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Over the last couple of years there has been more and more news in the media about the G8, however it is in the context of the G20 or G77. But what is the G8 in reality, what do we know about it, what is it doing, why is it something different from other forms of international cooperation and what is its history? These and more questions, I will try to answer in this thesis. The G8 as the subject of that essay should be defined at the very beginning. The easiest thing is to decode the abbreviation – the Group of Eight, but defining what the eight states create, the nature of the Group is already a challenge. In fact the G8 could be called an organization as it doesn’t meet criteria of an organization as a formal structure or continuous assistant body e.g. secretariat. However, for the sake of this thesis I would like to propose the following definition of the G8: the G8 is a systematized and regular process including summits of eight states, during which presidential level talks are held, regarding military, environmental, economic, societal, political and human security. Why did I choose this definition? From my point of view, security and people themselves are the most important issues in the G8 activity. But this is true not only for the G8, as security is a primal and critical human need, which is a basis of human activity that has been proven *inter alia* by Maslow in the form of the pyramid of needs. Security forms the basis of this pyramid, which means that without meeting that very need, man could not in fact develop any more. Security is familiar to each and every man and at the same time it is very often so hard to reach. Different researchers have tried and are still trying to present in some regular way the components, conditions or ways of understanding of the security question. To show security in the G8 activity I chose a method based on classification of three authors: Barry Buzan, Ole Wæver and Jaap de Wilde – representatives of the Copenhagen School that I matched with a concept of human security in order to obtain as wide as possible a picture of the G8. The classification presented in the book “Security: A New Framework for Analysis” written by Barry Buzan, Ole Wæver and Jaap de Wilde, lets me in a simple and clear way systemize all action taken during the G8 entire history as well as to describe them in a way showing this primal human need without unnecessary complications. Adding to that method also the human security approach has let me to present and place in a proper order a whole spectrum of different issues which were touched in debates by G8 leaders. It is worth notice, that The Group has never been and it is still not unequivocally equate with security but more with economy or recently with global politics. Although, the fundamentals of the G8 were created
by the hard economic situation in the 70ties (oil crisis that led to the first summit in Rambouillet in 1975), over the course of the years, the scope of topics placed in the G8 agenda shows that the character of that process had been significantly changed. In individual chapters of my thesis, I’m presenting the evolution of the above mentioned kind of security, with which the Group has handled from 1975 till 2007 (some critical issues from later years are also mentioned in the Conclusions). In most cases the following trend could be observed: starting from economic issues, through military, political, environmental, societal to human security – or in other words starting from general conditions and abstractive subjects such as economy but ending with individual and real man. It shows that leaders could not and did not want to in their debates to escape from the subject of security of an ordinary man, human security. For sake of this work, broad definition of human security was assumed i.e. freedom from fear and freedom from want, created in 1994 by the UN. The main reason why I decided to use the human security approach is the fact that nothing else and no one else but man, is the cause of all events happening in the world, sometimes as a decision maker and sometimes as a victim, but always directly or indirectly he is present in all these events. The Classic approach to security doesn’t allow presenting all factors and issues related to the security concept and it will be much harder to describe a wide scope of decisions made by the Group, over more than 35 years in a clear and concise way. This thesis is divided into four parts: history, methodology, description of G8 actions from the angle of the Copenhagen School security concept and human security approach, and conclusions. Part one describes the unusual background of establishing the G8 and its quite a long history. The Concept of summits occurred on the level of five states and only in 2 years evolved into a status of the G7, which over ca. 20 years has not changed till the moment when Russia joined the Group. The First chapter shows shortly the development of the G8, starting from its roots already before 1975 till the Heiligendamm Summit in 2007, dividing that period into 7 series, according to the classification of Prof. Bayne, created in relation to their leitmotifs. Next to the process of the Group’s evolution, decision making as well as preparation of summits, which are quite specific in case of the G8, has also been shown. Moreover, in that first part there can be found an outline of the G8’s relation with international organizations in different approaches: with the European Union, IGOs, NGOs and civil society groups.

The Second important part of this thesis constitutes a description of the methodology that was used. As it was already mentioned, the goal of the work is to present in detailed scope a variety of issues discussed on the G8 forum. In order to do this, I needed tools that will help
me classify each decision and action taken by leaders of 8 countries. To meet that target I choose the concept of the Copenhagen School represented by Barry Buzan, Ole Wæver and Jaap de Wilde which I’ve complemented with the human security approach. In my dissertation I started from a different meaning of the security term, its evolution and definitions that occurred over the years, as from strict military until a very wide meaning, embracing human security. I presented in detail the concept of above mentioned authors, based on 5 sectors of security, such as military, economic, environmental, societal and political. However, as in my opinion a variety of topics and a scope of debates on the Group’s forum is so wide, that the classification created by the Copenhagen School is not enough, I also use an idea of human security popularized on an international arena by the UN. In that second chapter, I tried to explain what human security is in fact, what are its origins and what kind of definitions could be found in literature on that subject. Different researchers, in different ways have been trying to define the core of the human security concept by widening or narrowing the scope of its interest. For sake of this thesis, I assumed that the human security idea will be understood as it was presented in 1994 in the UN Human Development Report, edited by Mahbub ul Haq. In that document, human security was defined as freedom from fear and freedom from want, and additionally the differences between that concept and human development term where presented there.

The Third part of the thesis is the most crucial as it describes the G8’s actions systemized accordingly to above mentioned methodology. Chapter III is devoted to all issues discussed by leaders in the military area. Military security was especially important for the G7 during the Cold War. This, the oldest meaning of security, took a lot of place in the Group meetings. There has even been a special summit, dedicated entirely to military issues, held in 1996 in Russia. Generally, here could be found three additional areas: non-proliferation (related to general nuclear safety), arms control (connected with nuclear as well as conventional weapons) and terrorism (that gained special momentum after 9/11). Chapter IV describes economic security, something that is commonly perceived as a core of the G8’s being, and something that was in fact the reason of establishing the Group. Dealing with economic crisis, sustainable growth, reduction of high inflation and high unemployment rate, trade liberalization - these all are only some subjects that were occupying leaders over the years. Economic help for the poorest and developing countries is also very important and creates separately a big story. Quite a significant role in the economic sector was played by international organizations cooperating with the Group, such as the World Bank, OECD, IMF,
GATT/WTO. Because of its importance, the economic subject was present from the first summit in 1975, quite contrary to environmental issues that occurred in the debate for the first time at the Bonn Summit, in 1978. In chapter V is described the process of getting more and more importance by environmental topics. While almost for a decade environmental security was almost totally neglected by leaders, since 1984 issues such as ozone layer depletion, climate change, water pollution or destruction of tropical forests and far more, were widely discussed on the G8 forum and what is more, they are still gaining on importance. Very interesting in relation to the G7/8, was the definition of issues connected with societal security which is highlighted in chapter VI. As the G8 is a group of states, it is hard to talk about a strict definition of the societal sector in a way described by the Copenhagen School. However, it could be observed, that from the very beginning, member states had shared common values and ideology. In the first period of the Group’s existence, an identity was building in relation to communism, as Western countries were underlining their faith in freedom, free trade, democracy, independence of states and their aim to create a safer world. With the passing of time, after eth end the Cold War and joining of Russia to the Group, values promoted by leaders had been shifted towards protection of human rights, handling with the effects of globalization, maintaining world peace, and all this mainly in context of Third World countries. Chapter VII is devoted to political discussions held by leaders during more than 30 years of the G8 history. Although, all started with economy, it was not possible to avoid political topics for a long time. During the first five meetings, the politics were discussed in some informal and indirect way, at the edge of summits, but already in 1980, at the Venice Summit a separate statement titled “Political topics (Afghanistan)” was published. During the whole G8’s history it is hard to find any important international issues, conflicts or catastrophes, to which there was no comment by summits participants. What is more, in some political issues, it was the G8 that played the leading role and its actions had contributed to solving the problem (e.g. Balkan War and issue of Kosovo) The last chapter included in part III of the thesis, is devoted to these decisions of the Group, that are connected with human security. In the context of the G8, human security is shown from the angle of its actions and approach towards developing countries. This topic emerged for the first time already in 1975, but only in the form of economic help. However, from the start, the Group underlined the necessity of achieving the sustainable growth, which is impossible without close collaboration between the North and the South. The Leading role in that area was passed to the UN, as an organization that has tools and measures to help the most needing people. Next to economic
help, the G8 paid special attention to education, IT support, sanity, fight with AIDS and other infectious diseases, aging of population, rights of women and children, as well as all other forms of help, that will lead to human security.

The last, fourth part of my thesis is somehow a summary of the G8’s actions as well as predictions on its possible development. While the core of my work is an analysis of decisions made since 1975 till 2007, here could be find also the most important events that happened later, such as the Heiligendamm Process or actions connected with food security. An important question is related to the G8’s future – will it gain or lose on its importance in an international environment? How will the evolution of the Group look – will new members join or will it be replaced by some other form of cooperation? To these and others question connected with the possible future of the G8, I’m trying to give answers in the last chapter. What is interesting is the fact that in interviews, all my respondents underlined the importance of the G8 in the international environment as well as the evolution of the character of summits during past years. Sir Nicholas said: “The G8 summit is not strictly necessary, but it has proved useful over the years, in providing political leadership, reconciling domestic and external pressures and providing collective management to the world economy.”¹ However, all interviewers with one voice stress, that the Group could not be treated as a last resort in international relations as it plays a more steering role.

¹ Interview, N. Bayne
Chapter I
HISTORY

The Group of Eight was established in 1975 as a meeting of six states, one year later it transformed into the G7 and after Russia had joined in 1998 it is known as the G8. From the very beginning till now the G8 is functioning as informal meeting of heads of state and government, based on personal relations. With time, an extensive bureaucratic mechanism was formed, which gave the leaders concrete knowledge how to tackle a wide spectrum of subjects discussed during summits. The current shape of the summit process is the result of evolution of the political and economic background, which has been dramatically changed from the 70-ties, when contemporary conditions induced the US, France, the Great Britain, Germany, Japan, Italy and Canada to establish deeper cooperation.

Background

Circumstances of the establishment of the G7 are connected with the economic crises in the 70-ties caused by several reasons:

1. Collapse of the monetary system from Bretton Woods, when on 15.08.1971 the United States had abolished the dollar-gold parity, which upset the whole worldwide economic system, this showed that existing economic organizations cannot manage this situation.

2. The oil crisis related with the fourfold increase of oil prices by the OPEC, which after the Yom Kippur War of 1973, between Israel and the coalition of Egypt and Syria, put an embargo on oil supplies. An economic effect of this move was the recession in OECD countries, which had brought a decrease of the economic growth, increase of unemployment and high inflation. A political effect of the OPEC decision was the deterioration of the already tense atmosphere among the US, Japan and Europe. Because the US were producing energy, meeting 2/3 of its needs, they took a stiff

---

2 The Bretton Woods system of monetary management established the rules for commercial and financial relations among the world's major industrial states signed by delegates from all 44 Allied nations gathered at the Mount Washington Hotel in Bretton Woods, New Hampshire, United States, for the United Nations Monetary and Financial Conference in July 1944. The Bretton Woods Agreements established the IMF and the IBRD, which today is part of the World Bank Group.

stance toward the OPEC, but Europe and Japan were strongly dependent on oil supplies and wanted to reach a fast agreement with OPEC countries. Additionally, the international political situation of the 70-ties created tensions in the US- Europe line. The enlargement of the European Community (with Denmark, Ireland and Great Britain) caused drawing together of all European economic leaders making the EC a strong partner or a rival for the US. Since in Europe, economic conditions after the II World War were much better and at the same time a decreased fear against a next war was felt, Europe led by the President of France, Georges Pompidou, was heading in the direction of a greater independence from the US.\(^4\)

Economic difficulties caused that on 25.03.1973, the finance ministers of West Germany Helmut Schmidt, France Valery Giscard d’Estaing, the US George Schultz and the UK Patrick Jenkin, who established a so called Library Group which with time got the name Group of Five, met in the White House library (in September 1973 a representative of Japan joined these meetings). G5 members valued an informal character of the meetings, thanks to which they could freely exchange their views and reach agreement easier than e.g. during the meeting of the IMF or the Committee of 20. G5 had worked for fourteen years. Its last meeting was in Paris, in February 1987, as by the decision of the G7 Tokyo Summit in 1986, the Group of Five was replaced by the forum of the G7 finance ministers.\(^5\)

In 1974, two members of the G5 were promoted to main leaders of their countries, Valery Giscard d’Estaing became President of France, and Helmut Schmidt became Federal German Chancellor. They both came to the conclusion that such informal meetings should be continued, but at a level of heads of state and government. President Giscard at the meeting in Martinique, 16-17.12.1974, along with President Ford and Secretary Kissinger, proposed an initiative of calling international meetings of few of the most important states in order to repair the world economy and he got the approval of the US President.\(^6\) Chancellor Schmidt also had an opinion, that heads of states and government should be involved in finding solutions for economic problems, but in a different way. He suggested to create a five-person group, of which each was to be chosen by the head of state/government and could not hold any public position. This group met before the end of 1974 and at the beginning of 1975, and

---


\(^5\) P. Hajnal, *op.cit.*, p.12

produced reports in which they tackled the situation caused by the oil crisis. Members of this group were - from West Germany, Dr Wilfried Guth of Deutsche Bank, from the US, George Schultz (former Secretary of the Treasury), from France, Prof. Raymond Barre (former Vice President of the European Commission), from the UK, Sir Eric Roll (former Permanent Secretary of the British Department of Economic Affairs), from Japan, Mr. Hideo Suzuki (former employee of the Japanese Finance Ministry).\textsuperscript{7}

In the original proposition, President Giscard suggested meetings of only heads of state/government, on which the Americans did not agree. The US Secretary of State Henry Kissinger and the Treasury Secretary William Rogers did not trust President Ford enough to send him alone for such an important meeting, on account of that it became a tradition that heads of state/government meet each other along with their personal representatives, finance and foreign ministers.\textsuperscript{8}

Originally the summit was supposed to rely on a small circle of participants, which should be the most important and influential states. Heads of state and government were supposed to have an occasion for a direct and honest discussion, that should enable an establishment of the creative and effective leadership and to move on with matters that till then got stuck in the bureaucratic maze.\textsuperscript{9} Creators of the summit idea, Giscard and Schmidt, believed that heads of state and government, thanks to their function would be able to combine interests of domestic and foreign policies in order to reach international agreement and thanks to their authority, summit’s members would be able to do more than any other existing international organizations.\textsuperscript{10} In his original concept, President Giscard did not plan regular annual meetings: “To maintain the usefulness of the summit process and to protect it from bureaucratic invasion, we decided...to let the next inviting country suggest a meeting when the economic situation made it useful”. He also said that the number of participants should be strictly limited. He reluctantly agreed on the presence of Italy in Rambouillet, he turned down the possibility of Canada’s participation and he strongly opposed to the presence of the European Community.\textsuperscript{11} By contrast, Chancellor Schmidt treated the summit not only as an opportunity to present personal views of leaders (as President Giscard did) but as a measure to

\textsuperscript{7} Ibidem, p.16
\textsuperscript{8} N. Bayne, \textit{Staying together}, Ashgate, 2005, p.8
\textsuperscript{9} R. Putnam, N. Bayne, \textit{op.cit.}, p.9
\textsuperscript{10} Ibidem, p.20
\textsuperscript{11} Ibidem, p.22
encourage states to compromise and to build the mutual trust and predictability among them. He was afraid that the crises of the 70-ties could lead to economic nationalism, because it would force countries to solve their problems at others expense and the summit idea should prevent such situation.\textsuperscript{12} The signature of the Final Act of the Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe (31.07.1975) was the occasion for representatives of four Western powers to meet, so at lunch in the British Embassy in Helsinki, leaders of the UK, France, Germany and the US set subjects of the future summit in Rambouillet and agreed on the necessity to invite Japan.\textsuperscript{13} However, President Ford was afraid that France would want to use the summit to come back to fixed exchange rates and in order to sound out European intentions, sent George Schultz, in the middle of September 1975, to Bonn, London and Paris, who after a series of bilateral meetings came back to the US with the positive recommendation for the summit. This made it possible for President Giscard to call the summit on 15-17.11.1975 to the Château of Rambouillet.\textsuperscript{14}

From the American side, George Schultz and Henry Kissinger played key roles. Schultz treated the summit as a chance for direct contacts and to build personal relations with leaders. By contrast, Kissinger during his first speech in Pittsburgh on 11.11.1975 talked about the summit not only in the context of economic relations but also the connection between economic relations and security cooperation among allies. He perceived the summit as a decision-making institution, with its own preparatory and follow-up apparatus.\textsuperscript{15} Similar treatment of the summit as a beginning of regular meetings was present also in the Japanese attitude, what was in turn opposed to European expectations which assumed that the summit would be an informal and occasional meeting without any binding decisions.\textsuperscript{16}

**First series: reviving growth, 1975-1978**

According to Prof. Bayne, the course of the summits’ history to these days, allow to divide them into seven series. The first one lasted from 1975 till 1978 and its leitmotif was “reviving growth”.\textsuperscript{17} The economic crisis and the fact that Giscard and Schmidt were former finance

\textsuperscript{12} Ibidem, p.23  
\textsuperscript{13} P. Hajnal, *op.cit.*, p17  
\textsuperscript{14} R. Putnam, N. Bayne, *op.cit.*, p.17  
\textsuperscript{15} Ibidem, p.25  
\textsuperscript{16} Ibidem, p.26  
\textsuperscript{17} P. Hajnal, *op. cit.*, p.54
ministers caused that in the beginning the summits were focused mainly on economic matters. Only with time, political and security matters appeared in the official agenda. The main subject of the first summit at Rambouillet was the reform of the international monetary system. Before the summit, there bilateral talks between the US and France were hold, which aimed at an agreement on exchange rates. Finally, already during the summit it was decided that the IMF should permit on floating exchange rates, as a legitimate currency regime but the condition from the French side was that the US and other countries would intervene in order to eliminate short term currency fluctuations.\textsuperscript{18}

On the basis of this agreement the IMF made an amendment in its articles, because until that time floating had been possible only in emergencies.\textsuperscript{19} The Summit at Rambouillet was a success. It concluded with an agreement on floating rates, statement of participants against protectionism and a direct, multilateral discussion evoked enthusiasm concerning the possibility of an international economy recovery.\textsuperscript{20} However, overtones of the final declaration implied that it was a one-time meeting, whose results would be executed by other institutions. Such a message was mainly connected with the position of the European countries wanting to explain to the European Community the absence of its representatives. The American position was different. Kissinger already in a plane coming back to the US had told gathered journalists that the next summit would be called within a year, which was confirmed on the 3rd of June, when President Ford invited his colleagues to the second summit in Puerto Rico.\textsuperscript{21} In this case there was not enough time for preparation, so the effect was worse than before. The Puerto Rico summit was placed at El Dorado Beach Hotel, 20 miles from the San Juan capital. The summit lasted only 24 hours and its main subject was balance of economic policies, in other words a question of how high an economic growth could be maintain without high inflation.\textsuperscript{22} An important part of that summit was the presence of Canada, invited by President Ford, who used his right as the host to invite a guest. Thereby the number of summits’ participants was established at seven.\textsuperscript{23} While the presence of Canada was connected to the compensation of the representation of European countries and countries

\textsuperscript{18} M. Fratianni, P. Savona, J. Kirton, \textit{Governing Global Finance: New Challenges, G7 and IMF Contributions}, Ashgate, c2003, p.29
\textsuperscript{19} N. Bayne, S. Woolcock, \textit{op.cit.}, p.129
\textsuperscript{20} R. Putnam, N. Bayne, \textit{op.cit.}, p.37
\textsuperscript{21} Ibidem, p.37
\textsuperscript{22} Ibidem, p.39
\textsuperscript{23} Ibidem. p.38
from the North hemisphere, the question of Italy’s presence at the summit was heavily discussed during personal representatives’ meetings before Rambouillet and related to fear for a possibility of the communist regime in Italy. Because of that, during lunch before the Puerto Rico summit President Ford, Chancellor Schmidt, President Giscard and Prime Minister Callaghan, discussed possible financial support for Italy, if the Communists came to power. This conversation was supposed to be kept a secret, however two weeks later Chancellor Schmidt, in an interview with American journalists, stated quite categorically, that G7 leaders would not agree on financial support for Italy if the Communists came to power, through that he caused political turmoil. Because the election in 1976 did not give the Italian Communist any place in government, the reaction of G7 countries had never been verified.24 It was agreed in Puerto Rico, that the next summit would be called only, if one of the participant decided that it would be necessary and effective, and if others agreed on it. There was no binding statement on the summits’ continuation; however by the end of 1976 President Giscard called for the next meeting because of a slowdown in the economy.25 At that time in the US, President Carter came to power, whose administration had more of an institutional approach to the summit than their predecessors. In their opinion, the summit was ideal for their aim, which was replacement of US hegemony with a system of collective management. They believed that the summit not necessarily should end with formal and mutually binding decisions and act only as a forum for exchanging ideas but it could contribute to solve differences in important political matters. That is why, bureaucracy was for them part of the system, not a problem (as in Giscard ideas).26 Before the London summit personal representatives, who henceforth were called “sherpas”, had met only at two preparatory sessions, in the course of which for the first time the leaders’ conduct at the summit was discussed in detail and a draft of the final communiqué was prepared.27 The third Summit at Downing Street, 06-08.05.1977, started regular annual meetings lasting two or three days between June and July. In London, leaders agreed on the institutionalization of the sherpas’ “follow-meetings”. An important element of the meeting was President Giscard’s consent to the presence of the EC, represented by the President of the

24 Ibidem, p.42
25 Ibidem, p.43
26 Ibidem, p.45
27 Ibidem, p.46
European Commission and the head of government of the country holding the EC Presidency at G7 summits.28

Personal relations among summits’ participants played an important role at G7 meetings. Although the cooperation between Chancellor Schmidt and President Ford got on very well, when President Carter had come to power the situation had unfortunately changed. It seemed that even the very concept of the summit was endangered, when prior to the meeting in February 1978 in Bonn, President Carter had threatened Chancellor Schmidt that he would not come if they did not agree on the economic difference in advance - the problem was, that the German economic growth was too small for the economic balance.29 However, they eventually came to an agreement and the Bonn Summit turned out to be a success, and it is still an example of the international policy accommodation.30 President Giscard said after, that “a new era of mutual trust among the seven” had come.31 While the Bonn Summit had ended with the trilateral economic agreement, according to which Germany and Japan should act to revive growth in their countries and the US should increase oil prices to international level, in economic respects it turned out that decisions then made were unusually ill-judged.32 It is also worth notice, that in Bonn for the first time, the leaders were concerned with a subject other than economy and in effect they published the declaration on hijacking.

### Second series: holding down inflation, 1979-1982

The year 1979 was rich in events that turned out to be disastrous for the international economy (the taking of hostages in the US Embassy in Teheran; Soviet invasion of Afghanistan; overthrow of the Shah of Iran which caused the 2nd oil crisis and in the effect high inflation in OECD countries).33 Because of this, from the end of 1979 in G7 countries an anti-inflation approach prevailed. It means that the attention was focused on actions aimed at reducing inflation *inter alia*, through the control of the amount of money on the market, reduction of public spending and incentives for the private sector. This move was connected with government changes. Namely, in 1979 the British Prime Minister Callaghan, had been

---

28 N. Bayne, *op.cit.*, p.20
29 R. Putnam, N. Bayne, *op.cit.*, p.82
30 Ibidem, p.99
31 Ibidem, p.95
32 N. Bayne, *op.cit.*, p.21
33 R. Putnam, N. Bayne, *op.cit.*, p.102
replaced with conservative Margaret Thatcher; in 1981 President Ronald Reagan seized power and in France President Mitterrand replaced the G7 founder, President Giscard; and in 1982 Chancellor Schmidt left his office. After 1979, a less ambitious approach to the summit could be noticed. It was agreed that the course of discussion during the summit should be simplified and unified, as well as precise regulations should be left for more general alignments. Because of the huge oil price increase, the Tokyo Summit in June 1979 was dedicated mainly to energy matters. A set of national targets for energy imports in 1979 and 1980 were agreed there. One could also have noticed the abandonment of macro-economic strategy, developed during earlier meetings. Holding down inflation through strict monetary policy was the top priority in Tokyo. The Venice Summit, June 1980, also focused on energy and an austere macro-economic policy. However, regarding the tense international situation (Soviet invasion of Afghanistan and the taking of hostages in Iran) it was the first time when the whole day was devoted to a political debate. What is more, as neither Mitterrand nor Reagan, or other participants did not have any economic experience, they had started their discussions by concentrating more on political matters and treating the summit less attentively. It was clearly seen in the US. While Carter’s administration had wide and serious intentions toward the possibility of using the summit, the Reaganies were afraid, that engagement into international alignments may influence badly the domestic obligations of the President. For that reason, the Montebello Summit (organized by the Canadians in a castle 70 km from Ottawa) July 1981, brought only one important result. Leaders established the “Quadrilateral” or the “Quad”, encompassing the US trade representative, the EC Trade Commissioner and trade ministers of Japan and Canada.

The coming to power of President Reagan caused the tightening of the US policy toward the USSR, which in turn alarmed European countries. The matter of strict restraint on economic relations with the Soviet Union was brought up by President Reagan at the Versailles Summit, June 1982. Americans tried to make Europe decrease the dependence on Soviet gas, but there

34 Ibidem, p.103
35 Ibidem, p.104
36 N. Bayne, *op.cit.*, p.12
37 R. Putnam, N. Bayne, *op.cit.*, p.171
38 N. Bayne, *op.cit.*, p.22
was no lasting agreement on that. The only significant decision of that meeting was the alignment that the IMF Managing Director should be present at the G7 ministers meeting.\textsuperscript{40}

**Third series: rise of politics, 1983-1988.**

The Williamsburg Summit was the first in which Chancellor Helmut Kohl took part and \textit{ipso facto} none of G7’s founders were present at the summit. It was also the first time, where economic matters did not dominate the meeting (one could observe the first signs of economic recovery) and where political matters were widely discussed. For the first time the issue of an East-West strategy had been raised. It was caused by the displacement of Soviet medium-range missiles threatening Japan as well as the US.\textsuperscript{41} Actions aimed at the simplification of the summit process were seen during arrangements of that summit. In spite of the fact that arrangements started later than usual, they focused less on the substantive side but more on logistics, protocol and relation with the media. The second new thing was the resignation of the preparation of a draft of the official communique. These simplifications were possible only because of the resignation of the wide scope of the summit, and the expectation that summit participants would tackle current issues of practical policy.\textsuperscript{42} Beginning with the Williamsburg Summit (except for the London Summit in 1984) the tradition of a specific logo for each annual summit had started.\textsuperscript{43}

Political circumstances such as the outbreak of the Iran-Iraq war and Libyan terrorism had caused, that the London Summit, June 1984, focused mainly on political subjects. Economic matters took form of a futile discussion on calling a new round of multilateral trade negotiations, as Europeans were against it. That subject was the leitmotif of the next summit in Bonn, May 1985. The US economic situation demanded the softening of strong protectionism pressures. One of the ways preferred by Reagan’s administration was the start of a new trade round of negotiations, which was opposed by France. In result, already existing tensions among the summit’s participations deteriorated even more. Also, in a political respect, the summit showed big differences- all participants feared the effects of a new project - the Strategic Defense Initiative presented by President Reagan.\textsuperscript{44}
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The question of beginning a new round of trade negotiations was solved mainly thanks to the GATT meeting, which had taken place before the next Tokyo Summit, May 1986. Once more, political issues played an important role in discussions of leaders- while catastrophe of Chernobyl caused a debate on the nuclear safety issue, the most important subject addressed was terrorism. American air raids in Libya, in retaliation for supporting terrorism by Muamar Kaddafi, had lead to hot disputes in the G7 and condemnation of the US by the French. The most important result of that summit was the decision to transform the G5 into the G7, consisting of seven finance ministers from all participating countries. In the end, the debate on macro-economic and monetary issues was moved from the level of heads of state and government to the minister’s level. The Tokyo Summit was the most productive one in the whole third series.\(^{45}\)

The next meeting in Venice, June 1987, did not bring such lasting decisions. Leaders were focused mainly on the discussion on the Soviet Union, but this debate did not end with any binding conclusion. A different situation was at the Toronto Summit, June 1988, where unlike the other summits of this series, political issues were less vital. This meeting was dominated by the issue of debt relief for low-income countries, which had appeared already in 1982 in Latin American countries, but had been ignored at the Versailles Summit. Creditors of the debt countries were mainly governments. The summit’s participants agreed, on the so called “Toronto terms”, on debt relief even up to one third, if the states would adopt relevant economic policy under the IMF surveillance.\(^{46}\) In the Toronto Economic Declaration for the first time the host country and exact date of the next summit had been given, from then on, it is the tradition that the next host country is indicated.\(^{47}\) The Toronto Summit was the last in the third series and the last in which President Reagan took part.

**Fourth series: the end of the Cold War, 1989-1993**

The fourth series started from the meeting in Paris (Arch), July 1989, which turned out to be one of the most effective. The year 1989 had brought huge political changes in Central and Eastern Europe. Poland and Hungary had freed themselves from the Soviet Union dependence, which the USSR, led by Gorbachev was able to agree upon. In response to that situation G7 leaders decided to establish a mechanism, which would supply technical and
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financial support for countries of Central Europe, building democracy and a market economy. That is why the G24 had been established. Americans raised the issue of the debt crisis in middle-income developing countries, and in Paris a debt reduction plan was agreed on, presented in the “Brady Plan”, the author of which was Bush’s Treasury Secretary Nicholas Brady. The American initiative at this summit was not the only one. The US, together with France presented an idea of establishing the Financial Action Task Force (FATF), which was supposed to penalize the laundering in the process of the illegal drugs trafficking. The initiative was accepted by the G7. France also put the global environment issue on agenda, and for the first time leaders made binding decisions on that subject, which were aimed at including environmental protection into governmental policies. It is also worth notice, that before the Paris Summit, President Gorbachev had sent a letter, in which he asked for an invitation to the G7 forum. The advocate of this was the French sherpa Attali, but G7 countries did not agree.

The environment issue came back also at the next summit in Huston, July 1990. However, some change had occurred, weight of debate moved from a domestic to global dimension e.g. global warming, protection of oceans. In Huston also the trade issue returned. Leaders discussed the necessity of finishing the Uruguay Round of GATT, and brought forward the idea of establishing a new World Trade Organization (WTO). Different opinions regarding agriculture caused that the Uruguay Round subject had returned during next summits. Political situation at the turn of the 80ties and 90ties caused that relations with the USSR were the leitmotif. The European countries, which for a long time made less restrictive policies toward the Soviet Union, wanted the drawing up of an economic support plan for the USSR, but the US and Japan were reluctant to that and in the result nothing was agreed. In the course of hot discussions *inter alia* between the UK and the US it was agreed that there is a need for bringing the USSR into the international market economy and in effect an invitation for President Gorbachev to join as guest at the London Summit in July 1991 was issued. After the

---

48 FATF - est. in 1989. It was aimed *inter alia* at limitation of an access to the financial system for drug-traffickers and other criminals. This initiative brought effect after a year in a form of the FATF Forty Recommendations. During 90-ties the FATF was trying to persuade countries to adapt theses recommendations. In 2000 the FATF published a list of 15 countries which had not wanted to cooperate. This list was verified at the Okinawa Summit where countermeasures against obstructive countries were presented. (p.35 Savona)
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stormy debate, G7 leaders agreed on help for the USSR, but under the condition that it would be conducted under surveillance and stipulated with conditions. Shortly after the meeting in London, Gorbachev was overthrown and the USRR was disassembled. 52 Besides the East-West relations issue, in London also the question of the debt relief for poor countries was discussed. The “Toronto terms” had been changed into the “London terms”, in which the debt relief was possible even to one-half.

The new Russian President, Boris Yeltsin, had been invited to the Munich Summit, July 1992. Heads of state and government, continuing their policy toward Russia, agreed on $24 million support, but with restrictions, that this fund would be supervised by the IMF program. Because of difficulties in realization, most of money had never been used by Russia.

The question of the political and economic situation in Russia returned also during the Tokyo Summit, July 1993. However, the most important alignment of the meeting was the decision, worked out just before the summit by the Quad, a plan on tariffs which caused the finishing of the Uruguay Round by the end of 1993. As a result of earlier raised voices to simplify the summit’s formula, the final declaration of the Tokyo Summit was only six pages long. However, it did not turn out to be a lasting practice. 53

Fifth series: institutions for globalization, 1994-1997

This series was started by the Naples Summit, July 1994, which besides the decision on debt relief for the poorest countries up to two-thirds (“Naples terms”) would not be remembered for anything special. Nevertheless, the Naples Summit initiated two important changes. First of all, the approach of the G7’s participants to the position of Russia had changed. President Yeltsin had been invited to the summit not for discussing financial support for Russia, but for participating in a political debate as a full-member. Second of all, heads of state and government consented to begin a review of international institutions. That decision was connected with the realization by the G7 leaders of the huge role of the globalization process in the world. 54

The review issue returned at the next year’s meeting in Halifax, June 1995, when the host of the summit, Prime Minister Jean Chrétien focused on the revision of the international monetary regime and the United Nations system. According to the first issue mentioned
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above, leaders, on the basis of the crisis in Mexico by the end of 1994, had worked out a
mechanism of the financial crisis treatment and its prevention in the future.\footnote{Ibidem, p.31} Unfortunately,
the four-point reform plan for the IMF and the World Bank had not been fully implemented,
which resulted in perturbations connected with the Asian crisis in 1997.\footnote{M. Fratianni, P. Savona, J. Kirton, \textit{op.cit.}, p.32} Revision of the UN
system did not bring any concrete decisions, although it was agreed that it is just the
beginning of the debate.\footnote{N. Bayne, \textit{op.cit.}, p.31}

The Lyon Summit, June 1996, was dominated mainly by the matter of further debt relief for
the poorest countries, which they owed \textit{inter alia} to the IMF, the World Bank or governments
of other countries. The G7 had established the Heavily Indebted Poor Countries program
adapted by the IMF and the World Bank. Representatives of these two institutions together
with UN and WTO members were for the first time invited to the session of the G7 and
Russia. At this meeting a group of officials aimed at tackling a problem of the international
crime, the so called “the Lyon group” was established.\footnote{Ibidem, p.31}

The meeting in Denver, June 1997, was important because of the further strengthening of
Russia’s role in the summit process. President Clinton in order to appease Russian feeling
toward NATO’s enlargement through some countries from Central Europe, had invited
President Yeltsin not only to a debate on political, but also on economic issues ,concerning
\textit{inter alia} Africa crime and the environment. That summit is also known as “the Summit of
Eight”, but the G7 finance ministers met without any Russian representative, in fact, leaders
of G7 countries discussed trade and finance, before the arrival of Yeltsin at the meeting.

While summits of the fifth series were more productive than the previous, the overload of
summit issues was a big problem. Although, there were separate meetings of foreign, finance,
environment, employment, justice and home affairs ministers, still the heads of state and
government had not enough time to discuss all issues on the agenda. The overload was also
present in documents published at the end of the summit (e.g. the declaration of Denver was
twenty nine pages long).\footnote{Ibidem, p.32}
Sixth series: globalization and development, 1998-2000

The Birmingham Summit, May 1998, beginning the sixth series, turned out to be an important step toward the simplification of the whole process. Prime Minister Tony Blair, the host of the meeting, was aware of the necessity of summits’ reshaping. His aims were more informal discussions among leaders, shorter agenda and concise final documents. Generally, he achieved all of this: heads of state and government met alone, only in company of sherpas and from then on practice of separate finance and foreign ministers’ meeting was a standard; Birmingham’s agenda was limited to three points, and the economic communiqué at the end of the summit was only ten pages long.60 These reforms were possible inter alia thanks to very precise and organized preparations, which happened among sherpas, ministerial meetings and working groups. Although the Birmingham Summit was the first official G8 summit, Russia still did not take full part in some economic discussions e.g. on the international financial architecture. However, President Yeltsin discussed on employability, international crime and debt relief. Traditionally, Russia took part in the political debate, which was at that time dominated by the Indian nuclear tests and Indonesian riots. The Birmingham meeting was the first one, which directly raised the most actual globalization issues, talking about its benefits as well as anxieties regarding this process.61

Chancellor Gerhard Schröder who in 1998 replaced the right-wing Helmut Kohl, was the host of the next meeting in Cologne, June 1999. That change had reinforced a trend, noticeable for some time, of moving from the right to the centre-left. 62 Though an ideological rapprochement, atmosphere at the summit was far from ideal. During the meeting, issues connected with globalization were playing main roles. Heads of state and government gathered at Cologne discussed inter alia on the possibility of the HIPC program improvement. In result, the Cologne Debt Initiative was created, which was supposed to reduce debt for the poorest countries by more than half. Leaders were also talking about economic support for Russia. Plans on reduction of the Russian debt and the economic help for that country were presented in the main communiqué.63 Economic issues were pushed into the background by the hard political situation in Kosovo and in the Balkans. Started by the NATO on 24 Mar. 1999, air raids against the Serbian army aimed at forcing President Milosevic to sign a peace
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agreement, had lead only to escalation of Serbian violence and deterioration of the situation in Kosovo. As a result Russia had threatened with an intervention in support of Milosevic, what brought to the sharpest disagreements between Russia and NATO since the Cold War. In this situation Germany called a special meeting of G8 foreign ministers in Bonn in May, during which they worked out main rules of the peace plan for Kosovo, which was accepted by President Yeltsin at the beginning of June. But the Russian approach was unstable. Yeltsin wanted to receive under his responsibility one of five sectors, into which Kosovo had been divided, and which had belonged to the US, Great Britain, France, Germany and Italy. On 12.06.1999 Russian forces had entered Kosovo on their own and occupied the Pristina airport. Only intensive negotiations in Helsinki on 18th June, between Russia and the US, lead to a compromise on that issue, but still it was not known what President Yeltsin’s reaction would be. The President of Russia came to Cologne just on the last day of the summit, 20th of June (the official reason was his bad health condition) and to the relief of all participants, agreed on all arrangements and on the idea of a new Stability Pact. The Cologne Summit was very productive in a political respect, which dominated the discussion because of the crisis in Kosovo. While focusing mainly on the Balkans issue, the G8 leaders had started formulating an approach to "human security", crisis prevention and threats to human rights. They also briefed their foreign affairs ministers to prepare a plan of action on that issue for the next summit in 2000.

The Okinawa Summit, July 2000, initiated some changes in the summit formula. The Japanese had put a lot of effort into committing of non-G8 countries to the process of pre-summit consultations as well as meetings of ministers and leaders. Moreover, the Japanese sherpa had met with representatives of NGOs before the summit, and during the meeting a special NGO centre had been set up. All these changes were aimed at decreasing skepticism about the summit and increasing its transparency. Prime Minister Obuchi, responsible for the summit preparations, decided to focus on development, and more precisely on IT issues. However, instead of choosing three main subjects, as Blair and Schröder did, Obuchi sketched three wide areas: prosperity, stability and peace of mind, so it was hard to keep a tight rein on the agenda. Among summit participants, only three were newcomers - Prime Minister
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Yoshiro Mori, who replaced Obuchi (he died two months before the summit); the President of Russia Vladimir Putin, who showed himself as a praiseworthy successor of the fickle President Yeltsin; and Prime Minister of Italy Giuliano Amato. 68 This time, unlike in Cologne, political issues did not play the most important role. The main questions were the peace process in the Middle East, in former Yugoslavia and in Korea. President Putin, who on the way to the summit had visited Pyongyang and Beijing, had a lot to say on the last subject. Leaders debated also on the conflict prevention and disarmament. However, the most important issues in Okinawa concerned the economy. Detailed works before the summit, with the involvement of the private sector, allowed leaders to adapt the Charter on Global Information Society, which was divided into three parts, and dealt with the IT role in rich and developing countries. During the leaders’ conversations the issues of the debt relief and poverty reduction returned. Though a long debate, it did not manage to work out anything new than the Cologne terms. It did however work out an agreement on joining the UN and WTO programs, aimed at reducing the spread of AIDS, tuberculosis (TB) and malaria in poor countries. The Okinawa Summit showed how important a role the NGOs are playing, and made leaders aware of better communication with the NGOs, media and non-G8 members. These issues turned out to be even more important during the next summit in Italy. The Genoa Summit, July 2001, went down in history in respect of massive protests that accompanied it. During two days of riots one person was killed, more than 200 were injured and losses were estimated at $40 million. 69 Leaders gathered in Geneva were shocked by the scale of violence and they devoted a part of the meeting to the discussion on a way which would enable in the future to avoid similar situations. Consequently, they agreed that a more proper localization should be chosen; the number of delegation members should be limited; and there should be an intensification of consultations with civil society groups and regular contacts with non-G8 countries. 70 In spite of huge perturbation, the G8 had managed to carry out an effective debate in three areas chosen by Italy: poverty reduction, global environment and conflict prevention. During the G8 meeting, Prime Minister of Italy Berlusconi and the UN General Secretary Annan proclaimed the establishment of a Global Fund to Fight AIDS, Tuberculosis and Malaria. This issue was connected with a hard situation of African countries, discussed during a working lunch on the 20th of July, between the G8 and five African Presidents. The
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discussion focused on the New African Initiative (which later became the New Partnership for Africa’s Development-NEPAD), which was supposed to restore order in the African countries. In result, the G8 Genoa Plan for Africa was published, promising the G8’s help in conflict prevention and widely understood development. This plan was the only case in the G8 history of a partnership with the group of non-G8 countries. In the next months it had been transformed into the G8 Africa Action Plan. In the economic area the biggest success was a report of the DOT-Force (Digital Opportunity Task Force), created at the Okinawa Summit in order to help the poorest countries to benefit from IT technology. In the political area a debate on Africa played the main role and only a short discussion was devoted to the situation in the Middle East and to regional issues.\(^7\)

**Seventh series: fighting terrorism and its causes, 2002-2007**

After the 9/11 attacks on the US, the worldwide political situation had changed dramatically. The US focused on combating terrorism and they were expecting the same from their allies. An anti-terrorist campaign defined the fight, not only with the effects of this phenomenon but also with its causes. That is why the Canadian hosts decided to put on the agenda, next to terrorism also issues that were continuities from the former summits. As a result, in the three areas of the agenda, such subjects as terrorism, situation in Africa and strengthening of the economic growth appeared. Canadians as a meeting place had chosen a resort in the Rockies called Kananaskis. That localization ensured good protection against possible terrorist attack as well as against possible anti-globalist demonstrations (which were fresh in memory in respect of the Genoa riots). But it also demanded a small number of delegation members, which caused that the summit atmosphere was informal and quite spontaneous. Additionally, the media and civil society were placed in Calgary, 90 km away.\(^2\)

The Kananaskis Summit, June 2002, lasted only one and a half days and it had not published any G8 communiqué. Instead of this, Prime Minister of Canada Jean Chrétien announced the “Chair’s summary”, which was quite concise and included only main points of the heads’ discussion. Additionally, the summit published a separate document concerning concrete issues that were raised at the meeting. One of the leaders’ first decisions was to plan the summit session till 2010 and an agreement on the Russian host in 2006. It was a clear sign of the fact, that Russia would become G8’s full-member. In political issues, the most
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important matter was the fight against terrorism. In this subject leaders agreed on a very important document - “The G8 Partnership against the Spread of Weapons and Materials of Mass Destruction”, aimed at preventing the possibility of nuclear, chemical or biological weapons falling into terrorist hands. Moreover, the heads of state and government agreed to allot $20 billion over ten years to finance the destruction or clear-up of nuclear and chemical weapons and other materials in Russia and others states of the former USSR.\footnote{Ibidem, p.130} Leaders of the same four African countries as in Genoa (South Africa, Nigeria, Senegal, Algeria) were also present at the Kananaskis Summit, who together with the UN Secretary Kofi Annan took part in a meeting on the situation in Africa. A result of that meeting was the G8 Africa Action Plan, declaring the G8’s support in two political (peace and security, strengthening governance) and six economic areas (trade and investment, debt relief, expanding knowledge, improving health, agriculture and water resources). This plan in its principles was referring often to NEPAD (African initiative) and was welcomed by the African leaders at Kananaskis. Economic issues were connected with political matters and focused mainly on the situation of developing countries. The heads of state and government allotted $1 billion for the HIPC Trust Fund; expressed will to finish the Doha Round by 2004 and worked out economic support for the Africa Action Plan.\footnote{Ibidem, p.133} In the end, the Kananaskis Summit was measured as a success.

Similarly, as a year ago, also before the Evian Summit, June 2003, international events influenced the atmosphere of the meeting. This time, the war in Iraq had an opposite effect than the 9/11 attacks, as it had divided participants. The UK, Italy and Japan backed up the US, by contrast France, Germany, Russia and Canada were against the American strategy. So, the Evian Summit was for its members a chance for consent and restoring mutual good relations. Responsible for the meeting’s organization, President Chirac, had used changes, introduced earlier by Canada, and thanks to that the summit took place in two nearby hotels, the Hotel Royal and the Ermitage Hotel in Evian, while the media centre was located at Publier, 5 km from Evian. The President of France took care of the participants’ security introducing strict security measures and in effect demonstrations were relocated from France to Switzerland.\footnote{Ibidem, p.141} However, Chirac abandoned an idea of the clearly specified agenda and chose four wide topics, such as solidarity, responsibility, security and democracy, which
caused that the documentation from the meeting was exceptionally copious. The Evian Summit was singled out because of two reasons. For the first time there was no separate meeting of the G7, and President Putin joined the discussion from the very beginning. Secondly, the heads of state and governments met with a large group of eleven representatives of developing countries (including five from Africa) and heads of the UN, the IMF, World Bank and the WTO. As in the last four years, also at Evian a meeting took place gathering the G8 leaders with representatives of four African countries, concerning inter alia the NEPAD realization and further engagement of the G8 in the help for Africa. An economic session of the G8 did not bring any significant decisions. Leaders discussed on trade, corruption and transparency in the management of extractive industries and in the financial management in developing countries. A little bit more had been reached in political issues, where the attention was focused on terrorism and non-proliferation. In the main political document, “The Declaration on Non-proliferation of WMD”, leaders submitted a warning to North Korea to finish any nuclear weapons programs and a petition to Iran to adapt the IAEA recommendations. Besides this declaration, an important event was the establishment of the CTAG (Counter-Terrorism Action Group), which was supposed to cooperate in that area with the UN. The G8 leaders discussed also the development in the fields of health – the G8 declared $1 billion financial support from the US side and $1 billion from the EU side for the Global Fund to Fight AIDS, Tuberculosis and Malaria; water; famine; science and technology.

