

THE DAG HAMMARSKJÖLD LECTURE 2018

Twenty-first century challenges and the enduring wisdom of Dag Hammarskjöld



António Guterres

THE DAG HAMMARSKJÖLD LECTURE 2018

**Twenty-first century challenges
and the enduring wisdom
of Dag Hammarskjöld**

António Guterres

*This is the text of the
annual Dag Hammarskjöld Lecture given by
António Guterres at Uppsala Castle on 22 April 2018*

*The Dag Hammarskjöld Lecture 2018 was organised by
the Dag Hammarskjöld Foundation and Uppsala University.*

ISBN 978-91-982875-7-8

Photos by Johan Wahlgren pages 6 (top and centre), 10, 24, 34, 37.

Mikael Wallerstedt Cover, pages 6 (bottom), 8, 27, 31, 32, 41.

UN photo page 36. Kristin Blom page 39. Uppsala University page 38.

Layout by Kristin Blom, Dag Hammarskjöld Foundation.

Printed by X-O Graf, Uppsala

Dag Hammarskjöld Foundation,

Uppsala, Sweden

2018, 2nd print run

Twenty-first century challenges
and the enduring wisdom
of Dag Hammarskjöld

António Guterres

Preface

The Dag Hammarskjöld Lecture is co-organised by Uppsala University and Dag Hammarskjöld Foundation and was created in memory of the United Nations' second Secretary-General. The lecture is an annual event given in recognition of the values that inspired Dag Hammarskjöld as a statesman and in his life – compassion, humanism and commitment to international solidarity and cooperation. According to the lecture guidelines, the rostrum shall be offered to a person who, in significant and innovative ways, contributes to a more just, peaceful and environmentally sustainable world through valuable achievements in politics or research.

His Excellency, António Guterres, Secretary-General of the United Nations, delivered the 2018 Dag Hammarskjöld Lecture, the 19th honoree and third Secretary-General to do so since the series was instituted two decades ago. He was chosen as lecturer for his long-standing commitment to the values of the United Nations and to the Organisation. In his work, he has displayed courage, integrity and resolute leadership of the United Nations and laid out a bold vision for a strengthened UN that demands resourcefulness and accountability.

António Guterres delivered the lecture on the topic “Twenty-first century challenges and the enduring wisdom of Dag Hammarskjöld”, starting by paying tribute to his predecessor Dag Hammarskjöld, calling him an inspiration in the work and a central reference for the United Nations.

In looking at the world today, globalisation, while providing considerable benefits to human kind, has also brought about increased inequality and insecurity. There is a need to rebuild the trust in multilateral organisations such as the United Nations to be able to solve the problems of our time. “The problems of our time are global problems that can only be solved with global solutions”, Guterres stated.



Many of today's problems are related to conflict and these conflicts are both difficult to end but also becoming more and more interlinked. A surge in diplomatic capacity to solve conflicts is essential and prevention should be the key instrument.

Guterres also pointed to several other pressing challenges of the 21st century, such as terrorism, nuclear weapons, climate change, migration and cyber wars. These are examples of issues that need more discussion and attention and a stronger international commitment as well as new forms or regulations on control. "I do believe there is an entry point for the UN to be a platform where governments, civil society, academia and the private sector can come together and discuss how we can find ways to address these problems", he said.

The Secretary-General expressed gratitude to Sweden for its strong support to the UN and the consistent commitment to multilateralism, as well as for its active engagement in prevention and sustaining peace.

This year's Dag Hammarskjöld lecture was delivered in Rikssalen, The State Hall, in Uppsala Castle. The venue was appropriate for the occasion, as the Castle is the place where Dag Hammarskjöld grew up when his father served as County Governor of Uppsala.

The programme also included an opportunity for student questioning, orchestra and choir performances, as well as awarding the Dag Hammarskjöld medal to the lecturer. The Dag Hammarskjöld lecture was given in the presence of H. R. H. Crown Princess Victoria.

Uppsala, April 2018

Henrik Hammargren

*Executive Director
Dag Hammarskjöld Foundation*

Peter Wallensteen

*Senior Professor
Peace and Conflict Research
Uppsala University*



António Guterres delivering the 2018 Dag Hammarskjöld Lecture.

