



urban forum



Nobel Peace Prize and Peacemaking

Transcript of the Online Forum

In cooperation with

SINOPRESS





Speakers

Prof. Dr. Mehmet Şükrü Güzel
President of “The Center for Peace and
Reconciliation Studies” in Switzerland

Dr. László Flamm
from „Europahaus Budapest“ in Hungary

Prof. Dr. Georg Zanger
well-known Lawyer; President Austrian
Chinese Business Association

Mag. Philipp Agathonos
Austrian Diplomat

Mag. Helena Chang
SINOPRESS

Bernhard Müller, BA, MPA
Urban Forum

Moderator

Alice Schmatzberger
founder of the platform ChinaCultureDesk
based in Vienna

17th September 2021

Impressum:
Urban Forum –
Egon Matzner-Institut für Stadtforschung

Tel.: +43/2622 21132 | Fax.: +43/2622 21388 |
E-Mail: office@urbanforum.at | www.urbanforum.at
Neunkirchner Straße 15/7, 2700 Wiener Neustadt |
ZVR-Zahl: 169347700 |
Titelseite: © Bigstock



Transcript

Moderator: Ladies and gentlemen, welcome to the forum on “Nobel Peace Prize and Peacemaking”. Today’s Forum is jointly initiated and organized by Urban Forum and SINOPRESS. Urban Forum is a non-profit association in Austria with the objective of enhancing the meaning of urban and municipal local affairs, raising the awareness of the strength of city economy, promoting regional and cooperative thinking, supporting public economy and public enterprise, contributing to modern administrative reforms, and all with the emphasis on the values of the European Union. SINOPRESS is an independent, non-profit and self-supportive media outlet based in Vienna dedicated to the free expression of cultural and social opinions east and west.

My name is Alice Schmatzberger, founder of the platform ChinaCultureDesk based in Vienna – I will be your moderator today and guide you through the agenda. The title of today’s forum is “Nobel Peace Prize and Peacemaking”, and we are looking forward to discussing the following 6 topics:

1. The will of Alfred Nobel and today’s Nobel Peace Prize
2. The polarizing and politicizing effect of the Prize
3. The Prize vs. its goal of fraternity between nations, the standing armies and promotion of peace
4. Nobel Peace Prize and Peacemaking
5. 2021 nominees for the Prize and the related controversies
6. The challenge of returning the Prize to its original goal

We are honoured to have the following distinguished panelists with us today:

- Prof. Dr. Mehmet Sükru Güzel, 3-fold Nobel Peace Prize nominee, President of enter for Peace and Reconciliation Studies in Switzerland (We don’t have someone like that every day)
- Dr. László Flamm, scholar at Europahaus Budapest
- Dr. Georg Zanger, Austrian Lawyer, President of ACBA
- Mag. Philipp Agathonos, Austrian Diplomat

Representing organizers are

- Mag. Bernhard Müller from Urban Forum
- Mag. Helena Chang from SINOPRESS

Before the panel discussion, I’d like to take a moment to present today’s agenda prepared by our initiators:

Early this year, the Norwegian Nobel Committee stated that 329 candidates have been nominated for the 2021 Nobel Peace Prize. Among the announced individuals and organizations are NATO, Alexei Navalny, Black Lives Matter, Martin Lee, Campaign to Stop Killer Robots and others.

The question is: What is the ultimate goal of the Nobel Peace Prize? Is it still for the sake of peacemaking and peacekeeping? Take a moment with NATO. NATO is put under the spotlight, as the dramatic situation in Afghanistan is holding the world’s breath recently. Participating in the rescue operation in addition to the US, a dozen other NATO countries have sent aircraft to Kabul, including Britain, Germany, Belgium, Denmark, France, Finland, Italy, Canada, Spain, Sweden, the Czech Republic and Turkey to get their people out of the crisis zone.

As a Nobel Peace Prize nominee, what role does NATO want to play in crisis operations and nation building in the future? In view of the experiences in Afghanistan, the tough defense alliance is left with a big question mark rather than any feasible concepts.

One might as well question the goal of today’s Nobel Peace Prize.

For more than 100 years, the Prize has been awarded annually (with some exceptions) to those who have „done the most or the best work for fraternity between nations, for the abolition or reduction of standing armies and for the holding and promotion of peace congresses”, according to Nobel’s will. Is NATO in line with the original goal? Is it causing more atrocities than peace for Afghanistan?

The Nobel Peace Prize is a prestigious one, as those outstanding personalities in history proved. For example, the double laureate Linus Pauling who received his second Nobel Prize (the Peace Prize) in 1962/1963, eight years after receiving the Prize in Chemistry. Linus Pauling used quantum mechanics to understand and describe chemical bonding, later vehemently campaigning against nuclear weapons and spearheaded a petition to ban

nuclear testing.

According to the Norwegian Nobel Committee, Alfred Nobel’s friendship with Bertha von Suttner, the Austrian peace activist and later recipient of the prize, profoundly influenced his decision to include peace as a category. Furthermore, the reason Alfred Nobel let the Peace Prize to be administered in Norway, rather than in Sweden, is believed to be related to the concern that the Norwegian parliament, which was only responsible for domestic affairs, would be less exposed to manipulation by the government.

Yet in the past years and decades, the political tendency of the Nobel Peace Prize is not to be ignored. The award has been strongly influenced by current events and its interpretation under certain ideology, thus, not void of controversy. The selected people or organizations often have a polarizing effect, which generates hostility about the award decision. Obama once told Colbert that his Nobel Peace Prize is still a head-scratcher.

Looking back, the prominent Mahatma Gandhi, who advocated lifelong India’s peaceful struggle for independence, failed to be awarded Nobel Peace Prize. Jassir Arafat, on the other hand, got the Prize in 1994. But he had neither contributed to the peace nor done anything else that would justify the award. Again, the 2019 Nobel Peace Prize laureate Abiy Ahmed was largely responsible for the outbreak of civil war in 2020 between the central government of Ethiopia and the Tigray Province.

Today, the interpretation of the Nobel Peace Prize is broader than it used to be. In 1960, the Prize was awarded for the first time for commitment to human rights. Recognized for the first time were also work for the environment and sustainable development in 2004 and for climate protection (IPCC) in 2007.

As for organizations, however, the view on the Prize is polarized, too. The UN has been probably rightly awarded the Nobel Peace Prize for several times. Kofi Annan, for instance, got the Prize in 2001 alongside the UN for his work on a better organized and more peaceful world. The UN World Food Program won the Nobel Peace Prize in 2020. But on occasion of awarding the Prize to the EU in 2012, former winners declared that the EU was “clearly not a champi-



on for peace” and that the decision distorts the will of Alfred Nobel.

One could mention here as another example an NGO called DAFOH – Doctors Against Forced Organ Harvesting – founded by some medical doctors in 2006, which was nominated twice for the Nobel Peace Prize, respectively in 2016 and 2018, by falsely accusing China of the forced organ harvesting using prisoners and religious practitioners as victims for transplant operations and other medical procedures.

If the current Nobel Peace Prize is distorting the will of Alfred Nobel, and in which way or to which extend, is a question worth asking.

Now, allow me to have the honour of inviting Prof. Dr. Güzel to the floor. As I mentioned before, he himself was three times nominated for the Nobel Peace Prize. Prof. Dr. Güzel, would you like to share with us your reflections on the will of Alfred Nobel and today’s Nobel Peace Prize? Please, the floor is yours!

Mehmet Şükrü Güzel: Thank you very much for inviting me to this forum on the Nobel Peace Prize!

According to will of Alfred Nobel, written in 1895 at the Swedish-Norwegian Club in Paris, all his remaining realizable assets are to be disbursed as follows: the capital, converted to safe securities, is to constitute a fund, the interest on which is to be distributed annually as prizes to those who, during the preceding year, have conferred the greatest benefit to humankind.

The interest is to be divided into five equal parts and distributed as follows: one part to the person who made the most important discovery or invention in the field of physics; one part to the person who made the most important chemical discovery or improvement; one part to the person who made the most important discovery within the domain of physiology or medicine; one part to the person who, in the field of literature, produced the most outstanding work in an idealistic direction; and one part to the person who has done the most or best to advance fellowship among nations, the abolition or reduction of standing armies, and the establishment and promotion of peace congresses.

