

Nassrine AZIMI, Director, Hiroshima Office for Asia and the Pacific, United Nations Institute for Training and Research

Global Citizenship: Our Inner and Outer Spheres for Action?

Allow me first to give thanks to the University and to all of you, for being here. A number of circumstances almost made my presence today impossible so I feel particularly glad to have made it after all. If even one of you leaves this room thinking more passionately of how to change the world then I think it would have been well worth it. I am very pleased you can be here in Hiroshima. These are important times and this is an important place - so yours is not just any summer seminar. You find yourself here this week in Hiroshima and it well has the potential to change your lives. Hiroshima has been my home for the last five years and I am very amazed by what Hiroshima has done. I think you all listened to the wonderful talk by my friend and former colleague, Jayantha Dhanapala, yesterday on nuclear issues. I will not add further, other than reminding you that Hiroshima has dealt with the tragedy by keeping three philosophies constantly present in its reconstruction: first, to forgive but not to forget. You will not hear of any hatred for the Americans who dropped the bomb. Hatred for the bomb itself yes, but it's not directed towards Americans - so Hiroshima has decided to forgive, but not forget. Second, the philosophy of 'Never Again' - never again to nuclear weapons. This small city not only revived, but it also revived the anti-nuclear movement, this is really no small achievement. Third, becoming a city of peace. This didn't happen overnight, becoming a city of peace. Some of you may not know, but Hiroshima was a military city before the war. So not only it was devastated, but it also lost its identity after Japan's defeat. And what did it do? The history is very interesting. Hiroshima transformed its psychology, its identity from a city dedicated to military to a city dedicated to peace. Today if you sit in Bolivia or Fiji or Switzerland or Australia, you think of Hiroshima, you think of peace. This is a remarkable transformation. So it's not just the reconstruction of the city, but what it did to survive and become a city of peace. So Hiroshima has a very special place in my heart because of what it managed to do, and continues to do, after its devastation.

Last year we dealt, in this forum, with the topic of global climate change. I must confess that it was easier. I have tried to think what is the meaning of the nature of global citizenship. Global citizenship sometimes is depicted as each of us jet-setting from here to there, Hong Kong to Dubai, to Brasilia, to New York - being everywhere and nowhere; attached to everything and nothing. Having an identity that is so diluted, so much so you don't know what is the global citizen, leaves one doubtful. So I would like in the next 40 minutes or so to think not as a global citizen with just some rights but as a global citizen with responsibilities. The problem today is that today we still do not pay global taxes, we don't vote globally, we don't elect our officials globally. We enjoy the rights of the global citizen anywhere but then should we not also have to exercise responsibilities globally? Yes we are not given tools to exercise our responsibilities globally. It is changing. International law is changing, shifting. There may be deeper reflection as to what is meant by global citizen.

I have spent most of my career with the United Nations. So I feel affinity with the idea of an 'international citizen', but I also feel this affinity personally. Born in Iran, a Muslim, I was educated in Jewish and Christian schools all over the Middle East. My country of adoption is Switzerland. My home is Japan. My family is American. My deepest spiritual moments are in Buddhist and Shinto temples. I cannot reject any single one of those identities. It is a lifelong quest to ask myself what is my real identity. And is there such a thing? And therefore, coming from this background, what are my responsibilities? And I think, to some extent, increasingly we ask ourselves these questions if we aspire to being 'global'. Who are we? Why are we here? And what are we going to realize? I think that's the question behind the title of this morning.

I have tried to highlight in the chart here some of the issues that maybe in the last 12 months may have occupied each of you, as global citizens, as international students interested in global affairs, as conscientious humans, or merely as people with some curiosity. This is of course not exhaustive but it roughly outlines some of the big issues of our times. Iraq-Afghanistan wars were pervasive on the global agenda, I am sure some of your professors may have commented on it. I think what Iraq really signifies -- and I'm not going to go into details here - but what it signifies is the folly, is the folly of doing business as usual. Hiroshima is an embodiment of the principle that we simply cannot repeat the mistakes of the past. Today with 27,000 nuclear warheads, if we repeat the mistakes of Hiroshima and Nagasaki, well we are all gone. The stakes are so much higher than 63 years ago. And I think the Iraq War, too, in a way is an embodiment, a sign that if we continue business as before, these are some of the perils that await us. So if we decide war, embrace war, are upbeat about war, go into war without thought, take action for action's sake, well these are some of the consequences.