Twenty-first century challenges and the enduring wisdom of Dag Hammarskjöld

António Guterres

*H.E. António Guterres, Secretary-General, United Nations
speaking on the occasion of the Dag Hammarskjöld Lecture 2018
Uppsala, 22 April 2018*

Your Royal Highness, Excellencies, students, ladies and gentlemen,

It is for me an enormous pleasure and honour to be here today, paying tribute both to this prestigious University and its contributions to the creation of the ‘European spirit’, as well as to a man who I consider my reference and my inspiration as Secretary-General of the United Nations: Dag Hammarskjöld.

Were I to ask anywhere in the world, who represents the United Nations best, I have no doubt that the answer would be unanimous: Dag Hammarskjöld.

Indeed, what he has done, the values he fought for, and the supreme sacrifice of his life in the line of duty for the UN and for its values, makes him a central reference of the United Nations. It makes him a fundamental inspiration for those of us who want to pursue the same goals, and the same objectives, with reference to the same values.

I find it particularly inspiring that he was not only a man of action and an extremely sophisticated diplomat, but a man of culture. It is this special characteristic that has become rare amongst world leaders and high ranking officials of international organisations like the United Nations.

Allow me to read to you a few sentences that illustrate how deeply a man of culture he was.

When asked which book he would most like to have with him when stranded on a deserted island, he responded ‘Cervantes Don Quixote, and preferably in an old French edition’.

Secondly, he called poetry ‘a necessary and indispensable complement to diplomacy; the diplomat, like the poet, works with words, transposes words, using them as a key, although not necessarily a master key’.

He also said he devoted at least two hours each day to what he called serious matters, by which he meant literature.

He said one of his constant challenges was ‘maintaining a balance, which we too easily lose without the firm hand and open eye to great art’.

Indeed, it is the fact that he was a man of culture that allowed him to have a universal view, a universal perspective; to consider diversity as a richness; to be able to understand others; to promote tolerance; to promote dialogue and to find solutions for the most difficult and intricate diplomatic problems of his time. This is what, indeed, is sometimes lacking today.

The proof that this translated into a vision of the world that remains as accurate today as during his lifetime is very well captured in the following, and I will quote him again. ‘Our world of today [of course many decades ago] is more than ever before, one world. The weakness of one is the weakness of all, and the strength of one – not the military strength, but the real strength, the economic and social strength, the happiness of people – is the strength of all.

‘Through various developments that are familiar to all, world solidarity has been forced upon us. This is no longer the choice of enlightened spirits, it’s something which those whose temperament leads them in the direction of isolationism have also to accept.’

This shows the vividness of his spirit, the accuracy of his memory and thinking, and how important it is to take his words as inspiration for what we can do today. What we can do today is not easy.

I remember when I became a member of Government, Prime Minister in Portugal, twenty- something years ago, we were living in a period of enormous optimism in the world. The Cold War had ended, globalisation was seen by many not only as an immense source of prosperity for the world, but as having the ability to trickle down in order to benefit the whole of humankind and not just the prosperous few.

We had a clear moment in which the human rights agenda was gaining ground in relation to the national sovereignty agenda. After the end of the Cold War, and after the tragedies in Rwanda and the Western Balkans, an idea gained ground: that a new kind of democratic order would prevail everywhere or according to Francis Fukuyama ‘The end of history’.

The truth is that this optimism was of short duration. First of all, if it is true that globalisation has provided enormous benefits to humankind by increasing wealth, trade, life expectancy, and the middle class, while reducing absolute poverty, it is also true that globalisation has increased inequalities dramatically.

Eight persons – by the way eight men – today own as much as the poorest half of the global population. This shows the level of inequality we have reached, and how many have been left behind by globalisation in the rustbelts of this world.

Together with increased insecurity and the inability of the international community to manage human mobility, this has progressively generated an environment in which the trust of people in political establishments and international organisations like the United Nations and multilateralism more generally, has dramatically reduced.

This is one of the greatest difficulties we face today: how to build enough trust to allow for meaningful action to solve the problems of our times.

The problems of our times are global. They can only be solved with global solutions.

In contrast, there is a certain trend of isolationism that was already detected by Dag Hammarskjöld. We witness it with all its consequences today.