The development issue was also present at the next meeting at Sea Island, June 2004. Considering health, leaders agreed on the development and distribution of an HIV vaccine, while on the topic of debt relief, they prolonged the HIPC Program until the end of 2006. Apart from such topics as famine or fighting corruption, heads of state and government issued an “Action Plan on Entrepreneurship and the Eradication on Poverty”, in which they for the first time, tried to assist the private sector operations within developing countries. Leaders did not talk much about economic issues. Fundamentally, aside from a general statement on the necessity of finishing the WTO’s Doha Round, there were no productive decisions. The most important matters of the Sea Island Summit had a political character, specifically the situation in the Middle East and in North Africa were intensively discussed. Representatives
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from these regions had been invited to the summit, in order to discuss issues which interested all sides, unfortunately many countries, including Egypt and Saudi Arabia, had rejected, saying that they could not accept reforms imposed from outside. Despite these difficulties, the G8 was able to publish two documents. First of them established the “Partnership for Progress and a Common Future in the Region of the Broader Middle East and North Africa”, which described the G8’s support for the reforms in the region, based on such values as freedom, democracy and the rule of law. The second one, the “G8 Plan of Support for Reform”, had described eight concrete initiatives to support reforms.79 Two of the most important were the establishment of a “Forum for the Future” and the creation of a “Democracy Assistance Dialogue”. Participation in the Forum was supposed to be free-will and governments as well as business and civil society were supposed to be involved. Debate on the Middle East could not have ignored Iraq and the Israel-Palestine conflict. G8 countries expressed readiness to any assistance for the newly chosen “Iraqi interim government”, in order to restore peace and introduce democracy in this country. Incidentally a discussion on Iraqi debt relief had also occurred. The US wanted total reduction, on this there was no consent from the rest of the participants, who claimed that it would be unfair toward poor countries, which unlike Iraq, have no rich oilfields. In the end, this question was shifted to a debate on the Paris Club forum.80 The G8 had also made a statement about the peaceful solution of the Israel-Palestine conflict. Leaders accepted the leading role of the Quartet, encompassing the US, the UN, the EU and Russia, in implementing the Road Map81, aimed at a final solution of the conflict. At Sea Island, heads of state and government announced the “Action Plan on Non-proliferation”, elements of which were initiatives implemented by the UN, e.g. the PSI (Proliferation Security Initiative) or the Global Partnership set at the Kananaskis Summit in 2002.82 The issue of the fight against terrorism returned a year later at the Gleneagles Summit, 2005, because of the bomb attacks in London, in which more than fifty people were killed. The attacks had directly impacted Prime Minister Tony Blair limiting his presence and shortening
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the time of discussion. G8 leaders in a special statement proclaimed full support for the UK and condemned the terrorist attacks. Despite difficulties, they managed to fully discuss the planned agenda. Prime Minister Blair already in October 2004 had announced that by returning to the Birmingham formula, the summit would raise two main topics, African development and climate change. The venue chosen by the UK, a fashionable golf resort of Gleneagles in Scotland, was supposed to ensure an informal and friendly atmosphere. Various NGOs and civil society groups were engaged in a clear and wide way in the summit process, among which an important role was played by the “Make Poverty History” campaign, in which the famous singer Bob Geldof was a significant figure. Geldof, U2 frontman Bono and a group of other stars came to Gleneagles, where Bush, Chirac and Schröder had met. There they handed a petition with 38 million signatures to the G8 to increase aid for Africa. An important event of the summit was a meeting between the G8 and non-G8 countries. On the first day, the G8 heads of state and government met the leaders of five developing countries - Brazil, China, India, Mexico and South Africa and representatives of the IAEA, the IMF, the UN, World Bank and the WTO, and they discussed climate change. Representatives of seven African states - Algeria, Nigeria, Senegal, South Africa (that five was regularly present at the summit process), Ethiopia, Tanzania, Ghana as well as heads of the IMF, the UN, World Bank and the chair of the AU were, almost by tradition, invited to take part in the second day. The most important decisions were made on climate change and the situation in Africa. More trouble was expected on the first matter, as there were still differences on the Kyoto Protocol, which the Americans did not want to sign (the US was one of the biggest greenhouse gas emitters). In spite of initial difficulties, the G8 had published a statement, in which they confirmed their engagement in reduction of greenhouse gas emissions and reaffirmed that the UN Framework Climate Change Convention is the basis to any actions in the future. Heads of state and government acknowledged also the willingness of cooperation on energy efficiency, on renewable energy and on research and development. Moreover, they published a document “Dialogue on Climate Change, Clean Energy and Sustainable Development”, agreed between the G8 and non-G8 countries present at Gleneagles, dedicated to any state that wanted to join. It was also
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agreed that the energy issue would be continued in 2006 at the summit in Russia. In the
African issue, there were three main areas of discussion, such as debt relief, trade access and
aid volume. G8 finance ministers at a meeting before the summit agreed that full relief on
debts to the IMF, World Bank and the Africa Development bank would be possible for
eighteen countries (including fourteen in Africa) and nine would get the right later – in total it
would be more than $40 billion. Heads of state and governments gathered at the Gleneagles
Summit, accepted the solution without any amendments. However, the biggest achievement
of Gleneagles was the consent to double the aid for Africa between 2004 and 2010 by
providing $25 billion per year. Among political issues, the G8 leaders discussed a plan on
restoring peace between Israel and Palestine, giving their support for the program worked out
by the Quartet. They also published statements on the Indian Ocean tsunami as well as on
non-proliferation and counter-terrorism.85

It is worth notice, that in the course of the G8’s more than thirty year old history, an
additional Nuclear Safety and Security Summit was organized, which took place in Moscow,
19-20.04.1996. Besides the fact that in that time, it was still the G7, Russia had full rights
during all debates. In Moscow participants agreed on a program to prevent and treat the illicit
trafficking in nuclear materials.86

The decision making process

With time the subjects as well as the logistic process the summits evolved. President Giscard,
one of the summit idea founders, had planned that only heads of state and government should
take part in the meetings. However, because of the resistance from the American side personal
representatives, finance and foreign ministers also took part in summits.87 Personal
representatives (since Carter and Owen called sherpas) were present from the very beginning
and were recruited among the most trusted people around the head, because they often had to
make decisions on their own, without any consultations with their supervisors.88

So during the first several years, the decision-making process had two levels. Heads of state
and governments, together with finance and foreign ministers created first level, while the
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second was formed by small teams of bureaucrats led by sherpas.89 In the 90-ties, the number of topics was so large that ministers were forced to call separate meetings during the summit, and since the 1998 Birmingham Summit, they meet separately in time and space without the heads.90 In spite of a significant enlargement in the 90-ties, the summit always demanded a lot of preparation and the subject was from the very beginning so demanding, that the heads were forced to rely on the work of their sherpas.91 National sherpa teams consist of the sherpa and, two sous-sherpas, taken from the French language, who are recruited from the foreign ministry and the finance ministry, one from each.92 Generally, in the course of the summit preparatory phase, the sous-sherpa meet up to six times, while the sherpas four to five times.93

Within the sherpas’ responsibility is the preparation of an agenda and drafting of necessary documents. The host has the right to choose the summit’s subjects and usually he focuses on new topics, whereas the sherpas’s task during the fixing of the agenda is to continue previous issues which is often the reason of hot debates on what could be omitted in the agenda setting.94 Very often results of the sherpas preparatory works have been important strategic propositions e.g. the suggestion of the Attali Sherpa in 1989, who proposed the idea of the European Bank for Reconstruction and Development.95

G8 leaders gathered in Genoa in 2001, brought into existence the Africa Personal Representatives (APRs), who were supposed to prepare and supervise the implementation of the Africa Action Plan. APRs reported directly to heads, disregarding the sherpas.96 The leader of the host country, who usually holds the office of the chairman, has a particular role among the heads. The chairman has the privilege of determining the agenda, moderating the discussion, supervising the preparatory stage, and issuing the final communiqué, unless the parties wish to adapt a joint declaration. The final declaration, which can include
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recommendations, as well as legally binding international obligations for the members, is the primary act of the G8.  

The ministerial fora, of which a lot of emerged in the course of the G8’s more than thirty year history, have important supportive functions. The most important fora were - to begin with, the G5 Finance Ministers, which consist of the representatives of France, Germany, the UK, the US and Japan, and was established in 1973 as the Library Group. The last meeting of the G5 was on 21.02.1987 in Paris. Its greatest success was the Plaza Accord, signed on 22.09.1985, which started the “managed floating” of exchange rates. Secondly, the G7 finance ministers’ meetings, who from 1975 to 1998 met together with the heads, and since 1998 have separate meetings just before the summit. The Tokyo Summit in 1986 had officially established sessions of the G7 finance ministers group as separate meetings to be held four times a year. Heads of central banks of the G7 and the Managing Director of the IMF usually took part in these meetings. Since 1998 also pre-summit meetings are taking place, gathering the finance and foreign ministers and the President of the European Central Bank. On 1 Oct. 2004, finance ministers invited a representative of China to take part in the meeting. Since the Denver Summit, Russia was treated as a full-member, but finance ministers meetings were still called without Russia. If the Russian finance minister were to be present at the meeting, then such a meeting was held without central bank heads.  

Thirdly, since 1998, meetings of the foreign ministers take place separately just before the summit. Until then they met together with finance ministers and the heads, though since 1984 they began also separate mid-year meetings.  

Fourthly, an important forum was the G7 trade ministers’ meetings, which were started during the 1978 Summit. The 1981 Summit in Okinawa had established the Quad, the Trade Ministers Quadrilateral, which brought together representatives of the US, Canada, Japan and the EU. The Quad had met from 1982 to 1999. In 2005, the FIP was established. The Five Interested Parties included Australia, Brazil, the EU, India and the US.

With time, the heads stepped forward with an initiative to call on meeting of other ministers such as ministers of employment, environment, energy, education, development, justice and
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home affairs. Additionally, the G8 system allows for regular or ad hoc meetings of task forces, working or expert groups e.g. the Financial Action Task Force established at the Paris Summit 1989 or the Halifax Counter-terrorist Experts’ Group established in 1995.¹⁰¹

**G8 relations with international organisations**

Two relations could be found here - cooperation with the European Union and relationship with international organisations, NGOs and civil society groups. History of relations between the EU and the G8 is connected with the beginning of the G8 process., During the European Council meeting in Rome, 12.12.1975, just after the Rambouillet Summit, five members of the European Community (the EC), which had not participated in the summit, strongly criticised the decision of the UK, France, Germany and Italy on individual participation in the summit instead of collectively as the European Community.¹⁰² At a debate of the European Parliament in June 1976, the issue of participation of the European Community and its representation at the summit was deliberated on. But as the discussion started only a few weeks before the second summit in Puerto Rico no agreement was reached, and as a result the EC was not present at that meeting.¹⁰³ Countries absent at the summit raised an issue of an inconsistency with the 1957 Treaty of Rome, which gave the EC the single right to speak on behalf of its member on some economic issues e.g. international trade or protectionist measures. In March 1977, the European Parliament passed a resolution, in which it was pointed out that “Insist that the Community as such – Council and Commission – be represented at the forthcoming Western Economic Summit in London.”¹⁰⁴ Throughout the debate, the French approach was clearly noticeable. France was strongly opposed to any form of EC presence, and opted for such a formula of the summit, in which only the heads of state and government would gather to discuss issues in an informal and easy atmosphere. The EC got support from the American side after a power change in the US, after which Carter’s administration popularized a triaderist concept, at the heart of which lay the presumption that the European homogeneous approach would be more constructive than a concept in which a
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compromise would be reached separately with each country. In this way, The EC represented by UK Prime Minister Callaghan, who was at the same time the President of the Council and the host, and by the Commission President Roy Jenkins, who was present only on the second day of the summit took part at the meeting for the first time at the London Summit in 1977.

This limitation was related with the G7’s concession toward the President of France and the summit founder Giscard d’Estaing, who was a strong opponent of the EC participation. Since 1977, the EC is always present at G8 meetings, although only since the 1981 Ottawa Summit, EC representatives have the possibility to participate in a political debate.\textsuperscript{105} Currently, the EC participates in the whole process of summitry: in the preparatory stage it is represented by the EC sherpa, who is always the Chef du Cabinet of the President of the Commission. An opinion presented by the Commission on the G8 forum is usually a result of a regular EC process of discussion and consensus building.\textsuperscript{106} An important date in the history of G8 - EC relations was the year 1982, when for the first time the European Council President was not represented by G7 members. This is how countries not connected with the G7 gained access to an international debate forum. Currently, the EU has five seats in the G8 summitry, and is basically the ninth member of that group, although its official status is unknown. Fundamentally, the EU is treated as a full-member, with one exception - it cannot be the host of the summit. There are voices that on the G8 forum should be one united European opinion, but France, Italy, Germany or the UK are not prone to resign from their membership for the EU.\textsuperscript{107}

From the very beginning above all the G7 has had close relations with the IMF, the World Bank and the OECD, and since 1989 it also focused on the UN system reform.\textsuperscript{108} At an initial stage G7 leaders created only recommendations for specific organizations, mainly for the IMF, World Bank, GATT, the WTO, but in the process of time it has begun to use experience and resources of other organizations \textit{inter alia} the UN departments or the OSCE. However, when in some areas competencies of these organizations were insufficient, the G7/8 has been establishing its own working groups or special ministerial meetings. The strongest relations
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linked the G7 with the OECD, as G7 countries are all members of the OECD. In turn, since 1987, G7 finance ministers and central bank presidents meet at least once in six months, and the Managing Director of the IMF usually participates in this discussion as a supervisor. Also the deputies’ network of senior finance ministry and central bank officials meets once every six weeks, which gives assurance of continuation of works. One can say that cooperation of the G7 with the IMF or World Bank was easier than with the OECD, because it was hard to duplicate functions that two first organizations posses.

The Halifax Summit in 1995 proposed concrete actions to review and reform of international institutions. The aim was to clearly describe competencies of the UN agencies, to eliminate duplications and to support prestigiously some IGOs. For almost twenty five years the summit relied on relations mainly with international organizations and IGOs. Already in 2000, the Okinawa Summit expressed will to establish connections with the private sector and NGOs, which resulted in establishing the DOT Force. From then on, one can see a deeper understanding for the importance of cooperation with such participants of the international system as the business sector, e.g. the ICC (the International Chamber of Commerce), World Economic Forum at Davos; NGOs e.g. Médecins Sans Frontier; or civil society groups e.g. Make Poverty History.
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Chapter II
METHODOLOGY

Security meanings
As even researches themselves notice, the security studies are quite a new discipline. Generally, only after the First World War it was acknowledged that the contribution of the civil approach in the military affairs strategy could be helpful. However, the so called first wave of security studies had started with the end of the Second World War and was interested in subject concerning weapons of mass destruction.\footnote{113 S. Walt, \textit{The Renaissance of Security Studies}, [in] B. Buzan, L. Hansen (ed.) \textit{International Security}, The Transition to the Post-Cold War Security Agenda, v. II, SAGE Publications Ltd., 2007, p.216} The traditional approach, which emerged in the 40-ties of the 20\textsuperscript{th} century, characterized by a realistic approach claimed that the main actors in international systems are states. According to the realists, states cannot trust each other and try to obtain a dominant position, as a result of which, they try to expand their power wherever they could to secure themselves.\footnote{114 P. Hough, \textit{Understanding Global Security}, Routledge, 2004, p.3} Realistically, an individual interest is inseparably connected with the national interest. The balance of power rule can be seen, which give sense to anarchic international environment. In the 60-ties, the realist movement began evolving toward neorealism, which kept focus on a state and the search for power, but at the same time it accepted that not everything is caused by military possibilities e.g. states could grow in strength through economic international influences.\footnote{115 Ibidem, p.4} Neorealists claim that the main research subject of security studies is the “phenomenon of war” and security studies themselves may be defined “as the study of the threat, use, and control of military force”.\footnote{116 S. Walt, \textit{op.cit.}, p.215} At the beginning of the 90-ties a common movement in the debate on what is security occurred, and it was connected with the end of the Cold War. However, first signs of this occurrence were seen already in the 80-ties, when in the 1980 report of the Independent Commission on International Development Issues chaired by Willy Brandt (former West German Chancellor) it was noticed that the task of international policy would be to provide “a new, more comprehensive understanding of ’security’, which would be less restricted to the purely military aspects.”\footnote{117 P. Hough, \textit{op.cit.}, p.12} In 1982, the
Report of the Palme Commission was published, in which an idea of common security was presented.\footnote{More about common security: David Dewitt, Common, Comprehensive, and Cooperative Security, [in] B. Buzan, L. Hansen (ed.) International Security, The Transition to the Post-Cold War Security Agenda, v. II, SAGE Publications Ltd., 2007, pp. 409-429} Moreover, in 1975 Henry Kissinger, whose faith in the balance of power politics was very strong, admitted in his speech that we are stepping in a new era in which the world is more and more dependent on economics, on communications, and on human aspirations.\footnote{J. Nye, Jr., Soft Power, [in] B. Buzan, L. Hansen (ed.) International Security, The Transition to the Post-Cold War Security Agenda, v. II, SAGE Publications Ltd., 2007, p.187} In 1983, an article by Richard Ullman was published under the meaningful title “Redefining Security”, in which he called for adoption of an “alternative conception of national security”.\footnote{E. Rotschild, What is Security?, [in] B. Buzan, L. Hansen (ed.) International Security, Widening Security, v. III, SAGE Publications Ltd., 2007, p.4} He claimed that demographic pressure and resource depletion must be included as security threats on a par with military threats. He defined, in a wide way a threat to security as “an action or sequence of events that (1) threatens drastically and over a relatively brief span of time to degrade the quality of life for the inhabitants of a state or (2) threatens significantly to narrow the range of policy choices available to a government of a state, or to private, nongovernmental entities (persons, groups, corporations) within the state.”\footnote{P. Hough, op.cit., p.7} Ullman called in question the utility of concentrating on military security, because according to him it spreads a false reality image and causes that states focus on military threats and ignore other ones, which may be more dangerous, thus lowering their total security. Furthermore, this approach contributes to the militarization of the international relations and in the long run it only increases global insecurity.\footnote{S. Smith, The Increasing Insecurity of Security Studies: Conceptualizing Security in the Last Twenty Years, [in] S. Croft, T. Terriff (ed.), Critical Reflections on Security and Change, Frank Cass, 2000, p.77}

The next important article, \textit{nota bene} under the same title, was the work of Jessica Tuchman Mathews, who in 1989 anticipated that the 90-ties would demand redefinition of elements creating national security. According to Mathews, while the 70-ties brought the enlargement of the concept of international economics, the current global development demand broadening the definition of national security with the notion of resource, environmental and demographic
issues. She stated that “The assumptions and institutions that have governed international relations in the post-war era are poor fit with these new realities.”

However, the debate on the meaning of security started for good with the finishing of the Cold War, and with the change of the bipolar world into one more complex and unpredictable. Strength in a war stopped to be the traditional power factor. Factors such as technology, education, economic growth are becoming more important, while such factors as geography, population or raw materials are becoming less significant. Nye points out that military strength remains still the highest form of power in the system of self-help, but power use became more costly for modern states than it used to be. Instruments such as communications, organizational and institutional skills, and manipulation of interdependence are becoming more and more important. What is significant, the interdependence does not mean harmony, but rather the unevenly divided mutual dependence, which is often unevenly divided in different areas e.g. security, trade or finance. Additionally, the use of military force is more costly, it means power resources are less transferable so, for example, the shift of resources from economic to the military area could be painful for a state. The way, in which some of the scholars notice a new agenda of the security studies comply with military elements, but above all it concentrates on non-traditional issues ranging from fears of instability in the global trading and financial systems, through a bewildering array of supposed threats to national and religious identities, to alarmist predictions about the effects of various environmental pollutants.

The end of the Cold War caused that on a large scale, new actors emerged on the international scene inter alia NGOs. In the 90-ties, a new political theory of NGO became popular, where an NGO is perceived as “the uncorrupt, the uncynical or the unbureacratic.” Some scholars,
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for example Ignatieff, call for leaning the international relations on the basis of exchanges between NGOs.\textsuperscript{130} However, despite the fact that NGOs may play a lot of political roles, they cannot assure security, because security is the political connection between the individual and the political community, and cannot have a voluntary character.\textsuperscript{131} According to Rotschild, “security requires the predictability and repetitiveness that are the endless propensities of the state. That is why the rediscovery of the (international) state is at the heart of the politics of individual security.”\textsuperscript{132} In turn, Nye claims that it is not a matter which actors are more important, state or non-state (usually state are), but the point is that in our times compound coalitions bring results.\textsuperscript{133}

Most scholars, appreciating the role of states, notice that: “In widening the scope of security, other non-state actors, like multinational corporations and human rights advocacy groups, or other human systems and institutions, like global markets and the diffusion of scientific knowledge and technological know-how, will necessarily have to be considered and their importance to security studies specified.”\textsuperscript{134}

Generally, we have a trend in which the role of states as hard, self-contained, defensible units has been limited. Instead, it is visible that the priority of various systematic referent objects as the global economy, international society and the planet environment has been reinforced. According to Buzan, it is connected to the fact that postmodern states reject the Westphalian practice of hard boundaries and exclusive sovereignty, what is reflected \textit{inter alia} in the development of the EU.\textsuperscript{135}

However, in spite of such trends in security studies, some scholars remain by the state-centric conception. A statement that a state is the subject of security and only to a state does security refer to, authority and obligation is the most important assumption of neorealism. In this approach citizens’ security is identical with state security and everything that comes from the outside is a potential threat. The State acts only according to its own interest and others do exactly the same.\textsuperscript{136} And so, for example for Waltz the end of the Cold War brought collapse
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of the bipolarity, but we should not expect any more changes. Another representative of neorealism, Walt claims that excessive widening of the security studies *inter alia* with such issues as pollution or economic recessions “would destroy its intellectual coherence and make it more difficult to devise solutions to any of these important problems”. This narrow approach has a lot of critics, who are against e.g. the limitation of the subject of security studies only to “war between states” without including other actors and levels. Opponents of the Neorealists claim that the assumption that protection of “core values” of a state from military threats coming from outside is not adequate any more by evaluating what (or who) is to be secured from what threats and by which means. And that last question is particularly important, as after the Cold War a high rise of ethnic and nationalist conflict and decrease of intra-state conflicts had occurred, which is why classical theories lost their usability. Despite the fact that the nation state and the nation-state system are basic units of government, world population, ideological and institutional fundamentals of international order are strengthened by multilateral cooperation in international organisations such as the UN or the EU, which should regulate the use of force or threats, still weak states, which are not able to fulfil their function of security are a greater source of international disorder. Generally, one can say that widening of the security idea had four forms. First, downwards: from security of nations to security of groups and individuals. Second, upwards: from nations to security of international systems or supranational physical environments. Third, horizontally – as various kinds, this means from military to political, economic, social, environmental or human security.Fourth, there was the widening of political responsibility for security in all directions: upwards from states to international institutions, downwards to local or regional governments as well as to NGOs, public opinion, press or such abstractive
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Different scholars pay attention to the subject of broadening of the security studies e.g. Krause and Williams. However Steve Smith claims additionally, that the security studies have become something more than something to be explained, they are know also something to be understood. Kolodziej underlines that the proof of a widening interest in security subject could be seen during the last twenty years through an explosion of various governmental and non-governmental institutions engaging in security and a variety of research and analysis methods. Reports published by these institutions and international organisations also show how important a role is played by non-military threats. For example in the WHO report one can find information that illness is the cause of death of 91% of cases. Additionally, in favour of the importance of non-military threats weighs the fact that every year more people commit suicide than are killed in homicides and “collective violence”.

Between 1988 and 1992, a significant shift in research and teaching was noticed. Issues of military strategy, costs, profits or risk of new weapon systems were complemented with issues of economy, environment or human rights. This change was visible in developed as well as developing countries. Generally, it is seen that most scholars are inclined to agree that “The end of the Cold War is arguably the most momentous event in international politics since the end of World War II and the dawn of the atomic age.”

The variety of works concerning security studies after the end of the Cold War is so big that one could mark next to the traditional approach additional seven, which are according to Smith joined in “non-traditional literature” and these are:
2. The Third World security school, which emerged during the Cold War. Threats for states in the Third World are mainly internal, and because of that more economic and environmental than military.
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3. Buzan and the Copenhagen School, which according to Ken Booth “remains the most comprehensive theoretical analysis of the concept” of security.\textsuperscript{151}

4. Constructivist security studies, which base on works of authors, who have brought the assumptions of social constructivism into security studies.\textsuperscript{152}

5. Critical security studies - here we can mark out two streams: Keith Krause and Michael Williams, the second one being the so called “Welsh School”; both are questioning the focus of traditional security studies on the state.\textsuperscript{153}

6. Feminist security studies - according to Jill Steans, the representative of this stream, it shows “what is lost from our understanding of security when gender is omitted”.\textsuperscript{154}

7. Post structural security studies, which dispute the epistemological, methodological and ontological assumptions of traditional security studies.\textsuperscript{155}

In this work I use the concept presents by the so called Copenhagen School represented \textit{inter alia} by Barry Buzan, Ole Wæver and Jaap de Wilde, who in the work “Security: a new framework for analysis” introduced the following classification for security areas dividing the whole area into the military, environmental, economic, societal and political sectors. In their concept the authors focus on some important definitions. One of them is a subject, whom concerns the question of security and who must defend against danger, calling “referent object”. Usually this role is played by a state, which possesses the relevant measures enabling the reaction to an existential threat. But in the wider depiction the \textbf{referent object} could be seen in other meanings. In the military sector it is usually a state but in the political sector existential threat relates very often to sovereignty which could be understood in the category of a state or an international organization as e.g. the European Union. It is even harder to define existential threats and the referent object (which is usually a state or a nation) in the economic sector. Here we could find the global market as an object that could be threatened by factors that undermine its existential norms and rules. In the societal sector it is not a state but “large-scale collective identities that can function independent of the state, such as nations
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and religions”\textsuperscript{156}. Similar diversity could be observed in the environmental sector, where the referent object could apply to individual species or in the much wider context to the maintenance of the planetary climate.

The other important concept for Buzan, Wæver and de Wilde is \textit{securitization}. If a public issue is securitized it means “the issue is presented as an existential threat, requiring emergency measures and justifying actions outside the normal bounds of political procedures”\textsuperscript{157}. It is important to add that the issue is securitized only when the audience accepts it as such. This idea is often stand to the concept of politicization which means to make an issue an open matter of choice. By contrast, securitization means that issue could not be treated in normal political way but should be decisively dealt by leaders above all other issues. In fact the main goal is a desecuritization, because it means that the issue is not treated as urgent and existential, but is moved into ordinary public sphere. This definition should be understood intersubjectively as they are rooted among subjects (they are defined by actors).

It is important to answer such questions as: who securitizes (actors), on what issues (threats), for whom (referent objects), why, what’s the effect and under what conditions (when it could be successful). These concepts are necessary to understand methodology used in description of all five sectors.

The first one is the \textit{military sector}. Here the process of securitization is the most institutionalized. In most cases states are referent objects and securitizing actors are elites, which are legitimated legally and politically to prevent existential threats by using force. A government (as that which we are talking about) rules a nation and makes decision on its behalf in various fields, but the core task is to maintain sovereignty. This also includes the military domain. Threats which require military response may arise inside or outside the state; they can sometimes consist of both.

In case of internal threats a government is supposed to maintain territorial integrity, civil peace and their own machinery of government. The most popular examples are separatist, terrorist or criminal movements, against which governing elites could use force. These kinds of threats are dangerous for states as they very often have support from a part of society.

External threats usually apply to unity among citizens and are very easy to securitize. When one state begins to perceive other armed forces as a threat, it will begin to counteract, for example through proliferation of military facilities, arms race and policy of deterrence or on
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the other hand by arms reduction and arms control. It is easy to notice that politics play a very important role here - all these above mentioned processes are deeply connected with political relations.

Another important idea is the issue of what is the referent object for military security. Traditionally it is a state that has the right and capability to use force in case of threats, but in the contemporary international system there are also other referent objects that could be securitized. Tribes or nations living on the territory of a state and putting forward secession or revolution demands can be treated as referent objects. Just the same as religion, this is also very vulnerable to securitization. But not only states or would-be states remain available as referent objects for military securitization. Alliances such as NATO can also be treated in that way. It doesn’t mean an easy sum of claims of different states but also nuclear nonproliferation, balance of power or nonaggression can be seen as referent object on a higher level.

When the state is the referent object, clear rules define which state representatives are securitizing actors. However, states are sometimes heterogenous. In that case some pressure groups could effectively act as securitizing actors. In intergovernmental organization there are also legally chosen authorities, which can invoke some principles as referent objects of military security.158

Another important aspect is the diversity of military threats. Here they are usually connected with “to be or not to be” of states. Societies risk not only lives of people but its whole political, economic and social output. Vulnerabilities and threats depend mainly on military capabilities of enemies, and determine the nature and extent of dangers. A nuclear equipped aggressor in fact means a probable obliteration for the attacked country. The size or armed forces, the kind of equipment and type of their structure will determine military securitization. But there are also such factors as geography, history and politics which influence perceiving threats. The general rule of military relations says that states should be more afraid of their neighbors than of distant powers. This is very often joined by a second factor: historical enmity. Past experience in mutual relations is sometimes marked with such events as local conflicts, which could have an effect on military threats, especially when both actors have different political ideologies. That last political factor includes also the matter of recognition -
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equal treatment. “Absence of political and social recognition makes military threats much more open to securitization.”159

After a long period of the Cold War, the military sector came out of a global level to a regional one: superpowers became weaker and there was space for local dynamics. This situation was clearly seen especially in Europe, where collapse of the Soviet Union sharply revived conflicts in the Balkans.

Securitization of the environment is relatively new in international relations. One can say that it started with the United Nations Conference on Human Environment in 1972. In the environmental sector we may distinguish two different agendas: scientific and political. The first one is defined mainly by scientist and often gives arguments to political agenda conducted by intergovernmental and governmental organizations, which main task is taking political responsibility for dealing with these environmental issues. Both agendas overlap themselves. The environment could be considered on a different level. A more general one is usually brought up by various international organizations. It regards such global matters as climate warming, the depletion of the ozone layer and natural resources. On the governmental level some cabinets bring that issue as a one of the task to fulfill - it is clearly seen in countries that are heavily dependent on nature e.g. islands or Netherlands. On the lowest level environment is an important matter in many programs of political parties, but also companies connected with the environment. Such a situation creates politicization rather than securitization, but under some conditions it could be securitized, especially in poor countries when problems with scarcity of water reservoirs lead to bloody conflicts.

In that sector it is very easy to define a referent object - it is environment or its strategic part. The main goal is to preserve natural resources, and by that to maintain further progress of civilization. Now it is widely known that human life is not only determined by environment but it works also on environment. This is a mutual relationship. Environmental issues often create lots of controversy. There are securitizing actors who act on behalf of followers and opponents of environment protection. Such actors as states or international organizations have a wide range of instruments to take environmental matters into public debate. The main goal of Greenpeace is actually the securitization of the environment. These actors act mainly by raising awareness and leading diplomacy focused on environment. Most actions focus mainly politicization and ending at that level. However, the number of protagonists is still high, there are also firms and sometimes states which are guided by their particular interests and make
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decisions which do not pay attention to environment protection. These are for example chemical companies and poor countries in the Third World, where economy plays first role at the cost of the environment.

The relationship between environment and humans could be considered on three levels. First one is an effect that humans pose on the environment. It means how people change their habitat and to which extent their actions cause dangers to themselves. The best example in that area is industry, which poisons the atmosphere and in the end is a threat for human health. Contrary, the environment could also be a threat to human civilization. That fear is best reflected in such books and films as “Armageddon”. Nature with its earthquakes, tsunami and possibility of ice age could be an existential threat for the population. The third kind of this relationship are changes that do not seem to be existential for humans e.g. depletion of various mineral resources. These phenomenon caused people to seek other solutions, but do not decide on their fate.

In environmental security the most important matter is human activity on earth. It is understood not as a struggle with nature but as fight with effects of human activity. Especially two aspects of man’s life are crucial: economic and demographic. The growing number of world population during last 2000 years led inter alia to a discussion about overpopulation and caused that natural disasters are more noticeable and influential for people. Protection against natural events such as flooding in the Netherlands or earthquakes in Japan is a national interest and is subject to securitization. In an economic dimension we can take under consideration the role of technology, process of urbanization and continuous technical development, which from the one hand help us to protect earth but from the other lead to her deterioration.

Environmental problems are first of all treated as a global matter. Often local action and phenomenon seem to transfer into international interest. The best example for this is a hole in the ozone layer over Australia or cutting down rainforests in America, although they are regionally rooted they effect the world population as a whole. On the other hand, there are issues such as global warming which are widely perceived as important for every man and country and which are hardly discussed on different international organizations forums. A global attitude to the environment is needed and more and more popular, but there are also lots of regional agreements on environmental protection that turned to act very effectively.

The economic security is a very controversial matter. It depends on which point of view we take on economy itself. Liberals say that economy plays a key role in government politics and
should be created freely by the market. States complete only thes areas where markets fails to do so.

Economy is not as important for socialists and mercantilists - they want to put state first before economy, which should be used by state but for different purposes. This division could be well seen during the Cold War, when two powers fought hidden beside communist and capitalist philosophy. Now we can observe that liberalism is the most popular. Moreover, it is now an economic system which is more international than national. Pure liberalism aims to eliminate national economies and to push them into global economy with ideally no restrictions on the movement of goods, services, capital and people. But the problem is how to handle the constantly widening gap between the very rich and the very poor, and how to avoid political and economic turbulences because of that fact. On the global economic agenda a current subject in discussions is instability and inequality in international political economy (IPE).

Instability is connected with the declining role of the United States as the hegemon on the international scene, which brings important repercussions for the global economic balance. Inequality is best reflected by bad economic conditions of the Third World countries, which were inherited from their colonial past.

As in the previous sector also here the state is the main securitizing actor. As economy is such an important national interest issue, it is a good basis for various intergovernmental organizations. INGOs and sometimes firms could also be securitizing actors under specific conditions. But in no other sector there are as many referent objects: individuals and groups ranging from national economies to global level. In this sector there are also two unique referent objects. One of them is the company. Not every company could have that status, only these which are crucial for some reason e.g. large companies or banks that hire huge number of people and generate large profits. The second one is relatively abstract: the liberal international economic order (LIEO). Corrosion of LIEO could result in weakness of welfare considered on a national and global level. This sector is highly connected with the military and political sectors. Very often conflicts have economic grounds, but on the other hand it is not rare that economic bonds prevent governments from inflaming mutual claims.

In economy, security is connected with various needs. The most principal for individuals is assurance of food, water, clothing, shelter and education. On the higher level is the security of investments, both for individuals and organizations. The highest level is system security. All malfunctions could effect that every level of economy could lead to its securitization. To
prevent any troubles, states as well as INGOs, create different regulations and mechanisms which are supposed to protect them. The IMF and the World Bank take care of state economic conditions and the GATT-WTO prevent crises by mediating and stating rules.

It is interesting in that sector that although many issues need to be securitized, hardly few of them really do. That came out from the nature of liberalism, where losers are pay price for participation in global market. That is why their claims for securitization are dismissed. Constant economic development cause that economy got a global character. The whole philosophy of LIEO depends on crossing boundaries. Declining shipping costs and huge technical and IT progress made possible for local firms and individuals to earn money and to act globally. From one side it made economic life easier, but from the other side it means that every change in that system is widely noticed. That is the reason why economic stability and fluency turned to be international interest and made basis for different international organizations, agreements and meetings. These structures help to prevent crises and establish regulations, which should make the system work without disruptions. The problem is that a major economic breakdown will have effects not only in the economic, but also in the political and military sectors.

But the global level is not the only one. We can observe strong regional dynamic in that sector. The best example for that is the EU, which was established on basis of the European Economic Community. However, this process is not only connected with Europe. There are lots of different economic agreements and organizations around the world e.g. NAFTA, APEC. That kind of regionalization is an answer for globalization but also it serves to make daily life easier. Nevertheless, economic security is very blurry and hard to distinguish from other sectors.

In all of the above mentioned sectors, the state plays the main role, but in the societal security sector it is actually not the state but what it forms in reality: the nation. It is quite a rare phenomenon when state means nation. State is treated formally. It bases on organizational structures and formal rules. Society is closely related to ideology, feeling of identity and it is built by people, which already by definition brings subjectivity of perception. As groups consist of individuals, to understand society mean to understand their ideas and customs that define the identity of a group. Societal beliefs sometimes are distinct from political beliefs of a government currently in force and it is often the point of disagreements.
“Societal security is about large, self-sustaining identity groups”\textsuperscript{160}. These groups could be national, but also religious or racial. It is important to distinguish two ideas: social and societal. The first one concerns rather individuals and their economic situation. The second one comprehends communities with their common identities and actions taken in order to prevent from any threats aimed at destroying integrity. The most common threats defined by researchers are: migration, depopulation, horizontal and vertical competition. In case of migration, threat for a group from the side of another one could be either cultural or lingual. Depopulation could have its reasons in famine, illnesses, wars or extermination. Horizontal and vertical competition leads to internal changes caused by gradual adaptation to external conditions. These threats could exist independently or they could mix themselves. Response to that situation could be twofold: it could be solved on societal agenda or it could be brought to the political or security level where the state is present. This second variant is definitely more popular.

In the societal sector referent objects are large groups which are joined by common identity. The feeling of integrity makes them say “we”. This “we” policy could be shared by clan, tribe or in communism class. In some cases nation is closely related to state. In such a situation the state would be a referent object, but security matters are more conflict-generated when they regard religion. Vulnerability for threats is different for various groups and depends on two facts: how strong their identities are and on what they are based. Small, isolated groups will behave in a more hostile way towards any changes than big, heterogeneous ones. Each group is vulnerable to different types of threats. A threat that seems to be distant could be more dangerous than a closer one for a group that is exceptionally vulnerable for that kind of danger. As in the military sector also here regional matters are more likely to create tensions e.g. migration or vicinity of a culturally stronger partner (Quebec in Canada). In each region of the world societal threats have different roots. For instance in Africa, these are usually intrastate problems but in Latin America, cultural and economic power of the USA is seen as a threat. The most conflicted region is the territory of the former Soviet Union. Here political, military and societal matters are closely linked. Problems with Russian minorities in former soviet republics cause strong societal tensions. But also a difficult situation with European or Asian identity, with catholic or Islamic religion, with cultural and lingual heritage seems to be very conflict-generated. These mentioned above trends can be classified in regionalization, but societal security is also present in a globalizing trend. Two major directions can be found.
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here: migration from poor Third World countries and the so called “clash of civilizations”, which one can reduce to opposition against Westernization.

In the **political sector** the main issue is the security of a state’s organizational structure. As in the military sector also this issue is present, but in other aspects. The political sector regards nonmilitary threats. This general statement divides into two directions. First one concerns threats to political structures other than the state. Second considers the higher level, such as international society or international law. But in that sector also the individual level is clearly visible for example through human rights. This sector is very wide and quite problematic when we want to strictly separate it from others. Politicization is present in all sectors and almost always precedes the process of securitization. According to Buzan “Political threats are aimed at the organizational stability of the state”\(^{161}\). It means that there is no environmental, military or societal means, which is hard to reach as political security usually means security in general. Despite the previous we can say that political threats are about legitimacy, recognition or political support. As the discussion about the definition of politics is very wide and complicated, authors for needs of this book took definition that politics is “the relatively stable institutionalization of authority”\(^{162}\). The other important thing connected to that subject is the definition of political units; usually it is state but the definition could also include forms of government on defined territory, e.g. empires. Usually states (as much as other subjects in politics) have structurally defined procedures regarding internal and external functioning. This is the way serious political threats attempt to undermine either internal legitimacy (here are ideologies and political system that define state) or its external recognition.

The main referent object in the political sector is the territorial state. However, we can also take into account: a) quasi-superstates as the European Union, b) strong politically institutionalized, stateless societal groups, c) strong transnational movements, d) sometimes some world religions\(^{163}\). In that case securitizing actors can be well defined. Usually all these above mentioned subjects have their authorities and leaders, which are supposed to care about external and internal safety. In strong democratic states, where governments act on behalf of nations, its role as a safety guard is not a matter of discussion. But we can talk about such role also in case of some international institutions or structures. Their main role is to maintain
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political stability and for this they’ve been given rights from states or other political units. Stability can be understood in two ways: as a feature of relations among states or as a feature of domestic political systems. The most important criterion for an international commitment is violation of basic principles such as these in the United Nations Charter. In the process of securitizing such factors as main international media also play an important role, by widely announcing threats and calling states or other political units to take proper actions. In that process there is also place for varied governmental and non-governmental organizations, which are usually highly profiled and therefore more engaged in solving emerging problems.

In the political sector an existential threat concerns sovereignty, which is in fact a factor that creates a state as such. In this area we can also put any violations regarding political ideas or a state. Undermining the principles of political systems by an outside actor, which in fact means undermining domestic legitimacy, can also lead to a disintegration of state and is seen as an existential threat. Nevertheless, a controversy can also appear here when a state is weak and divided into nation and government that rules on behalf of a nation, but in fact without its legitimacy. In that case international environment will justify and support an intervention in spite of internal right of sovereignty.

In all above mentioned sectors we can find 3 kinds of security: global, regional and local. Importance of each trend is different in each sector but the crucial thing is that they overlap themselves. What seems to be a military conflict may be caused by economic or political factors. There is strong cross-reference between all sectors. In fact it is hard to find a case clearly caused only by one kind of threat. To fairly judge a situation, we could not focus on the most visible threat but we should pay attention to the background - it may turn out that the true reason is much more complicated.

The presentation of security policy conducted by the G8 through diversification into these five sectors has in purpose a better and more perfect understanding of the theme without passing over any important elements. This method will allow showing the whole spectrum of subjects bringing up by the G8 from the beginning of its origin till today.

**Human security**

In spite of significant widening of the subject of security studies with non-military sectors, some scholars claimed that it was still not enough and they came into a direction of total change of the referent object from the state- to people-centred. This change was also visible in the way of perceiving the issue of security by various international organisations, and was the
most obvious in UN actions. In 1994, the UN published the Human Development Report, in which it presented its vision of security “The concept of security has for too long been interpreted narrowly: as security of territory from external aggression, or as protection of national interests in foreign policy or as global security from the threat of nuclear holocaust. It has been related more to nation-state than to people.” 164 A new thing here is the broadening of a perspective – next to a state as the referent object individuals are also considered. Most of the classic security definitions base on the state-centred perspective underlying the importance of territorial integrity, political independence, survival and ability to protect its citizens. Here, most of the threats come from outside and have military nature.165 Basing on such perception of the international environment, it was a logical consequence that states had created huge defensive systems aimed at securing themselves.166 However, after the end of the Cold War it turned out that most of conflicts have not an intra-state but rather an inter-state character. While international conflicts were not totally eliminated, source of the danger is emerging mainly from internal threats caused by various animosities between different religious, ethnic and social groups as well as by the economic failure, violation of human rights, or political discrimination. That is the reason why the guarantee of the national security is not any more in military power but in propitious social, political and economic conditions.167 Today, the world is very interdependent and interconnected and it means that an event in distant places could have a significant influence in other places (the butterfly effect). A basic form of functioning in the post-Cold War period became cooperation. Only thanks to that, states are able to efficiently fight with such international threats as internal conflicts, failing and failed states or terrorism.168 Terrorism issue became even more important after the 9/11 attacks, in which circa 40 % of casualties were non-Americans. The policy of combating terrorism with force brought only a rise of spending on military forces, which rebounded on outlays for economic, educational or health sector at the national as well as at the international level. Meanwhile, in many scholars opinion combating terrorism should be started from fighting socio-economic causes such as poverty, disempowerment, lack of influence on decisions in
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political and economic spheres and insufficient livelihoods. These problems are caused by weak or badly managed political and economic systems at the national, regional and international level. States, which are unable to fulfil basic needs of their people, become discredited in eyes of non-state actors, who may apply more radical solutions.\footnote{S. Tadjbakhsh, A Human Security Agenda for Central Asia, [in] F. Sabahi, D. Warner, The OSCE and the Multiple Challenges of Transition. The Caucasus and Central Asia, Ashgate, 2004, p.170}

Moreover, poverty may lead to crime, migration or trans-border criminal networks engaging in human trafficking, weapon or drug trade. The disability of a state to prevent spreading HIV/AIDS, SARS or other epidemic may lead in the global world to a threat of survival/well-being of individuals everywhere.\footnote{S. Werthes, T. Debiel, op.cit., p.16}

The end of bipolar world caused the appearance of new actors such as international organisations, private investment companies or NGOs. While NGOs play in the today world a lot of functions e.g. in early warning, prevention and post-conflict reconstruction, still it is the state which is the main guarantor of its citizens’ security\footnote{S. Lodgaard, Human Security: Concept and Operationalization, http://cpdsindia.org/conceptandoperationalization.htm, 05.03.2010} and possesses an ultimate responsibility.\footnote{S. Tadjbakhsh, A Human Security Agenda for Central Asia, [in] F. Sabahi, D. Warner, The OSCE and the Multiple Challenges of Transition. The Caucasus and Central Asia, Ashgate, 2004, p.190}

Many scholars underlie that the human security concept does not replace a traditional security approach as they both represent rather different ideas how to react to existing threats. Human security does not negate the traditional concept of security because it includes traditional threats and means.\footnote{Iztok Prezelj, Challenges in Conceptualizing and Providing Human Security, p.6, http://www.etc-graz.at/cms/fileadmin/user_upload/humsec/Journal/Prezelj.pdf, 12.02.2009} State security and human security are interlinked because failed states are not able to assure human security.\footnote{Lodgaard, op.cit.}

States and regions in the global context could not any longer underlie only national security issues without recognizing that such abstractive concepts as values, norms and expectations also influence on choices and outcomes.\footnote{R. Floyd, Human Security and the Copenhagen School’s Securitization Approach: Conceptualizing Human Security as a Securitizing, http://www.peacecenter.sciences-po.fr/journal/issue5pdf/6.Floyd.pdf, 12.02.2009}

So, human security is not a replacement or alternative for national security, although the implementation of human security demands redefinition of the state’s role, cooperation, partnership and innovative approach. A state’s erosion and a domination of too weak or too
repressive states also put the security threats directly in front of individuals.\textsuperscript{176} People creating politics and making crucial decisions on behalf of states must pay attention to both aspects - traditional “national security”, where armed forces would still play a pre-eminent role, and human security, where “non-traditional” security issues are dominating and where other approaches would take significant part.\textsuperscript{177}

The human security concept is becoming more and more popular and started to influence on international and foreign policy of states. But what actually is human security and where are its roots?