On the environment and climate change front, what can we conclude? Beyond all these endless talks, what have we actually done? So last year your fellow students were stunned because when I was standing here, after 20 years working in the UN, I have now come down to doing very small things. I carry my own chopsticks in my bag and I don't have a car. I recall very clearly the face of your predecessors last year; they looked at me -- what kind of UN official are you without a car? they seemed to ask! And I told them, you know I can afford two cars, it's a choice. I live in a civilized country like Japan where there is a lot of public transport and I can manage very well without a car. It's my small action. I'm not saying that all of you should go back and force your parents to sell their cars. I'm just saying that we must snap out of this dependency that is constantly created where, for example, my family today living in southern California, they cannot survive if they don't have a car because there is no other alternatives, no real, reliable public transport, trains or buses. It's a question of what are the choices you are given not as consumers but as residents of the planet. And you can start from the small things. For me it was an act of defiance to say "no" in some way. So I don't buy a car, I ride a bicycle. That gives me some small sense of satisfaction on daily basis. I think you can start where you can and then you build up.

Recently there have been some wonderful developments, in May in Dublin. Groups like yours came together and shamed the governments into adopting an international ban on "cluster bombs" Cluster bombs are some of the filthiest bombs ever.

They are absolutely inefficient. They were designed for the wars of 50 years ago. They tend to explode mid-air. Most of the times they tend to not explode, but fall on the ground where they await a child or a farmer; they mutilate, they maim needlessly. They are stupid and it's a business, an on-going business. In May, groups like yours came together and banned it. There are still some shameless governments that are not part of it, but it's a movement; it's started. It is the same kinds of movements that led to the adoption of a ban on land mines. These are signs of the times that people can make a difference. It's not enough. It's not enough because governments still run the show. But these are good signs and you must build on these achievements.

There have been other positive developments: the International Criminal Court for example. I think you will grow up to remember that the existence of the International Criminal Court is one of the most revolutionary developments of our times. It was unthinkable even 20 years ago that one day heads of governments will be held accountable - when before no president or chief military staff could be held unaccountable. Even today they can commit genocide; they can commit crimes and not be held responsible. The ICC is not efficient, it's not really working yet. It may take 20 years, 30 years until it's running like the criminal court, but the concept is revolutionary. When I started my career, when I was at school like you, it was something you would never think, that a court would hold heads of state accountable?

The other global issue of our times is what we can term the cultural war. As a Muslim brought up in Jewish and Christian schools and going to Buddhist temples, I'm in trouble because of what is happening around the world. We need to restore the sanctity of the many religious traditions and belief systems we have in the world. It is a very dirty and dangerous game, to drag religion into politics. There are cultural sensitivities that one must understand. It requires attention. It's one of the big problems that you will confront in your lifetime.

I've put on the list the end of cheap food, and the topic of food crisis. There is something that will come to all of us. At the outset let me say that as a vegetarian I do believe that if the whole world would eat like one billion Indians and me, probably we would not have a food crisis. We have continued to improve food productivity ceaselessly over the last few decades. We have an abundance of food. The problem is that we cannot have the Chinese and Indians eat like Americans or Australians eat. That is the difference that we have to address. We cannot afford so much energy-consuming beefsteak! So it's not a food crisis. It's the kind of foods and life cycles that you will get.

In June of last year Stephen Hawking gave a talk at Hong Kong Institute of Technology. Basically this is what has said. Friends, it's better to start wrapping up as our planet as we know it, cannot survive the next coming years. We will self-destruct whether it is through nuclear or some great disaster, natural or man-made, or through epidemics like AIDS or Bird Flu or other catastrophes like the extinction of nature. He recommended that human beings should start exploring other planets like Mars and the Moon to set up residence. Ever since that time I've really been obsessed because I have looked at the Earth with different eyes and I think it is much more beautiful than Mars.

