Lithuania’s initiative to organise the Vilnius Conference as one of the major events dedicated to the United Nations Year of Dialogue among Civilisations. Lithuania is a country, where old cultures and civilisations have crisscrossed, competed and co-existed throughout the centuries. Lithuania was the last European state to accept Christianity. In the Middle Ages, our country not only suffered from the armed crusades coming from the West against the so-called “barbarity” of the East, but also had to promote concord among its residents representing different cultures and religions.

For many years, Baltic pagan temples, Roman Catholic churches and Byzantine Eastern Orthodox churches here stood next to each other. Later, mosques, synagogues and Karaim kenesas were built in the immediate proximity to Roman Catholic and Eastern Orthodox churches. Members of the families of Lithuanian Grand Dukes could even profess different religions. Different national traditions were respected in the lands under their rule.

Tolerance and coexistence of nations, which marked the history of the State of Lithuania in the past, regained their significance when our country restored independence. Since the very first days of independence, our state has been strengthened by both peaceful coexistence of its ethnic groups and good neighbourly relations. Lithuania’s strategic partners of the past have become its strategic partners of today: therefore participation of my colleagues, the Presidents of Poland and the Ukraine, at this conference is not accidental. I believe that the experience accumulated in Eastern and Central Europe over the centuries can be used as a background for the issues that this conference will address.

Globalisation is expanding in today’s world. The distances between its parts are shrinking and relations among peoples intensify. The contemporary world, dominated by modern information technologies, not only forces closer dialogue among civilisations, but is also gradually turning into a civilisation of dialogue. Of course, this is a complex and contradictory transformation. Quite often it is impeded by stereotypes that for many centuries have hampered the relations among civilizations.

Still, no civilisation can solely claim to represent the entire humanity or to assume full responsibility for it. Neither can a single civilisation claim exclusive rights to provide a universally valid vision of how to be a good human being and how to live wisely in today’s world. We may find answers to these questions only through the dialogue among civilisations or by way of a polylogue.

Only by participating in polylogue of civilisations, can a civilisation get to know itself better and put its core values to a critical test. Only lively polylogue of civilisations can help safeguard mutual respect and tolerance, dignity and partnership among people of different cultural experience.

I want to emphasise that dialogue among civilisations is not self-generated. It is the result of joint efforts. As my old friend, professor Vytautas Kavolis, former President of the International Society for the Comparative Study of Civilisations, said, every civilisation has its own denominator of cultural liberalism, which enables different societies to understand each other. He was convinced that this denominator of liberalism along with mutual understanding between civilisations should nowadays be promoted by a modern educational system. Professor Kavolis maintained that sooner or later comparative studies of civilisations will become an important part of modern education. Indeed, it will be essential to the people living in the contemporary world to be able to think and act being conscious of the entire complexity of civilisations and to build a new future on the basis of this consciousness.

It is gratifying that Lithuania - a Central European state which regained independence only eleven years ago - today can become the venue of dialogue among civilisations and make its modest contribution to building confidence among people and nations, and strengthening the traditions of mutual respect and tolerance in the 21st century.

I, as the Head of the State of Lithuania and a citizen of the world at the beginning of the new millennium, strongly support the efforts of Lithuania in this area. I wish the Vilnius Conference lively discussions, creative spirit and meaningful work, and to all its participants and guests I wish the best of success.

Annex II.2. Address by H.E. Mr. Aleksander Kwasniewski, President of the Republic of Poland:

Distinguished President of the Republic of Lithuania,
Distinguished President of Ukraine,
Distinguished Director General of UNESCO,
Ladies and Gentlemen!

Dialogue among civilisations is a process, which gives shape to the 21 century. The Vilnius Conference is an attempt to reflect on this challenge, and an important contribution to the global debate initiated by the United Nations. It is my privilege and a great satisfaction to be a co-patron of this initiative. I wish to thank the President of the Republic of Lithuania for the invitation. In my view, this is yet another friendly gesture from a well-wishing neighbour, a sign of close partnership between Poland and Lithuania. May I also thank the Director General of UNESCO for his presence among us, lending a very special significance to the Vilnius Conference. I wish to thank all the participants assembled in this room, luminaries of science and culture, people of good will and of great commitment. You represent many countries, many historical experiences, many points of view. This meeting is a phenomenon in itself. Dialogue among civilisations is taking here a more concrete shape, and develops in a real-life contact between people.

Ladies and Gentlemen!

The world's history is a history of many civilisations, of their progress and their inter-relations. Today this is an accepted truth which sets the tone of our epoch. But it was not always so. In our thinking about the world, we managed – to a large extent – to overcome two clichés.

The first one consisted in overemphasising economic factors at the expense of cultural ones. Today, we have distanced ourselves from this method of explaining the world. This is not only caused by the fact that political systems, which relied on such a model, broke down and collapsed. It is also because we can see how many phenomena and processes of the contemporary world need to be explained on the grounds of culture, customs; and to what extent people's attitudes may impact the condition of economy. Admittedly economy has a great influence on our life: globalisation is an evidence of that. But in our individual and collective choices we also refer to spiritual values, often without even realising it. The sense of identity and of belonging is very important in this respect. It is fulfilled in a civilisation, since – to quote Samuel Huntington – „Civilisations are the biggest “we” within which we feel culturally at home as distinguished from all the other “thems” out there”.

The other fallacy that we abandon consists in treating our own civilisation as the hub of the universe. More than ever do we realise that this is a multipolar and polyphonic world, which is a mosaic of various cultures and historical traditions. This intellectual break-through is a particularly valid experience for the Western civilisation. For many centuries, it flourished in the conviction of being a universal one. Based on these grounds, it developed a sense of its mission, fallacious as it often was, and justified its domination over other cultures. Revision of this mode of thinking was a difficult and painful exercise, but a purifying one. It proceeded gradually. Historical developments, such as decolonisation were of primordial importance here. Also, reflection of great thinkers and luminaries of science, such as Oswald Spengler, Arnold Toynbee or Fernand Braudel has shed a new light. Today, the Western civilisation views other civilisations as partners and interlocutors. It is able to define the pillars of its own uniqueness and identity, realising at the same time, how much it owes to other cultures. Also, the civilisation of the West knows now how to define the cornerstones of human universality, such as fundamental moral values, entire output of the world culture and human rights.

Ladies and Gentlemen!

In the contemporary world, even the greatest civilisations, ones most centred on their own identity, cannot develop in isolation. State-of-the-art information technologies, development of telecommunications, global economic processes, migrations – all of them result in broader and more frequent meetings of civilisations, embracing bigger groups of people. With the growing global interdependence, separate autonomous phenomena are declining. For this reason, dialogue among civilisations is more than just a humanistic proposition, it is more than curiosity of the exoticness or diversity. It is a necessity, and the world of the 21st century makes us realise this more acutely than ever.

We must seek what we have in common – codes of understanding. We must learn how to be a unity in a plurality. At the same time, we must increase our sensitivity so as to respect someone else's identity, the need to differentiate oneself, and different views on the world around and on life. Only then shall we be able to avoid problems, disappointments and dangers which globalisation has in store. If globalisation is only limited to its technical, economic and media manifestations, and if it does not produce genuine partnership between cultures and people, it will be of no avail. If a free movement of ideas, commodities, lifestyles is not equally vested in all societies, barriers will rise condemning many people to exclusion. Sense of unfulfilment, lack of understanding or inferiority complex may pose a substantial threat to the world's stability; they may fuel nationalism, tribalism, xenophobia. Dialogue among civilisations must involve our abilities to speak and to listen; to contribute and to benefit from the others. Globalisation provokes anxiety and resistance because it may eventually lead to destruction of traditional ways of thinking, systems of values, deep-rooted cultures. But it may also open an opportunity for development and constructive changes, it may lead to the formation of such an identity among individuals and communities, which will be more open, and less inclined to prioritise one's own views only.

Personally, I do not believe in insurmountable cultural barriers. I do not subscribe to the point of view under which there are boundaries between civilisations, which were formed by a century-long tradition, never to disappear. Time and culture are powerful stabilisers but they may equally forcefully promote changes. Clash of civilisations is therefore not predetermined. The mosaic world of the 21st century is not free from anxiety but there are also premises to look into the future with optimism.

Ladies and Gentlemen!

The venue of our meeting is symbolic. The colourful past of Vilnius provides an excellent example of dialogue among cultures. It is a place, which for centuries saw amicable cohabitation of people of various nations, religions and customs. Here civilisational influences of the West and East overlapped. Here was a crossing point of ideas, commercial routes and material culture. This all represents the heritage of the contemporary Vilnius, and from here a message is sent that in a polyphonic global civilisation, we do not need to build the new order for the new century from scratch. Let us draw on experience gathered on a local scale, let us benefit from positive developments from the past.

Such models can be also found in the history of the whole Central and Eastern Europe. Over four hundred years ago, this region gave birth to a unique phenomenon in the history, i.e. the Commonwealth of Two Nations: Poland and Lithuania. A peacefully built federation of two states in reality was able to accommodate more than just two nationalities: not only the Poles and the Lithuanians, but also the Ruthenians, Germans, Jews, Tartars and Armenians. This was a meeting point of the Western culture and of the Orthodox and Islamic influences. Much has changed from those days of yore, many wars and conflicts swept the region, many nation states were formed since. But the memory of that common existence is still alive in our minds.