The prizes for physics and chemistry are to be awarded by the Swedish Academy of Sciences; that for physiological or medical achievements by the Karolinska Institute in Stockholm; that for literature by the Academy in Stockholm; and that for champions of peace by a committee of five persons selected by the Norwegian Storting.

The Norwegian Storting is the Norwegian Parliament which was established in 1814. Following its defeat in the Napoleonic Wars with Denmark, Norway was ceded to Sweden by the Treaty of Kiel in 1814. Despite declaring independence and adopting a constitution, Norway was not recognized by the European States as a sovereign State and was forced to accept the Swedish rule under the terms of the Treaty of Kiel. In 1905, the union with Sweden was dissolved and Norway became an independent State. Former secretary of the Norwegian Nobel Committee and director of the Nobel Institute Geir Lundestad summarizes the most common educated guesses about Alfred Nobel’s possible motivations in his article “The Nobel Peace Prize, 1901-2000” as:

“Nobel left no explanation as to why the prize for peace was to be awarded by a Norwegian committee while the other four prizes were to be handled by Swedish committees. Alfred Nobel may have been influenced by the fact that, until 1905, Norway was in union with Sweden. Since the scientific prizes were to be awarded by the most competent, i.e. Swedish, committees at least the remaining prize for peace ought to be awarded by a Norwegian committee. Nobel may have been aware of the strong interest of the Norwegian Storting (Parliament) in the peaceful solution of international disputes in the 1890s. He might have in fact, considered Norway a more peace-oriented and more democratic country than Sweden.” (NobelPeacePrize, Why-Norway, <https://www.nobelpeaceprize.org/History/Why-Norway>, (Accessed on 14.08.2021).)

Today, the world has changed. The world means no more Europe, and Norway is no more neutral. In addition to being an independent State and a NATO member, Norway is also part of the European Union, a political identity of another alliance system. The famous definition of Clausewitz, „war is politics by other means“, is worth remembering. In this sense, a questi-

on arises as to whether Norway’s Parliament can choose a Nobel Peace Prize Committee member who is against NATO and Norwegian foreign policy in an earlier life such as against the military intervention to Iraq, etc..

We need to take into consideration also the concept of intent, I think. The intent is the most difficult element to determine. We need to think all possible effects of the Nobel Peace Prize. The Nobel Peace Prize means more to the ordinary people and controls the political psychology of the ordinary people. What was the intent to award the peace making when we remember the 1973 Nobel Peace Prize laureates Henry Kissinger from US and Lê Đức Thọ from Vietnam. The two were laureates together for the 1973 Paris Agreement to bring a cease-fire in the Vietnam War and a withdrawal of the American forces. Lê Đức Thọ declined to accept the Prize. One can think that the intent of the 1973 award was giving a political message to the world for the legitimizing of the outbreak of the Vietnam War of the US. Having given the award to the two representatives of the warring sides for peacemaking means, in fact, giving the message in political psychology for the ordinary people that both warring sides were equally responsible for the outbreak of the Vietnam War as well.

Moderator: The political messages through the Nobel Peace Prize today are not to be ignored, I guess. There is discrepancy between the Prize and today’s peacemaking, right? How is the role played by the United Nations in this context?

Mehmet Şükrü Güzel: During its 75-year existence, the United Nations, its specialized agencies, related agencies, funds, programs, and staff have won the Nobel Peace Prize twelve times. Among the agencies that has received the Nobel Peace Prize, the UN High Commissioner for Refugees received it in both 1954 and 1981. A UN web page describes the Nobel Peace Prize as prestigious. Kofi Annan and Dag Hammarskjöld were also honored for their work by the Norwegian Nobel Committee, according to the official UN website.

Unfortunately, the UN has accepted the Nobel Peace Prize as if it were a hegemonic award, giving prestigious to the UN. The concept of cultural hegemony was developed by Antonio



Gramsci on the basis of Karl Marx's theory that society's dominant ideology reflects the views and interests of the ruling class. It was Gramsci who argued that consent is gained through a spread of ideologies—beliefs, assumptions, values—through social institutions. By socializing people, these institutions produce norms, values, and beliefs derived from the dominant group. As a result, the group controlling these institutions controls the world at large. An accepted hegemonic culture can produce an imaginary universe reflecting its in-depth values and beliefs. The question is the legitimization of the hegemonic culture. By asserting that the Nobel Peace Prize's position is more prestigious than the UN, the website is saying that the decisions of the Nobel Peace Prize Committee who are selected by the Norwegian Parliament are more important than the UN values, thus should be accepted by the world as a reference and accepted truth as a hegemonic culture of peace. Next, we should ask whether the Norwegian Nobel Peace Prize Committee can be an accepted hegemonic culture of peace above the UN, its specialized agencies, related agencies, funds, programs, and staff.

Specialized UN agencies, related agencies, funds, programmes and staff, are defined as international civil servants and must act in accordance with the UN's purposes and principles as laid out in its Charter. In 2013, the UN General Assembly adopted Resolution 67/257, which contains Standards of Conduct in the International Civil Service of the UN.

In the section, Guiding Principles of the Standards of Conduct in the International Civil Service of the UN, the main principles for the standard of conduct are written as (International Civil Service Commission, Standards of Conduct in the International Civil Service of the UN, UN, New York, 2013, p.3):

The concept of integrity enshrined in the Charter of the United Nations embraces all aspects of an international civil servant's behavior, including such qualities as honesty, truthfulness, impartiality and incorruptibility. These qualities are as basic as those of competence and efficiency, also enshrined in the Charter.

The impartiality of the international civil service is to be maintained, international civil servants - must remain independent of any authority outside their organization; their conduct

must reflect that independence. In keeping with their oath of office, they should not seek nor should they accept instructions from any Government, person or entity external to the organization. It cannot be too strongly stressed that international civil servants are not, in any sense, representatives of Governments or other entities, nor are they proponents of their policies. International civil servants should be constantly aware that, through their allegiance to the Charter and the corresponding instruments of each organization, member States and their representatives are committed to respect their independent status.

The official UN internet web page today is in conflict with the standards of conduct in the UN's international civil service, adopted by the UN General Assembly in resolution 67/257 in 2013. It is vital to understand the priority and hierarchy of the values enshrined in the UN Charter. When there exists a conflict between the decisions of the UN within the Purposes and Principles of the UN Charter and any other instrument, we recall Article 103 of the UN Charter. In Article 103 of the UN Charter, it is written that:

In the event of a conflict between the obligations of the Members of the United Nations under the present Charter and their obligations under any other international agreement, their obligations under the present Charter shall prevail.

There cannot be a hegemonic culture of peace above the culture of peace of the UN. The UN definition of culture of peace is a set of values, attitudes, traditions and modes of behaviors, and ways of life that reject violence and prevent conflicts by tackling their root causes to solve problems through dialogue and negotiation among individuals, groups and nations. When the Nobel Peace Prize is accepted as a hegemonic culture of peace over the UN culture of peace, the result can be tragic as the example of 2019 laureate. He was mentioned in today's agenda, too.

The Nobel Peace Prize 2019 was awarded to Abiy Ahmed Ali, Ethiopian politician „for his efforts to achieve peace and international cooperation, and in particular for his decisive initiative to resolve the border conflict with neighbouring Eritrea.“ But Abiy Ahmed Ali rejected pleas from the UN and African Union to enter

peace talks after he was laureate to the Nobel Peace Prize. Rather, he went to war, committed war crimes and probably genocide, given that a tiny ethnic group – the Irob – now faces extinction because of the violence. He has also been accused of carrying out a “well-orchestrated campaign of ethnic cleansing” against Somali Muslims in Ogaden in 2018, before he was laureate to the Nobel Peace Prize.

Moderator: Thank you so much for this sharp and comprehensive explanation of the developments of the Nobel Peace Prize to us, Prof. Dr. Güzel! You pointed it out the discrepancy between the original goal of Alfred Nobel and the recent developments, mentioning for example the Nobel Peace Prize with the Vietnam War, the Eritrea question, the concept of cultural hegemony, the hierarchy of values, and the UN role in all this. You stressed the importance of the UN values, which should be higher than the Nobel Peace Prize.