And the question is can we get our act together to stay in our own home firstly rather than pack up our bags and then to move elsewhere? Hawking is pessimistic, but I think there is still place for hope.

I'm sorry for the quality of this slide. You may not be able to read it. I will quickly comment on it for you. It came out that same June, 2006 and I have not found any one page article that so well reflects some of the problems related to nature that Hawking underlines. Let me just comment on it for you.

Here is an article about Polar bears. It's on climate change. A film made by a French film maker. This other article is a mythology about Earthsea by Ursula Le Guin. I think in Japanese it's called "Gedo Senki." It's a mythology about the place of nature, of how little we know it and the importance of being able to put names to nature's components. If you are in Peace Park in Hiroshima, you may have seen that they have planted a very diverse number of trees. It's quite rare in Japan to get such diversity in an urban setting. So you have a very strange mixture of palm trees, pine, cherry, oak and all of them have names. This mythology is about the need to be able to recognize the magic of nature. This next article is about the bird flu and this is the Hawking's article and this is about the food crisis, actually talking that Norwegians are setting up, they have set up a food bank, to keep seeds of food. So in one page you have actually the threats that await us in the next few decades or so and I thought this is a masterpiece, because it prepared for my talk more beautifully than what I could have done in any way myself.

This is a recent article, you can find it on the New Yorker Magazine website, it is about the food crisis. It crashes some of the myths we have taken for granted. For example, those of you who love salmon; it talks about farmed salmon. Farmed salmon it turns out is actually carnivorous and very energy-consuming, very polluting, something I didn't know. It challenges the agro-industry and talks about how we can transform it.

This is an article I use now religiously when I talk about the United Nations. Once you read this article you may be much more sensitive as to what the UN can and cannot do. And not just the UN - all our international organizations. It's in the July 5th edition of the Economist magazine. There is a summary that basically says that the international architecture that we set up more than 60 years ago is no longer equipped to run the problems of the world of your generation. We need to revise this international architecture. Criticizing is very easy. The question is that what can we do to improve things. The UN was created in the midst of World War II. The concept was talked of in 1941 already, at the height of the war. It has embedded in it some universal values that deserve to be maintained. What you can do about it is a question that you have to address.

Let us now talk about the UN Charter. Some of it is actually quite relevant to today's world, while some clearly needs updating. The Charter ironically still refers to the Soviet Union, which does not exist and the Republic of China, which does not exist either. Partially the reason is that the five permanent members of the security council - the United States, France, U.K. China and Russia -- are so afraid if they start amending this constitution, they would have to deal with anomalies like why are they sitting as permanent members of the Security Council in the first place, that they'd rather keep the errors in the Charter rather than open the conversation. For example why are France and the U.K. are on the Security Council and not Japan and India? This being said, the Charter is quite a unique document. Remember it has only 9,000 words. How many of

you are from the European Union? As comparison the text of the European Constitution has 150,000 words. The UN Charter with its 9,000 words nevertheless holds some universal values.

Of course the International Criminal Court and its sister court, the International Criminal Tribunal. For former Yugoslavia, some of you may have heard of the arrest of Karadic this past week. This is really revolutionary, I think. There is a court, an international court. Where rulers can be taken to and brought to justice for crimes committed. So these are things we read easily in daily newspapers, but they are huge steps for humanity.