Perhaps it is this memory, combined with good sense and responsibility that helped us now to recover the way to reconciliation and partnership. It should be remembered that upon the collapse of communism, when the ice of Yalta melted, there were reasons to fear the revival of ethnical and civilisation clashes from the first half of the 20th century. However, we opted for good neighbourhood, openness, co-operation. The friendship of Poland and Lithuania may be an inspiring example here, and likewise excellent Polish-German relations, Polish-Ukrainian partnership, or the developing Polish-Russian dialogue. The entire Central Europe with so many historical and cultural threads woven into its heritage, is today an area of stability, security, co-operation. It enters the structures of the united Europe, while also remaining open to dialogue with the East, with other civilisations. This is our contribution in the forming of the world in the 21st century, the world of interdependence and mutual understanding.

Today Vilnius sends an important signal to the whole international community. I am convinced that the Vilnius conference will contribute to the building of openness, confidence and co-operation among great communities of the contemporary world. I trust that it will go down as an important event in the Year of Dialogue Among Civilisations.

I wish you interesting and fruitful debate.

Annex II.3. Address by H.E. Mr. Leonid Kutchma, President of the Republic of Ukraine

Your Excellencies,
Ladies and Gentlemen,

First of all let me express my sincere gratitude to the organisers of the Conference “Dialog among Civilisations”.

In my opinion it is rather symbolic that this important and extraordinary forum is taking place in the charming atmosphere of the ancient Vilnius where different cultures, religions and traditions have interacted and coexisted peacefully for hundreds of years.

I am very pleased that the Conference is held under the patronage of my good friends Presidents Valdas Adamkus and Aleksander Kwasniewski as well as the UNESCO Director General Koichiro Matsuura. Their addresses have already created a high intellectual atmosphere in this hall. I am convinced it will provide a stimulus for real breakthrough in further discussions on dialog among civilisations.

I believe that the objective of this forum is to define the most efficient forms of interaction between civilisations in modern world and to separate the truth from the stereotypes.

Two options for such an interaction – catastrophic and optimistic – have been the most common ones. The catastrophic option is represented by a well-known theory of collision by Huntington and the optimistic option – by the theory of victory of liberal values and ‘the end of history’ by Fukuyama.

I think that the truth is to be found somewhere in the middle.

Can we regard the collision of civilisations as an inevitable factor of modern history? I think we lack sufficient grounds to say yes.

Human history is full of instructive examples of mutual penetration, cultural and historic enrichment.

Let us ask whether the West or the Western Orthodox civilisations would be proud of their intellectual heritage if the Middle Age Europe had not been enriched with accomplishments of other cultures in mathematics, astronomy, medicine, architecture, philosophy and many other areas.

I believe the key is not in attempting to thrust one’s own outlook, but in perceiving the values of other civilisations.

Undoubtedly, it does not mean that we have to turn a blind eye on the severe violations of human rights, justifying them by local traditions.

But we ought to see something else: obliteration of cultural and religious peculiarities of any nation can result in extremely serious consequences.

Certain danger also lies in spreading simplified ideas about the modern process of globalisation.

One may sometimes get an impression that the revolution in the area of communication, the development of Internet mean, first of all, the wider spread of ideological and cultural influence of the West and not the whole West but the small group of countries that possess technological resources.

But the fast spread of technological ideas does not mean that only one civilisation holds the monopoly ownership on them as well as that they are more eligible than the others are.

Many people associate democracy, pluralism and tolerance with western cultures.

But just two and a half centuries ago democratic ideas were only pertinent to a small group of philosophers and did not have any influence on actual state policy in the feudal and monarchical Europe.

At the same time a well-known politologist and economist Amartya Sen described in his work ‘Democracy as a universal value’ the laws of Indian Emperor Ashoka written in the third century BC. Those laws depict the Emperor as the supporter of tolerance, pluralism and protection of minority rights.

Few people know that the Ukrainian Kozak State was an example of a democratic country in the 17 century. The first Ukrainian Constitution was adopted in a democratic manner in 1710 at the General Meeting of Zaporizhyya Forces headed by Hetman Pylyp Orlyk. In order to properly assess this fact I can remind you that the American Constitution was adopted 77 years later and the French Constitution – 81 years later.

That is why I believe that one cannot draw demarcation lines between the civilisations on the basis of 'collision theory'.

In this context I would like to touch upon the present situation in Europe. It is not because the European affairs are of greater importance than the developments on other continents. It is just that after dozens of years of ideological confrontation the prospects for unification have caused a great deal of expectations among the European nations that one can not but notice the attempts to draw the old demarcation lines on whatever grounds.

Dividing Europe into 'Latin' and 'Byzantine' parts where only one is perceived as capable of absorbing European values would be most dangerous. Such a division along the former borders of the long disappeared empires would forever cut half of Europe from modern integration processes.

The question arises: does it make any sense to impose artificial limits on the expansion of the European Union by stopping it at the western border of Ukraine? What will be the moral grounds and consequences of such a decision? Who will play the role of a supreme judge and an interpreter of the truth for the European nations?

Ronald Reagan used to say that demarcation lines do not exist on the maps but in the minds of the people.

It means that certain boundaries go through any society and even through our consciousness. Demons of the past raise their heads in western democracies in the form of extreme nationalism, xenophobia, racism and anti-Semitism.

Problems of the countries in transition do not lie in the deficit of democracy that is common everywhere, but they are lying in complicated problems that have to be resolved. The countries that used to exist under totalitarianism are not renewing their democracies but actually build them again from the very scratch.

Generally speaking the forced influence of any values is as counter-productive as the export of revolution in the past.

I can not but agree with the ideas of French politician Hubert Vedrine who correctly pointed out that democracy had always been the result of the process parallel to social, economic and cultural transformations and had never been parallel to the one imposed from outside or spontaneous metamorphosis. He thought it was impossible to immediately demand from the new democracies the level of democratic development that could be reached in a couple of stages.

That is why post socialists and first of all ex-Soviet European countries need from the West caring support, assistance and understanding of the complexity of their road to Europe.

Ladies and Gentlemen,

International dialog among civilisations is not possible without the dialog inside civilisations, specific countries and social groups.

As Mr. Matsuura has pointed out in one of his latest addresses, the real dialog begins at home.

Despite economic problems during the years of its independence Ukraine managed to build a pluralistic multicultural society where different nationalities and religions coexist peacefully.

Our country unlike many ex-Soviet countries has managed to avoid conflicts and bloodshed between different ethnic groups and confessions.

History has proved groundless all the forecasts that Ukraine would split into the Western and Eastern parts.

What makes the Ukrainian experience valuable in the context of the dialog among civilisations?

Firstly, Ukraine can serve as a model of harmonic coexistence of numerous national minorities in a Unitarian state. Today my country is a common home to 128 big and small nations.

Secondly, it is the experience of repatriation of the nations that have been forced to leave their historical motherland in the times of totalitarianism.

First of all I mean the Crimean Tatars.

More than 250 000 representatives of that nation have come back since independence.

In order to assess this achievement let us recall how much effort has been made by the world community to return Albanians to Kosovo.

Ukraine is alone in carrying the burden of accommodating the Crimean Tatars and helping them to adapt to new conditions.

To some extent we observe a unique phenomenon where the state authorities to restore historical justice consciously involve another culture, Islamic in this case, in internal civilisation dialog.

Thirdly, a complicated and in itself unique dialog between different confessions is currently under way in Ukraine.

Mutual enrichment of different confessions in Ukraine took place many times. The orthodox Kyiv-Mohyla Collegium actively and intentionally used accomplishments of the Catholic theology in the 17th century.

More than 105 various religious unions work in my country today. Dialogue between them is conducted within the framework of the All-Ukrainian Union of Churches and Religious Organisations. This forum was set up for the purpose of resolving the disputes by joining the efforts of the state and the religious communities.

We also count on the support of international religious unions and their leaders in carrying out the dialog between confessions.

In particular we have high hopes on the visit of John Paul 2 to Ukraine that is scheduled for June.

Ladies and Gentlemen,

In conclusion let me say that I am confident that the dialog among civilisations should become a permanent attribute of international life.

From the moral point of view we cannot wait until conflicts and confrontation make us look for a common understanding. Capabilities to run a dialog instead of monologue, the ability to listen and consider a different position have always been the shortest way to mutual understanding.

Because, to a larger extent, there is only one civilisation on this planet, and we call it humankind.

Thank you.

Annex II.4. Address by H.E. Mr. Koïchiro Matsuura, Director-General of UNESCO

Mr President of the Republic of Lithuania,
 Mr President of the Republic of Poland,
 Mr President of the Republic of Ukraine,
 Honourable Ministers,
 Excellencies,
 Ladies and Gentlemen,

It is a great honour for me to address you on the occasion of this conference in celebration of the United Nations Year of Dialogue among Civilizations. I am delighted to be here with you today. The United Nations General Assembly, proclaiming on 4 November 1998, the year 2001 as the UN Year of Dialogue among Civilizations, emphasized the importance of tolerance and recognized “the diverse civilizational achievements of mankind, crystallizing cultural pluralism and creative human diversity”.

The following year, on the initiative of Lithuania, UNESCO’s role in the United Nations Year of Dialogue among Civilizations was included on the agenda of the 30th session of UNESCO’s General Conference: “The collective endeavour of the international community to enhance understanding through constructive dialogue among civilizations...” was welcomed and Member States were urged “to give the year 2001... all due prominence and to support activities aimed at facilitating and promoting dialogue among civilizations”.