Mehmet Şükrü Güzel: The most important thing is, in my opinion, the Nobel Peace Prize should not be given as a reference by the UN, and the related page of the UN must be deleted. This is the critical point: nothing can be higher than the UN Charter. The UN's reference is a violation of the UN Charter.

Moderator: Thank you again, Prof. Dr. Güzel, for reinforcing the point with the UN! Next, I would like to invite Dr. Laszlo Flamm from Budapest to the floor to analyze the polarizing and the politicizing effect of the Nobel Peace Prize.

László Flamm: Thank you very much!

I would like to say that it is very important to refer to the very authentic and relevant sources about this question. Professor Güzel already mentioned many times the official website of the UN and other players in order to investigate this very delicate question about polarizing and politicizing effect to the Nobel Prize. I'll continue from this line.

The answers to these questions shall come from authentic and relevant sources. The Norwegian Nobel Committee and the Norwegian Nobel Institute shall be mentioned in this regard. The Committee expressed its opinions by delivering an article on political considerations that affect the decisions on the award of the Peace Prize. However, the article with the title



“Controversies and criticisms” was published by the Committee yet in year 2000. The article thus didn’t reflect on the dynamics in world politics that took place over the past twenty years. Moreover, these dynamics highlighted domains falling outside the original concept of peace-making. For example, when the 2007 Nobel Peace Prize was awarded jointly to the United Nations’ Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change, and the American politician and environmentalist, Al Gore, for their efforts to combat man-made climate change; or when Kailash Satyarthi from India and Malala Yousafzai from Pakistan won jointly the 2014 Nobel Peace Prize among others for their struggle for the right of all children to education.

If we take a closer look at the Nobel Peace Prize laureates since 2000 and, most recently, those 329 candidates — 234 individuals and 95 organizations — who have been nominated for the 2021 Nobel Peace Prize, there are further remarkable trends that might convey rather a negative message to people and nations, as well as the international community who are ardent supporters of peace. The European Union received the 2012 Nobel Peace Prize for its contribution over six decades to the advancement of peace, reconciliation, democracy and human rights in Europe. But the award ceremony didn’t provide any ground for celebration to many citizens, civil and church organizations whose fundamental rights were persistently violated by some EU-member country.

In the past decade, the situation of democracy and the rule of law have worsened due to the fact that EU is still not able to protect its citizens, as well as private and public organizations from state authorities that are in breach of the EU’s fundamental values.

As far as the 2021 Nobel Prize nominees are concerned, the long list includes among others NATO whose weapons were used by one of its member states to crush colonial independence movements in Africa in the 1960’s or by referring to the NATO’s withdrawal from Afghanistan this year which left thousands of people in the lurch and condemned them to death. These controversial matters have been attached not only to the performances of recognized international organizations but also to individual Nobel Prize laureates who have been subject to harsh criticism.

Such controversial matters distort the will of Alfred Nobel and multiply the polarizing and politicizing effect of the Nobel Peace Prize. It is worth considering, therefore, a refreshment of the value system and making attempts to use it as a working tool for scholars of the Norwegian Nobel Institute that assists the Nobel Committee in selecting recipients of the Nobel Peace Prize.

Moderator: Thank you, Dr. Flamm, for this valuable input and for pointing out more aspects of the related controversy. You mentioned an article by the Norwegian Nobel Committee in the year 2000 which has not been refreshed so far and therefore, does not reflect the global dynamics of the past 20 years. You also addressed some new and rather positive aspects, like taking into account of the subject of climate change or children’s education. On the other side, there is negative spirit concerning the EU and the NATO. All these developments are the basis for today’s polarizing effect. Thank you for the contribution!

I’d like to invite our next panelist Mag. Philipp Agathonos to the floor now. Mag. Agathonos, according to the will of Mr. Nobel, the Peace Prize should also aim at the goal of fraternity between nations, standing armies and the promotion of peace. How do you see the development of the Prize concerning this point?

Philipp Agathonos: Thank you for the invitation! I suppose that my current function is more relevant to today’s forum than my previous one, responsible for peacebuilding and civilian crisis management as the Security Policy Directorate at the Ministry of Foreign Affairs. I came back to this job after spending four years in China doing technology, which was like a bracket in my career. And before that, I had the pleasure of being the founder of the Austrian Peacebuilding Platform.

The criticism surrounding the nomination of the European Union has surprised me a lot because if there is a successful peace project globally, it is the European Union itself. Of course, there are member states that divide. I mean, Hungary is one of them, Poland is another. I’m sure that our member states are not without faults, but it’s not the Union’s fault. The Union is as much as the member states allow it to be. It took us 10 years to be able to have some possibilities of financial sanctioning against severe

breaches of basic human rights. It says a lot. So it is work in progress. But the operation of the European Union is a peace project itself. It is the biggest development or donor in action in the world, with a majority of two-thirds of the international crisis management concerning civilian needs, and even the military ones are non-combat. The European Union has contributed a lot for the world crisis management and peacebuilding globally.

Talking about the politicization and the original goal of Mr. Nobel, what would he have done now? Think of his friendship with Suttner, he was avant-garde, a peace activist I suppose. I happened to have worked with such personalities a lot. I know them. Both in Austria and abroad. I must say that peacebuilding is the most political issue you can ever imagine. There is no peace without conflict. It’s not about not having conflict, but about not having violent conflict, which is the essence of any social development. You cannot develop a society where everything is still and stable. You can’t have harmony and peace in it. To develop a society, you need conflict and you need to make sure that the conflict has non-violent mechanisms to evolve, to move the society forward, to trigger innovation, social and economic development, and development of democracy. Yes, it is a political process. Yes, I agree that some of the nominations went completely wrong and you cited a few. I believe in concrete choices. But what do you do in a very big conflict, like the Israeli-Palestinian conflict? Yasser Arafat, Shimon Peres and Yitzhak Rabin, they got the Nobel Peace Prize, you know, and the problem is still there. We have not arrived at a solution yet. We are far from that. And the recent incidents included some flag flying issue proved that it is still a very hot issue and there is still a lot of work to be done. But what do you do? Not giving the Prize? I’m not sure if that would have been a better message.

The same goes for another case. You mentioned the Vietnam War, or maybe after the war, an even better case than during the war. Big question marks. I read the stories but then again, I’m not sure how I’m going to think, why to give the Peace Prize to Le Duc Tho, who might not fully understand the scope of the Prize, or what Nobel really wanted. Anyway, it triggered a lot of discussions.



You mentioned human rights, climate change, I fully share the view on these issues. Look how climate is triggering migration movement and triggering fight over resources. Farmers versus herd keepers is the biggest conflict in the Sahel – but not only there in Africa – about water resources. Think about the five big rivers out of the Himalaya for potential conflict. Or go to see the situation in Siberia with the climate change and the carbon dioxide that goes into the atmosphere. There are a lot of issues out there. Education, you mentioned, too. Without education, there can't be any peace. And human rights: I remember the Prize was banned by the Chinese government for several decades, because twice the Committee made decisions that were not liked by China. And I remember how suddenly, after a period of disgrace, that one can be again in the play. The ambassador is again received, and nobody cares about politics. So always these controversial decisions... The UN, would they be able to do it better? No, they wouldn't, because the UN has five veto powers in the Security Council, which cannot even agree on Syria, cannot even agree on Israel-Palestine, cannot agree on the major conflicts, on the South China Sea... It is not a democratic organization, which can take the controversial stand for peace, unfortunately. To the solution of minor conflicts, they can agree. But to that of big conflicts, they cannot.

The fact that the Prize has been criticized by so many different people on so many different occasions, shows it could be ironical. Now NATO. First of all, nominations are nominations, not the rewards. Personally, I would very much doubt if NATO would get the Peace Prize. It would be extremely doubtful of any justification. But don't forget that last year, Donald Trump was also nominated. So that's all the criteria. The fact that Mahatma Gandhi didn't get it doesn't mean he wouldn't have got it. He was unfortunately killed, you know, too much ahead of his time. Mandela got it, but the price for Mandela getting the Prize? Frederik Willem de Klerk also got it. You know de Klerk was not one of the good guys.