Despite the fact that the very term human security had already existed, it is commonly associated with the UNDP Human Development Report 1994 edited by Mahbub ul Haq. Admittedly, already in 1945 the US Secretary of State returning from the UN establishing conference in San Francisco said that the aim of the UN is freedom from fear and freedom from want, but it was the 1994 report which expanded that idea presenting a characteristic of human security.\textsuperscript{178} The starting point for the human security approach was more poverty than war. Authors of the report noticed that for most people an insecurity feeling came more from worries about an everyday-living than from fear of any catastrophic event in the world.\textsuperscript{179}

Human security concerns not weapons but human life and dignity. There are four specific features of human security. First, it is universal for rich and poor. Second, components of the human security are interdependent. Third, human security is easier to ensure through early prevention than later intervention. Fourth, human security is people-centred.\textsuperscript{180} Human security was presented in the report in two aspects as freedom from such chronic threats as hunger, disease and repression; and as protection from sudden and hurtful disruptions in the patterns of daily life.\textsuperscript{181} There were seven categories of human security described, such as economic security that requires an assured basic income; food security which means that all people at all time have both physical and economic access to basic food; health security;
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environmental security; personal security; community security; and political security.\textsuperscript{182} Among these elements are links and overlaps which means that a threat of one of these elements may easily be transferred on others.\textsuperscript{183} All these components are included in two main parts of human security - freedom from fear (it means freedom from physical violence) and freedom from want (it means freedom from poverty).\textsuperscript{184} From the very beginning human security appears in close relation with human development, which is also people-centred and multidimensional. In the 70-ties, it was presented as a counter argument against economic development proposals aimed at growth, where humans were perceived mainly as inputs of labour.\textsuperscript{185} The 1994 report was trying to define human security and human development and to organize their relations. Human development is a wider term and was defined as a process of widening the range of people’s choices, whereas human security means that people can exercise these choices safely and freely and they can be relatively confident that the opportunities they have today are not totally lost tomorrow.\textsuperscript{186} In short, human security and human development differ from each other in range (human security is narrower and aimed at widening not all but only vital capabilities), in an approach to prevention (human security pays relatively more attention to that), and in time (human security has a shorter and more temporary time horizon).\textsuperscript{187} The description of human security presented in the 1994 UN report started a broad discussion among scholars, policymakers and organizations. From the very beginning this concept provoked lots of criticism because of its analytical ambiguity and disputable political usability.\textsuperscript{188} The human security approach is very wide – in the current circulation there are more than thirty definitions. Some of them focus mainly on threats from wars and internal conflicts, including sometimes domestic and criminal violence; others on threats from preventable disease, economic hardship or financial crisis – these are threats from want; and
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the third group concern both types of threats (described often as “fear and want” or as “first and second generation human rights”).

Various scholars in a different way understand human security trying to create a general definition of the human security. For example, Jorge Nef in his approach includes five elements of the human security such as environmental, personal and physical security; economic security; social security; political security; and cultural security. On the other hand, Laura Reed and Majid Teheramian mention ten elements compounding human security, *inter alia* communication security.

According to Caroline Thomas, human security describes conditions of living in which basic material needs are fulfilled and where human dignity, including in this aware participation in the community life, could be realize - such human security is indivisible. Material sufficiency is a necessary but not sufficient condition of human security, which includes more than physical survival. She also marked out the quantitative aspect of human security concerning material sufficiency and the qualitative aspect concerning achievement of human dignity. Similar differentiation on quantitative and qualitative dimensions of human security presented the 1997 UNDP report, which differs also income poverty (less than 1 US$) from human poverty (illiteracy, short life expectancy and so forth); they are often but not always interconnected. Canadian foreign minister, Lloyd Axworthy claims that “human security includes security against economic privation, an acceptable quality of life and a guarantee of fundamental human rights.” Some scholars broaden human security even more e.g. Robert Badeski. According to him human security includes “the totality of knowledge, technology, institutions and activities that protect, defend and preserve the biological existence of human life and the process which protect and perfect collective peace and prosperity to enhance human freedom.”

Also Kofi Annan in the 2000 report to the UN, “We the People”, describes human security in a wide way writing that

---
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“Human security in its broadest sense, embraces far more than the absence of violent conflict. It encompasses human rights, good governance, access to education and health care and ensuring that each individual has opportunities and choices to fulfil his or her own potential. Every step in this direction is also a step towards reducing poverty, achieving economic growth and preventing conflict. Freedom from want, freedom from fear and the freedom of future generations to inherit a healthy natural environment – these are the interrelated building blocks of human – and therefore national security.” In turn, Donna Winslow and Thomas Hylland Eriksen are representatives of an exceptionally wide approach to human security. They check how security is defined in different social and cultural contexts, through symbolic and social processes as well as how with security and insecurity manage social institutions.\footnote{D. Winslow, T. Eriksen, A Broad Concept that Encourages Interdisciplinary Thinking, Security Dialogue, vol. 35, no.3, September 2004, p.361}

There are also voices which call for the limitation of human security and creation of such definition which would be able to use by researchers and policy makers. Many scholars claim, \textit{inter alia} Roland Paris, that two things are limiting the usability of the human security concept - lack of precise definition; extensiveness and vagueness of this approach.\footnote{R. Paris, \textit{op.cit.}, p.88} Similar opinions declare Owen and Arneil, according to whom human security is too broad and vague concept to be meaningful for policymakers.\footnote{Ibidem, p.92} That is why Gary King and Christopher Murray propose to create a definition of human security which would encompass the most important elements, it means such elements that are “important enough for human beings to fight over, or to put their lives or property at great risk”.\footnote{Ibidem, p.94} These two authors define human security as individual’s “expectation of a life without experiencing the state of generalized poverty.” Their approach does not include violence and focuses mainly on freedom from want.\footnote{S. Alkire, \textit{A Conceptual Framework...}, p.15} They propose five indicators of human security measurement for individuals and groups such as poverty, health, education, political freedom and democracy. Even further reach Kanti Bajpal conclusions, who propose to create a “human security audit” measuring “direct and indirect threats to individual bodily safety and freedom.”\footnote{R. Paris, \textit{op.cit.}, p.94} A clear measurement or an audit of human security would let researchers to value factors which are causing decrease of human security or increase of human insecurity in separate groups or individuals.
He implemented the HSI (Human Security Index) in a human security project in India based on eleven measurements of threat. The aim was to correlate human development indicator to the HSI.\textsuperscript{202} According to Bajpai, human security concerns threats against life and freedom of individuals and communities balancing by capacities able to manage with these threats (security= threats – capacities). Threats and capacities will change in time and space.\textsuperscript{203} Sabine Alkire proposes her own definition of human security, which according to her is an optimal compromise. She declares that “The objective of human security is to safeguard the vital core of all human lives from critical pervasive threats in a way that is consistent with long-term human fulfilment”.\textsuperscript{204} Also Iztok Prezelj notices the heterogeneity of human security definitions, what he explains by the fact that different factors threatening human security were diversely spread in different parts of the world and that is why there are so many human security definitions- because of different priority of threats. However, there are values generally mention in situations threatening human security such as survival, safety livelihood, freedom, well-being and dignity.\textsuperscript{205} The meeting point for all human security definitions are threats. Alkire divides them into direct/indirect threats and idiosyncratic/covariant risks. The direct threats are often connected with violence but they may also take such form as e.g. deliberate social or economic exclusion. The indirect or structural threats are actions of groups, systems or institutions, which threat to security is a by-product of an action took in other purpose e.g. the mining could have environmental consequences next to economic purposes.\textsuperscript{206} Idiosyncratic risks touch individuals or households e.g. the loss of property from crime or an accident. Covariant risks concern groups- small groups e.g. community (meso) as well as big regional groups often national (macro).\textsuperscript{207} By contrast, Tadjbakhsh next to direct/indirect threats describes also objective (they have measurable elements as for example insufficient income) and subjective threats.\textsuperscript{208} All of them underlie that threats are interconnected and can spread across the country, region and globe.
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However, not every security issue includes threats – rather vulnerabilities which are for some people the same important as threats. According to Liotta, a threat is identifiable, often immediate and requires an understandable response and moreover is either visible or commonly acknowledged.\textsuperscript{209} Vulnerability is often only an indicator, often not clearly identifiable, often linked to a complex interdependence among related issues and does not always suggest a correct or even adequate response. Additionally, it is not clearly perceived, often not well understood, and almost always is a source of contention among conflicting views.\textsuperscript{210} Liotta divides vulnerabilities according to time criterion into extreme vulnerabilities caused e.g. because of conflicts or natural catastrophes, and long-term or creeping vulnerabilities as the climate change, disease.\textsuperscript{211} Also Astri Suhrke combines human security tasks with protection of the most vulnerable people, who according to Suhrke are in one of three categories: 1. Victims of war and internal conflict 2. Those who live close to the subsistence level and thus are structurally positioned at the edge of socio-economic disaster 3. Victims of natural disasters.\textsuperscript{212} In case of human security vulnerabilities of one are manifested as vulnerabilities of all.\textsuperscript{213}

The next term that appeared in some definitions, \textit{inter alia} in the 2003 report of the Commission on Human Security is a conception of “vital core”.\textsuperscript{214} This term has this advantage that although it is not precise philosophical term, it is not related to any literature of security, quality of living, poverty or similar debates carrying on from ages.\textsuperscript{215} At the same time it is imprecise – it is suggesting that human security is not able to secure every aspect of human well-being but in the end it will protect the core.\textsuperscript{216} According to Alkire, the vital core concerns a subset of human capabilities, which as people think should be protect during war or conflict and these are capabilities related to survival, livelihood and dignity.\textsuperscript{217}
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An important part of human security is relation with state and its security. While in the centre of human security is an individual, this is a state that constitutes a collective instrument to protect human life and reinforces human welfare. Fundamental elements of human security could be endangered by an outside aggression but also by internal factors including national “security” forces.\textsuperscript{218} Most of scholars claim that human security is not the alternative for a state and national security, but it is their complement. For example, Axworthy declares that national security and human security are in fact two sides of the same coin.\textsuperscript{219} These are states, which create rules and integrate societies thus their disintegration is dangerous. Human security is inseparably connected with protection of people and national interest in the global world. Disability in safeguarding human needs may lead to delegitimization of a political system and to failure of a state.\textsuperscript{220} According to Edward Newman, the human security approach reverses the role of a state and citizens – it is the state and state sovereignty that should serve and support citizens, from whom comes state legitimization.\textsuperscript{221} As the number of state actors functioning in the international institutionalised system has increased at least four time since the UN establishment in 1945, and additionally, changes in the international environment were accelerated by globalisation, technological and communication development, thus that all has weaken a state. States finished having the monopoly in six areas such as communications, technological development (more in the private sector), financial transactions, investments, international migration, and trade.\textsuperscript{222} A truly effective state plays the central role in the economic and social development either as a direct supplier or as a partner, catalyst or regulator. This means that strength or weakness of a state should not be value only on the fundament of tackling with security threats of a state (e.g. armed rising) but on the basis of ability to prevent health, welfare threats.\textsuperscript{223} State responsibility concerns securing stability of the development of the equal economic growth, securing important social services and providing people contribution in decision-making. Using human
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security by a state enables the reduction of social inequalities.\textsuperscript{224} That is the reason why next to the old slogan “growth with equity”, today a new approach is necessary “downturn with security”, because of the fact that occasional downturns are common and possibly unavoidable in the market economy.\textsuperscript{225} An important thing, to which Tadjbakhsh pays attention, is fact that there is also an obligation for citizens to engage in the human security process.\textsuperscript{226} People should not be passive recipients of security or victims of its lack but they should be active subjects, who contribute to solving security problems and that enabling proper education and information on social obligations.

However, it happens that state is unable to secure its citizens human security and at that time, according to human security proponents, should act the international community but it could not become an excuse for military interventions for “humanitarian” reasons.\textsuperscript{227} That responsibility of international actors relays not only on a moral obligation but also on a self-interest, because the existing strong bounds among all world sectors mean that they are all vulnerable.\textsuperscript{228} Fear of the fact that human security could become pretence of violating state sovereignty and a try at imposing by the West liberal values and political institutions on non-western countries caused that the G77 countries from the same beginning are mistrustful of the human security concept.\textsuperscript{229} To minimise these fears the Canadian government established the International Commission on Intervention and State Sovereignty, which in the “The Responsibility to Protect” report specified some valuable conclusions. Above all, it redefined the sovereignty term in the way that it encompasses two parts - in the foreign policy it means respect for sovereignty of other states, and inside a state respect for dignity and basic rights of its citizens. It also defined an intervention as an action against a state or its leader without its agreement for reasons described as humanitarian or protective.\textsuperscript{230} The decision about an intervention should be taken when other measures failed e.g. economic sanctions.\textsuperscript{231} One can say that there is a bilateral relation between human security and conflict. Conflicts mean
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human insecurities and they lead to disintegration and violence. The human security program is perceived as the best preventive mechanism against conflicts. Despite intra-state conflicts and the military diplomacy, human security pays attention to inter-state causes of a conflict such as hunger, disease, crime and repression. Proactive prevention of conflict, before it break out or escalate, turns out to be less costly than efforts to fight or reduce intensity, duration and geographic widening of the conflict. However, if a conflict already exists, the goal of human security cannot be only stop of war but also to prevent future conflicts and to build lasting peace.

Next to the above mentioned relations between human security and human development or human security and conflict, there are also bounds between human security and human rights, they both have similar goals and areas but there are also differences. Human security clearly wants a prioritization and a discussion on its elements, while proponents of the human rights claim that each right is equally important and indivisible and any institution has no right to choose some of them. Difference is also in instruments and institutions which are implementing human security, meaning human security uses economic, political and sometimes military measures whereas the human rights usually use legal instruments to prevent human rights abuses.

Human security has also an important function in some countries’ foreign policy. It is for example the leitmotif of the Canadian, Norwegian and Japanese foreign policy. Canada focuses on the narrow definition of human security (conflict focused) aimed at civilian protection, conflict prevention, public security and support of peace operations. This narrow approach Canada explains by the fact that international agendas are concentrated on promotion of national security, human rights and human development and they complement their actions. Also Norway pays attention to one element of human security – freedom from fear. Both countries started in May 1988 so called “Lysøen process” or the Human Security Network, in which took part eleven states including them and the UN High Commissioner
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for Refugees, Sadako Ogata. By contrast Japan bases on the wide definition of human security, which “comprehensively covers all the menaces that threaten human survival, daily life and dignity...and strengthens effort to confront these threats”. According to the Japanese blue-book it is necessary to tackle with such threats as poverty, environmental degradation, illicit drugs, transnational organized crime, infectious diseases, the outflow of refugees and antipersonnel landmines. In 2001, the government of Japan established the Commission on Human Security, which in its report “Human Security Now” next to the human security definition proposed two strategies for human security: empowerment (what should give people opportunity to take part in the decision-making process) and protection. It is interesting that while many Western countries adapted human security to their foreign policies, none of them implemented it into their domestic policies.

Among international organisations human security is the most popular in the UN – in its source. For the first time, this concept was formulated in 1992 on the Agenda for Peace edited by Boutros Ghali, where was underlined the role of the UN in an integrated approach to human security as one of the new measures in the peacemaking, peacekeeping and post-conflict management. However, it was only Kofi Annan, who developed the human security agenda, when in 1999 Millennium Declaration he defined peace as much more than absence of war and called for human security embracing the economic development, social justice, environmental protection, democratization, disarmament, and respect for human rights and the rule of law. In 2003, the Secretary General established the High-level Panel on Threats, Challenges and Change, which was supposed to analyse new threats. As a result, in this report threats were grouped into six categories and were described relations among them. In the
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2005 report, “In larger Freedom”, Kofi Annan underlined that threats do not only endanger people’s survival but also a state as a basic unit of the international system.\textsuperscript{245} There were also two more international organisations, which tried to adapt human security into their agendas - the EU and ASEAN. Human security was proposed as a foreign policy doctrine for the EU in “The Human Security Doctrine for Europe” in September, 2004 at the Barcelona Forum. Human security was defined there as freedom for individuals from the harm caused by human rights violations.\textsuperscript{246} The ASEAN Vision 2020 took as a goal “freedom from want, freedom from fear for future generations.”\textsuperscript{247} Despite the adaptation of human security into foreign policies or agenda of various international organisations there are still many critical voices. The main objection is wide range of human security definitions. According to Paris, generally each kind of unexpected or irregular discomfort may be perceived as a threat to human security.\textsuperscript{248} In turn, Newman says that if we treat the individual as a dependant variable then it is possible to identify and codify each psychological security threat, but it is unusable because it gives impossible number of variable. Moreover, at the same time it is problematic to decide arbitrarily on a type of threat\textsuperscript{249} because we choose some values and evaluate them as more important than others without clear explanation.\textsuperscript{250} That is the reason why, according to Kraus, human security should be limited to narrow “freedom from fear”, because at one point human security is becoming a synonym for “all bad things that could happen” and is losing its utility for politics and analytics.\textsuperscript{251} Similar approach shows Lodgaard, who limits even more “freedom from fear”, because according to him that phrase should be completed with freedom from fear of \textit{man-made} physical violence, so natural disasters should be excluded.\textsuperscript{252} However, with such understanding does not agree e.g. Neil MacFarlane, who claims that one cannot favour the narrow definition of human security that describes only one threat – violence, because it is not
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an explanation for people dying from hunger.\textsuperscript{253} Barry Buzan also speaks about human
security in critical way, accusing it of multiplying concepts without adding analytical value.\textsuperscript{254}
According to him, if one constructed moral grounds for constituting the individuals as ultimate referent object, then it costs the lost of analytical foundation on collective actors as main suppliers of security and as those who have right to survive.\textsuperscript{255} Buzan forewarns against paranoia, it means against perceiving threats that do not exist.\textsuperscript{256} He also formulates two more restrictions. Firstly, he agrees that a state could threaten security of its citizens but at the same time claims that the same state is “a necessary condition for individual security because without the state it is not clear what other agency is to act on behalf of individuals”. Secondly, making the individuals as referent object of security may quickly lead to “questions of human rights, intervention, and risks generating major conflicts in places where human rights are not accepted as universal value...In this view the national security, state-centric position on security is the preferred one.”\textsuperscript{257} The reason why the attention of the Copenhagen School is focused on the state is fact that most securitizations are still performed by state actors.\textsuperscript{258} The human security approach, although inadequate to analytical utility, has a lot of to offer in the field of normative utility, where the Copenhagen School approach is fundamentally limited.\textsuperscript{259} According to Mack, it is possible to share political and moral values that bring human security, still negating its analytical utility.\textsuperscript{260} Combination of Buzan’s sectored configuration with the wide understanding of human security will provide opportunity to deep analysis of the G8 security policy evaluating with its history. The G8 does not focus on only one part of security issues but it reacts on all threats to international system, starting from conflict and finishing on poor education. The division into five sectors assures clear arrangement of G8 actions and complement by human security provides full presentation of G8 decisions from 19875 till 2007.
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In my essay the subject is the whole group from the moment of its establishing in 1975 till 2007 when it is already enlarged with Russia.
Chapter III
MILITARY SECTOR

In the military sector we can distinguished three areas: non proliferation, which refers to the danger of nuclear technology, nuclear safety, nuclear weapons control etc.; arms control, which concerns reduction and control of nuclear, chemical, biological, radiological conventional and dual use weapons, material, technology and delivery system but also all issues related to proliferation; terrorism, which focuses on protection against attacks on the earth, the ocean or in the air, measures against terrorism and its roots.

Non-proliferation issue occurred for the first time relatively early in the summit history, at the 1977 London meeting. In the communiqué is declaration of the G7 to support growth of nuclear energy in order to meet world’s needs of energy but at the same time to reduce risk of nuclear proliferation. That matter was wider described in the Appendix to above mentioned communiqué, where was stated that: “Our objectives is to meet the world’s energy needs and to make peaceful use of nuclear energy widely available, while avoiding the danger of the spread of nuclear weapons.”

Nuclear energy was supposed to serve diversification of energy sources, based till then mainly on oil, what was the cause of the world economic crisis. In the 1978 Bonn final declaration, in the part concerning energy, there was an assurance of continuing the nuclear fuel cycle studies initiated by the London Summit moreover the President of the US and the Prime Minister of Canada underlined their position “as reliable suppliers of nuclear fuel within the framework of effective safeguards.”

At the Tokyo Summit 1979, was stated that growth of the nuclear energy is integral to economic development but at the same time peoples’ safety must be assured and here is significant role of the IAEA.

The 1980 meeting in Venice stressed an important role of nuclear power and necessity of its development while assuring proper methods for dealing with spent fuels and disposal of nuclear waste. The fourteen point of the communiqué was dedicated to the results of

established at the 1977 London Summit the International Fuel Cycle Evaluation Group, which raised inter alia an issue of the most effective utilization of uranium sources.\textsuperscript{264} In 1981, at Montebello, the G7 admitted that “In most of our countries progress in constructing new nuclear facilities is slow.” Leaders called for further development of new technologies “particularly in spent fuel management” and for meeting public concerns regarding inter alia nuclear waste management.\textsuperscript{265}

During the next four years summits at Versailles, Williamsburg, London or Bonn did not make any binding alignments concerning nuclear energy - there were of course mentions about the importance of that issue but without any wider development. Only the year 1986 brought pressing return of the nuclear issue because of the Chernobyl disaster.\textsuperscript{266} The G7 countries in the “Statement on the Implications of the Chernobyl Nuclear Accident” expressed their sympathy for victims and reminded that “Each country... is responsible for prompt provision of detailed and complete information on nuclear emergencies and accidents, in particular those with potential transboundary consequences.”\textsuperscript{267} They also paid attention to the IAEA role in international cooperation on the safety of nuclear installations and called for international convention committing the parties to inform about threats and accidents. It was reiterated that: “Nuclear power is and, properly managed, will continue to be an increasingly used source of energy.”\textsuperscript{268} The IAEA engagement in the international nuclear energy management was also underlined in the declaration of the Venice Summit, 1987.

Hitherto G7 communications of nuclear energy were concerning its utility as an alternative energy source and contribution to the economic growth. Leaders gathered at the Toronto Summit, 1988 for the first time in the published “Political Declaration” raised issue of nuclear
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\textsuperscript{266} The \textbf{Chernobyl disaster} was a nuclear reactor accident that occurred on 26 April 1986 at the Chernobyl Nuclear Power Plant in Ukraine (then part of the Soviet Union). It is considered to be the worst nuclear power plant disaster in history and the only level 7 event on the International Nuclear Event Scale. It resulted in a severe release of radioactivity following a massive power excursion that destroyed the reactor. Most deaths from the accident were caused by radiation poisoning.
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energy related to weapons. It was stated that the INF Treaty (Intermediate Range Nuclear Forces Treaty) between the US and the Soviet Union served security of each country and is the first agreement that actually reduce nuclear arms and at the same time is an important basis for future arms control agreements through “asymmetrical reductions and intrusive verification arrangements.”

In Paris 1989, the “Declaration on East-West Relations” reiterated a need of “a substantial reduction in Soviet and American strategic nuclear arms” and remained that nuclear energy “plays an important role in limiting output of greenhouse gases.” This last sentence was also present in the final communiqué of Houston, 1990, where also devoted lots of space to non-proliferation subject. In the “Statement on Transnational Issues”, all states were called again for implementing IAEA safeguards and nuclear supplier for adapting control measures contained in the Nuclear Suppliers Group Guidelines. It was also announced wide debate on working out as wide as possible consensus on establishing stable non-proliferation regime: “Such a regime should be based on an indispensable balance between the non-proliferation of arms and the development of peaceful and safe uses of nuclear energy.” In Houston for the first time concerned danger related to the Korean Peninsula, as the North Korea has not yet signed a nuclear safeguard agreement.

At the London Summit 1991, was underlined the importance of nuclear energy in the environment protection through a reduction of greenhouse gas emission and necessity of assuring the highest possible security standards. Because of the Gulf Crisis there was published a declaration on security, in which was expressed a will to establish a non-proliferation regime based on balance between nuclear non-proliferation and development of peaceful nuclear energy use. It was stressed an importance of the NPT and asked non-signatory states for joining it so to strengthen the NPT regime beyond 1995. Final communiqué of Munich 1992 devoted a lot of space to the issue of “Safety of Nuclear Power Plants in the New Independence States of the Former Soviet Union and in Central and eastern Europe”. After the disaster in Chernobyl the world was afraid of possible rerun because of obsolete technology and insufficient security of the post Soviet power plants. The G7 offered

interested states support “within framework of a multilateral programme of action”, which embraced short and long-term goals. As short-term goals presented technical and operational improvements and enhancing regulatory regimes. There were described as long-term plans: replacement of less safe plants by other energy sources and an upgrade of plants of more recent design. Program funding was supposed to be through the World Bank and the EBRD in cooperation with the IAEA and the G24. In “Political Declaration: Shaping the New Partnership” the G7 countries repeated that it is necessary to establish a nuclear cooperation which let on safeguard, detection and prevention from the illicit production and transfer of nuclear materials. This cooperation should be based on the NPT, internal binding agreements and the IAEA safeguards. They underlined an important role of the IAEA and at the same time “willingness to share benefits of peaceful nuclear technology with all other States, in accordance with our non-proliferation’s commitments.”

At the next meeting in Tokyo 1993, was made short review of progress of the nuclear safety program agreed in Munich. Leaders called for quick closing down of power plant in Chernobyl. They also remained that states which on their territory have a nuclear plant “bear the primary responsibility” for nuclear safety. They also expressed concern at the throwing to the ocean radioactive wastes by Russia.

An issue of shutting down Chernobyl returned also in Naples, 1994, where in the final communiqué was written that “The closing down of the Chernobyl nuclear power plant is an urgent priority.” The G7 countries offered the government of Ukraine an action plan which intended “The closure of Chernobyl would be accompanied by the early completion of three new reactors of adequate safety standards, by comprehensive reforms in the energy sector, increased energy conservation and the use of energy sources.” To achieve this G7 planned for the beginning $200 million in grants.

A year later, at the Halifax Summit, G7 countries reiterated their support for Ukraine and expressed pleasure of President’s Kuchma decision on closure of the Chernobyl nuclear plant.

---
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by the year 2000. Prime Minister Jean Chrétien announced also that at President’s Boris Yeltsin invitation a special Summit on Nuclear Safety would take place in Moscow, 1996. This meeting indeed took place in Moscow, 19-20.04.1996, and brought a lot of important alignments. This kind of summit was possible thanks to political and economic reforms in Russia, which occurred with the end of the Cold War. The main goal, which participants set, was “an absolute priority to safety in the use of nuclear energy”, but they also underlined that “the prime responsibility... rests with national governments.” Various security subjects were singled out, *inter alia* safety of civilian nuclear reactors, what in perspective of the Chernobyl disaster was a basic worry for all participants. It was said that “Nuclear safety can also be enhanced by greater internal transparency in nuclear power activities, in particular by means of peer reviews.” An important step was the acceptance by all countries the Convention on Nuclear Safety. They repeated readiness to help nuclear safety in the countries of Central and Eastern Europe and the Newly Independent States. It was clearly written that “nuclear liability regime must assure adequate compensation to victims of, and for damaged caused by nuclear accidents.” The responsibility belongs to “operator of the nuclear installations” and he should assure proper financial resources for “adequate compensation.” It was also noted that “National authorities must ensure radioactive waste is managed safety and that provisions are made for its proper handling, storage and ultimate disposal”. Leaders reiterated ban on dumping at sea of radioactive waste and called for the Convention on the Safety Radioactive Waste Management. Participants of this summit widely discussed an issue of the illicit trafficking of nuclear materials and established a Programme on Preventing and Combating Illicit Trafficking in Nuclear Materials aimed at “cooperation among our governments in all aspects of prevention, detection, exchange information, investigation and prosecution in cases of illicit nuclear trafficking.” To prevent this occurrence leaders planned actions which concerned “safe and secure storage of nuclear materials and effective material protection, control, and accounting to prevent its diversion; cooperative intelligence, customs, and law enforcement efforts to prevent the transportation and sale of diverted material; and joint efforts to identify and suppress illicit supply of, and demand for, nuclear material and to deter potential traffickers.” Control, protection and proper storage under international safeguards should concern also nuclear materials released by the dismantling of nuclear weapons. All countries were called for immediate ratification the Convention on the Physical
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Protection of Nuclear Materials. Leaders reiterated that nations, which possess nuclear materials are responsible for their control, accountancy and physical protection. Because of proceeding from some years earlier nuclear disarmament raised an issue of stocks of fissile materials designed as no longer required for defence process and their safety management with eventual transformation into spent fuel or “other forms equally unusable for nuclear weapons.” Options presented by participants in that issue concerned “safe and secure long-term storage vitrification or other methods of permanent disposal, and conversation into mixed-oxide fuel (MOX) for use in nuclear reactors.”

The Lyon meeting, in 1996, also partly concerned issue of nuclear safety and security. Participants underlined importance of the Convention on Nuclear Safety and further progress in adjusting a relevant domestic legislation and preparing an international convention on the safety of radioactive waste management. They repeated willingness to help countries in transition developing “safety-oriented energy policy.”

In the final communiqué was received with pleasure President’s Kuchma decision on closure reactor number 1 at Chernobyl by the end of 1996 and the whole plant till the end of 2000. Leaders announced also meeting of experts in Paris the same year, who were supposed to discus on management of fissile material no longer required for defence purposes. In order to fast implement decisions agreed at the Moscow summit, the G7 countries decided that on their behalf France would undertake demarches to encourage as many states as possible to accept a “Programme for Preventing and Combating Illicit Trafficking in Nuclear Materials” and that it would be establish a special meeting dedicated to that program. Additionally, they called all states for implementing measures included in the “Program 93+2”, which was aimed at preventing a rerun of situation when a country “under full-scope safeguards could carry out undeclared nuclear activities.”

The debate of the Moscow summit was continued also at the foreign ministers’ meeting, who in their Progress Report raised *inter alia* an issue of illicit nuclear trafficking. Ministers fully approved actions of the Non-Proliferation Experts Group based on alignments from Moscow and Lyon and they repeated willingness to enlarge number of the Program’s participants. They also received with pleasure development of nuclear forensics capabilities under
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direction of the IAEA and ITWG (International Technical Working Group). Experts appointed by the G7 leaders at the Moscow Summit stated that the most optimal option is “the consumption of plutonium as mixed-oxide (MXO) fuel in nuclear reactors” and complementary “mobilization of plutonium in glass or ceramic form mixed with high-level radioactive waste.” This all contributes to nuclear arms reduction as well as to fulfil international non-proliferation objectives. Experts expressed also satisfaction of project of building “a demonstration scale MOX fuel fabrication facility in Russia” and of progress on works on “Guidelines for the Management of Plutonium.”

The Birmingham communiqué, 1998, expressed full support for works of the Nuclear Safety Working Group; agreed on deepening of Russia’s role in the G7 process and on its eventual participation in the NSWG. Leaders expressed their pleasure of smooth cooperation on the project of the International Thermonuclear Experimental Reactor and hope for further works for civil nuclear fusion development.

Foreign ministers, gathered at the London meeting a week before, discussed on situation of the Reactor number 1 of the Kursk nuclear plant and on Russian agreement on its international inspection. They repeated necessity of adopting international alignments on the question of nuclear liability regimes and called for additional funds for protection of the Chernobyl plant in Ukraine.

At the Cologne meeting, 1999, was stressed problem of protecting and managing weapons-grade fissile material, especially plutonium. The G8 countries reiterated their support for “scientific and technical cooperation necessary to support future large-scale disposition programs.” They repeated also necessity of achieving high standards of nuclear safety and announced cooperation on computer problem related with 2000 year (so called “Millennium Bug”) in the area of nuclear safety. They also presented progress on financing closure of the Chernobyl plant, which was supposed to help Ukraine reforming its energy sector. Foreign ministers, gathered 10 June in Gürzenich, expressed engagement of the G8 countries in fast

beginning of negotiations on a Fissile Material Cut-Off Treaty and in expanded threat reduction program.\textsuperscript{286}

The Okinawa Summit, 2000, shortly discussed an issue of nuclear safety. Leaders repeated only importance of “full and timely implementation of the Nuclear Safety Account Grant Agreement”\textsuperscript{287} and with satisfaction accepted President’s Kuchma decision on closing the Chernobyl Nuclear Power Plant on 15.11.2000, at the same time declaring further financial support.

Closure of the Chernobyl found its place also in the G7 Statement of Genoa, 2001. That Summit, in spite of this short communiqué, did not touch wider question of nuclear safety. Foreign ministers, gathered traditionally before the summit, called for obeying existing moratoria on nuclear testing as long as the Comprehensive Nuclear Test Ban Treaty has not entered into force. They also expressed their support for negotiations on a Fissile Material Cut-Off Treaty and necessity of financial help for Russian program on using weapon-grade plutonium no longer required for defence purposes.\textsuperscript{288}

Year 2001 brought 9/11 terrorist attacks that shocked the world. This agitation was seen at the Kananaskis meeting, 2002, where one of the goals included in first sentences of Chair’s Summary was fighting terrorism. In “The G8 Global Partnership Against the Spread of Weapons and Materials of Mass Destruction” announced launching a new G8 Global Partnership aimed at the best support for “specific cooperation projects, initially in Russia, to address non-proliferation, disarmament, counter-terrorism and nuclear safety issues”\textsuperscript{289} and to achieve this allot $20 billion over the next ten years. In this area each country must implement “obligations and requirements and commits, its full cooperation within the Partnership.”\textsuperscript{290} Leaders decided also to establish a new G8 Nuclear Safety and Security Group by the time of the next summit.

\textsuperscript{286} Conclusions of the meeting of the G 8 Foreign Ministers, Gürzenich/Cologne, \url{http://www.g8.utoronto.ca/foreign/fm9906010.htm}, 10.12.2009


\textsuperscript{288} Conclusions of the meeting of the G8 Foreign Ministers’ Meeting, \url{http://www.g8.utoronto.ca/foreign/fm091901_conclusion.html}, 10.12.2009
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The 9/11 events made the G8 bring up above all combating terrorism and securing from eventual attacks. The Evian Summit was devoted in great measure to these issues and since then was clearly seen a trend to perceive nuclear safety from the angle of terrorism.

That tendency was also seen at the Sea Island Summit 2004, where leaders stated that “Determined to prevent, contain and roll back proliferation... announce on action plan to reinforce the global proliferation regime” 291 also in context of the fight against terrorism. In point 8 of this plan they once more concerned Chernobyl, calling Ukraine for closer cooperation on closing the plant by 2008 “in a way that contributes to a radiological safety”. 292 They expressed anxiety that “Trafficking and indiscriminate spread of sensitive nuclear materials, equipment, and technology that may be used for weapons purposes are a threat to us all.” They declared to take special steps to prevent export of the sensitive nuclear items into terrorist hands. That export should be in conformity with “criteria consistent with global non-proliferation norms and to states rigorously committed to those norms.” Moreover, it was decided that there would not be any new initiatives including “transfer of enrichment and reprocessing equipment and technologies to additional states.” Heads of state and governments underlined a central role of the Nuclear Suppliers Group Guidelines, the IAEA comprehensive safeguards and the Additional Protocol as indicators of the highest standards. Concerning the nuclear technology, the G8 countries supported suspension of nuclear fuel cycle cooperation with states that violate their nuclear non-proliferation and safeguards obligations and agreed on necessity of establishment of a new Special Committee of the IAEA Board of Governors responsible for enforcement of safeguards and verification. 293

At the next meeting in Gleneagles, 2005, the decision of the Committee on Safeguards and Verification, which would review the IAEA’s ability to ensure compliance with NPT obligations and safeguards, was noted with pleasure. In a years’ time it succeeded to take steps in order to set criteria for the export of sensitive nuclear terms. One more time the decision on not implementing initiatives involving transfer of enrichment and reprocessing technologies to additional states was prolonged for a year. Leaders declared that they would work on “a way which provides genuine access while minimising the risks of
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proliferation.” They also underlined importance of cooperation with the IAEA “in the area of nuclear and radiological safety and security, including on strengthening regulatory infrastructures and the interface between safety and security.” Summit’s participants declared support for the Global Threat Reduction Initiative and announced that fund allotted for securing ruins of the Chernobyl reactor was enlarged till ca. $1 billion.

After ten years from the Moscow Summit, in Russia took place another summit and in the same time first one when Russia was a host as the G8 member. In the declaration “Global Energy Security”, heads of state and government devoted one paragraph to nuclear energy. They expressed opinion that use of safe and secure energy would contribute to global energy security inter alia through less polluted environment. However, it should be noticed that use of nuclear energy “must be based on a robust regime for assuring nuclear non-proliferation and reliable safety and security system for nuclear materials and facilities.” In the same time it was confirmed that goals set in the 2004 G8 Action Plan on Non-Proliferation, which enabled reliable access of all countries to nuclear energy with obeying non-proliferation commitments and safeguards. In the “Statement on Non-Proliferation”, G8 countries reiterated their support for the NPT, the IAEA safeguards and all measures aimed at preventing trafficking in nuclear equipment technology and materials. It was underlined that Article IV of the NPT should have been interpreted as “an inalienable right of all the Parties of the Treaty to develop research, production and use of nuclear energy for peaceful purposes without discrimination.” However, it was added that “An expansion of the peaceful use of nuclear energy must be carried forward in a manner consistent with nuclear non-proliferation commitments and standards”, and in order to do so there should be implemented a mechanism giving the states access to nuclear fuel related services as “an alternative to pursuing enrichment and reprocessing activities.” Concerning this issue, leaders once more prolonged for a year the decision not to start initiatives involving transfer of enrichment and reprocessing technologies to additional states. They also declared that “We will exercise enhanced vigilance with respect to the transfers of nuclear technology, equipment and
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material, whether in the trigger list, in the dual-use list, or unlisted, which could contribute to enrichment-related and reprocessing activities, and will be particularly vigilant with respect to attempts to acquire such technology, equipment and material by covert and illicit means.\footnote{298}

As the year 2000 was the 20\textsuperscript{th} anniversary of the Chernobyl disaster, in the “Report of the Nuclear Safety and Security Group” was presented history of help for Ukraine and was declared further support by works on a New Safe Confinement and pre-decommissioning activities for Ukraine.\footnote{299} In the same document heads of state and government called Armenia for preparing and implementing an upgrading program for its nuclear power plant in order to make it possible to operate safety till its closure. In St Petersburg George Bush and Vladimir Putin in a joint statement proposed their initiatives for developing global nuclear energy infrastructure. Russia’s proposal anticipated an establishment of “a system of international centres to provide nuclear fuel services, including uranium enrichment, under IAEA safeguards.”\footnote{300} The US in turn, proposed an establishment of the Global Nuclear Energy Partnership “to develop innovative nuclear reactor and fuel cycle technologies.” Both countries authorized their representatives to begin negotiations on an agreement between them on cooperation in the peaceful use of nuclear energy. The US and Russia, together with France, Germany, the Netherlands and the UK tabled at the IAEA initiative concerning a concept for a multilateral mechanism for reliable access to enrichment services for nuclear fuel.\footnote{301}

International cooperation in fighting global nuclear proliferation was also underlined at the next summit in Heiligendamm, 2007, where clearly stated the key role of the UN Security Council (UNSC) in addressing the challenge of proliferation and declared willingness to solve regional proliferation challenges by diplomatic means.\footnote{302} In the Heiligendamm “Statement on Non-Proliferation” was noted that the UNSC play role of the final arbiter in issues regarding disobeying international obligations arising from international agreements, treaties and conventions. The G8 repeated its engagement in establishing the IAEA Comprehensive Safeguards Agreement together with an Additional Protocol “the universally accepted

\footnote{298}{Ibidem}
\footnote{300}{Joint Statement by George Bush and Vladimir Putin, \url{http://www.g7.utoronto.ca/summit/2006stpetersburg/bushputin060715a.html}, 11.12.2009}
\footnote{301}{Ibidem}
\footnote{302}{Chair's Summary, \url{http://www.g7.utoronto.ca/summit/2007heiligendamm/g8-2007-summary.html}, 12.12.2009}
verification standard for the peaceful use undertakings of the NPT.” Leaders also reiterated necessity of keeping to moratorium on nuclear weapon test explosions or any other nuclear explosions. They called the Nuclear Suppliers Group for faster work on mechanism to strengthen controls on transfers of enrichment and reprocessing equipment, facilities and technology. Moreover, they expressed approval for initiative in the field of multilateral approaches to the nuclear fuel cycle, reserving the fact that participation must be voluntary and “should not precluded any state from purchasing nuclear fuel cycle services on the existing market, beyond the frameworks of multilateral mechanisms.”

In Heiligendamm was presented the “Report of the Nuclear Safety and Security Group”, in which repeated that the G8 is guided by the rule “nuclear safety first” and continuously strives after improvement of the national regulatory systems and after promotion of nuclear safety standards and security guidelines. Authors mentioned about safety decommissioning of the Chernobyl Nuclear Plant in Ukraine and the Medzamor Nuclear Plant in Armenia. They also expressed pleasure of establishing the IAEA Incident and Emergency Centre and of actions of the Global Nuclear Safety and Security Partnership.

Next to the issue of nuclear safety an important role in G7/G8 meetings played question of arms control. For the first time this issue was noticed in 1983, at the Williamsburg Summit, where in the Declaration on Security was written “we shall maintain sufficient military strength to deter any attack, to counter any threat, and to ensure the peace. Our arms will never be used expect in response to aggression.”

The G7 countries gathered at the summit expressed willingness of significant arms reductions and called the Soviet Union for verifiable cooperation based on equality. The Western side put forward the following proposals: on strategic weapons, the START on intermediate range nuclear missiles, the INF, on chemical weapons, on reduction of forces in Central Europe, the MBFR (Mutual and Balanced Force Reductions), and a Conference on Disarmament in Europe (CDE). The G7 leaders clearly stated that any attempts’ of the USRR at dividing the West in that matter would not succeed.

They called for fast finishing of talks on the INF, in the same time reiterating deployment of

---
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the US systems in Europe beginning at the end of 1983. They also underlined that “The security of our countries is indivisible and must be approached a global basis.”

At the London Summit 1984, was repeated that the G7 goal is its security and the lowest possible level of forces. Heads of state and government expressed willingness to achieve fast positive results in talks on arms control and to renew suspended negotiations. They called the Soviet Union for a constructive answer for the US offer “to restart nuclear arms control talks anywhere, at any time, without preconditions.” They also expressed faith that maintaining peace, reducing risk of accidental war or preventing the spread of nuclear weapons is in the interest of the East as well as the West.

In the Political Declaration on the 40th Anniversary of the End of the Second World War published at the Bonn Summit in 1985 the G7 countries expressed their determination to preserve the peace and declared “each of us will work to maintain and strengthen a stable military balance at the lowest possible levels of forces, neither seeking superiority for ourselves nor neglecting our defences.” In relations with the East they announced that they are accepting with pleasure the opening of negotiations in Geneva and looking forward for positive reactions from the Soviet Union in talks on “meaningful reductions in existing levels of nuclear arms, limitations on conventional arms, the banning of chemical weapons and lessening the risk of conflict.” The President Kohl in his conclusion statement informed that “The task in Geneva is to reduce drastically strategic and medium-range nuclear weapons and to start early discussions on the relationship between offensive and defensive weapons with a review to achieving cooperative solutions in the future.

It was not until 1988, when in the Political Declaration of Toronto Summit leaders summed up progress on reduction of the US and the Soviet Union nuclear weapons, what was important for each of the G7 countries. They announced that the INF Treaty was the first treaty which truly reduces nuclear arms and in the same time was basis for future arms control
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agreements such as “asymmetrical reductions and intrusive verification agreements.” Summit’s participants expressed their expectation of significant cuts also in US and Soviet strategic offensive arms.

In Houston, 1990, in the “Statement on Transnational Issues” were presented results of a debate inter alia on the threat to international security posed by the proliferation of nuclear, chemical and biological weapons, and of ballistic missile weapons delivery system. Leaders noticed that while for decades was focus on this last issue, currently one can see new and growing problems from the proliferation of chemical and biological weapons. Because of that, they decided to make efforts to prevent the diversion of chemical precursors at a national level, as well as in the relevant Western fora and to prevent also potential diversions in the field of biological technologies. They expressed pleasure of the agreement between the US and the USSR on destruction and non-production of chemical weapons. Leaders underlined necessity of the ban on chemical weapons and supported initiative had put forward by the NATO countries to become original signatories to the Chemical Weapons Convention. They called all countries for signing this document and because of the 1991 Review Conference on the Biological Weapons Convention called all nations, who still have not joined it, for signing it as soon as possible. Moreover, they stressed necessity of implementing by all countries the MTCR (Missile Technology Control Regime) Guidelines in order to control missile proliferation.

The 1991 London Summit notably devoted its debate to the issue of arms control. Political situation in the Eastern block and the Gulf Crisis had clearly shown danger posed by the uncontrolled spread of nuclear, biological and chemical weapons and by excessive holdings of conventional weapons. In that last matter, leaders noticed that progress could be achieve if all states would adapt three rules: transparency, consultation and action. The first issue, transparency, proposed a universal register of arms transfer under the auspices of the UN, what would help to prevent states’ attempts to build up holdings of conventional weapons beyond a reasonable level. Consultation rule was supposed to be reinforced by implementation of initiatives discussed by leading arms experts aimed at common guidelines applied in the transfer of conventional weapons. Action rule assumed that “all countries should refrain from arms transfers which would be destabilising or would exacerbate existing

tensions.” They also called for moderation in the level of military expenditure. They reiterated their support for the Biological Weapons Review Conference and for banning chemical weapons and called for its fast implementation. They underlined that the goal is “a total and effective ban on chemical and biological weapons.” “Use of such weapons is an outrage against humanity”, that is why they called for strengthening controls on exports every material, equipment and technology which could contribute to the proliferation of such weapons. With pleasure were accepted efforts of the Australia Group in this area and accession of new states to the Missile Technology Central Regime. During the press conference, foreign secretary Douglas Hard, pointed out 14th paragraph of the Declaration on Conventional Arms Transfer and NBC (Nuclear, Biological and Chemical) Non-Proliferation, in which are taken up “severe measures in the UNSC and elsewhere against any state which uses either chemical or biological weapons”, what was supposed to be a preventive warning before relevant international agreements are fully in place.