On 5 September 2000, in co-operation with the Islamic Republic of Iran, UNESCO convened at United Nations Headquarters in New York a Round Table of Heads of State on Dialogue among Civilizations, followed by a Round Table of Eminent Persons in order to launch the UN Year of Dialogue.

I know, President Adamkus, that you were very sorry not to be able to attend the Round Table of Heads of State. However, two days later, your participation in the Millennium Summit provided a most symbolic moment for you to make your first address to an international gathering as the Head of State of Lithuania. It was also a valuable opportunity for us to discuss our ideas and to launch in earnest the preparations for this conference here in Vilnius. I would like to say, how gratifying it is to work with someone in your position who shares the same commitment to the promotion of dialogue between civilizations and different cultures.

I would also like to congratulate you on your musical taste! Four months after the Millennium Summit, on 8 January 2001, we attended together a memorable concert held at the Théâtre des Champs Elysées in Paris in order to commemorate the Year of Dialogue among Civilizations. Co-sponsored by the Government of Lithuania and UNESCO, this concert, previously given in Vilnius, saw Maestro Mstislaw Rostropovich lead the National Philharmonic Orchestra of Lithuania in a performance that will long live in my memory. It was a remarkable occasion that I am honoured to have shared with you.

Today, we are here to open a major international conference which for the next three days will provide an opportunity for analysis, debate, and perhaps even a re-framing of the very meaning of dialogue in the 21st century. Lithuania is very well-placed to host this event. Modern Lithuania is indeed a place where cultural diversity and on-going intercultural dialogue are flourishing. Of course, this has been greatly facilitated and encouraged by the events of 1990. Since then, Lithuania has been actively engaged in forging closer ties and promoting better understanding among its neighbours. The presence here today of President Kwasniewski is a clear sign of the spirit of friendship and co-operation that both Lithuania and Poland are cultivating. It is a great pleasure, to meet with you again. Allow me to express my appreciation of your efforts to promote democracy and civic dialogue within Poland and to foster regional co-operation in its many dimensions.

I equally welcome President Leonid Kutchma of Ukraine. I recall my visit to your beautiful country last September. Given Ukraine’s important role in the history of Europe, especially in the past ten years, your participation in this conference on dialogue among civilizations is particularly welcome.

At the same time that Lithuania is encouraging inter-cultural dialogue, Lithuanians are becoming increasingly aware of the value of their own heritage. As one sign of this, the contemporary folklore movement is reputed to be particularly strong. As you know, ancient Baltic and Lithuanian customs, traditions and folklore were mentioned in the chronicles and sagas of the past millennium. For over a century now – with a great deal of public participation – various well-established research societies have been actively engaged in the collection and publication of ethnographic material that reveals the richness of Lithuania’s cultural heritage. In this regard, it is also worth underlining that Lithuania was the first to propose using the new information technologies for the preservation of cultural heritage. As a result, information on Lithuanian dialects, an anthology of classic Lithuanian literature, historical collections of the

Vilnius University Library are among the items that can be consulted on UNESCO's website and are also available on CD ROMS. It is indeed important for all societies to know and appreciate their own cultural origins and lines of development.

Excellencies,

Ladies and Gentlemen,

At a time when the impact of globalization on the world's cultural diversity is increasingly felt, UNESCO places particular emphasis on protecting diversity and safeguarding the world's tangible and intangible cultural heritage. UNESCO's vision is one that respects all civilizations. It is a vision with no room for an evolutionary perspective that separates civilizations in such a way that some are ranked above others and some are set in opposition to others. The term "civilization" must denote a universal, plural and non-hierarchical phenomenon and one that is also interactive since every civilization has been enriched by contact and exchange with other civilizations. Civilizations are profoundly "inter-cultural". We recognize that, in the past, contacts between different civilizations and cultures have sometimes been violent and oppressive. We also acknowledge that the need still exists for dialogue not only among civilizations but also within civilizations: the recent actions taken by the Taleban regime in Afghanistan testifies to this fact.

However, we must take heart from the fact that civilizations have thrived on peaceful inter-cultural exchange and mutual enrichment through dialogue. It is this that we are here to celebrate and encourage. In today's world, inter-cultural exchanges have intensified in scope and pace owing to rapid globalization; as a consequence, we are confronted with new cultural realities and experiences. The huge growth of new information and communication technologies over the past two decades has brought many parts of the world into closer contact, so much so that the predicted "global village" is virtually with us. However, many people fear that this will lead to an enforced cultural homogenization at the expense of the world's creative diversity. This brings the question of cultural diversity, and how it is to be promoted and protected, to the heart of the larger framework of dialogue among civilizations.

The Report of the World Commission on Culture and Development *Our Creative Diversity* advocates that each culture should cultivate within itself values of respect for other cultures. Given the increased scope of inter-cultural exchange in a globalized world as well as certain tendencies towards local exclusiveness and inward-looking prejudices, these values of respect for other cultures are more vital than ever.

Indeed, with the growth of our knowledge-based societies, an old truth is becoming increasingly evident: namely, that the flow of cultural change and exchange pays little attention to boundary lines on political maps. Today, cultures are crossing frontiers by being exhibited and exchanged throughout the world via the media and the Internet. Certain types of activities – networking, lobbying, reflection and the building of solidarity – suggest that culture must increasingly be regarded as a process rather than as a finished "product". The challenge for governments and civil societies is to find ways to channel such processes of exchange – such "dialogues" – through democratic practices that respect human rights, gender equity, sustainability, and diversity.

While globalization is creating new opportunities for cultural exchange, there is also a downside. Whereas violent conflicts formerly took the form of wars between nation-states, conflicts are increasingly arising within nation-states and often they involve cultural matters. New forms of intolerance and aggression are emerging. Xenophobia and racism, ethnic conflict, prejudice and stigma, segregation and discrimination (mainly based on ethnicity and gender) are widespread, generating appalling violence and deep human suffering. Tensions between immigrants and host communities have intensified in some places, in part because cultural minorities – especially refugees, internally displaced persons, guestworkers and other underprivileged groups – are increasingly able to express their aspirations, grievances and cultural concerns through the language and framework of human rights.

In all these new situations, economic factors and global pressures are at odds with national policies and local cultural fears, including fears about globalization. As a result, a new kind of dialogue is needed as a constructive alternative to contemporary cultural conflicts.

As emphasized by several participants at the Round Table on Dialogue among Civilizations held in New York last September, many of the problems facing today's world have arisen as a consequence of differences within nations. Dialogue, therefore, must begin at home.

But what is a dialogue? First of all, dialogue presupposes the capacity to listen – and to listen, furthermore, with an accommodating attitude. This implies a certain moral risk. The effort of listening is one of accommodating the "other" without changing oneself completely, without disappearing and abandoning

oneself. In this perspective, dialogue is the testing-ground of tolerance. Indeed, the dynamics of genuine dialogue and tolerance are closely connected. Through dialogue, a mutual understanding that transcends differences is achieved. The goal of genuine dialogue is not conversion but mutual understanding. I say "genuine" because one has to recognize that in our daily dialogues and exchanges, agreement is sometimes reached by convenience rather than by conviction.

That is not "genuine dialogue". But when somebody, absolutely convinced by his or her own ideas, reconciles these with an aspect of another person's experience or values – then the point has been reached where dialogue demonstrates its true communicative capacity and discovers its vocation for tolerance. Dialogue thus opens the possibility of personal change, of an encounter with the "other". This is perhaps one way to understand what Emmanuel Levinas, one of Lithuania's sons, meant when he referred to the "rupture with indifference". Genuine dialogue, therefore, involves risk because it invites us to re-think the very idea of humanity. It does this by asking us to embrace simultaneously our common humanity and its irreducible diversity too.

Excellencies,
Distinguished Representatives,
Ladies and Gentlemen,

Understanding the relationship with "others" has a new urgency in the contemporary international context. We must attempt to capture the significance of dialogue in an increasingly interconnected world where cultural diversity presents not only difficult challenges but also fresh opportunities for mutual understanding, tolerance and peace.

In the contemporary world, "difference" is sometimes used as a reason or excuse for violent political struggles. But a barrier that supposedly protects against an outside threat may well imprison those living on the inside. However, where a framework of political equality and human rights exists, these very same differences can – and often do – provide the opportunity to explore new horizons and to enrich our lives. Hence, the motto adopted by the United Nations for the Year of Dialogue among Civilizations – "Diversity is not a threat" – is very appropriate.

Let me emphasize that the acknowledgement and approval of diversity implies pluralism. Cultural pluralism is a way of addressing diversity in a dynamic and open-ended manner, both within and between states, and it implies a quest for sustainability. The manner in which diversity is defined and acted upon by governments and civil society will determine whether it is to lead to greater overall social creativity, freedom, cohesion and inclusion – or to violence and exclusion.

The UN Year of Dialogue among Civilizations – and its celebration on the occasion of the present conference – represents an excellent opportunity to take a fresh look at the potentialities of dialogue in a globalized world. We must seek to endow the concept of dialogue with renewed meaning and to identify dynamic and inclusive approaches for reinforcing its relevance and vitality. Dialogue must become an instrument of transformation, a way for tolerance and peace to thrive, a vehicle for diversity and pluralism, and hence a means for furthering the common good.

I wish you success in your deliberations.