In line with his ideals and his values, in order to deal with the global problems we are facing, we need to put multilateralism at the centre of our objectives.

Of course, the most dramatic of today's challenges are related to conflict.

We have seen in the recent past not only an enormous difficulty in ending conflicts – look at Afghanistan, look at Somalia, look at the Democratic Republic of Congo – it was there that it all started when he was alive, but also a multiplication of conflicts as well as conflicts becoming more and more interlinked, with the additional threat of global terrorism.

Terrorism has always existed, but this form of global terrorism can strike anywhere, anytime, without us understanding why, and for what reason – this new threat is clearly linked to the multiplication of conflicts and to the interconnection between those conflicts.

If you look at the map from Mali to Nigeria, continuing into Libya and Somalia, then onto Yemen, Syria, Israel-Palestine, Iraq and Afghanistan and all the way to Myanmar:

All of these conflicts are becoming more and more linked, and more linked to this threat of global terrorism.

We are witnessing the enormous difficulty of the international community to resolve them.

That is why prevention, and the capacity to prevent conflict – so central to Dag Hammarskjöld's thinking – is today more important than ever.

The truth is that if we look at this complex set of conflicts, the most dramatic group is in the Middle East with the Palestinian-Israeli conflict at its centre. While we do not see hope of any meaningful resumption of negotiations, serious negotiations, in the short term, I am a true believer that there is only one solution, there is no plan B to a two-state solution with Israel and Palestine living side by side in peace and security.

Unfortunately, instead of progress in the peace process, in the last few days we have seen the resumption of violence in Gaza, with dramatic consequences that are difficult to foresee. We see the international community, including the United Nations, paralysed and without the power and capacity to really make things move.

In Yemen, we see the worst humanitarian tragedy in today's world. And in Libya, it remains difficult to put the country irreversibly on the path to peace.

The most dramatic of all situations remains, of course, Syria.

The country where progress has been made recently, and we need to recognise it, is Iraq.

When one looks at the Middle East region, it is clear that we are witnessing several divides that are interconnected, that enhance each other and make it extremely difficult to find solutions or to even discover an entry point to be able to move positively in relation to these situations.

First of all, we are witnessing the rebirth of the Cold War, but I would say with two fundamental differences. In the Cold War, the two superpowers were more or less able to control their conflicts, and the world was divided ideologically and politically between the two.

Now, if one looks at Syria, you do not only have two superpowers, but you have another group of countries that have influence and without the superpowers' ability to control them as in the past.

Secondly, during the Cold War, there were mechanisms of dialogue and control in order to make sure that the risks that existed, the tensions that existed, did not spiral out of control to nuclear war, ending the life of our planet. Those mechanisms were in place and those mechanisms worked.

Today, those mechanisms are no longer in place; people seem to have forgotten about the Cold War.

Now, tension is growing – and we have seen in recent days how dramatic this can be – without us having mechanisms that guarantee that things will not get out of control.

Returning to the divides we now see in the Middle East: There is the Sunni-Shia divide, and other divides within the Sunni community for a number of reasons, namely positions vis-à-vis the Muslim Brotherhood.

You have the Turkish-Kurdish question that is not solved, and – on the contrary – getting worse and more dramatic in recent times.

You have the situation of at risk communities in the Middle East. During my time as High Commissioner, I worked a lot with the refugees from Iraq and Syria belonging to Christian communities. I always remind people that when, in my country, people were still worshipping the trees and the rivers, people in the Middle East were already discussing whether the Holy Ghost would come out of the Father, or out of the Father and the Son – which proves that these communities, the Yazidis and many others, are part of the vital societal structure of this region. Their situation is dramatic and another factor of instability that we cannot forget.

With all these divides, we find it sometimes difficult to find an entry point.

The Security Council has largely been paralysed in relation to Syria. I have to pay tribute to Sweden, who has been consistently trying to build bridges.

But of course, you can only make a bridge between two banks of a river if the banks themselves accept the bridge to be there. If the banks are not really

interested in a bridge, it is very difficult to build that bridge. But I pay tribute to what has been the consistent effort in Swedish diplomacy to build the bridges to allow us to find an entry point to address the tragic situation in Syria.

