

The Power
of the Powerless
Revisited

POWERLESS

The Power
of the Powerless
Revisited



The Power
of the Powerless
Revisited

Kraków 2014

© Copyright by Villa Decius Association 2014

Edited by:
Danuta Glondys, Ph.D.
Ziemowit Józwik

Translation:
Piotr Krasnowolski
Xymena Pietraszek

Proofreading:
Paulina Duda

Photographs:
Paweł Mazur
Janusz Skórski

Design and composition:
Piotr Hrehorowicz, Małgorzata Punzet, Inter Line SC

Printed by:
Drukarnia Leyko sp. z o.o.

The views and opinions expressed in this publication are those of the authors and do not necessarily reflect the views or the official position of the organisers.

ISBN 978-83-61600-01-5

“ At the beginning
of everything,
there is the word.
It is a miracle
to which we owe the fact
that we are human.
At the same time
it is a warning
and an attempt
and a test.

Vaclav Havel

Welcome and opening of conference

Danuta Glondys

Ladies and Gentlemen, welcome to Villa Decius to our annual conference devoted to the idea of freedom. This year, the conference will be a reflection on the powerless – thus, on those people who are able to peacefully change political systems.

Before we proceed with the conference, let me first welcome our special guests: Minister Jan Lityński of the Chancellery of the President of the Republic of Poland and HE Staffan Herrström, the Ambassador of Sweden to Poland. We also have the pleasure of having with us a secretary of Bulgarian Embassy to Poland, Ivan Kitov, and a counsellor of the Polish Embassy in Bulgaria, Jarosław Dziedzic. Especially warmly I welcome Magda Vašáryová, a former Ambassador and Secretary of the State in Slovak Ministry of Foreign Affairs and Enrique ter Horst, a former United Nations Deputy High Commissioner for Human Rights. I welcome the authorities of the city of Kraków who are with us today and who always support us. The authorities are represented by Deputy Mayor of Kraków, Anna Okońska-Walkowicz, and Andrzej Hawranek, the President of the Budgetary Committee of the Kraków City Council.

I welcome the consular corps: the Dean of the Corps and the Consul General of Ukraine in Kraków, Vitaliy Maksymenko; the Consul General of Slovakia in Kraków, Ivan Škorupa; the economic and political counsellor of the US Embassy, Andrew Caruso, and Andrzej Tombiński, the Honorary Consul of the Republic of Austria in Kraków. It is a great pleasure to also host the representatives of our partners: Joanna Stępińska and Mariusz Lewicki from the Polish Ministry of

Foreign Affairs as well as Jan Baster, the Director General of the Polish National Remembrance Institute. Thank you for being here with us.

Let me now welcome our magnificent guests and experts who decided to join us making this conference possible: László and Judit Rajk from Hungary, Rüstem Ablátif from Crimea, Krzysztof Bobiński from Warsaw, Wolfgang Eichwede from Germany, Tamara Sujú and Enrique ter Horst from Venezuela, Samuel Abrahám and Michal Vašečka from Slovakia, Lavon Barshcheuski from Belarus, Atakhan Abilov from Azerbaijan, Kareem Amer from Egypt, Teodora Krumova from Bulgaria, Wojciech Przybylski from Poland, Taras Voznyak from Ukraine and Adam Reichardt from Poland. I also welcome the members of Villa Decius Association: Bogusław Sonik, Zbigniew Jamka, and among our friends, Ewa Bielecka.

Today's conference would not be possible without the financial support of the many public and private institutions. The biggest words of gratitude go to the Municipality of Kraków and the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of Poland for supporting our work and co-financing today's event. I also thank the authorities of the Małopolska Region for their support. My very special "thank you" goes to the commercial sponsors of our project: PZU, Kraków Airport, SPL, Villa Decius Restaurant and ZUE Group.

I would also like to thank our project partners who have collaborated with us for many months: the Prague Foundation 2000 set up by Václav Havel, the PAUCI foundation from Warsaw-Kiev, the Consulate General of the United States and all the media patrons.

Before I ask the Mayor to welcome you on behalf of the city, please let me address the students of the Jagiellonian University, the University of Science and Technology and the Pedagogical University in Kraków: Thank you very much for joining our events and being here with us.

Now the floor is yours, Mayor.

Anna Okońska-Walkowicz

Distinguished Ladies and Gentlemen, it is a great honour for me to speak on behalf of Professor Jacek Majchrowski, the Mayor of the city, and to welcome especially warmly those who are not from Kraków but who arrived from far away. It is a great honour for the city to host people for whom the love for freedom has become both the inspiration and the goal of life. Thank you for your readiness to be here to debate on important matters concerning the future, and to reflect on the idea of freedom – a value that has been cherished by people for many centuries. I would like to thank Villa Decius Association for initiating and implementing this important project concerned with human rights, which have always played important role in our city.

Danuta Glondys

Before we start with panels and debates, let me pay a special tribute to Vaclav Havel. In his famous collection of essays *The Power of the Powerless*, published in 1978, Václav Havel wrote: “In the beginning of everything is the word. It is a miracle to which we owe the fact that we are human. But at the same time it is a pitfall and a test, a snare and a trial”. The Czech philosopher understood the imperative to defend freedom as absolute necessity – something that has been emphasized throughout history. At the time of writing the essay, he forecasted that freedom would triumph over totalitarianism in his part of the continent. He saw power in the citizens’ powerlessness. Nearly thirty-five years later, these famous words of Havel acquire new meaning. They strengthen our faith; they brace our hearts. Today, it is relevant to reconsider the idea of solidarity and



Judit and László Rajk



Magda Vášaryová and Andrzej Tombiński

responsibility just as much as to reflect on the transformation's balance sheet of gains and losses. This conference is an attempt to look at the Powerless AD 2014 – and to discuss whether they have the similar power that those living in Central and Eastern Europe once had. With this question I open the conference.

Opening Lecture

Bogusław Sonik

Welcome Ladies and Gentlemen.

I will start with so-called “times of innocence” – that is, with the pre-1989 opposition. Jacek Kuroń once used a similar phrase in a book that described the times of the opposition – he called that period “the time of the stars”. In those days, many dissidents were sure that all they did must have been done on moral foundations. Václav Havel remained faithful to such principle: in whatever he said and wrote after 1989, he practically always emphasised that every policy must be grounded in moral values. I will close my speech with what I believe to be the most important matter, i.e. building one united Europe.

In 1989, like a house of cards, the power of the Soviet Union fell into pieces. The Soviet empire was built on murder of millions of their own people and the enthralled Europe. The spring of nations in 1989, which started in 1980 at the gates of Gdańsk shipyards, enabled us to rebuild the new independent and democratic state whose existence was interrupted in 1945 by Stalin (with the consent of the Western powers).

One could probably analyse the reasons behind that joyful event of 1989 in order to increase the importance of the economic and ideological bankruptcy of the communist system that, just like a boxer who throws his towel to the ring, was finally forced to give up. But today we are speaking of the power of the powerless and their role in the process.

The year 1989 brought the victory of the spirit of resistance and the victory of power of those who – like the Polish Solidarity – knew how to unite. This was also the victory of those who in many other countries continued their lonely fight against the powerful enemies who had the whole gamut of repressions at their disposal. The Polish opposition movement looked with admiration at the lonely and heroic struggle of Russian, Ukrainian and Baltic dissidents. Andrei Sakharov, Alexandr Solzhenitsyn, Vladimir Bukovsky and the famous poet Natalya Gorbanevskaya (who went out to the Red Square to protest against the invasion of Warsaw Pact on Czechoslovakia in 1968), became the rays of light in those dark days. They really showed us the way. Here, I should also mention the dramatic and tragic death of the Ukrainian dissident Marchenko. In fact, his death became the turning point in the policy of the Soviet Union and the reason why Gorbachev decided to free Sakharov from his exile. At the same time, in 1988, the European Parliament established the Sakharov Prize for Freedom of Thought. The first double prize was posthumously given to Mandela and Marchenko.

At the time, we were in our twenties. We had already known that we did not want to participate in the lies of the official propaganda. We read Solzhenitsyn's "Live Not By Lies" and his simple appeal made us to take a stand against totalitarian deceptions. At the same time, this appeal proved to be radical as it led to confrontations with authorities. The communists, who had the monopoly on governments in this part of Europe, based their power on absolute subjugation and dependence of every citizen and on control of all social ties between people.

The breaking of the system started in the 70s when Charter 77 was set up in Czechoslovakia, and when the Workers' Defence Committee together with other movements such as the Students' Committee of Solidarity and the Confederation of Independent Poland appeared. The powerless discovered the power of being together, of being solidary. As Bulat Okudzhava sang at the

time: “Brothers let’s hold our hand so that we don’t die alone”. The election of a Kraków cardinal to the Chair of Saint Peter catalysed more events; even the coup of the military junta on 13th of December 1981 in Poland, when general Jaruzelski waged war against his own citizens, could not stop the changes. Communism in Poland was finally defeated on the 4th of June, 1989 and its fall opened the way to democracy and freedom in Poland, and consequently, in all other countries of the Soviet bloc and the Soviet Union itself.

Václav Havel once wrote that a dissident is like a Sisyphus, pushing the stone upwards although the chance of reaching the top is practically none. He pushes it because he finds no other opportunity to reach the truth; this way he can understand the sense of his life and possibly discover a new horizon of hope. Another eminent figure of Charter 77, Jan Patočka, a few days before his death caused by interrogation by the Czech security services, said: “Many ask me if the Charter 77 deteriorate the position of our society.” We too – operating in the 1970s – were asked the same question. Patočka answered: “No thralldom has ever improved the position of any society. It could only be damaged. The greater servility and fear, the bigger authorities’ liberty to do whatever they please. They have done so and they will continue to do so”. Havel in the quoted *The Power of the Powerless* wrote that such state of affairs is rooted in the very nature of the authority, which is capable of repression. Havel confessed that he understood the bitterness of people; the bitterness that was made of human fragility, loneliness and defenceless. And yet, he added he was convinced that in that valley of tears, there was nothing that would in itself be capable of taking away human faith and people’s will to live. We lose them only when we fail. The faith and free will were precious to those whom Havel called the Powerless.

After 1989, Havel, already as the President of Czechoslovakia, focused his public activity on persistent reminding of the importance of moral foundations for every true policy. He

emphasised the moral criteria and values in all realms of social life. In *Summer Mediations* he wrote: “if a handful of friends and I were able to bang our heads against the wall for years by speaking the truth about Communist totalitarianism while surrounded by an ocean of apathy, there is no reason why I shouldn’t go on banging my head against the wall by speaking *ad nauseam*, despite the condescending smiles, about responsibility and morality in the face of our present social marasmus”. After the fall of communism, the yesterday’s Powerless had to face the brutal reality of the times when politics were based on accusing one another, on dark past and untrue intentions.

Now demagogy and populism take its toll on societies by moving them away from political engagement. Interestingly enough, a similar diagnosis was stated on another continent. Peruvian writer, Mario Vargas Llosa, once said: “freedom and democracy destroy intelligentsia”; he pointed to the fact that the lack of censorship destroyed social involvement and solidarity. In one of his essays Llosa also noted: “culture is getting more and more banal and carefree”; everything turns into amusement and art loses its critical eye.

So the question is whether the powerless turned into the helpless. When the walls collapsed and the free nations started to be self-governed, it turned out that many of the yesterday’s heroes could not meet the expectations of a new society. They did not know how to participate in the struggle for power. Generally, in this type of game, the one who is more efficient and demagogic towards the voters – wins. Politics is no longer a debate on the solutions of social problems. Mario Vargas Llosa much like Václav Havel appeals: “politics cannot be reduced to pure pragmatic actions”. When it turns into so called “current practice” going beyond the values, the institutions wither and people stop being interested in politics. Nationalism and populism continue to appear even in Europe.

The European Union project is genuinely questioned. The public debate is taken over by those who are not the most valuable political figures. Mario Vargas Llosa appeals: “you have to oppose that before it is too late. We need politics that would be value-based”.

Until 1989, the challenge in the communist bloc was to fight for freedom. We had the opportunity to see with our own eyes the fall of communist dictatorship. What could be a similar goal today? Perhaps it could be the politics based on values I have discussed *in extenso*.

Looking into the future, I believe that the main goal for all of us should be building common European policy; a European community of nations that would include not only those who are already within the EU but also those who live at its borders. Not an easy task. The economic crisis, that Europe plunged into, together with the lack of transparency in European politics undermine citizens’ trust and reinforces the anti-European sentiments. With the lack of attractive vision of the European project and the absence of European leaders capable of reigniting the enthusiasm for the idea of a united Europe, how can we build a common future?

Laying the foundations of post-war Europe, the grand figures like Churchill, Adenauer, Schumann and Monnet were capable of creating a new vision of the continent. In 1948, during the meeting in the Hague, Churchill said that in the future it would be worthwhile to have one parliament and joint institutions. Then the idea of creating common defence policy emerged (objected by France in the early 1950s); Robert Schumann advocated building the common project made of individual policies in such a way that all countries (six at the time) could see their own interests in it. That’s how the European Coal and Steel Community was established. Creating common regulations was something that Schumann rightly believed, would gradually lay the foundations of the European body.

Yet, the future of the European Union is linked to the future fate of the countries that are beyond our Eastern border. Today we are facing Moscow’s aggression towards Ukraine and, as never



Bogusław Sonik



Krzysztof Bobiński

before, we need a joint intervention. We must tighten the ties between our nations and remember how important in the 80s was the support of Western European societies given to us. Their support was much greater than the one we got from trade unions, civic movements, churches, citizens and governments.

We still remember the incredible wave of support that Poland received after the martial law had been imposed. It included the never-ending visits of various authorities and persons who would come here with humanitarian aid, who multiplied our opinions and presented it to the Western world. We knew we were not alone.

Today, similar reactions towards our Eastern neighbours are also necessary. Conferences are not enough. Summits and similar meetings, institutional activities are always burdened with their inborn need for various compromises towards administrative steps. One needs to remember that a broad programme of exchanges and scholarships is necessary not only for students from those countries but also for people working in cultural institutions. Our institutions should be open to variety of internships; the ties between authorities should also become stronger. Although borders no longer exist, personal relations among us have not intensified. We should organise more meetings like those between the young people from Germany, Poland and France; they could be a good example for us today.

We need cooperation between the EU states and Moldova, Ukraine, Georgia, Kazakhstan, Azerbaijan and Armenia. Today the citizens of those countries stand at the forefront of the fight for human rights and freedom. They struggle with the powerful enemy that can threaten their freedom and independence even in military terms as it happened in Ukraine, Georgia and Moldova.

We, who are already members of the European Union, should do as much as possible to prevent those people from losing their hope. We are in a position of citizens who found themselves

within the realm of the European Union. However, being in the EU is not just holiday; it is also a harsh game for our own and our community's interests.

As a Member of the European Parliament, I travelled a lot to the countries that were neighbours of the European Union. I also negotiated association agreements with the Latin American countries. Among their citizens, I saw the need to respect human rights as well as institutions. Their hope is something that in our daily practice we frequently fail to perceive.