It should be clear that the military organization has nothing to do with the Peace Prize. Of course, they have some aspects, you know, crisis management, securing certain situations, etc.. I would not neglect that there is a role, but I wouldn't go as far as to say that the military organization should be awarded the Peace Pri-

ze. There are a lot of people and organizations that should go before a military organization. I think that the Peace Prize should be both a recognition of the past and an encouragement for future.

Martti Ahtisaari, former President of Finland got the Nobel Peace Prize for his great efforts on several continents and over more than three decades, to resolve international conflicts. For example, he helped to bring the long-lasting conflict in the Aceh province in Indonesia to an end in 2005. He is still one of the leading actors, even at a very high age.

Gorbachov also got the Prize, but he got it more or less because he managed to oversee a very civilized breakup of the Soviet Union without much bloodshed, which could have gone differently if you look at other scenarios. But about acting presidents, I think they wouldn't do it again. I think it's learning by doing every time.

In my opinion, having this discussion or having triggered this discussion and many more discussions on peace and peace building around the world, already justifies the Peace Prize. Thank you.

Moderator: Thank you very much. Mag. Agathonos. Your contribution broadens the perspectives we have been talking about so far. You relativized the controversy by observing one point, that is, there is no development without conflict. You said peacebuilding does not go without conflict. So controversy about the Nobel Peace Prize is an important point in the process. You also mentioned the European Union, not a member states, but as a Union, is one of the most successful peace projects in the world. You reminded us of distinguishing between the nomination and the award, too. Thank you again for your perspective!

I would like now to move on to the next panelist, Prof. Dr. Georg Zanger. Could you give us some insights into the 2021 nominees for the Nobel Peace Prize? There are some controversies about the list, as you know. Thank you so much, Prof. Dr. Zanger! The floor is yours.

Georg Zanger: Thank you! First, I have something to say about Mag. Agathonos' speech. From what I heard just now from your speech, Mag. Agathonos, I would say maybe the Peace Prize should be given to people who make con-

flict, too, because they are the basis of peace process. (Laugh)

Now let me come back to my topic. The awarding of the Nobel Prize has become increasingly political in recent years. Ideology, social system, power gestures characterize the development.

Although the Nobel Prize itself should be politically neutral, the selection of the laureates repeatedly leads to controversy. It is often awarded at a relatively short distance from the relevant event, so that historical consideration and the inclusion of long-term consequences are not possible.

This year, the people and groups nominated for the Peace Prize could not be more controversial: NATO, Alexei Nawalny, Martin Lee, Svetlana Tikhanovskaya, and Donald Trump on the one hand, Black lives matter and the Swedish environmental activist Greta Thunberg on the other.

I will limit my points to some individual nominees, including NATO, Martin Lee, black lives matter and Greta.

First, NATO. That NATO and President Biden have blamed the local Afghan government for failing to stand against the Islamic militant group does not mitigate its own senseless bombing without a humanitarian objective. He has concealed the fact that 20 years of war, over 100,000 civilian casualties have not brought peace, that neither infrastructure nor education and poverty reduction have been achieved.

What has remained: Stoltenberg said members of NATO are concerned about getting their staff and other personnel out of Afghanistan.

Next, Martin Lee. Lee was part of "Agents of Western anti-China forces in Hong Kong". Long before the return of Hong Kong to China, Martin Lee actively cooperated with the policy deployment of the British Hong Kong authorities, while trying to internationalize the Hong Kong issue and begging for the intervention of foreign powers. After the return of Hong Kong to the motherland, Martin Lee was a member of the Legislative Council of the SAR. But in his actual words and deeds, he repeatedly challenged the bottom line of the principle of „one country, two systems“, condoned „Hong Kong

independence”, spared no effort to attack the Chinese government, and deliberately discredited China.

Lee stopped his public activism because of the Hong Kong National Security Law which went into effect on 1 July 2020. What was his contribution to the fraternization of people, what was his contribution to peace?

Now, Black Live Matters. „Black Lives Matter“ is a transnational movement that originated in the United States and opposes violence against Black people or people of colour. Black Lives Matter regularly organizes protests against the killing of Black people by police officers and more generally against racial profiling, police violence and racism. It now stands worldwide against racism of any kind and strives for peaceful non-violent coexistence without distinction of origin, social status and race.

And Greta Thunberg. She fights for the preservation of the environment, for the reduction of CO2 and thus for the chance to prevent further environmental catastrophes. She makes an important contribution to humanity and its peaceful coexistence.

So different people, all nominated for the Prize. Now that we are talking about the Peace Prize, let me conclude with some thoughts on poverty reduction in China. In his book „Successful China“, Robert Fitztum writes:

Bringing economic development to poor areas is the key to sustainable liberation from poverty. This includes structural land reforms, heavy investment in infrastructure and education, know-how and financial resources. Under these criteria, the award of the „Alfred Nobel Memorial Prize in Economic Sciences“ in November 2019 to the scientists Esther Duflo, Abhijit Banerjee and Michael Kremer, who work on poverty research, should be considered. In the context of their child development programme, they concede in the interview, „We will never understand poverty“. If someone does not understand the causes of poverty, how can they fight poverty?

Instead of awarding the Nobel Peace Prize for political reasons to countries that wage wars, consideration should be given to those who behave peacefully and ensure that all people in this world are freed from poverty!

Moderator: Thank you so much, Dr. Zanger, for sharing your thoughts and consideration with us! You pointed out that the Nobel Peace Prize should be neutral, and the nominees should be in this sense neutral. You talked about

NATO and Martin Lee on one side, Black Lives Matter and Greta Thunberg on the other. You mentioned the importance of poverty fighting, which should be taken into consideration as a category for the Nobel Peace Prize. You had a rather different viewpoint from our previous speaker. This is meaningful, I think, sharing different perspectives. They build fruitful basis for exchange and discussion. Thank you very much again for the contribution!

Allow me now to come back to Prof. Dr. Güzel. We are going to hear some very personal experience, which is definitely not to be heard every day. As I mentioned in the introduction, Prof. Dr. Güzel is himself a three-time nominee for the Nobel Peace Prize. Dear Prof. Dr. Güzel, you are willing to share some of your stories in connection with the Peace Prize with us, right? Thank you!

Mehmet Şükrü Güzel: Many thanks! Yes, I'd love to share my stories with you!

My Fist Nomination in 2013 was for my efforts in preventing a new future potential civil war in Iraq based on Article 140 of the 2005 Constitution of Iraq and further legalized by the UN Security Council resolutions and the Secretary General's report to the UN Security Council on Iraq.

When I was nominated for the first time, it was a big surprise for me. I was nominated with a friend of mine, a rector of the university in Azerbaijan. I had written a petition to the UN Human Rights Council for the sake of preventing the potential new future civil war in Iraq, which originates from and is premised on Article 140 (First the executive authority shall undertake the necessary steps to complete the implementation of the requirements of all sub paragraphs of Article 58 of the Transitional Administrative Law. Second The responsibility placed upon the executive branch of the Iraqi Transitional Government stipulated in Article 58 of the Transitional Administrative Law shall extend and continue to the executive authority elected in accordance with this Constitution, provided that it accomplishes completely (normalization and census and concludes with a referendum in Kirkuk and other disputed territories to determine the will of their citizens), by a date not to exceed the 31st of December 2007) of the 2005 Constitution of Iraq, further legitimized by the choice and breadth of the language used to describe it as “disputed internal territories” by the Security Council resolutions and the Secretary General's report to the Security Council on Iraq. When the new future potential civil war in Iraq is legitimized with the Security Council resolutions as well by the re-

ports of the Secretary-General, we can see that both do not fulfill their obligation to pursue due diligence, originating from Article 55 (c) of the UN Charter on the validity of Article 140 of the 2005 Constitution of Iraq.

The first due diligence obligation of the Security Council and the Secretary-General is to control whether Article 140 of the Constitution of Iraq is within the scope of Article 2.7 of the UN Charter or not that is if Article 140 is purely under the domestic jurisdiction of Iraq or not.

As in the Tunis-Morocco Nationality Decrees decision of the Permanent Court of International Justice, the question of whether a certain matter is or is not solely within the jurisdiction of a state is an essentially relative question; it depends upon the development of international relations.