Of all the topics that I would have liked to address when talking about a global citizen I have chosen three: the arms trade, energy/environment and ethics. There could have been more, but I would like to leave some time for Q&A. I've chosen these three and I think they are quite inter-related and also we need to look at some of the other topics, namely the nuclear dossier. The world has a major bearing on the nuclear dossier. I won't talk about it in this session because I think all week you will be hearing much about the nuclear threats to humanity. Simply to say that the more I stay in Hiroshima, the more I am convinced that Robert Oppenheimer, the founder of the atomic bombing, was himself absolutely prescient when he observed the first nuclear test in the deserts of New Mexico in July 1945, three weeks before Hiroshima and Nagasaki were bombed. Oppenheimer, who was a very erudite man, who knew the Hindu Upanishads by heart, wrote in his memoirs that as he looked at this mushroom cloud rising in the desert he was reminded of the Upanishads 'I am death, the destroyer of the Universe'. The nuclear catastrophe that unfolded over Hiroshima and Nagasaki bear the seeds of the destruction of humanity. Any form of international agreement or treaty that we have in one way or another, whether the Geneva Conventions, the Hague conventions. The convention against genocide, whether the International Court of Justice, all of them again and again have said or implied that nuclear, chemical and biological weapons are illegal and cannot be accepted alongside humanity. We must find a way to dismantle these weapons that hang over our necks like Democles' sword.

So I won't talk too much about nuclear arms here, but focus on other forms of arms. Please look at these graphs, they are from the International Peacebuilding Institute, for 2007. In 2007, we increased by six percent overall trade in arms. We are spending worldwide one trillion, 339 billion US dollars on arms trade. By far it's the single most extensive expenditure worldwide. It comes down to roughly 202 dollars annually per every man, woman and child who lives on earth. If you know that more than one billion people live on less than one dollar a day you realize the magnitude! And for me it has always been really a troubling question. We put drug dealers in prison, but we treat arms dealers as businessman and statesman. How is it possible that the five permanent members of the Security Council that are responsible for protecting our security are the largest exporters of arms in the world themselves? So I am hoping that it will be a grand swirl of public outrage and derision to force governments to review their policies. And sadly the arms trade is expanding, even to space. If you look at space today, the space is starting to be militarized; it still hasn't been weaponized, but we are on the verge. We must keep an eye on space to not allow the mess we have now created on earth to be exported to space.

Military expenditure worldwide has increased 45% since 1998. It now eats up 2.5% of world Gross Domestic Product. And if you want to know, who is spending most...the United States, followed by Europe, China, East Asia, Australia, Middle East and South Africa, Russia, Latin America, Central America, Sub-Saharan Africa.

This is a clear indication of where we missed our chance, collectively, after the fall of the Berlin Wall. The cessation, if I may say, of the Cold War brought a period of hope, and indicatively, there was a dip in arms expenditures as you can see in the chart, when intelligent voices really started saying; why do we need all these arms? But you can see clearly that those voices were not heard - we have gone right back to business of massive spending on armaments.

So as global citizens, my first recommendation is we must fight this arms trade, which remains unchallenged. As you saw from the charts most developing countries are involved. Japan too is one of the big spenders. It does not have an army, but it has the self-defense forces, one of the costliest in the world. Japan is not in the arms trade however, it cannot, by constitution, export arms even if some voices of insanity are trying to dismantle that clause. I have always felt that Japan should export very proudly its constitution. It is the most beautiful constitution that I have come across and others should take its lessons to heart.

The second area we should focus on, as global citizens, is that of environment/energy, those two are obviously more and more intertwined. The talk on climate change is now on everyone's agenda, though it is still too much talk and little action. I heard Margaret Thatcher in 1988 in Geneva talk about climate change and that changed my mind. Then I watched for 20 years of inaction since. You don't need to like Margaret Thatcher. But Thatcher had something that few politicians have - she was a scientist, a chemist by training, and she was one of the first politicians to understand the signs of climate change. And in 1988 already, at the climate conference in Geneva, she said climate change was going to be one of our greatest challenges.