Being a subject to bitterness (the bitterness resulting from everyday life's difficulties), as Havel wrote, we have to be ready to address those hopes and dreams. We must create a policy that meets the expectations of those nations just like the one that built our country after 1989 – and eventually let us join the community of European nations. It was not a day-to-day process. It took fifteen years between the fall of communism and the EU membership. That was a very laborious period of building institutions, introducing new laws etc. Our Eastern neighbours must be aware of it. The accession into the EU is not just signing a contract. You need to adjust your system to a system of a democratic state.

Being the member of the European Union, we must have our own opinion on how to go through the crisis that the community is now facing. The election of the Polish prime minister for the president of the European Council can be interpreted as one of the steps strengthening our position and allowing us to initiate new programmes for the EU – just like we did with Sweden in case of the Eastern Partnership.

We need more civic initiatives like the one run by Villa Decius Association but it is also important to have the structures that would support them. It is of the utmost importance that we should never take away the hope from those who hold the banner of solidarity and freedom. They are our successors. Sometimes it may be difficult to help them because we have to respect certain

administrative procedures and regulations. Besides the strength of the spirit, one also needs wisdom. Those essays of Havel, Patočka, Kuroń and many others teach us how not to be dominated by demagoguery, populism and other powers that destroy our ability of independent thinking. We need to be sane. We must not be so easily divided by tagging each other: leftist, rightist, nationalist, populist. We must seek something that really lies at the foundations of our better future, namely cooperation and solidarity.

Panel 1:

TIMES OF INNOCENCE

Remembering Solidarity

Political Developments in Central Europe in 1989

Challenges of Transformation

Krzysztof Bobiński

Let me start with brief comments on the matter of innocence, and ask whether in 1989 we really were so innocent. I know for sure that we were very tired. In a way, the political situation was imposed on us by Gorbachev who started the changes in his own country; later, the changes affected us as well. Twenty-five years have passed since 1989. It is time now to start thinking seriously about what happened back then. We must never forget that during the transformation, the Soviet Army was still in Poland – and that we had no idea how things would evolve. In 1989, we certainly wanted to lead normal lives and to live in a normal state. One of the most pressing questions was how to create state institutions that would safeguard the state.

Today, witnessing many conflicts in different parts of the world, we are once again concerned with the future of freedom and democracy. Sometimes I think that the question of freedom is

moving backwards because there are more and more people who think that authoritarian state is the only solution. What's more, the increasing number of people believes that freedom only destructs us.

We arrived at the point in history when we should start thinking about what we are doing now and what the year of 1989 really was about. What has happened between then and now? How will the future look like? Referring to young people is a bit hopeless because they have other issues on their minds. However, those who were born in 1989 are twenty-five years old now; they are mature today and, whether they like it or not, they should start thinking about similar questions.

Now, let me first ask László Rajk about the situation in authoritarian democracy – thus, in Hungary.

László Rajk

Before I address your request, I would like to refer briefly to another very important date. Today is the 23rd of October, the day of the outbreak of the Hungarian Revolution of 1956. The revolution started as a demonstration supporting the Poznań protests in Poland. But I'm not going to go as far back as '56; what's more, I think I'm not even going to go back to '89. Rather, I'd like to give a brief account on what is happening in Hungary today and why – using Krzysztof Bobiński's words – it matters whether we are innocent or not. Given that we were unable to execute our beliefs and our dedication to democracy and freedom, it seems that Hungarian former dissidents are not innocent at all. It is time to start thinking about how it happened, why it happened and what could be the consequences. So these are the three points I would like to address.

If we went back to 1989 and analysed the opposition strategy in Hungary (and the strategy of most opposition movements throughout the Eastern Europe), it becomes clear that the strategy adopted was that of creating institutions guaranteeing democracy. That was a very practical part of our moral dedication. There are people who called it Velvet Revolution, to quote Havel again, but it could also be called Institutionalised Revolution because the process of creating institutions was the most important matter. I personally perceived those institutions and checks and balances as the guarantee of democracy.

We succeeded at that time: through bloodless political change we created democratic institutions in Hungary. Now it seems that we failed. It turned out that it was not enough to create the institutions because there is always a personal, human factor that should secure the respect for them. Today's occurrences in Hungary are dismantling most of democratic institutions and parliamentary work; the independence of the judges and freedom of speech are threatened. Hungary is in a very bad state.

Going back to what I have mentioned earlier: we are not innocent because we did not manage to pass over our dedication to freedom to new generations of policy makers. They are in their forties now, one generation younger than us. I do not know the reason why we did not succeed but certainly it was a mistake; a mistake especially relevant because Hungary is a member state of the European Union. It is a warning example of how a member state, which was an eminent student of democracy twenty-five years ago, threatens democracy in the EU now.

Institutions are necessities but not guarantees of democracy. Practicing democracy is as important as the institutions. Those people, who were in their twenties in 1989, stopped believing in democracy and started to believe in business before reaching the age of forty and fifty. This is a warning example demonstrating that in spite of democratic institutions and democratic atmosphere in



Lavon Barshcheuski



László Rajk

culture, and despite the fact that democracy in Hungary has existed for twenty years, people can become anti-democratic. This is a demonstration that it is not enough just to talk about democratic education, democratic culture and democratic institutions. Something else is needed. Since Hungary is a member of the EU, I think it is also worthwhile to discuss whether similar scenario could unfold in other EU member states as well. I am not a fortune-teller, I cannot foresee the future, but I certainly know that the danger is there.

In light of what I have just said, I think that the last year's proposal of the European Parliament to create a monitoring body responsible for evaluating and examining the state of democracy among EU member states, was a very important initiative. And although the European Parliament rejected the proposal, I hope it will be accepted in the future. I also hope that the structure of this monitoring body called the Copenhagen Committee, will be adopted and forwarded by the European Parliament in the same way it was proposed. It would mean that the Committee would be composed of representatives of the civil society only and no professional politician could join it.

I think it is very important to institutionalise civil society just like the opposition movement in '89 was institutionalised. It would mean that NGOs or the civil society are officially recognised in the institutional framework – not only because of the good will of a politician or government.

Magda Vášáryová

When Krzysztof Bobiński provided us with the information about the panel, he told us that we should not speak that much about the past and focus on future or present situation instead.

of Pan-Slavism (which, by the way, Čarnogurský has lately used to defend Russian expansion in the Crimea and Eastern Ukraine). How innocent is this? Although Čarnogurský had spent some weeks in the prison before, and although I risked my career at the time signing the letter to free him, now he represents opinions that I am not able to understand.

Non-Catholic dissidents in Slovakia consisted predominantly of former communists expelled from the party after 1968. These people had very limited idea about living in democratic regime. Nowadays, they are mostly disappointed with Slovakia's development because their expectations were different. In social sciences this is called "a revolution of higher expectations". They were not dreamers; they were illusionists who are now completely disappointed with the democratic regime and its institutions such as parliament.

The second question: innocence. Recently, at the Institute for Cultural Policies, we organised a conference that focused on the crucial issues we have to discuss within Central Europe. (Please, note that I am not speaking about the Central-Eastern Europe because Central Europe is now Central Europe while Eastern Europe is Eastern Europe). One of the issues was who is a victim of whom. Why the process of victimisation of our history is still so attractive today in Central Europe? Perhaps it suggests that we are still unable to bear responsibility for the past and for what happened here, in Central Europe, in the last century. One of the unpleasant consequences of this situation is blaming others, what is evident today in the Czech Republic, Hungary and Slovakia. It seems that only Poles seized the moment and they can now be a mature partner of the EU; they keep reminding the other three countries of the Visegrad Four who say: "in our backyards we do not permit Brussels to do anything" that the way forward may be different. But let us face directly and openly that the crisis in Crimea and Eastern Ukraine has divided us completely. We, in Slovakia, have also lost our consensus about the orientation of our foreign policy. I think all of it is very dangerous.

And the third question: what did we want to represent in the EU? First of all, we wanted to be represented and we wanted to be respected. Moreover, we wanted to bring to the EU our substantial contribution, namely our experience of resisting totalitarian regimes. Did we succeed in doing so and did we contribute to the elimination of extremist movements, which today disintegrate the EU and NATO? No. We are not able to do this because we were not able to institutionalise our cooperation and move forward with the strategic issues within V4. Why? Because these are not the issues that help one win in domestic elections. We only run our own shows and do not feel responsible even for Central Europe; and in fact, such shared responsibility was the case in the 90s when Poland, the Czech Republic and Hungary helped Slovakia to bounce back to them after Mečiar's regime. Why is the situation different now? I have no answer to this question. I can only say that Slovakia, the Czech Republic and Hungary have immersed into irresponsible, provincial politics – and their voters have nothing against that.

Lavon Barshcheuski

I will speak in Polish because that is the language of both terminology and the narrative of freedom fights. We, in Belarus, used to read Polish underground press created by, for example, Jan Lityński. We used to read it and we were inspired by it. In the early 1980s, we did not understand all questions but we understood the opportunity of changing something; we comprehended that something new must come. At that time, we were young and we found it easier to think about the future than we do now.

Nevertheless, it's pointless to grumble about young people because as early as in the 18th century BC, an Egyptian poet already wrote that young people of his time were useless and understood nothing. Of course, it has been always like that. For some young people values were important, for others careers mattered more. Quite obviously, the events of the late 1980s, i.e. the Velvet Revolution and what happened in other Central and East European countries, may be a source of inspiration – as it is for us who have experienced those events. We should pass our beliefs over to the youth. This is obviously a very difficult task.

When we circulated underground press in the 1980s – it was a real revelation, something that had to be read. Now, we have huge amounts of information that fall on people every day. But the information resources cannot be even compared to what it was at the time. It was easier to look at those things and distinguish what was true from what was false. Nowadays, the amount of information leads to forgetting, to forgetting things that inspired us in the 1980s. Nevertheless, wasn't it Ernest Renan who once wrote that the nation exists not only because its citizens share its memory but because it is capable of forgetting collectively? A nation must not remember everything. One needs to remember certain things and in order to be able to remember, sometimes one has to forget other things.

For us, Belarusians, the concept of solidarity is not something that could be forgotten. For twenty-five years I have been running a secondary school of humanities in Minsk that in 2003 was pushed by the government to the underground. We were shocked because it was difficult for us to survive in such conditions. Fortunately, we got support. Some people from the Catholic Intelligentsia Club in Warsaw read an essay on our situation in *Gazeta Wyborcza*. They got visas to come to Belarus and told us: “we will help you”. And they did. For eleven years now, our youth has travelled semi-legally to Poland to participate in regular, normal classes – although in Belarus we still act in clandestine manner. Another example is the case with Václav Havel. Two days before

his death, Havel had signed letters to political prisoners in Belarus but they reached them when he was no longer among the living. The situation was highly symbolic.

Today we must think about Ukraine. Our future, and the future of Belarus, depends on how and whether Ukrainians succeed in overcoming their problems and what will be their public life in the shadow of the vast Russian empire. That public life, sooner or later, will form itself on the basis of the new elite. These young people may think a bit differently from us but as far as history concerned, I am an optimist.

Jan Lityński

I would like to start by saying that Poland has become the success story of Eastern Europe. We have achieved a huge success in the last twenty-five years. In 1989, when we just started our relationship with democracy, we entered it with plenty of hopes. We, the people of opposition in Poland, and also abroad, in Hungary, former Czechoslovakia and other countries of the former Soviet Union, we thought more or less like this: we managed to overthrow totalitarian system, we succeeded in destroying the system of strong power and we are now entering the family of democratic nations. At the same time we are bringing something very specific into that circle of democratic states: our memory of totalitarianism and we, the Poles, also our solidarity. We believed that we would bring something new. We would be able to be different, to be better. That was not the case, unfortunately. We had just the same problems.

The memory of totalitarianism quickly disappears from the public discourse and equally quickly turns into a quarrel. That memory is easily forgotten and might cause certain distaste. We are similar

to other nations and – just like other countries new to democracy – we experience everything that they have experienced before.

“Poland is a country of success”. In 1989 *Gazeta Wyborcza* published short essays by Michał Ogórek and I remember reading his text in November or December '89. In the article, he wrote that once you arrived to Poland, you stopped using the toilet. His remark summarized what happened in Poland then. Poland was a hopeless country where the cities were dirty, villages destroyed and what you saw around was just horrible. My impression was similar when in the early 90s I stopped in the Czech Republic on my way to Bavaria. In Bavaria, everything was in order. A few years later, I arrived from Ukraine to the so-called “Poland B”, to the Eastern part of the country that is not so rich. For the second time, I felt as if I entered Bavaria again. Poland seemed managed well. That was a great change. The country has been re-born, transformed into a nicely looking place. This is a success.

Poland has been successful in other fields as well. The standard of life and life expectancy have increased. For someone who lived in totalitarian system, it gives certain joy that crossing borders is so easy. Poland is a country of success. We feel that we now live within safe borders and that we really live in a country that is even stronger than Poland in the 16th century, the greatest Golden Age of Poland. Today, we have the new Golden Age in Poland.

In the 70s, actors of the student theatre (a very important theatre for the Polish intelligentsia of the time) used to sing: “If it is so good, why is it so bad?” Well, we still see the poverty of Polish politics. The public debate is below any level of decency. Especially on TV we deal with complete lack of thinking, lack of ideas, values or reflections about the future. Most TV debates focuses on conflicts between people from various political parties who do not propose anything new. The only way of exchanging opinions and thoughts is the attack. The things are even worse on the Internet.

Students





Jan Lityński

There is absolutely no respect for someone who has different opinions; one must be simply hauled over the coals by other Internet users. This is the mediocrity of the public discourse in this country.

Another reason for our concern is the juridical system. It is true that courts in Poland are one of the biggest failures, one of the worst problems in Poland after 1989. Judges are independent but they simultaneously believe that they are independent from their duties. They are not ready for difficult economic cases and sometimes it takes them years to give a simple verdict. One of our friends connected to the Workers' Defence Committee, who was a deputy mayor of one of the Warsaw districts, was accused of accepting a bribe by a person who at the time of filing the lawsuit was in prison. It all resulted in an acquittal twelve years later.