Thank you.

Annex II.5. Address by H.E. Mr. Boutros Boutros-Ghali, Secretary-General of the Francophony

Monsieur le Président de la République de Lituanie,
 Monsieur le Président de la République de Pologne,
 Monsieur le Président de l'Ukraine,
 Monsieur le Directeur général de l'Unesco,
 Excellences,
 Mesdames, Messieurs,

Je suis particulièrement heureux d'être, aujourd'hui, parmi vous, pour ouvrir cette conférence internationale sur le dialogue entre les civilisations.

Et si nous sommes ici, aujourd'hui, à Vilnius, c'est, d'abord, aux autorités lituaniennes que nous le devons.

Mes premiers mots veulent donc aller vers son Excellence le Président de la République de Lituanie pour le remercier chaleureusement, en tant que Secrétaire général de l'Organisation internationale de la Francophonie, de sa cordiale hospitalité. Et saluer le rôle toujours plus actif que joue son beau pays au sein de notre Communauté.

Permettez-moi, aussi, de me réjouir de la présence du président de la République de Pologne. La Pologne, qui a rejoint, elle aussi comme observateur, l'organisation francophone.

J'y vois, pour ma part, le signe du rôle croissant que jouent les pays de l'Europe centrale et orientale au sein de notre communauté. Ce dont je me réjouis fortement.

Je voudrais dire, enfin, que c'est toujours avec une immense joie que je retrouve le Directeur général de l'Unesco.

L'Unesco et la Francophonie ont désormais pris l'habitude de travailler ensemble, car nous avons beaucoup de sujets d'intérêt commun. Comme en témoigne, d'ailleurs, cette rencontre, aujourd'hui.

Une rencontre, dont je voudrais vous dire qu'elle revêt une importance tout particulière pour l'Organisation internationale de la Francophonie, puisque nous menons, depuis plusieurs mois déjà, une réflexion sur le dialogue des cultures qui sera le thème central du prochain Sommet de la Francophonie, à Beyrouth, en octobre 2001.

Et nous aurons, dès le mois de juin, une réunion des ministres francophones de la culture, à Cotonou, au Bénin.

C'est dire que cette conférence de Vilnius viendra nourrir utilement nos débats. Et je voudrais vous faire part, maintenant, de la perspective dans laquelle la Francophonie entend inscrire cette réflexion.

Le dialogue entre les civilisations est devenu, à l'heure de la mondialisation, un enjeu politique, économique, social et culturel pour tous.

L'interdépendance entre les hommes, les sociétés, les espaces est, en effet, désormais la norme.

Les mutations scientifiques et techniques, la globalisation économique et financière, la circulation instantanée de l'information ont précipité l'humanité vers une communauté de destin.

Est-ce à dire, pour autant, vers un destin commun ? Loin s'en faut !

J'en veux pour preuve l'aggravation des inégalités et de la pauvreté dans le monde !

J'en veux pour preuve la ségrégation numérique que l'on voit s'instaurer entre le Nord et le Sud !

J'en veux pour preuve le risque d'hégémonie de quelques puissances sur l'élaboration des normes ou des décisions qui engagent l'avenir de la planète !

Le risque, aussi, d'assujettissement des économies locales à des stratégies industrielles conçues ailleurs, et qui ont peu de relations avec les besoins réels des pays.

Le risque, enfin, de monopole de quelques acteurs- privés ou publics- sur la fabrication d'un imaginaire uniforme. Sur la diffusion de modes standardisés d'être, de se comporter, de consommer, de penser, de créer.

En d'autres termes, alors que les échanges internationaux s'amplifient, les citoyens ont de plus en plus le sentiment de se voir confisquer la gestion du monde, de se voir imposer une «monoculture».

Face à cette perte de décision, à cette perte de repères, à cette perte d'identité, grande est la tentation de se replier sur soi-même, de se cristalliser sur les valeurs sécurisantes et figées du passé, dans un climat d'intolérance qui confine parfois au fanatisme, à la haine et au rejet de l'Autre.

Et si l'on veut éviter que la guerre froide d'hier ne se mue en un affrontement culturel, attisé par d'amples mouvements de migrations internationales, il faut, au sens large du terme, démocratiser la mondialisation avant que la mondialisation ne dénature la démocratie.

C'est dire instaurer au plus vite, et entretenir, entre ces espaces potentiels d'affrontement, un dialogue et une coopération.

Car j'ai la conviction que les grandes aires culturelles et linguistiques constituent, aussi, des espaces privilégiés de solidarité qui, lorsqu'ils se rencontrent et s'entremêlent, sont les meilleurs garants de la démocratie, de la paix et du développement.

Le dialogue entre les civilisations n'a donc rien d'éthéré.

Il s'agit d'une véritable projet de société à l'échelle de la planète !

Un projet de société où les cultures, les civilisations se complètent et ne s'excluent pas, où elles se renforcent et ne se diluent pas, où elles se rassemblent sans pour autant se ressembler.

Avec, pour ultime objectif, un monde véritablement multipolaire, respectueux des plus vulnérables et de leur droit à la solidarité, respectueux d'une gestion véritablement démocratique des relations internationales.

Mais cela suppose que l'on reconnaisse que la diversité culturelle mondiale est une condition préalable pour instaurer un dialogue réel entre les peuples.

En d'autres termes, que l'on reconnaisse que le droit de tout individu de participer à la vie culturelle de sa communauté et le droit de toute collectivité culturelle de préserver son identité sont des droits fondamentaux inscrits dans la Déclaration universelle des droits de l'Homme, comme garants de la démocratie.

Que l'on reconnaisse que la culture n'est pas une exception, mais qu'elle est au fondement de la civilisation.

Qu'elle ne se limite pas aux arts et à la littérature, mais qu'elle englobe tous les aspects de la vie dans sa dimension spirituelle, institutionnelle, matérielle, intellectuelle et émotionnelle, ainsi que la diversité du tissu social.

Que l'on reconnaisse que culture et développement sont indissociables, sans pour autant se limiter à une approche strictement commerciale et économique de la culture.

C'est dire que le temps est venu de voir l'ordre politique prendre l'ascendant sur l'ordre commercial et économique dans la gestion du rapport, par nature ambigu, que la culture entretient avec l'économie, le commerce, l'investissement, la concurrence, leurs modes et leurs règles de fonctionnement.

La Francophonie a très tôt compris le rôle qu'elle pouvait jouer, tant au sein de son espace institutionnel, que dans les enceintes internationales, parce qu'elle reconnaît d'emblée la pluralité et la complexité des identités culturelles des pays qui la composent.

Parce qu'elle a, aussi, pour vocation première de lutter contre la marginalisation des plus vulnérables et de faire en sorte que ce dialogue entre les civilisations ne soit pas un dialogue entre nantis.

C'est toute cette réflexion que la Francophonie, a voulu mener, d'ores et déjà, avec le Monde arabe, ainsi qu'avec les lusophones et les hispanophones, afin que ce débat soit progressivement élargi à l'ensemble des membres de la communauté internationale.

Messieurs les Présidents, Excellences, Mesdames, Messieurs,

Nous entrons, aujourd'hui, dans un nouveau monde où la démocratie, la diversité, la dignité et la liberté doivent, plus que jamais, être notre étendard commun.

Car ce monde pourrait bien être aussi celui de l'indifférence, du silence, de l'intolérance et de la violence.

Tel est l'enjeu, aujourd'hui, du dialogue entre les civilisations.

Tel est l'enjeu du pas décisif qu'il nous franchir.

Mais j'en suis convaincu : il peut arriver que, dans un monde de dangers, de craintes et de drames, l'imagination l'emporte sur le calcul, la volonté sur l'immobilisme, l'espoir sur la résignation, la solidarité sur la loi du plus fort, l'esprit de paix sur la volonté de puissance.

Il peut arriver, qu'envers et contre tout, les peuples se mobilisent pour un grand dessein.

Un concept peut devenir alors le ferment d'une prodigieuse avancée.

C'est à ce moment là que l'histoire bascule et que progresse la civilisation.

Je vous remercie.

Annex II.6. Speaking remarks by H.E. Mr. Brunson McKinley, Director-General of the International Organisation for Migration

Migration and the Dialogue of Civilisations

Introduction

In this, IOM's 50th year, it is a great pleasure and honour for me to be addressing this distinguished company gathered here to analyse and celebrate the benefits of the dialogue among civilisations for creativity, mutual understanding and solutions to complex issues.

Historical perspective

- ?? The interactions between civilisations have taken many forms over the centuries -- and not always in the form of dialogue. But the migration of persons is a constant element.
- ?? Conquerors, sailors, explorers, missionaries and pilgrims of all religions, scholars, adventurers, traders, nomads, refugees in search of security, farmers in search of land, workers in search of jobs -- all have marked the world through the centuries.
- ?? The cultures of our world are the product of the interaction of migrants through the millennia.
- ?? Look at the great and ancient civilisations of Asia. India and China have always accepted and amalgamated outsiders, forging their unique and lasting cultures through a composite of influences from outside -- religious, military, economic. They are living examples of the power of **cultural integration and assimilation**.
- ?? Look at the world of Islam, created through the expansion of a militant religion whose proponents unified vast territories and many races around an idea still strong and valid today. Islam can serve as a living example of the power of **multiculturalism**.
- ?? Or look at the power of the global economy, based on modern technology, which has made our world smaller and brought its people closer together. One result has been increased opportunities for migration. Another has been the **unifying force of the marketplace**.