I was asked at a lecture whether it was correct that India and China were allowed to develop and have basically become more polluting, emitting more CO₂. I do want to remind people of the figures. Please look at these charts. This is China. The green you see is population and the red is energy consumption. You can see the population versus energy consumption. This is India. This is the US. What does it reflect? Four percent of the world population in the US produces 25% of CO₂ emissions. 4% of population versus 25% of CO₂ emission. If I just look at these graphs, you basically have the US with the population of roughly one third of China, emitting almost one third more CO₂ than China. Of course China and India want to develop. But relatively speaking they are doing pretty well on the climate change front, at least I am rather optimistic about China, as it tries to face and tackle its energy problems. Those of you who have visited southern California or live there as my family does today will note that in 2008, in the wealthiest state of the wealthiest country in the world, if you want to travel between two high density urban poles, i.e. from San Diego 150 km north to Los Angeles Airport, there is no way you can do so without driving a car. California which is the eighth largest economy in the world but not able to run 150 km of bullet trains! What does this say about denial and resistance to innovation? So I think we are not in a position to pontificate to China, not until we clean our own house. Over the last few years China seems to have fully grasped what is at stake, that it will itself be terribly vulnerable to climate change. One of the most

promising areas of trade actually between China and Japan is in environmental technology and I'm hopeful that there can be a bridge between the two. So there is hope China will get its act together but will the US get its act together?

This graph is a 2006 slide and I think we can all say with the price of oil currently running at 120, 140 dollars this slide was debunked! I am actually of the belief that the rise of oil prices may bring some good - am simply dismayed that we have not prepared better for this day. But better late than never. Renewable technologies are still here. Please see the chart on renewables - you also have nuclear energy here. Only 6 % of the global energy portfolio is renewable energies. Only 6%. We can go fight wars for oil? And we cannot develop solar panels? If you took a train from Tokyo to Hiroshima and you look out of this bullet train, you see so very few roofs with solar panels. And you've seen the amount of sunshine here in the summer?! The technology is there. It's the political will that is not there and consumer pressure is not there, so the next time your parents or yourself, you want to build a house, ask for it to use renewable sources of energy. Demand it. If there are enough people demanding authorities will pay attention. The only advantage of the rise of oil prices is it will force these other resources to be developed a bit more consistently in time.

Again here is the oil consumption per country. You can see the United States. This is China. So again one third of the population and one third of the energy consumption. This is Japan, by the way. How many Japanese are in the room? Excellent. So Japan has some of the most advanced renewable technologies yet they don't seem to be marketing it domestically, because there is no political will. So it's nice for politicians to wear Okinawan shirts in summer to save energy, but it's not enough. The stakes demand more. We do a lot for show. Where are the technologies, the government subsidies and markets? If we can put men on the moon, so can we expand, meaningfully - not just at 6% - the use of solar, wind, geothermal, we can. We just don't have the will. Please don't believe talk about oil being the cheapest. It's cheapest because of enormous indirect subsidies, and the monopoly of oil companies that can control prices. If there is political will, renewables could be the cheapest and cleanest. So let's aim for that.

The IPPC (International Panel on Climate Change) has given different scenarios for the effects of climate change, low, average and high. In fact I think we all understand that nature is unpredictable. Most of the unfolding scenarios are starting to look more like the most extreme. That is to say we don't really know, for example, how oceans will react. We cannot play with nature with impunity, think we can actually control it, and we are utterly dependent on it. This is the most fundamental lesson as a global citizen. We are only global citizens in so far as there is a globe. If there is no globe, there are no citizens.

What I'd like to highlight with this graph here is the impact of misguided, automobile-focused policies, especially in the United States on the climate issues. This is China, numbers for passenger rail. It shows that China is actually doing well in expanding and up-keeping its passenger rail system. China comes at the very top in terms of numbers, followed by India, Russia, Japan. Many European countries are here too - Switzerland, the Netherlands. You can see the United States down here, the wealthiest nation on earth, 23rd only in terms of its rail carrying capacity. I guess one element

consistent in my talk is that as societies we have to see beyond the short term focus on profit and privatization, there is infrastructure and policies that governments have an obligation to implement, because it is the long-term right things to do. This obsession with the private sector being able to run everything has been the undoing of what we have systematically built for our societies for the last 200 years and it is time it is discarded.