In Syria, we do not only see the suffering of the Syrian people after eight years gaining in proportions that are unimaginable, with more than five million refugees, with levels of displacement, of humanitarian need, that are unique in the world. We also witnessed the use of chemical weapons, and the use of chemical weapons with total impunity and the inability of the international community to find the mechanisms of retribution and accountability that would be necessary in order to make sure that those weapons that polarised the world in the First World War, in the war between Iraq and Iran, and other tragic moments of humankind, can no longer do harm.

So, it is absolutely essential to have a surge in our diplomatic capacity to solve these conflicts. But it becomes ever more visible how wise Dag Hammarskjöld was when he said prevention must be our key instrument.

We had to broaden the concept to ‘prevention and sustaining peace’, because unfortunately, sometimes when we are able to reach a settlement in a situation, we see how difficult it is to preserve the stability and the peace for the period to come.

But more recently, we also discovered that it is not only these kinds of conflicts that are mostly – except for the threat of terrorism – localised that are threatening us.

We are back to a situation in which the nuclear issue is on the table, as dramatically witnessed on the Korean Peninsula. We have also seen how it has fortunately been possible, in relation to the Democratic People’s Republic of Korea, to apparently find a way to move in the right direction. But we are not yet there.

We see the fragility of the JCPOA [Joint Comprehensive Plan of Action], that was a very important diplomatic achievement in the international community in relation to the Iranian nuclear programme – we see it at dramatic risk.

Together with the proliferation in chemical weapons, we see a risk of a new surge of proliferation of nuclear weapons.

If the JCPOA fails, and if Iran moves ahead with their nuclear programme, there will be other countries trying to imitate. If the situation on the Korean Peninsula is not solved, we will probably see the end of the successful non-proliferation commitment of the international community that we had in the past few years. This new level of threat needs to be addressed with total commitment from our side.

The threats that we face are not only related to conflict. I think that the defining element of our age, and probably the biggest threat for the future of our planet, is climate change.

It is important to say that climate change is running faster than us. First, the Paris Agreement commitments are not yet being met by all, and second, the commitments we reached in Paris are not enough to address the threat of climate change.

We have seen in the last forecasts presented by different international organisations – the World Meteorological Organization [WMO] and others – that we are reaching levels that create the risk of making the threat irreversible in four or five years, irreversible and impossible to reach the Paris targets – which means that we need an enhanced ambition in relation to the control of emissions, and the reduction of emissions.

Sweden has set a fantastic example. We need all countries to show the same resolve.

We need more ambition and we need consistency in the implementation of that ambition in relation to the Paris commitments. We need to make sure that we do not lose this race. If we do, it will have devastating consequences for our planet. What has happened in the last season of hurricanes in the Caribbean is a clear demonstration of the risks we are facing.

The truth is that, independent of many aspects of progress in many countries, independent of the fact that technology is in our favour, today renewable energy is competitive and can be the cheapest available energy in any part of the world.

The truth is that we still see many policies subsidising fossil fuels and the building of infrastructures that are completely negative in relation to climate change perspectives.

Last year, we had an increase in emissions of CO₂ for the first time in the past few years, which means that things are not under control. Fossil fuels remain a serious problem and I underline the Swedish commitment to get rid of the use of fossil fuels in a meaningful and short period.

I have quoted repeatedly – I am not sure who said it, but I find it a very good anecdote – that the Stone Age did not end for lack of stones, so the age of fossil fuels should not end for lack of fossil fuels. We need to be able to end the age of fossil fuels. It is a necessity for humanity and for a healthy planet. We need to have an enhanced ambition in relation to climate change.

This brings me to our programme for fair globalisation – the Agenda 2030 Sustainable Development Goals, and the need to assume this Agenda globally. It is also important to recognise that the Agenda needs to be seen in the context of the most recent evolutions of science and technology.

I believe that we are witnessing transformations that we are not able to entirely forecast: consider genetic engineering, artificial intelligence and cyber space.

The truth is that we are entering a new age, many term it the fourth industrial revolution. It is clear that we are not yet prepared for it. Governments are not taking it fully into account, and international organisations are not able to deal with many of its aspects.

I think we must seriously reflect on the fourth industrial revolution and its enormous potential for the benefit of humankind, for Agenda 2030 to become a reality, but also on the risks we are facing at a global level.