Now, let me move on to the third question that is our biggest concern. Before the European Parliament elections, in schools, there were pre-elections in which about 200 thousands young people took part. The results were alarming: if the youth voted in reality, Poland would be ruled by a party rejecting all values that one could call democratic in a coalition with a party of nationalistic egotism – something like Jobbik in Hungary. This must attest to something but to what? Well, I think it is a sign that we are losing the battle over the past. In 1989 and in the 90s, we were fascinated with the economic changes, economic development and economic freedom. It was the time when business people were recognised as mass media heroes (worth mentioning, some of them were later imprisoned). But back then they appeared on the first pages of various newspapers: Bagsik, Gawronik, Gąsiorowski. They were the heroes. There was the overall atmosphere that the one who got more was better, the one who achieved more was better. In 1989, we had the sensation that the past did not matter. What mattered was what you achieved after 1989. We cut off our roots; we cut off our past. We fed the young generation with a vision of the world in which the stronger wins, the richer is better and that the natural, necessary inequalities

I was one of the first ambassadors sent by Václav Havel to Vienna right after the transformation. I felt really honoured that I could stand next to him. Today, unfortunately, Václav Havel's image in the Czech Republic and Slovakia is being destroyed on everyday basis. Havel has been turned into a kind of dreamer and unpractical person who did not understand, as László Rajk said, that nowadays we should focus on business and that talks about values are worthless; that today we should just be normal and concentrate on everyday, short-term issues without looking beyond the horizon and without thinking about the future. I am very sad to say that Václav Havel's image, Patočka's image and also the image of Mazowiecki in Poland (so the images of people whom I have known and respected very deeply) are being destroyed. The reason why this is happening is that people care only about short-term success.

Let me raise three questions. The first one is: how were we prepared in our part of Europe for the changes that had been awaiting us? The second would be: how do we process our experiences of living in totalitarian regimes? And the third question is: what did we want to represent in the EU?

Let me answer these three questions shortly. It seems that from the Slovak point of view, we have not been prepared for these changes at all. Let me give an example of my debate with the first internationally known Slovak dissident Ján Čarnogurský; he was a Catholic dissident. I remember speaking to him in 1993 when I founded the first think tank concerning the foreign policy issues – the Slovak Association for Foreign Policy. Being an organiser of a conference about the history of the foreign policy on the Slovak territory, I asked him: “how was the Catholic dissident prepared to discuss the issue of Slovakia's involvement in international structures?” He stood up, holding the microphone, and responded in a very short manner: “We have not discussed that at all”. So, it means that they only talked about the past. They were interested in what happened in the past and had no idea about what future of Slovakia would be. They were enchanted by ideas

in society are glorified. In the last elections we were given the answer. We did not know how to address this original sin of 1989: the necessary liberal economic reforms that resulted in economic success were not accompanied by any community-related reflection. This is an especially difficult problem.

At that time, a young professor Nowak, later an eminent Polish sociologist, one of the creators of the Polish school of sociology, conducted research among students in Warsaw. His research proved something very characteristic, namely, that these people had very strong ties on the family level and very strong ties on the patriotic level. But there was nothing in the middle; there was no social tie in between. The research was repeated in various constellations for many years and gave similar results. The civic engagement in Poland is very low; the turnout at the polls is low. There is certain frustration. People are unwilling to see any form of government and are uninterested in the institutions controlling authority. This results in a gap between the authorities and the society. NGOs are fairly weak because the local authorities have a tendency to take over the role of NGOs. The money that should be granted to NGOs is taken by the local self-government that creates its own institutions; they are quite nepotistic in developing them and take over the role of the institutions that should build the social services and also control the authorities. They do not do it. Hence this dangerous gap in Poland (as the examples of my predecessors show) can easily turn into the system that, as we believe, should never ever come.

In 1989 we believed that, to a certain extent, it was the end of history. History was over and everything was going to be better. Although we also had examples that things could go wrong (the conflict in former Yugoslavia, for instance), we thought that things would move forward nevertheless. But things do not move forward by themselves; we must control the process, as Bogusław Sonik said. Let me refer to an almost forgotten poem by Jonasz Kofta entitled “The eye”.

It was written under the influence of the '68 events in Poland. Kofta wrote a tale of a man who lost the possibility to work and he only had his eyes left. "History stopped happening. The present is gone to sleep. It depends on us whether we are going to take this over or not". An excellent Polish sociologist, who researched the attitudes of the young people in the 60s, proved that the youth of the 60s was the most idea-free generation. They were not interested in public matters. Two years later, in 1968, they rebelled. I believe that this can be the optimistic statement to close my presentation.

Krzysztof Bobiński

Before we return to the speakers, let me give the floor to the audience.

Zbigniew Zgała

I work for local authorities. I believe that the reason behind the problems we face in Poland now is that despite the fact we have democracy and freedom, we nevertheless lack justice. If we observed the situation in Poland during the past twenty-five years, it would become apparent that the society has been greatly divided. People do not experience the principles of social justice on everyday basis – and that leads to frustration. Jeffrey Sachs, who was the author of the shock therapy in Poland, admitted that he did not advocate the liberal solution which was implemented in Poland. At the beginning it was good but then we did not introduce the Scandinavian model and turned

instead towards the model of South America or maybe the American model – but neither of them really fits Poland.

Krzysztof Bobiński

We really should think where to go. Twenty-five years ago we did not anticipate that there would be a country in Central Europe where a nationalist party (financed mainly by Russia) would become so successful. I am obviously thinking about Jobbik. So, how did it happen that on one hand we expect from the young generation to come up with some ideas that would fit this generation (because Poland cannot be ruled by Jan Lityński forever), and on the other hand, this new generation uses the ideas of nationalistic right that existed in Poland in 1930s?

Wojciech Przybylski

I believe there are two important matters that have been mentioned in our discussion. One of them concerns Europe (not only Central Europe). Europe is still disintegrated. Actually, it is getting more and more fragmented because Russia wants Europe to be this way. Russia wants to polarise Europe; it wants to strengthen various forces that could destroy Europe. Jobbik, Le Pen – these are the figures that actually postulate disintegration of Europe. So the problem that we should discuss is not the force of particular countries but rather the power of Europe as such. There is one thing that we have not overcome yet and one thing we are still not ready for. If we

want our situation to be better, we need to be united and this is something that we have not achieved yet. Another issue is whether we are ready to become a federation.

Now, another issue related to the young and the old. All of you, who sit at the table now, represent the '68 generation; the generation that has been very successful and today leads different European nations. However, time goes by, and young people (not only in our part of the world) are constantly excluded from policy-making. Spain is a good example here. This is a problem. With their frustration, the disintegration of Europe increases. So, maybe your role should be altered. Maybe it is time for you and other politicians to step aside and give room to young people or prepare them to cover your positions. In Scandinavian countries we do see that. Young people at the age of twenty-eight are able to become efficient ministers of education, defence and foreign affairs. They fill some key positions, and I am talking not only about politics but also about economy. Is it because you had to fight for your position, you expect young people to fight for their positions as well? Perhaps we could change the rules of the game; perhaps you could step aside a bit and promote young people instead. I am obviously aware of all the risks. However, this may provide some food for thought.

Staffan Herrström

Although this discussion primarily focuses on Central Europe, several of the challenges that have been mentioned can be observed in other countries as well. Here, I mostly refer to the increase of the non-democratic and non-liberal ways of thinking. Such increase was reflected in the elections to the European Parliament as well. I think we are facing a broader challenge that also affects countries in Western and Northern Europe. To some extent we are all looking for solutions to address this.



Staffan Herrström

Wojciech Przybylski



I will not pretend that I have some solutions although I do think that to change such state of affairs is a long-term process and that we should not make any concessions. Obviously, in many countries, we have pending discussions about immigration, often influenced by xenophobic tendencies. I think that is a good example. When people and politicians start making concessions – e.g. closing borders – they start giving way to several of the forces that the previous speakers have already addressed.

I would like to pose two questions. One to Ambassador Vašaryová: I am genuinely surprised at your observations concerning different ways in which the V₄ countries respond to the Russian aggression in Ukraine. The fact that among the countries with communist “heritage” could exist the open support for Russia is rather shocking. My simple question is similar to Krzysztof Bobiński’s earlier inquiry about Jobbik – why? How is it possible?

My second question goes to László Rajk and the idea of creating some kind of monitoring mechanism not only for countries that joined the EU recently but also for all EU members. I do believe that we definitely need something of the kind. But on a more general level: what would you expect from other countries to do with respect to situations such as in Hungary or in Austria, when ten years ago there was a kind of reaction but not necessarily a successful one? What kind of political advices would you suggest to other EU member states? How should they act in a given situation without making it worse?

Samuel Abrahám

We actually could have the whole conference on a theme “what has been wrong” because the history we are discussing here is almost twenty-five years old. What Lityński said earlier struck

me: if we gave the vote only to students in Poland they would vote for extremist parties. This could be the major topic on what has been wrong. Young people cannot formulate exactly what is wrong, what is the problem.

Now, what is the reason why young people are not listening to our politicians or us? Is it because we keep saying the same things for decades now, or is it because our voice is not as distinctive as it should be? At the same time, however, it is precisely the voices of politicians and their actions that frustrate young people. The thing is that populists and nationalists, no matter how ugly things they might say, often say them sincerely and they go straight to the point. We are consistently trying to be rather evasive because we are thankful for the general improvement; we also do not want to be professional pessimists so we are searching for the positive sides. But young people are not patient. They do not care for this evasiveness. They want straight, simple answers and actually I would like to now hear from students: what is wrong that you do not get the message? Some of you, of course, are part of democratic movements, fights against the Olympics, fights against extremism and so on. But a number of you might actually be surprised to realise that some of the extremists' voices sound acceptable and there must be a struggle in your heads. I would like to hear from students: what is it that makes you find some ideas of populism, extremism more appealing than the voices of today's intellectuals and politicians?

Krzysztof Bobiński

Jan, could you explain why, after fifty years, are you still running the country?

Jan Lityński

First of all, let me address two issues that are polemics against or perhaps a discussion with Wojciech Przybylski. The first one concerns young people. Some time ago Tadeusz Mazowiecki advised President Bronisław Komorowski to organise a very interesting meeting with young people associated with different groups. Do you know what was the first thing young people did? They asked journalists to leave. They wanted to debate things between themselves – knowing this would not have any influence over society. There are young people who are involved in NGOs but they do not want to get involved in larger societal matters. They stick with their own groups.

The second point refers to the question whether our generation should leave or not. Well, Łászlo, Magda and I, represent the parties that have lost and that have actually stopped existing. However, we have not been replaced by anything interesting. And when it comes to the choice between Nowak and Hofman – this does not give us any hope for the future because those people do not have any ideas or any proposals concerning the future. Young people are frustrated and are exposed to ultra-liberal or ultra-nationalistic talks. But all depends on this young generation because they should replace us. It is not for us to leave but they should replace us.

Lavon Barshcheuski

I am not an expert on the mood of Polish youth. However, I think that what you said was right: young people nowadays have less time to think about greater things because they are always in a hurry; if populists provide simple answers to difficult questions then the young people will vote

for them and support them. I come from the country where a populist won the elections twenty years ago; and this person did not give power to anyone else since then. Our democratic mechanisms should guarantee that even if the populists win, another party would win after them.

Magda Vášáryová

Yes, it is time to die; it is time to die... I do see this clearly. Our generation, well, we were twenty in 1968, we had some freedom but there was the Iron Courtain that did not allow us to leave our country for over forty years and to have access to the Western ideas. It was a disaster.

So, yes – I guess it is time to die; it is time to leave. But look, a generation of Mikuláš Dzurinda (the prime minister of Slovakia who managed to make Slovakia the member of the EU, NATO and Schengen) was fifteen years younger than us. And despite his achievements, he lost the support of young people. Why? I am afraid that a lot of young people are looking for some colourful, hysteric originals. We can see this in the Slovak parliament. They are playing like in the theatre. They are better than me in performing this drama although I have been an actress for twenty-six years.

We have young people in the audience here but you have not been listening carefully to what we said. Some of you just kept sending texts. This is the problem. We cannot reach you. We are not as colourful as the psychopaths. On the other hand, your expectations are higher and you take for granted the fact that we have the freedom of speech, that we are part of Schengen, that you can study, that you can say whatever you want and go wherever you want. But remember that you can lose all of it overnight. That is exactly what happened to the generation of my father. They lost everything in 1948; they lost everything overnight. Please bear this in mind.

Now, let me answer the question of His Excellency Ambassador of Sweden: this pro-Russian policy in Slovakia results partly from the fact that some people in power, like our prime minister Fico, are former communists or young communists. Once Fico was asked if he noticed what happened on the 17th of November 1989 in Czechoslovakia – i.e. the Velvet Revolution – and he said “no”. He did not notice it. He also represents the younger generation. What’s more, his only goal in politics is to win the next general elections and he wants to say to people: you will have lower prices for gas. Slovakia is 100% dependent on Russian gas.

László Rajk

I agree that there is a generational clash between the ‘68 generation and the younger one. I also agree with the argument that the ‘68 generation – including us – learnt how to fight; we are very potent in sustaining solidarity among ourselves; that means we know how to effectively defend our positions. Regardless of the fact whether such attitude is political or only symbolical.

There is a generational clash and I wish it were bigger. You should not ask us to step aside; you should kick us out instead. But in order to do this, one needs some kind of positive radicalism and at the moment I do not see it anywhere. I only perceive negative radicalism such as extreme right-wing parties, fascists, neo-fascists, hate-speech, etc. I do not see anyone who says: “Screw this whole federation of Europe, make just one Europe with one president, one prime minister and one government”. Even this does not exist.

If we accept that there is positive and negative radicalism, the biggest problem is that there is no positive radicalism that would attract younger generations and would make it active. One of

the faults of the '68 generation is that we got rid of all radical parts of us: the Maoists, the extremists, the Trotskyists. We could have incorporated them into a solid kind of thinking in philosophy and politics. Back then I did not ever think that radicalism was needed. Just like Fukuyama who was not right in telling that the history has ended. This is not the end of the history. The history is just starting again.



Magda Vášáryová



Anna Wierzbowska and Bartosz Czauderna, students

Special Lecture by Rüstem Ablâtif

Qırımlı Nation: Losing Motherland and Freedom

As known, last March, the Russian Federation violated treacherously the Budapest Memorandum and occupied the part of Ukraine's territory, the Autonomous Republic of Crimea. Under this memorandum, Russia was one of the guarantors for the Ukrainian territorial integrity. It turned out later, that it was the first step of the Moscow's aggression against Ukraine.

The Crimean peninsula historically was, and still remains, a point of conflict for many nations. Representatives of many civilizations used to populate Crimea. But Crimea is the motherland for the *Qırımlı* nation (or so-called the Crimean Tatar people). Although the *Qırımlı* is a relatively young nation, its ethnogenesis is rooted exactly in Crimea. Many nations (including the Kipchaks to Genoveses) made their contributions to this Crimean "melting pot". Therefore, the *Qırımlı* rightly consider themselves the indigenous population of Crimea. Between 1441 and 1783 Crimean Khanate was established; it was the multiethnic and multireligious state where, in contrast to medieval Europe, mosques were erected next to Karaite kenasas, Jewish synagogues and Armenian churches. I would like to remind you that the Crimean Tatar people went through a lot of distress in their history, including the Moscovites' annexation in 1783.