In the “Political Declaration: Shaping the New Partnership” of Munich, 1992, was written that “The end of the East West confrontation provides a historic opportunity, but also underlines the urgent need to curb the proliferation of nuclear weapons, other weapons of mass destruction and missiles capable of delivering them.” Leaders gathered at Munich declared that process of nuclear arms control and reduction must be continued inter alia through an enlargement of the NPT Treaty signatories and particularly through an accession of such nonnuclear-weapons States of Ukraine, Kazakhstan, Belarus and other non-Russian States of the former Soviet Union. They also noticed an importance of establishing in the former Soviet Union an effective control on nuclear materials, weapons and other sensitive goods and technologies and declared their help in this area. They called all countries for implementing guidelines of the Missile Technology Control regime and reminded about rules of transparency and consultation as well as about passing information to the UN Arms Register.


316 The Australia Group is an informal group of countries (now joined by the European Commission) established in 1985 (after the use of chemical weapons by Iraq in 1984) to help member countries to identify those of their exports which need to be controlled so as not to contribute to the spread of chemical and biological weapons. The name comes from Australia’s initiative to create the group.
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They expressed hope that START and the CFE Treaty would be basis for further agreements on nuclear weapons and particularly “the unilaterally announced elimination of ground launched short-range nuclear weapons by the United States and the former Soviet Union.”

They also called for ending in 1992 negotiations on global ban on chemical weapon. Moreover, the G7 countries supported demands of the Baltic States’ governments to withdraw Russian arms from their territories, what has expressed in his statement German Foreign Minister Klaus Kinkel.

At the Tokyo Summit, 19993, shortly was raised question of arms control. Leaders called all states for implementing the Chemical Weapons and the Biological Weapons Convention and accepting rules of the MTCR. They also called: the North Korea for returning to the NPT and fulfilling the IAEA safeguards agreement as well as the Joint Declaration on Denuclearization of the Korean Peninsula; Ukraine for ratification of the START Treaty; and Kazakhstan and Ukraine for joining the NPT. This appeal turned to be partly successful because at the Naples Summit, 1994, the G7 countries expressed their pleasure of Ukraine’s ratification of the START I Treaty and their hope that Ukraine would join the NPT as non-nuclear state. Unfortunately, still was not resolved a question of the North Korean retreating from the IAEA. Leaders called the DPRK for purification from any suspicions concerning its nuclear activities through implementing total transparency in its nuclear program and maintaining the freeze on its nuclear activities.

The Halifax Summit, 1995, was an important meeting and brought a lot of new in that area. Leaders noticed with pleasure the indefinite extension of the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty, the entry into force of START I, Ukraine accession to the NPT and expressed hope for fast ratification of START II. They announced works on adaptation of weapons-grade plutonium and on universal treaties to ban nuclear weapons test and to cut off the production of fissile material for nuclear weapons and other nuclear explosive devices. They also declared cooperation “to strengthen systems of control, accounting and physical security for nuclear materials; to expand... cooperation in the area of customs, law enforcement and intelligence and to strengthen through venues such as the IAEA and INTERPOL the
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international community’s ability to combat nuclear theft and smuggling.”\footnote{Chairman’s Statement, \texttt{http://www.g7.utoronto.ca/summit/1995halifax/chairman.html}, 18.12.2009} Once more the G7 countries underlined importance of bringing the Chemical Weapons Convention into force and of developing verification systems for the Biological and Toxin Weapons Convention.\footnote{Ibidem} They expressed concern at the excessive transfer of conventional arms and called all states for implementing 1980 Conventional Weapons Convention and for full implementation of the UN Register of Conventional Arms. For the first time heads of state and government officially raised issue of injuries to civilians caused by anti-personnel landmines. In Halifax Chairman’s Statement was described a situation in the North Korea. This country was called for fulfilling terms of the Agreed Framework between the Korea and the US and for joining to the Korean Peninsula Energy Development Organisation (KEDO). Conflict in Kashmir drew attention of the G7 to India and Pakistan, which were called for joining the NPT and refraining from further ballistic missile deployment.\footnote{Ibidem}

Special Moscow Nuclear Safety and Security Summit contributed to the issue of arms control publishing the Statement on CTBT (Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty), which was supposed to prohibit any nuclear test explosion or any other nuclear explosion.\footnote{Statement on CTBT, \texttt{http://www.g7.utoronto.ca/summit/1996moscow/ctbt.html}, 18.12.2009} The Lyon Summit, in the same year, reiterated the role of the CTBT and expressed strong support for goals in the document “Principles and Objectives for Nuclear Non-Proliferation and Disarmament”, adopted on 11 May 1995 at the conclusion of the NPT Review and Extension Conference.\footnote{Chairman’s Statement [Political Declaration]: Toward Greater Security and Stability in a More Cooperative World, \texttt{http://www.g7.utoronto.ca/summit/1996lyon/chair.html}, 28.12.2009} The G7 countries expressed satisfaction of signing in Bangkok, 1995, treaty establishing a nuclear weapon free zone in Southeast Asia; of signing by China, France, Russia, the US and the UK the protocols to the Treaty of Raratonga establishing a nuclear weapon free zone in the South Pacific; and of signing by members of the Organization for African Unity Treaty of Pelindaba establishing a nuclear weapon free zone in Africa. They underlined a necessity of establishing treaty forbidding production of fissile material for nuclear weapons or other nuclear devices and necessity of entering into force the START II Treaty.\footnote{Ibidem} Additionally, they expressed they hope for fast entering into force the Treaty on
Open Skies and their strong support of the ABM Treaty.\textsuperscript{328} The G7 heads of state and government noticed with satisfaction results of the Review Conference on the 1980 Conventional Weapons Convention, particularly a consent “on a new laser weapons protocol as well as strengthened protocol on mines, booby-traps and other devices.” They called all states for joining the moratoria and bans on the production, use and export of anti-personnel landmines and for supporting actions of the UN Register of Conventional Arms. They accepted with pleasure the agreement launched at Wassenaar on “transparency and greater responsibility in transfers of conventional arms and dual-use goods and technologies” as well as results of the Review Conference of the Treaty on Conventional Armed Forces in Europe (CFE).\textsuperscript{329}

The next Summit at Denver, 1997, devoted large part of its communiqué to issues of non-proliferation, arms control and disarmament. It was reminded that the CTBT “is a historic milestone”\textsuperscript{330} and called for its fast ratification. Leaders expressed pleasure of entering into force the Chemical Weapons Convention and willingness of the fastest possible establishment of a legally-binding and effective verification mechanism for the Biological and Toxin Weapons Convention. They called countries for adapting Additional Protocols concerning IAEA’s safeguards and for fast start of works on a convention banning the production of fissile material for nuclear weapons or other nuclear explosive devices. The G7 noticed with satisfaction an agreement among Russia, Kazakhstan, Kyrgyzstan, Tajikistan, and China on reduction of military forces along their borders. They reiterated hope for starting negotiations on START II and support for an agreement regulating transfer of arms and sensitive technologies such as the Wassenaar Agreement or the UN Register of Conventional Arms and

\begin{itemize}
  \item The \textbf{Treaty on Open Skies} entered into force on January 1, 2002, and currently has 34 States Parties. It establishes a program of unarmed aerial surveillance flights over the entire territory of its participants. The treaty is designed to enhance mutual understanding and confidence by giving all participants, regardless of size, a direct role in gathering information about military forces and activities of concern to them. Open Skies is one of the most wide-ranging international efforts to date promoting openness and transparency of military forces and activities.
  \item The \textbf{Anti-Ballistic Missile Treaty (ABM Treaty or ABMT)} was a treaty between the United States of America and the Soviet Union on the limitation of the anti-ballistic missile (ABM) systems used in defending areas against missile-delivered nuclear weapons. Signed in 1972, it was in force for the next thirty years until the US unilaterally withdrew from it in December 2001.
\end{itemize}

\textsuperscript{328} The \textbf{Treaty on Open Skies} entered into force on January 1, 2002, and currently has 34 States Parties. It establishes a program of unarmed aerial surveillance flights over the entire territory of its participants. The treaty is designed to enhance mutual understanding and confidence by giving all participants, regardless of size, a direct role in gathering information about military forces and activities of concern to them. Open Skies is one of the most wide-ranging international efforts to date promoting openness and transparency of military forces and activities.
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\textsuperscript{330} 1997 Denver Summit Communiqué, \url{http://www.g7.utoronto.ca/summit/1997denver/g8final.htm}, 29.12.2009
for works of the UN Panel of Governmental Experts on Small Arms aiming at preventing and reducing the excessive and destabilising transfer of small arms and light weapons. G7 countries discussed also on the global ban on anti-personnel landmines noticing with satisfaction “the restrictions on anti-personnel landmines unilaterally declared by States, including by the members of the EU” and negotiations during the Ottawa Process, which had set the goal achieving a ban on this subject before the end of 1997. They called all states for strengthening the Protocol on Mines, Booby Traps and Other Devices and for cooperation by development of technological solutions to mine detection and clearance. They also raised the question of the North Korea calling her for fulfilling its non-proliferation obligations as well as abandoning its development, deployment and export of ballistic missiles.  

At the G8 foreign ministers’ meeting in Birmingham 1998, were set series of decisions serving non-proliferation, arms control and disarmament. Ministers decided to intensify works on reinforcement of the Biological and Toxin Weapons Convention and on safe and effective management of fissile material designated as no longer required for defence purposes. Moreover, they announced enlargement of membership in the Programme for Preventing and Combating Illicit Trafficking in Nuclear Materials and further strengthening of safeguards system by adaptation of the Additional Protocols of the IAEA. They also supported review process for the NPT and for actions of the Organisation for the Prohibition of Chemical Weapons. Ministers called all countries for joining the NPT and the CTBT. They expressed hope for fast entry into force the START II and start of negotiations on START III and a Fissile Material Cut-Off Treaty. They also supported actions of the UNSCOM and the IAEA on eliminating Iraq’s WMD program. Ministers expressed concern at accumulations of conventional weapons in regions of tension and called interested states for disarmament and obeying rules of transparency and responsibility in transfers of conventional arms and dual-use goods and technologies. They called also for actions against the criminal use of Man-Portable Air Defence Systems (MANPADS) as it is a serious threat to civil aviation.  

Representatives of the G8 expressed hope that the Ottawa Convention, which is an important step towards a world free of anti-personnel landmines “will enter into force at on early date.” They underlined also an importance of the Amended Protocol II of the UN Convention on Conventional Weapons, the UN Conference on Disarmament and role of the UN Mine Action
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Leaders of the G8 countries in the Birmingham communiqué raised also a necessity of assuring the effective implementation of export controls of WMD and their delivery systems through strengthening laws regulations enforcement mechanism and the exchange of information. In Political Statement they condemned the nuclear tests carried out by India in May 1998 as incompatible with the CTBT and undermining the global non-proliferation regime as well as regional and international peace and security. They called India for joining the NPT, the CTBT and negotiations on a global treaty to stop the production of fissile material for nuclear weapons as well as Pakistan and other states for refraining from any unnecessary action.

However, this request had not brought any results and the G8 foreign ministers gathered in Gürzenich called again India and Pakistan for joining the CTBT condemning conducted nuclear test. Also the G8 in its communiqué expressed concern at “missile flight tests and development in missile proliferation, such as actions by North Korea” calling also India and Pakistan for obeying the UNSCR 1172. Leaders underlined that “Strengthening the international non-proliferation regime and disarmament measures is one of our most important international priorities.” They reiterated their support for the MTCR and for effective export control mechanisms creating inter alia by the Nuclear Suppliers Group.

Year 2000 brought success of the 2000 Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty Review Conference. G8 countries gathered at the Okinawa Summit 2000, expressed hope for fast entry into force the CTBT, START II reminding at the same time about the ABM Treaty as a “cornerstone of strategic stability and as a basis for further reductions of strategic offensive weapons.” With pleasure was approved the agreement on plutonium disposition between the US and Russia and their statement of intention concerning non-separation of additional weapon-grade
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plutonium. The G8 expressed also support for the MTCR and proposition of a Global Monitoring System as steps reinforcing global regimes to prevent proliferation of WMD. Additionally, foreign ministers of the G8 gathered in Miyazaki before the meeting of the G8 leaders expressed necessity of support for the Russian chemical weapons destruction program and give their approval for initiatives aimed at elimination of anti-personnel landmines *inter alia* the Ottawa Treaty.  

At the Genoa Summit, 2001, heads of state and government did not discuss issues of arms control, non-proliferation and disarmament. However, these subjects were reflected in the “Conclusions of the G8 Foreign Ministers’ Meeting” in Rome, just before the Geneva venue. They reiterated support for strengthening international arms control and non-proliferation regime through fundamental treaties related to WMD such as the Biological and Toxin Weapons Convention, the MTCR, the CTBT or the Chemical Weapons Convention. They announced also cooperation on positive results of the 2001 Review Conference for the Convention on Certain Conventional Weapons and on efforts “in the areas of mine clearance, humanitarian demining, victim assistance and in the development of the technologies for mine action”. Moreover, they declared active engagement in works on achieving goal of the UN Conference on the Illicit Trade in Small Arms and Light Weapons.  

The Kananaskis meeting 2002, took place in atmosphere of shock after the 9/11 terrorist attacks in the US a year before, and that is why it was mainly devoted to fight with terrorism. However, at the G8 foreign ministers venue in Whistler was continued a subject of threat to global security and stability posed by proliferation of WMD. They applauded recent agreement between the US and Russia on reduction of nuclear weapons and expressed “the need to use all available instruments from multilateral mechanisms and legally binding arrangements to export controls”. It had been also noticed that there were works on finishing negotiations on a multilateral framework for Russia’s plutonium dispositioning program in 2003.
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The Evian Summit 2003, published “Non-Proliferation of Weapons of Mass Destruction: A G8 Declaration”, where was reaffirmed the commitment to the NPT, the Chemical Weapons Convention, and the Biological and Toxin Weapons Convention. Leaders called all countries for joining them and for establishing “effective procedures and machinery to control the transfer of materials, technology and expertise which may contribute to the development, production or use of WMD and their means of delivery.”  

They expressed concern at the North Korea’s uranium enrichment and plutonium production programs as well as at Iran’s advanced nuclear program. They called both states for abandoning these activities and for submitting to the IAEA safeguards. Additionally, the G8 foreign ministers discussed on strengthening the IAEA role, its subsidiary; on the role of the UNSC in fight with proliferation of WMD; and on combating illicit trade in small arms and light weapons.  

Considerable breakthrough turned out to be the Sea Island Summit, 2004, where was announced the “G8 Action Plan on Non-Proliferation” aimed at reinforcement of the global non-proliferation regime. The G8 countries declared that they “will help and encourage states in effectively implementing their obligations under the multilateral treaty regimes” and they called all states for signing the Hague Code of Conduct against Ballistic Missile Proliferation. They also expressed strong support for the UNSCR 1540 “calling on all states to establish effective national export controls, to adopt and enforce effective laws to criminalize proliferation, to take cooperative action to prevent non-state actors from acquiring weapons of mass destruction, and to end illicit trafficking in such weapons, their means of delivery, and related materials.” The G8 countries treated significantly approvingly the Proliferation Security Imitative and the Statement of Interdiction Principles aimed at prohibiting trafficking in WMD, their delivery systems, and related materials. They also declared further cooperation on combating proliferation and coordination of actions aimed at “stopping illicit financial flows and shutting down illicit plants, laboratories, and brokers.” Moreover, they called for expanding membership of the PSI; reiterated necessity of full implementation of the Chemical Weapons Convention with its non-proliferation aspects; and raised problem of countries...
violating international nuclear safeguards such as North Korea. It was noticed with satisfaction Libya’s decision on ridding itself of its WMD and longer-range missiles as well as its joining the NPT, the Biological and Toxin Weapons Convention, the Chemical Weapons Convention and the MTCR.\textsuperscript{350}

At the Gleneagles Summit 2005, it was reaffirmed that “the proliferation of WMD and their delivery means, together with international terrorism, remain the pre-eminant threats to international peace and security”.\textsuperscript{351} Leaders called again on all states which were still not signatories of the NPT, an IAEA Comprehensive Safeguards Agreement and Additional Protocol, the Chemical Weapons Convention, the Biological and Toxin Weapons Convention, the 1925 Geneva Protocol and the Hague Code of Conduct Against the Proliferation of Ballistic Missiles to join them as soon as possible. It was also devoted a lot of space to the role of the UNSC Convention in addressing the challenges of proliferation. The G8 expressed pleasure that most of UN members reacted to UNSCR 1540 “by submitting reports on their domestic non-proliferation provisions including export controls, and their contribution to international cooperation.”\textsuperscript{352} They called on states which still had not sent their reports to send them as soon as possible. Moreover, leaders appreciated the role of the Conference on Disarmament and the NPT in fields of non-proliferation, although they expressed regret that consensus had been not reached at the 2005 Review Conference on the NPT. The G8 reiterated its engagement in the PSI and its Statement on Interdiction Principles calling all states for strengthening cooperation on combating proliferation networks and illicit financial flows. Leaders gathered in Scotland expressed deep concern at the DPRK activities. They called North Korea for dismantling all its nuclear weapons-related programs, not proliferating missiles elsewhere and rejoining the Six-Party Talks immediately without preconditions. They also called on Iran to prove that its nuclear program is only for peaceful purposes as well as to start negotiations form an initiative of France, Germany, the UK, and the High Representative of the EU on long-term arrangements and in that time to sustain all enrichment-related and reprocessing activities. In the “Gleneagles Statement on Non-Proliferation”, was noticed that in 2005 is falling the 30\textsuperscript{th} anniversary of the entry into force of the Biological and Toxin Weapons Convention and the 80\textsuperscript{th} anniversary of the opening for signature of the 1925
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Geneva Protocol prohibiting the use in war of asphyxiating, poisonous or other gases and bacteriological methods of warfare. On this occasion, the G8 reminded that till November 2005, in accordance with 2003 Action Plan, all parties of the Chemical Weapons Convention should have implemented national measures contained in this plan.\textsuperscript{353}

Leaders gathered at the St Petersburg Summit 2006, once more declared \textit{inter alia} “re-invigoration of relevant multilateral fora, beginning with the Conference on Disarmament”\textsuperscript{354} and in its framework to support negotiations on the Fissile Material Cut-Off Treaty. They expressed satisfaction of progressive reducing stockpiles of the chemical weapons, what was a result of implementation of the Chemical Weapons Convention. They also called for effective course of the 6\textsuperscript{th} Biological and Toxin Weapons Convention (BTWC) Review Conference reminding about the role of the BTWC in control over pathogenic micro organisms and toxins. Heads of state and governments raised again problem of Iran’s advanced nuclear program and North Korea’s activity, which had launched multiple ballistic missiles and has been still developing its nuclear weapons program. They reiterated the UNSCR 1695, which prohibits any external cooperation with the DPRK’s missile and WMD programs. Additionally, in St Petersburg was taken decision on enhancing cooperation in the area of the illicit trade arms through air channels in accordance with the UNSC arms embargos.\textsuperscript{355}

Almost traditionally, the Heiligendamm Summit 2007, has been finished with publication of the “Statement on Non-Proliferation”, in which was reiterated that “The strengthening and universalisation of WMD related treaties, in particular the Treaty on Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons, the Chemical Weapons Convention and the Biological and Toxin Weapons Convention, are therefore a key priority. These three treaties continue to be essential instruments to maintain international peace and security and are the cornerstones of the international regime for non-proliferation and disarmament.”\textsuperscript{356} Leaders declared once more engagement in development of cooperative procedures to identify, track and freeze financial transactions and assets associated with WMD proliferation network. They called again for full implementation of the UNSCR 1540 and for constructive contribution to the 2010 Review
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Conference on the NPT. In the 10th anniversary of the entry into force of the Chemical Weapons Convention they called on all states to further works in this area and cooperation in preparatory for the Second Review Conference. The G8 countries condemned Iran for not obeying obligations included in UNSC Resolutions 1696, 1737 and 1742 as well as the DPRK for its nuclear test, calling her for refraining from any more such tests and missile launch and for resigning from its nuclear program.357

Fight with proliferation of nuclear, chemical and biological weapons was strongly stressed after the 9/11 attacks, when it took one of the most important ways to combat international terrorism. Terrorism issue occurred very early during the leaders meetings. Already in 1978, in Bonn, was published the single “Statement on Air-Hijacking”, in which was declared that governments of the G7 “will intensify their joint efforts to combat international terrorism.”358 Heads of state and governments gathered in Bonn decided that in case when “a country refuses extradition or prosecution of those who have hijacked an aircraft and/or do not return such aircraft” their countries would cease all flights to that country and halt all incoming from that country or from any country by the airlines of the country concerned.359 They also called all governments for joining that initiative.

Leaders noticed with satisfaction a year later at Tokyo Summit that their appeal found a wide response and were agreed procedures of implementation of the Declaration of Bonn.360

At the Venice Summit 1980, was published once more a “Statement on Hijacking”, in which leaders expressed their satisfaction that on the Bonn appeal had responded so many states what was reflected in joining the 1979 Declaration and conventions “dealing with unlawful interference with civil aviation.”361 They underlined that “hijacking remains a threat to international aviation and that there can be no relaxation of efforts to combat this threat.”362

After events in Iran, in 1979, when were taken American hostages in the US Embassy in Teheran, leaders gathered in Venice published the “Statement on the Taking Diplomatic Hostages”, where firmly announced fight with such acts. They called for finishing works on the International Convention against the Taking of Hostages and called on states to join the
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Convention on the Prevention and Punishment of Crimes against Internationally Protected Persons of 1973. Moreover, the G7 called all governments for taking “appropriate measures to deny terrorists any benefits from such criminal acts.”\footnote{Ibidem} Leaders commit themselves to give each other diplomatic and consular assistance in the event of the seizure of diplomatic and consular establishments or personnel. They also reminded that each state has an obligation “under international law to refrain from organizing, instigating, assisting or participating in terrorist acts on another State”.\footnote{Ibidem}

In 1981, in Ottawa, was published a single “Statement on Terrorism”, which till that moment in the widest way talked about that problem. G7 countries expressed concern at support given to international terrorism through financing and arming the sanctuary and training groups. They condemned acts of violence such as aircraft hijacking, hostage taking and attacks against diplomatic and consular personnel and announced deepening of international cooperation on combating similar actions. Leaders referred also to the 1978 Bonn Declaration calling on states which were involved in several hijackings to fulfil their obligations and to solve these matters according to international arrangements’ criteria. Moreover, they agreed on cooperation in the event of attacks on diplomatic and consular establishments or personnel discussed in Venice. Countries which would help terrorists condemned in the Venice Statement “should face a prompt international response.”\footnote{Ottawa Summit Statement on Terrorism, \url{http://www.g7.utoronto.ca/summit/1981ottawa/terrorism.html}, 02.01.2010} Leaders agreed on exchanging information of terrorist threats and activities as well as cooperation on dealing with and countering terrorist acts and promoting antiterrorist conventions.\footnote{Ibidem}

Another important document in that subject was the “Declaration on International Terrorism” published at the London Summit, 1984. It was noticed that the number of hijackings and kidnapping had decreased what was related with an improvement of security measures introduced by Declarations of Bonn, Venice and Ottawa, but at the same time leaders mentioned that terrorism had developed other techniques, included this connected with trafficking drugs. They also stated that “the increasing involvement of States and governments

\footnote{Statement on the Taking of Diplomatic Hostages, \url{http://www.g7.utoronto.ca/summit/1980venice/hostage.html}, 02.01.2010}
in acts of terrorism, including the abuse of diplomatic immunity.”

Because of that the G7 leaders proposed deepening of cooperation between police and security organisations and other relevant authorities; exterminating gaps in its national legislation which might be used by terrorists; revising arm trading to states supporting terrorism; use of the powers of the receiving states under the Vienna Convention; and cooperation over the expulsion or exclusion of known terrorists. These proposals were directed also to international community to prevent and punish terrorist acts.

The next summit in Bonn, 1985, did not raise that subject but in Tokyo, a year later, was announced again the “Statement on International Terrorism”, where leaders condemned international terrorism, in all forms, noticing increase in number of states which were treating it as instrument of government policy. The G7 strongly underlined that terrorism has no justification and “must be fought relentlessly and without compromise.”

They called all likeminded countries for cooperating with the G7, “particularly in such international fora as the United Nations, the International Civil Aviation Organisation and the International Maritime Organisation.” Heads of state and governments decided on intensification of information exchange of potential terrorist threats. In the Statement were also mentioned measures which were supposed to be use toward “any State which is clearly involved in sponsoring or supporting international terrorism, and in particular of Libya.” Among these measures were inter alia refusal to export arms; strict limits on the size of the diplomatic and consular missions and other official bodies abroad of such states or event the closure of such missions and bodies; denial of entry to all persons expelled or excluded from one of G7 states connected with terrorism; improved extradition procedures of terrorists; stricter immigration and visa requirements for citizens of above mentioned states; and the closest possible cooperation between police and security organisations and other relevant authorities in the fighting terrorism. Leaders announced also development of further bilateral and multilateral actions, promotion of the 1978 Bonn Declaration and called other governments for joining fight with terrorism.
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Rules elaborated in Tokyo were reiterated at the Venice Summit, 1987, where in the next “Statement on Terrorism” the G7 countries reaffirmed their engagement in the combat with terrorism and noticed with satisfaction progress in that subject, particularly initiative of France and Germany to convene in Paris a meeting of Ministers of nine countries, who were responsible for counter-terrorism. Leaders declared continuation of works on improvement of the safety of travellers in cooperation with the ICAO and the IMO as well as increased cooperation on the investigation, apprehension and prosecution of terrorists. In the annex to the above mentioned document the G7 governments in order to make the 1978 Bonn Declaration more effective agreed that “in case where a country refuses extradition or prosecution of those who have committed offences described in the Montreal Convention for the Suppression of Unlawful Acts against the Safety of Civil Aviation and/or does not return the aircraft involved, the Heads of State and Government are jointly resolved that their Governments shall take immediate action to cease flights to that to that country as stated in the Bonn Declaration.”

Subject of terrorism occurred also in the “Political Declaration” of the 1988 Toronto Summit, together with the illicit drug problem. The G7 countries condemned every acts of terrorism, “in particular the destruction of a Korean airliner and the hijacking of a Kuwait airliner”, and expressed their support for the declaration of the ICAO Council which said that “hijacked aircraft should not be allowed to take off one they have landed, except in circumstances as specified in the ICAO declaration.” Leaders noticed with satisfaction the adoption of two international agreements on aviation and maritime security to enhance safety of travellers. In the subject of narcotics, they expressed necessity of international cooperation on programs combating production, trafficking and financing of the drug trade as well as monitoring incomes of drugs traffickers to curb money laundering. The G7 gave its support for negotiations on a UN Convention on illicit trafficking and for the US initiative for a special task force in the field of fighting against narcotics.

At the Paris Summit, 1989, in the Economic Declaration was written that “The drug problem has reached devastating proportions” and called for immediate actions on a national and international basis. In order to achieve that, leaders decided on a greater support of bilateral
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and UN programs for the conversion of illicit cultivation in the producers country; strengthening the role of the UN Fund for Drug Abuse Control and other UN and multilateral organisations in fight with narcotics; intensification of information exchange on the prevention of addiction and rehabilitation of drug addicts; ratification and implementation of the Vienna Convention on illicit traffic in narcotic drugs and psychotropic substances; supporting international conference on cocaine and drug reduction; establishing a financial action task force from summit participants and other interested countries aimed at valuing realised actions “in order to prevent the utilization of the banking system and financial institutions for the purpose of money laundering”; and supporting initiatives connected with “identification, tracing, freezing, seizure and forfeiture of drug crime proceeds.”

In Paris was also published a single “Declaration on Terrorism”, where was reiterated the G7 commitment in combating terrorism. Leaders condemned in particular state-sponsored terrorism and expressed determination to punish terrorists in accordance with international law. They called for immediate and unconditional release of hostages. Moreover, they expressed concern at civil aviation significantly condemning recent attack on an aircraft over Scotland calling at the same time for further works on strengthening security measures. Additionally, the G7 gave its support for developing by the ICAO “international regime for the marking plastic and sheet explosive for detection.”

In the “Statement on Transnational Issues” of Houston 1990, the heads of state and government expressed concern at repeating terrorist attacks on civil aviation and called for “the immediate, unconditional and safe release of all hostages and for an accounting of all persons taken hostage who may have died while being held.” They reiterated cooperation on negotiating convention requiring the introduction of additives into plastic explosives to aid in their detection and expressed their support in this subject conducted by the ICAO. In Houston was raised also an issue of fight with narcotics. In the Economic Declaration, leaders called all states for implementing measures form the Program of Action of the UN Special Session on Drugs as well as the UN Convention against Illicit Traffic in Narcotic Drugs and Psychotropic Substances. They also expressed support for the declaration of the ministerial meeting on drugs convened by the UK “that drug demand reduction should be accorded by
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the same importance in policy and action as the reduction of illicit supply.”

Summit participants committed themselves to implement recommendations presented by the FATF and decided on prolonging her activity for the next year. They also proposed to create in imitation of the FATF a similar task force which would be supposed to work out procedures assuring that “precursor and essential chemicals are not delivered to manufacture illicit drugs.” Leaders supported a strategy of fighting the cocaine trade presented in the Cartagena Declaration and announced help in fight against drug trafficking for countries such as Columbia, Peru and Bolivia. Moreover, they mentioned about the problem with the heroin in many countries and expressed willingness of establishing an informal narcotics consultative arrangement.

Issue of drugs occurred also a year later in London, where in the summit’s Economic Declaration was noticed the entry into force 1989 UN Convention Against Illicit Traffic in Narcotic Drugs and Psychotropic Substances and establishment of the UN International Drugs Control Programme. Leaders expressed hope that political changes in Central and Eastern Europe contribute to deeper cooperation in fighting smuggling of cocaine and heroin to Europe. They called all countries for combating money laundering *inter alia* through joining FATF and implementing measures recommended by the CATF (Chemical Action Task Force) report. They also appreciated the Dublin Group work on fight with narcotics production and trafficking as well as called the Customs Cooperation Council for reinforcing cooperation with international traders and for presenting report of its activity.

The 1992 Munich Summit reaffirmed that “The fight against drugs remains a major challenge” but did not raised that subject. In turn the G7 discussed omitted a year before an issue of terrorism, calling again on all states to cease financial and territory support for terrorist organisations. Heads of state and government clearly condemned the taking of hostages and called for realising all detained persons. They also called on Libya “to comply
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with Security Council resolutions 731 and 748 promptly and fully\textsuperscript{382} and on all countries to enforce rigorous sanctions against Libya.

While terrorism and narcotics questions were described by the Chairman of 1994 Naples Summit\textsuperscript{383} as “a threat to political as well as economic and social life”\textsuperscript{384} and leaders reiterated their condemnation for all form of terrorism, in particular state-sponsored, still these subjects were not widely discussed. In their communiqué summit’s participants stated that “We are alarmed by the growth of organized transnational crime, including money laundering, and by the use of illicit proceeds to take control of legitimate business.”\textsuperscript{385} In order to achieve that they called on all states to adopt necessary legislation, including these proposed by the FATF.\textsuperscript{386}

Transnational criminal organisations were a year later in Halifax described as “a growing threat to the security of all nations. They undermine the integrity of financial systems, breed corruption, and weaken emerging democracies and developing countries around the world.”\textsuperscript{387} Leaders declared a lot of forms of cooperation in fight with transnational organized crime (TOC) and decided on establishing “a group of senior experts with a temporary mandate” obligating it to present report of its activity in 1996. Additionally, the G8 obligated “terrorism experts group to report to a ministerial level meeting on specific, cooperative measures to deter, prevent, and investigate terrorist acts.”\textsuperscript{388}

G8 countries at the Lyon Summit 1996, declared support for works of the Senior Experts Group on Transnational Organized Crime as well as for forty presented by its recommendations and asked for active follow-up and other report to the next summit. Moreover, they committed to support existing organisations that dealt with TOC, to share information and to encourage all states to adopt existing conventions, treaties and agreements.\textsuperscript{389} In Lyon, were raised again issues of narcotics and terrorism. In the Chairman’s
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Statement expressed faith that “terrorist threats will also curbed by the elimination of isolation and poverty.” A single Declaration on Terrorism was published because of terrorist attack in Saudi Arabia. G7 leaders expressed also sympathy for victim’s families and condemnation of terrorism “in all its forms and manifestations, regardless of its perpetrators or motives.” They reiterated that fighting terrorism is an absolute priority and because of that it has been necessary for all countries to adopt every relevant international convention. It was also announced a ministerial meeting in Paris aimed at discussing on next steps in that subject. 1997 Denver meeting had brought again wider interest in TOC, terrorism and drugs. In communique was written “Our efforts to combat transnational crime will be a priority of the group for the foreseeable future. Transnational criminal groups can often adapt to global change more swiftly and efficiently than our governments.”

G7 countries admitted that they must reinforce their cooperation in order to implement forty recommendations from Lyon and named themselves two critical activity’s areas for the next year “First, the investigation, prosecution, and punishment of high-tech criminals, such as those tampering with computer and telecommunications technology, across national borders. Second, a system to provide all governments the technical and legal capabilities to respond to high-tech crimes, regardless of where the criminals may be located.” Leaders announced also additional borders’ securities; development of new strategies fighting alien smuggling; new standards for firearms identification; strengthening cooperation on extradition and mutual legal assistance. In narcotics area they underlined necessity of demand reduction, help for programs aimed at treatment and rehabilitation. G7 countries announced cooperation through exchanging information on money-laundering, chemical precursors, new synthetic drugs, trafficking patterns and support for institutions fighting illicit drugs. They reiterated that terrorism still is a serious threat to security and peace. Twenty five recommendations, worked out at 1996 Ministerial Conference on Terrorism in Paris, were accepted not only by the G7 but also by international community. The communiqué mentioned inter alia about establishing a UN convention on terrorist bombing and international standards for airport security, explosive detection, and vehicle identification; promoting stronger laws and export controls on the manufacturing, trade and transport of explosives; inviting all states to promote the use of
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encryption which may allow, consistent with OECD guidelines, lawful government access to combat terrorism. Leaders also announced works of their officials on strengthening counter-terrorism measures aimed at e.g. prevention of terrorist attacks on electronic and computer infrastructure. Moreover, they announced deeper cooperation on maritime security and called on all states to join international counter-terrorism conventions specified in the 1996 UN resolution.\textsuperscript{394}

At the Birmingham Summit 1998, was widely raised a problem of TOC which takes many forms \textit{inter alia} trafficking in drugs and weapons; smuggling human beings; the abuse of new technologies to steal, defraud and evade the law; and the laundering of the proceeds of crime.\textsuperscript{395} Heads of state and government reminded that only by the cooperation such serious threats may be effectively battled. Because of that they agreed on further steps towards better coordination of their actions. They announced support for establishing a UN convention on TOC; implementation of ten point action plan and ten principles agreed by the G8 Ministers on high-tech crime; combating all forms of trafficking of human beings including smuggling of migrants. Moreover, leaders appreciated FATF works; announced a Ministerial Meeting on combating TOC in Moscow 1999, as well as agreed on establishing Financial Intelligence Units (FIUs) in countries, where they are still absent. Leaders declared that “the G8 is committed to partnership and shared responsibility in the international community to combat illicit drugs. This should include reinforced cooperation to curb illicit trafficking in drugs and chemical precursors, action to reduce demand in our countries, including through policies to reduce drug dependency, and support for a global approach to eradicating illicit crops.”\textsuperscript{396}

Additionally, G8 foreign ministers gathered in London raised the issue of terrorism, positively valuating progress which could have occurred through twenty five measures adopted by the G8 in 1996 and arrangements of Denver Summit, including the adoption of the International Convention for the Suppression of Terrorist Bombings. Ministers announced further actions aimed at strengthening cooperation e.g. negotiations on a draft of a UN Convention on the Suppression of Acts of Nuclear Terrorism and set four priority areas for further actions: preventing terrorist fund-raising; no concession to terrorists to deter hostage-takers;
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denying terrorist access to arms, explosives and related items; strengthened aviation security.\textsuperscript{397}

The Cologne Summit 1999, maintained G8’s engagement in combating TOC, recommending further works of the Senior Experts Group on TOC and on Terrorism. G8 countries called on progress on negotiating the UN Convention on the Financing of Terrorism and on implementation of conclusions of the 1998 UN General Assembly Special Session on the World Drug Programme.\textsuperscript{398}

The communiqué of the Okinawa Summit 2000 raised at length issues of narcotics and crime noticing “Everyone deserves a life free from the threat of crime.”\textsuperscript{399} Leaders called for implementing, till the end of 2000, the UN TOC Convention and three related Protocols on firearms, smuggling of migrants and trafficking in persons for the establishment of an effective legal framework against TOC. They also raised a problem of the cyber-crime, wider described in the Okinawa Charter on Global Information Society and reiterated necessity of cooperation on fighting illegal drugs, new threats from amphetamines and other synthetic drugs as well as combating money laundering and corruption. They also called all states for implementing the OECD Anti-Bribery Convention. Leaders stated that “We must also protect vulnerable groups and the young in the fight against crime and provide particular care for the victims of crime.” In the final communiqué they called “for the urgent strengthening of international cooperation, in particular in exchanges of counter-terrorism information, improving measures against the financing of terrorist activities, and working together to bring terrorists to justice.”

The questions of TOC and terrorism were deeply discussed at the Ministers’ of Justice and Interior meeting in Milano 2001, just before the G8 Genoa Summit. In the communiqué from this venue, next to above mentioned subjects, was also announcement of taking “actions to tackle serious phenomena of racism, xenophobia and intolerance.” Ministers with satisfactions commented success of the Palermo Conference, on which were signed the Palermo Convention against TOC, the Protocol to Prevent, Surpass and Punish Trafficking in Persons, Especially Women and Children as well as they called for endorsing the Protocol against Illicit Manufacturing of Trafficking in Firearms, Their Parts and Components and Ammunitions. Ministers also expressed their concern at the use of new technologies for
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criminal purposes, “in particular for the sexual exploitation of children” that was the reason why they decided to give the “high priority to the issues of public awareness and prevention as well as investigation and prosecution against individuals and criminal organisations involved in child pornography.” They called on the Lyon Group to work on localization and identification of criminals who use network communications for illegal purposes and on creating a G8 database “coordinated by Italy, to be extended to other countries with the aim of ensuring a real-time exchange of information using also the existing 24h points of contact network.” In an issue of money-laundering ministers called all countries for implementing international standards of the FATF Forty Recommendations announced intensification of cooperation and mutual legal assistance in the confiscation of illicit assets and reiterated necessity for “legislative and administrative measures aimed at assuring transparency of the financial system.” Moreover, ministers noticed that corruption becomes even more serious problem, which has “many manifestations in addition to the criminal aspects of the problem”, and they called for faster works on establishing a new UN Convention against corruption.400

Leaders gathered in Genoa, accepted all the conclusions of the G8 Justice and Interior Ministers and announced intensification of works on fighting the trafficking and use of illegal drugs. This short statement was included in the final document of the summit.401

The Kananaskis Summit 2002, was concentrated mainly on problem of terrorism because of the 9/11 attacks in the US. The most important result of that meeting was establishment of a new G8 Global Partnership against the Spread of Weapons and Material of Mass Destruction, to which the US allotted $20 billion for the next ten years.402 In a special statement leaders stated that “We commit ourselves to prevent terrorists, or those that harbour them, from acquiring or developing nuclear, chemical, radiological and biological weapons; missiles; and related materials, equipment and technology. We call on all countries to join us in adopting the set of non-proliferation principles we have announced today.”403 Priorities of this Partnership were counted out: the destruction of chemical weapons; the dismantlement of decommissioned nuclear submarines; the disposition of fissile materials; and the employment
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of former weapons scientists. Leaders proposed six rules to prevent terrorists or those who harbour them from gaining access to weapons or materials of mass destruction:

1. "Promote the adoption, universalization, full implementation and, where necessary, strengthening of multilateral treaties and other international instruments whose aim is to prevent the proliferation or illicit acquisition of such items; strengthen the institutions designed to implement these instruments.

2. Develop and maintain appropriate effective measures to account for and secure such items in production, use, storage and domestic and international transport; provide assistance to states lacking sufficient resources to account for and secure these items.

3. Develop and maintain appropriate effective physical protection measures applied to facilities which house such items, including defence in depth; provide assistance to states lacking sufficient resources to protect their facilities.

4. Develop and maintain effective border controls, law enforcement efforts and international cooperation to detect, deter and interdict in cases of illicit trafficking in such items, for example through installation of detection systems, training of customs and law enforcement personnel and cooperation in tracking these items; provide assistance to states lacking sufficient expertise or resources to strengthen their capacity to detect, deter and interdict in cases of illicit trafficking in these items.

5. Develop, review and maintain effective national export and transshipment controls over items on multilateral export control lists, as well as items that are not identified on such lists but which may nevertheless contribute to the development, production or use of nuclear, chemical and biological weapons and missiles, with particular consideration of end-user, catch-all and brokering aspects; provide assistance to states lacking the legal and regulatory infrastructure, implementation experience and/or resources to develop their export and transshipment control systems in this regard.

6. Adopt and strengthen efforts to manage and dispose of stocks of fissile materials designated as no longer required for defence purposes, eliminate all chemical weapons, and minimize holdings of dangerous biological pathogens and toxins, based on the recognition that the threat of terrorist acquisition is reduced as the overall quantity of such items is reduced."

Leaders also set guidelines for new or expanded cooperation projects to address non-proliferation, disarmament, counter-terrorism and nuclear safety. They underlined that “the phrase “new or expanded cooperation projects” is defined as cooperation projects that will be initiated or enhanced on the basis of this Global Partnership... The Global Partnership’s initial geographic focus will be on projects in Russia, which maintains primary responsibility for implementing its obligations and requirements within the Partnership."405 The Kananaskis Summit published also separate statement on transport security, in which were presented “actions to promote greater security of land, sea and air transport while facilitating the cost-effective and efficient flow of people, cargo, and vehicles for legitimating economic and
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G8 countries decided *inter alia* on implementing global standard for the collection and transmission of advanced passenger information (API); establishing recommendation “on minimum standards for the application of biometrics in procedures and documents by the spring 2003”; implementing an improved global container security regime to identify and examine high-risk containers and ensure their in-transit integrity; supporting amendments of the International Convention for the Safety of Life at Sea (SOLAS) aimed at improving maritime security; and establishing security regime for the overload transportation and distribution of hazardous cargos. G8 foreign ministers published the “G8 Recommendations on Counter-Terrorism”, which according to their authors should have been complement to works of experts from different regional and international institutions. This document consisted of ten sections, in which were presented best practices, principles and actions aimed at helping in the fight with terrorism. Ministers called on the fastest possible implementation of twelve UN conventions and protocols addressing counter-terrorism issues, all relevant UNSC Resolutions, the Convention on Cybercrime and on cooperation with the UN on drafting the UN Comprehensive Convention on International Terrorism. They underlined necessity of every action preventing chemical, biological, radiological and nuclear weapons from terrorists, particularly importance of establishing International Convention for the Suppression of Acts of Nuclear Terrorism. Additionally, G8 ministers called all states for adopting effective domestic laws and regulations addressing explosive and firearms to prevent their use for terrorists and for implementation of the UNSCR 1373, the International Convention for the Suppression of the Financing of Terrorism, the FATF Special Recommendations on Terrorist Financing, the Money Laundering, Related Terrorist Financing and Asset Forfeiture. Moreover, they called on all countries to reinforce transport security through implementation of the recommendations of the ICAO, the IMO, the WCO and other relevant initiatives in this area and to strengthen bilateral as well as multilateral cooperation *inter alia* on an international forum such as the UN. Additionally, leaders paid attention to connections between terrorism and TOC and in order to prevent this they decided on implementation of the G8 Recommendations on Transnational Crime worked out at the
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meeting of Ministers of Justice and Interior in Mont-Tremblant, May 2002. Ministers at their
venue raised also a question of high-tech crime because according to them “the Internet has
been used by terrorists to communicate and plan attacks.” The fight against terrorism was
also a main subject of G8 Foreign Ministers’ meeting in Whistler 2002. They presented a
report in which was described a progress in three areas: strengthening security measures in G8
countries and with each other; implementing and reinforcing international measures against
terrorism; and assisting other countries in implementing counter-terrorism measures.
The next summit at Evian 2003, in a part three “Improving Security” of the Chair’s Summary
stated that “Commendable progress has been achieved against terrorism world-wide.
However, we note with concern the remaining threats of terrorist networks, the challenges of
proliferation of weapons of mass destruction in several countries and the risks to peace and
security that unresolved conflicts pose to the world.”

The G8 Senior Officials Group presented the annual report on the Global Partnership, in which were described results of its
actions in four main areas: implementation and transportation of the Kananaskis guidelines;
initiation and development of concrete cooperation projects; financial contributions; and
outreach strategy towards non-G8 countries. Moreover, leaders published the G8 Action
Plan, in which were presented goals of the Global Partnership such as: the universal adoption
of the non-proliferation principles; gathering declared at Kananaskis $20 billion over ten
years; widening projects activities; implementation of all guidelines; participation in the
Global Partnership to interested non-G8 countries; wide presentation of this Partnership to
other organisations and publics. In Evian, was also published the G8 Action plan titled
“Building International Political Will and Capacity to Combat Terrorism.” Leaders stated
there that “Developing a successful capacity to tackle terrorism requires a focus on three
main areas of counter-terrorism activity: first, to deny terrorists the means to commit terrorist
acts (for example, to prevent the financing of terrorism, and denial of false documents and
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weapons); second, to deny terrorists a safe haven and ensure that terrorists are prosecuted and/or extradited (for example to accelerate the conclusion of counter-terrorism conventions and protocols, to deny terrorists entry into a country and to reinforce law-enforcement agencies); and third, to overcome vulnerability to terrorism (for example to enhance domestic security measures and capability for crisis management and consequence management).”