I am convinced that we are witnessing today multiple incidents of cyber war between states. I have no doubt that if there would be a new serious war between states, the war would be preceded by a massive cyber-attack.

In the First World War, before an offensive, there was usually a barrage of artillery. In more recent wars, it tended to be the air force and some cruise missiles that would provoke a defensive reaction from the other side. I believe the next war – serious war, I am not talking about localised regional conflicts – if it starts, it will start with a massive cyber-attack.

I think we need to make an effort – it is actually absolutely essential – to make sure that what we had as a legal framework for war, the Geneva Conventions, apply to cyber war. The First Committee of the General Assembly of the United Nations has to address this important matter. I think we all need to take this very seriously.

However, the risk is not only cyber war. If one looks at cyber space today – it is both a fantastic instrument for all of us, but also used by terrorist organisations and criminal gangs – it is clear that we need some kind of capacity to regulate the Internet.

I do not think it can be a traditional form of regulation. Those traditional mechanisms – to have an international convention and then to apply that convention globally – take a lot of time. Matters are now progressing so quickly that this would not work. Nor could it be a simple intergovernmental mechanism. And let us be honest, for some governments the Internet is a tool to exert power over citizens.

So what we need is a multi-stakeholder approach to consider creating protocols, guidelines and ways in which we can make sure that cyber space works in favour of all and not as an instrument that places our civilisation at risk.

Similarly, we need to consider artificial intelligence globally. It is clear that there will be an enormous impact on labour markets and the structure of our societies. Again, there is a strong appeal to us to make an effort in order to make sure that this impact is, first of all, foreseen, and second, that governments and

international organisations are able to cooperate and thus reap the benefits of artificial intelligence for humankind rather than making it a risk vis-à-vis the way our societies are organised.

I do believe it is possible. However, the fourth industrial revolution will be much quicker than previous ones, and the impact on the structure of society will be much more dramatic. The capacity to retrain people for new jobs will be much more limited, especially in the developing world.

So again, there are a number of things that require a strong commitment from the international community, a strong international communication and the mobilisation of government, civil society, academia and the private sector, in order to be able to anticipate the fourth industrial revolution and create the conditions for it to be a positive step in the evolution of our planet.

There is also a need to address some of the ethical questions that this technological transformation is creating.

Look at genetic engineering: again it holds fantastic possibilities to benefit our health, fantastic possibilities for the development of all communities, but enormous risk that – with ill intentions – could create monstrosities that we need to avoid at all costs.

Genetic engineering, artificial intelligence and cyber space need to be discussed more thoroughly and require a stronger international commitment. Traditional forms of regulations do not apply, traditional forms of control do not apply.

But I do believe there is an entry point for the United Nations: as a platform where governments, civil society, academia, the private sector can come together and discuss how to address these matters, how to transform this technological evolution into a positive contribution to the solution of our global problems.

One last word about human mobility: I have been, for 10 years, the High Commissioner for Refugees.

I must confess that during my time as High Commissioner for Refugees, refugee protection was more or less respected around the world. Borders were essentially open, the cases of ‘refoulement’ – when someone is sent back to a country where he or she can suffer persecution – were very limited. Refugee protection was granted, I would say, by the overwhelming majority of states in the world.

Today, we see that refugee protection is no longer guaranteed. We see many borders closed. We see situations of refoulement.

I think it is absolutely essential to re-establish the integrity of the refugee protection regime.

There is a strong link to how societies look at migration more broadly. I am a strong believer that migration is a positive contribution to the future of our planet. It is even a necessary element for the future of our planet. However, if something is necessary, it also needs to be well organised.

The dramas that we have witnessed, both in relation to migration but also in relation to refugee flows, result from a total disorganisation in some parts of the world, and in particular in Europe.

I remember when we had the massive outflow of Syrian refugees, it was expected that Europe would come together. We were talking about one million people that came into the European continent, into a Union that has more than 500 million people. In other words, we were talking about 0.2 per cent of the European population.

In normal circumstances, in the context of European solidarity – beyond of course the work that needs to be done before in prevention and support of the state of first asylum – if this flow would have been organised with proper reception centres and with an equitable distribution of people among all European states, as many of us proposed at the time, this would not have been felt.