Crimea experienced four waves of emigration of its native inhabitants due to harassments from the Russian Empire and its heiress – the Soviet Union. As a result of these emigrations, the Crimean diaspora has been scattered across the world: in Turkey, Bulgaria, Romania, Germany, the USA, Canada, Lithuania, Russia, Uzbekistan as well as Poland. Today we can observe the fifth

wave of emigration from Crimea. Each of these waves had an unsettling impact on the *Qırımli*'s fate as the population dramatically decreased: from 98% in 1783 to 0% in 1944. However, their biggest tragedy became the forcible deportation executed on May 18, 1944 by the regime of Josef Stalin. In a single night, about 200,000 people (including babies and the elderly) were deported under the extrajudicial procedure. Thus, the peninsula was cleansed totally from its native inhabitants. As a result of this crime against humanity, 46.2% of them died. For ten years, until Stalin's death, the *Qırımli* in exile were under NKVD's thorough surveillance. Thousands of them were sentenced to the Soviet penal servitude on account of breaches and anti-Soviet acts. But even after the death of Stalin, people were prohibited to return to their motherland for as long as thirty-three years. For almost half of the century the *Qırımli* national movement has been struggling with the Soviet Communist Party for the right to return to their own motherland. The love for their motherland together with the intrinsic feeling of freedom encouraged them to fight for their rights despite all repressions. The symbol of the non-violent struggle of the *Qırımli* people became the legendary national leader, the Soviet prisoner of conscience, Mustafa Cemil; he is now called Qırımoğlu – “the son of Crimea”.

The *Qırımli* national movement (which was the sole national movement in the former USSR) not only made its own substantial contribution to the victory over the Soviet regime but also achieved the return of the nation to Crimea. This repatriation process has passed under very difficult political, social and economic conditions. The *Qırımli* had to struggle for their rights again: this time against the post-communist bureaucratic establishment and the pro-Russian forces. Nevertheless, the national movement was guided by the principle of non-violence. Certainly, during all years of Ukraine's independence, the Ukraine's central government often ignored the problems of the Crimean repatriates. That was the case despite the movement's unambiguous support

for Ukrainian sovereignty and its assistance in strengthening the public authority of Ukrainian leaders. According to political experts, it was an unprecedented example in the world of a support for the central government offered by an ethnic minority. The *Qırımli* nation have supported Ukraine's centuries-old struggle for freedom hoping to build a European, modern and democratic state, where the rights of both nations will be respected. The *Qırımli* people were able to build their own elective self-government system that is grounded in democratic principles: the Qırım Milliy Qurultay (Crimean National Congress) and the Qırım Milliy Meclis (Crimean National Council). Actually, these self-government bodies are the examples of true democracy in Crimea. They enjoy the high prestige not only among the *Qırımli* nation but among other populations as well.

I should note that the *Qırımli* feel spiritual affinity with the Ukrainian nation, Ukrainian freedom fighters and Ukrainian human rights activists; therefore, despite some disregard for the interests and issues of the *Qırımli* shown by the Ukrainian state, they support Ukraine's aspiration for becoming a European state.

The *Qırımli* and their representative bodies resolutely supported Ukraine's "*Revolution of Dignity*" and actively participated in the Euromaidan movement. They also supported the Ukrainian territorial integrity at the Supreme Council of the Autonomous Republic of Crimea on February 26. I personally was one of the participants of the meeting that brought together all our men between the age of sixteen and seventy – about thirty thousands people in total. These men joined the meeting because they felt threatened by their own motherland Ukraine. They gathered at the huge meeting under the Crimean and Ukrainian national flags in order to uphold their own dignity, freedom and democracy. On that day, we were able to prevent the "separatist" session of the Crimea's supreme council. But, as known, at night, the Russian rangers seized the buildings of the Crimean government and the representative body. The annexation of Crimea started. Thousands

of the *Qırımli* people appeared on the streets in protest against the Russian invasion; hundreds of them aided Ukrainian regiments but they were not able to overpower neither the Russian forces armed to the teeth nor the armed pro-Russian gangs. A civil activist, and a father of three, Reşat Ahmet, our people's man of worth, was captured and tortured to death by so-called "Crimean self-defence".

On March 11, at the gun point, the pro-Russian members of the Crimean Supreme Council declared the "independence of Crimea". What's more, these deputies fixed the day of the illegal "referendum" that aimed at joining the Autonomous Republic of Crimea to the Russian Federation. By means of several illegal steps, Moscow joined Crimea and declared it as the Russia's federal subject on March 18, 2014. The *Qırımli* concerned with Ukraine did not take whatever action was appropriate in order to prevent the annexation and to defend the Ukrainian citizens in Crimea (including their own people). Ukraine's myopic public policy against the *Qırımli* nation, their policy of distrust and suspicion towards Crimea's natives were one of the factors that led to the loss of the peninsula.

Unfortunately, once again, nobody is interested now in the opinion of the indigenous people about the fate of their motherland. The fate of the *Qırımli* nation has become the exchange coin for global players. Russia made reference to article 1 of the United Nations Charter about the right of non-existent "Crimean" people to self-determination; by doing so, Russia tried to assure the loyalty of the *Qırımli*, understanding that only indigenous people have the legal right to determine the fate of a land. Russia tries to use the "carrot and stick policy" against the Crimea's natives: thus, Moscow prohibits the *Qırımli* national leaders Mustafa Cemil and Refat Cubar to enter their own homeland. At the same time, the Russian authorities are promising to allocate enormous amounts of money to resettlement of the formerly deported people and proclaiming

their language as the official in so-called “Republic of Crimea”. Using several representatives chosen from the *Qırımli* people, the new rulers in the peninsula want to influence the public opinion by asserting that the indigenous people of Crimea supposedly approve Russian actions in Crimea.

According to Crimean residents, the peninsula immersed in a climate of fear: mass searches of the Crimean Moslems, mosques and madrasahs, witch-hunt, impunity of gunmen from so-called “Crimean self-defence”, arbitrary verdicts taken by judges, whistle-blowing policy, discrimination by ethnic origin, intimidations, etc. We could observe the brutal attack on the building of the Crimean National Majlis, where the *Avdet* newspaper together with the Qırım Charitable Fund is located. The public, including international community, worries about disappearances of the young *Qırımli* people over the past few weeks. Together with the *Qırımli* representative bodies, they talk about some inactivity of today’s Crimean authorities; some people have assured that the local government together with the so-called “self-defence” is privy to these crimes.

The occupation administration and the Federal Security Service of Russia try to destroy the Crimean Majlis and the whole system of the national self-governance. They want to destroy these institutes because this system is a centre of resistance to Russia’s brazen aggression against Ukraine.

Ukraine together with international community does not know how to pacify Putin. I asked personally the President of Ukraine Petro Poroshenko: “Does Ukraine have some strategy to get back the Crimea? If not, does Ukraine think of such strategy?” I think that the president could not answer my question. When you strip rhetoric away, the Crimean issue exists only as a declaration. Only now Ukraine has begun to take some legislative steps in order to recognize our nation as “the indigenous people of Crimea and Ukraine”, and our right to have our own autonomous territorial entity in independent Ukraine. It is good that even the enthusiasts and public figures such



Rüstem Ablâtif

as Andrii Klymenko from the Black Sea News and the Maidan of Foreign Affairs Foundation are taking up the Crimean issue. They are working on the strategy to return Crimea to Ukraine; the protection of the *Qırımli*'s rights is one of most important components.

Meanwhile, the *Qırımli*, Ukrainians and Russians continue to suffer on the occupied territory. They feel abandoned. Unfortunately, the Ukrainian state is not able to help its own citizens living in the peninsula's territory. Of course, we shall not see any "deportation" or "ethnic cleansing" in the 21st century in one of the European regions. I do not think that Russia could venture to commit such crimes against the humanity. However, the new "rulers" of Crimea try to use some policy of "pressure": they force pro-Ukrainian activists and authoritative members of the Moslem community to leave the peninsula. I call this a "soft ethnic cleansing". Therefore, the number of "refugees" in their own country is growing. I have already mentioned the fifth wave of emigration: tens of our compatriots have already left for Turkey, Poland, Sweden, Belgium and even for Canada and the USA. About ten thousands of the *Qırımli* became "internally displaced persons" in different regions of Ukraine, mostly in Kyiv and Western Ukraine. (By the way, I must express our appreciation of the hospitable people in Western Ukraine: in Lviv, Ivano-Frankivsk, Chernivtsi, Rivne, Lutsk, who accepted us in their own homes and continue to help us).

Today, the leadership of Ukraine, together with the international community, set hopes upon the economic sanctions against Putin's Russia; I think, however, that such authoritarian leaders write off their own people. The process of returning Crimea to Ukraine can drag on for years and the question how to survive becomes crucial for the *Qırımli* now. The *Qırımli* gear up for a struggle for their own rights again. They do not mean to accept the occupation of their motherland. Tens of our representatives are fighting in volunteer battalions and the regular forces against the separatists and Russian troops in Eastern Ukraine. These young men sincerely hope that after

the liberation of the Donbas, they will liberate their motherland Crimea. At the same time, the *Qırımli* nation would like to see more active efforts from Ukrainian government, the international community and global leaders to liberate the Crimean peninsula. Those efforts include political, economic, diplomatic and military aid. Not only the global peace is threatened but also the small minority of *Qırımli* people.

Panel 2:

LOST EQUILIBRIUM

The End of the Post-Cold War World

Methods and Tools for Regulating Internal

and External Relations

Citizens in a Media Trap

Adam Reichardt

Thank you very much for the presentation on Crimea. I think that the topic will return in our discussions today. As Danuta Glondys noted, the subject for this debate is the lost equilibrium. Certainly, the geopolitical developments of the last years (such as the revolution in Ukraine, the annexation of Crimea, the aggression and separatism in Eastern Ukraine) have been very important not only locally but also on a global scale. Those circumstances caused “the lost equilibrium”. We should also add to them the most recent events in the Middle East, the battle against ISIS, as well as the rise of China, the Eurozone crisis and even the fight against Ebola. All of these suggests, as Zbigniew Brzezinski recently stated, that we live in a very unstable global context. Perhaps the issue of lost equilibrium was something we have already been trying to deal with over the last twenty-five years.

The end of the Cold War meant the end of the bipolar world that was divided between two superpowers. It did not mean, however, the end of the systemic competition. In fact, in 1991, on the pages of *Foreign Affairs*, John Lewis Gaddis wrote: “The end of the Cold War was too sweeping a defeat for totalitarianism and too sweeping a victory for democracy”. He predicted that once the Cold War was over, we would see a new type of competition. This is the competition between integration and fragmentation. When it comes to integration, this was exactly what people hoped for twenty-five years ago; they hoped for the integration of ideas, economics and security. During the Cold War we held the belief that if you could integrate all these things into liberal democracy, there would be no causes for war. But in fact, we also witnessed a competitive force to the rise of integration: fragmentation. Most recently, we observed the rise of nationalism, populism and even separatism. If we look at the areas like the east of Ukraine or the Middle East, the separatism became the force of fragmentation against the force of integration. Ironically enough, we can also refer to the Russian version of integration, namely to the Eurasian Union. Yet, this Eurasian integration is actually forcing the West to become more fragmented.

Here we are, twenty-five years after the end of the bipolar equilibrium and the system that was based on tensions. Now we live in the system that is based on integration and fragmentation. This leads to serious questions.

I would like to ask our speakers to consider discussing the following questions: international law and global governance in post-Cold War world, conditions of the multilateral international relations system (which is kind of the opposite of the bilateral system that we had during the “equilibrium”), the meaning of values in the post-Cold War era and whether we are actually on the road to a new Cold War or to a new equilibrium.

Wolfgang Eichwede

I do not think we lost equilibrium because in the first place the equilibrium did not exist in the past. Even in the times of Cold War the West was stronger. The US and Western Europe were stronger than the Soviet Block. In the military aspect there might have been some equilibrium, but in terms of economy or attractiveness of social models there was never equilibrium between the sides.

I will focus my presentation on two specific aspects. First, I would like to talk about Germany after the war. In light of our discussion, I think it will be stimulating to take into account some aspects of postwar German development. Afterwards, I would like to concentrate on the contemporary Russian position from the German point of view.

Let's comment on Germany after the war: why did we succeed in such a short time to become democrats after Hitler and after the war for which we have been responsible? Perhaps the main reason why it happened is that we recognised our total defeat. That means the generation of my parents was forced to recognise the defeat. Another reason is connected with developments after the war; I must admit that, to some degree, Western Germans profited from the Cold War because they were included into the American sphere of influence. (By the way, there was a famous book published many decades ago in my country, entitled *Democracy from Outside* dealing with the subject). We recognised the power of the US; it was not a shame for us to acknowledge that we lost the war. Thanks to that we got the European perspective and were included in Europe. I think that by respecting the rules of European integration, we organised our mentality. Germans became democrats. Nevertheless, we also became democrats due to our economic success and development of the new – private and personal – perspectives.

To the international and economic aspects we need to add the cultural aspect and should also mention Eastern Europe. After the Second World War, we learnt a lot of Western values through Eastern Europe. Western Europe tried to unite Europe but it were our friends from Eastern Europe who had to fight for their freedom. They gave us the lesson of how to execute our common values in real live. Here I mean the Hungarian Revolution, the Prague Spring, the rise of Solidarność in Poland as well as the thinkers such as Leszek Kołakowski, Adam Michnik, Jan Lityński. We had a chance to learn values through the East and, to some degree, the West has been constituted with the help of your countries.

This morning we have already celebrated 1989 and I do not need to go into many details concerning that time – perhaps except mentioning the fact that Russia also took part in destroying the former Soviet Union. All analysts in the West were convinced that Russia would resist the collapse of USSR. But the opposite turned out to be the case: to some degree, Russia liberated itself from the Soviet imperialism and signed many European conventions.

All the values that Putin denies today, were approved by the first post-Soviet Russian leaders. Paris Charter, the Copenhagen Declaration – these were our common values. Why did not Russia succeed in respecting those values? The answer was already given by László when he said that you succeeded in building the institutions but you did not succeed in reorganising your thinking and accepting these institutions. Russia did not succeed even in building those institutions. I think this is the main point. The only thing they tried to do was to re-organise its economy but they did it on the grounds of a very wild capitalism, without any rules, and not disciplined by any international or European structures.

The new Russia was forced to pay not only for its Soviet heritage but also for the costs of the new economic order. This happened when a former officer of KGB, Vladimir Putin, appeared. His

understanding of Russians' needs was an authoritarian one; in his world no alternative existed. In the first years of his rule he fought to monopolise the power by neutralising all ambitions inside the Russian civil society. If you have no power – he proposed to the Russian society – you may think what you want. The power is I. He organised the monopolist structure of power by excluding the Russian society. However, at the end of 2011, very unexpectedly, a protest movement against Putin's system emerged in Moscow and other Russian cities. Huge masses of people protested against the manipulation of the power at the top. They did not demand freedom but they demanded dignity. Putin recognised the danger and answered. First, he strengthened the repressive apparatus, denounced the opposition forces as foreign agents and developed new laws against any critical voices in his country. He saw the possible dangers appearing in Russia, namely a confrontation between Russian society and his own power. Therefore he tried to isolate the civic society inside the Russian society with the help of the new Russian nationalism. Indeed, at the time he succeeded.