G8 countries decided to help all countries interested in the capacity building on the fields appointed by the UN Security Council’s Counter-Terrorism Committee (UNSCCTC) such as counter-terrorism legislation; financial law and practice; immigration law and practice; customs law and practice; extradition law and practice; police and law enforcement; export control and illegal arms trafficking; and domestic security measure. Leaders announced also support for the UNSCCTC inter alia through the establishing of a Counter-Terrorism Action Group (CTAG) which was supposed to focus on coordination of capacity building assistance and which members should have been representatives of the CTC and other UN bodies. Additionally, the G8 announced that it would encourage third countries, regional and functional organisations to join above mentioned actions.

Third Action Plan published at Evian concerned preventing terrorist threats against mass transportation and was a continuation of the Kananaskis Action Plan. This document raised an issue of terrorism in the widest way and focused on five areas. First area concerned criminal use of MANPADS and announced above all reinforcement of national export controls on MANPADS and its parts as well as protection of stockpile management and prohibition of transfers of MANPADS to non-state users. Second one talked about air transport. Leaders announced here development of aviation quality control systems world-wide in cooperation with the ICAO. In the third area they focused on people describing international standards of biometric applications and security of identity documents. Additionally, they discussed on actions for the Container Security Imitative and for securing sea transport.

According to heads of state and government, the 9/11 events “highlighted the risk posed by the use of certain highly radioactive sources for malevolent or terrorist purposes.” Because of that, in a special statement leaders committed themselves to combat radiological terrorism, underling at the
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same time the leading role of the IAEA in this subject and announcing strong support for her actions. In the published “G8 Action Plan on Securing Radioactive Sources”, the G8 promised to support IAEA’s works through promotion of her Code of Conduct on the Safety and Security of Radioactive Sources and its elements which could have been applied at the national level. To this elements were included national registers for tracking sources; programs for recovering orphan sources; national regulations limiting export of high-risk sources to states that have effective controls; notification requirements to recipient states of exports; national measures to penalize theft or misuse of radioactive sources; national physical protection measures and access control; and national laws to ensure the safe and secure disposal of high-risk spent sealed sources. Additionally, in cooperation with the IAEA was announced conference in France 2005 which supposed to provide further debate on radioactive source problem. 419

The 2004 Sea Island Summit, once more raised an issue of security of the travelling public through the G8 Secure and Facilitated International Travel Initiative (SAFTI), which supposed to expand the Evian MANPADS plan. The SAFTI Action Plan included proposal of 28 actions concerning four areas: document interoperability through international standards; international information exchange; MANPADS threat reduction; and capacity building and collaboration. 420 G8 countries noticed with satisfaction that till that time they managed to introduced the following actions “the promotion and implementation of enhanced international standards for the secure issuance of passports; the establishment of a 24-hour aviation point of contact network to address imminent threats to airlines; and the preparation of an information manual for assessing the vulnerability of G8 airports to the MANPADS threat.” 421 In Sea Island, the G8 stated also that “Since its launch by the G8 Leaders two years ago at Kananaskis, the Global Partnership has become a significant force worldwide to enhance international safety and security.” 422 Leaders announced further action in the framework of this project inter alia works on controlling and securing radiation sources as well as on securing fresh and spent HEU fuel. They expressed satisfaction of declaration on
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participation of additional donor countries and reiterated commitment to rising up to $20 billion for that project through 2012. In the “G8 Action Plan on Non-Proliferation” next to above mentioned issues leaders raised also problem of bioterrorism. They committed to “expand or, where necessary, initiate new bio-surveillance capabilities to detect bio-terror attacks against humans, animals, and crops; improve our prevention and response capabilities; increase protection of the global food supply; and respond to, investigate, and mitigate the effects of alleged uses of biological weapons or suspicious outbreaks of disease.” In the same document was noticed with satisfaction that the IAEA approved a revised Code of Conduct on the Safety and Security of Radioactive Sources in September 2003. The G8 called on the IAEA to establish fast export and import control guidance for high-risk radioactive sources, which had been agreed by the G8.423

At the Gleneagles meeting 2005, was published the “SAFTI Summit Progress Report”, in which was described progress in each of 28 points mentioned in the document of Sea Island.424 Besides, in the Statement on Non-Proliferation leaders expressed hope for the fast entry into force the International Convention on the Suppression of Acts of Nuclear Terrorism and for strengthening the Convention for the Suppression of Unlawful Acts against the Safety of Maritime navigation. They also confirmed engagement in the Global Partnership and called for the raising up the $20 billion over ten years, what would allow opening new projects. They called on other states to join the Partnership, with satisfaction noticing accession of Ukraine.425 In the same document was raised an issue of radioactive sources. Leaders commented with satisfaction fact that more than seventy countries joined the IAEA Code of Conduct on the Safety and Security of Radioactive Sources and announced further efforts in that subject. In response to terrorist attacks in London, heads of state and government published the “Statement on Counter-Terrorism”, in which next to sympathy for victims, they declared “We will work to improve the sharing of information on the movement of terrorists across international borders, to assess and address the threat to the transportation
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infrastructure, and to promote best practices for rail and metro security.”

They announced deeper cooperation with the UN and other international and regional fora on a Convention on International Terrorism. Additionally, the G8 called for stronger collaboration among security agencies, law enforcers, intelligence collectors and analysts, policy makers and practitioners to disrupt terrorists and to prevent more people turning to terrorism. There were also announced actions aimed at reducing vulnerability to attack *inter alia* through reinforcement of international standards of transport security and creating plans aimed at minimising the consequences of attacks. In conclusions was noticed that “As G8 leaders, we pledge the sustained commitment required to identify and reduce the terrorist threat, to promote freedom and security, to protect democracy and to ensure the rule of law. We call upon all States to join us in this crucial endeavour.”

The heads of state and government gathered next year in St Petersburg, again widely discussed problem of terrorism. In the “G8 Declaration on Counter-terrorism”, they declared the deepening of the cooperation among them and with other countries on the UN forum on the protection of global critical energy infrastructure. It was underlined an importance of private sector partners in the fight against terrorism and was given the support for the Global Forum for Partnerships between Government and Businesses to Counter-Terrorism. Leaders reiterated plans of collaboration of the G8 with other partners in actions aimed at protection against terrorist attacks *inter alia* through combating terrorists’ attempts to get access to weapons; fighting terrorism financing; implementing international and national legislation on counter-terrorism; counter actions to terrorist propaganda and recruitment; protection against attempts to misuse cyberspace for terrorist purposes. Moreover, they declared cooperation in the area of transport security (in subway, rail, road, aviation and maritime security area). In a separate “G8 Statement on Strengthening the UN’s Counter-Terrorism Program”, was noticed that “As the only truly world body, the UN is the sole organization with the stature and reach to achieve universal agreement on the condemnation of terrorism. We call upon the Secretary-General to continue to use the unique international stature of his office to reinforce this point. A comprehensive response to the urgent threat of terrorism must be a core focus of
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Leaders underlined that while the Security Council plays the crucial role, to achieve a positive result in cooperation across the whole UN system is needed, particularly among the ICAO, the WCO, the IMO and the IAEA. They called the UN for elaborating concrete standards of accountability of each state implementation of its obligations from the UNSC resolutions. They also called on the UN General Assembly to finish as soon as possible works on a Comprehensive Convention on International terrorism and declared that “We seek to ensure that the UN makes a significant and long-lasting contribution to the global counter-terrorism effort with the ultimate goal of eliminating the terrorist threat.”

In the report on the Global Partnership published at this summit, leaders noticed progress in the implementation of Kananaskis goals. As focus was on projects in Russia, there was expressed satisfaction that Russia had built two chemical weapons destruction facilities to eliminate its stockpiles of chemical weapons and the next four were in plans as well as Russia had dismantled sixty one nuclear submarines and had started research project to employ former weapons scientists. In the same document was established the Global Partnership Working Group that was supposed to serve as a “forum to identify and resolve any problems that arise.”

In the “Report of the Nuclear Safety and Security Group” the G8 called on all countries to implement the International Convention for the Suppression of Acts of Nuclear Terrorism and the Amendment to the Convention on the Physical Protection of Nuclear Material and expressed their satisfaction that more number of states had implemented the IAEA Code of Conduct on the Safety and Security of Radioactive Sources. Leaders also supported, announced by the President Putin and President Bush on 15 July, the Global Initiative to Combat Nuclear Terrorism which legal basis was the International Convention for the Suppression of Acts of Nuclear Terrorism, the Convention on the Physical Protection of Nuclear Material and Nuclear Facilities, the UNSC Resolutions 1373 and 1540, as well as national legal authorities. In the Chair’s Summary was written that “We trust that, through their participation in this new Global Initiative to Combat Nuclear Terrorism, all countries that share our common goals of suppressing and mitigating the consequences of acts of nuclear terrorism will - on a voluntary basis and on the basis of independent responsibility of...
each country for the steps taken within its jurisdiction - reinforce joint efforts to increase international cooperation, in accordance with international law and national legislation, in combating this threat.” To this project the IAEA was invited as an observer. 432

The Heiligendamm Summit 2007, to large extend engaged itself in a debate on fighting terrorism. In the “G8 Summit Statement on Counter-Terrorism”, heads of state and government wrote that “We, the leaders of the G8, are united in condemning in the strongest terms all acts of terrorism and reaffirm that there can be no justification for such acts which constitute one of the most serious threats to international peace and security, and to life and the enjoyment of human rights...Mindful of both the benefits and the challenges that globalization brings to our economies, and recognizing the growing interdependence and interconnectedness of our global economy, we resolve to enhance our cooperation and coordination in order to counter the threats to our way of life posed by terrorism and violent extremism.”433 Once more was reiterated the crucial role of the UN in the fight against terrorism and was noticed with satisfaction a consent to the UN Global Counter-Terrorism Strategy resolved by the General Assembly in September, 2006. Because of using modern communication and information technology by terrorist, G8 countries decided to cooperate in order to combat that in the most effective way but in the same time “respecting scrupulously the fundamental freedom of expression.” They announced continuation of efforts aimed at ensuring protection of critical energy infrastructures and called on all states to implement all relevant documents preventing terrorists from acquiring nuclear weapons. They also expressed satisfaction of completing all twenty eight projects of the SAFTI and announced establishment of the International Working Group on Land Transport Security composed of G8 and non-G8 countries. The G8 called for fighting with cash smuggling used to finance terrorism and violent extremists through implementation of FATF’s 40 Recommendations on Money Laundering and nine Special Recommendations on Terror Finance. Additionally, G8 countries committed themselves to promote values and implement actions preventing terrorist radicalisation and recruitment, “We reaffirm that the promotion and protection of human rights for all and the rule of law is essential to all counterterrorism efforts”.434 In Heiligendamm was also published the “Report on G8 Support to the United Nations’ Counter-
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Terrorism Efforts”, in which was valued progress made from the last meeting at St Petersburg. As the Heiligendamm venue took place five years after establishing in Kananaskis the Global Partnership and in the middle of its lifespan, leaders made valuation of its activity. In the Global Partnership Review was written that “The GP is a unique and successful G8 joint effort and has already made important achievements in the first half of its life.” According to Kananaskis goals, was noted significant progress in constructing facilities for the destruction of chemical weapons stocks; dismantling decommissioned nuclear submarines and removing the material from them; improving the safety of fissile nuclear materials and chemical weapon stocks; and employing former weapons scientists and technicians. With satisfaction was noticed the fact that Russia had considerably increased its own funding for the Global Partnership since 2002 and the project would probably achieve $20 billion by 2012. The G8 called to all states for joining the Global Partnership and announced that “The major political lesson learned from the GP implementation is that the G8 together with other partners have proved and demonstrated their ability to work successfully together to address the topical issues of international security and safety.”


Ibidem
Chapter IV
ECONOMIC SECTOR

Leaders of the six countries met in Rambouillet 1975 were motivated above all by the economic crisis connected *inter alia* with an increase of oil price. The economic situation in Europe was very bad. Protectionism was a prevailing trend and the US needed partners for economic cooperation. In such spirit, heads of state and government gathered in France “held a searching and productive exchange of views on the world economy situation, on economic problems common to our countries, on their human, social and political implications, and on plans for resolving them...The purpose of our meeting was to review our progress, identify more clearly the problems that we must overcome in the future, and to set a course that we will follow in the period ahead.”437 According to the six leaders, the most serious dangers were high unemployment, inflation and energy problems. In that last issue was declared collaboration “in order to reduce our dependence on imported energy through conservation and the development of alternative sources.” Leaders raised trade liberalization, calling for acceleration of multilateral trade negotiations directing to “the maximum possible level of trade liberalization” and its ending in 1977 as well as for implementation of principles of the OECD “to avoid resorting to measures by which they could try to solve their problems at the expense of others, with damaging consequences in the economic, social and political fields.” In the subject of monetary matters, participants decided to start works on greater stability, noticing with satisfaction the rapprochement between the US and France about the reform of the international monetary system. In that field was underlined the huge role of the IMF. Representatives of the biggest economies debated also on cooperation with developing countries on reduction of their large deficits as “Sustained growth in our economies is necessary to growth in developing countries; and their growth contributes significantly to health in our own economies...We believe that industrialized and developing countries alike have a critical stake in the future success of the world economy and in the cooperative political relationships on which it must be based.” The six countries committed also to intensify collaboration “in the framework of existing institutions as well as in all the relevant international organizations.”438
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At the next meeting in Puerto Rico 1976, seven countries were already present as to the circle Canada had joined and close the number of participations for long years. At that venue, the economic situation was much better than a year before, what was noticed in the Declaration: “Renewed confidence in the future has replaced doubts about the economic and financial outlook. Economic recovery is well under way and in many of our countries there has been substantial progress in combating inflation and reducing unemployment.” Leaders wanted to achieve a sustained economic expansion together with reducing unemployment and avoiding inflation. As an important issue they mentioned the necessity of stable monetary system as well as stable and lasting payments structure. They strongly condemned protectionist outburst proposing establishment of an open trading system and “liberal climate for international investment flows.” Relatively much space was devoted to help for developing nations. It was underlined that industrialized democracies play crucial role in efforts to improve leaving conditions of developing countries. The G7 decided to reinforce cooperation among themselves as well as on international fora “to find practical solutions which contribute to an equitable and productive relationship among all peoples.”

In London 1977, leaders raised above mentioned economic areas underlying that “Our most urgent task is to create more jobs while continuing to reduce inflation.” All actions in domestic economies were supposed to direct to sustained noninflationary growth worldwide. Participants attached a lot of weight to the issue of balance-of-payments financing related to dependence on imported oil. They stressed the role of the IMF in solving problem concerning reduction of deficits and in maintaining the progress of the world economy. G7 leaders called for fast finishing of the Tokyo Round as “Policies of protectionism foster unemployment, increase inflation and undermine the welfare of our peoples.” That was the reason why they tried to reach agreement till the end of 1977 in the following areas: a tariff reduction plan; reduction of non tariff barriers; a mutually acceptable approach to agriculture with maintaining special benefits to developing countries. Constantly important subject in discussion was an issue of energy. Leaders decided to join efforts in order to limit energy
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demand to increase and diversify supplies, to develop more efficient energy use, to improve use of coal and to develop new energy sources. Moreover, they decided to attach greater weight to nuclear energy which was supposed to be present in developed as well as in developing countries. They also reiterated how important is help for developing countries as “Both developed and developing nations have a mutual interest in maintaining a climate conducive to stable growth worldwide.” They noted that ca. $8 billion would be available from the IDA (International Development Association) over the next three years (as the fifth replenishment) and $2 billion was given by the IMF the year before.\textsuperscript{443} Additionally, in the Appendix to Downing Street Summit Declaration were presented assumptions aimed at helping developing countries in faster improvement of their economies.

The same set of subjects was discussed also at the Bonn Summit 1978. However, in an issue of fighting unemployment and inflation leaders admitted that “A program of different actions by countries that face different conditions is needed to assure steady noninflationary growth.”\textsuperscript{444} Each of seven countries presented its foundations in these areas. Moreover, they agreed that there is a necessity of incentives for a flow of private investments and for fast trade liberalisation “for more sustained and balanced economic growth.” Issue of the North-South relations were described in a separate part of declaration, where was reiterated a necessity of help for developing countries and where leaders called for supporting replenishment of the multilateral development banks resources, the IDA and the World Bank. The Prime Minister of Japan declared duplication of Japan’s official development assistance in three years. Moreover, the G7 reiterated its support for greater stability in international exchange markets and for the IMF in promoting effective functioning of the international monetary system. A lot of space was devoted to a question of energy because “In spite of some improvement, the present energy situation remains unsatisfactory. Much more needs to be done.” The heads of state and government decided above all to reduce dependence from imported oil and presented arrangements of the European Community and the US in this area. They expressed hope that “the oil exporting countries will continue to contribute to a stable world energy situation.” At the same time they decided to develop nuclear energy and in order to achieve that the US and Canada declared to provide a nuclear fuel within the framework of effective safeguards. However, it was written that “Coal should play an increasingly
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important role in the long term.” Leaders also called the OECD and the World Bank for help in cooperation with developing countries in the field of energy.\textsuperscript{445} The Tokyo Summit in 1979 took place in shadow of the next oil crisis. High prices and oil shortage caused sharp reversion of inflation and for this reason the G7 announced in declaration that “The most urgent tasks are to reduce oil consumption and to hasten the development of other energy sources.”\textsuperscript{446} The European Community countries decided to limit oil consumption to 500 million tons in 1979 and to maintain oil imports between 1980 and 1985 at annual level not higher than in 1978. Similar limitations were also forecasted for the US, Canada and Japan and all industrialized countries were called for the same actions. Moreover, the G7 agreed that it should be establish a register of international oil transactions and maintain domestic oil prices at world market prices level. Leaders called for an increase of coal use as the energy source developing at the same time other alternative energy sources, nuclear power and new technologies in the energy area. They agreed that they would have to implement actions which would assure their economies the long-term efficiency and flexibility. They also announced further fight against protectionism through implementation of the Tokyo Round, strengthening of the GATT, and intensification of efforts aimed at stability in the foreign exchange market. Additionally, the G7 raised an issue of the North-South relations, calling OPEC countries for reconsideration of their decision on increasing oil prices, which very unfavourably rebounded on economic situation of developing countries.\textsuperscript{447} The same reflection was presented in the introduction of the Venice Summit’s Declaration 1980, where was written that “The fact is that the industrialized countries of the free world, the oil producing countries, and the nooil developing countries depend upon each other for the realization of their potential for economic development and prosperity. Each can overcome the obstacles to that development, but only if all work together, and with the interests of all in mind.”\textsuperscript{448} As a top priority leaders mentioned the reduction of inflation. They agreed that this would demand shift of resources “from government spending to the
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private sector and from consumption to investment." In an energy issue they decided that “maximum reliance should be placed on the price mechanism, and domestic prices for oil should take into account representative world prices.” The G7 with satisfaction accepted decisions of the EC, the IAEA and the OECD on starting works on structural changes leading to reduction of oil consumption. The Group decided to support every initiative which could replace oil or would be more efficient in oil using. It was reiterated necessity of increasing coal use, nuclear power, synthetic fuels, solar energy and other sources of renewable energy. Because of oil increase grew problem of payments imbalances, particularly for oil importing developing countries and for that reason it was necessary to cooperate with the IMF and the World Bank in order to assure stability in the monetary system. Concerning trade leaders called all countries for joining the GATT and strengthening the International Arrangement on Export Credits as well as supporting the UN actions to prohibit illicit payments to foreign government officials in international business transactions.

The Ottawa Summit 1981 set as a goal the revitalization of economies of industrial democracies. The economic situation was still difficult. High inflation and unemployment were the biggest problems. Because of that, leaders decided to reduce public borrowing in most countries and introduce the following changes “change in expectations about growth and earnings, change in management and labour relations and practices, change in the pattern of industry, change in the direction and scale of investment, and change in energy use and supply.” Moreover, they noticed that low and stable monetary growth is necessary for inflation reduction. They reiterated commitment in fight against protectionism, efforts to maximal opening of the G7 market and to reinforce GATT. In energy area leaders called for intensifying efforts to create nuclear facilities and to use sources of renewable energy such as solar, geothermal and biomass energy. They also reiterated declaration on cooperation with developing countries and assistance for them in a process of integration with international economic system.
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The final declaration of the Versailles Summit 1982, was exceptionally short, however a lot of its space took economic issues. As one of two goals, participants mentioned that “Growth and employment must be increased.”\textsuperscript{455} This was supposed to be achieved through the fight with inflation; decrease of interest rates through greater control of budgetary deficits; and introduction of more stable exchange rates. Additionally, leaders reiterated necessity of strengthening the open multilateral trading system through finishing the Tokyo Round and supporting GATT. In an energy issue they called for further works to economize energy and to develop new energy technologies in order to minimise vulnerability to energy crisis. At this meeting, President of France Francois Mitterrand presented the report “Technology, employment and growth”, in which he described potential of new technologies and their influence on the economic development \textit{inter alia} on unemployment decreasing. In his report, Mitterrand proposed three areas of action with concrete proposals for a concentrated development of the world economy. Leaders decided about establishing a working group of representatives of G7 governments and the EC which was supposed to analyse these proposals and present its own report before the next summit.\textsuperscript{456} In the “Statement On International Monetary Undertakings”, G7 countries committed to cooperate among themselves as well as with all interested countries and monetary institutions, particularly with the IMF which should take a crucial role inactions for greater stability, “We are determined to see that greater monetary stability and freer flows of trade and capital reinforce one another in the interest of economic growth and employment.”\textsuperscript{457}

At the Williamsburg Summit 1983, President Reagan reading a declaration said “Significant success has been achieved in reducing inflation and interest rates; there have been improvements in productivity; and we now clearly see signs of recovery.”\textsuperscript{458} In spite of that, leaders decided to continue works on reducing inflation and interest rates, increasing productive investment and employment. In the issue of trade, they were in favour of further negotiations in GATT for its greater liberalization, stressing necessity of trade expansion with
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and among developing countries, which were hardly touched by worldwide recession. The G7 underlined importance of help for the poorest countries, reiterated its engagement to provide agreed funding levels for the IDA, and supported actions of the Non-Aligned Movement, Group of 77 and the UN. There was also discussion on problem of debts of many developing nations; leaders set strategy based on “effective adjustment and development policies by debtor nations; adequate private and official financing; more open markets; and worldwide economic recovery.” They expressed satisfaction of report the Working Group on Technology, Growth and Employment and gave their support for 18 there presented projects. While were noticed a decrease of oil prices, leaders agreed that it was necessary to work further on development of alternative sources. To the declaration was attached an “Annex: Strengthening Economic Cooperation for Growth and Stability”, in which was raised a question of monetary stability. G7 countries declared collaboration with the IMF in two areas: convergence of economic conditions in the medium term; and monetary and financial domestic policies coordination because as was written in the declaration “While retaining our freedom to operate independently, we are willing to undertake coordinated intervention in exchange markets in instances where it is agreed that such intervention would be helpful.”

At the London meeting in 1984, heads of states and governments noticed that economic recovery is clearly seen in all G7 countries and “It is more soundly based than previous recoveries in that it results from the firm efforts made in the Summit countries and elsewhere over recent years to reduce inflation.” However, this fact could not be a prerequisite to stop hitherto actions. Leaders still had opinion that very important is to conduct prudent monetary and budgetary policies; to strive to decrease interest rates and inflation; to reduce budgetary deficits as well as to create new jobs, especially for young people and to adapt technological change. Fixed goal stayed a necessity of the liberalization of capital markets and widening international trading system inter alia through the OECD and GATT. Participants stressed that developing countries also should benefit from the economic recovery, reiterated willingness of cooperation with them on improving living conditions and proposed a strategy for dealing with debts of many developing nations. The main role in that plan played the IMF which together with the IBRD should help debtor countries to make necessary economic and financial policy changes. Additionally, the G7 reminded necessity of further work on stability

459 Ibidem
460 The London Economic Declaration, http://www.g7.utoronto.ca/summit/1984london/communique.html, 09.01.2010
of international monetary system and called on the finance ministers “to carry forward, in an urgent and thorough manner, their current work on ways to improve the operation of the international monetary system, including exchange rates, surveillance, the creation, control and distribution of international liquidity and the role of the IMF.” Moreover, G7 countries gave support for the program developed by the US to create manned space stations, and to which other countries were invited.\textsuperscript{461}

While at the 1985 Bonn Summit leaders admitted that had occurred further improvement of economic conditions in G7 countries and had improved situation in developing countries, still there were necessary actions aimed at prosperity maintaining and its further developing. They announced continuation of actions to decrease inflation, to reduce budget deficits, to create new jobs and greater adaptability to technological change. In order to achieve that, they noted concrete actions for each of seven countries participating in that meeting. Additionally, participants reminded that “Protectionism does not solve problems; it creates them.”\textsuperscript{462} For that reason they had decided that it was necessary to start the next round of negotiation in the framework of GATT, in which should take place as much as possible developed and developing countries. They expressed support for works \textit{inter alia} of finance ministers of the Group of Ten and the IMF on making the international monetary system more stable and more effective. G7 countries reiterated that there was connection between economic situation of developed and developing countries and proposed their further assistance in negotiations on debt restructuring agreements. They stressed that the main role in that process played the IMF and the World Bank Group and announced works “to ensure that these institutions are equipped with the necessary resources and instruments”\textsuperscript{463}. They accepted with satisfaction fact that to the United States Manned Space Station Program had joined the Member States of the European Space Agency together with Canada and Japan because, as they said “We are convinced that international cooperation in research and technology in major projects should be enhanced to make maximum use of our scientific potential.”\textsuperscript{464}
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In declaration of the Tokyo Summit 1986, was written that “The economies of the industrialized countries are now in their fourth year of expansion”⁴⁶⁵, inflation was decreasing, interest rates were reduced, oil prices decreased and “Overall, these developments offer brighter prospects for, and enhance confidence in, the future of the world economy.” However, still to achieve sustained growth, were necessary actions aimed at fighting high unemployment, domestic and external imbalances, protectionism pressure as well as actions which would help to solve problems in energy sector and solve debt problems of many developing countries. Leaders underlined “the need to implement effective structural adjustment policies. Such policies include technological innovation, adaptation of industrial structure and expansion of trade and foreign direct investment.” The Tokyo meeting brought transformation of the Group of Five Finance Ministers into the Group of Seven because to that five had joined finance ministers from Italy and Canada. Heads of state and government obliged them to meet at least once a year; to cooperate with the IMF in strengthening multilateral surveillance; to improve coordination to promote noninflationary economic growth; to strengthen market orientated incentives for employment and productive investment; to open the international trading and investment system; and to foster greater stability in exchange rates. Leaders stressed necessity of the further trade liberalization and announced that “The new round should, inter alia, address the issues of trade in services and trade related aspects of intellectual property rights and foreign direct investment.” They expressed support for OECD actions aimed at solving problems of surplus of some important agricultural products as it hit above all in the economies of certain developing countries. For developing countries were proposed five lines thanks to which they could integrate more fully into the international economic system by adopting structural adjustment policies; by mobilizing domestic savings; by encouraging the repatriation of capital; by improving the environment for foreign investment; and by promoting more open trading policies. Leaders announced support for diversification of their economies and for further processing of their products. They maintained the G7 opinion on financial flows, stressing importance of eight replenishment of the IDA and capital increase of the World Bank. Moreover, they expressed satisfaction of progress in the cooperative debt strategy and underlined bad situation of the African countries promising assistance for medium and long term development of this region.⁴⁶⁶
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At the Venice Summit 1987, as main handicaps to sustained global growth were mentioned external imbalances, which should be perceived through exchange rates changes and budgetary discipline; high employment; large public sector deficits; and high level of real interest rates. G7 countries called newly industrialized economies (NIE) for taking greater responsibility for functioning of the international economy inter alia through an open trade. Leaders stated that “Protectionist actions would be counterproductive, would increase the risk of further exchange rate instability and would exacerbate the problems of development and indebtedness.”

That was the reason why they called on the Contracting Parties of the Uruguay Round “to negotiate comprehensively, in good faith and with all due dispatch, with a view to ensuring mutual advantage and increased benefits to all participants.”

The heads of state and government with satisfaction accepted work results of the Group of Seven Finance Ministers in developing and implementing strengthened arrangements for multilateral surveillance and economic coordination as well as called for intensification of efforts to achieve greater currency stability and noninflationary global growth. In Venice was also continued a discussion on the agricultural problem recognized earlier in Tokyo. Leaders agreed that “the structure of agricultural production needed to be adjusted in the light of world demand, and expressed our determination to give full support to the work of the OECD [Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development] in this field...We underscore our commitment to work in concert to achieve the necessary adjustments of agricultural policies, both at home and through comprehensive negotiations in the Uruguay Round.”

In the Venice declaration was reiterated the importance of assistance for developing countries and was expressed support for actions of the IMF, the World Bank and the IDA in that area. There was also presented a strategy, for the major middle-income debtors to reinforce the growth prospects that contained three elements: “the adoption of comprehensive macroeconomic and structural reforms by debtor countries themselves; the enhancement of lending by international financial institutions, in particular the World Bank; and adequate commercial

---
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bank lending in support of debtor country reforms.”470 Additionally, the G7 admitted that problems of the poorest countries should be treated in a special way and called the Paris Club for actions which would simplify writing of the debts.471 In the 1988 Tokyo declaration, for the first time leaders in a direct way mentioned a globalization issue as a factor that strongly influenced the world economy. In spite of significant successes in fighting recession and stimulating the economy, still was present an opinion that “To sustain noninflationary growth will require a commitment to enhanced cooperation.”472 Tokyo and Venice Summits arrangements had introduced the coordination of G7 economic policies assessed on the basis of economic indicators what contributed to improvement of the international monetary system functioning. The Group decided to continue reduction of budgetary deficits, spending in countries with large external deficits and large external imbalances in order to achieve a profitable situation in the world economy. Moreover, leaders noticed that “Structural reforms complement macroeconomic policies, enhance their effectiveness, and provide the basis for more robust growth...We will continue to pursue structural reforms by removing barriers, unnecessary controls and regulations; increasing competition, while mitigating adverse effects on social groups or regions; removing disincentives to work, save, and invest, such as through tax reform; and by improving education and training.”473 G7 countries expressed satisfaction of the Free Trade Agreement between the US and Canada and called for further works on trade liberalization through the Uruguay Round. They also called for strengthening of GATT inter alia through greater engagement of the developing countries, particularly the NIE, “Certain newly industrializing economies (NIEs) in the Asia Pacific region have become increasingly important in world trade...With increased economic importance come greater international responsibilities.”474 Leaders raised also question of the poorest middle-income countries debts reiterating that “The market oriented, growth led strategy based on the case by case approach
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remains the only viable approach for overcoming their external debt problems.”

They stated that a central role in the debt strategy plays the official financing through the IMF and the World Bank, but also important are commercial bank and international direct investment, which support debtor countries reforms. In case of the poorest developing countries over US $18 billion was mobilised by the IMF’s Structural Adjustment Facility, the World Bank Official Development Assistance (ODA) and African Development Fund. Out of this total, US $15 billion was planned for the Sub-Saharan African countries. Additionally, Paris Club creditors rescheduled debt and repayment periods.

In Paris 1989, as the most important subjects for discussion were chosen “measures needed to maintain balanced and sustained growth, counter inflation, create jobs and promote social justice...The development and the further integration of developing countries into the world economy.” Leaders called for cooperation on adjusting external imbalances in a way that deficit countries could increase their exports and surplus countries their imports. They also called on the NIEs to “permit exchange rates to reflect their competitive position, implement GATT [General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade] commitments and reduce trade barriers.”

G7 countries expressed satisfaction of results of the agreement on surveillance and coordination of economic policies what had contributed to greater stability of exchange rates as well as to better functioning of the international monetary system. They also called for increase of saving and for taking actions aimed at eliminating inefficiencies in their economies, “In this context, tax reforms, modernization of financial markets, strengthening of competition policies and reducing rigidities in all sectors including energy, industry and agriculture are necessary. So are the improvement of education and vocational training, transportation and distribution systems and further policies aimed at giving more flexibility and mobility to the labour market and reducing unemployment.” There was also stressed the necessity of fighting against any form of protectionism and discrimination which could
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undermine multilateral trade system and the Uruguay Round negotiations. In declaration was noticed plan of finishing the Uruguay Round by the 1990. An important subject at Paris was an issue of help for the poorest and most debt countries. Leaders expressed satisfaction of the Paris Club decision thanks to which thirteen countries had benefited from significant reduction of debt service payments. Moreover, they presented a strengthened debt strategy for the heavily indebted countries. The G7 stressed necessity of continuing efficient development assistance but in the same time called on the developing countries “to implement sound economic policies. A vital factor will be the adoption of financial and fiscal policies which attract inward investment and encourage growth and the return of flight capital.”

13 July 1989, was published the press release from Presidents Abdou Diouf, Mohamed Hosni Mubarak, Carlos Andres Perez, And Prime Minister Rajiv Gandhi, where was written that “We believe that steps should be taken to organize as soon as possible an appropriate meeting, at the Summit level, to deliberate on global economic and environmental issues of mutual interest. This should mark the beginning of the process of continuing consultations on such issues between the leaders of the North and the South.”

The 1990 Houston meeting was special because of political changes in Central and East Europe (CEE), what G7 countries received with enthusiasm announcing “the renaissance of democracy throughout much of the world.” Although in comparison to in the recent decade significant economic progress had occurred, still there were a lot of matters to improve. Leaders agreed that because of progressing economic interdependence of countries it was important to reinforce cooperation and to conduct sound domestic budgetary and monetary policies what would help to achieve optimal functioning of the international monetary system, “Balanced expansion of demand with increasing productive capacity is key, while external imbalances and structural rigidities require correction. Price pressures warrant continued vigilance.” Leaders expressed satisfaction of the EC decision to launch the International Conference on Economic and Monetary Union as well as a perspective of unified Germany and the market-orientated restructuring of Central and Eastern Europe. They assured help for
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economic and political reform of CEE and expressed expectation that newly established the European Bank for Reconstruction and Development (EBRD) and the Centre for Cooperation with European Countries in Transition at the OECD and the G24 would give a significant support for CEE countries. Participants of the Houston Summit raised also a question of increase economic efficiency and stressed necessity of “regulatory reform and liberalize areas such as retail trade, telecommunications, transport, labour markets, and financial markets, as well as to reduce industrial and agricultural subsidies, improve tax systems, and improve labour-force skills through education and training.” They reiterated determination to finish the Uruguay Round by the end of 1990 and support for negotiations on “reform of agricultural policies; a substantial and balanced package of measures to improve market access; strengthened multilateral rules and disciplines; the incorporation of new issues of services, trade-related investment measures, and intellectual property protection within the GATT framework; and integration of developing countries into the international trading system.”

The most disputable issues were questions of subsidies and protection of agriculture. For that reason leaders paid particular attention to necessity of solving them by the time of July meeting of the Trade Negotiations Committee. They also called all countries for reduction of barriers for foreign direct investment and gave support for negotiations in the OECD aimed at strengthening multilateral disciplines on trade- and aid-distorted export credit subsidies. The G7 stated that “our commitment to the developing world will not be weakened by the support for reforming countries in Central and Eastern Europe. The poorest of the developing nations must remain the focus of special attention.” Additionally, heads of state and government reminded that implementation by debtor countries of economic reform programs with the IMF and the World Bank was “a prerequisite for debt and debt-service reduction within commercial bank financing packages.” They summed up achievements from the last year thank to which were contracted debt and debt-service reduction agreements between many debtor countries and the IMF, the World Bank and commercial banks. Leaders called also on the Paris Club to ease further debt burdens.483

Period till the next venue in London 1991 was distinguished by a slowdown in the economy and the Gulf crisis, however at the London Summit started to be seen signs of economic recovery. As main goals of the meeting were mentioned a sustained recovery, price stability, further reduction of budgetary deficits and impediments to private saving what should together lead to lower interest rates and increase of investment. Participants decided also to
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conduct together with the OECD the following actions to improve economic efficiency: greater competition in G7 economies; greater transparency, improved education and training; a more efficient public sector adaptation of advances in science and technology; and investments in infrastructure.\textsuperscript{484} They also called for fast finish of the Uruguay Round before the end of 1991 and to achieve that they called for progress in the negotiations of Geneva in four basic areas: market access, agriculture, services and intellectual property. Because of the Gulf crisis in 1990, came back a subject of assuring worldwide energy supplies through: elimination of barriers to energy trade and investment; international cooperation on research and development in energy sector; improvement of energy efficiency; use of nuclear power; and development of renewable energy sources.\textsuperscript{485} Moreover, leaders supported establishing of a European Energy charter which aim was “to promote free and undistorted energy trade, to enhance security of supply, to protect the environment and to assist economic reform in Central and East European countries and the Soviet Union.”\textsuperscript{486} They also reiterated support for reforms in CEE and expressed satisfaction that all CEE countries (without Albania) had joined the IMF and the World Bank. AT the same time they reminded an important role of the EBRD and the G24, which helped countries in that region. The G7 once more assured the developing countries of financial and technical assistance aimed at achieving growth and reducing debt burdens as well as announced new financial flows to developing countries.\textsuperscript{487} Leaders gathered at the Munich Summit 1992, admitted that the end of the Cold War was a unique chance to affiliate an international cooperation, “The close coordination of our policies as part of this cooperation is now more important than ever.”\textsuperscript{488} As the most serious threats were mentioned unemployment and actions tempering trade. The heads of state and government called for fast finalization of the Uruguay Round and expressed satisfaction of implementation of the EC’s Common Agricultural Policy. They also declared actions aimed at building confidence for investors, savers and consumers as well as creating jobs and
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growth.\textsuperscript{489} In order to achieve a sustained growth the G7 decided to continue sound monetary and financial policies; to decrease interest rates through reduction of public deficits and promotion of savings; to limit public spending; to integrate environmental and growth objectives. Additionally, leaders paid particular attention to encouragement of competition and creation of “a more hospitable environment for private initiative...improvements in infrastructure and greater attention to research and development.”\textsuperscript{490} Moreover, they called on the G7 Finance Ministers to intensify works on coordination of economic and financial policies for noninflationary growth. Heads of state and government reiterated their readiness to help developing countries, “We will continue our best efforts to increase the quantity and quality of official development assistance in accordance with our commitments. We shall direct official development assistance more towards the poorest countries that undertake credible efforts to help themselves.”\textsuperscript{491} They also announced finish of negotiations on a replenishment of IDA funds before the end of 1992 and further support from the IMF side. They confirmed continuation of efforts to further debt relief and expressed satisfaction of the Paris Club decision on in this subject. Leaders also summed up assistance gave CEE countries, which since 1989 amounted to $52 billion. In the end they called CEE for further opening of their markets, development of economic relations with each other and creation of reliable investment conditions for private capital.\textsuperscript{492} The main goal noticed in the economic declaration of the 1993 Tokyo Summit was assuring sustainable noninflationary growth and fighting unemployment, which had above all structural character. In the G7 Finance Ministers’ Report to the Tokyo Summit, which considered about what the heads of state and government asked last year, it was written that “Well targeted structural policies are needed to enhance opportunities for employment and growth.”\textsuperscript{493} Ministers recommended increase of investment in training and education; re-examining social insurance schemes; restructuring government spending from consumption to
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productive investment; maintaining and improving the multilateral free trade system; reducing
subsidies; considering economic effects of aging population; controlling overall outlays on
health care; continuing financial deregulation and cooperating on the environment. They also
advised work on “fiscal consolidation at all levels of governments over the medium
term...Regarding monetary policy, it should be conducted within a medium term framework
with the objective of price stability.” 494 The heads of state and government gathered in Tokyo
supported above mentioned Ministers’ proposals and announced that “We will consult closely
so that our national policies can be mutually reinforcing and compatible with our shared goal
of a strengthened and recovering world economy.” 495 It was reiterated that priority was still
finishing of the Uruguay Round and that any kind of regional integration should be
complementary to the multilateral trading system. 496 In an issue of the developing countries
leaders stated that “we will pursue a comprehensive approach, covering not only aid but also
trade, investment and debt strategy, and a differentiated approach, tailored to the needs and
performances of each country at its particular stage of development and taking environmental
aspects into account.” 497 They expressed satisfaction of renewal of the IMF’s Enhanced
Structural Adjustment Facility and of a planned International Conference on African
Development as well as of the International Conference on Population and Development. 498
A Naples venue was the 20th in turn and took place in the 50th anniversary of the Bretton
Woods meeting. Leaders stated with satisfaction that economic recovery was under way and
the growth strategy agreed in Tokyo had brought positive results. In spite of these
circumstances, high unemployment stayed still a main problem. On the basis of analysis of
the OECD they decided to work on “the growth and stability, so that business and individuals
can plan confidently for the future” 499 and to improve capacity of G7 economies to create
jobs. In order to achieve that were presented concrete structural measures such as increase of
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investment in people through education and training; elimination of excessive regulations; active labour market policies; promotion of new technologies; promotion of job creation in areas where new needs exist; and promotion of competition. To implement these arrangements the G7 called for help from the side of business and labour. An important event was signing of the Uruguay Round Agreement. Leaders gathered in Naples declared that “We are determined to ratify the Uruguay Round Agreements and to establish the WTO by January 1st, 1995 and call on other countries to do the same.”\textsuperscript{500} They also called for further works on trade liberalization in the framework of the OECD, the WTO, the IMF and World Bank as well as for “intensified efforts to improve our understanding of new issues including employment and labour standards and their implications for trade policies.”\textsuperscript{501} Moreover, participants of Naples meeting expressed satisfaction of economic progress in many developing countries as well as reiterated their engagement in promotion of trade and investment and development assistance for these countries through debt reduction and help from the side of the IMF, the Paris Club and the World Bank.\textsuperscript{502}

Already in Naples were described main subjects of the next summit in Halifax, 1995: sustaining development in 21\textsuperscript{st} century and adopting existing institutions and building new to ensure the future prosperity. In response to these foundations was elaborated The Halifax Summit Review of the International Financial Institutions, which “examines the need for changes to the architecture of the international financial institutions -- i.e., International Monetary Fund, the World Bank Group, and the regional development banks.”\textsuperscript{503} From the moment of establishing the Bretton Woods system, economic conditions had dramatically changed; globalization had bought greater interdependence of all countries; liberalization of trade and capital market had been introduced; new technologies had been implemented; transformation of the former USSR countries had been introduced; and the role of the developing countries in the world economy had increased. However, in spite of all these conveniences still could have been observed a lot of challenges such as “promoting economic policies that ensure sustained non-inflationary growth and correct imbalances that engender
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financial and exchange market instability; adapt to a world of large and highly mobile private capital; and promoting more effective sustainable development and poverty reduction. In the report, leaders were in favour of giving support for existing institutions, which should be reconstructed paying special attention to increasing their efficiency. They should also still play a main role in the areas where there were no actions of the private sector. Leaders also stated that for noninflationary growth was important a close cooperation on macroeconomic policies and appropriate structural policies. Moreover, to achieve greater exchange market stability it was important to conduct sound domestic monetary and financial policies and, what was connected with that, reduction of fiscal deficits as well as increase of national savings. Participants of the Halifax Summit raised also a question of preventing economic crisis in a globalized economy proposing actions aimed at improving ability of the international community to response to such challenges. They proposed improvement of an early-warning system through reinforcement of surveillance conducted above all by the IMF, “Properly constituted, surveillance serves three key functions: it provides the discipline needed to ensure that economic developments are systematically reviewed by the multilateral institutions and their implications clearly identified; it provides an opportunity for governments to deliver collective advice to one another with respect to economic policy measures, and it permits the private sector to make informed decisions and perform its role more efficiently...Given its global mandate and the expertise of its staff, the IMF should continue to be the focus of surveillance.” After a problem identification was needed an early and appropriate response and financing mechanism. In both cases an important role were playing international financial institutions, which could help countries needed immediate assistance. The next important matter was strengthening of international cooperation “the methods of coordination and cooperation among the major industrialized economies and the multilateral financial institutions must be modernized and brought into line with the growing speed and breadth of financial market integration.” G7 Finance Ministers and Central Bank Governors proposed in their report such kind of actions aimed at strengthening financial
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market supervision and regulation by the IMF, the World Bank and the WTO; as well as a one-time special allocation of SDR’s and a lot of actions dedicated for the multilateral development banks which were supposed to help *inter alia* in more effective allocation of their services. In report was also noticed that “A number of key governance mechanisms of the international system have become less effective in recent years. There is a clear need to redesign and refocus a number of these mechanisms if they are to have a more meaningful role.”

Ministers also called international financial institutions for a better prioritization of their activity and for cost effectiveness. The heads of state and government in the Halifax Summit Communiqué were all for that report and discussed equally widely the current situation and economic perspectives. Still creation of good quality jobs was appointed as a priority; reduction of unemployment; fight with internal and external imbalances; and fluctuations in financial and currency markets. Leaders expressed support for earlier agreed medium-term economic strategy as well as for “reforms in the areas of training and education, labour market regulation and adjustment, technological innovation and enhanced competition.”

They called for actions aimed at ensuring protection for aging populations and implementing “the series of pilot projects designed to help promote innovation and the spread of new technologies.” Moreover they noticed that “International institutions have been central to our pursuit of stability, prosperity, and equity for the past 50 years...We pledge our full energies to strengthening the institutions in partnership with their entire membership to enhance the security and prosperity of the world.”

The economic crisis just before the Halifax Summit drew the G7 attention to an important role of crisis prevention. For that reason leaders urged the IMF to “establish benchmarks for the timely publication of key economic and financial data; establish a procedure for the regular public identification of countries which comply within these benchmarks; insist on full and timely reporting by member countries of standard sets of data, provide sharper policy advice to all governments, and deliver franker messages to countries that appear to be avoiding necessary actions.”