The second due diligence obligation of the Security Council and the Secretary-General is to control whether the Minority Protection Regime of Iraq is still in force. The 1925 Constitution of Iraq with the addition of Minority Protection Regime articles by the 1932 Declaration of Independence of Iraq Kingdom has been described as Iraq's “only legitimate, permanent constitution” prior to the 2005 constitution. The Council of the League of Nations gave effect to the provisions of Article 22 of its Covenant for Iraq and put Iraq under the mandate administration of the UK in 1924. As the Kingdom of Iraq was the first mandated state to gain its independence with the implementation of Article 22 of the Covenant of the League of Nations, The Declaration of the Kingdom of Iraq consists of 2 Chapters. Chapter 1 is on the protection of minorities with 10 articles. The first 9 articles are defined as the fundamental laws of Iraq

In Article 4.1, it is written that:

“All Iraqi nationals shall be equal before the law and shall enjoy the same civil and political rights without distinction as to race, language or religion.”

In Article 4.2, it is written that:

“The electoral system shall guarantee equitable representation to racial, religious, and linguistic minorities in Iraq.”

One of the objectives and the purpose of the Declaration of Independence of the Kingdom of Iraq should be understood to as to realize the right to internal self-determination of all peoples, including the minorities living in Iraq within the territorial frontiers at the date of independence. *Raison d'être* of the establish-

ment of the Minority Protection Regime (MPR) with the Declaration of Independence of the Kingdom of Iraq was to achieve the goal of the right to internal self-determination without any exception for all.

Iraq was the only country which gained its independence during the League of Nations period by the implementation of Article 22 of the Covenant of the League of Nations, which is equivalent to the UN Trusteeship System, Chapters XII and XIII of the UN Charter. If Iraq was not to gain its independence during the League of Nations era, then it would be one of the Trusteeship Territories of the UN and was to gain its independence as the other mandated territories under the UN Charter.

The text of the Declaration of Independence of Iraq was prepared by the Permanent Mandate Commission (PMC) of the League of Nations as a “decolonization treaty” in the concept of the UN, in other words, a “self-determination treaty”. Self-determination is *jus cogens* norm. Declaration of Independence of Iraq has the same characteristics of an international treaty as mentioned in the South West Africa case by the International Court of Justice (ICJ).

In the 1950 South West Africa Advisory Opinion of the ICJ, the ICJ specified as the obligations of the mandate represent the very essence of the sacred trust of civilization. Their *raison d'être* and original object remain. Since their fulfillment did not depend on the existence of the League of Nations, they could not be brought to an end merely because this supervisory organ ceased to exist. Nor could the right of the population to have the Territory administered in accordance with these rules depend thereon. In the 1962 South West Africa Advisory Opinion of the ICJ, the ICJ found out the Mandate had the character of an international treaty. The Declaration of Independence of Iraq was not given as of a unilateral declaration of a state. When the Declaration of Independence was put as an obligation to get its independence, originated from Article 22 of the Covenant of the League of Nations by the PMC, the Declaration became an international treaty.

After the establishment of the UN, the Declaration is still a valid international treaty, as Article 22 of the Covenant of the League of Nations is equivalent to the Chapter XII International Trusteeship System. The Declaration is ceased to be exist if it was prepared by the minority section of the League of the Nations as the MPR of the League of Nations ceased to exist.

When the independence of Iraq was the result of decolonization at the time, the rights acqui-

red by the minorities are under the definition of *jus cogens* norms and the articles have erga omnes character. The existence and the validity of the Minority Protection Regime of Iraq had nothing to do whether the UN decided to take the place of the League of Nations' MPR or not. The rights obtained by the minorities with the Minority Protection Regime of Iraq are the fundamental laws of Iraq within the concept of *jus cogen* norms. No law, regulation or official action could conflict or interfere with these stipulations, nor any law, regulation or official action now or in the future could prevail over them as written in the Declaration of Independence.

MPR of Iraq and Article 4.1 Declaration of Independence of Kingdom of Iraq is still in force. All Iraqi nationals shall be equal before the law and shall enjoy the same civil and political rights without distinction as to race, language or religion. A referendum as written in Article 140 of the Constitution of Iraq for Kirkuk is against the 1932 Declaration of Independence of Kingdom of Iraq.

Now, my 2nd Nomination in 2017 on West Papua with H.E. Leon Kaulahao Siu, Minister of the Foreign Affairs of the Hawaiian Kingdom.

West Papua (West New Guinea–West Irian) was defined as a non-self-governing territory, by General Assembly Resolution 448 of December 12, 1950a colony of Netherlands. Indonesia, argued with the doctrine of *uti possidetis juris*, is valid for the decolonization process of West Papua. And West Papua had been an inherent part of the former Dutch East Indies. Therefore, if the Netherlands transferred sovereignty to West Papua but not to Indonesia, this would be considered an act of separatism. New York Agreement was signed on August 15, 1962, between Netherlands and Indonesia. According to the agreement, Netherlands would transfer the administration of West Papua to a UN Temporary Executive Authority, established by and under the jurisdiction of the secretary-general, who would appoint a UN administrator to head it. The administrator would have discretion to transfer all or part of the administration of the territory to Indonesia at any time after May 1, 1963. The inhabitants of West were to exercise their right of self-determination before the end of 1969, and were to decide whether they wished to remain with Indonesia or to sever their ties with it (gain their independence).

The New York Agreement was accepted by the UN General Assembly as an agreement on decolonization by its Resolution 1752 in 1962. In paragraph 3 of Resolution 1752, the General Assembly officially takes note of the agreement under its jurisdiction by using the wor-

ding “having taken cognizance” of the agreement. The New York Agreement clearly stated that all adults from the territory were eligible to participate in the act of self-determination and that this should be “carried out in accordance with international practice.” However, the Indonesian government was intent on applying its own method of *musyawarah*, a process of collective decisionmaking. With this method, only a few people were selected as representatives, whereas the majority of Papuans were excluded from the process.

In 1969, the population of West Papua was 816,896 people. The Indonesian military appointed 1,026 West Papuans of various backgrounds—namely 400 traditional leaders, 300 regional representatives, representatives of political and social organizations, and 60 Christian and Islamic representatives. The system of “voting” entailed several representatives in each assembly standing up to be asked questions by the representative of the government of the Republic of Indonesia. Then a government official told the other assembly members to stand up if they agreed. Without dissent, all enlarged councils had pronounced themselves in favor of the territory remaining with Indonesia. The report of the Secretary-General after the Act of Free Choice included the sentence, “an act of free choice has taken place in West Papua in accordance with Indonesian practices,” which indicated the non- fulfillment of the responsibility of Indonesia originating from the New York Agreement.

In the operative paragraph 1 of the resolution 2504 of the UN General Assembly of 1969 after the Act of Free Choice, it is written that the General Assembly “took note of the report of the Secretary-General of the UN”. The wording in the operative paragraph 1 “took note of “in fact opens the debate on the validity of the implementation of the Act of Free Choice, as written in the New York Agreement.

Full implementation of the New York Agreement is an obligation arising under the peremptory norm of international law standards, not only for Indonesia but for all the member states of the UN and the international community. As the ICJ noted in the East Timor case, “the principle of self-determination ... is one of the essential principles of contemporary international law,” which gives rise to an obligation by the international community as a whole to permit and respect its exercise. When the General Assembly took cognizance of the New York Agreement of 1962, with its Resolution 1752 under its obligations to the charter and Resolution 448, the General Assembly accepted responsibility for the full realization of the

New York Agreement. Because Resolution 2504 of the General Assembly cannot be against its Resolutions 448 and 1752, its charter and its obligations coming from the *jus cogens* norms of international law, no one could make any comment for the approval of the *legibus solutus* thesis of Indonesia and claim that with the Resolution 2504, the sovereignty of West Papua had passed to Indonesia. Both the General Assembly and the Security Council were created by the UN Charter, and their powers and limitations are based on the UN Charter. The General Assembly does not stand beyond or above the charter but acts within the international legal system.

Under Resolutions 448 and 1752 of the General Assembly, and until the implementation of the last phases of the New York Agreement, West Papua is still a trust territory under the administration of Indonesia, just as it was on May 1, 1963. In order to solve the *modus vivendi* situation of West Papua, the Special Political and Decolonization Committee (the Fourth Committee) should make a recommendation to the General Assembly to request an advisory opinion from the ICJ on the meaning of Resolution 2504, and thus to affirm the inalienable right of the people of West Papua to self-determination in accordance with Chapter XI of the Charter of the United Nations and General Assembly Resolution 1514 (XV).