Migration is here to stay

Population Change: The latest UN population forecasts suggest that:

- ?? **By 2050**, the world's population will rise from **6 billion** today to 9.3 billion.
- ?? Most population growth will be in developing countries.
- ?? By contrast, in developed countries, the population is expected to decrease while aging. The result will be an increasing demand for younger workers from outside.

Migration:

- ?? Migration pressure will increase in the next 50 years.
- ?? There are currently some **150 million** migrants in the world, a figure expected to rise to **230 million by 2050**.
- ?? More countries will need to take in migrants to sustain their economic viability and social service systems.

Migration as Policy Challenge

- ?? Migration poses challenges on many levels to governments and societies. All of us need to increase our attention to:
 - ?? Balancing the need for workers with the need for work -- **organized labour migration**.
 - ?? Assisting the development of societies and economies **through rational use of acquired skills and earnings**.
 - ?? Managing migration to encourage **respect for law and the human rights of migrants**.
 - ?? Helping societies cope **with the challenges of diasporas and multiple allegiances**, including the particular dilemma of statelessness.
 - ?? Minimizing social and political problems **through intelligent and humane efforts to welcome strangers** among us.

Integration of Migrant Populations

- ?? Whether as '**melting pot**' or as '**salad bowl**', every society will increasingly be required to cope with the integration of newcomers.
- ?? Successful integration normally implies assistance to migrants through **language acquisition and orientation** in social and cultural aspects of the host.
- ?? **Religion** can help unite migrants from different countries and ease integration problems. It can also be manipulated to create tensions and problems.
- ?? Different national communities in the same host country have differing integration experiences, thus, even in one country, **one single model cannot always be applied**.
- ?? What may work best for one individual may not work for another individual of the same national group.
- ?? Several elements are vital in successful integration:
 - ?? **Acceptance of change** by host communities.
 - ?? Acknowledgement of the **positive contributions** that migrants bring.
 - ?? **Education** of the younger generation of host communities and of migrants.
 - ?? **The arts** as a method of promoting mutual understanding across language barriers.

Conclusion

This conference offers a timely opportunity to focus attention on the lessons of the past and reinforce a world-wide effort to use migration for positive economic and social change. Our deliberations promise to be fascinating and important.

Annex II.7. Address by H.E. Mr Giandomenico Picco, Personal Representative of the Secretary- General for the United Nations Year of Dialogue among Civilizations

President Adamkus, President Kwasniewski, and President Kuchma,
 Director General Matsuura
 Excellencies,
 Distinguished scholars,
 Ladies and Gentlemen

I wish, first and foremost, to convey to you the best wishes of the United Nations Secretary General for a successful conference.

To many the idea of Dialogue among Civilizations may seem like wishful thinking, an unreachable ideal. Most will say, as they have said to me on several occasions, that it cannot be achieved because it has never been achieved.

Indeed there are entire institutional cultures based on the perception that we cannot pursue what was not previously achieved; and indeed there are institutional cultures that are based on the concept of "following precedents".

And yet it is exactly the challenge of pursuing something new, something that we do not even know that exists at the very basis of the work of scientists and researchers.

When I was a young man, and wiser and elder people at the United Nations told me not to engage in adventures with no precedents I could not understand it, for those challenges seemed to me the most attractive ones. And so I followed my instinct and yes, I believe I pursued what was not done before. If a scientist is allowed to continue his quest for the unknown why then should such a quest be forbidden to me? I think that, as a result, many lives were saved and at least my life became more meaningful.

Too many times elders bequeath to the young a degree of scepticism that they mask under the false pretense of experience. Perhaps it is not realism that we communicate to the young in that way, perhaps what we call experience may simply represent our failure.

To the new generation, I do not wish to communicate any reluctance to pursue new enterprises, to discourage aiming for what has yet to be achieved, or to provoke them to abandon their aspirations and dreams.

Even if the dialogue among civilizations proves to be an impossible feat for our generation perhaps it will not be so for the next generation or the one thereafter. So it seems to me that the journey starts with each one of us now.

One can hardly pursue the ambitions and goals of a dialogue among civilizations without a certain belief in the power of the human spirit transcending the barriers, divides and obstacles that may have existed for centuries. Dialogue is above all a mind set that appreciates diversity as an element of betterment and growth, thus overstepping the old paradigm which perceives diversity as a threat or, worse yet, as a synonym for "enemy".

The Dialogue among Civilizations undoubtedly has many meanings. As such it may be useful to focus primarily on one meaning if we do not wish to get lost in the vagueness of an everlasting conversation without direction.

If the focus of our dialogue is on changing the mindset that perceives diversity as a threat, its ultimate objective may well be the elaboration of a new paradigm of international relations based on that change.

This is the ambitious goal that the Group of Eminent Persons, established by the Secretary General, has set for itself.

A new paradigm will include the following elements:

- ?? a re-assessment of the concept of "enemy." Can we aspire to leaders that can lead without enemy?
- ?? alignments based on issues rather than alliances based on ideology (even good friends can agree on some issues and disagree on others)
- ?? stakeholders in a interdependent world rather than superpowers or medium powers (a century ago major powers could easily influence minor powers, today even small nations can affect superpowers as we have seen in the financial sector not to speak of terrorism)

?? and finally a paradigm based of course on collective decisions but also on individual responsibility for individual responsibility had taken a leave of absence form the institutional and legal frameworks of the international system. It can be argued that if we do not take individual responsibility the commitments to collective decisions may be very weak indeed.

The group's reflections in this regard will, later in the year, be presented to the Secretary General, who will in turn convey them to the members of the General Assembly.

The Dialogue across the divide is not a new discovery. Beyond words and good intentions a dialogue appears to be most successful when individuals across the divide "build something together". Building something together is, at the end of the day, the real form of dialogue. When we build something together we will likely use the different talents we have for a common purpose. When we have a stake in a common task, we have a stake in a common future. I am speaking of building physical structures, or joining in common projects or in institutional building. Constructing takes time, requires stamina, determination, courage and wisdom. And though much can be said about the material construction of structures across divides, clearly school programs, and uniting forces to fight against common diseases and natural disaster is equally important.

Building something across the divide may at the end defeat the arrogance of power, which has been the core malaise of local and international societies. Beyond respect, tolerance, and cultural and intellectual acceptance of the other, building across the divide gives a sense of lasting to a dialogue.

The Dialogue Among Civilizations, the way the Secretary General and I see it, is thus a dialogue between those who perceive diversity as a threat and those who see diversity as a step towards betterment and growth.

If there is a skill we may all have to refine or to learn better and better - it is how to manage diversity .

I wish to thank you Excellencies, Ladies and Gentlemen for the opportunity you have given me to address you today.

Annex II.8. Message by H.E. Mr. Jacques Chirac, President of the French Republic, given by Ms. Hélène Carrère d'Encausse, Permanent Secretary and Member of the French Academy

Messieurs les présidents,
Monsieur le directeur général de l'UNESCO,
Monsieur le secrétaire général de la Francophonie,
Mesdames, messieurs,

Retenu à Paris par les devoirs de ma charge, j'ai demandé à Mme la secrétaire perpétuelle de l'Académie française, mon amie Hélène CARRERE d'ENCAUSSE, de me représenter et vous dire l'importance que revêt à mes yeux la conférence de Vilnius sur le dialogue des civilisations, organisée avec l'UNESCO.

Lorsque le Président ADAMKUS m'y a convié, il m'a immédiatement paru évident que la Lituanie se devait de recevoir une telle manifestation et que nul mieux que son Président ne pouvait en ouvrir les travaux.

Pétrie d'héroïsme et de gloire, l'histoire de la Lituanie nous conte l'affrontement des peuples d'Europe en ces terres du Nord où se croisent depuis les temps les plus reculés Slaves, Germains, Scandinaves et Baltes. Elle nous conte la lente pénétration du christianisme, l'alliance ancestrale du peuple lituanien avec le peuple polonais, ses relations complexes, souvent douloureuses, avec ses grands voisins.

Elle nous conte aussi l'obstination d'une nation à construire son identité malgré les vicissitudes, à la tremper aux apports allogènes sans jamais se résigner à l'assimilation.

Elle porte en son sein, aussi, la marque des drames de notre siècle, ces totalitarismes qui ont défiguré, meurtri, l'Europe.

Au fil des siècles, la Lituanie et les nations d'Europe du Nord ont subi le choc des impérialismes et appris l'inestimable valeur du dialogue pacifique entre les peuples et leurs cultures. Quel message d'espoir pourtant, que celui de la Lituanie et des autres Etats Baltes ! Quelle magnifique leçon de vitalité et de haute civilisation. A peine votre pays libéré, vous voilà à la tâche, pour rattraper le retard ; construire tout naturellement la démocratie et l'Etat de droit ; adhérer sans délai à l'Union européenne, où vous voyez à juste titre la promesse de la paix et de la prospérité ; rallier la Francophonie, afin de mieux participer à la symphonie des cultures du monde !

J'aurais aimé, Monsieur le Président, vous rejoindre en ce jour pour témoigner de mon admiration devant cette renaissance, rendre hommage à votre peuple et à sa force, célébrer avec vous la joie de la liberté, de la diversité des cultures, la fécondité du dialogue des civilisations. J'aurais aimé saluer les Présidents KOUTCHMA et KWASNIEWSKI, M. MATSUURA et M. BOUTROS-GHALI, me mêler à vous, participants venus du monde entier pour apporter à ce colloque votre expérience et votre science.