Participants of the Halifax meeting called on the IMF to establish an Emergency Financing
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Mechanism that would assure faster access to financial assistance. They called G-10 Ministers and Governors for proposing other procedures which would be helpful in crisis situations. For the first time a problem of international financial fraud was raised in a declaration. In order to reinforce coherence, effectiveness and efficiency of multilateral financial institutions leaders proposed introduction of improvements *inter alia* for the World Bank and the IMF as well as reforms of the United Nations to “complete the Agenda for Development, which should set out a fresh approach to international cooperation and define the particular contribution expected of U.N. bodies; develop a more effective internal policy coordination role for the Economic and Social Council (ECOSOC); encourage deeper cooperation between UN and specialized agencies both at headquarters and in the field; consolidate and streamline organizations in the economic and social fields, such as humanitarian relief and development assistance; and encourage the adoption of modern management techniques, with a more transparent and accountable Secretariat; update and focus mandates to avoid duplication; eliminate overlaps with new organizations; e.g. UNCTAD with WTO, and consider the roles of certain institutions in light of evolving challenges; e.g. Regional Economic Commissions and UNIDO.” Subject of the UN reform was supposed to be analysed in a wide circle during the 50th anniversary celebration in October 1995. The next important issue raised in Halifax was a further reduction of remaining barriers for global open market. Because of that leaders declared full support for the WTO works; full implementation of the Uruguay Round Agreements; and works on trade, employment and labour standards. Additionally, they reiterated support for a reform in the economies in transition aimed at their full integration into the global economy.\(^5\)

The next summit in Lyon 1996, focused on “benefits and challenges posed by increasing economic globalization.”\(^6\) There were mentioned advantages of that process, however leaders also paid attention to its challenges and stated that “In an increasingly interdependent world we must all recognize that we have an interest in spreading the benefits of economic growth as widely as possible and in diminishing the risk either of excluding individuals or groups in our own economies or of excluding certain countries or regions from the benefits of globalization.” A response to globalization challenges should be an increased international cooperation. As a main goals were set a sustained noninflationary growth; jobs’ creation;
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reduction of unemployment; anti-inflationary policies; low interest rates; structural reform; reduction of external imbalances; and international monetary stability. Summit’s participants positively evaluated results of their Finance Ministers’ actions and called for continuation of close cooperation on economic policy and exchange markets. They also expressed satisfaction of progress in preserving the stability of the international monetary and financial system, particularly strengthening of capital standards. For the next year was planned: a concentration on enhancing cooperation among the bodies responsible for the supervision of international financial institutions; improvement of transparency and stronger risk management; promotion of effective supervisory structures in the emerging economies; and making possible the creation of sophisticated methods for retail electronic payments. Heads of state and government expressed satisfaction of the progress in implementing proposals of the Halifax Summit addressing increase in effectiveness of international financial institutions. They decided to support the IMF through doubling the resources available to that organisation. They reiterated commitment in fight with international financial fraud and with effects of aging populations as well as for the first time they raised an issue of harmful tax competition between states. In order to prevent this phenomenon the G7 asked the OECD to elaborate a multilateral approach and to present report by 1998. The OECD was also made responsible for presenting agreement on the investment that would ensure high standards of investment protection and liberalization. G7 countries stressed the central role of the WTO in multilateral trading system and necessity of full implementation of the Uruguay Round Agreement. Moreover, they declared the standardization and simplification of customs procedures among G7 countries as well as the intensification of efforts aimed at combating corruption in international business transactions. In order to create new jobs, the heads of state and government decided to support proposed by the Ministerial Conference on Employment in Lille, April 1996, actions: investment in people such as sound basic education, skill formation and training; reinforcement of people’s employability; reforms specified to situation in each country e.g. tax and social reforms; modernization of regulatory frameworks; and facilitation of dissemination of new technologies. They also expressed satisfaction of progress in reforming multilateral institutions “in order to improve coordination, reduce overlap, and increase their effectiveness”, thank to which the World bank and the IMF were cooperating more closely and the multilateral development banks had intensified their cooperation. Leaders presented plans of reform of the UN and called for deeper cooperation among UN agencies, the international financial institutions and the WTO. A separate chapter in the
declaration was devoted to assistance for the poorest countries. It was announced that thanks to starting the IDA-XI and interim Trust Fund US $22 billion would be allotted over next three years. Leaders also expressed satisfaction of the replenishment of the African Development Fund and called for similar action for the Asian Development Fund. They stressed an important role of the Enhanced Structural Adjustment Facility as a main instrument of the IMF for the poorest countries. Moreover, they called for elaborating additional actions for highly indebted countries which would lead to their debt relief and called the Paris Club for “debt conversion schemes up to 20% instead of currently 10% of the stock of debts, and increased debt alleviation.”  

For the Lyon Summit, G7 Finance Minister had prepared the report in which they presented decisions on more effective macro-economic surveillance in the G7 meetings; continuation of the G7 close cooperation in exchange markets; better prudential safeguards in the international financial markets proposed by the Basle and IOSCO Committees; strengthening of G7 collaborative ability to respond to financial crisis with particular attention to the IMF’s role.  

The Denver Summit 1997 was critical on account that for the first time had been officially written in the declaration that it was the “Summit of Eight” as to seven major industrialized democracies Russia had joined. In the final communiqué once more leaders paid attention to results of globalization, rapid technological change and demographic shifts on the global economy. They discussed also on “‘active aging” -- the desire and ability of many older people to continue work or other socially productive activities well into their later years” on the possibility to use that to do structural reforms in the areas of health and social welfare as well as they agreed “within the OECD and with other international organizations, to promote active aging through information exchanges and cross-national research.”  

Summit’s participants debated also on ways of promoting small and medium-sized companies increase deciding to continue works in that subject. In spite of above mentioned declaration, the summit published also the Denver Summit Statement by Seven titled “Confronting Global Economic and Financial Challenges”, where were presented economic goals of cooperation of the G7 and the representatives of the EU. Still as a priorities leaders
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named promotion of noninflationary growth and job creation. To these two objects they added ensuring sound public finances and necessity of introducing appropriate structural reforms addressing changes of aging societies. Moreover, they described top tasks for each of the G7 countries and called on finance ministers to continue works on greater monetary stability, which progress was seen in Lyon arrangements. Heads of state and government expressed their satisfaction of actions of the Working Party on Financial Stability in Emerging Markets Economies and of the Basle Committee on Banking Supervision, which contributed to the reinforcement of stability of the international financial system. They reiterated support for reform of the international financial institutions: “It is incumbent on us to help ensure that the IFIs have the multilateral support and financial resources needed to succeed with their ambitious and important reforms.”518 They noticed with satisfaction the fact of substantial progress of the Lyon debt imitative for heavily indebted poor countries (HIPC Initiative), which could be owed to actions of the IMF, the World Bank and the Paris Club. Leaders called on other countries to “reinforce efforts to reduce or, where possible, extinguish such debt for the poorest reforming countries.” A lot of space in their debate the G7 devoted to ways of fighting corruption and money laundering. In this last subject, leaders underlined the role of FATF, whose Forty Recommendations were especially important in fight against money laundering. They expressed satisfaction of a trade agreement in information technology and telecommunications services as well as they called for further trade liberalization. A special attention was paid to necessity of the WTO’s membership expansion, to an integration of the last developed countries into the trading system and to development of electric commerce. In this last mentioned subject as well as in an issue of harmful tax competition leaders called for the OECD support.519

In 1998, summit took place in Birmingham, England. In the final communiqué was written that one of the goals was “achieving sustainable economic growth and development throughout the world in a way which, while safeguarding the environment and promoting good governance, will enable developing countries to grow faster and reduce poverty, restore growth to emerging Asian economies, and sustain the liberalisation of trade in goods and services and of investment in a stable international economy.”520 Leaders expressed their
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satisfaction of an establishment of the EMU (European Economic and Monetary Union) and hope for an improvement of the prospects for growth and employment. Because of 50th anniversary of the founding of the GATT, G8 countries called for further trade liberalization; expanding the WTO’s membership; greater integration of emerging and developing countries; and greater transparency in the WTO. They also presented actions aimed at helping the developing countries, in which next to negotiations on fast replenishment of the IDA-XII, ESAF and the African Development found, they committed to support these countries in the developing of basic social infrastructure, building democracy and greater transparency as well as developing measures to improve trade and investment. Moreover, they announced ratification of the OECD Anti-Bribery Convention by the end of 1998 and further works on expanding debt relief to more countries within the HIPC Initiative. Heads of state and government supported seven principles agreed by G8 finance, economic, labour and employments ministers at their London Conference in February. On the basis of these seven rules, each state produced an Action Plan aimed at improving employability and job creation. Important arguments in economic issues were “Conclusions of G7 Finance Ministers”, who had met in London, before the Birmingham Summit. Asian crisis clearly had showed that it was necessary to reinforce the global financial system which had turned out to be substantially susceptible to fluctuations. In an single report “Strengthening Architecture of Global Financial System”, the ministers presented actions in five main areas such as enhanced transparency; helping countries prepare for integration into the global economy and for free global capital flows; strengthening national financial systems; ensuring that the private sector takes responsibility for its lending decisions; and enhancing further role of the international financial institutions and cooperation between them. In the next report G7 finance ministers presented Ten Key Principles for information exchange to improve financial stability through greater international cooperation. In “Conclusions” ministers called for effective cooperation between financial regulators and law enforcement authorities at the international level to fight against financial crime. They also decided to prolong mandate of the FATF for
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the next five years assuming that its task “during this period should be the establishment of a world-wide anti-money laundering network encompassing all continents and regions of the globe.”

Moreover, they expressed satisfaction of the OECD agreement on action against harmful tax competition, of the OECD Forum on harmful tax practices as well as of complementary development of the EU Code of Conduct on business taxation. Additionally, the ministers announced separate “G7 Initiative on Harmful Tax competition” aimed at reinforcing the OECD Report. Finance ministers in their “Conclusions” called on experts to intensify works on standardization and simplification of customs procedures “including the development of standardised electronic declarations and to encompass the related import and export data requirements of other government departments and agencies.”

Meeting in Cologne 1999, “on the threshold of the new millennium” used a claim “growing opportunities as well as forward-looking solutions to the challenges facing our nations and the international community.” While general economic situation had improved, still were seen effects of the 1997 Asian crisis. Participants of the meeting stated that “Without an open, rules-based world trading system and the beneficial flows of goods and services it encourages, the countries affected would be having much greater difficulty recovering from these crises and stabilizing their economies.” Once more they called for strengthening of the WTO through expanding its membership and improving its transparency. They also called on “all nations to launch at the WTO Ministerial Conference in Seattle in December 1999 a new round of broad-based and ambitious negotiations with the aim of achieving substantial and manageable results”, what should help inter alia in further integration of the developing countries into the world economy. Moreover, leaders announced works on biotechnology matters at the national and international level. As the high unemployment still was a serious problem they announced “two-tiered approach: promoting structural re-forms to enhance the adaptability and competitiveness of our economies and to help the long-term unemployed to return to the labour market; pursuing macroeconomic policies for stability and growth and ensure that monetary and fiscal policies are well balanced.”

The heads of state and
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government gave support to the G8 labour ministers’ recommendations to provide social safety nets that support employment. Special attention was paid to an issue of investing in people through agreement on implementation of goals mentioned in the Köln Charter\(^{528}\) and through call on the OECD and the UNESCO to analyse how different countries were trying to raise education standards. Representatives of states gathered in Cologne decided to introduce consecutive facilitations in debt payment for the heavily indebted poor countries. In spite of significant progress since the HIPC Initiative implementation in 1996, the liabilities of these countries were still significantly large. For that reason, in the Report of G7 Finance Ministers on the Köln Debt Initiative to the Köln Economic Summit, the ministers wrote that this initiative was elaborated to provide deeper and broader debt relief for the poorest countries, “If implemented, the debt stock of countries possibly qualifying under the HIPC Initiative would be reduced, from some $ 71 billion in Net Present Value (NPV) remaining after traditional debt relief, by an additional $ 27 billion. These measures, together with forgiveness of debts arising from Official Development Assistance (ODA), of which some $ 20 billion in nominal terms are owed to G 7 countries, would lower countries’ debt service burden significantly and free resources for priority social spending...The new HIPC initiative should be built on an enhanced framework for poverty reduction, developed by the International Financial Institutions (IFIs). This is critical to ensure that more resources are invested in health, education and other social needs, which are essential for development.”\(^{529}\) Similar to the last year, leaders of seven countries published an economic statement, in which they described concrete actions for each of their countries aimed at achieving stable and sustainable economic growth. They declared to continue close cooperation to avoid effects of such financial crisis as the one in Asia in future, to achieve support on the report of finance ministers on strengthening the international financial architecture. They paid special attention to six actions e.g. reinforcing and reforming the international financial institutions and arrangements \textit{inter alia} through establishing a new Financial Stability Forum and transforming the Interim Committee of the IMF into the International Financial and Monetary Committee; enhancing transparency and promoting best practices; strengthening financial regulation in industrialized countries and macroeconomic policies and financial systems in

\(^{528}\) This subject is wider described in the chapter on human security.  
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emerging markets. Additionally, they wanted to improve crisis prevention and management, and involving the private sector. The last mentioned issue was promotion of social policies to protect the poor and most vulnerable. Seven leaders reiterated their commitment in combating financial crime through the support of an implementation of the Key Principles elaborated by the finance minister and through the support of the FATF’s actions. They called on the FATF to “take concrete steps to bring offshore financial centres and under regulated and non-cooperating jurisdictions into compliance with the 40 recommendations against money laundering and to protect the international financial community from the adverse impact of those that do not comply.” In the end, they expressed satisfaction of progress made by the OECD’s Fiscal Committee and the FATF “to explore further the links between tax evasion and avoidance and money laundering, and in particular to ensure the effective flow of information to tax authorities without undermining the effectiveness of anti-money laundering systems.”

The Okinawa Summit was the first G8 meeting in the 21st century. In order to ensure greater economic prosperity the heads of state and government noticed in the communiqué: “Together with many of our partners around the world, we have devoted ourselves to alleviating the adverse effects of the crisis, stimulating economic recovery, and identifying ways to help prevent future upheavals, including measures to strengthen the international financial architecture.” They emphasized the need of reforms in financial and corporate sectors as well as of an improvement of public and private sector governance and transparency. One of the subjects discussed in Okinawa was fast development of the IT that forced to structural changes in economies. Summit’s participants announced establishment of the Digital Opportunities Task Force, which was supposed to propose actions to maximise benefits of the IT and as wide as possible access to the IT. They also agreed the Okinawa Charter on the Global Society aimed at bridging “the international information and knowledge divide”. One of the goals of the international development set by G8 leaders assumed the reduction of the share of the world’s population living in extreme poverty to half its 1990 level by 2015: “Small and medium sized enterprises, together with the opportunities presented
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by IT can be powerful tools for development.” Leaders announced cooperation with the UN and other fora to reduce poverty. They also expressed satisfaction of collaboration results between the ILO and the international financial institutions in the area of an adequate social protection and core labour standards. Moreover, they stressed an importance of cooperation between the ILO and the WTO on the social dimensions of globalisation and trade liberalization. The G8 expressed concern at the low flow of foreign direct investment to the developing countries and called on international organisation to support “developing countries’ efforts to create a favourable trade and investment climate.” States gathered in Okinawa confirmed that there were necessary actions which would push forward the HIPC Initiative; provide improved access to G8 markets; strengthen effectiveness of the ODA; ensure additional resources for basic education; address the widening digital divide; and implement measures to prevent conflict. They noted with satisfaction progress in the implementing the Enhanced HIPC Initiative, form which were benefiting already nine states and their total debt relief was US $15 billion in nominal terms. Leaders declared that “We will work expeditiously together with HIPC and the IFIs to realise the expectation that 20 countries will reach the Decision Point within the framework of the Enhanced HIPC Initiative by the end of this year. In this regard, we welcome the establishment of the Joint Implementation Committee by the World Bank and the IMF.” Once more was reiterated a huge role of free trade for economic growth and social progress as well as support for trade-related capacity building of the developing countries. Leaders announced intensification of efforts in order to launch a new round of WTO trade negotiations still in 2000. They also gave support for China in their accessing talks with the WTO. At the Okinawa Summit was published once more a G7 Statement on Economy, in which for the first time from a long time was raised a question of greater stability of oil markets. The heads of state and government accepted actions proposed by finance ministers addressing reinforcing the international financial architecture. They anticipated inter alia the reform of the IMF through: strengthening IMF surveillance to prevent crisis; implementation of international codes and standards; reforming IMF’s facilities; safeguarding IMF resources and post-program monitoring; strengthening governance and accountability; and promoting private sector involvement in crisis prevention and resolution. The G7 leaders stated: “The MDBs should increase their resources devoted to core social investments such as basic health and education,
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clean water and sanitation...All the MDBs should allocate their support increasingly on the basis of borrower performance.” Moreover, they expressed expectation that MDBs would play a main role in developing measures against infectious and parasitic diseases including HIV and AIDS as well as gave support for recommendations of the Financial Stability Forum concerning regulation of highly-leveraged institutions, capital flows and offshore financial centres (OFCs). Additionally, it was noticed that “Co-operative financing arrangements at the regional level designed to supplement resources provided by the international financial institutions (IFIs) in support of IMF programmes can be effective in crisis prevention and resolution.” Seven heads of state and government strongly supported propositions of G7 finance ministers presented in the report on “Actions against Abuse of the Global Financial System”. They accepted with satisfaction a publication of the FATF, review on money laundering, in which were indentified fifteen non-cooperative countries and territories (NCCTs). At the same time was declared support or technical help for jurisdictions that commit themselves to take necessary reform. G7 leaders acknowledged also the OECD Report on Progress on Identifying and Eliminating Harmful Tax Practices that contained two lists: certain jurisdictions meeting tax haven criteria, and potentially harmful regimes within the OECD member countries. They called on the OECD to continue works and to talks with non-member countries. Finance ministers called OFCs for adapting to recommendations of the FATF, the OECD and of the Report of the OFCs Working Group of the Financial Stability Forum as well as for improving their systems in eight areas: international cooperation; exchange of information; customer identification; abolition of excessive secrecy; effective vetting of financial institutions; enhanced resources for financial supervision and anti-money laundering compliance; improved legislation; and elimination of harmful tax practices. They also called on the international financial institutions to help countries adopting international standards against money laundering and corruption.

Leitmotif of the 2001 Genoa meeting was the necessity of elaborating a strategy of the poverty reduction. As the best way to fight poverty, leaders mentioned maintaining strong, dynamic, open and growing global economy. They reaffirmed a promise of development assistance and help developing countries in implementing open domestic systems of governance. G8 countries also announced full implementation of the OECD Bribery Convention and support for the UN to elaborate an effective instrument against corruption.
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They expressed satisfaction that already 23 countries benefited from the debt relief of over $53 billion through the Enhanced HIPC Initiative, at the same time they announced that it was one of the elements of fast growth stimulation in the poorest countries.538 There were proposed three mutually reinforcing actions: greater participation by the developing countries in the global trading system; increased private investment; and initiatives to promote health, education and food security. Moreover, support for the least developed countries (LDCs) to integrate them to the global market inter alia through duty-free and quota-free access for all products originating from these countries was announced. Leaders called on the international financial institutions, above all on the World Bank and MDBs, to help the developing countries to increase the private sector investment. They also declared that “We commit ourselves to implement the landmark OECD-DAC Recommendation on Untying Aid to LDCs which should increase aid effectiveness and achieve more balanced effort-sharing among donors.”539 Economic problems and plans of G7 countries were presented in a separate G7 statement, where were described fundamental goals for the economies of the US, Canada, Japan, the Euro area and for emerging market economies. They expressed concern at results of high and volatile oil prices, especially for the developing countries. As the basic foundations for further cooperation were mentioned: launch of a new trade round; stability and integrity of the international financial system; and implementation of the HIPC Initiative. G7 leaders announced their personal engagement in the launch of new round of global trade negotiations at the Fourth WTO Ministerial Conference in Doha 2001, “the interests of all, the new Round should be based on a balanced agenda, while clarifying, strengthening and extending multilateral rules. An improved dispute settlement mechanism is central to this effort.”540 They also expressed satisfaction of the progress of negotiations between the WTO and China and Russia on their accession to this organisation. G7 leaders positively valued the report of their finance ministers on strengthening the international financial system and special attention paid to the recommendations “for reforming the MDBs and sharpening their focus on core social and human investments.”541 Ministers in the report raised also an issue of private sector commitment in crisis prevention and resolution as well as subjects of
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surveillance and implementation of standards and codes, and the opening of access to capital markets.\textsuperscript{542}

The Kananaskis Summit focused mainly on the fight against terrorism and against poverty. One of the results of the debate was G7 statement “Delivering on the Promise of the Enhanced HIPC Initiative”, in which was written that “Debt relief alone, no matter how generous, cannot guarantee fiscal solvency, long-term economic growth, and social development. Good governance, prudent new borrowing, and sound debt management by heavily indebted poor countries (HIPCs), as well as responsible financing by creditors, are also essential elements of the policy framework needed to achieve these goals.”\textsuperscript{543} In order to assure the participation of all creditors, G7 leaders called on the IMF and the World Bank to more rigorous surveillance of works on the HIPC Initiative implementation. They also called for actions aimed at completing the financing of this initiative and preparing review of debt sustainability at the completion point. G7 finance ministers, who had met in Halifax, just before leaders’ summit, as the basic economic goal set further strengthening of the financial sector to assure domestic economies resilience to external shocks. They paid attention to importance of transparency; well-functioning labour, capital and product markets; and trade liberalization. Ministers announced further works on improvement of the predictability in emerging markets in cooperation with the IMF. They also called on the MDBs to improve their collaboration and efficiency of their assistance for the developing countries. Moreover, G7 ministers stated that “We support an increase in the use of grants, in the range of 18 per cent to 21 per cent of the IDA13 program.”\textsuperscript{544} In response to the 9/11 terrorist attacks, G7 finance ministers published an Action Plan to Combat the Financing of Terrorism aimed at freezing flow of funds to terrorists, protecting the international financial system form abuse and reinforcing transparency.\textsuperscript{545} Assessing progress on that plan ministers noticed that “Over 160 countries and jurisdictions have taken action to freeze terrorist assets. The
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implementation of UN instruments has intensified and countries are working diligently to comply with the FATF’s Special Recommendations.”

In the summary of Evian 2003, G8 leaders paid attention above all to actions aimed at raising growth, such as structural reforms and flexibility. They announced structural reforms of labour, product and capital markets; pension and health reforms; raise of productivity; reinforcement of investor confidence; improvement of transparency; and fight against corruption. They also expressed satisfaction of progress in financial crisis prevention and resolution as well as called the IMF for further efforts to enhance its surveillance and to restructure sovereign debt. G8 leaders publish also a separate declaration “Fostering Growth and Promoting a Responsible Market Economy” that described “common principles that are the foundations for sound macro-economic growth.” These rules were addressing three areas. The first one concerned the corporate governance- here were proposed actions to improve market integrity; to strengthen market discipline and effective regulation; and to ensure accountability and enhanced corporate governance. The second area talked about the enhancement of corporate, social and environmental responsibility, and the third one concerned corruption and transparency. The G8 created an “Cooperative G8 Action on Trade”, because as they stated “The multilateral system embodied in the World Trade Organisation (WTO), and the current Doha Development Agenda, is thus central to the G8’s approach to energising the global economy, increasing employment, spurring sustainable development, improving international governance, and eradicating poverty.” In order to ensure the delivery on schedule, by the end of 2004, the goals mentioned in the Doha Development Agenda, G8 leaders ordered their finance ministers and officials, together with WTO partners, the following actions - working on further significant opening of trade in all areas; strengthening the existing WTO rules and developing new ones; finding solutions in the WTO for the developing countries with insufficient or no manufacturing capacities in the pharmaceutical sector; seeking agreement on the negotiating modalities for each of the four Singapore issues; delivering capacity building technical assistance to the developing
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countries; better integrating trade, financial and development policies; and improving preferential trade agreements and/or programs with the developing countries. The next declaration was addressing “Fighting Corruption and Improving Transparency”. There was noticed inter alia that “Increased transparency of government revenue and expenditure flows, as well as strengthened enforcement efforts against bribery and corruption, will contribute to achieving these goals [fight against corruption and mismanagement of public resources – author] and to increasing integrity in government decision-making - thereby ensuring that resources, including development assistance, achieve their intended purposes.”

There were described actions in six areas: improvement of public financial management and accountability; enforcement of anti-bribery laws; contribution to the completion of a UN Convention against Corruption; fighting financial abuses; promotion of Transparency in Government Procurement and the Awarding of Concession; and promotion of transparency of revenues from the extractive industries.

In the annex to the G8 statement of finance ministers, who had met in Deauville before leaders’ meeting, was presented a new Paris Club approach to debt restructuring for countries other than HIPC, which were experiencing a serious debt problem. In order to make easier for these countries to return to debt sustainability ministers proposed the Paris Club to focus on such options as debt reduction in exceptional cases; an active policy of adjusting the “cut-off-date”; and use of flexible instruments such as debt buybacks and swaps.

Finance ministers in a working paper on aid effectiveness stated that “Our challenge is to work together with developing countries to implement the most valuable lessons we have learned from our many years of experience in supporting development: sound economic policies, good governance and access to world markets form the basis of long-term prosperity.” To achieve these plans ministers proposed actions in four areas: enhancing the role of poverty reduction strategies; harmonizing efforts between donors and recipient countries; focusing development assistance on measurable results; and promoting and rewarding good governance.
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At the Sea Island Summit 2004, military and political subjects dominated, as well as issues addressing fighting hunger and diseases in the poorest countries. Economic matters were described in a separate statement *inter alia* on trade. It was underlined that liberalization was a crucial factor to the economic prosperity, “The G8 is committed to expanding economic growth, development, and opportunity by achieving ambitious results in the global trade negotiations, the Doha Development Agenda (DDA) of the WTO.”\(^{556}\) As the most important issues of negotiations were mentioned - “substantially reducing trade-distorting agricultural subsidies and barriers to access to markets; opening markets more widely to trade in goods; expanding opportunities for trade in services; overhauling and improving customs rules and other relevant procedures to facilitate trade; and advancing the development of all countries, especially the poorest, within the WTO system.”\(^{557}\) Leaders stressed an important role of the integration of the developing countries into the world economy through the development of their trading capacity and poverty reduction strategies. They called on G8 ministers and WTO members to finalize the frameworks before the end of July 2004 to put the negotiations back on track. There was also published a statement on “Fighting Corruption and Improving Transparency”, in which G8 countries announced building the voluntary partnership with these developing countries that want to increase transparency and accountability in the management of public resources. They also expressed support for fast implementation of the UN Convention against Corruption and called on experts to work on denying safe haven to officials guilty of corruption. Moreover, they expressed satisfaction of progress in strengthening public financial management and accountability as well as of reinforcing the OECD monitoring of the Anti-Bribery Convention. Leaders reaffirmed their commitment in continuation of works on strengthening transparency and supervision standards in off-shore financing centres and on fighting financial crimes, money laundering and the financing terrorism. Heads of state and government called on their finance ministers to work on expanding the sunset date of the HIPC Initiative until December 31 2006; provisioning the necessary financing for completion of this initiative; and considering further measures for the debt sustainability of the poorest countries. Additionally, they discussed on necessity of “balanced energy policies, which increase energy supplies and encourage more efficient
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energy use and conservation, including through new technologies.\textsuperscript{558} In the Chair’s Summary was also a reference to the fight against counterfeiting and piracy of intellectual property.

In the published at the 2005 Gleneagles Summit statement on “Global Economy and Oil”, was noticed with satisfaction the global economic growth in 2004. At the same time, leaders admitted that still were such challenges as persistent global imbalances as well as high and volatile oil prices. To decrease global imbalances were declared the following actions: continued fiscal consolidation to increase national savings in the US; actions to raise productivity in Canada; further structural reforms in Russia and the EU; the boosting of growth, employment and domestic demand; and further structural reforms, including fiscal consolidation in Japan. There was also underlined an importance of reforms aimed at increasing flexibility, raising productivity and enhancing job creation. The G8 noticed that oil demand have been projected to grow so there would be needed significant investments “in the short-, medium-, and long-terms, in exploration, production, and energy infrastructure to meet the needs of a growing global economy.”\textsuperscript{559} They called on the oil-producing countries to open markets and increase opportunity for foreign investment as well as to increase transparency in the markets through e.g. universally agreed reporting system for oil supply and demand. Moreover, they expressed support for the “Joint Oil Date Initiative” (JODI) launched by several international organisations, including the IAEA and now managed by the Secretariat of the International Energy Forum.\textsuperscript{560} In the Chair’s Summary, G8 leaders declared the doubling of efforts to achieve a conclusion of the Doha Development Agenda in 2006 as well as “to address products of interest to Least Developed Countries in the negotiations, and to ensure Least Developed Countries have the flexibility to decide their own economic strategies.”\textsuperscript{561} In Gleneagles was also published statement on “Reducing IPR Piracy and Counterfeiting through More Effective Enforcement”. Leaders decided \textit{inter alia} to promote and uphold laws, regulations and/or procedures to strengthen effective intellectual property enforcement; to enhance detection and deterrence of the distribution and sale of counterfeit goods through the internet and combat online theft; to improve coordination of anti-counterfeiting and anti-piracy crime strategies; as well as to work with the developing
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countries to reinforce legislation, and build and help to improve national anti-counterfeiting and anti-piracy and enforcement capacities.  

One of the leitmotifs of the St. Petersburg venue was global energy security - “ensuring sufficient, reliable and environmentally responsible supplies of energy at prices reflecting market fundamentals is a challenge for our countries and for mankind as a whole.” The heads of state and government defined the most important problems connected with the issue of energy security to which they counted inter alia high and volatile oil prices; growing demand of energy; investments along the entire energy chain; and the need to protect environment. They also stressed that “development of transparent, efficient and competitive global energy markets is the best way to achieve our objectives on this score” as well as noticed that the energy security question should be considered in combination with the economic growth and environmental protection. G8 leaders in the statement on global energy security presented in eleven points’ objective principles and approaches to which they elaborated a strategy described in the “St. Petersburg Plan of Action on Global Energy Security”. They stated there that “We will enhance global energy security through actions in the following key areas: increasing transparency, predictability and stability of global energy markets; improving the investment climate in the energy sector; enhancing energy efficiency and energy saving; diversifying energy mix; ensuring physical security of critical energy infrastructure; reducing energy poverty; addressing climate change and sustainable development.”

Moreover, participants of the St. Petersburg Summit published separate statements on “Fighting high-level corruption”, Combating IPR Piracy and Counterfeiting”, and “Trade”. In an issue of the fighting corruption, they noticed that “Large-scale corruption by individuals who hold senior executive, judicial, and legislative positions can have a devastating effect on democracy, the rule of law, and economic and social development...Corruption by holders of public office can deter foreign investment, stifle economic growth and sustainable development, and undermine legal and judicial systems.
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The net effect of corruption is felt most directly, and disproportionately, by the poor.\textsuperscript{566} In the prepared Action Plan, they pledged the following actions - to continue investigating and prosecuting corrupt public officials and those who bribe them; to force financial centres to implement the highest international standards of transparency and exchange of information; to deny entry and safe haven to public officials found guilty of corruption; to combat fraud and corruption and misuse of public resources; to support the global implementation of the UN Convention Against Corruption and the OECD Anti-Bribery Convention; to promote greater fiscal transparency; to promote transparency in government procurement and concessions; and to fight against money laundering. In an issue of the combating IPR piracy and counterfeiting leaders stated that “To continue the anti-piracy and anti-counterfeiting activities, we consider it necessary to enhance cooperation in that area among the G8 and other countries, as well as competent international organizations, notably the World Intellectual Property Organization (WIPO), the World Trade Organization (WTO), the World Customs Organization, Interpol, the Organization for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD), and the Council of Europe.”\textsuperscript{567} There was announced \textit{inter alia} in each of G8 countries a creation of a website with information on mechanisms available and procedures necessary to secure and enforce their intellectual property rights in that country on relevant legislation and law enforcement practices; the OECD engagement in preparing a report on economic consequences of piracy and counterfeiting; technical assistance for the developing countries in implementing pilot plans combating trade in counterfeit and pirated goods. In the statement on trade, G8 leaders called for the significant progress in negotiations on agricultural and industrial products and on services in order to conclude the Round by the end of 2006. They expressed satisfaction of the decision at the Hong Kong ministerial meeting that “developed countries, and developing countries that are in a position to do so, should provide duty-free and quota-free market access on a lasting basis for at least 97% of products originating from all LDCs by 2008, or no later than the start of the implementation period of the DDA.”\textsuperscript{568} Additionally, leaders stressed importance of Aid for Trade (AfT) and Trade Capacity Building programs in helping the developing countries to benefit from trade.
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The Heiligendamm Summit was in large extent devoted to economic issues. Participants published declaration “Growth and Responsibility in the World Economy” in which they presented basis foundations - “We have agreed on a policy agenda to promote a smooth adjustment of global imbalances which should take place in the context of sustained robust global economic growth...Our agenda builds on discussions at the IMF and other international fora. Open markets and competition are crucial elements, as are our efforts to promote freedom of investment and the dynamics of innovation described hereafter.”

In the declaration was raised necessity of vigilance of hedge funds and in that issue leaders ascribed the main role to activity of the Financial Stability Forum. They also recognized the importance of the cross-border investment and announced actions aimed at maximising benefits from their flows such as strong support to the freedom of investment; promotion of the open investment environment in industrial countries and emerging economies; greater benefits form and sustainability of foreign direct investments (FDI) for the developing countries; and promotion and reinforcement for corporate and other forms of social responsibility. In the declaration was also stressed the role that for the economic growth and prosperity play science, research and innovation - “Whereas the promotion of research involves education and higher-education policy, economic policy can play a crucial role in promoting the translation of research into innovative products and in fostering an innovation-friendly business environment.” G8 countries called for sharing information among them and with emerging economies in order to enhance efforts of cooperation. As possible areas of collaboration the following were mentioned: sustainable use of water and land; research in the field of energy efficiency; and promotion of environ mentally-related innovations in the public as well as in the business sector. Moreover, leaders noticed that “The benefits of innovation for economic growth and development are increasingly threatened by infringements of intellectual property rights worldwide. We therefore strongly reaffirm our commitment to combat piracy and counterfeiting.” They expressed support for the WTO initiative to implement the International Medicinal Products Anti-Counterfeit Taskforce (IMPACT) and for the joint declaration of business communities of G8 countries on “Strategies of G8 Industry and Business to Promote Intellectual Property Protection and to Prevent Counterfeiting and Piracy”. Heads of state and government decided also to endorse the Guidelines for Customs and Border Enforcement Cooperation as well as new Guidelines
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for Technical Assistance for the developing countries. They invited the major emerging economies to establish a new dialogue on innovation and intellectual property protection because “Such a dialogue will provide a forum for the positive exchange on topics critical for growth of successful knowledge economies and the promotion of an innovation-friendly business environment also taking into account the needs of small and medium sized enterprises.”

As main purposes of that process the latter were described: intellectual property protection; market incentives for innovation and the diffusion of knowledge; efficient innovation value chains which promote business commercialization of patented research results. At the Summit was also published the “G8 Trade Declaration” in which was stressed “the need for achieving an ambitious, balanced and comprehensive agreement on the Doha Development Agenda.”

Leaders called on all WTO members to intensify works to finish the Round by the end of 2007. In the end they underlined the G8 commitment to use the DDA to better integration of the developing countries into the multilateral trading system. To achieve that they called on all donors “to improve quality and quantity of the means available by 2010 and encourage partner countries to include the AfT agenda in their poverty reduction and national development strategies.”

---
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Chapter V
ENVIRONMENTAL SECTOR

First summits were focused almost exceptionally on economic issues, however quite early because already in 1978 in Bonn, for the first time heads of state and government mentioned about the environment role when they noticed in the communiqué, in the part addressing energy that “In energy development, the environment and human safety of the population must be safeguarded with greatest care.”

Similar tone was maintained in the 1979 Tokyo Declaration where was written that “We pledge our countries to increase as far as possible coal use, production, and trade, without damage to the environment...We need to expand alternative sources of energy, especially those which will help to prevent further pollution, particularly increases of carbon dioxide and sulphur oxides in the atmosphere.” In the declaration of Venice, a year later, also could be found a note of an environmental risk connected with coal production as well as an assurance of taking all measures to protect the environment. This was also reiterated at the 1981 Ottawa Summit, where an environment issue was mentioned in energy as well as in economic part of the final communiqué - “In shaping our long-term economic policies, care should be taken to preserve the environment and the resource base of our planet.”

The Versailles Summit did not mentioned anything about the environment, but in the declaration from the Williamsburg meeting in 1983 leaders decided “to strengthen cooperation in protection of the environment, in better use of natural resources, and in health research.” The tenth summit in London 1984, for the first time in a wider way addressed “the international dimension of environmental problems and the role of environmental factors in economic development.”

The heads of state and government called on their ministers to cooperate in the agreed areas of environmental policies created by the Versailles Summit’s Working Group on Technology, Growth and Employment invited to identify “specific areas for research on the causes, effects and means of limiting
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environmental pollution of air, water and ground...and to identify possible projects for industrial cooperation to develop cost effective techniques to reduce environmental damage.” Additionally, they expressed satisfaction of the German government initiative to call conference on the environment in Munich, 1984. In the 1985 Bonn declaration could be already found a separate section titled “Environmental Policies”, in which leaders called for the international cooperation on such issues as: the acid deposition and air pollution from motor vehicles and other significant sources; climate change; protection of the ozone layer; management of toxic chemicals and hazardous wastes; and protection of soils, fresh water and the sea. They announced the development of the “polluter pays” principle and as well as increase of cooperation with international organizations and the developing countries to avoid environmental damage and disasters worldwide. At the 1986 Tokyo meeting, the G7 reiterated its support for international cooperation to protection of environment and called on environment experts to elaborate a report “on the improvement and harmonization of the techniques and practices of environmental measurement.” On the basis of this report leaders gathered in Venice 1987, called on the United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP) to create forum that would continue works in this area in cooperation with inter alia the International Organisation for Standardization (ISO) and the International Council of Scientific Unions (ICSU). They mentioned series of issues that in their opinion should have an international range such as stratospheric ozone layer depletion, climate change, acid rains, endangered species, hazardous substances, air and water pollution and destruction of tropical forests. Moreover, they committed “to examine further environmental issues such as stringent environmental standards as an incentive for innovation and for the development of clean, cost effective and low-resource technology; as well as promotion of international trade in low-pollution products, low-polluting industrial plants and other environmental protection technologies.” In the end, the G7 gave support for IAEA’s works on safety management of nuclear energy.

Ibidem

The 1988 Toronto Summit, expressed support for the position of the World Commission on Environment and Development that in its report had underlined that “environmental considerations must be integrated into all areas of economic policymaking.”582 As “threats to the environment recognize no boundaries”583, G7 leaders called on all countries to sign and ratify the Montreal Protocol on Substances that Deplete Ozone Layer584, to conclude negotiations on a protocol on emissions of nitrogen oxides within the Geneva Convention on Long-range Transboundary Air Pollution, to support works of the UNEP on the trans-frontier shipment of hazardous wastes as well as to establish an inter-governmental panel on climate change under the auspices of UNEP and the World Metrological Organization. Additionally, G7 countries expressed concern at adverse influence of agriculture on the environment through the over-intensive use of resources or desertification.585

Subject of the environmental protection was one of the three basic issues raised at the G7 Summit in Paris, 1989. The participants stated that “Decisive action is urgently needed to understand and protect the earth's ecological balance. We will work together to achieve the common goals of preserving a healthy and balanced global environment in order to meet shared economic and social objectives and to carry out obligations to future generations.”586

All countries were called to improve observation and monitoring on a global scale as well as to develop technology of pollution’s reduction. Leaders stressed necessity of including the environmental protection in economic decision-making in industry and in agricultural sector, “In order to achieve sustainable development, we shall ensure the compatibility of economic growth and development with the protection of the environment. Environmental protection and related investment should contribute to economic growth.” They also called on the World Bank and regional developments banks to include in their activity an environmental
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consideration. The OECD, the UN and other similar organizations were asked to help governments to assess “appropriate economic measures to promote the quality of the environment.” In Paris, special economic incentives for the developing countries which care for the environmental protection were announced. The G7 underlined the importance of the depleting ozone layer problem; called for elaborating an alternative to chloro-fluorocarbons and limiting emissions of carbon dioxide and other greenhouse gases but at the same time stressing the necessity of increasing energy efficiency. There was also raised a question of exterminating rain forests calling on international organisation to create a report on the state of the world’s forests by 1990. Special attention was paid to an issue of preserving the tropical forests. Leaders called for fast implementation of the Tropical Forest Action Plan elaborated in 1986 by the FAO. They also asked the UN for a report on the world’s oceans, condemning “use of oceans as dumping grounds for polluting waste” and calling on all countries to implement “the international conventions for the prevention of oil pollution of the oceans.” Heads of state and government agreed that the main role in protection of the environment should play institutions within the UN system and expressed political support “to projects such as the joint project to set up an observatory of the Saharan areas, which answers the need to monitor the development of that rapidly deteriorating, fragile, arid region, in order to protect it more effectively.” In the same declaration they called for assist in introducing in Bangladesh program that would help this country “periodically devastated by catastrophic floods.”

The next meeting in Houston 1990, also widely raised an issue of the environment. In the final declaration, G7 leaders discussed such subjects as the climate change, ozone layer depletion, deforestation, marine pollution and loss of biological diversity. They supported the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change and the Second World Climate Conference, which were working *inter alia* to limit greenhouse gases emissions. They also called for intensifying works on a convention on climate change under the auspices of UNEP and the WMO to conclude them until 1992. Heads of state and government expressed satisfaction of the amendment of the Montreal Protocol “to phase out the use of chlorofluorocarbons (CFCs) by the year 2000 and to extend coverage of the Protocol to other ozone-depleting substances.” Moreover, they asked for the deeper cooperation - “We recognize the

---
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importance of working together to develop new technologies and methods over the coming decades to complement energy conservation and other measures to reduce carbon dioxide and other greenhouse emissions.” They also announced actions to increase area of forests stressing worrisome destruction of the tropical forests. They welcomed a decision of the new Government of Brazil to provide sustainable forest management. Leaders proposed start of negotiations on a global forest convention or agreement as “Loss of temperate and tropical forests, developmental pressures on estuaries, wetlands and coral reefs, and destruction of biological diversity are symptomatic. To reverse this trend, we will expand cooperation to combat desertification; expand projects to conserve biological diversity; protect the Antarctic; and assist developing countries in their environmental efforts. We will work within UNEP and other fora.” Participants of the Houston Summit expressed concern at marine pollution, oil spills and unregulated fishing practices. They called on all states to implement the International Maritime Organization Convention and to cooperation between developed and developing countries in solving all environmental problems. Once more was stressed the importance of works on the energy efficiency and on alternative energy sources, including nuclear energy. Leaders expressed satisfaction of launching the Human Frontier Science Program and called for involving the private sector into works on the environmental protection. The G7 asked the OECD to intensify its efforts in the area of the environment, “Of particular importance are the early development of environmental indicators and the design of market-oriented approaches that can be used to achieve environmental objectives.”

In the economic declaration, “Building World Partnership”, of London 1991, in the part devoted to the environment was noticed that “The international community will face formidable environmental challenges in the coming decade. Managing the environment continues to be a priority issue for us...Environmental considerations should be integrated into the full range of government policies, in a way which reflects their economic costs. We support the valuable work in this field being undertaken by the OECD.” The G7 called on the developing countries and Central and Eastern Europe nations to cooperate in this area. Leaders expressed satisfaction of progress of the Sahara and Sahel Observatory, the Budapest Environmental Centre as well as of consensus on the Environmental Protocol of the Antarctic Treaty. As in June, 1992 took place the UN Conference on Environment and Development
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(UNCED), G7 countries decided, to ensure success of this project, on creating an effective framework convention on climate change that was supposed to contain concrete strategies to limit emissions of greenhouse gases and “agreement on principles for the management, conservation and sustainable development of all types of forest, leading to a framework convention.” They also announced a financial support for the developing countries to resolve their environmental problems through the Global Environment Facility; the working out of common approach to the oceans and seas; development of international law of the environment; and reinforcement of international organisations concerned with the environment, in particular the UNEP. The G7 asked for fast conclusion of negotiations in the UNEP on convention on biodiversity as well as expressed satisfaction of progress “in developing the pilot programme for the conservation of the Brazilian tropical forest.” However, they also expressed concern at the burning oil wells and polluted seas in the Gulf, calling for creation of international actions to prevent and respond to environmental disasters. Additionally, leaders called on closer cooperation in environmental science and technology, particularly in scientific research into the global climate, including satellite monitoring and ocean observation as well as in the development and diffusion of energy technologies.591

In the final declaration of the 1992 Munich meeting, “Working Together for Growth and a Safer World”, were summed up results of the UNCED and noticed actions aimed at strengthening results of the Rio Conference. Heads of state and government called for ratification of the Climate Change Convention and for elaborating national action plans, as foreseen at the UNCED, by the end of 1993. They promised to give additional financial and technical support to the developing countries. Moreover, leaders decided to establish the Sustainable Development Commission at the UN, which would monitor the implementation of Agenda 21592 as well as to work out an international review process for the forest principles. In the end they called for improving monitoring of the global environment;
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592 The full text of Agenda 21 was revealed at the United Nations Conference on Environment and Development (Earth Summit), held in Rio de Janeiro on June 14, 1992, where 178 governments voted to adopt the programme. The final text was the result of drafting, consultation and negotiation, beginning in 1989 and culminating at the two-week conference. The number 21 refers to an agenda for the 21st century. It may also refer to the number on the UN’s agenda at this particular summit.
promoting innovative technologies; and calling as soon as possible the international conference on straddling fish stocks and highly migratory fish stocks in the oceans.\textsuperscript{593} Participants of the next venue in Tokyo 1993 noticed that “Environmental issues remain a high priority on our policy agenda despite difficult economic times.”\textsuperscript{594} They welcomed results of the first meeting of the Commission on Sustainable Development (CSD), progress in ratification and implementation of the Framework Convention on Climate Change and the Convention on Biological Diversity as well as progress in negotiations on convention on desertification. There was reiterated engagement in realisation of UNCED arrangements and were announced efforts to the smooth functioning of the Global Environmental facility as the “financial mechanism to provide funding for the incremental costs of implementing the global environment conventions signed at Rio.”\textsuperscript{595} G7 countries announced also continuation of works on an international agreement on the management, conservation and sustainable development of forests.