Two years later, another protest movement emerged, this time in Ukraine – the Maidan. Putin was forced to recognise a yet another danger in the closest neighbour state. At the same time, he tried to organise a counterweight to Europe, which was the Eurasian Union. But it was only a joke. It was Putin's attempt to stabilise political elites, to stabilise the authoritarian structures in his sphere of influence. In order to succeed, he had to include Ukraine. But Ukraine drifted away. The movement toward Europe in Ukraine was combined with the movement for freedom and democracy. Putin understood it was a threat for his own power in his own country; so he attacked the Crimea. So far, the events (as the colleague from the Crimea described) are not the local questions, not a separate question of Russian and Ukrainian relations but questions about relations with Europe.



Enrique ter Horst and Wolfgang Eichwede

Wolfgang Eichwede



Taras Voznyak

Putin's Russia decided to say "Goodbye Europe" and to simultaneously keep the economic ties between his country and Germany as well as the other European states. Putin needs money not universal values. The challenge we are now confronting is perhaps not the new Cold War but some years of a very cold time. Nevertheless, Putin creates his own problems and by militarising Russian political thinking and foreign policy, he will reduce the civil economic possibilities of his country. He is facing the dilemma that the former Soviet Union experienced before: equality in military sense but inferior position in terms of economic attractiveness. Our answer should not be "Goodbye Russia"; instead, we should reject their "Goodbye" to us and organise the resistance; we should reformulate our thinking about this country. Putin is the president of Russia whom we have to acknowledge and do not forget.

Enrique ter Horst

Recently, I participated in the conference Forum 2000 in Prague, which was titled "Human Rights and Security". Human rights have been closely related to security ever since the adoption of the United Nations Charter. The preamble to the charter links peace and security with respect to human rights, the rule of law, economic and social development based on a promise that democracy never initiates a war of aggression. In the first years of the UN's existence, during the Cold War, much of that did not transpire very clearly not only because the Security Council was very polarised but also because the type of situation where one side violates human rights rarely appeared.

That changed very radically in 1993 when Bacre N'diaye, the special rapporteur on extrajudicial summary or arbitrary executions of the Commission of Human Rights, published his report on

the threats facing the Hutu minority in Rwanda. In his report, N'diaye had predicted the genocide that happened about eight months after the publication. The massacre shook the world; it also propelled the United Nations and the Security Council into action and made us understand that violations of human rights are always a precursor of much deeper global and local troubles.

The violation of human rights is not only the precursor of troubles ahead but it also highlights the need of having predictable public policies among the member states hoping for economic integration. You cannot loose cannons, literally speaking, creating havoc in trade relations and investment relations.

Power is no longer understood in terms of territory but also in terms of economic strength. The EU today is the greatest concentration of wealth and well-being the world has ever seen; the GNP of Russia is still only a small fraction. I think it is an equivalent of the GNP of Belgium. It gives you an idea of how lopsided this relationship is. Russia's political cost of invading Ukraine is enormous.

The invasion coming from a permanent member of Security Council also has naturally deep implications on the whole concept of collective security on which the UN is based. According to the UN policies, the aggression of one member state or the aggression on one member state of the United Nations is considered by the members an aggression on all of them. The instance when one of the members threatens another UN member is probably something that has not been evaluated entirely in its enormous gravity as it may shake the post-1945 world order. One can only take solace in what you said earlier: that maybe we are not facing a fundamental change within Russia but rather the issues emerging from power monopolised by one person.

There is a parallel in Latin American context, where my perspective comes from. There, just like in Europe, we also observe how regional institutions in charge of human rights have been

undermined. In fact, in 2001, the Organisation of American States approved the Inter-American Democratic Charter that includes a very precise definition of democracy. It is a definition of representative democracy. It goes beyond electoral legitimacy to also include pluralistic system of political parties and organisations, the separation of powers and independence of branches of government, the rule of law, freedom of expression, promotion and protection of human rights including all principles of Vienna Conference (i.e. civil, political, economic, social and cultural rights for all). The Chavez government, which was elected democratically, proceeded to undermine national institutions (which were not very strong), and to centralise executive power. Having succeeded with this, Chavez proceeded to undermine also the Organisation of American States and the application of Inter-American Democratic Charter which foresees that any state can denounce the violation of human rights in another state; in order to do so, a meeting needs to be convened to analyse the situation under investigation. To convene such a meeting, and to apply possible sanctions, $\frac{2}{3}$ of majority of total votes are needed. They are twenty-seven or twenty-eight signatory countries and fifteen countries that are the members of CARICOM – the Caribbean Community of nations – all of them are oil importers. Chavez proceeded to finance oil sales to these fifteen countries on a highly concessional basis; naturally, the fifteen votes that are needed to achieve the $\frac{2}{3}$ majority has never been able to come together.

One naturally comes to the conclusion different than in the case of Russia and the European Union. The mismanagement of the economy in Venezuela has brought the country on the brink of bankruptcy; demonstrations happen every day and the government has only been able to retain power by engaging in very brutal repression. People have been killed during peaceful demonstrations – something that also happened in Ukraine. At present, we are in a state of suspended animation. No country dares to convene the Organisation of American States because nobody wants

to risk failure or political defeat. There is no leadership and the country continues to go down the grade of accelerated process of impoverishment.

How one does address a situation like this? How should one deal with this apparent mutual cancellation of defending values and protecting business opportunities? What corrective action can be thought of? I was interested to hear Rajk's talk about the Copenhagen Committee and democracy monitoring. In the end, maybe the only way to improve global security is the process of democratisation of Russia. Naturally, it is not a short-term effort. What's more, it is closely linked not only to the education of citizens but also, as Professor Eichwede mentioned, the awaking civil awareness among Russian society.

From what I heard from Rajk this morning, there seem to be an effort to staff this Copenhagen Committee exclusively by academics and people who have not participated in political life. Without addressing the earlier discussion about old people stepping aside, I think there are some old people who would be worth to include in such a Committee.

Taras Voznyak

It was said that we would have a number of perspectives here: the local and the European one. Since I am from Lviv, I believe to represent the local perspective. Let me add some remarks that, I hope, will expand our discussion and make it deeper.

In order to understand what is going on now, one needs a bit of the historical perspective. The first world order was the one based on the Westphalian peace and existed until the French Revolution. Ironically speaking, the world was ordered like this: if the ruler was a Protestant, he had the

absolute right to kill all Catholics; but when he was a Catholic he could kill all Protestants. The second system was established after the Congress of Vienna and existed till the end of the 19th century (although in fact, it regulated the world since 1815 until 1914). Then came the Versailles order that existed until Hitler invaded Austria, Czechoslovakia and finally Poland 1939.

In this historical perspective, what Putin is doing now is very similar. Just take a look at the way of thinking. Just by looking at that short guy, lieutenant colonel Putin, you come up with the joke that he offered Tusk to divide Ukraine between Russia and Poland. That is a similar joke to what Hitler did to Poland when he divided it with Stalin. The 1945 Yalta-Potsdam order. The new arrangement regulated the world until 1989 or 1991 when the Soviet Union fell apart. In the 90s there was a single pole order – *Pax Americana* – or, as it is called here, the post-Cold War system. But such a unipolar world system existed until 2010 when in the Euro-Atlantic-centric world we began to see the rise of China. Then, more or less in 2010, the world began to change. Hardly anyone noticed that in 2008 in Munich, Putin said the truth, namely that to him the worst tragedy was the collapse of the Soviet Union. Everyone thought it was a marginal remark.

Unfortunately, Putin is only on the top of a pyramid. You can call it KGB, you can call it anything else, but the bottom line is that he is only a functionary. He can be replaced but the pyramid is going to stay there with its interests, funds, finances and so forth. Therefore, I would not be so quick to personify those matters.

What do we have now? Well, now the world is like a triangle. We have the “US plus”. What is the “US plus”? It is the US plus NATO, NAFTA, Canada, Mexico, the World Bank and other countries/organisations where the US is highly influential. Another pole represents China plus its allies like Iran. Then there is this European Union plus some friendly countries – probably Israel, Turkey and some purely European institutions such as the European Central Bank. And if you ask

me where is Russia in this triangle, I will have to tell you the truth. And the truth is that Russia is just a minor participant of the Chinese project. What Putin is doing now is not just moving away from some ideas or standards of Europe because besides the standards, besides what we want, there is also the reality. The reality is that Russia is not managing this world; it cannot be a centre of power or develop its own global project. Regionally – yes – and here, I am thinking about Georgia.

What to do about Russia? You cannot return to the Soviet Union, because there is no ideology, no funds. In the first years of his presidency, Putin tried to flirt with the European project and with NATO; but he failed and had to stop working with the EU. The main reason of his failures was that he wanted to keep his presidential post. That is why he changed the social structures in Russia so his following presidencies became a natural question and not an oxymoron. This is why Putin wants to change the world, as Hitler did. Will he succeed? I doubt it. But Putin is not the only revisionist. There are other powers that compete in doing so. Let me mention only China and Iran. They are moving toward the international stage. The result is that the world begins to change, to move, to shift; the wars are waged on the edges, not on the fronts. It is not directly China vs. EU or China vs. US. Such wars are impossible. There is no front like in 1930s. The World Wars really started in Ethiopia or in Albania, somewhere on the side. Today such wars are in Gaza, Ukraine, Syria and Georgia. In those places, Putin (but not only him) is fighting for his position in a new world order.

Beata Kowalska

You have described the global geography of today's world order. I would like to ask how the anarchisation of the internal systems relates to the citizens trapped by the media? To what



Jan Lityński and Adam Reichardt



Katarzyna Trojanowska and Taras Voznyak

extent the situation of the current world results from us being lost in contemporary times? I personally believe that the current unstable situation resulted from growing inequalities – and that made our thinking in categories of common good rather difficult. This obviously influences our approach to democracy. Our guest from Venezuela emphasised the fact that stabilisation is based on human rights but we see that our democracies are to large extent ruled by the opinion polls and lack any discussion that results in absentism when it comes to voting. What do you think about this kind of erosion within the Western world and how does it influence the world's security?

Vasyl Payuk, Student of Jagiellonian University

I have just one brief question. What is the future of Donbas?

Taras Voznyak

When it comes to Donbas, it is a very serious thing. The perspective of the next couple of years should be taken into account. Ukraine has two solutions. It can either cut Donbas off (but it is not possible because of the sovereignty of the state) or to deal with this unsolved situation for many years. I believe that President Poroshenko has adopted the only possible strategy, i.e. partial isolation. Now there is a kind of peace between pro-Russian terrorists and anti-terrorist soldiers; in the future, we will slowly return to the constitutional state in this territory. The case of Crimea is

a bit different because so far there have not been any ideas what to do with it. But when it comes to Donetsk, the most important is not what we call “the liberation of the territory”; the most important is to change the mentality of the people of Donbas which is a bit different from the mentality of the people living in the rest of Ukraine.

Let me address Beata Kowalska’s question now. We perceive the fact that the world is changing as the collapse of the world, as a kind of anarchy. In the past we had a “clear-cut” world with the Soviet Union on one side and the United States on the other – and everything was in order. We now live in post-information era. We live in the media and see everything through the media. You do not need to have army in Donbas, but if you see it on TV – then it is war. Such a thing first happened in 2008 when Russia invaded Estonia. I guess that a lot of you did not notice that. This is the second instance of such a war – a hybrid war where the media are used the way cannons were used in the past. The media, information – this is the new kind of weapon. Estonia and Ukraine are the first victims of information war.

Enrique ter Horst

The expression “trapped by the media” may lead to some confusion. When reading any newspaper, listening to any TV channel or radio station, and particularly when reading the social media, you always have to know where it comes from; you have to know who is at the origin of the piece of information or analysis.

Wolfgang Eichwede

I have just returned from the meeting of Ukrainian, Russian and German journalists in Kyiv. They compared their reports. It was fascinating. By looking at different reports on the same events, one gets the impression there are totally different events. The possibility to manipulate and to construct events is just enormous.

Let me address the question about Donbas. After consultations with people from that region, I got the impression that the situation is totally unclear. I am afraid that Russia will use the eastern part of Ukraine to weaken the whole state because it is no longer able to win. Putin is forced to either destroy or to make up for the damages caused to Ukraine. This is his fundamental problem. Even if the Europeans decide to develop some sort of the Marshall Plan for Ukraine, the Russian leadership will have the opportunity to increase the damage and costs. This is the real trap.

Awarding the Polish Prize
of Sérgio Vieira de Mello
United Nations
High Commissioner
for Human Rights
(2002–2003)

11th Edition

Welcome addresses

Danuta Glondys

Ladies and Gentlemen, it is my pleasure and honour to open the eleventh edition of the ceremony of awarding the Polish Prize of Sérgio Vieira de Mello, the UN High Commissioner for Human Rights. Let me ask the Panel of the Judges, who decided on bestowing the Prize, to take their seats. I invite here Jan Lityński, the Chancellery of the President of Poland; HE Jorge Geraldo Kadri, the Ambassador of Brazil to Poland; HE Staffan Herrström, the Ambassador of the Kingdom of Sweden to Poland; Anna-Carin Ost, the UNHCR Representative to Poland; Mariusz Lewicki, Ministry of Foreign Affairs of Poland; Agnieszka Rudzińska, the Deputy President of the Institute of National Remembrance; Anna Mroczek, the Member of the Board ZUE S.A.; Leszek Szafarczyk, the director of Kraków Airport; Tomasz Sendyka, Smart Practical Logic sp. z o.o.; Jacek Weremczuk, the Regional Director of PZU and Bogusław Sonik, the President of the Panel and Chair of the Villa Decius Association.

Let me also welcome our special guests: the former Deputy High Commissioner for Human Rights, Enrique ter Horst and the representatives of diplomatic and consular corps.

I'd like to welcome numerous experts, former politicians and human rights activists who came here from all over the world: Magda Vašáryová, a former Ambassador and Secretary of State in the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of Slovakia; László Rajk, a former dissident from Hungary; Rüstem Ablátif from Crimea, Ukraine; Krzysztof Bobiński from Poland, Wolfgang Eichwede from Germany; Tamara Sujú from Venezuela; Samuel Abrahám and Michal Vašečka from Slovakia;



Statuete of Sergio Vieira de Mello

Staffan Herrström and Panel of Judges





PZU dla dialogu kultur

GRUPA ZIE...

Stellan
HERBSTROM
SILA FOR MER

Lavon Barshcheuski from Belarus; Atakham Abilov from Azerbaijan; Kareem Amer from Egypt; Teodora Krumova from Bulgaria; Taras Voznyak from Ukraine and Adam Reichardt and Wojtek Przybylski from Poland.

I would also like to express my deepest gratitude to our patrons and sponsors who generously supported today's event.

Let me now ask Bogusław Sonik, the President of the Panel of Judges and the Chair of the Villa Decius Association, to welcome our guests.