Puis-je rappeler que la France elle aussi s'est construite par l'apport de multiples civilisations. Une France qui aime à assimiler ceux qui viennent d'ailleurs, qui fait son miel de leurs savoirs, qui leur donne sa citoyenneté comme un passeport vers l'universalité. Une France qui a choisi l'Europe et demeure ouverte au monde dans sa diversité. Une France qui voit dans la francophonie un dialogue exemplaire de cultures, un de ces contre-pouvoirs dont chacun ressent de plus en plus le besoin.

Si j'ai voulu établir ce parallèle entre l'histoire de la France et celle de la Lituanie, c'est parce que la plupart des pays du monde, la plupart de vos pays, peuvent également puiser dans leur histoire exemples et matière à une réflexion sur le sens du dialogue des civilisations.

Un dialogue pour la paix, dans un monde où le contact de plus en plus systématique entre des peuples très éloignés et différents les uns des autres impose des efforts accrus afin de se comprendre.

Un dialogue pour la liberté et le progrès, afin d'affirmer la force de la diversité, la légitimité de nos identités multiples face au risque de l'uniformisation.

Un dialogue pour les générations futures, car les formidables défis de notre temps nous imposent d'imaginer les instruments inédits d'une gouvernance mondiale, que nous forgerons ensemble en confrontant nos expériences et nos savoirs.

Sensibles aux promesses immenses dont sont porteuses l'explosion des échanges humains et l'accélération des découvertes scientifiques et techniques, sans doute vous témoignerez de notre conviction que la liberté seule les a rendu possibles.

Mais vous parlerez aussi, j'en suis sûr, de l'éthique planétaire qu'il faut élaborer, pour subordonner à l'Homme, dans son intégrité et dans sa dignité, le progrès économique et technologique, afin d'en maîtriser les dérives possibles, de progresser ensemble sur la voie d'une civilisation universelle riche de sa diversité.

Je vous remercie.

Annex II.9. Message by H.E. Mr Seyyed Mohammad Khatami, President of the Islamic Republic of Iran, given by H.E. Mr. Ahmad Jalali, Ambassador and Permanent Representative of the Islamic Republic of Iran to UNESCO

IN THE NAME OF GOD THE MERCIFUL THE COMPASSIONATE

Mr. President of the Republic of Lithuania,
Mr. Director General of UNESCO,
Heads and Representatives of International Organizations,
Excellencies,
Ladies and Gentlemen,

On behalf of myself and the Government of the Islamic Republic of Iran, I would like to thank His Excellency Mr. Valdas Adamkus the President of Lithuania and the Lithuanian Government for their initiative in organizing this meeting. I would also like to thank H.E. Mr. Koïchiro Matsuura, the Director General of UNESCO, for his efforts in promoting the idea of dialogue among cultures and civilizations through UNESCO's different actions including co-organizing this event.

The presence of Mr. President of Poland, Mr. President of Ukraine, special envoys of many International Organizations intellectuals, writers, artists, scientists and tinkers in this gathering indicate the multi faceted importance of the issue of Dialogue among Civilizations and Cultures and the comprehensiveness of the approach we need in this field.

It would have been a pleasure for me to be able to personally participate in your discussions, because I think that, in the long run, these kinds of gatherings are much more important than those which follow a strictly political point. It is better to come together to discuss questions and causes which can give rise to clashes and antagonisms than to try to make up for their consequences.

Your gathering is both a beginning and a renewal. On the one hand, it is part of a continuing process, which has been going on from the beginning of history. On the other hand, in as much as it is a deliberate action, it marks a new step in this process. The fact that the year 2001 has been chosen as the United Nations' Year of Dialogue among Civilizations is a revealing sign of the interest of the international community in this idea and the need of the whole world to such a dialogue.

I would like to seize this occasion to thank UNESCO for going beyond the Year 2001 having included the theme of dialogue among cultures and civilizations in its mid-term strategy for the years 2002-2007.

The events we witness today highlight the ever-increasing need for dialogue among all cultures of the world. In the beginning of this third millennium, clashes and antagonisms are no less acute than before, and this situation has had some irremediable cultural effects. Disastrous as they are, these events can give rise to a general consciousness of the importance of the preservations not only of cultures but the cultural heritage existing in different parts of the world as part of our common cultural heritage. These unfortunate events can also serve as a starting point for further reflections on the nature of culture and civilization, the conditions of coexistence among different cultures and civilizations, and the prominent role dialogue can play to achieve these ends.

I am confident that this conference will provide a valuable occasion for highly qualified reflections on the nature and necessary conditions of dialogue among civilizations. A brief look at the subjects to be debated during the conference shows that sufficient attention has been paid to the multidisciplinary character of this issue. Themes such as identity and otherness are not exclusively philosophical questions to be dealt with only by professional philosophers. In fact, the theoretical problem of defining identity in such a way that it does not lead to exclusion and discrimination is related to some more urgent practical issues: For example, how can we begin a real dialogue while we are far from a wholly inclusive concept of humanity and, both at national and international levels, discrimination and exclusion are still facts of everyday life? How can we ignore the fact that even our contemporary world has its own ways to draw barriers between different human groups, and that sometimes political imperialistic goals are pursued through drawing a wholly negative picture of other cultures and civilizations? How can we achieve a real dialogue among civilizations if science and technology remain exclusively in the hands of some powerful sectors of humanity?

On a more theoretical level, one of the main questions that occupies many individual thinkers as well as many cultures and civilizations of the world is how to preserve their identity, without falling into isolationism and introversion, and how to begin a dialogue with others without losing their own identity. That is why a more inclusive concept of identity is a necessary condition for any kind of dialogue.

Nevertheless, dialogue is also conditioned by the realities of the world we live in. In a world divided into the privileged and the unprivileged (and this division is not limited to any specific aspect of life) one of the main obstacles which stand in the way of dialogue is a two-fold fear. On the one hand, some of those who are in an unprivileged situation are afraid to enter into a real dialogue with others, because they consider it a danger to their identity, while some others do not possess the means of making their voices heard. On the other hand, the privileged prefer not to enter into dialogue, either because they do not see any necessity for it, or out of fear of the loss of their privileges.

These problems show that the issue of dialogue and the concept of justice cannot be separated. Thus our efforts to establish a fruitful dialogue between cultures and civilizations should be accompanied by a parallel effort to build a world based on justice and true equality between all of its members.

**The unique light of the sun in the sky,
Becomes a hundred lights in the court yards.
But, when walls are removed,
There will be no light, but one.**

Excellencies,
Ladies and Gentlemen,

I wish you the best success.

Annex II.10. Message by H.E. Mr Abdoulaye Wade, the President of the Republic of Senegal, given by H.E. Ms. Penda M'Bow, Minister of Culture for the Republic of Senegal

Monsieur le Président de la République,
Messieurs les Présidents,
Excellences,
Mesdames, Messieurs,

Le Sénégal se réjouit de participer à cette conférence internationale sur le « Dialogue entre les Civilisations », organisée à l'initiative du gouvernement de la République de Lituanie. Nous voudrions en tout premier lieu exprimer nos remerciements à Monsieur le Président de la République, pour l'invitation qu'il nous a adressée à cet effet.

Notre pays qui a soutenu fermement l'adoption par l'Assemblée Générale des Nations Unies de la résolution faisant de l'an 2001 « L'Année des Nations Unies pour le dialogue entre les civilisations », mesure l'importance de nos travaux qui inaugurent les actions qui seront menées à cette occasion.

Dans la longue marche de l'humanité, beaucoup de drames ont eu pour origine l'incompréhension mutuelle entre les peuples et la volonté qui en est résultée pour les plus forts, d'entreprendre de subjuguier les plus faibles, au nom d'une prétendue supériorité de leur civilisation. Les drames vécus par mon Continent au cours des quatre derniers siècles en sont l'illustration la plus éclatante. L'Afrique est sans doute la région du monde qui a souffert le plus, de l'ostracisme à l'égard de ses peuples et de leurs cultures. Et les conséquences en sont encore visible.

Pour réduire en esclavage, déporter et exploiter la force de travail des éléments les plus jeunes, les plus créatifs, de sa population, dans les plantations des Amériques et des Antilles, pendant trois siècles, il fallait leur dénier la qualité d'homme. Et c'est ce qui a été fait, sans état d'âme, même en plein siècle dit des « Lumières ». En affirmant alors que les Noirs n'avaient pas d'âme, pour justifier l'injustifiable, on leur niait aussi, contre toute évidence, d'être des créatures de riches cultures et des civilisations dont témoignages étaient pourtant nombreux.

En entreprenant vers la fin du XIX^{ème} siècle de se partager son territoire, de dominer ses peuples et d'exploiter à merci ses ressources, on prétendait apporter aux africains la « civilisation » dont on estimait qu'ils étaient dépourvus, quand bien même de nombreux érudites commençaient déjà à montrer la richesse de leurs créations artistiques et l'universalité de leurs systèmes de valeurs. Les extractions qui ont marqué la colonisation, la violation des droits de l'homme, les dénis de justice qui en ont résulté, ont été d'autres manifestations de ce que l'ignorance ou le mépris de l'autre pouvaient amener à faire de tragique. Mais qu'on nous comprenne bien, et je dois le dire tout de suite, loin de nous est l'idée de tout rejeter en bloc et d'ignorer cette autre face des choses, à savoir certains acquis de la colonisation, puisque la langue dans laquelle je m'exprime devant vous, me vient de celle-ci.