My 3rd nomination in 2019 for solving statelessness of all the minorities in Myanmar.

The British Empire conquered Burma in stages, beginning in 1824 and finally ousting the Burman King Thibaw in 1886. The First Anglo-Burmese war (1824-26) ended with the signing of the Treaty of Yandabo on 24 February 1826, when the monarch agreed to cede the Arakan (Rakhine) and Tenasserim (Thanintaryi) provinces to the British, thus marking the beginning of British rule in Burma. After the Second Anglo-Burmese War of 1852, the British conquered the cities of Pegu (Bago) and Rangoon (Yangon), resulting in a territory under British administration called "Lower Burma". The entire country would ultimately come to fall under British rule after the third Anglo-Burmese war of 1885.

After the third battle in 1885, which ended Burmese rule, the British adopted the time-tested policy of divide and rule. Burmese, who constituted 70 percent of the population, were purposely excluded from government services while minority groups like the Rohingya, Chin, Kachin, and Karen got favored treatment. Myanmar got his independence on 4 January 1948, with its constitution of 24 September 1947, with full

citizenship given to all the ethnic minorities living in the country. The first citizenship law of Myanmar, the 1948 Union Citizenship Act limited Myanmar citizenship to the eight ethnicities identified as "indigenous races of Burma". Afterward, the Myanmar framework on citizenship law of 1982 constitutes a unique, exclusive, ethnic citizenship regime in the country.

Acquisition of nationality follows almost exclusively ethnic and *ius sanguinis*, descent-based criteria with barely any possibility for naturalization of foreigners (which in other jurisdictions is often present through marriage, adoption, or habitual residence). Indeed, the legal meaning of "naturalized citizen" in Myanmar in practice relates primarily to descent-based criteria (from the country's indigene) and not to naturalization procedures. In essence, one of the main characteristics of a "naturalized" or an "associate" citizen in Myanmar is that he or she does not belong to one of the eight legally recognized ethnic groups (Bamar, Chin, Karen, Kayah, Kayin, Mon, Rakhine, Shan, later sub-divided into 135 groups through an administrative instruction), considered to be genuine citizens.

The 1982 citizenship law sought to further define the country's indigene by addressing what the regime perceived as a historical wrong: the incoming of migrants during the colonial area and to relegate anyone not belonging to the indigenous population to a lower citizenship status.

In the Article 3 of the Myanmar Citizenship Law 1982, a citizen defined as:

"Nationals such as the Kachin, Kayah, Karen, Chin, Burman, Mon, Rakhine or Shan and ethnic groups as have settled in any of the territories included within the State as their permanent home from a period anterior to 1185 B.E., 1823 A.D. are Burma citizens."

Full citizens consist primarily of the members of eight ethnic groups presumed to have settled in Myanmar's territory before 1823 (the First Anglo-Burmese War). This criterion is accepted as essential to being a full citizenship under Article 3 of the citizenship law, in fact, indicates that Myanmar Citizenship Law 1982 was prepared on the concept of the Doctrine of State Continuity (DSC). The legal concept of Article 3 of the citizenship law was based on the legal theory that the Kingdom of Burma retains its international legal personality despite being colonized by the UK from the year 1824 until the time of decolonization by the UN Charter in 1948.

According to the DSC, a State continues to exist

both in law and in fact, irrespective of changes in territory or form of government. For the DSC, first, there must be a loss of independence and restoration of independence. After the restoration of independence with the DSC, there may raise nationality problems if the new nationality laws are codified. The DSC is the background of the situation of citizenship problem in Myanmar with the article 3 of the 1982 citizenship law.

At the time of colonization of the Kingdom of Burma by the British Empire, conquest was a legal right for the states, not only the British Empire but for the Kingdom of Burma as well. The Kingdom of Burma already had used his right to conquest under international law just some years before the Kingdom of Arakan and added the territory of the Kingdom of Arakan to the territory of himself. If the government of Myanmar insists on using the DSC, the legal background of his legal action may even work against himself and the result of using the DSC by Myanmar can even be the legitimization of the possible claims for the reconstitution of the Kingdom of Arakan from the territory of today's Myanmar.

In its Advisory Opinion on the Tunis and Morocco Nationality Decrees of 1923, the Permanent Court of Justice (PCIJ) on citizenship stated that whether a certain matter is or is not solely within the domestic jurisdiction of a State is an essentially relative question; it depends on the development of international relations of the State. The PCIJ said that while nationality issues were, in principle, within domestic jurisdiction, States must, nonetheless, honour their obligations to other States as governed by the rules of international law. Denationalization or arbitrary deprivation of nationality which is against the international treaties and obligations of a State should not be recognized as lawful as stated by the PCIJ decision of 1923.

The Nu-Atlee Agreement is an agreement of decolonization, in other words, State succession of Burma (Myanmar) from the British Empire. The effect of change of sovereignty upon the nationality of the inhabitants of the territory has a long history in the Customary International Law before the Nu-Atlee Agreement. The territorial transfer is usually based on a treaty, and the agreement made between the ceding and cessionary State will, as a rule, include provisions concerning the nationality of the inhabitants of the ceded territory. The Nu-Atlee Agreement provided, *inter alia*, that a person who ceased to be a British subject under the Act and who upon independence neither became, nor became qualified to become, a citizen of the independent country of Burma, had the right of election of its citizenship. In general, no

minorities of Myanmar had the option to refuse the nationality of new on the date of decolonization.

The Nu-Atlee Agreement is an international agreement under the UN system of decolonization. If by the Nu-Atlee Agreement, Myanmar remained part of the British Empire, the status of the Nu-Atlee Agreement would have remained a matter of British constitutional law. Upon the independence of Myanmar, the Nu-Atlee Agreement became a matter of international law between the Parties. Permanent Court of Arbitration (PCA) in the Matter of the Chagos Marine Protected Area Arbitration, under Annex VII of the UN Convention on the Law of the Sea, between the Republic of Mauritius and the had given the same definition for the Lancaster House Undertakings as an international agreement.

The Nu-Atlee Agreement, in fact, other than being an international agreement but as an agreement made under the Article 73 of the UN Charter, carries the norm of an agreement with *jus cogens* character, which makes the *erga omnes* responsibility to the international community as a whole. This is the key point that makes the citizenship problem of the minorities in Myanmar out of the context of the Article 2.7 of the UN Charter.

The very object of the Nu-Atlee Agreement is the decolonization of the all peoples living in Burma (Myanmar) which cannot be sacrificed as an *erga omnes* norm by the international community in 1947.

The UK is primarily responsible for the internationally wrongful act of Myanmar on the modification/termination of the citizenship article of the Nu-Atlee Agreement as the party to the agreement and should act with his responsibility as codified in Article 14 of the agreement. The UK should begin to negotiate on full implementation of the Article 3 of the Nu-Atlee Agreement. The UK if cannot solve the dispute of the full implementation of the Article 3 of the Nu-Atlee Agreement than shall defer the validity of the Article 3 of the Agreement to the ICJ for a binding decision. The UK Shall take the necessary steps on the non-recognition of the statelessness resulting from the Myanmar Citizenship Law 1982 and shall ask the international community on the obligation of the non-recognition of the “*de facto*” statelessness of the Myanmar minorities as the consequence of the implementation of the Article 3 of the Myanmar Citizenship Law 1982. This is an obligation for the UK under the principle of *pacta sunt servanda* and good faith under international law.

Decolonization is based on the principle, “leaving no one behind” for the right of the peoples to self-determination. The UN and the international community as a whole under the *erga omnes* responsibility for the protection of the Nu-Atlee Agreement on the base that “no derogation shall be allowed from the right of the peoples to self-determination.”

Thank you!