My third and last point I would like to raise is about what a global citizen really means. Why not impose responsibility on global citizens? I still vote only in Switzerland. As a global citizen I legally don't have any responsibility. All I can do to fulfill my responsibility as a global citizen, is to revert to the term 'ethics'. Ethics comes from a Greek word *ethos*. Actually it means habit, customs. It's about how to run your daily life. How to live a good life. When I was your age, I had this idea that I will grow up and save the world and I realized as the years passed by that it is of course impossible for any single person to save the world. At the minimum you can try and save yourself. So there is something you can do by yourself and for yourself. Earlier, we talked about bicycles. We talked about chopsticks. I think the question of ethics is not unrelated to these small, mundane choices. What are your principles, what are your daily habits? How do you go about living the life of a global citizen? Where can you make a difference? I think my principle remains the same. "Act where you can." You cannot dismantle the arms industry tomorrow. O.K. but then defy the consumerism and buy your food locally. Pay a bit more and don't go to the supermarket that imports strawberries from the other end of the world in the middle of winter. Strawberries in the middle of winter can make their way here by emitting a lot of CO₂. So think about your life's habits. Where is it that you can diminish your carbon?

And cultivate the sacred. Are any of you familiar with James Lovelock? He was also a chemist. He lives in a cottage in Wales. I had an honor of meeting him once 15 years ago. He is a walking genius. Again a chemist, he identified the earth as a breathing entity. It's breathing, so it's alive. He was one of the first to even consider the issue of climate change. As a chemist, he regards science with a sense of the sacred. If you want to transform the globe, you cannot just think of facts and figures. You must be able to introduce the "sacred" into your daily life. Lovelock was the first who said this earth is a breathing organism and every time we cut a tree, we're doing something that impacts the ability of this planet to grow.

One of the things I love about Switzerland is that if you were the richest home owner and have a 200 year old tree in your backyard you cannot just go ahead and cut it, you need a permit. This is so appropriate. That tree is not yours. That tree was planted 200 years ago, it should still be here 200 years hence. So by law you need to justify and get an authorization. The tree puts a shadow on your nice living room and on your furniture? Too bad for your furniture, the tree shall stay. Basic and understandable concept. It is not just one person's home, but our collective planet. As a global citizen means you have a say in the world.

I recently read a book by Deepak Chopra - some of you may know him, he is a medical doctor, Indian American medical doctor. He has become an outspoken proponent of the mind-body connection and the holistic health movement. In recent years, he has become something of a poet and peacemaker. His idea is Gandhi's idea. It's not about the way to do this and that to get peace. Peace is the way. Peace is the way. How do we actually translate peace into our way without sounding like the Hippies of the 60s?!

Mastering facts and figures are important but mastering the very fundamental principles behind our humanity, so that we can actually make a change, is even more important.

(Question 1) Thank you very much for the opportunity. It was a very good and inspiring speech. Thank you very much. I am very impressed with your speech. The first thing that I want to ask is the limit of developing also conservative. You know in some part of development, you have to sacrifice environment, for example, building dams or building some energy resources. It seems that we don't have a clear line between what we have to conserve or we have to develop in developing countries such as Indonesia, my country. To set the line between we have to conserve and we have to use for development seems confusing. Things to do. This is the first question. My second question is not really a question; it's the sign of global warming. I study Ecology now in Hiroshima University. Have you noticed that there are deadly fevers and more scaring diseases in the tropics is now found in New Zealand. Mosquitos are found in New Zealand. It is a proof that it is a sign of global warming. Also have you noticed that fish from Indonesia is grave thing in the Seto Inland Sea, devouring all the seaweed there. It has come from Indonesia to Seto Inland Sea. It's never happened in the history of human life. So global warming really exists now. The temperature is increasing. And thirdly if you want to live in the international society or international school or citizens, there is suspiciousness. Before I was here, before G8 Summit, in this community we have a regular visit of some Japanese Intelligence or justice department guy, they questioned us a lot of things about Muslim and so on. It's bothering us. We are not terrorists. Why do they keep asking things? We explain that and they understand. Then we've become good friends. But still there is suspicion everywhere. Thank you very much.

(Azimi) Thank you. Are you from Indonesia?

(Question 1) Yes.