My country, Portugal, would have received 20-something thousand Syrians, who would have been easily absorbed.

However, there was no European approach, no European solidarity. Basically, two countries, Sweden and Germany, suffered most of the impact with total lack of solidarity by other European countries.

We cannot handle migration and refugees in a world without effective international cooperation. Only with effective international cooperation can we make sure that phenomena that can be a benefit for our societies are handled in a way that does not undermine the wellbeing of people, that does not undermine public opinion and that does not undermine the values that have been traditionally our values in this part of the world.

When we see the development of forms of xenophobia, racism and rejectionism, it is clear that to a large extent they originated when international solidarity and proper cooperation were lacking. Developments that are, to a certain extent, inevitable, and possibly also largely positive, if left uncoordinated, create enormous problems that in turn generate enormous opposition in public opinion, and thus render it difficult for those who try to do the right thing in these circumstances to follow through.

I, therefore, appeal to all concerned: let us benefit from the two negotiations that are now taking place within the General Assembly of the United Nations in relation to migration and refugees. I am convinced that it is possible to have a rational approach of international cooperation and thereby make sure that this phenomenon – that can be a positive phenomenon – is indeed well managed.

Effective management can serve the purpose of countries of origin, countries of transit, countries of destination and can be to the benefit of all.

My country is, of course, much poorer than Sweden, but even my country, which has had a difficult period in the last few years, could not survive today without migration. The Portuguese are not as consistent as the Swedes in making sure that our ethnic group is maintained; our fertility index is about 1.3, I know Sweden is much closer to the 2 that is supposed to be the reference level.

Without migration, Portugal cannot survive. I always tell the story of my mother who is now 95 years old: there is permanently one person with her who helps and cares for her. I have never seen a Portuguese person supporting her.

Portugal is not the richest country in Europe. It is clear that we need migration, but if migration is not properly organised it is also clear that we will see, emerge in our societies, forms of rejectionism of all the evils of hate and xenophobia that we need to absolutely eliminate.

In closing, allow me to reiterate my enormous gratitude towards Sweden for the support that Sweden has always provided, when I was High Commissioner for Refugees, to all programmes, but also for the support that Sweden is, today, providing to the United Nations.

Sweden is a very important builder of multilateralism in today's world. Sweden has been not only very active in our own bodies, and I mentioned the Security Council and the General Assembly, in the definition of policies, but Sweden has been supporting some of the most relevant programmes from development cooperation, to humanitarian action, to the combat against sexual exploitation or abuse, or sexual harassment.

The priorities of Sweden's foreign policy are absolutely crucial for the effectiveness of the United Nations, especially Sweden's active engagement in mediation, prevention and sustaining peace. All are absolutely crucial for our world to be successful.

My last words are of profound gratitude to the Swedish government and the Swedish people for what has been your consistent commitment to multilateralism, your consistent commitment to international solidarity. My appeal to Sweden is to remain that fundamental pillar for our common work, as key reference both for your country and for the United Nations – the unique contribution and inspiration that Dag Hammarskjöld has given to all of us.

Henrik Hammargren, Executive Director of Dag Hammarskjöld Foundation presented the medal to the Lecturer.

*Your Royal Highness
Secretary-General
Mr. Speaker (of the Parliament)
Ministers
Excellencies
County Governor
Vice-Chancellor
Colleagues and Students
Ladies and Gentlemen*



Your Excellency Secretary-General António Guterres,

You are the 19th in line to have delivered a Dag Hammarskjöld lecture at Uppsala University—and the third Secretary-General to do so.

*It is an honour to the Dag Hammarskjöld Foundation and to the University.
We thank you and congratulate you.*

His Excellency, Secretary-General António Guterres was chosen by the Dag Hammarskjöld Foundation and Uppsala University to deliver the 2018 Dag Hammarskjöld lecture for his long-standing commitment to the values of the United Nations and to the Organisation.

The multitude of global challenges, such as sustaining peace, ensuring sustainable development and addressing climate change and migration, cannot be effectively addressed by any single country or coalition. Notwithstanding, there is alarming evidence that mounting nationalism, protectionism and populism is leading to scepticism towards existing multilateral arrangements. This contributes to unilateral or bilateral action, where international norms are increasingly ignored and eroded. Renewed efforts are therefore needed to



sustain and advance multilateral solutions and institutions, particularly the United Nations.