Il aura fallu la deuxième guerre mondiale, son cortège de malheurs et ses actes de barbarie, dont les auteurs avaient fait des théories raciste leur credo, pour qu'on comprenne enfin ce qu'il y a de dangereux pour l'humanité, à ce que soient érigées, sur la base d'idéologies perverses, des barrières de mépris et d'incompréhension, entre les peuples.

Aujourd'hui les peuples dialoguent et se comprennent mieux, et il faut féliciter le système des Nations Unies et en particulier l'organisation des Nations Unies et l'UNESCO d'y avoir contribué de toutes leurs forces. En reconnaissant la culture de chaque peuple et en proclamant l'égalité de toutes les cultures, en dressant une liste du Patrimoine mondiale de l'humanité dans laquelle figurent les monuments et les ensembles qui témoignent des capacités créatrices des peuples de tous les continents, on a accompli un pas considérable dans la voie d'une vision plus juste des réalités du monde. En rendant ainsi justice au passé de chacun, on trace les chemins qui mènent au rapprochement mutuel entre tous les peuples.

Mais il reste encore beaucoup à faire pour réconcilier, enfin, l'humanité avec elle-même, pour que chacun sente la communauté de destin qui nous unit désormais tous, pour le meilleur et pour le pire. Nombreux sont encore les préjugés qu'il faut surmonter, nombreuses les distorsions qui marquent le traitement de l'information, dans la présentation du passé et du présent des peuples anciennement colonisés.

Trop de silence est fait autour de faits majeurs de leur histoire dont la connaissance est essentielle pour comprendre les situations d'aujourd'hui. Leurs cultures sont souvent ignorées, minimisées, ou sciemment biaisées, alors que d'autres sont glorifiées plus que de raison. Si on veut créer dans la conscience des jeunes générations le respect pour les cultures des autres, il faut les éduquer et les informer sans chauvinisme excessif. Il faut qu'ils aient conscience que nous appartenons tous à la même communauté humaine, et que les accomplissements de chaque peuple sont un enrichissement pour les autres. Certes l'ignorance liée à l'analphabétisme, à la pauvreté, à l'isolement, marginalise trop de peuples les empêchant d'accéder aux savoirs modernes, ce qui les prive des instruments d'une meilleure appréciation de ce qui dépasse le cadre strict de leur propre univers.

C'est à corriger ces insuffisances et ces distorsions, que les conclusions de notre conférence peuvent et doivent contribuer, afin que soient réalisés les objectifs définis dans la résolution de l'Assemblée Générale des Nations Unies. La volonté commune peut, en effet, nous permettre de faire du monde un lieu ouvert de dialogue, d'enrichissement et de compréhension mutuels, de solidarité et d'entraide. Les conquêtes scientifiques et techniques et les nouvelles technologies de communication nous en fournissent les moyens.

Le Sénégal, pour sa part, y apporte déjà sa contribution qu'il compte amplifier sur la base des décisions qui seront adoptées ici. Il est conscient qu'en dépit des bouleversements qui l'agitent et du dénuement qui frappe nombre de ses populations, l'Afrique peut grâce aux valeurs sociales et humaines qu'elle recèle et au dynamisme de ses créations artistiques, apporter une contribution décisive à une coopération culturelle internationale fructueuse, fondée sur le respect mutuel.

Nous sommes un pays qui porte encore les traces visibles des drames qui ont sillonné l'histoire de l'Afrique. Cette histoire nos peuples ont contribué à la façonner dans ce qu'elle comporte d'accomplissements significatifs. C'est pourquoi nous sommes un pays d'ouverture et de dialogue. Nous avons conclu des accords culturels avec un nombre important de pays. Nos échanges avec eux se multiplient. Nous accueillons des expositions, des conférences, des activités culturelles les plus diverses. Nos intellectuels, nos écrivains sont lus et reconnus dans le monde entier. Nos artistes, peintres, musiciens, chanteurs, cinéastes, sont appréciés dans toutes les grandes capitales du monde. Nous avons fourni au système des Nations Unies quelques uns de ses fonctionnaires les plus appréciés. Nos soldats participent aux missions de paix des Nations Unies, dans toutes les parties du monde.

Nous croyons à la possibilité pour les Hommes, malgré les blessures de l'histoire, d'entretenir entre eux des relations de confiance mutuelle et de justice. Nous savons que c'est à ce prix, que peut être assurée la paix du monde, notre commun espoir. Je vous remercie de votre attention.

Annex II.11. Welcoming Remarks by H.E. Ms Sonia Mendieta de Badaroux, Chairperson of the Executive Board and Ambassador and Permanent Representative of the Honduras to UNESCO

H.E. Mr. Valdas Adamkus, President of the Republic of Lithuania,
 Excellencies, Heads of States or their Representatives,
 Mr. Koïchiro Matsuura, Director-General of UNESCO,
 H.E. Ms. Ugnė Karvelis, Ambassador and Permanent Delegate of Lithuania to UNESCO,
 Distinguished Guests,

Please allow me, first and foremost, to bring you the greetings of the Executive Board of UNESCO, a body that represents a cross-section of the cultures and civilizations of the world. The theme of “dialogue” and the values it revives is a recurrent one on the Executive Board, and it is an honour for me to participate in the present meeting. I would like to express my appreciation to the government and the people of Lithuania for hosting this important conference, a main event in pursuance of the “United Nations Year of Dialogue among Civilizations”.

Ladies and Gentlemen,

The underlying principle of dialogue among civilisations and its promotion implies – pre-eminently – the recognition of cultural coexistence and unbiased interaction of the peoples, religions and cultures of the world, as values that are complementary to one another rather than as distinctive features that are mutually exclusive. We should see this exercise as our moral duty to nurture and promote the intangible heritage of the peoples living together in our global village. I regard these considerations as a pre-requisite for dealing successfully with the fundamental question of dialogue among civilisations, that is, creating a common universe of discourse, and arriving at common values, while striving to accept and manage cultural diversity, as well as removing prejudice.

The dialogue among civilisations must of necessity be an ongoing, open-ended process, which should be allowed to run its course freely across civilizations. In our present-day world, however, the inescapable phenomenon of globalisation impinges upon the realization of this ideal. As this historical process cuts across economic, trade, and cultural boundaries, and pursuing objectives that very often run counter to the promotion of intercultural dialogue and understanding among nations, it impacts - inevitably and strongly – on human interaction and – more importantly – on the sustainability or survival of minority cultures. It would be a happy co-incidence if globalisation were to be holistic and all-embracing in its consequences and effects, in that it would, in its wake, concomitantly, promote intercultural understanding and artistic expression through intensive goal-oriented human interactions.

Another major obstacle to the fruitful development of intercultural dialogue and cultural diversity is intellectual stereotyping, which has been a perennial evil for centuries. It is not seldom at the very basis of representations and misrepresentations of other cultures and civilizations in respect of one’s own. The eruption of hatred, racism, violence, xenophobia, and other atrocities in many societies and across borders can often be traced back to many reprehensible stereotypical conventions. Each and everyone of us should find the determination and the tolerance within ourselves of looking beyond all the boundaries of civilization for a better understanding and appreciation of the richness that cultural diversity comprises, and for getting immersed in civilisations and their structures other than one’s own.

In our thematic deliberations and discussions of this conference we cannot afford to take a narrow, if pedestrian view of civilization and dialogue, but we should rather see these concepts as constituting deep-seated values, as being part and parcel of sustainable living. We must bear in mind that individuals in every society need to be encouraged and accommodated to foster their identities, and that we need to promote and preserve these values, in order to be able to cope with ethnic and cultural diversity in the widest possible sense. Our present efforts and their follow-up may in the long term prove to be the crucible for lasting sustainable development and for the ultimate survival of human kind.

This workshop should be able to pave the way for a total revaluation and subsequent embracement of the different cultural concepts, by all parties from all regions and civilizations. I express the hope that together we will make a significant contribution towards giving plural societies the tools and the support necessary to cultivate openness and tolerance, and that we will also succeed in developing objectives and defining concepts, strategies, and social mechanisms for establishing and sustaining a true intercultural dialogue that will cut across all the civilizations of the world.

Thank you.

Annex II.12. Welcoming Remarks by H.E. Mrs Ugnė Karvelis, Vice Chairperson of the Executive Board and Ambassador and Permanent Representative of Lithuania to UNESCO

Excellences M.M. les Présidents,
 M. le Directeur Général de l'UNESCO,
 M. le Secrétaire Général de l'Organisation Internationale de la Francophonie,
 M. le Directeur général de l'Organisation Mondiale de la Migration
 Madame et M.M. les représentants des Chefs d'État,
 M. le représentant du Secrétaire Général de l'ONU,
 Excellences Mesdames et Messieurs les Ambassadeurs,
 Mesdames et Messieurs, Chers amis et participants de la Conférence,

La Lituanie est fière et heureuse de vous accueillir aujourd'hui dans sa capitale. Je voudrais également saluer la Présidente du Conseil Exécutif, Madame Sonia Mendieta de Badaroux, qui se trouve parmi nous et qui s'adressera tantôt à vous.