Bogusław Sonik

Ladies and Gentlemen, where, if not in Poland, where, if not in Kraków should we welcome you at such ceremony? In fact, Kraków is a city that is inseparable from the struggles promoting human rights. It used to be the bastion of values represented by Solidarity and democratic aspirations in Poland.

I am extremely glad that today we can commemorate Sergio Vieira de Mello, a man whose attitude and life attested to his appreciation of moral foundations and who showed the path that societies and citizens should follow. Sergio was a participant and a witness of fights for human rights. For that he paid the highest price.

I truly believe that promoting human rights is more important than any other administrative agreements between the states and would like to thank you for coming here and for being here with us during today's ceremony.

HE Jan Lityński

Distinguished Ladies and Gentlemen, thank you very much for the invitation and for the opportunity to address you in a few words. What I am going to say may not be too political, and it certainly is not too politically correct. One of the saddest things in free Poland that happened to me was the cooperation of the Polish Border Guard with the Vietnamese security services in order to search the Vietnamese refugees and to catch political dissidents among them. The cooperation highlighted that during those years of freedom something went wrong; that we forgot something. I found the incident very painful and I believe that we have to do everything to avoid similar situations in the future.

Any state will always find an excuse to forget that human rights stand above anything else; above any other value. We penetrate some milieus because we are afraid of penetration and infiltration from criminals – there will always be some explanation.

During communism, people who lived in Eastern Bloc were given a relative sense of security by those who lived in free countries and stood up in their defence. At that time we knew that each time somebody was detained, the world would find out about it and would help us. Such certainty taught us what to do.

That is why I am so very glad that we hold the award ceremony in Kraków, in Poland, in a place known for being open to diversity. The city has always been open to other nations, religions and races. Thank you very much, Director, thank you very much to all who participated, thank you for your great work.

Krzysztof Markiel

Ladies and Gentlemen, it is a great honour for me to speak here about human rights. One probably should not speak too long about them but instead go to the room next door to see an exhibition that only a year ago could not have been displayed. It is a documentation of what happened so close – in Kyiv, and in the rest of Ukraine – last year. But the exhibition is also about our fight, and when I saw a poster announcing the introduction of the martial law in Poland, I remembered the shivers I felt when that poster appeared on Krakow's streets in 1981.

The eleventh edition of this excellent award gives us a great opportunity to reflect on the most important values. Today, new laureates will be awarded the Sérgio Vieira de Mello Prize. This can also be a moment when our attention is turned not only to those receiving it but also to those who often are no longer among us and who struggled for people's right to decent life. I am incredibly pleased that I can be with you again in Kraków and give also best regards from the Marshal of Małopolska Region.

Stanisław Dziedzic

Distinguished Ladies and Gentlemen, let me start a bit differently. This place was developed by Decius, an excellent politician living during the period when Poland, ruled by King Sigismund, was a really powerful state. This is a place where varieties of meetings and congresses took place. Everything that you could call “humanism” at the time was not empty word.

It is great that by initiating the Prize in 2003, Villa Decius reached back to those traditions of Humanism. By looking at the portrait of Princess Czartoryska, née Radziwiłł, a person known for her humanitarian attitude and artistic talents (and who was the owner of the place where we are gathered) it makes one remember that these traditions are beautifully cultivated today. It is a great pleasure to see that we do not want to be only a beautiful history but we also want to demonstrate that Poland is still a country where highest humanistic values are respected.

Opening ceremony

Anna-Carin Öst

It is an honour and privilege for me to be with you today to participate in the 11th Gala Award of the Polish Sérgio Vieira de Mello Prize granted in memory of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights.

Eleven years ago, the UN staff members were deliberately targeted and murdered in the attack on the UN Headquarters in Bagdad. It was a terrible attack that took the life of many remarkable people: true human right activists and aid workers. Driven by a selfless and restless passion, they devoted their lives to freeing others from misery and fear. Among them was Sérgio Vieira de Mello, a brilliant and thoughtful High Commissioner for Human Rights, and a former colleague of mine during his work for UNHCR. He was there to bring reconciliation to the country that was torn by violence and hatred.

Some referred to Sérgio as skilful diplomat, others identified him as superb intellectual, some others believed him to be a principle pragmatist. I would agree with all of these identifications but I would like to characterise him simply as an outstanding field worker. In some circles in UNHCR, “a field worker” stands for the highest tribute to a qualified colleague. They are the ones who work the closest to refugees, who care for real people under real dangers.

Throughout his brilliant and diverse career, Sérgio was always focused on people. He looked closely into the causes of their suffering and mobilised the response to meet their needs. This is the UNHCR mandate today – the protection of people. Sérgio dedicated his



Rüstem Ablätif and Atachan Abilov



Jorge Geraldo Kadri and Enrique ter Horst

Enrique ter Horst





Enrique
TER HORST

THE POWER OF THE
POWERLESS REVOLVED

INTERNATIONAL CONFERENCE
ON CLIMATE ACTION
2014

**SILA
POWER**

life to those who were in fateful situations: the refugees or those who were under foreign occupation. Throughout his career, Sergio remained the ultimate field worker who always stayed close to the people.

Ladies and Gentlemen, today we're here because still, time after time, we see similar acts of simple, unselfish courage by the UN and NGO staff and individuals. They deliberately choose to work in the situation of intense discomfort and danger, in places to which many others would simply not choose to go. They do this in order to mitigate oppression, repair disasters, to heal the scars of conflict and to promote peaceful co-existence. What motivates these humanitarian workers, are the universal values that underpin the work of the United Nations: justice, freedom, human rights, safety, integrity and the embracement of human diversity. They seek to improve human conditions in order to provide all people with lives in freedom, equality and dignity. Their work is impartial, performed on a sole basis of the need, without regard to ethnic divisions or other forms of discrimination. Today, as we honour Sérgio, we reaffirm our own commitment to pursue his ideals by continuing to protect and promote human rights of all people, no matter where they are.

HE Jorge Geraldo Kadri

Excellency Ambassador of Sweden, Excellency Minister of the President, distinguished guests. Brazil is proud to be a supporter of the Polish Sérgio Vieira de Mello Prize. We recognise the actions of people and institutions in favour of co-existence and cooperation inside societies, religions and cultures.

It is an honour to be invited every year by Villa Decius to take part in this enterprise along with the representatives of Polish government, UNHCR, the Embassy of Sweden, the Consulate of the United States of America, the authorities of Kraków and the Prize sponsors.

The Prize this year once more stresses to broad perspective and the scope recognising people and institutions from different parts of the world, different origins and different ways to fight for human rights. As you know, free speech, tolerance towards ethnic minorities, geopolitical developments in Eastern Europe were the main themes contemplated by the jury this year. In other circumstances, subjects as distinct as religions, tolerance, women's rights, migrants and refugees' support, humanitarian aid, etc. were also part of the list.

If Sérgio Vieira de Mello could be here today with us, he would certainly praised himself such diversity and inclusiveness. As a man who personified the best ideals and achievements represented by the United Nations, he knew that the most urgent problems not always are the ones showed every night in the main news channel or receive the appropriate attention from the governments. If a firm belief in the multilateral institutions as the pillar for a more peaceful and fair world is necessary so are the initiatives that can raise awareness and make our heads turn and look at the directions that otherwise we perhaps would have ignored completely. Not everyone we follow on idealistic field missions in complicated spots in Africa, the Balkans or South-East Asia like Sérgio Vieira de Mello did himself, however, the pass trodden by people like him and the ones usually recognised by this Prize can illuminate the realities of those places and hopefully help to turn all of us in part of a solution. Even if you play a small role.

I would like to congratulate Danuta Glondys, the Director of Villa Decius Association once again for organising this 11th Gala Awards of the Polish Sérgio Vieira de Mello Prize and of course I would like to congratulate the winners.

The Communiqué of the Panel of Judges

HE Staffan Herrström

On the 11th of September 2014, the eleventh meeting of the Panel of Judges of the Polish Prize of Sergio Vieira de Mello, United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights (2002–2003) took place at Villa Decius in Krakow, to award the Prize to a person and a nongovernmental organisation for their activities for the peaceful coexistence and cooperation of societies, religions, and cultures.

Attendees of the meeting included:

1. Giuliano Moreira Ventura – Third Secretary of the Embassy, Head of the Culture Section (representing Jorge Geraldo Kadri, Ambassador of the Federal Republic of Brazil to Poland)
2. Janusz Kahl – Honorary Consul of Sweden in Krakow (representing Staffan Herrström, Ambassador of the Kingdom of Sweden to Poland)
3. Mariusz Lewicki – Head of the Department for Human Rights and the Promotion of Democracy (representing Krystyna Żurek, Head of the Department of United Nations and Human Rights at the Ministry of Foreign Affairs)
4. Rafał Kostrzyński – Spokesperson for the Polish Representative Office of the UNHCR (representing Anna Carin-Öst, Representative of the UNHCR in Poland)
5. Ryszard Czerniawski – Deputy Human Rights Defender (representing Irena Lipowicz, Human Rights Defender)

6. Brian George – Consul for Press and Cultural Affairs, Consulate General of the United States in Krakow (representing Ellen Germain, Consul General of the United States in Krakow)
7. Jan Piekło – Director of the PAUCI Foundation
8. Urszula Podraza – Press Spokesperson for Krakow Airport (representing Jan Pamuła, President of Krakow Airport) – Funder
9. Jacek Weremczuk – Director of the Regional Branch of PZU in Krakow – Founder
10. Karolina Żesławska – Head of the Management Board and PR Office, ZUE S.A. – Founder
11. Sylwia Gajownik – The ZNAK Christian Culture Foundation
12. Danuta Glondys – Director of the Villa Decius Association

Due to important commitments, the following Panel members could not take part in the meeting: Tomasz Sendyka – Smart Practical Logic, Sp. z o.o., who gave up his vote to Danuta Glondys, Marek Lasota – Director of the Krakow Branch Office of the Institute of National Remembrance, who marked out his candidates for the Prize in writing, Irena Wóycicka – Undersecretary of State for social affairs at the Chancellery of the President of the Republic of Poland, and Bogusław Sonik – Chairman of the Board of the Villa Decius Association.

Having checked the validity of the submissions, Danuta Glondys, who presided over the meeting, stated that the “Person” category includes 30 nominees, and the “Non-Governmental Organisation” includes 15 nominated entities, including two organisations with double nominations.

Nominees in the “Person” category:

1. Adam Bartosz
2. Adam Bulandra

3. Ales Bialiatski
4. Andrea Riccardi
5. Anna Kaszubska
6. Anna Šabatová
7. Antonios Papanikolaou
8. Dariusz Paczkowski
9. David J. Kramer
10. Dorota Parzymies
11. Eitan Bronstein Aparicio
12. Eva Karadi
13. Ewa Wierzyńska
14. Irena Dawid-Olczyk
15. Yevhen Sverstiuk
16. Joanna Klimowicz and Jakub Medek
17. Joanna Talewicz-Kwiatkowska
18. Justyna Stepinska de Luca
19. Karel Schwarzenberg
20. Krystyna Starczewska
21. László Rajk
22. Leyla Yunus
23. Maayan Shellef
24. Maria Książak
25. Marianna Jara



Guests of the ceremony



Leszek Szafarczyk and Teodora Krumova



Jacek Weremczuk, Agnieszka Rudzińska and Atachan Abilov

26. Piotr Bystrianin
27. Semenova Kateryna
28. Stefan Batruch
29. Tomasz Pietrasiewicz
30. Witold Klaus

Having discussed the candidates and conducted a debate and a vote, the Panel of Judges decided that the Prize in the “Person” category will go to Leyla Yunus from Azerbaijan.

Nominations in the “Non-Governmental Organisation” category:

1. Albanian Human Rights Project
2. “Amalipe” Centre for Interethnic Dialogue and Tolerance
3. The ANKIZY GASY Children of Madagascar Foundation
4. The BORUSSIA MENDELSON HOUSE Foundation
5. Foundation for Somalia – nominated by: Paulina Adamczyk-Zielonka
6. Foundation for Somalia – nominated by: Abdulcadir Farah Gabeire
7. The HumanDoc Foundation
8. The Rule of Law Institute Foundation
9. The Foundation for Polish-German Cooperation
10. The Polish Red Cross
11. The Serbian Democratic Forum
12. The “Terra” Social Cooperative
13. The Association for Legal Intervention – nominated by: Anna Piłat

14. The Association for Legal Intervention – nominated by: Iwona Nowacka
15. The Arab Countries Culture and Tourism Association

Having discussed the candidates and conducted a debate and a vote, the Panel of Judges decided that the Prize in the “Non-Governmental Organisation” category will go to the “Amalipe” Centre for Interethnic Dialogue and Tolerance from Bulgaria.

Signed by Bogusław Sonik, President of the Chapter of the Prize of Sergio Vieira de Mello and
Members of the Panel of Judges:

Irena Wóycicka – Secretary of State, Chancellery of the President of the Republic of Poland

Jorge Geraldo Kardi – Ambassador of Brazil to Poland

Staffan Herrström – Ambassador of Sweden to Poland

Anna-Carin Öst – Representative of the UNHCR in Poland

Krystyna Żurek – Head of the Department of United Nations and Human Rights at the Ministry
of Foreign Affairs

Irena Lipowicz – Human Rights Defender

Łukasz Kamiński – President of the Institute of National Remembrance

Ellen Germain – Consul General, Consulate General of the United States in Krakow

Jan Pamuła – President of Krakow Airport

Wiesław Nowak – President of ZUE S.A.

Jacek Weremczuk – Director of the Regional Branch of PZU in Krakow

Tomasz Sendyka – President of Smart Practical Logic Sp. z o.o.

Jan Piekło – Director of the PAUCI Foundation

Sylwia Gajownik – The ZNAK Christian Culture Foundation

Bogusław Sonik – Chairman of the Villa Decius Association

Danuta Glondys – Director of the Villa Decius Association

The justification of the verdict in the category: Person

HE Enrique ter Horst

The award of the Sergio de Mello prize for virtuous behaviour is usually an occasion for rejoicing by family and friends but in the case of Leyla Junus, in an Azerbaijani prison along with her husband Arif since the end of July, it is unfortunately a moment of sad reflection on the extent of injustice we still see around us in today's world. It is a moment when we acknowledge the courage of people like Leyla Junus who are ready to defend such ideals such as solidarity, justice, freedom and the rule of law. These values are defended by them in the face of dictators whose imagination fails to stretch beyond the simple expedient of locking their opponents into prison. Instead they should be engaging in a dialogue with their critics to attempt to improve the lot of society at large rather than to continue ruling in the interests of a narrow elite intent on retaining its privileged position.