This calls for courage, integrity and resolute leadership of the United Nations, qualities we have already seen from the current Secretary-General. As High Commissioner for Refugees, by determined action and diplomatic skills, António Guterres worked effectively for the protection of the most vulnerable. He displayed courage and leadership in managing the UNHCR [United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees] mandate and its administration, initiating and implementing operational change and decentralising operations.

As Secretary-General, António Guterres has laid down a bold vision for a strengthened UN that demands resourcefulness and accountability. It prioritises the advancement of the development system and the implementation of the Sustainable Development Goals, the progression of sustaining peace and the strengthening of the leadership and management of the organisation.

Your Excellency, we look forward to supporting you in this work and as the Dag Hammarskjöld lecturer, you are invited to join the International Honorary Committee of the Dag Hammarskjöld Foundation, where leaders in your field can gather to reflect and drive debate and progress on global challenges and solutions.

The University has instituted a special medal, which is only bestowed upon the Dag Hammarskjöld Lecturers. The medal has been created by the artist Annette Rydström and is cast in bronze. Its obverse shows a portrait of Dag Hammarskjöld and the reverse a handshake, the old symbol of Concordia, representing Hammarskjöld's legacy in diplomacy. In the Latin inscription, Uppsala University dedicates the medal in memory of his outstanding achievements.

Your Excellency Secretary-General António Guterres, I now invite you to receive the 19th medal, with your name engraved on the rim, from the Vice Chancellor.



António Guterres, Secretary-General of the UN, and Peter Wallensteen, Senior Professor, Peace and Conflict, Uppsala University.



Henrik Hammargren, Executive Director of the Dag Hammarskjöld Foundation presents the medal to the Lecturer.



António Guterres

António Guterres, the ninth Secretary-General of the United Nations, took office in January 2017. Having witnessed the suffering of the most vulnerable people on earth, in refugee camps and in war zones, the Secretary-General is determined to make human dignity the core of his work, and to serve as a peace broker, a bridge-builder and a promoter of reform and innovation.

Prior to his appointment as Secretary-General, Mr Guterres served as United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees from June 2005 to December 2015, heading one of the world's foremost humanitarian organisations during some of the most serious displacement crises in decades. The conflicts in Syria and Iraq, and the crises in South Sudan, the Central African Republic, and Yemen, led to a huge rise in UNHCR's activities as the number of people displaced by conflict and persecution rose from 38 million in 2005 to over 60 million in 2015.

Before joining UNHCR, Mr Guterres spent more than 20 years in government and public service. He served as Prime Minister of Portugal from 1995 to 2002, during which time he was heavily involved in the international effort to resolve the crisis in East Timor. Mr Guterres was born in Lisbon in 1949 and graduated from the Instituto Superior Técnico with a degree in engineering.

Adapted from www.un.org

Dag Hammarskjöld



Dag Hammarskjöld (1905–1961) served as Secretary-General of the UN with the utmost courage and integrity from 1953 till his death in 1961, creating standards against which his successors continue to be measured. He stood firmly by the UN Charter and lost his life in pursuit of dialogue and peace; Hammarskjöld died in a plane crash on a mission to mediate in the 1960's Congo crisis. For his service, he was posthumously awarded the Nobel Peace Prize.

Hammarskjöld's most notable achievements while serving as the world's top international civil servant include restructuring of the UN to make it more effective, creating the basis for UN peacekeeping operations, and successfully implementing his "preventive diplomacy" in crises from the Middle East to China. Before he was appointed UN Secretary-General, Hammarskjöld held several senior positions in the Swedish civil service and became a non-partisan member of the Swedish Cabinet.

Hammarskjöld also had many cultural interests and served as a member of the Swedish Academy, the body that awards the Nobel Prize for Literature. Another testament to this literary side is his journal of personal and spiritual reflections which was published posthumously as *Markings* in 1963. Hammarskjöld spent much of his childhood and adolescence in Uppsala, which also became his final resting place.



António Guterres and Crown Princess Victoria of Sweden in a meeting at the Dag Hammarskjöld Foundation.