Moderator: Thank you so much, Prof. Dr. Güzel, for this long account of your three nominations! Your first nomination was in 2013 for your efforts in preventing a new potential future war in Iraq. It was the question whether the minority protection regime is still in force. The second nomination concerned West Papua, which is still a trust territory under the administration of Indonesia. And the third nomination was in the context of your efforts for solving the issue of a statelessness of the minorities in Myanmar. We could see from your stories how complex and multi-faceted the process of peacemaking is, and how much effort it takes to come one or two or three steps further. Thank you again so much for sharing your valuable personal experiences with us!

Concerning the Nobel Peace Prize, we have talked about its original goals and its present situations. We have heard a lot of points through the presentations and discussions today. But what could be done about the development of the Prize? How to refresh the goal or rather, how to realign the Nobel Peace Prize with its original goal? In this context, I would like to invite Dr. Flamm again to the floor. Dr. Flamm, you had some thoughts on how to return the Prize to the original goal. Would you please share your ideas and considerations with us?

László Flamm: This is a very complex question. I cannot give you any ultimate solution, not in just some minutes, nor in my position either. I would just like to make some points on this awesome, very important issue.

How to tackle the challenge of returning the Prize to its original goal? On one hand, key fields where Nobel Prize laureates carried out their activities in the 20th century are relevant nowadays and can, therefore, serve as a reference for this purpose e.g. in respect of humanitarian and refugee aid, solving of military and civil conflicts and health crises, combating poverty and non-discrimination or promoting democracy, human rights, civil liberties, economic and social equalities. I think this could be a very good starting point. Just look at Professor Güzel. He is a reference to the original spirit of the Nobel Peace Prize.

On the other hand, the activity fields of peace-making shall respond also to global and complex challenges of today such as climate change, sustainable development or food security. Mr. Agathonos, for example, mentioned the very known challenges of Sahel region with its problems of access to water resources.

Mr. Agathonos knows that the Nobel Peace Prize should be a guide for the future. And Mr. Zanger analyzed some nominees of the Nobel Peace Prize this year. We can see the controversies through these nominees. We should strive to unite the original Spirit of Nobel Prize, its original value system. The Nobel Peace Prize shall remain a normative project implemented by laureates who don't divide people and nations but strengthen international understanding and cooperation in the permanently growing complexity of fields and conflict-affected areas of peace-making. Scholars should also play key roles, because they are competent in their respective field, how to select the nominees, upon which value system categories, etc.. Half of the input come from the international committee of researchers, professors and so on. It's time they provide updated new articles for the official website of the Nobel Committee.

Moderator: Thank you very much for outlining the challenges ahead. You mentioned the values, the original topics for peace and also the new global challenges. You pointed out the role of scholars for the Norwegian Institute. They should play some key roles in applying a new set of categories, for instance. Thank you again for all this input!

Now that we have some minutes left, I was wondering if Mag. Agathonos would take the opportunity to add some point to today's discussion?

Philipp Agathonos: Well, the scientific method or the screening is important. But we have the nomination rule: Any government can nominate. Of course that bounds to have nominations which might be, let's say, questionable. Even North Korea can nominate, for example, for its great leader. It is per definition so.

There are Heidelberg approach and other scientific advice, whatever the Institute called them. But in the end of the day, there should also a bit of self-restraint. I agree with some of you here on awarding the Prize in ongoing situations, because it's really an ongoing thing. It's not that you shouldn't wait a bit to let the thing play out, with the exceptions of those very big conflicts, especially when it comes to the Middle East because it's a hundred-year conflict. So

from time to time, the Prize could be for the sake of reflection. It's like a bit of a carrot so that you don't give up completely in ongoing conflicts.

There's a second prize that is awarded for the ongoing conflict, which is the Andrei Sakharov Prize (named after the famous Soviet nuclear physicist, dissident, Nobel laureate, and activist for disarmament, peace and human rights). The European Parliament is awarding the Prize to those defending human rights and fundamental freedom. This includes regularly Chinese activists. Here I don't agree to what Dr. Zanger said.

The Sakharov Prize is not the Nobel Prize. It is by the European Parliament, which is political, giving a political message. They should do that. When one gets it, the burden is off the shoulders because one is already on a blacklist. Nothing more can happen.

Back to the Nobel Prize, I think it is a symbol to address the hundreds of thousands of real peace promoters. I've dealt a lot with Myanmar. I also teach strategic planning, and one of the scenarios is very much built on Myanmar. It has a very complex situation, the justice system, the civil administration system, the different federal levels of government, very complex situation. I was very enlightened about what you all have said today. I am happy that somebody is dealing with the topic and goes deep into it, because that's what we're lacking, the deep analysis. We are too much relying on the CNN effect of where the spotlight is. It is really not good! I've got to tell you that I see daily discussions of ministers driven by media. If a scholar ignores the headlines, but digs and looks deep from time to time, it's very encouraging. But will the Nobel Prize Committee do that? I'm not sure because of the past lessons. Yet if they award the Prize to a popular figure, say a Russian figure, they'll get the publicity. That's the age we are living in, unfortunately. In this media and quick time. Not very good for peace-building. Thank you!

Moderator: Thank you very much for your contribution, your initiative and your insight, Dr. Löschner! With this very interesting historical background of APC, also mentioning Israel quite a couple of times, let me get back to our expert from Israel, but with a question about the USA.

Dr. Hochberg-Marom, in the USA, four Blackwater employees who committed war crimes in Iraq have been pardoned. How do you interpret this in terms of human rights? Does it mean that power and double standards can define the connotation of human rights?

Anat Hochberg-Marom: Well, clearly, the four Blackwater employees who committed war crimes in Iraq and pardoned by the former US president Donald Trump violated the human rights of the Iraqi people.

As an act against persons and property, war crime constitutes a serious violation of the laws of war that gives rise to individual criminal responsibility. This includes a long list of acts such as intentionally killing civilians or prisoners, destroying civilian property, torturing, taking hostages, and the like.

The concept of war crimes developed particularly at the end of the 19th century and beginning of the 20th century, when international humanitarian law, also known as the law of armed conflict, was codified. However, following the end of World War 2, the international community was united under common efforts to regulate laws of war and determine rules to protect citizens and non-involved people. For example, the Geneva Conventions in 1949 defined new war crimes and established that states could exercise universal jurisdiction over such crimes.

Evidently, many of these rules are prominent elements in, and derived from human rights, and as such, are binding on all states.

The Black Water action manifests Trump's disrespect toward Iraq's people human rights. As such, it is a prominent instance for the blatant hypocrisy behavior and double standards attitude of the U.S and Trump administration.

Generally speaking, the gap between professed values and actual American policy is especially evident outside of the Western world. U.S. officials routinely criticized Iraq, Syria and Iran, not only for their external behavior, but for manifestations of domestic abuse and repression.

Some of those criticisms are valid. But the credibility of Washington's expressions of outrage is vitiated when those same officials remain silent, or even excuse, equally serious — and in some cases, more egregious abuses that the United States and its allies commit.

The Trump administration came to office signaling a desire to shake up diplomatic norms. In his inaugural address, Trump assured listeners that no longer would the United States "seek to impose its way of life on anyone." Moreover, he has not only avoided to proactively promote human rights, but rather ignored the human rights violations.

Ironically, some foreign observers praised the new administration's nationalistic approach as

more honest than its predecessors, especially when contrasted with the uneven — and often counterproductive — record of American democracy promotion.

But in practice, this "liberal" attitude has meant a worrisome gravitation toward autocrats. Trump has praised leaders from Russia, Saudi Arabia, the Philippines, and even North Korea, while disdaining traditional allies.

Unfortunately, this cynical use of human rights is likely to cause further damage to norms elsewhere, at a moment when authoritarianism is rising. It suggests that the Trump administration sees human rights primarily as an instrumental tool to be exploited in certain circumstances. Worse, the message to America's authoritarian allies is clear: So long as you say nice things about Donald Trump, feel free to be as repressive as you like with your own populations.

Trump has praised North Korean dictator Kim Jong-un as "very honorable," despite of the fact that he rules over a terrible/gulag state. And in respect to Egypt and Saudi Arabia, two of Trump's closest Arab partners.

Egyptian President Abdel-Fattah al-Sisi (who has "done a fantastic job," according to Trump) has presided over the arrest of thousands of prisoners without trial, and the shuttering of hundreds of nongovernmental organizations and websites. In 2017, the State Department suspended \$195 million worth of U.S. security assistance, pointing to rising levels of repression and human rights abuses.