The 1994 Naples Summit actually reiterated all hitherto declarations concerning implementation of arrangements from the Rio Conference. Heads of state and government expressed satisfaction of replenishment of the Global Environment Facility as well of conclusion of the Convention on Desertification and the results of the Conference on Small Islands. They also declared acceleration of implementation of national plans agreed in the Rio Climate Treaty.\textsuperscript{596}

In the final declaration of the Halifax Summit 1995, participants stressed necessity of fulfilment of all obligations emerging from arrangements of the 1992 Rio Earth Summit and expressed satisfaction of progress in works of the Commission on Sustainable Development on forests. They announced efforts to successful conclusion of the UN Conference on Straddling Fish Stocks and Highly Migratory Fish Stocks and to an international agreement on the world’s oceans. There was also recommended a clearer delineation of the Commission on Sustainable Development and the UNEP - “CSD should be the global forum for identifying and agreeing upon long term strategic goals for sustainable development. UNEP
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should act as an international environmental voice and catalyst; it should focus on monitoring, assessment, and the development of international environmental law.\textsuperscript{597} In the same declaration was written that “In their policies, operations and procurement, G7 governments must show leadership in improving the environment...Efforts must focus on pollution prevention, the ‘polluter pays’ principle, internalization of environmental costs, and the integration of environmental considerations into policy and decision making in all sectors.”\textsuperscript{598}

At the Lyon Summit 1996, the G7 with Russia declared that “We are exploring the possibility of supplementing our national income accounts to better measure resources, such as forests, minerals and fish, and the economic value of air, water and soil quality.”\textsuperscript{599} It was also added that “1997 will be a pivotal year for the environment.” The heads of state and government announced renewal of the Rio agreements and concentration of all efforts on preparatory to the 1997 special session of the UN General Assembly. Moreover, they declared actions to positive results of the Conference of the Parties to the Climate Change Convention; agree on sustainable management of forests; fast implementation of the Convention on Biological Diversity and the Convention on Desertification; and to negotiate a global instrument on particular persistent organic pollutants (POPs). Leaders expressed concern at international crime in areas such as illegal trade in CFCs, endangered species and hazardous wastes, calling for international cooperation in implementing all environmental agreements. Additionally, they asked international institutions for higher efficiency, stressing the importance of political role of the Commission on Sustainable Development and calling for more precise obligations’ division between the CSD and the UNEP.\textsuperscript{600}

At the Denver Summit 1997 participants discussed mainly on progress in promoting the sustainable development since the 1992 Rio Conference. They called on the UN General Assembly to raise at the Special Session an issue of implementation of Rio commitments and to create an index of priority issues to address in the future. As one of the goals was written the reversal of a climate change trend through \textit{inter alia} reduction of greenhouse gases emissions by 2010 what was supposed to be legitimized in a form of agreement during the
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Third Conference of Parties to the UN Framework Convention on Climate Change in Kyoto. Leaders underlined that actions must be taken by developed as well as developing countries promising them technological and financial help. They also announced cooperation on further developing the global system for monitoring climate change and other environmental change. They expressed concern at continuous destruction of forests and in order to stop this the heads of state and government called on their officials to call a meeting, at which they should discuss implementation of an Action Program agreed in Denver and that “includes implementing national programs and building capacity for sustainable forest management; establishing networks of protected areas; assessing the state of each nation’s forests using agreed criteria and indicators; promoting private sector management of forests; and eliminating illegal logging.” Moreover, they asked for creating a plan of action to address all fresh-water related issues e.g. promotion of efficient water use. The G8 announced the intensification of efforts to protect the world’s oceans against overfishing, marine pollution or oil spills, including special cooperation in the area of monitoring the ecology in the Northern Pacific, forecasting tsunamis and earthquakes. Leaders welcomed the entry into force the Convention to Combat Desertification and they stated that “Governments should help promote sustainable practices by taking environmental factors into account when providing financing support for investment in infrastructure and equipment.” They gave clear support for international institutions, including the CSD for which were perceived four priority areas fresh water, oceans, land resources (including forests), and sustainable energy use. The G8 supported also the refocused mandate for UNEP that “should promote the coherent implementation of environmental protection within the UN system and serve as an authoritative advocate for the global environment.” Additionally, the Group called on the Secretary General to review the way of handling environmental matters within the UN system in order to ensure the long term coherence and efficiency.

On 09.05.1998, a week before the Birmingham Summit, was published the “G8 Action Program on Forests” focused on “domestic actions in the G8 member countries and areas where they can make unique contributions through their bilateral assistance programmes and through their support for intergovernmental processes.” G8 countries committed there to monitor and assess trends in forest conditions and management; to implement national
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programs of the sustainable forest management; to develop clear criteria of protected areas and maintain/establish protected forest areas; to involve the private sector in the sustainable forest management; and to develop counter measures against illegal logging and its trade.\footnote{604}{Ibidem}

In the final communiqué of the Birmingham meeting, G8 leaders raised arrangements of the Kyoto Protocol confirming plans of significant reduction of greenhouse gases emissions. They announced that they “will work further on flexible mechanisms such as international market-based emissions trading, joint implementation and the clean development mechanism, and on sinks.”\footnote{605}{The Birmingham Summit 15-17 May 1998 Communiqué, \url{http://www.g7.utoronto.ca/summit/1998birmingham/finalcom.htm}, 19.01.2010} They also called on the developing countries to collaborate promising help in the technological development. G8 countries reiterated that “The greatest environmental threat to our future prosperity remains climate change” and announced the assessment in 2000 progress on implementation of the G8 Program on Forests.\footnote{606}{Ibidem}

In the G8 declaration of Cologne 1999, was noticed that “We agree that environmental considerations should be taken fully into account in the upcoming round of WTO negotiations. This should include a clarification of the relationship between both multilateral environmental agreements and key environmental principles, and WTO rules.”\footnote{607}{G8 Communiqué Köln 1999, \url{http://www.g7.utoronto.ca/summit/1999kola/finalcom.htm}, 19.01.2010} Leaders announced cooperation with the OECD in elaborating environmental guidelines for export and finance agencies as well as in implementation of the Kyoto Protocol. They stressed the importance of the climate change problem and necessity of reduction of greenhouse gases emissions, underlying the need of collaboration with the developing countries. In the end, they stated that “We support the outcome of the G8 Environment Ministers' meeting in Schwerin and will expedite international cooperation on the establishment, general recognition and continual improvement of environmental standards and norms.”\footnote{608}{Ibidem}

Participants of the 2000 Okinawa Summit announced works on creating a future-orientated agenda for the Rio+10 in 2002 and actions to effective course of the Sixth Conference of the Parties to the Framework Convention on Climate Change, what should act as a catalyst to fast entry into force of the Kyoto Protocol. They also called on the parties of the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety to similar efforts. Leaders promised support for projects that would let
local and indigenous communities practice sustainable forest management as well as for projects that would prevent illegal logging. They found it necessary to establish a Task Force that at the next summit would present recommendations for “sound ways to better encourage the use of renewables in developing countries.” The G8 reaffirmed its commitment in elaborating common environmental guidelines for export credit agencies by the next summit, at the same time stressing roles of the OECD and the MDB in that area. The heads of state and government announced cooperation with the IMO on improvement of maritime safety through *inter alia* improvement of safety standards for ships carrying dangerous or polluting cargo as well as they gave support for “the IMO efforts to pursue practical reform of current international regimes on maritime pollution, in particular the 1992 Convention on Civil Liability for Oil Pollution Damage and the 1992 International Oil Pollution Compensation (IOPC) Convention with respect to, *inter alia*, better compensation.” In Okinawa, was also published the Report on Implementation of the G8 Action Program on Forests in which was described progress in the following five areas: monitoring and assessment; national forest program; protected areas; private sector; and illegal logging. Additionally, in its annex were presented individual reports of G8 countries and the European Commission.

In 2001 at the Genoa Summit, heads of state and government admitted that there was a disagreement on the Kyoto Protocol and its ratification, however they would continue cooperation on climate-related issues in order to “find global solutions to threats endangering the planet...We are committed to providing strong leadership.” Great attention was paid to an issue of energy renewable resources, which not only preserve the environment but also contribute to poverty reduction and was especially important for the developing countries. Leaders called on the MDB and other relevant institutions to develop financing mechanism for renewable energy. Moreover, they called for third replenishment of the Global Environment Facility and announced cooperation with the developing countries and civil society in preparatory of an agenda for the World Summit on Sustainable Development in Johannesburg in 2002, which was described as “an important milestone in the Rio process.”

---
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They also expressed satisfaction of the adoption of the Stockholm Convention on Persistent Organic Pollutants and Russian declaration to convene in 2003 a global conference on climate change. G8 countries announced reaching agreement till the end of 2001 on common environmental guidelines for Export Credit Agencies in the frameworks of the OECD. 613

From the Kananaskis Summit 2002, one could see significant shift of the environment subject above all into direction of G8 Environment Ministers and the European Commissioner. In the Kananaskis Chair’s Summary was noted only short sentence: “We recognized that climate change is a pressing issue that requires a global solution, and we discussed the problem of deforestation.” 614 An important document of that meeting was Banff Ministerial Statement on the World Summit on Sustainable Development elaborated by G8 Environment Ministers gathered in Banff, in April 2002. The goal of this venue was preparatory for the World Summit on Sustainable Development in Johannesburg. The debate was considering three areas: environment and development; environment and health; and environmental governance. In the report was seen a more comprehensive approach to the environment issue, “In order to reverse environmental degradation, we must attain more sustainable patterns of consumption and production, alleviate poverty, further improve domestic and international institutions, resolve conflict and curtail pollution.” 615 In that document ministers inter alia stressed an important role of private sector players which they have in investment, technology and corporate social responsibility as well as they called for improving financial situation of UNEP and for supporting its coordinating role.

The 2003 Evian Summit published two documents concerning the environment - Marine Environment and Tanker Safety: A G8 Action Plan and Science and Technology for Sustainable Development: A G8 Action Plan. In the first one was written that “The fisheries sector alone is the main source of protein for one billion people as well as a major provider of livelihoods: it provides some 5-10% of the world's food supply...we will work towards sustainable fisheries and marine conservation.” 616 Participants of the Evian Summit announced inter alia the ratification of the UN convention on the Law of the Sea; urgent
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restoration of fish stocks; effective implementation of the UN Fish Stocks Agreement; improvement of cooperation between national agencies and international organisations, particularly the IMO, the FAO, UNEP and the Intergovernmental Oceanographic Commission; and establishment of ecosystem networks of marine protected areas. The G8 announced also support for the IMO works on increasing maritime safety through e.g. introducing a code especially for flag states or training seafarers. Leaders asked for intensification of port states control inspections and for adoption of international liability conventions such as the 2001 International Convention on Civil Liability for Bunker Oil Pollution Damage and the 1996 International Convention on Liability and Compensation for Damage in Connection with the Carriage of Hazardous and Noxious Substances by Sea.\textsuperscript{617} The second above mentioned document concerned results of the World Summit on Sustainable Development - “We recognise the need, as acknowledged in the World Summit on Sustainable Development (WSSD) Plan of Implementation, to support the development of cleaner, sustainable and more efficient technologies. Co-operative scientific research on transformational technologies offers potential to improve public health by cutting pollution and reduce greenhouse emissions to address the challenge of global climate change.”\textsuperscript{618} G8 leaders pledged to reinforce the international cooperation on global observation; to promote clean technologies, energy efficiency technologies, and renewable energy resources; to develop fuel cell and hydrogen technologies and more efficient fossil fuel technologies; and to work on codes and standards for next generation vehicles, cleaner diesel and biodiesel. In subjects of agriculture and biodiversity as goals were set out inter alia the promotion of use of genetic resources for food and agriculture; help for the developing countries to improve their agricultural productivity; use of modern technologies to combat illegal logging, to promote sustainable forest management, to promote agricultural biodiversity and conservation. In the same document was announced help for the developing countries in implementing technologies which contribute to sustainable development as well as was announced further debate on aspects of the global climate change at the World Conference on Climate Change in Moscow, September 2003. Moreover, the heads of state and government declared that “We will convene senior G8 policy and research officials and their research institutions to compare and to link programmes and priorities, to involve and assist in more effective planning and
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potential linkage of future programmes addressing research on global observation, cleaner energy, agriculture and biodiversity.”

The Sea Island Summit 2004 was devoted mainly to assistance for the most needed countries, particularly in Africa. Concerning the environment issue, leaders published “Science and Technology for Sustainable Development: "3r" Action Plan and Progress on Implementation”, in which they noticed that “we commit to launching the Reduce, Reuse, and Recycle ("3R") Initiative to encourage more efficient use of resources and materials. The initiative will be formally launched in the coming year at a ministerial meeting in Japan.”

G8 countries declared, in cooperation with the OECD, to seek to reduce, reuse and recycle resources and products; to reduce barriers to the international flow of recycled and remanufactured products; and to promote science and technology suitable for 3Rs. They also presented hitherto actions to implement the Evian S&T Action Plan such as: launch of the International Partnership for a Hydrogen Economy and the Carbon Sequestration Leadership Forum; adoption of a framework document on a Global Earth Observation System of Systems (GEOSS); or the entry into force of the International Treaty for Plant Genetic Resources for Food and Agriculture.

The Gleneagles Summit 2005 discussed the environmental issues quite widely. There was published a document “Climate Change, Clean Energy and Sustainable Development”, in which were defined main subject of the debate such as the climate change, promotion of clean energy and global sustain development. Participants announced cooperation on limitation of greenhouse gases emissions and on promotion of low-emitting energy systems. They called for actions aimed at energy efficiency, increase of awareness of the importance of climate change among business and consumers and for cooperation with the developing countries to enhance transfer of technologies. They also stated that “We therefore agree to take forward a Dialogue on Climate Change, Clean Energy and Sustainable Development, and invite other interested countries with significant energy needs to join us.” Moreover, there was announced collaboration with relevant institutions, including the IAEA and the World Bank.

---
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As a supplement of this declaration was published the “Gleneagles Plan of Action”, in which were described actions in six areas. The first one concerned transformation of a way in which energy is used and here the main goal was improvement of energy efficiency in building, appliances, vehicles, aviation and industry. The second one was titled “Powering a cleaner future” and assumed the diversification of energy supply mix basing inter alia on danger fossil fuels, renewable energy and safer nuclear energy. The third area was aimed at “Promoting networks for research and development”. Leaders called here for an increased international cooperation in the fields identified in the Evian S&T Action Plan and gave support for works of the International Partnership for the Hydrogen Economy and the IAEA on technologies using hydrogen as an energy carrier. The fourth section was devoted to financing the transition to cleaner energy. There was declared e.g. support for “a market-led approach to encouraging energy efficiency and accelerating investment and the deployment of cleaner technologies which will help transition to a low-emission future.” There was also stressed the role of the Global Environment Facility in facilitating collaboration with the developing countries on cleaner energy as well as the World Bank and the MDB’s were called to intensify work with borrower countries on energy issues. The next area described actions in an issue of managing the impact of climate change. The heads of state and government expressed hope that in future debate would be find solution “on how development and energy strategies can be strengthened to build resilience to climate impacts.” They also expressed satisfaction of adaptation of the 10-year implementation plan for development of the GEOSS and called on the World Bank to elaborate “'best practice' guidelines for screening their investments in climate sensitive sectors to determine how their performance could be affected by climate risks, as well as how those risks can best be managed.” The last area concerned illegal logging. Leaders announced inter alia common efforts from both timber producing and timber consuming countries as well as support for regional initiatives such as the FLEG Regional Ministerial Process, the Asia Forest Partnership, the Congo Basin Forest Partnership and the EU Forest Law Enforcement, Governance and Trade Action Plan.  

In 2006, at the St. Petersburg Summit “St. Petersburg Plan of Action on Global Energy Security” was published, in which participants announced actions to protect the environment inter alia through enhancing energy efficiency and energy saving; diversifying energy mix; and addressing climate change and sustainable development. There was written that “Increased energy efficiency and conservation reduce stress on infrastructure and contribute
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to a healthier environment through decreased emission of greenhouse gases and pollutants.”624

The G8 announced continuation of the Dialogue on Climate Change, Clean Energy and Sustainable Development; further works under the UNFCCC and engagement of the private sector in achieving these goals. Leaders also promised support for technologies and projects aimed at making transportation more energy efficient and environmentally advanced such as biofuels, hybrid/clean diesel or “hydrogen economy”. Moreover, they supported the Carbon Sequestration Leadership Forum aimed at “preparing and implementing demonstration projects on CO2 capture and storage and on the development of zero emission power plants” as well as working the Renewable Energy Efficiency Program and the Global Bio-Energy Partnership. In St Peters burg was announced the intensification of cooperation on the forest management, especially in addressing deforestation, forest degradation, trade in illegal logging and forest fires. G8 countries declared partnership with the private sector “to accelerate market entry and utilization of innovative energy technologies by supporting market-led policies that encourage investments in this area.”625 They confirmed commitment in Gleneagles arrangements concerning reduction of greenhouse gases emissions and of air pollution as well as reiterated their support for international initiatives combating climate change as e.g. UNFCC, the Kyoto Protocol, the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change or the Asia-Pacific Partnership on Clean Development and Climate.

The 2007 Heiligendamm Summit to large extent was devoted to the environment issue. Almost a half of the final declaration, “Growth and Responsibility in the World Economy”, was dedicated to this matter, as “climate change is a long-term challenge that has the potential to seriously damage our natural environment and the global economy...Tackling climate change is a shared responsibility of all, and can and must be undertaken in a way that supports growth in developing, emerging and industrialised economies, while avoiding economic distortions.”626 The limitation of the greenhouse gases emissions was set out as the basic goal. Leaders stressed that achieving this would be possible only through very close international cooperation and through establishing complementary frameworks addressing not only climate change but also energy security, economic growth and sustainable development. The UN
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climate process was indicated as the fundamental forum of activity. The G8 promised support for development and commercialisation of new less carbon intensive clean energy and climate friendly technologies through *inter alia* incentives to the private sector. It was also stated that “Reducing, and in the long term halting deforestation provides a significant and cost-effective contribution toward mitigating greenhouse gas emissions and toward conserving biological diversity, promoting sustainable forest management and enhancing security of livelihoods.” In order to achieve that, the summit’s participants called on the World Bank to create, in cooperation with the G8, the developing countries, the private sector, NGOs and others, a forest carbon partnership as well as they announced further efforts to combat illegal logging. Leaders stated that they are aware of the fact that especially the developing countries are exposed to climate change and for that reason they promised assistance in adapting to that process and in enhancing their resilience to climate variability. They supported the Potsdam Initiative – Biological Diversity 2010 and announced actions to significant reduction of the rate of loss of biodiversity by 2010. An important question was the issue of energy efficiency - “According to the International Energy Agency, successfully implemented energy efficiency policies could contribute to 80% of avoided greenhouse gases while substantially increasing security of supply.” They also called for elaborating national energy efficiency programs and international efficiency standards as well as for implementing concrete actions to increase energy efficiency in the building, transport and industrial sectors, and in high efficient power plants and grids. Additionally, G8 countries stressed the importance of energy diversification through increased use of clean fuels, renewable energy sources and peaceful use of nuclear energy, at the same time underlying that “We are committed to the paramount importance of safety, security and non proliferation in using nuclear power.”

---
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As the G7/8 is a group of states, in that case it is hard to talk about strict definition of societal sector in the way described by Buzan. However, form the very beginning leaders meeting at summits had their own ideology of world and group’s actions. A good example of the protection of the ideological identity and transformation are relations with the USSR and then with Russia. In that case one could noticed that the G7 posses its own separate identity and clear ideology. In the 15 points Declaration of Rambouillet, first three points are devoted to description of rules which were used by leaders of six countries. As the purpose of the meeting was mentioned the debate on economic situation of the world but at the same time there was paid attention to its “human, social and political implications”.\(^\text{628}\) There were stressed common benefits and responsibility for open democratic society connected with individual liberty and social advancement as well as fact that “Our success will strengthen, indeed is essential to, democratic societies everywhere.” In that first declaration leaders raised also an issue of the strange socialist regime noticing that “We look to an orderly and fruitful increase in our economic relations with socialist countries as an important element in progress in détente, and in world economic growth.”\(^\text{629}\) Economic relations were supposed to be translated into political relations and clearly expressed affection to the declaration of individual liberty showed that an ideology of these six countries had been clearly defined.

In the 1976 Declaration of Puerto Rico, was generally no ideological mentions. Leaders stressed above all an economic character of summits and expressed hope that “economic relations between East and West would develop their full potential on a sound financial and reciprocal commercial basis.”\(^\text{630}\) Contrary, in the declaration of London 1977, in the first sentence the heads of state and government announced that “we have agreed on how we can best help to promote the wellbeing both of our own countries and of others.”\(^\text{631}\)

---

\(^{628}\) Declaration of Rambouillet, [http://www.g7.utoronto.ca/summit/1975rambouillet/communique.html](http://www.g7.utoronto.ca/summit/1975rambouillet/communique.html), 20.01.2010

\(^{629}\) Ibidem

\(^{630}\) Joint Declaration of the International Conference, [http://www.g7.utoronto.ca/summit/1976sanjuan/communique.html](http://www.g7.utoronto.ca/summit/1976sanjuan/communique.html), 24.01.2010

\(^{631}\) Declaration: Downing Street Summit Conference, [http://www.g7.utoronto.ca/summit/1977london/communique.html](http://www.g7.utoronto.ca/summit/1977london/communique.html), 24.01.2010
underlined the importance of cooperation on reacting on “the challenges of the future” and after mentioning a series of economic issues they stated that “The message of the Downing Street Summit is thus one of confidence: in the continuing strength of our societies and the proven democratic principles that give them vitality; that we are undertaking the measures needed to overcome problems and achieve a more prosperous future.”

Communiques of Bonn 1978 and Tokyo 1979, focused mainly on economic questions related to oil crisis. This subject was continued at the Venice Summit 1980, however here leaders noticed that “We are confident in the ability of our democratic societies, based on individual freedom and social solidarity, to meet these challenges.” They also stressed that to achieve a better future was necessary a continued common effort, as “our efforts will only bear fruit if we can at the same time preserve a world in which the rule of law is universally obeyed, national independence is respected and world peace is kept.”

The G7 called on all countries and regional groups to cooperate on building safer world. That was connected with the Soviet occupation of Afghanistan. Leaders stressed that it was against the law of Afghan people for national independence and against the rules of the UN Charter as well as it was a threat to the real détente through leveraging “foundations of peace, both in the region and in the world at large.”

In the introduction to the Declaration of the Ottawa Summit 1981, was clearly stated that “We are conscious that economic issues reflect and affect the broader political purposes we share. In a world of interdependence, we reaffirm our common objectives and our recognition of the need to take into account the effects on others of policies we pursue.”

The G7 stressed that responsibility should be shared with all partners around the world as well as called the Soviet Union and its partners to give greater development assistance and to increase its exports of developing countries “while respecting their independence and nonalignment.” For the first time in the history of summits in Ottawa was separated a part devoted to East-West relations,

632 Ibidem
634 Political Topics (Afghanistan), http://www.g7.utoronto.ca/summit/1980venice/political.html, 24.01.2010
635 Ibidem
definitely economic relations, where was stated: “our economic policies continue to be compatible with our political and security objectives.”638 At the end of this document was also underlined the willingness of collaboration with all countries “in spirit of cooperation and harmony”.639 In the Chairman’s Summary of Political Issues published at the Ottawa Summit the heads of state and government expressed concern at increasing armament of the USSR. They stressed readiness for a dialogue and cooperation with the Soviet Union, in a range that would be enabled by the Soviet attitude, to achieve balanced and verifiable arms control and disarmament, at the same time they underlined the “need for a strong defence capability.”640 Leaders also reiterated engagement in efforts to international security and stability as well as they declared: “we shall continue to promote peaceful resolution of disputes and to address underlying social and economic problems.”641 In the 1982 Versailles Declaration, was noticed a progress in the world’s economic situation, however at the same time was stressed a necessity of cooperation “to maintain confidence in the democratic values that we share, and to preserve the cultural heritage of our peoples in all their diversity.”642 Leaders reiterated the importance of good and constructive relations with developing countries and President Mitterrand in the statement to the press stressed that in the intention of the summit’s participants there was no idea of aggression towards anybody and added that: “We want to safeguard certain common values of civilization, as we call them, and especially, as regards political systems, to preserve the democratic traditions, practices and institutions that are characteristics of the countries participating in this meeting.”643 In turn, in the report “Technology, Employment and Growth”, he stated that the G7 do not reserve for itself the right to decide on future of the world neither on advocating its matters at the cost of other states, although as the richest seven countries in the world the G7 was aware
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643 [Translation:] President Mitterrand’s Statement To The Press At The Conclusion Of The Versailles Summit, http://www.g7.utoronto.ca/summit/1982versailles/statement_english.html, 24.01.2010
of its responsibility “both for the present and for the future”.644 For the first time was clearly stated that to G7’s obligations belong not only care for the economic prosperity of the world but also it should “explore the vast fields of endeavour open to our common effort. Among the latter, science and technology, whose rapid development is revolutionizing our societies, threaten to turn against man, their creator, if he does not master them properly.”645 In the report were raised issues of new technologies such as biotechnologies, which should be used in a wise way in order to not be a threat to important value systems. There was also stressed a huge responsibility of G7 countries as a leaders in the process of adaptation to new technological, cultural and environmental changes, and in the process of combating North-South imbalances, generally speaking in the process of creating new civilisation. In the Versailles declaration was also raised an issue of East-West relations, limiting mainly to dimension of economic relation, however there was stressed that economic approach should be “consistent with our political and security interests.”646 Leaders announced common East-West works on improving the international system for controlling exports of strategic goods to the USSR and Eastern Europe as well as exchange of information on the OECD forum on economic, commercial and financial relations with these countries.

The first sentence of the 1983 economic Williamsburg Declaration was: “Our nations are united in their dedication to democracy, individual freedom, creativity, moral purpose, human dignity, and personal and cultural development.”647 In the annex to the above mentioned document, the heads of state and government underlined the importance of democratic values and set G7 countries in the role of guards of these values as well as they reiterated responsibility of the richest countries for building better future.648 In the declaration on security, the G7 called on the Soviet Union to cooperate on effective arms control agreements. At the same time leaders decided that in the framework of “the freedom and justice on which
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our democracies are based” they should maintain such military power as to deter any attack. They assured that arms of G7 countries “will never be used except in response to aggression.” Participants of the Williamsburg Summit stressed their indivisible position to a question of their countries’ security and declared that any attempts from the USSR side to divide the West in the subject of the INF talks would be without any success. Moreover, they announced intensification of efforts to reduce the threat of war stressing “We have a vision of a world in which the shadow of war has been lifted from all mankind, and we are determined to pursue that vision.” This necessity of unity of the G7’s vision was stressed by the President Reagan during dinner toast at Rockefeller Folk Art Centre where he said that “Our individual perceptions about particular issues may sometimes differ, but gatherings such as this give us an opportunity to work together on a regular basis to address the problems we share.” An important reference of the President Reagan in the question of East-West relations was his response during the press conference to the accusation of the fact that the Soviets had blamed him for wrecking détente with the INF statement, when he stated that “Détente, as it existed, was only a cover under which the Soviet Union built up the greatest military power in the world. I don't think we need that kind of a détente.” This could have been treated as a change in the G7 position on East-West relations although in the declaration on economy was only published short reference concerning economic relations: “East-West economic relations should be compatible with our security interests.”

The tenth annual summit in London 1984 published a separate “Declaration on Democratic Values” describing G7’s beliefs and ideology. Heads of state and government confirmed their commitment to the rule of law which implicates the rights and liberties of every citizen and which make possible a development of human spirit. They expressed faith in the system of democracy which ensures free elections, free expression of opinion and “the capacity to
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respond and adapt to change in all its aspects.” Moreover, they stressed that they are sure that in their countries the government should create conditions for freedom of choice and personal initiative; for ideals of social justice, obligations and rights; for development of enterprises and employment opportunities; for equal share in the benefits of growth and support for the needed people; for development of innovation, imagination and scientific discovery; and for the soundness of the currency. Additionally, leaders noticed that thanks to the strong cooperation among their countries they could reinforce political stability and economic growth around the world as well as they should lead the new industrial revolution. Apart of this, the heads of state and government raised the issue of cooperation with nonaligned countries: “We look for cooperation with all countries on the basis of respect for their independence and territorial integrity, regardless of differences between political, economic and social systems. We respect genuine non-alignment.” Leaders underlined their moral responsibility to fight with hunger and poverty throughout the world what comes from the fact of their economic strength. They also raised a question of world peace stressing that each conflict should be solved by peaceful means and force should be rejected as a mean of resolving problems. They reiterated that “Each of us will maintain only the military strength necessary to deter aggression and to meet our responsibilities for effective defence.” In “The London Economic Declaration” participants noticed with satisfaction “the continuing consensus on the security and other implications of economic relations with Eastern countries”. At the same time, in the “Declaration on East-West Relations and Arms Control” was announced “extended political dialogue and long-term cooperation with the Soviet Union and her allies” in different fields. The US proposed the Soviet Union a restart of nuclear arms control talks, what should give expression to the principle of the non-use of force. Leaders expressed faith that in the common interest of both East and West was: preserving peace and security; reducing the risks of surprise attack or accidental war; improving crisis management techniques; and preventing the spread of nuclear weapons.

---
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In 1985 was the 40th anniversary of the end of the Second World War. On this occasion leaders gathered in Bonn published the special political declaration that was a measure of presentation G7 beliefs: “As the sounds of battle ceased, we tackled the tasks of moral and spiritual renewal and physical reconstruction.”\textsuperscript{658} Participants of the Bonn Summit stressed that through the reconciliation had been set common values, to which belong freedom, democratic principles, human rights, free elections, freedom of opinion, freedom of religion, freedom of travelling, and individual initiative. They expressed dissatisfaction of the fact that “Other nations that shared with ours in the agonies of the Second World War are divided from us by fundamental differences of political systems.” At the same time, they expressed hope that it would be possible to lower the barriers within Europe \textit{inter alia} through the activity of the CSCE. The heads of state and government reiterated that all countries have a responsibility to maintain international peace and security without use of force. Moreover, they once more underlined a readiness of the G7 to talk with the USRR about reducing nuclear arms, limiting conventional arms, banning chemical weapons and avoiding a new conflict. Leaders stressed also a necessity of assistance for developing countries in fighting hunger and disease as well as they called the Soviet Union and other communist countries to commit in that help.\textsuperscript{659}

The Tokyo Summit 1986, as one of the goals presented sustaining and improving “the prosperity and wellbeing of the peoples of our own countries.”\textsuperscript{660} In the separate declaration, “Looking Forward to a Better Future”, participants stressed deep roots of G7 countries in the civilisation of Europe and Asia, and what is connected with it, the sharing of common principles and objectives. They stressed close cooperation among North America, Europe and Japan what should lead to “safer and healthier, more civilized and prosperous, free and peaceful world.” They noticed with satisfaction the powerful appeal of democracy, personal initiative, individual creativity and social justice. Once more leaders expressed determination in fighting hunger, disease and poverty in order to help developing countries in a full participation in international relations. As the future task was described necessity of handing down healthy environment and cultural values. Moreover, leaders committed to cooperation on combating narcotics and creating new jobs \textit{inter alia} through use of science and

\textsuperscript{658} Political Declaration on the 40th Anniversary of the End of the Second World War, \url{http://www.g7.utoronto.ca/summit/1985bonn/political.html}, 24.01.2010

\textsuperscript{659} Ibidem

\textsuperscript{660} Tokyo Economic Declaration, \url{http://www.g7.utoronto.ca/summit/1986tokyo/communique.html}, 24.01.2010
technology. As the basic values were mentioned peace, freedom, democracy and human
dignity. In the same document the heads of state and government reiterated their “common
dedication to preserving and strengthening peace” through a constructive relationship with
East based on a dialogue and negotiations. They also announced that “we shall work for
improved respect for the rights of individuals throughout the world.” In a separate
document, “Statement on The Implications of The Chernobyl Nuclear Accident”, G7
countries called on the Soviet Union to give all required information in that matter and
expressed satisfaction of the Soviet’s willingness to discuss with the Director General of the
IAEA.

At the Venice Summit 1987, participants debated *inter alia* on East-West relations. They
noticed with satisfaction “recent developments in the internal and external policies of the
Soviet Union,” what should lead to lower tensions and arms reductions. They also
welcomed the intensification of dialogue on arms control and expressed hope for the concrete
agreement. For the first time in the official declaration leaders in a so clear way raised
political and ideological matters of the Soviet Union. Namely, they called for “significant and
lasting progress in human rights” as it was foreseen in the Helsinki Final Act. They also called
for “an early and peaceful resolution of regional conflicts, and especially for a rapid and total
withdrawal of Soviet forces from Afghanistan” as well as for “greater contacts, freer
interchange of ideas and more extensive dialogue between our people and the people of the
Soviet Union and Eastern Europe.” In the end, representatives of G7 countries stressed that
“freedom, democracy and respect for human rights are the source of the dynamism and
prosperity of our societies.” Additionally, in the Chairman’s Summary on Political Issues
appeared for the first time a clear condemnation of the apartheid policy and announcement of
help for its victims.

In the Toronto Declaration 1988, for the first time leaders assessed activities of hitherto
summits. They stated that these meetings had lead to greater political and economic solidarity
and to sustainment of the democratic values in their countries what had a positive influence on

---
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the wider world community: “Summits have proven an effective forum to address the issues facing the world economy, promote new ideas and develop a common sense of purpose.”666 In the “Political Declaration”, participants of the Toronto Summit raised a question of East-West relations. They noticed with satisfaction changes that had occurred in the Soviet Union, namely greater freedom and openness as well as the decision on withdrawing Soviet soldiers from Afghanistan. That all, together with a progress on nuclear weapons reductions, in an asset of the G7 had contributed to reduction of mistrust and to maintenance of peace. However, leaders were still concerned at the “the massive presence of Soviet conventional forces in Eastern Europe” expressed through the Warsaw Pact and at the “Soviet military build-up in the Far East”667, what occurred instability in Asia. They called again for the ban on chemical weapons and for respect for human rights, especially stressing necessity of removing handicaps to emigration. Additionally, the G7 called on countries in Eastern Europe to open their economies and societies as well as respect human rights. With great satisfaction was noticed the growing interest of these countries in ending their economic isolation. G7 countries reiterated their condemnation of apartheid, calling for non-racial democracy in South Africa.668

Year 1989 and the Paris Summit were crucial for East-West relations. In the “Declaration on East-West Relations”, leaders confirmed that they see “desire for greater freedom and democracy in the East” and actions of some leaders of the Eastern bloc aimed at “a pluralist democratic society.”669 They strongly condemned all, who are against these efforts taking repressive measures and expressed hope that “after decades of military confrontation, ideological antagonism and mistrust” there would be time for an effective cooperation. G7 countries underlined that they belief that new attitude of the Soviet Union would be transformed into concrete actions. They stressed that still the military imbalance in favour of Soviet in Europe and Asia was the reason for maintenance of strategic deterrence through relevant conventional and nuclear forces. Leaders noticed with satisfaction the beginning of the reform in Poland and Hungary, announcing at the same time necessary economic assistance in order to create fully competitive economies. Additionally, there was announced
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help from the European Community’s side and from the IMF and the Paris Club, which were supposed to offer a new debt strategy for Poland. Generally, in the East-West relations the G7 noted a significant change that was supposed to be a basis “to work together to find just solutions to conflicts around the world, to fight against underdevelopment, to safeguard the resources and the environment and to build a freer and more open world.” In a Paris was also published the “Declaration on Human Rights”, in memory of 100th anniversary of French revolution and 40th of the UN’s Universal Declaration on Human Rights. The G7 reiterated its affection to freedom, democracy, the rule of law, human rights and rights and liberties of citizens. Leaders announced further development of international standards of human rights and their promotion. They stressed the importance of freedom of thought, conscience, religion, opinion and expression, plurality of opinion and freedom of association. They condemned tortures underlying a right of every man to psychical integrity and dignity. The heads of state and government announced actions to fight against extreme poverty as everyone has a right to equality of opportunity and to own property. They stressed necessity of special care for children, the disabled and the seniors. Moreover, they noticed that actions of human sciences such as e.g. genetic research must comply with all human rights and human dignity. In the end, they once more stressed the role of democracy as the best guarantor for human rights and freedoms. Generally, the letter from the Mikhail Gorbachev to the president of France was directed to all participants of the Paris Summit. Gorbachev presented there “some ideas about the key problems of the world economy” and paid attention to “a stable interdependence” as a guarantee of international economic security. He stated that in order to adjust to the new shape of the international economy the Soviet Union had implemented the policy of “perestroika” that was supposed to lead to “full and complete participation in the world economy.” Gorbachev noticed that a lot of contradictions exist in relations between the USSR and the rest of the Western world; however one could see here positive changes inter alia through the establishment of CMEA-EEC relations (Council for Mutual Economic Co-operation-European Economic Community). The Soviet Union announced also its help for countries of Third World: “We are in favour of collective assistance to development, in favour of coordinating the actions of creditors and debtors, of
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Donors and debt-collectors, in favour of extending multilateral forms of aid.” In spite of this, there was also paid attention to the process of economic integration around the world. Gorbachev stressed that “It is becoming urgent that we understand each other concerning the methodology for measuring and harmonizing economic processes, a methodology acceptable to all countries and for universal use.” To achieve the best cooperation he proposed establishing of professional contacts in a form of e.g. meetings of governments experts which would let on “a reciprocal exchange of information” in various areas.673

At the Houston Summit 1990, participants already in the first sentence raised an issue of “the renaissance of democracy”.674 They expressed satisfaction of even more popular throughout the world such values as multiparty democracy, free election, the freedom of expression and assembly, the rule of law, human rights and open economy. Transformations in Europe were, according to leaders, an example of the fact that “when people are free to choose, they choose freedom.” G7 countries announced assistance for all on the world who strive for achievement and sustainment of economic prosperity and political freedom.675 In the political declaration “Securing Democracy” was written: “As we enter the final decade of this century, which we intend should be a Decade of Democracy, we reiterate our commitment to support the strengthening of democracy, human rights, and economic reconstruction and development through market-oriented economies.”676 Because of historical changes in Europe the heads of state and government expressed hope that NATO transformation,677 unification of Germany and efforts of the European Community would contribute to creation of stable, free and peaceful Europe. They also welcomed some positive changes towards more political openness in Mongolia, Nepal, Philippines, China, Namibia, South Africa and in some countries of Latin
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677 The London Declaration on a Transformed North Atlantic Alliance: On 6 July 1990, the Heads of State or Government of the Member States of the North Atlantic Treaty Organisation (NATO) issue the London Declaration on a transformed North Atlantic Alliance. The Declaration includes a series of proposals aimed at fostering cooperation with the countries of Central and Eastern Europe (CEECs) through a wide range of political and military activities and, in particular, through the establishment of regular diplomatic contacts between these countries and NATO.
America. At the same time, leaders expressed concern at re-emergence of intolerance effecting ethnic and religious groups, which could cause conflicts. In that document was announced the assistance for countries in the process of transformation through “the provision of constitutional, legal, and economic know-how and through economic assistance, as appropriate.”

G7 countries called also on other industrialized democracies stressing the fact that political freedom and economic liberty are multilaterally reinforcing. Representatives of seven countries gathered in Houston debated also on the situation in the USSR and Gorbachev’s propositions. They accepted Soviet offer on sustained economic dialogue and decision on perestroika: “We welcome the efforts underway in the Soviet Union to liberalize and to create a more open, democratic, and pluralistic Soviet society, and to move toward a market-oriented economy.” They decided to help the USSR individually and collectively through technical assistance and large-scale financial credits, underlying necessity of further shift of Soviet resources away from military sector towards economic sector. To organize in a better way process of help, G7 countries decided to use structures of the IMF, the World Bank, the OECD, the EBRD and the European Community. Additionally, leaders mentioned the necessity of peaceful resolution of Japan and the Soviet Union disagreement on Northern Territories. Moreover, in the political declaration it was added that “We are heartened by indications that a constructive dialogue is underway between the Soviet government and the Baltic states, and we urge all sides to continue this dialogue in a democratic spirit.”

At the London Summit 1991, once more the situation in the Soviet Union was reflected in a separate chapter of the economic declaration. Participants reiterated necessity of help in integrating the USSR into the world economy and in political transformation, stressing at the same time need of mobilisation of own Soviet natural and human resources. They also invited Gorbachev to the meeting in order to discuss reform policies and their implementation, noticing that “We are sensitive to the overall political context in which reforms are being conducted, including the "New Thinking" in Soviet foreign policy around the world. We are
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sensitive also to the importance of shifting resources from military to civilian use. G7 countries raised also a question of developing countries which based (and should base) their reform policies on the following rules: human rights and respect for the law; democratic pluralism and open systems of administration; and market-based economic policies. They also expressed satisfaction of the interest from the OECD side at migration phenomena as “there is a growing concern about worldwide migratory pressures, which are due to a variety of political, social and economic factors.” However, one of the main subject of the London Summit were propositions of strengthening the UN system, as according to the G7, it was vital to achieve the goal which was defined in the following way: “to underpin democracy, human rights, the rule of law and sound economic management, which together provide the key to prosperity.” In London, was also published the political declaration “Strengthening the International Order”, where was announced reinforcement of international system, in which the UN plays the central role: “We commit ourselves to making the UN stronger, more efficient and more effective in order to protect human rights, to maintain peace and security for all and to deter aggression.” Leaders paid special attention to the preventive diplomacy. Additionally, they gave strong support for the UN’s role in peacekeeping and decided to strengthen UN relief in coping with emergences through inter alia establishing a high level official for international response to emergences, answerable only to the UN Secretary General.

In the introduction to the economic declaration of the Munich Summit 1992, the heads of state and government stressed that the international community was “at the threshold of a new era, freed from the burden of the East-West conflict” and for that reason cooperation was more
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necessary than ever. They strongly underlined the importance of cooperation among developing countries because “Economic and social progress can only be assured if countries mobilise their own potential, all segments of the population are involved and human rights are respected.” At the same time leaders reiterated support for the process of building democracy in Central and Eastern Europe, including the Baltic States, and in new independent states of the former Soviet Union. Participants of the Munich Summit had invited President Boris Yeltsin to discuss cooperation in support of profound changes. They declared that “We offer the new States our help for their self help. Our cooperation will be comprehensive and will be tailored to their reform progress and internationally responsible behaviour.” G7 countries expressed hope for adoption of sound economic policies and urgent progress in two sectors agriculture and energy. Moreover, they stressed that “All Summit participants have shown solidarity in a critical situation by providing extensive food aid, credits and medical assistance.” In Munich, was also published a separate political declaration, “Shaping New Partnership”, in which the G7 reiterated its support for democratic revolution that had ended the East-West confrontation and started new chapter of international cooperation. There was announced close collaboration of former East-West countries in the field of economic, political and security matters. Leaders stressed that a partnership could exist if were the following conditions: political and economic freedom, respect for human rights, democracy, justice and the rule of law. They also expressed hope for cooperation among regions. Additionally, G7 countries enthusiastically welcomed the Maastricht Treaty and the establishment of the North Atlantic Cooperation Council, what should be reflected in security and stability in Europe. However, they expressed concern at nationalism and territorial disputes in the former Yugoslavia and in parts of the former Soviet Union, calling for international cooperation on solving conflicts. They also expressed faith in realisation of the Russian’s commitment to lead foreign policy based on the rule of law and justice what would help to solve territorial disagreement between Russia and Japan on Northern Territories.
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Once more leaders raised an issue of reinforcing the UN system, stressing its central role in the crisis prevention, conflict management and the protection of minorities. The G7 called on new members of the UN to respect principles of the UN Charter as well as condemned all actions leading to creation of new waves of refugees. Leaders expressed satisfaction of the Secretary General’s report “An Agenda for Peace”, announcing political support and resources for the UN in order to maintain international peace and security. In the last sentence of the political declaration G7’s representatives stated that “The protection and the promotion of human rights remain one of the principal tasks of the community of nations.”

In the economic declaration of the Tokyo meeting 1993, G7 countries noticed with satisfaction that “Progress around the world towards democracy and open market economies surpasses our most optimistic expectations of only some years ago.” However, at the same time leaders were aware that still were present conflicts which have roots in the past and for that reason it was necessary to strengthen international cooperation “with broader partnership and scope.” They reiterated support for the UN, particularly for increasing its efficiency in preventing diplomacy, peacemaking, peacekeeping and post-conflict peace building. They stressed the importance of regional cooperation appreciating involvement of regional organizations in Europe, Africa, Americas and Asia-pacific in maintaining regional security dialogues. Moreover, they announced special interest at resolving an issue of increased number of refugees and displaced people as well as uncontrolled migration. At the Tokyo Summit, President Yeltsin had published a statement, in which he stressed the importance of reforms, which took place in Russia during the last year, towards democratic society: “A democratic Russia is a major factor in the stability of the world.” He declared willingness of close cooperation with the G7 in various fields in order to secure peace and eliminate

---
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WMD. In response to that declaration, G7 countries agreed to give further financial support to improve economic situation in Russia and to implement a nuclear safety program.\textsuperscript{698}

In documents of the Naples Summit 1994, one can see continuation of the subject of the UN reform. The G7 significantly stressed financial obligations of UN members that let on effective fulfilment of the UN role. Leaders paid attention to the importance of regional organizations in the field of preventive diplomacy and peacekeeping, stressing that their actions should be consistent with the UN Charter and CSCE documents, “We also emphasize that a mandate is to be sought from the UN when peacekeeping forces can be confronted with the need to use force beyond the requirements of self-defence.”\textsuperscript{699} They expressed satisfaction of the establishment of the position of a UN High Commissioner for Human Rights what should contribute to better promotion and protection of human rights in the world. G7 countries announced also necessity of establishing more official means to respond promptly to humanitarian emergencies world-wide as well as strengthening actions against racism, racial discrimination, xenophobia, aggressive nationalism, anti-Semitism and other forms of intolerance. Additionally, leaders reiterated they support for reforms in Russia and other countries in transition, underlying that in accordance to arrangements with President Yeltsin “We intend to cooperate on such topics as transnational crime, money laundering, and nuclear safety.”\textsuperscript{700}

The meeting in Halifax 1995 was in large extent devoted to the G7 ideology. In the final declaration were published such chapters as “Promoting Sustainable Development”, “Reducing Poverty”, or “Preventing and Responding to Crisis”. Participants of that venue stated that “Democracy, human rights, transparent and accountable governance, investment in people and environmental protection are the foundations of sustainable development”\textsuperscript{701} and while the fundamental responsibility in this subject rested with individual countries, still it was necessary to cooperate on such international fora as the UN or the Bretton Woods institutions where “The UN offers a unique forum for consensus building on global priorities,
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is an advocate for core values, and responds to development and humanitarian needs.”

Leaders described also series of actions that were supposed to help multilateral institutions in realising sustainable development. Moreover, the G7 as a priority set the fight against extreme poverty and marginalization of the poorest countries what was influencing not only on the world-wide prosperity but also on international security. Leaders mentioned also concrete actions throughout the Paris Club, World Bank, the IMF, and the WTO aimed at improving economic situation of the poorest countries. They noticed necessity of improving process of reacting to disasters and other crises connected e.g. with the refugees or human rights as well as the need of reinforcing the role of the Department of Humanitarian Affairs in the UN structure.