Today Leyla languishes in prison but her friend Atachan Abilov who was forced to flee Azerbaijan himself, is here to accept the award. Both Leyla and her husband were arrested and now stand accused of state treason as well as fraud, tax evasion and conducting illegal business activities. They risk high prison sentences. The arrests came as other human rights defenders have also been imprisoned and sentenced in Azerbaijan in the wake of a rigged presidential election last autumn and before European Olympic Games which Baku is planning to stage next year. The

number of political prisoners in Azerbaijan is now around 100 including Anar Mammadli, an election monitor who dared last autumn to declare that the election had fallen far short of European standards and has been sentenced to 5.5 years in prison, Hasan Huseynli, a civil rights activist sentenced to 6 years in prison on entirely false charges of assault or Ilgar Mammadov, the head of the Baku School of Political Studies who was sentenced to 7 years in prison after criticizing the authorities in the wake of riots in Ismayilli, north west of Baku in January last year.

We know the number of political prisoners in Azerbaijan, whose officials claim that the country holds no political prisoners, thanks to the Institute for Peace and Democracy (IPD) which has been headed by Leyla Junus since 1995 and which put together and published the list of political prisoners last summer to the fury of the authorities.

This was in line with her work since the end of the 1980s for the independence and security of Azerbaijan and for the rule of law and release of political prisoners. A historian by profession Leyla Junus was one of the founders in 1988 of the “Popular Front of Azerbaijan in support of Perestroika”. In January 1990 she helped to found the Social Democratic Party and was vice minister of defence from 1992 to 1993 even as the war raged over Nagorno Karabakh, a district disputed by Azerbaijan and Armenia.

As the war ended she understood that bringing the two societies together was a priority if further bloodshed was to be avoided and the IPD became a vehicle for this examining peace and security issues in the South Caucasus. At the IPD she worked for the release of political prisoners and for the rule of law. She worked on joint projects with Armenians to secure a measure of reconciliation while developing public dialogues (www.publicdialogues.info) on the internet and face to face meetings. But other issues closer to home were never far from her mind. In 2009 she charged that senior interior ministry officials were involved in trafficking young girls which

led to an official campaign against her and she was saved from prison by international protests. In 2011 she came out against the illegal eviction of Baku residents to make way for high worth construction projects. The protest angered the authorities and she risked imprisonment while her office was literally demolished without notice as a gesture of official revenge.

As the Azeri government's campaign against NGOs and human rights defenders developed over the past twelve months the storm clouds began to gather over Leyla and her husband Arif. Earlier this year they were stopped from leaving the country and on 30 July both were detained. Leyla was accused of spying for Armenia. If she is convicted then the prison sentences which include treason could be heavy and the Azeri authorities show no signs of liberalizing their tough approach to independent civil society and the opposition. Recently four veteran Russian dissidents from Soviet times Lyudmila Alekseeva, Svetlana Gannushkina, Sergei Kovalyov and Oleg Orlov were moved to protest at Leyla Janus's fate and appealed to the European Parliament to award her the Sakharov prize. They said:

“As members of the last generation of dissidents in the Soviet Union and followers of Andrei Sakharov, we wish to support our colleagues in Azerbaijan who are unfortunately suffering for the brave stand they are taking to defend human rights in their country. By receiving the award, Leyla would also be a worthy successor to Memorial which was awarded the prize in 2009.”

They noted that Leyla Yunus has long worked for reconciliation, at times when few others dared:

“In recent times Akram Ailisli has been persecuted by the Azerbaijani authorities for publishing his novel *Stone Dreams* in which he described the tragic events of January 1990 and life in his home town of Ailis, where Armenians and Azerbaijanis lived together peacefully. Leyla and Arif Yunus were amongst the very few who decided to speak out in defense of the writer. This Armenian-Azerbaijani peace-building work is now being described as state treason.”



Panel of Judges and Laureates



Bogdan Klich and Staffan Herrström



Anna-Carin Ost

It remains to congratulate the jury of the de Mello prize for recognizing Leyla Yunus's actions in support of peaceful coexistence and cooperation of societies, religions and cultures. We hope that she and her husband and other political prisoners will be freed forthwith. Azerbaijan needs such people as these prisoners to work in freedom for a peaceful and stable future rather than to suffer the waste of leaving them for years in prison.

Elaborated on behalf of the Panel of Judges of the Polish Prize of Sergio Vieira de Mello, UN High Commissioner for Human Rights (2002–2003) by Krzysztof Bobiński.

Danuta Glondys

Ladies and Gentlemen, only last Friday turned out that Leyla's daughter, Dinara Yunus, cannot join us because she did not receive her travel documents. But we were very lucky to bring here a family friend of Dinara and Leyla Yunus, a refugee and a human rights activist, Atakham Abilov. He will speak on behalf of Leyla Yunus.

Now I would like to ask Agnieszka Rudzińska, Deputy President of the Polish National Remembrance Institute and Jacek Weremczuk, Regional Director of PZU Group to come forward and present the Prize.

Atakham Abilov

First of all, on behalf of Leyla Yunus and her friends, I would like to express my gratitude to the Villa Decius Association and all present at this ceremony for the prize awarded to Miss Leyla in

honour of the famous human rights defender and former UN High Commissioner for Human Rights, Sérgio Vieira de Mello.

In some respect, receiving this award on behalf of Leyla Yunus is an honour for me. At the same time, being a citizen of Azerbaijan, I'm feeling again all the bitterness of the current state of affairs related to human rights and lack of self-conscious society in my country.

Being a young person, Leyla Yunus has begun her fight for human rights and her struggle against the former Soviet Empire. Along with her husband Arif Yunus, she is among those who gave the grounding for the independent Azerbaijani state on the ruins of the horrible Empire. They could not have fancied that in such a short period of time the elements of the Empire would seize the power and govern their country using the methods which would surpass those of the Soviet Union in their cruelty and mercilessness.

Today Leyla and Arif are imprisoned by evil forces. Leyla is daily subjected to unbelievable tortures both from her recidivist cellmates and the prison personnel. She is tortured, beaten, pulled by the hair, and thrown to the floor. We are greatly concerned that Leyla and Arif may share the same grievous fate of Novrusali Mamedov, who was brutally murdered in torture chambers of Baku prison.

Leyla and like-minded people managed to defeat the Soviet Empire. However, today we are powerless and unprotected against Aliev's authoritarian regime. Do you know why? The whole world, its progressive part in particular, used to fight alongside Leyla Yunus against the Communist regime. However, nowadays those people have bartered human rights and democratic values for gas, oil and black caviar.

On my way here I was wondering what Leyla Yunus would say if she could receive this award personally. While trying to understand this, I recalled the course of Leyla's life once again and

I concluded that she would come here with the banners of the political prisoners. Today, the total number of political prisoners in Azerbaijan approximately amounts to 100 (one hundred) people!

I ask the organizers of today's event to show the pictures of the political prisoners on the screen.

They are people of different backgrounds: an educator and lawyer Intigam Aliyev, an election expert Anar Mamedli; journalists Tofik Yagublu, Hilal Mamedov, Avaz Zeynally and Piarviz Gashimli; promising and competent politicians – Yadigar Sadykhov and Ilgar Mamedov; an attorney Gurban Mamedov; young bloggers Abdul Abilov and Ilkin Rustamzade; young members of the N!DA movement who have graduated from the leading European universities. It is impossible to name all of them in this speech...

To sum up, I would like to address you all and ask you not to consider your mission accomplished with the award presented to Leyla. I strongly urge you to go the extra mile and pursue your active participation in doing everything possible for the sake of not only Leyla and Arif, but other political prisoners in Azerbaijan as well.

The justification of the verdict in the category: Nongovernmental Organisation

Mariusz Lewicki

Laudation in honor of the Center for Interethnic Dialogue and Tolerance “AMALIPE”: Laureate of the 11 edition of the Polish Prize of Sérgio Vieira de Mello, the UN High Commissioner for Human Rights (2002–2003)

Madam Director, Distinguished Laureates, Ladies and Gentlemen,

On behalf of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of Poland, please allow me to thank Villa Decius for organizing the 11th edition of the Polish Prize of Sérgio Vieira de Mello. This year, this Prize – in the category of nongovernmental organisations – is awarded to AMALIPE Center for Interethnic Dialogue and Tolerance from Bulgaria.

The AMALIPE Center for Interethnic Dialogue and Tolerance has been chosen as this year’s Laureate of the Polish Prize of Sérgio Vieira de Mello in recognition of the work the organization has been carrying out promoting equal integration of the Roma communities in Bulgaria, thus setting good example for Roma organisations in the whole Europe.

Amalipe strives both to preserve the Roma identity and to modernise the Roma communities, empowering them to access opportunities offered to all people. By developing civic leadership and strengthening self-organization, Amalipe helps overcoming social exclusion and marginalization of the Roma communities. An increased participation of Roma in policy-making thanks

to advocacy skills developed by Roma organizations translates into better public awareness, better policies, and eventually better access to education, employment, social services or health care.

Support project run by Amalipe are benefiting largely from the support of the EU and the Bulgarian government funds. They are carried out in cooperation with grass-root Roma organizations. Some of them involve a network of schools, attracting communities round school and education, and tackling difficult issues such as high dropout rate of students or early/forced marriage. Amalipe provides also assistance and help through the Roma Community Support Centers (6) established in different regions of the country.

Amalipe has succeeded in advocating for Roma social and economic integration before national and international institutions, and in particular the EU. The process of Roma inclusion has become not only internal policy matter but a part of the entire European cohesion policy.

This decade has been (2005–2015) called the Roma inclusion decade by several European countries with substantial Roma community, who work together with international organisations and NGOs with a view of bettering Roma social inclusion and act against poverty and discrimination. Therefore we are glad to present this award to Roma advocacy organization.

Thanks to the vision and hard work of Amalipe, a disadvantaged ethnic minority is becoming a part of the European social tissue, a piece of the European cultural puzzle, forming unity out of diversity.

Amalipe's dedication to promote and protect Roma's equal right, diversity as well as dignity have visible effects on lives of many people in Europe.

Madam Director, I wish you and the whole organization of Amalipe further success and hope that the Polish Prize of Sérgio Vieira de Mello will serve as valuable support and acknowledgment of your work for the community of Roma people in Bulgaria and Europe.

Danuta Glondys

Now I would like to ask Anna Mroczek from ZUE and Leszek Szafarczyk, who is here on behalf of the Kraków Airport, to award the Prize to Teodora Krumova representing The AMALIPE Center for Interethnic Dialogue and Tolerance.

Teodora Krumova

I want to thank Villa Decius for organising this initiative and to express my gratitude to the Jury for appreciating our efforts. I want to thank you all not only on behalf of our organisation but also on behalf of our whole community.

As we spoke during the conference today, there are three things that turn the powerless into the powerful. The first thing is the sense of solidarity that gives one the strength to keep going and to overcome various difficulties. The second thing is the vision of a better world in which one can achieve whatever one dreams of; a world, where one can communicate freely and where human rights are respected. But it is the third thing that appears most important: it is the belief and dedication to this vision of a better future.

Many people, especially the young ones, simply do not believe they can change anything about themselves. Our major mission is to try to make people believe that if they really are passionate about certain ideas, nothing can stop them. Inspired by today's conference, I must say I am a lucky person because I had a chance to live in two worlds: first, in the world before '89, and later in the world after '89. That is why I have a chance to appreciate what we have now. I have the motivation

to keep striving for what we still have to improve. So, now, the Prize makes our responsibility for bettering the future even bigger.

There is a new generation coming. As we spoke today in the discussion, this generation consists of very active, talented, smart young people and our responsibility and challenge is to pass to them our devotion and our mission. Some of those young people will not understand what are we speaking about because they have never lived in the world deprived of freedom of speech and expression. The other portion of this young generation does not believe that any change is possible. Therefore, our responsibility is to bring these two groups of young people together and make them cooperate. I do believe that young people are really the future. I just want to give you an example, a very short story. Three years ago in Bulgaria there was an ethnic conflict. The tension evolved around the Roma people. There were marches on the streets against the Roma neighbourhoods. The children from those neighbourhoods were beaten at schools. Unfortunately, when we confronted ourselves with the people who participated and formed those marches – it turned out that most of them were young people. They were between sixteen and twenty years old. That was frightening for us. Then we started to consider what's going on. After many discussions with those young people we finally understood that they just did not know anything about the world. They were active, they wanted to do something, they wanted to be visible and the marches were the only field where they found a space to express themselves. Today, some of them are our most devoted activists fighting for the rights of the Roma and participating in tolerance campaigns.

This was an important lesson for us: we realised that we needed to find the right message and communicate it using the language that is comprehensible to the youth; we need to seduce them and make sure that they also support similar goals and missions. I do believe it is possible and this Prize motivates us even more. It is a great honour for us.



Magda Vášáryová and Taras Voznyak



Michal Vasecka and Charles F. Doran

Bogdan Klich

Dear Bogusław Sonik, dear Danuta Glondys, our hosts, dear guests, it is a great pleasure for me to attend this ceremony in such an environment and with the presence of such distinguished guests. This is the year that we celebrate the 25th anniversary of the beginning of democracy and freedom in Poland. Throughout those years, we managed to make an extra-ordinary progress in the sphere of security and economic prosperity. We keep in mind that the year 1989 was incredibly significant for the countries of the Central and Eastern Europe. But we also remember that for some of our neighbours in Eastern Europe, that year was just the beginning of the period that had been completed only several years ago. It seems that Schumpeter and Huntington were right in what they wrote about the waves of democracy: those waves of democracy and human rights do appear but not necessarily withstand forever. Poland was lucky to take advantage of the circumstances following the transition of '89. For us, just like for other countries of Central Europe, one of the most important legacies is to remember about those under threats.

Today, we stand in solidarity with our friends from Azerbaijan, Russia, Kazakhstan and other parts of the former Soviet Union. We still keep in mind the results of the Arab Spring that also rose our hopes for implementing human rights and political freedoms in that part of the world. We also bear in mind what happened in North Africa and the Middle East afterwards.

Being together with those who fight for democracy and human rights, let me express the gratitude on behalf of Polish Senate for those remembering freedom fighters.

Experts

Rüstem Ablâtif

Lawyer and expert on ethnic policy. He received the Bachelor in Law and the Master in Public Administration. He served with the government of Ukraine and the Office of the President of Ukraine. Former Fellow of the Kennan Institute, the Woodrow Wilson International Center for Scholar and Visiting Fellow of the Carleton University, Ottawa. Carleton University, Ottawa. Scholar and Visiting Fellow of the Carleton University, Ottawa.

Samuel Abrahám

Studied Political Science and Political Philosophy at the University of Toronto and the Carleton University in Canada and received doctorate from the Carleton University. Since 1996 publisher and editor-in-chief of “Kritika & Kontext”. Representative of the Project on Ethnic Relations in Slovakia at Princeton University (1996–2001). He teaches political science at the Comenius University. Author of “An Attempt to Analyze Slovak Society” (2002), and regular contributor to Slovak and English magazines. Member of Advisory Board of Eurozine. Director of the Bratislava Institute of Humanism. Since 2006 President and teacher of the Bratislava International School of Liberal Education.

Kareem Amer

Egyptian cyber-dissident, human rights activist. The first blogger in the Arabic world sentenced to four years of imprisonment for the content of his writing. In 2007 awarded with the Reporters

without Borders Prize. In 2012 received a scholarship from the City of Krakow as a writer-resident of the International Cities of Refuge Network.