In Saudi Arabia, the royal family does not tolerate even a hint of domestic opposition: People have been imprisoned or beheaded merely for daring to criticize the regime. Saudi Arabia's overall human rights record is easily one of the worst in the world, as Human Rights Watch and Amnesty International have documented. It is a measure of just how stifling the system is that the government finally allowing women to drive is considered a radical reform. But the move coincided with the arrest of a dozen prominent Saudi activists, most of them women's rights campaigners.

Yet, President Trump and other U.S. officials express little criticism of those brutal, autocratic allies. Moreover, Washington has continued to provide military assistance for the Saudi and Emirati campaign in Yemen, despite their legendary human-rights abuses, and the increased concerns by United Nations officials that coalition attacks against civilians might amount to war crimes.

The above-mentioned examples reflect the double standards and hypocrisy of Trump administration in respect to violation of human rights. Indeed, this double standards policy demonstrates to abuse of power by a superpower.

Unlike the pardoning of the American citizens who committed war crimes in Iraq, citizens of former Yugoslavia, Cambodia and African states were tried and convicted by the International Court. Ironically, the leading democracy in the world is internationally defying/mockng its liberal ideology, which is at the same time being applied on the American public.

Therefore, the international community should not only prosecute criminals from non-powerful countries, but also put pressure on the powerful US to stop/avoid the double standards policy and be in-tolerant towards human-rights violation worldwide.

Moderator: Thank you very much, Mag. Agathonos! I believe the most important thing is to disclosure the wording from politicians or governments to experts. Not only the decision must be made by the experts but also the nominees for the award. To tackle the problems involved so far and to direct the Prize back to the original will as well as into the future, the Committee needs people with the ability of deep analysis, not just looking at the hot spot.

Today's inputs by all of you have showed us how complex the road ahead of us is. Of course, we are not going to solve it by this forum, but we have discussed the possibilities, to do with the original intention, the controversies, and the questions ahead of us, which are necessary to move further. Allow me to thank you all again, distinguished panelists, for taking the time to prepare on the topic, and to have shared your time with us to realize this fruitful exchange on the "Nobel Peace Prize and Peacemaking". Before we say "Wiedersehen" to each other, I would like to pass the floor to Mag. Bernhard Müller, one of the organizers and representative of Urban Forum, to officially close our meeting.

Bernhard Müller: Thank you very much, Alice, for the competent moderation! And many thanks to the distinguished panelists today! I think a debate needs contradiction, and we lived this today at the beginning. I would like to mention the numerous successful cooperation between SINOPRESS and Urban Forum. We have had high-ranked participants, leaders of NGOs, scientists, diplomats and more for our forums up to now. Thank you again very much for the interesting discussion!

For today's online forum, we asked some initial questions. One important question was, what assumptions should the Nobel Peace Prize still be based on in the year of 2021? For more than hundred years, the Prize has been awarded annually with some exceptions, and hence being awarded to those who have done the most or the best for fraternity between nations, for the abolition or reduction of standing armies, for the holding and promotion of peace congresses, as stated in the will of Nobel's. So the starting point of the agenda is whether Alfred Nobel's will is still being implemented at all.

Beyond the topic of the Nobel Prize, however, we also asked broader questions: To what extent is the Nobel Peace Prize linked to peacemaking? In recent years, numerous nominations have caused a sensation, partly even astonishment. In particular, we discussed the nomination of NATO as a potential laureate. We talked about the Prize's polarizing effects and we heard the opinion that nominations are only nominations. Whoever is nominated has not yet won the Prize. We mentioned controversies versus neutrality. And we tried to give a view to the past, to the status quo, and to the future. We also learned today that the Nobel Peace Prize can make head scratchers.

One important question is: Are the objectives of the Nobel Peace Prize based on the goals of the United Nations? It was discussed enormously today. Also mentioned was the important role of the European Union for peacebuilding. Finally, I would like to say that peacebuilding and peacemaking is the major challenge. We will not be able to live happily without serious efforts made in this area.

We are in time today and as usual, this forum will be transcribed into brochure and published on our websites, too. Thank you, Helena, for the wonderful support and the enormous cooperation! Thank you, Alice! Thank you all again! Have a nice day after this very interesting and fruitful event!

17th September 2021

Perspektiven 2030

17 Ziele für den Weg in eine lebenswerte Zukunft

Herausgegeben von: René Hartinger (Ökosoziales Forum Wien) & Florian Leregger (Institut für Umwelt, Friede und Entwicklung)
ISBN: 978-3-200-07090-5
EUR 22,- (zzgl. Versandkosten)

Der Sammelband bietet umfangreiches Grundlagenwissen zur Agenda 2030 und ihren 17 Zielen für nachhaltige Entwicklung (SDGs). Entstehungsgeschichte, Struktur, inhaltliche Fundamente, Hintergründe und Relevanz, besondere Merkmale sowie Chancen und Herausforderun-

gen ihrer Umsetzung werden umfassend erläutert. Fachkundige AutorInnen beleuchten in 18 Beiträgen vielseitige praxisbezogene Facetten der Agenda 2030 in unterschiedlichen Gesellschaftsbereichen und zeigen Perspektiven ihrer Umsetzung auf: Städte und Gemeinden, Wirtschaft und Unternehmertum, Arbeit, Wissenschaft, Bildung, Kunst, Digitalisierung, Ernährung, Abfallwirtschaft, Inklusion, Klima- und Umweltschutz sowie privates Engagement und Handeln.



Wege zur Wohlfahrtsstadt

Wirtschafts- und sozialpolitische Überlegungen für eine moderne Kommunalpolitik



Herausgegeben von: Renate Brauner & Bernhard Müller
ISBN: 978-3-200-07300-5
EUR 25,- (zzgl. Versandkosten)

Dieser Sammelband will einen kompakten Überblick zur Rolle der öffentlichen Hand und vor allem der Kommunen und ihrer Leistungen der Daseinsvorsorge, aber auch der wirtschaftspolitischen Rolle, die Staat und Kommunen, gerade in Krisenzeiten haben können und müssen, geben. Die aktuellen Diskussionen und Erfahrungen stehen dabei ebenso im Fokus wie der Versuch eines Blicks in die mögliche Zukunft

einer progressiven, kommunalen Wirtschaftspolitik. Der Begriff der Wohlfahrtsstadt ist im Gegenzug zu jenem des Wohlfahrtsstaates jung und wenig etabliert – zu Unrecht, wie die HerausgeberInnen meinen. Nach Jahrzehnten an Privatisierung, Deregulierung, Outsourcing und reiner Austeritätspolitik hat in den letzten Jahren ein gewisses Umdenken stattgefunden. Nicht zuletzt durch die COVID-19-Pandemie und ihre mannigfaltigen verheerenden Folgen wurden die Vorzüge einer öffentlichen Daseinsvorsorge inklusive stabilem Sozial- und Gesundheitssystem öffentlich wahrgenommen, thematisiert, geschätzt und dadurch mancherorts gestärkt.

50 Jahre österreichisch-chinesische Beziehungen

Urbane Überlegungen

Herausgegeben von: Bernhard Müller
ISBN: 9 783200 077928
EUR 25,- (zzgl. Versandkosten)

Im Mai 2021 feierte Österreich 50 Jahre diplomatische Beziehungen mit der Volksrepublik China. Als diese 1971 begannen, konnte keines der beiden Länder erahnen, wie sich die bilaterale Zusammenarbeit in den nächsten 50 Jahren entwickeln würde. Wiewohl im Laufe der Jahrzehnte einige Festschriften bzw. Monografien erschienen sind, hat es noch keine Publikation gegeben, die urbane Überlegungen in das Zen-

trum ihrer Betrachtungen stellt. Der Sammelband setzt nach einer einleitenden Chronik bewusst auf die Mischung aus wissenschaftlichen Texten, Interviews und persönlichen Erlebnisberichten, um ein möglichst breites Spektrum der Beziehungen zwischen der Alpen- und der Volksrepublik abzudecken, ohne den Fokus auf Urbanität und damit zusammenhängende Politikfelder (wie Bildung, Digitalisierung, Kultur, Mobilität, Wirtschaft etc.) zu verlieren.