La Conférence sur le « Dialogue entre les Civilisations » qui s'ouvre réunit des intellectuels, des scientifiques, des artistes venus de quatre continents et d'une vingtaine de pays. La Lituanie répond ainsi au vœux de l'ONU qui a proclamé l'année 2001 « année du dialogue entre les civilisations ». Elle a pour nous double valeur de symbole.

Grâce à elle, Vilnius renoue avec une tradition séculaire de tolérance, de pluralité ethnique et linguistique qui fut la sienne dès le Moyen Age. Au XIVe siècle, le grand-duc Gediminas invita les artisans et marchands étrangers à s'établir dans sa capitale, leur garantissant liberté de circulation et exemption d'impôts pendant dix ans. Allemands et Russes affluèrent bientôt rejoints par les Juifs en faveur de qui un premier acte de Privilège fut promulgué en 1388, grâce à quoi Vilnius devint la « Jérusalem du Nord », le centre intellectuel, scientifique et spirituel du monde ashkénaze. Des communautés de karaïmes venus de la Mer Noire et de tatares musulmans firent également souche dans notre pays.

A la croisée des chemins entre Est et Ouest, Vilnius était alors une rose des vents où les civilisations d'Orient et d'Occident se rencontrèrent et s'enrichirent mutuellement. La différence ici est monnaie courante si bien qu'il régnait un esprit de tolérance rare en ces temps-là. A l'époque de la Renaissance, la capitale du grand-duché, uni à la Pologne en une « république commune » fut une métropole cosmopolite où règnent une liberté d'expression comparable à celle qui fit la réputation de Bâle.

En même temps, la Lituanie s'apprête à fêter le dixième anniversaire de son admission à l'UNESCO. La confiance que l'UNESCO nous témoigne en nous donnant la possibilité d'organiser cette conférence est également à nos yeux un symbole dont nous sommes fiers et dont nous espérons qu'il permettra à notre pays de redevenir un lieu de rencontre et d'échanges, un espace privilégié de dialogue entre les civilisations, essentiel dans la quête d'une paix, d'un développement et d'une prospérité durables commune à l'humanité entière.

A l'heure de la globalisation, la reconnaissance de l'identité de chaque peuple, donc de la diversité culturelle, est essentielle au même titre que la recherche et la définition des valeurs communes à tous les habitants de notre planète.

Pourquoi parler de civilisations plutôt que de cultures ? Tout simplement parce qu'il s'agit de prendre en considération tous les domaines, toutes les facettes de la vie, de l'activité, de la créativité humaine et notamment leur dimension esthétique, éthique et spirituelle.

Le dialogue des civilisations requiert certes la connaissance de soi-même et de l'autre, mais aussi une attitude d'empathie envers autrui. La tolérance ne saurait être simple indifférence.

Puisse le dialogue entre les civilisations déboucher sur une civilisation du dialogue !

**Conference Agenda
International Conference on
Dialogue among Civilizations
23 – 26 April 2001
Vilnius, Lithuania**

April 23, Monday

- 10.00-21.00 Arrival and registration of participants
- Hotels:
- | | |
|---|--|
| Vilniaus Narutis
Pilies street 24
2001 Vilnius
Tel.: (370-2) 222894
Fax: (370-2) 622882
e-mail: laima@narutis.lt | Vilnius RadissonSAS Astorija
Didzioji street 35/2
2001 Vilnius
Tel.: (370-2) 220110
Fax: (370-2) 221762
e-mail:
Vaida.A@RadissonSAS.lt |
|---|--|
- 13.00-14.00 Press conference (Ministry of Culture, J. Basanaviciaus street 5)
- 17.00-17.30 Meeting of workshop moderators (Hotel Vilnius RadissonSAS Astorija, Didzioji street 35/2)
- 17.30-19.00 Get-to-know-each-other cocktail (Hotel Vilnius RadissonSAS Astorija, Didzioji street 35/2)
- 19.30-20.45 Aide Mémoire by Kibutz Dance Co.: (Israel) (Opera and Ballet Theatre, A. Vienuolio street 1)

April 24 (Day I) Tuesday

Office of the President of the Republic of Lithuania (S. Daukanto square 3/8)
Plenary session (White Hall)

Moderator: H.E. Ugnė Karvelis, Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary, Permanent Representative of the Republic of Lithuania to UNESCO

- 9.00-9.10 Welcome speech by H.E. Valdas Adamkus, President of the Republic of Lithuania
- 9.10-9.20 Welcome speech by H.E. Mr Koïchiro Matsuura, Director General of UNESCO
- 9.20-9.30 Welcome speech by H.E. Aleksander Kwasniewski, President of the Republic of Poland
- 9.30-9.40 Address by H.E. Leonid Kuchma, President of the Ukraine
- 9.40-10.00 Addresses by the Heads of international organisations:
- H.E. Boutros Boutros-Ghali, Secretary General of the International Organisation of Francophony
 - H.E. Brunson McKinley, Director General of the International Organisation of Migration
- 10.00-10.30 Addresses of special envoys of Heads of State and international organisations:
- H.E. Mr Giandomenico Picco, Personal Representative of the United Nations Secretary-General for the International Year for Dialogue among Civilizations
 - Ms. Hélène Carrère d'Encausse, Special Envoy of the President of the French Republic, Perpetual Secretary of the French Academy
 - H.E. Mr Ahmad Jalali, Ambassador and Permanent Representative of the Islamic Republic of Iran to UNESCO
- 10.30-11.00 Coffee break
- 11.00-11.30 Key note speech: Prof. Alphonso Lingis (USA)

- 11.30-12.00 Key note speech: Prof. Alexander Yakovlev (Russia)
- 12.00-14.30 Reception by H.E. Valdas Adamkus, President of the Republic of Lithuania (Vilnius Art Gallery, Didzioji street 4)
Plenary session (Office of the President, White Hall)
Moderator: Prof. Alphonso Lingis (USA)
- 15.00-15.05 Welcome speech by H.E. Ambassador Sonia Mendieta de Badaroux, Chairperson, Executive Board of UNESCO
- 15.05-15.30 Key note speech: Ms. Hélène Carrère d'Encausse (France)
- 15.30-15.55 Key note speech: Dr. Rekha Menon (India)
- 15.55-16.20 Key note speech: Mr. Javier Wimer (Mexico)
- 16.20-16.40 Coffee break
- 16.40-17.05 Key note speech: Dr. Yves Plasseraud (France)
- 17.05-17.30 Key note speech: Mr. Ataollah Mohajerani (Iran)
- 19.00-20.15 Lithuania – Home of Nations (St. Johns' Church, Vilnius University Grand courtyard)
Dr. Marija Krupoves and the Chamber orchestra (conductor Mr. Donatas Katkus): Folk songs of Lithuanian ethnic groups: Karaim, Tatar, Jewish, Russian, Polish, Lithuanian
- 20.45 Dinner (Hotel Vilniaus Narutis, Pilies street 24)

April 25 (Day II) Wednesday

- 9.00-12.30 Workshops (Vilnius University, Universiteto 3)
1. Reciprocal knowledge and interaction. Moderator: Dr. Yves Plasseraud (Senate Hall)
2. Globalisation and cultural plurality. Moderator: Dr. Steve Austen (Theatre Hall)
3. Plural identities and common values. Moderator: Dr. Yersu Kim (Little Aula)
- 10.30-11.00 Coffee break
- 12.30-14.00 Lunch break (Hotel Vilniaus Narutis, Pilies street 24)
- 14.00-17.30 Workshops (Vilnius University, Universiteto 3)
4. Trade, science, and cultural exchange. Moderator: Mr. Peter Curman (Senate Hall)
5. Otherness. Moderator: Dr. Arthur Cromwell (Theatre Hall)
6. Concepts of civilisation for the 21st century. Moderator: Dr. Leonidas Donskis (Little Aula)
- 15.30-16.00 Coffee break
- 18.00-19.00 Dinner (Hotel Vilniaus Narutis, Pilies street 24)
- 19.00-20.30 Sounds of the Globe (Vilnius Congress Palace, Vilniaus street 6/14)
Osuwa Taiko (Japan)
Petras Vysniauskas and Veronika Pavilioniene (Lithuania)
Les Go de Koteba (Ivory Coast)
Golestan Quintet (Iran)

April 26 (Day III) Thursday

Plenary session (Vilnius University, Universiteto 3, Little Aula)

Moderator: Dr. Leonidas Donskis (Lithuania)

9.00-11.00

Summary of workshops – reports of workshop moderators

11.00-16.00

Meeting of the drafting group for the Vilnius Declaration

11.30-16.30

Cultural program: excursion around Vilnius and Trakai

13.30-14.30

Lunch

Plenary session (Vilnius University, Universiteto 3, Little Aula)

Moderator: Mr. Doudou Diene, Director, Division of Intercultural Dialogue, UNESCO

17.00-18.30

Closing session: Discussion over the Vilnius

19.00-22.00

Farewell party (Vilnius Artillery Bastion, Boksto street 20/18)

April 27 Friday

Departure

Contact persons:

Mr. Egdunas Raciunas

Co-ordinator of the Conference

E-mail: egdunas@centras.lt

Tel.: (370) 2-618584, 89-83807

Fax: (370) 2-623120

Ms. Dalia Sukackiene

E-mail: dalisu@president.lt

Tel.: (370) 2-664081

Fax: (370) 2-226433