Uppsala University

Uppsala University, founded in 1477, is the oldest and best-known university in Scandinavia. Famous scholars such as Rudbeck, Celsius and Linnaeus were professors here, as well as eight Nobel Prize laureates, among them Archbishop Nathan Söderblom, who was also the University's Pro-Chancellor. He received the Nobel Peace Prize in 1930. In the same year Dag Hammarskjöld completed his studies at Uppsala with a bachelor's degree in Law. He had begun his studies here in 1923, receiving a BA in Romance Languages, Philosophy and Economics in 1925 and took a further post-graduate degree in Economics early in 1928.

The University's international studies library is named after Dag Hammarskjöld and, in 1981, the Swedish Parliament established the Dag Hammarskjöld Chair of Peace and Conflict Research at Uppsala University.

www.uu.se



Dag Hammarskjöld Foundation

The Dag Hammarskjöld Foundation is a non-governmental organisation established in 1962 in memory of the second UN Secretary-General, which aims to advance dialogue and policy for sustainable development and peace. The Swedish parliament took the initiative to set up the Foundation shortly after Hammarskjöld's tragic death and UN General Assembly Resolution 1757 welcomed its establishment. The Foundation is an autonomous institution and is unaffiliated with any political, religious or ideological groups; its work is guided by respect for and alignment to the principles outlined in the UN Charter.

www.daghammarskjold.se



Dag Hammarskjöld Lecture

The Dag Hammarskjöld Lecture is given in memory of Dag Hammarskjöld, and in recognition of the values that inspired him as Secretary-General and generally in his life – compassion, humanism and commitment to international solidarity and cooperation.

The invited speaker should be an outstanding international personality who in significant and innovative ways contributes to a more just, peaceful and environmentally sustainable world through valuable achievements in politics or research. Further information about the annual Dag Hammarskjöld Lecture including the full list of previous lecturers as well as their published speeches, can be found online at www.daghammarskjold.se.

Other Dag Hammarskjöld Lectures available in print and on-line:

Ban Ki-moon: *Evolving Threats, Timeless Values: The United Nations In A Changing Global Landscape*, 2016

José Ramos-Horta, *Preventing Conflicts, Building Durable Peace*, 2015

Helen Clark, *The Future We Want - Can We Make It A Reality?*, 2014

Margot Wallström, *Sexual Violence in Armed Conflict*, 2013

Tarja Halonen, *Women's Participation in the Sustainable World*, 2012

Jan Eliasson, *Peace Development and Human Rights
– The Indispensable Connection*, 2011

Francis Deng, *Idealism and Realism – Negotiating sovereignty in divided nations*, 2010

Karen AbuZayd, *Rights, Justice and United Nations Values*
– *Reflections through a Palestine Refugee Prism*, 2009

Martti Ahtisaari, *Can the International Community Meet the Challenges Ahead of Us?*, 2008

Sture Linnér and Sverker Åström, *UN Secretary-General Hammarskjöld*
– *Reflections and personal experiences*, 2007

Hans Blix, *UN Reform and World Disarmament – Where do we go?*, 2005

Noeleen Heyzer, *Woman, War and Peace*
– *Mobilising for Peace and Security in the 21st Century*, 2003

Lakhdar Brahimi, *The Rule of Law at Home and Abroad*, 2002

Kofi Annan, *Dag Hammarskjöld and the 21st Century*, 2001

Joseph Rotblat, *The Nuclear Age – A Curse and a Challenge: The Role of Scientists*, 2001

Brian Urquhart, *Between Sovereignty and Globalisation*
– *Where does the United Nations fit in?*, 2000

Mary Robinson, *Human Rights – Challenges for the 21st Century*, 1998



The medal which Uppsala University has produced in memory of Dag Hammarskjöld is awarded to the Dag Hammarskjöld Lecturers. It is designed by Annette Rydström and cast in bronze. The obverse shows a portrait of Dag Hammarskjöld and on the reverse a handshake and a text in Latin which reads: 'Uppsala University to its disciple in memory of his outstanding achievements.'

Photo: Jan Eve Olsson, Kungl. Myntkabinettet



Dag Hammarskjöld
Foundation



UPPSALA
UNIVERSITET