(Azimi) I have often heard in these last 20 years about the dichotomy between development and conservation. I think it's a false problem. You didn't need to cover Indonesia with telephone poles in order to be able to use mobile phones, did you? You jumped, a technological leap. In technological terms it's very common. You don't need to put energy poles all over the world as they had to do in Japan in the 50s and 60s to take energy from Point A to B. There are vastly improved ways of doing things now. So why are we stuck in this dilemma, that we can only develop at the cost of sacrificing our natural environment. We have to either conserve or develop. There may be some trade-offs necessary, but basically we have to do both. I mentioned earlier renewable sources of energy, it is one example. Why is there not a massive campaign of funding in renewable sources of energy in developing countries even as we have a massive campaign of funding nuclear energy? Because there are only a few companies in the world that export nuclear energy technology. Even though we know that nuclear energy technology, useful as it may be in the context of climate change, has terrible problems. Waste for one. Security for one. But how come so many countries, from the United Arab Emirates to many countries in Latin America, they want it? Maybe because it has been lobbied for. If you and governments and businesses spend the same amount of time and money on

lobbying renewable technologies, it could very well take off so that your energy portfolio could conceivably have 60% of renewable 50 years hence. It's possible. All the experts know it's possible. It's the political will and public and private support that is needed. So I would definitely say yes there are some areas where developing countries have to make trade-offs but in principle we have leap-frogged before and we can here too. We didn't have to drive the horse in some places for x number of years so that we could get access to train. We jumped immediately to the train because others tried it and we know how to make it. As an ecologist, you need to know this. As to suspiciousness, I think there is the whole thing of clash of civilizations that some are hunting to brought up. You're yourself are fulfilling prophesy. If you say something loud enough and long enough, it'll start happening. I think it's really a kind of rubbish. But that's not enough to say that it's a kind of rubbish - events have happened since 2001 around the world that make us responsible. But I think as someone from a Muslim background I would say we too need to take responsibility. The absence of voices condemning terrorism in Islamic countries against Muslims themselves is disheartening. Muslims, I won't say moderate Muslims, because there is no such a thing. They are just extremists killing other Muslim. Muslims themselves are paying the highest price for this fundamentalism and return to an obsolete world. I think we as Muslims too, need to take responsibility to transform ourselves and our societies.

(Question 2) My name is Shintaro Nagira, Hiroshima University student. I want to ask you one thing. Do you think solar power or hybrid cars can really solve the energy problems? Those technologies seem suspicious to me. I think we need a lot of energy to manufacture hybrid cars and solar powers or those recycled energy facilities or factories. More energy is needed to manufacture hybrid cars like Toleos than energy we use to manufacture cars, old type cars. I think we have to sacrifice a lot of energy to make the world environmentally friendly. What do you think about it?

(AZIMI) Number one, we are not still on the 1960s' trains, right? We are on the third generation Shinkansen. Constantly you take a model, work at it and you further develop it. We know now that with solar power, we can actually conserve energy. Before it had to be used immediately. We didn't have any way of reserving, keeping the energy generated. So that one day if there was no sun, we couldn't operate those systems. Now that's not the case. My point is this. If you are not putting any money into research and development, your first generation solar panels will remain inefficient. It's the same for wind energy, geothermal, wave.... We have to pour money into research and also provide market mechanisms. If investors and entrepreneurs are interested, researchers are interested to pursue. If you say, the model we had in 1980, it doesn't work, well of course it doesn't work. You need to work on it. As for hybrid cars, it's a good development, but for me it is a bit of distraction. We also need to change our lifestyle. If people want to have a car, it's better that they have a hybrid car. But the basis is that even as they have a car they should NOT have to bring it out every day. I live in Hiroshima. It's a car producing city. So if I talk too much against cars, what will they do to me? My point is you should not have to depend on your car every day for survival. I think Switzerland actually has one of the highest rates in Europe of car ownership but the lowest, in terms

of daily car usage. Those are two different things. Why? Because Switzerland has an extraordinary network of public transport, of rails and buses and small connecting buses.