Lavon Barshcheuski

Belarusian member of opposition, with anti-Communist and pro-independence origins. Ph.D in philology; academic teacher, translator, writer, poet and politician. Member of the Belarusian Parliament (1990–1995) and Chairman of the BPF Party (until 2009). From 1991 deputy director of the Lyceum of Humanities (since 2003 an underground school). Arrested many times for his activities against the regime of Alexander Lukashenka. Former chair of the Belarusian PEN Club. Translates from Latin, Ancient Greek, German, English, French, Polish, Czech and other languages.

Krzysztof Bobiński

Graduated in history at the Universities of Oxford and London. For many years he has worked as the Warsaw correspondent of the “Financial Times”, cooperated with, among others, the BBC and the “Washington Post”. Since 1998 he has focused on European affairs. Co-founder and publisher of the Polish “Unia&Polska” magazine. Currently president of the Unia&Polska Foundation and board member of PAUCI, the Polish – Ukrainian Cooperation Foundation. Co-chair of the Steering Committee of the Civil Society Forum of the Eastern Partnership.

Charles F. Doran

Co-director of the SAIS Global Politics and Religion Initiative. Former professor and director of international management program at Rice University. Directed major research projects on North

American trade, Canadian-U.S. relations, Persian Gulf security and U.S.-German-Japanese relations. He is a regular adviser to business and government and has provided congressional briefings and testimony on trade, security, and energy policy. He received his Ph.D. in political science from the Johns Hopkins University.

Wolfgang Eichwede

A prominent historian. Founder and the Director of the Research Center for Eastern Europe at the University of Bremen and Chair of Contemporary History and Eastern European Politics of the University of Bremen. He is also Vice-President of the German Association for East European Studies. His research focuses on the Soviet and Russian social and cultural history.

Sylwia Gajownik

Secretary of the Board of ZNAK Foundation. Initiator and manager of numerous initiatives dedicated to human rights and tolerance. Member of the Jury of the Polish Prize of Sérgio Vieira de Mello, the UN High Commissioner for Human Rights (2002–2003).

Ellen Germain

Consul General of the United States of America in Krakow. From 2008–2011 she was Deputy Political Counsellor at the U.S. Mission to the United Nations in New York, where she was responsible for issues relating to the Middle East and Asia, and to non-proliferation of weapons. From 2007–2008 she served as Deputy Political Counsellor at the U.S. Embassy in Baghdad.

Danuta Glondys

Director of the Villa Decius Association and university teacher. Ph.D. in Cultural Studies, English philologist and political scientist. Previously director of the Culture Department of the Municipality of Krakow (1993–1999) and European Commission expert for selections of the European Capitals of Culture (2006–2011). Member of Advisory Board of the Genshagen Foundation (Germany).

HE Staffan Herrström

Ambassador of the Kingdom of Sweden to Poland. Former political advisor to Deputy Prime Minister Ola Ullstein. Former Ambassador of the Kingdom of Sweden to Vietnam and Tanzania.

Enrique ter Horst

Lawyer and political analyst. Former United Nations Deputy High Commissioner for Human Rights. Currently a Member of Forum 2000 Foundation Program Council, established by Vaclav Havel. Previously the UN Secretary-General's Special Representative for Haiti (1996–1997) and Special Representative of the Secretary-General for El Salvador and Chief of the UN Observer Mission in El Salvador. Former Ambassador in the foreign service of Venezuela since 1986 serving as a Deputy Permanent Representative of Venezuela to the UN and as a Representative to the Commission on Human Rights.

Ziemowit Józwik

Holds a diploma in the Ukrainian studies and post-graduate studies for specialised translators of the Ukrainian language. Currently studying law at the Jagiellonian University. Visegrad Summer School alumnus.

HE Jorge Geraldo Kadri

Ambassador of Federative Republic of Brazil to Poland. He started his diplomatic career in Rio Branco Institute in 1983. He worked in Brazilian embassies in: Australia, France, Spain, Switzerland, Paraguay, and Guinea-Bissau.

Marcin Kędzierski

Research assistant in the Department of European Studies at Cracow University of Economics. Head of the Jagiellonian Club. Awarded with internships at the European Parliament, Polish Ministry of Foreign Affairs and the Polish Embassy in Germany. Editor-in-chief of “Visegrad Plus – Forum for Visegrad+ Studies”.

Bogdan Klich

Graduate of medicine and history of art. Polish politician, in the past active member of democratic opposition students’ movements. Member of the European Parliament (2004–07) and Member of the Polish Parliament (2001–04). Former Minister of National Defence of Poland (2007–11). Since 2011 he serves as a Senator in the Polish Parliament.

HE Jan Lityński

Former democratic dissident, participant of students’ manifestations in March 1968, for which he was sentenced to two and a half years in prison. Editor of “Information Bulletin”, the first uncensored Polish magazine and “The Worker”. Member of Committee for Social Self-Defence of the Workers’ Defence Committee (KOR) and of the Solidarity. Between 1989–2001 Member of the Polish Parliament. Now advisor to the President of Poland Bronisław Komorowski on issues relating to political parties and political environments.



Round Table



Kareem Amer and Michal Vasecka



Taras Voznyak and Danuta Glondys

Wiesław Nowak

President of the Board and the founder of ZUE S.A. – one of the leading European companies in the public transport infrastructure construction industry. A graduate of the Faculty of Electrical Engineering, Automatics and Electronics of the University of Science and Technology in Kraków. His professional career commenced in 1982 in the Municipal Transport Company in Kraków. In 1986–1990 he was a coordinator of computerisation and communication at Housing Enterprise in Krakow. In 1991 he established ZUE and developed its activities and has implemented most complex and prestigious transport infrastructure projects in Poland and abroad.

Anna-Carin Öst

United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees (UNHCR) Representative in Poland. Studied Public International Law and then European Law at the Abo Academi University in Finland. Served as Repatriation and Resettlement Officer in UNHCR offices in Turkey, Yugoslavia, Pakistan, Switzerland, Thailand and Syria.

Jan Pamuła

Chairman of the Board of Krakow Airport. Holds Ph.D. degree from Economics. His professional experience includes management of companies from financial, real estate and transport sectors. Former vice-president of Bank Przemysłowo-Handlowy, chairman of Chamber of Trade in Krakow and Foundation for Restoration of Monuments of Krakow. Lecturer at the University of Economics in Krakow.

Jan Piekło

Director of Polish-American-Ukrainian Cooperation Initiative (PAUCI). Previously program director for ZNAK Foundation, journalist and the editor of “Tygodnik Powszechny”. Co-operates with the European Journalism Centre, Rutgers University of New Jersey and MU Columbia School of Journalism. Laureate of the Polish Journalists Association Award. Cofounder of the Polish Prize of Sergio Vieira de Mello.

Wojciech Przybylski

Historian of ideas, graduate of the University of Warsaw and the European College of Liberal Arts in Berlin. Editor-in-chief of “Res Publica Nowa” and “Visegrad Insight”. A research assistant at the Erasmus Chair at the Warsaw University. Recipient of scholarships from the Institute of Human Sciences in Vienna, the Minister of Science in Poland and the Goldman Sachs Global Leader. Author of numerous articles on society, culture and public policy.

László Rajk

Former Hungarian dissident. Architect and designer, doctor of Liberal Arts. One of the founders of the Network of Free Initiatives and the Alliance of Free Democrats. Between 1990–1996 a Member of the Committee on Foreign Affairs and the Committee on Culture of the Hungarian Parliament. Professor of Film Architecture at the Hungarian Film Academy. Former advisor to Hungarian UNESCO Committee and to the European Union.

Adam Reichardt

Editor-in-chief of “New Eastern Europe”. He spent eight years on studies of implementation of public policy in Washington DC. Holds MA in Public Administration and BA in Political Science and International Relations. Nominated for the 2012 European Press Prize in the category of “Editor” for his work in New Eastern Europe.

Agnieszka Rudzińska

Deputy President of the Polish Institute of National Remembrance. Former director of Public Education Office of the Institute of National Remembrance.

Tomasz Sendyka

International expert in restructuring and enterprise management. He holds a Ph.D. in Materials Science and Engineering from the University of Pennsylvania in Philadelphia and a Master’s Degree in Theoretical Physics from the Jagiellonian University in Krakow. He is a member of the Jury of the Polish Prize of Sérgio Vieira de Mello, the UN High Commissioner for Human Rights (2002–2003).

Bogusław Sonik

Active member of democratic opposition students’ movements. Chairman of May’77 Association and President of the Board of the Villa Decius Association. Member of the European Parliament in the period 2004–2014. Former director of the Polish Institute in Paris and minister plenipotentiary at the Embassy of the Republic of Poland in France (1990–1996). Director of Kraków 2000 – European City of Culture Festival (1996–2002) and later of the Department of Promotion of City of Krakow.

Magda Vášáryová

Outstanding actress and politician. Between 1990–1993 Ambassador of Czechoslovakia to Austria (nominated by Vaclav Havel). Former State Secretary in the Ministry of Foreign Affairs and Ambassador of Slovakia to Poland. In the years 1993–2000 the Director and the Chairman of the Board of Slovak Society of Foreign Policy. Currently Member of Parliament of the Slovak Republic and lecturer at the Comenius University in Bratislava. In 2010 awarded with a Polish Gold Medal for Merits for Culture ‘Gloria Artis’.

Michal Vašečka

Holds a PhD degree in sociology from the Masaryk University in Brno. Founding member of the Civic Institute in Bratislava and the Civic-Democratic Youth. Former researcher at the InfoRoma Foundation and advisor for the UNHCR in Bratislava. Since 1999 researcher at the Institute of Public Affairs and since 2000 its Program Director. He works on expert analyses of the Slovak transformation process focusing on national minorities and the state of civil society in Slovakia. Since 2000 the World Bank consultant. Since 2002 Assistant Professor at the Faculty of Social Studies of the Masaryk University. Author and co-author of numerous studies and research reports dealing with ethnic minority issues, media discourse and problems of civil society.

Taras Voznyak

Ukrainian culture expert, political scientist, editor-in-chief and founder of independent cultural journal “Ľ”. After Gorbachev’s thaw he became an activist of democratic movement and co-organised the first general strike in Ukraine at Lviv Factory of Milling Machines. He is the initiator and organiser of community campaigns on the promotion of heritage of Halychyna and of an

honorary distinction “Order for Intellectual Bravery”. Author of ca. 400 publications in Ukrainian and foreign media. Awarded with i.a. a distinction “20 Years of the First Democratic Convocation of Lviv Regional Council” and “Saint George Distinction of Honour” by Mayor of Lviv.

Marcel Wandas

Journalist and news reporter for Radio Krakow, the leading local broadcaster in a city and the region. Graduate of Marie Curie-Skłodowska University in Lublin and a student of Jagiellonian University in Krakow. Interested in new technologies, NGO sector and public participation in politics.

Jacek Weremczuk

Director of Regional Office in Krakow of PZU Group – the leading company on the insurance market and one of the largest financial institutions in Poland and top insurance groups in Central and Eastern Europe.

Krystyna Żurek

Director of Department of the United Nations and Human Rights of the Polish Ministry of Foreign Affairs. Worked at the Permanent Representation of Poland to UNESCO in Paris (Department of International Organizations), and at the Permanent Mission of Poland to the UN Office in Geneva.

About the Villa Decius Association

The Villa Decius Association was founded in 1995 by well-known representatives of the world of science, economy and culture. Within several years it has established itself as a cultural institution of international outreach and a platform of cultural dialogue linking nations and uniting Europe.

Members of the Association include artists, researchers and academics as well as animators of cultural and educational events. The Board of Association is chaired by the former Rector of the Jagiellonian University, Professor Aleksander Koj and the Association's activities are supervised by Director Danuta Glondys, Ph.D.

Villa Decius' interdisciplinary programmes are addressed to representatives of scientific, artistic and political milieus, and also to managers and entrepreneurs working in multicultural communities. In its programmes Villa Decius gives important place to global and civilization issues, European integration, protection of cultural heritage, promotion of ethnic and national minorities and human rights.

Villa Decius hosts meetings and debates of outstanding guests, scientists, artists and representatives of the political elites. Thus the ideas of Renaissance which accompanied its beginnings are enriched with new contemporary dimension and perfectly match the character and tradition of the place.

The Polish Prize of Sergio Vieira de Mello The United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights (2002-2003)

Following the initiative of the Villa Decius Association, the Sergio Vieira de Mello Prize was established in the year 2003 with an aim to promote democracy and tolerance, and to pay tribute to Sergio Vieira de Mello, UN High Commissioner for Human Rights.

The Prize is awarded to a Person and an Organization for their merits for peaceful coexistence and cooperation of communities, religions and cultures.

The Prize is awarded to Individuals and Organizations from Poland and abroad.

The Prize is awarded by the Panel of Judges composed of the High Representatives of: the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees, the President of the Republic of Poland, HE Ambassador of the Federative Republic of Brazil, HE Ambassador of the Kingdom of Sweden, Polish Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Polish Commissioner for Civil Rights Protection, Consul General of the United States of America to Krakow, the Polish Institute of National Remembrance, foundations cooperating with the Villa Decius Association in matters related to human rights as well as Sponsors of the Prize and the Chairman and the Director of the Villa Decius Association.

The Laureates are given a Statuette of Sergio designed and made by Andrzej Renes and a Personal Diploma. The Prize may also have a financial dimension.

2004

Tadeusz Mazowiecki
“One World” Association

2005

Father Marian Żelazek, SVD (1918-2006)
“Krzyżowa” Foundation for Mutual Understanding in Europe

2006

Aleksandr Milinkevich
Jewish Culture Festival

2007

Maryna Hulia
Magurycz Association

2008

Krystyna Pryjomko-Serafin;
The Helsinki Foundation for Human Rights;
Shevah Weiss - Honorary Prize;
Michał Żejmis - Special Distinction

2009

Fatos Lubonja;
The United Nations Assistance Mission
for Iraq (UNAMI);
Leopold Unger (1922-2011) - Honorary Prize

2010

Nagy El-Khoury and Mohammad al-Nokkari;
The Memorial Association;
Andrzej Przewoźnik (1963-2010) - Honorary Prize

2011

Hassan Omar Hassan;
Halina Nieć Legal Aid Centre;
Bernard Kouchner - Honorary Prize

2012

Sister Rafaela - Urszula Nałęcz;
People in need (Človek v tistni);
Arnold Wellman - Honorary Award

2013

Denis Hurley’s Centre;
Myroslav Marynovych;
Adam Daniel Rotfeld

2014

Leyla Junus;
AMALIPE Center for Interethnic
Dialogue and Tolerance

organiser



cooperation



founders



Project cofinanced by the Department of Public and Cultural Diplomacy of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs as part of the Call for Proposals “Cooperation in public diplomacy 2014”



Project cofinanced by the Malopolska Region

sponsors





WER
POV