As in 1995 was the 50th anniversary of the end of the Second World War and of the establishment of the UN, leaders stressed the positive role that the UN had played during the Cold War. They reiterated commitment to principles of the UN Charter and the need of reforming this organisation in a way that would enable an effective and fast reaction to threats for international peace and security: “A high priority should be placed on the early warning of crises, political mediation and, in accordance with realistic mandates, the rapid deployment of UN civilian and military personnel, including peacekeepers, to areas of conflict.” They called on all member states to fulfil their financial organisations to conduct the modernization of command and control equipment, logistical arrangements and facilities. G7 countries with Russia called also for fast implementation of the UN Convention for the Safety of United Nations and Associated Personnel. They expressed satisfaction of the increasing role of regional organizations in building stability and security, at the same time stressing necessity of cooperation between them and the UN. Representatives of states gathered in Halifax unanimously agreed that there was a need of creating new approaches toward such issues as environmental degradation, unsustainable population growth, mass displacement of victims of conflict and involuntary migration. There was underlined the importance of NGOs in such areas as human rights or humanitarian assistance, calling on them to coordination with the UN and other organisations. The G7 reiterated support for rights of individuals, promotion of good governance and democratic accountability, at the same time condemning any signs of discrimination and intolerance. In the end leaders called on all states to comply with the
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Universal Declaration of Human Rights and to cooperate with courts, tribunals, investigative commissions in case of human rights violations within boundaries of international and domestic law.705

The 1996 Lyon Summit focused mainly on consequences of globalization process: “we are convinced that the process of globalization is a source of hope for the future.”706 In the economic declaration, chapter IV was devoted to a new global partnership for development between developing countries, developed countries and multilateral institutions, which was supposed to enable developing countries to take advantage of the benefits of globalisation. A significant part of the economic communiqué was devoted to the reform of the UN system. As basic tasks for the UN were mentioned: reducing poverty; increasing employment; housing the provision of essential services, especially those relating to health and education; advancing women; protecting children; giving humanitarian assistance in general; promoting democracy, human rights and the rule of law; protecting the environment; giving emergency relief; and helping the poorest countries through technical assistance in full participation in the international trade and investment. Leaders admitted that in order to fulfil its obligations, the UN should enhance efficiency of its Secretariat and operational framework. The UN should consolidate tasks and improve cooperation among its structure and with other international organizations to avoid duplication of activities. Savings that would emerge from this reform should be devoted to development programs. The heads of state and government expressed satisfaction of the renewal of the UNCTAD, what was particularly important for integration of developing countries into international trade system. They also called for better cooperation between the UN agencies (such as the UNDP) and international financial institutions (such as the World Bank, the IMF and the WTO) what would allow to limit duplication, to rationalise work of donors and to introduce a comprehensive approach to non-military aspects of peace operations.707 In the political declaration, “Toward Greater Security and Stability in a More Cooperative World”, was written: “We are committed to achieving early and practical results in the renewal of the UN so that, for both individuals and countries, it can more readily and
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effectively respond to the demands placed on it, and more clearly demonstrate its importance to the search for solutions to our globally shared problems.”

Leaders of seven countries and Russia decided on intensification of their efforts in the working groups established for that reason by the General Assembly as well as on cooperation with other countries belonging to the UN system. They also announced elaborating of new long-term plan of financial obligation based on more equitable scale of contributions. Once more they reiterated the significant role of the UN as a body responsible for international peace and security, and because of that leaders gave significant support for the development of “more flexible instruments for peace, including mediation by elder statesmen and United Nations representatives...We favour strengthening the United Nations’ capacity for rapid deployment by further developing the stand-by arrangements initiative and the rapidly deployable headquarters team, as well as other efforts to enhance the Secretariat's ability to deploy new peacekeeping operations quickly and manage existing ones effectively.” Participants of the Lyon Summit warmly welcomed the international help for countries needing restoration after conflicts as well as contribution of regional organizations in international stability. G7 countries set as a goal to reduce tensions and resolve conflicts, stressing that achieving peace and stabilization in the world is possible only if exist respect for human rights, democratic institutions, individual citizen’s security as well as are realize sustainable development and economic security. They also noticed that interdependence was growing and “Major issues need to be treated at a global level.” Each country must have tackled with such issues as environmental protection, nuclear safety, terrorism, TOC or new types of epidemics, however effective solutions could be found only through close cooperation. Leaders gathered in Lyon reiterated their faith in universality of human rights and fundamental freedoms, gave support for the High Commissioner for Human Rights at the UN as well as for actions of the International Tribunals which prosecute and trial people indicated for violations of human rights in the Former Yugoslavia and Rwanda. Moreover, the heads of state and government appreciated assistance gave by the NGOs countries in process of democratization, reminding the G7’s engagements in this field inter alia by helping organize free and impartial elections. In the economic declaration, its signatories expressed also satisfaction of transformational achievements of countries in Central and Eastern Europe and Russia. They also reminded that

---
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economic and political reforms are mutually reinforcing and announced further political and economic support for Russia.  

The Denver Summit 1997 was the first one where in the final declaration was officially used a form: “Summit of Eight”. Almost whole introduction in final communiqué was devoted to relationship with Russia. There was admitted that “Russia has taken bold measures to complete an historic transformation into a democratic state with a market economy.”

Previous G7 leaders announced continuation of actions aimed at greater Russia’s participation in the summit process and in works between summits. For that reason they gave support to Russia’s access to the WTO and the OECD and welcomed agreement between Russia and the Paris Club. An important question for participants of the Denver Summit was the consequence of globalisation. They announced intensification of efforts in order to make possible for all countries and all segments of society to take advantages of prosperity of global integration and technological innovations as well as of international peace and security, where the crucial role play the UN. They also expressed satisfaction of progress in implementing the UN reform, stressing at the same time necessity of executing the financial reform not only form the donors’ side but also in the budget system of the UN. For that reason they called for urgent revision of the UN’s funds, programs as well as roles and mandates of specialized agencies and commissions. Leaders announced support for the further development of the UN’s capacities in conflict prevention and resolving. They also paid attention to the role of the UN in the process of economic and social help for Africa as well as welcomed cooperation between African leaders and the UN in conflict prevention, peacekeeping and post-conflict recovery. G8 countries declared their political cooperation to build secure and stable international community, announcing also common actions against those who are threat to principles of international cooperation: “We recognize our common interest and responsibility in helping bring an end to conflicts that threaten to disturb international peace and to undermine our deepened cooperation.” Additionally, they declared strong affection to democratic values, offering help in its maintaining and implementing in places where they were still absent. Because of 50th anniversary of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights in 1989, leaders announced that “Our efforts will focus on promoting good governance and
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the rule of law, strengthening civil society, expanding women's political participation, and boosting business and labour support for democracy, particularly in young democracies and societies in conflict.” In the end, eight leaders announced works on adoption of an International Labour Organization Convention on the eradication of intolerable forms of child labour as well as they called on their ministers to present recommendations in these fields at the next summit.712

The venue in Birmingham 1998 was focused mainly on economic issues. Ideological matters were quite widely presented in the documents published at the G8 foreign ministers meeting in London. There was stressed the G8 commitment in sustainable development and poverty reduction as well as a lot of space was devoted to the UN reform, which in above mentioned issues was an important factor. The most important challenge were the UN financial problems so ministers underlined that “We must find a solution which includes full and timely payment of obligations, and development of a more logical and more equitable scale of assessment.”713

They supported Kofi Annan’s recommendation on increasing capabilities of the UN in conflict prevention and recommendations on addressing conflict in Africa as well as officially confirmed the central role of the UNDP in peace building. Ministers decided that there was a need of establishing an effective International Criminal Court. Moreover, they announced series of actions aimed at promoting human rights such as increase of the human rights awareness; providing political and financial support for the High Commissioner for Human Rights; efforts to early conclusion of a ILO’s Convention on Extreme Forms of Child Labour; adoption of the ILO’s Declaration on Core Labour Standards; adoption of voluntary codes of ethical business practices; commitment to democracy, development, human rights and peace and good governance in developing countries; and promotion of government-sponsored organizations which promote democracy.714

At the Cologne Summit 1999, G8 countries focused mainly on a way of controlling the results of the globalisation process and on an issue of coming 21st century. Next to these questions, they came back to the situation in Russia, expressing satisfaction of agreements between Russia and the IMF and World Bank. They also stated that “We agreed to intensify our dialogue within the G8 structures on the longer term social, structural and economic reform in
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As the most basic areas of common cooperation were mentioned: small business
development; strengthened cooperation with regions; health; the social impact of economic
transformation; law enforcement; fighting organized crime; and money laundering. G8
countries noticed that the process of integration and rapid changes brought not only benefits
but also disadvantages such as feelings unable to keep up by some individuals and groups. For
that reason they decided that one of the G8’s goals should be bestowing “human face” upon
globalisation what could be able through inter alia strengthening social security policies.
Leaders underlined that in spite of financial difficulties caused by the wave of financial crisis
in 1997/98, it was necessary to maintain investment in basic social services. “Democracy, the
rule of law, good governance and respect for human rights and for core labour standards are
further indispensable prerequisites for social stability.” This meant that not only financial
support but also respect for some values contribute to social security. The G8 called on the
IMF to support and monitor social policy and infrastructure in developing countries. Leaders
support on actions of the UN, the OECD or the ILO in this area. Moreover, they paid attention
to the necessity of reinforcing the mechanism of conflict prevention that should focus on roots
of conflict. They proposed the following actions to improve ability to prevent crisis: effective
monitoring of risks and causes of conflicts; coordination of G8’s security, economic,
environmental and developing policies; strengthening the UN capacity in this area; regular
monitoring of military expenditure in the context of general public expenditure; support for
regional organizations and arrangements; promotion of free press; establishment of fair
electoral process; improvement of the democratic accountability and functioning of
legislatures, of judicial systems and military and police forces; improvement of human rights
monitoring and advocacy.716

The Okinawa Summit 2000, because of its particular time- the beginning of new millennium,
focused on subjects that were supposed to describe the G8’s role and its development in the
21st century. Leaders also summed up hitherto events which had happened since the first
summit in Rambouillet 1975, “During the last quarter of the 20th century, the world economy
has achieved unprecedented levels of prosperity, the Cold War has come to an end, and
globalisation has led to an emerging common sense of community.”717 As causative factors of
these events were mentioned: the global promotion of basic principles and values advocated
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by the Summiteers; democracy; market economy; social progress; sustainable development; and respect for human rights. At the same time, leaders marked that they were aware of the fact that in many places in the world still exist poverty, injustice and human suffering. For that reason as goals for the next century they planned inter alia to find solutions to tackle with causes of poverty and conflicts. Moreover, they called for more effective use of new technologies in the field of life sciences, information and communication in order to maximise for all benefits of globalization: “In a world of ever-intensifying globalisation, whose challenges are becoming increasingly complex, the G8 must reach out.” The G8 announced establishing of a new partnership with non-G8 countries, international organizations and the civil society, including NGOs as well as expressed hope that arrangements of the Okinawa Summit would contribute to a new vision of the UN for 21st century. Leaders raised in the declaration for the first time the importance of cultural diversity, which “is a source of social and economic dynamism...it inspires creativity and stimulates innovation.” They welcomed actions of international organizations in this area, especially the UNESCO, reminding that promoting of cultural diversity building mutual respect, inclusion and non-discrimination and help combating racism and xenophobia. Basic for cultural diversity is preservation and promotion of cultural heritage. Additionally, G8 countries paid attention to the fact that “IT opens up unprecedented opportunities for individuals to create and share cultural content and ideas inexpensively and worldwide” and they announced promotion of digitalisation of cultural heritage. In the declaration was stressed that in order to achieve so precious state as peace and stability of international community there are necessary actions to prevent and resolve violent conflicts. The results of conflict are the dead and injured, the devastated economies and environment and these negative effects in today interdependent world spread very fast. Because of that it is necessary to promote a “Culture of Prevention” throughout the world and all participants of international relations should strive for resolving their disputes by peaceful means, in accordance to the Charter of the UN. Leaders expressed special concern at the illicit trade in diamonds what contribute to armed conflicts, in particular in Africa and called for a conference, whose results would be submitted to the UN. They also announced support for works of their ministers of foreign affairs on conflict prevention, who discussed on that subject in Berlin 1999 and in Miyazaki 2000 and who published their conclusions in the “G8 Miyazaki Initiatives for Conflict Prevention”. In this document, next to the “Culture of Prevention”, had appeared the
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idea of a “Comprehensive Approach” which includes Chronological Comprehensiveness (efforts need to be made at every stage: from pre-conflict to post-conflict) and Comprehensiveness in Measures for Conflict Prevention, all this should be coherent to an individual conflict. Primary responsibility for maintaining peace and security belongs to the UN Security Council and the UN Secretary General, however G8 foreign ministers also stated that “While the principal responsibility for preventing conflicts lies with the parties directly concerned, conflict prevention is a joint venture involving all the international community, including other international and regional organizations, states, business sector, NGOs, and individuals.”

In the “G8 Miyazaki Initiatives for Conflict Prevention” was clearly stated that the G8 support every international action aimed at preventing conflict. There were presented five main G8’s initiatives in the field of conflict prevention. First one was aimed at elaborating projects, which would provide measures for fight against uncontrolled and illegal transfer of small arms and light weapons. The second one concerned taking advantage of the fact that the G8 is a main provider of development assistance and taking special steps in three areas: promoting the consideration of conflict prevention in G8’s development assistance strategies; focusing help to ensure quick action to prevent conflict; and ensuring a smooth transition from emergency humanitarian assistance to development assistance in the post-conflict stage. The next initiative focused on fighting the illicit trade in diamonds, especially in Africa, which provides funds for arms purchases. Fourth one tackled with the impact of violent conflict on children. The last one concerned reinforcing capacity of international civilian police, which was a critical element in conflict prevention.

Issue of conflict prevention was continued in the debate of G8 foreign ministers at the next meeting in Rome, before the Genoa Summit 2001. There was discussed inter alia the progress in five areas agreed in Miyazaki. Minsters announced special attention to the questions of conflict and development, to cooperative and sustainable water management, disarmament, demobilisation and reintegration. They also worked out additional G8 Rome Initiatives on Conflict Prevention, which were addressing actions in two areas: strengthening the contribution of women in conflict prevention, resolution and peace building; and
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incorporating the private sector into the process of conflict prevention (role of the Corporate Social responsibility).\textsuperscript{722} The heads of state and government in their final communiqué of Genoa reiterated necessity of a broad partnership with civil society and the private sector and stressed that: “we believe in the fundamental importance of open public debate on the key challenges facing our societies.”\textsuperscript{723}

The Kananaskis Summit 2002, was special not only because of a difficult international situation occurred after 9/11 attacks but also because of historical decision on giving Russia the right to host G8 annual summit in 2006. In a special statement, “Russia’s role in the G8”, was noted that “This decision reflects the remarkable economic and democratic transformation that has occurred in Russia in recent years and in particular under the leadership of President Putin.”\textsuperscript{724} Moreover, G8 leaders published a separate statement, “G8 Conflict Prevention: Disarmament, Demobilisation and Reintegration (DDR)”, that announced a new approach to a definition of DDR presented in the Miyazaki Initiative. There was agreed that exist some essential conditions for successful DDR such as a peace agreement with genuine commitment from all parties; proper coordination and clear leadership within the groups of actors involved in DDR; and the personnel, material and financial resources. The heads of state and government paid attention to the fact that the central point of any DDR process is disarmament, but equally important is reintegration: “Ideally reintegration should offer incentives to soldiers to return to civilian life, including access to health and education programmes...reintegration incentives should focus on the establishment of a visibly successful, long-term reintegration programme, which goes beyond military intervention and emergency humanitarian assistance into long term development assistance.”\textsuperscript{725} There was presented the series of concrete actions to support DDR in the context of peace building and development, and the G8 committed inter alia to support every DDR programs and to elaborate national expertises necessary for creating a coherent DDR plan.\textsuperscript{726}

The next reference to G8 values and beliefs was clearly visible in the document of Sea Island Summit 2004, “G8 Action Plan: Expanding Global Capability for Peace Support
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Operations”. 727 Leaders stated there that “The number of peace support operations throughout the world continues to grow, increasing the need for the international community to respond with military and related complex security operations to bring the stability and security that is fundamental to social, economic, and political progress in countries in crisis.” 728 They noticed that together with an increase of peace support operations around the world there is no increase of well-trained and equipped units. Units such as carabinieri/gendarme-like forces could fill the security gap between military forces and civilian police, and form this aroused idea of a G8 Action Plan to expand global capability for peace support operations. Authors stressed that each nation would take sovereign decision on deploying its units to a particular peace operation and “All peace support operations and other related activities undertaken by G8 members under this initiative would be in accordance with the UN charter. Moreover...all actions undertaken by the G8 to expand global capability for peace support operations should be implemented in close cooperation with the UN, in accordance with its technical standards, and take into account the recommendations of the Brahimi Report.” G8 countries committed to train and equip approximately 75 000 troops worldwide by 2010; to enhance African peace support operations capabilities and to build such capabilities in other regions by 2010; to develop a transportation and logistics support arrangement; and to support existing training centres for carabinieri/gendarme-like forces and new initiatives in that respect. To achieve these goals they announced inter alia creation of a common doctrine and common operational standards for carabinieri/gendarme-like forces in peace support operations. Leaders underlined that “We look forward to the day when these units are no longer needed, but until then we acknowledge that expanding global capability for peace support operations is a critical element to a safer and more secure world.” 729 Participants of the Sea Island Summit announced also support for democratic, social and economic reforms in the region of the Broader Middle East and North Africa. They welcomed the statement issued at the Arab League Summit in Tunis, in which was noticed the declaration of Arab leaders ““to firmly

727 Since the Evian Summit one can see a big interest in subjects which could be above all put in the frameworks of human security. They are strongly connected with G8 ideology but because of their special character will be described more detailed in the chapter concerning human security.
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establish the basis for democracy.”730 To support freedom and reform in that region, it was announced in Sea Island “Partnership for Progress and a Common Future”, which was supposed to be based on “genuine cooperation with the region’s governments, as well as business and civil society representatives to strengthen freedom, democracy, and prosperity for all.” There were mentioned such fundamental values as: human dignity, freedom, democracy, the rule of law, economic opportunity and social justice. As a goals of this Partnership were noticed e.g. the resolution of long-lasting disputes, particularly the Israeli-Palestinian conflict or the restoration of peace in Iraq. G8 countries paid attention to the fact that “Each country is unique and their diversity should be respected...Each society will reach its own conclusions about the pace and scope of change. Yet distinctiveness, important as it is, must not be exploited to prevent reform.” In the document were described three area of the Partnership. Firstly, in the political sphere actions toward democracy were announced, as well as the the rule of law, human rights, fundamental freedoms, respect for diversity and pluralism. Secondly, in the social and cultural sphere actions toward education for all were mentioned, freedom of expression, equality between men and women, and access to global information technology. Thirdly, in the economic sphere actions toward creation of new job places, expansion of trade and investment, financial reforms, secure property rights, promotion of transparency and fight with corruption were described.731

The Gleneagles meeting 2005 was disrupted by terrorist attacks in London 07.07.2005. Gathered at the Summit G8 leaders, the leaders of Brazil, China, India, Mexico and South Africa, and the heads of international organisations published immediately the statement, in which they utterly condemned these attacks, expressed condolences for victims and their families, and announced the united fight with terrorism. They also stated that “We will not allow violence to change our societies or our values.”732 Moreover, they stressed that attacks would not disturb in further works of the Summit, which is aimed at combating “world poverty and save and improve human life.”733 G8 countries raised the issue of the 2004 Indian Ocean disaster, calling for improving the global early warning capacity and more effective
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tackling of disaster risk reduction. They noticed that this tsunami had stressed the necessity of reinforcing the humanitarian system and rules of humanity, impartiality, neutrality and independence of humanitarian assistance. Moreover, the G8 expressed satisfaction of progress, made during the last year, in realizing plans presented in the Partnership for Progress and a Common Future with the Broader Middle East and North Africa. Leaders announced further support for regional efforts for political, economic, social and educational reform, stressing the significant need of changes in improving governance, strengthening the rule of law, fighting corruption, promoting equality for women, liberalising media and creating jobs. They reiterated the assumption that “each country is unique and diverse and that our role is to support regionally-led and locally-owned reform.” Additionally, they declared support for the Civil Society and Business Dialogues and the Democracy Assistance Dialogue, calling on them to promote also the role of women through political, educational and economic reform.

The 2006 St Petersburg Summit as well as the 2007 Heiligendamm Summit, to large extent were devoted to matters related mainly with human security. However, the meeting in St Petersburg returned to the issue of international peacekeeping publishing the “G8 Declaration on Cooperation and Future Action on Stabilization and Reconstruction”. There was reiterated that the UN play in this subject the central role, however “The G8 Heads of State commit as a group to establish a more coordinated approach with each other and key external partners to conflict prevention, stabilization and reconstruction that ties together existing initiatives - both inside and outside the G8.” G8 leaders proposed series of measure to improve efficiency of international actions in the following areas: peace support operations, conflict prevention, coordination, awareness of capabilities or gaps, pre-positioning of resources, strengthening of regional organizations, and interoperability.
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Chapter VII
POLITICAL SECTOR

The meeting’s idea of leaders of the most industrialized democracies in Rambouillet 1975, was finding the most optimal response to the increase of oil prices in 1973 made by the OPEC organization, what caused a huge economic crisis. None of the contemporary leaders assumed that the G6 and then the G7 would tackle with questions other than economy. However, it turned out that the politics are indivisibly connected with the economy. Although there were no direct references to political issues in final declarations of the first summits, it quickly turned out that, already since the Rambouillet meeting, leaders could not totally ignore these issues. In the Declaration of Rambouillet was indirectly touched the question of East-West economic relations and their influence on the détente as well as a similar dependence between developed and developing countries. At the press conference after the Puerto Rico Summit 1976, the US Secretary of State Henry Kissinger admitted that “Not in the meetings as such, but at the fringes of the meetings” were discussed political subjects such as e.g. problematic situation in southern Africa and Rhodesia. In 1978, at the Bonn venue in spite of the final declaration was also published the separate statement on air-hijacking, which was talking about the common fight against terrorism and was a reaction to increased hijackings of aeroplanes during last two years. A year later in Tokyo, leaders raised the problem of refugees from Vietnam, Laos and Cambodia, who “poses a humanitarian problem of historic proportions and constitutes a threat to the peace and stability of Southeast Asia.” They announced the material support for refugees and called on the UN to call a special conference in that matter.

The question of refugees returned at the Venice Summit 1980, where the heads of state and government expressed concern at increasing number of refugees around the world. They stressed that in spite of efforts from the G7 as well as from the international community side, it would be impossible to solve that problem, until the responsible states themselves keeping up the policy that caused this situation. In Venice, for the first time, was published the separate statement addressing political issues titled “Political Topics (Afghanistan)”. Leaders
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clearly condemned there the Soviet military occupation of Afghanistan as contradictory to principles of the UN Charter as well as threaten the world peace. They called on the Soviet Union to withdraw all its troops from Afghanistan and announced support for all actions aimed at the political interdependence of states of the region. They also added that “Those governments represented at this meeting which have taken a position against attendance at the Olympic Games vigorously reaffirm their positions.”

In the “Chairman’s Summary of Political Issues” published at the Ottawa Summit 1981, in a wider way than previously was treated a discussion on international affairs. There was stressed that existing crisis, tensions and disputes were threatening the international security and stability, and for that reason they should be managed by the G7 in spirit of solidarity, cooperation and responsibility. The heads of state and government expressed concern at the long-lasting Arab-Israeli dispute and particularly bad situation in Lebanon. Moreover, they raised an issue of East-West relationship, expressing inter alia hope that the USSR would adapt results of the Madrid Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe as well as it would withdraw totally its troops from Afghanistan. The G7 also supported sovereign aspirations of Kampuchean people and called on all governments to refrain from actions which could lead to massive flows of refugees.

At the 1982 Versailles meeting, leaders issued a separate “Statement on Lebanon”, where they expressed shock of huge numbers of dead, injured and the scale of destruction: “We think that this new cycle of violence, if it were to continue, could have disastrous consequences for the whole area.” They called on all the parties to immediate cease of violence and announced actions of each G7 government to restore peace on this area. Moreover, President Mitterrand in his summary mentioned that G7 countries discussed also on the war in the Falklands and stated that “we wished to make a point of affirming our full solidarity with Great Britain whose national interests and national pride have been violated, such solidarity being natural.”

---
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The Williamsburg Summit 1983, focused on economic issues. Political discussions, although surly present, did not reflect in official documents. But leaders gathered in London 1984, issued the special statement on the Iraq-Iran conflict. They expressed concern at the scale of destruction and human suffering as well as called for refrain from mutual attacks and from aggression on shipping of other states. They reiterated that “The principle of freedom of navigation must be respected.”\textsuperscript{744} The heads of state and government expressed also hope that this conflict would not seriously affect world oil supplies and, connected with that, the world economy.

The Bonn Summit published the “Political Declaration on the 40\textsuperscript{th} Anniversary of the End of the Second World War” which was above all the ideological manifest of G7 countries. There was expressed hope for peaceful solution of the issue of German as well as Korean Peninsula division; for an effective dialogue with the Soviet Union; and for a fruitful cooperation with developing countries.\textsuperscript{745}

Not before the Venice Summit 1987, was again published a separate statement on political issues. In the “Statement on Iraq-Iran War and Freedom of Navigation in the Gulf”, once more leaders called for as fast as possible resolution of that conflict using measures proposed by the UN Security Council. They stressed that “The free flow of oil and other traffic through the Strait of Hormuz must continue unimpeded.”\textsuperscript{746} In the “Chairman’s Summary on Political Issues”, the heads of state and government referred to the issue of Afghanistan and Kampuchea sovereignty and expressed hope for a better dialogue between North and South Korea as well as they welcomed economic reform in China and the Philippines. The G7 also admitted that there was a lot to do on the African continent in economic, social and political areas, but particular priority was attached to fighting the apartheid regime in South Africa. They called for the humanitarian assistance for the victims of apartheid and announced support for members of SADCC (Southern African Development Coordination Conference). Moreover, leaders stated that in the Near and Middle east it is necessary to solve the Arab-Israeli dispute and serious situation in Lebanon with the problem of the Palestinian camps. In
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reference to Latin America they discussed on necessity of supporting initiative conducting
democratic governments and regional integration. Additionally, leaders expressed hope that
forthcoming summit in Guatemala would play a positive role in a development of Central
America.\footnote{Chairman's Summary On Political Issues, \url{http://www.g7.utoronto.ca/summit/1987venice/political.html},
27.01.2010}

In the next statement on political issues of the Toronto Summit 1988, were raised three
subjects. First of them was concerning the instable situation in the Middle East. Leaders
declared their support for negotiations in the Arab-Israeli dispute and for “the convening of a
properly structured international conference as the appropriate framework for the necessary
negotiations between the parties directly concerned.”\footnote{Chairman's Summary Of Political Issues, \url{http://www.g7.utoronto.ca/summit/1988toronto/chairman.html},
28.01.2010} They also discussed on the Iraq-Iran
conflict, condemning use by these countries chemical of chemical weapons and proliferation
of ballistic missiles in the region. The second area of the debate addressed South Africa. The
heads of state and government expressed their opinion in three issues: secure of democracy
for the Sharpeville Six in South Africa; South Africa relations with each of the G7’ members
in case of enactment of legislation designed to deprive anti-apartheid organisations of
overseas; and the finishing of the conflict between Angola and Namibia. The last matter
discussed in Toronto concerned the conflict in Cambodia. The G7 called on Vietnamese
troops to withdraw from that country, reminding that Cambodia has full support of the G7 in
its right to self-determination.\footnote{Ibidem}

The Paris Summit 1989 continued the debate in many of earlier mentioned questions. Once
more participants of the meeting condemned the apartheid and called on the South Africa
government to release Nelson Mandela and to start a dialogue with the ANC (African
National Congress), the UDF (United Democratic Front) or other organisations. They
expressed satisfaction of progress of the implementation of Resolution 435 of the UNSC for
the independence of Namibia as well as hope for fast ending of civil war in Angola and
conflict in Mozambique.\footnote{Statement On Southern Africa, \url{http://www.g7.utoronto.ca/summit/1989paris/africa_english.html}, 28.01.2010} Leaders again referred to the situation in Lebanon, giving support
for works of the Committee of the three Arab Heads of State and the mission of the UN aimed
at ceasing fire and implementing political reforms.751 In Cambodia case, they enthusiastically welcomed the French initiative to call an international conference in Paris, which would lead to final conflict resolution and to withdrawal of Vietnamese troops. They also officially appreciated the ASEAN’s efforts in ending that conflict.752 Leaders reiterated once more the necessity of fast resolution of the Arab-Israeli dispute: “Certain recent partisan declarations in Israel, the persistent violence in the occupied territories, as well as the deterioration of living conditions in the West Bank and in Gaza show more clearly than ever that a solution concerning the legitimate political rights of the Palestinian people, as well as the right to security of all of the states in the region, including Israel, is once again an urgent necessity.”753 They agreed that the elections proposed for the occupied territories could significantly contribute to the mutual recognition on the condition that they are in an atmosphere of free expression. Additionally, the heads of state and government called on all countries of Central America to respect human rights and the rule of law.754 They expressed concern at cancellation of elections results in Panama and at repressive measures used toward the opposition in this country.755 There was also published the special “Declaration on China”, in which China was condemned because of violent repressions in defiance of human rights: “We urge the Chinese authorities to cease action against those who have done no more than claim their legitimate rights to democracy and liberty.”756 Leaders announced the suspension of bilateral ministerial and high-level contacts and arm-trade with China; postponement of the examinations of new loans by the World Bank; and extension of stays of those Chinese students who so desire. In the end they called on Chinese authorities to introduce policy that would lead to the cessation of isolation and its greater openness.757 At the next meeting in Houston 1990, political situation in the world was, thanks to transformation in countries of Central and Eastern Europe, one of the most important subjects of the Summit. In the political declaration, “Securing Democracy”, leaders expressed
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satisfaction of subversion of communist regimes in countries of the region: “the introduction of the rule of law and the freedoms that are the bedrock of a democratic state.” Additionally, they called on Romania to take similar steps. With huge enthusiasm was welcomed the unification of Germany and an intention of the Soviet Union to introduce a democratic political system. Summit’s participants also noticed signs of greater openness in Mongolia, Nepal and the Philippines. They announced the maintain of the measures against China agreed at last year’s Summit, at the same time adding that they could be modified if from the China side would occur some more developments. Moreover, leaders expressed hope that talks started between the government and a black majority in South Africa would lead to a peaceful and non-racial democracy. They approvingly applied to changes in Latin America such as a re-establishment of democracy in Chile; free elections in Nicaragua; the dialogue in El Salvador and Guatemala; and the positive evolution in Haiti. They also expressed hope for implementation of democratic tendencies by the governments of Panama and Cuba. In the Chairman’s Statement G7 countries confirmed that they also discussed on such issues as the introduction of democracy in Namibia; changes in Nepal and Mongolia; regional conflicts in Afghanistan, Cambodia and Angola; hard situation in the Middle East; human tragedy in the Horn of Africa and in Ethiopia; dangerous events in Kashmir; resolution of the Northern Territories; as well as a tense situation on the Korean Peninsula, as North Korea had not signed and implemented a nuclear safeguards agreement.

In the document “Strengthening the International Order” of the London Summit 1991, a lot of space was devoted to the G7 ideology and cooperation with the UN, however there was also a long discussion on political issues present in international relations. Leaders mention about the war in Kuwait; hard situation in Iraq, on which were imposed sanctions because of violent repressions against its own citizens; and about the perspectives for introduction of security in Lebanon. They paid special attention to the necessity of introducing a peace process between Israel and Arab states, including the Palestinians, which should be based on resolutions 242 and 338 of the UNSC. They called on the Arabs to suspend their boycott and on Israel to cease building settlements in the occupied territories. The G7 reiterated its support for the democratic reform in countries of Central and Eastern Europe and the Soviet Union, calling

---
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on Albania to introduce similar changes. The heads of state and government expressed concern at situation in Yugoslavia. They called for ending violence in this country and to comply with provisions of the Brioni agreement.\footnote{761} They also welcomed the engagement of the European Community in resolving the conflict in Yugoslavia and supported the dispatch of the EC monitors to that country, within the framework of the CSCE emergency mechanism as well as they announced that “We will do whatever we can, with others in the international community, to encourage and support the process of dialogue and negotiation in accordance with the principles enshrined in the Helsinki Final Act and the Paris Charter for a new Europe, in particular respect for human rights, including rights of minorities and the right of peoples to self-determination in conformity with the Charter of the United Nations and with the relevant norms of international law, including those relating to territorial integrity of states.”\footnote{762} Leaders expressed satisfaction of suppression of the legislative pillars of apartheid in South Africa. At the same time, they expressed hope that the process of establishing new non-racial constitution in that country would be peaceful and nonviolent. In order that new political system had a chance to succeed, G7 countries agreed that the international help for South Africa is necessary to re-build economy, education, health and social sectors.\footnote{763} Additionally, in the Chairman’s Statement was noticed that leaders discussed also on the normalization of relationship between Japan and the Soviet Union; China’s cooperation in opposing Iraqi aggression; North and South Korea’s admission to the UN; peaceful changes in Cambodia, Mongolia and their lack in Afghanistan and Burma; support for democracy tendencies in Central and South Africa; hopes for reconciliation in Ethiopia, Mozambique, Somalia, El Salvador and Guatemala; and the implementation of the bizonal settlement on Cyprus on accordance with the UNSC Resolution 649.\footnote{764}

\footnote{761} The Brioni Agreement is a document signed on the Brijuni islands near Pula, Croatia, on 7 July 1991 by representatives of the Republic of Slovenia, Republic of Croatia and the Socialist Federal Republic of Yugoslavia under the political sponsorship of the European Community. With this document, the SFRY stopped all hostilities on Slovenian territory, thus ending the Slovenian War, whereas Slovenia and Croatia froze independence activities for a period of three months.

\footnote{762} Political Declaration: Strengthening The International Order, \url{http://www.g7.utoronto.ca/summit/1991london/political.html}, 28.01.2010
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\footnote{764} Chairman [British Foreign Secretary Douglas Hurd]'S Statement, \url{http://www.g7.utoronto.ca/summit/1991london/chairman.html}, 28.01.2010
At the Munich Summit 1992, because of complicated political situation around the world, participants had a lot to discuss. One of the issues was the fighting in Karabakh. The G7 called on all the parties to take part in negotiations in Rome and Minsk, and stressed that there would not be accepted any “faits accomplis” made by force. The heads of state and government expressed concern at escalation of the conflict in Republic of Moldova and appealed “to all countries to allow no steps which might serve, politically or materially, to sustain the fighting.” They welcomed the suspension of fights in the southern Ossetia and expressed hope for a quick and peaceful settlement between Russia, Georgia and Ossetia on the basis of CSCE principles. Leaders called also on the Baltic States and Russia to conclude an agreement on the presence of the Soviet troops in these countries, stating that “However, these problems must not be allowed to hinder the application of the principle of international law to the effect that military forces may not be stationed on the territory of another State without its consent.” At the same time they stressed that all minorities in the Baltic States should be equally treated. Moreover, G7 countries expressed their “unqualified support” for the Middle East peace process and their satisfaction of the progress achieved in this field by five multilateral working groups. They called on Iraq to comply with the Security Council resolutions, to eliminate its WMD, to release all prisoners, to equal treating of its minorities and to stop repressions against the peoples of Iraq. Moreover, leaders expressed concern at North Korea’s nuclear weapons program, calling for implementation of the IAEA Safeguards Agreement and for a deeper dialogue with the South. They welcomed recent economic reforms in China and adoption of principles of the NPT and the MTCR, expressing at the same time hope for improvement of situation in the area of respecting human rights and for playing by China “a more constructive role in the international sphere.” Though G7 countries admitted that “In Africa respect for basic human rights, political pluralism and market economy systems are gaining ground”, nevertheless situation in Ethiopia, Somalia and other places were alarming. They also appealed to all sides in South Africa to cease violence and return to negotiations leading to a non-racial democracy. In reference to Latin America, leaders appreciated efforts in direction of consolidating democracy and market economy structures as well as increasing awareness of that region of a necessity of joining international cooperation against global threats. They expressed satisfaction of Brazil and Argentina decisions on inspections of their nuclear activities and on consideration of signing safeguards

Chairman [German Foreign Minister Klaus Kinkel]’S Statement,
http://www.g7.utoronto.ca/summit/1992munich/chairman.html, 28.01.2010
agreements with the IAEA. In the political declaration the heads of state and government underlined that “The full and immediate implementation of all CSCE commitments is essential in building security and stability in Europe.” They called for strengthening the CSCE’s capabilities for conflict prevention, crisis management and peaceful resolution of disputes as well as for establishing a security cooperation forum at the Helsinki Summit. They also expressed concern at the situation in Cambodia, stressing that such existing regional frameworks in Asia-pacific region, as the ASEAN Post Ministerial Conferences and the Asia Pacific Economic Cooperation play an important role in promoting peace and security. Because of conflict in the former Yugoslavia was published the separate declaration, in which were stiffly condemned the actions directed against civilian populations and expulsion of ethnic groups, underlying that greater responsibility for this state of affairs laid on the Serbian leadership and the Yugoslav Army. The G7 supported the EC Conference on Yugoslavia chaired by Lord Carrington as a main forum aimed at elaborating political solutions to the situation in the former Yugoslavia, at the same time expressing satisfaction of consultancies between this forum and the EC, the UN and other parties. Leaders stressed the tragic humanitarian situation, especially in Bosnia and Herzegovina; called for restoration of Sarajevo and for ceasing attacks on people engaged in the relief operation. As the previous aid passed in the airlift to Sarajevo was insufficient to appease the needs of hundreds of thousands of refugees and displaced people, the G7 announced that “We are willing to contribute and ask others also to make fair contributions.” G7 countries called on Serbia and Croatia to respect the territorial integrity of Bosnia and Herzegovina and on all military forces not subject to the authority of the government of Bosnia and Herzegovina to withdraw or disband and disarm. They also urged the Serbian leadership to respect minority rights, stop repression in Kosovo and define a status of autonomy according to the draft convention of the EC Conference on Yugoslavia. The Group of Seven gave its support for the UN peace plan for Croatia and announced that would not accept Serbia and Montenegro “as the sole successor
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state of the former Yugoslavia**, at the same time calling for the suspension of the Yugoslavia’s delegation in all international fora and organisations.

The Tokyo Summit to a lesser extent discussed on political issues. Its participants expressed satisfaction of announcing the Provisional National Government in Cambodia; restoration of the legitimate authorities in Haiti and progress toward democracy free from apartheid in South Africa. They called on Israel and the Arab States to increase efforts to establish long-lasting peace in the Middle East as well as on Iraq and Libya to implement all relevant UNSC resolutions. Leaders expressed also concern at the situation in Iran and appealed the government of this country to cooperate with international community to achieve peace and stability. Because of the even worse situation in the former Yugoslavia they reminded about the necessity of respecting arrangements of the London Conference and territorial integrity of Bosnia and Herzegovina. Moreover, they sharply opposed any solutions dictated by Serbs and the Croats at the expense of the Bosnian Muslims: “If the Serbs and Croats persist in dismembering Bosnia through changes of border by force or ethnic cleansing, they will place themselves beyond the pale of the international community and cannot expect any economic or commercial assistance, especially reconstruction aid.”

The G7 underlined the necessity of the full and immediate implementation of the UNSC Resolutions and safe areas as well as declared help in implementing the UNSCR 836 by sending troops, by air protection of the UNPROFOR, by financial and logistical contributions or by appropriate diplomatic actions. In the end, leaders called on the Serbian government to receive back the expelled CSCE monitors to Kosovo and elsewhere in Serbia as well as to increase their number.

The meeting in Naples 1994 was exceptional and important because for the first time in history the President of Russia fully participated in the political discussions. In the Chairman’s Statement leaders called on all parties of the Bosnian conflict to accept the plan presented to them in Geneva before July 19th, in order to prevent the renewal of war on a larger scale: “We shall ensure that the measures made known to the parties in the event of either acceptance or refusal are implemented.” They announced support for the UN Action Plan for Sarajevo’s restoration as well as expressed hope for peace in Croatia and for success

---
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**772 Ibidem**

**773 Chairman’s Statement (Political), [http://www.g7.utoronto.ca/summit/1994naples/chairman.html](http://www.g7.utoronto.ca/summit/1994naples/chairman.html), 29.01.2010**
of the Memorandum of Understanding on the EU administration of Mostar. They also welcomed the Israeli-Palestinian Declaration of Principles and the Gaza-Jericho agreement, calling at the same time on the League of Arab States to end their boycott of Israel. The G7 reiterated its appeal to Iraq and Libya to full implementation of all relevant UNSC Resolutions and to Iran to a constructive participation in international relations, particularly with regard to terrorism. The heads of state and government expressed satisfaction of decision to continue the economic reform in Algeria, calling on this country to stop any violence and terrorist actions. They also expressed concern at the situation in the Republic of Yemen, stressing that any political differences within the country should be resolve by peaceful means. Leaders congratulated people of South Africa on having eliminated the apartheid by constitutional means. At the same time, they expressed regret of the level of the humanitarian tragedy in African countries. They noticed that especially hard situation was in Rwanda, where because of fights the humanitarian aid was interrupted, so they called for ceasing fights, deploying the UNAMIR II and increasing humanitarian aid in this country. The G7 raised also question of situation on Haiti, where had gained power the military leadership: “We call upon all states to bring pressure on the de facto regime as well as to enforce strengthened UN measures in relation to Haiti.”

Political issues returned as a main part of the debate at the Halifax Summit 1995. In the Chairman’s Statement a lot of space was devoted to the renewed escalation of conflict in the area of Sarajevo. The Bosnian and Serbs were asked for coming back to negotiations and for accepting the Contact Group proposals. In turn the Bosnian government was asked for renewing the Cessation of Hostilities Agreement and for enabling the free passage of the humanitarian assistance. The G7 countries with Russia stated that “We condemn the taking of UN hostages by the Bosnian Serbs, their deplorable shelling of civilian populations and their obstruction of UNPROFOR’s freedom of movement.” They welcomed the decision of the UNSC on reinforcing UNPROFOR through inter alia establishing The Rapid Reaction Force. Eight leaders gave official support for the UN negotiator Thorvald Stoltenberg and the EU negotiator Carl Bildt in their efforts to establish peace. Moreover, leaders called on states of the former Yugoslavia to reach an agreement within their existing international borders and expressed concern at risk of new fights in Croatia. They appealed to the Croatian government and Croatian Serbs to respect the ceasefire and to “political talks to achieve a settlement

774 Ibidem
775 Chairman's Statement, http://www.g7.utoronto.ca/summit/1995halifax/chairman.html, 29.01.2010
respecting the internationally recognized borders of Croatia while establishing autonomy for the Serb population on the basis of the principles underlying the Zagreb-4 Plan for Croatia.”

The heads of state and government discussed also on the progress of the Middle East peace process, welcoming the Israel-Jordan Peace Treaty and expressing hope for a similar agreement among Israel, Lebanon and Syria. They supported the Israeli-Palestinian Declaration of Principles and called on both sides to conclude the arrangements for elections in the Palestinian Autonomous territory and the redeployment of the Israeli Defence Forces. There was also reiterated an appeal to the League of Arab State to stop the boycott of Israel. Moreover, leaders called on the Iran government to end supporting radical groups, which want to destroy the Middle East peace process and to renounce terrorism by inter alia desistance from threats toward the writer Salman Rushdie. Additionally, they expressed hope for the end of violence in Algeria, Burundi and Rwanda, announcing support for the International Tribunal for Rwanda and for the region itself by increasing humanitarian assistance. The G7 welcomed “the peaceful and democratic transition of power in South Africa, the successful holding of elections elsewhere in Southern Africa, and the Angolan peace process.” Moreover, G7 countries with Russia announced that each of them would carry on dialogue with China and they expressed hope for a smooth transfer of government in Hong Kong in 1997. They applaud an increased cooperation in the region of Asia-pacific inter alia through the ASEAN Regional Forum. Leaders expressed also hope that North Korea would adhere to arrangements of the Agreed Framework and of the IAEA safeguards as well as it would access to the Korean Peninsula Energy Development Organisation (KEDO). In the Chairman’s Statement was also expressed the concern at the potential conflict in Kashmir and appeal to India and Pakistan to join the NPT as well as to stop any action connected with ballistic missile deployment. Leaders called also on the Myanmar government to release Aung San Suu Kyi and other political prisoners, starting actions aimed at democracy process. They also referred to the situation in Americas, supporting the Miami Summit Plan of Action which was supposed to “strengthen democratic institutions, eliminate the threat of terrorism, eradicate poverty and discrimination, conserve their natural environment, and negotiate the Free Trade Area of the Americas.” In the end, they expressed satisfaction of positive changes towards democracy in Mexico and Haiti as well as efforts of the Guarantor Group of the Rio Protocol to establish peace between Peru and Ecuador.\footnote{Ibidem}
In the document of the Lyon Summit 1996, “Toward Greater Security and Stability in a More Cooperative World”, the second part was devoted to regional situations. At the beginning, leaders of the G7 and Russia admitted that regional and inter-regional organizations and fora significantly contribute to peace, stability and prosperity of their members, expressing support for such organizations as the OSCE, the EU, the OAS, the ASEAN and initiatives such as the ASEM (Asian-European Meeting). They appreciated the economic progress and political transition in Central and Eastern Europe as well as accepted the proposal of widening the EU by inviting countries of this region and the Baltic states. In reference to the Middle East, the G7 expressed hope for further fruitful progress and full implementation of all reached agreements. They stated that the interim Israeli-Palestinian agreement on the Gaza Strip and West Bank was a milestone in the peace process as well as called for transferring it into permanent status. They appealed to the Palestinian authority and Mr Yasser Arafat “to promote the development of democratic institutions, the rule of law, transparency of public administration and respect for human rights.” They also paid attention to the necessity of the international community’s help for the Palestinian economy and called on the government of Israel to complete lifting of the closure in the West Bank and Gaza. The G7 welcomed peace between Israel and Jordan and expressed hope for the similar end of negotiations between Syria and Israel. Leaders called on all parties “to adhere to the 26 April 1996 Understanding which restored calm along the Lebanese-Israeli border.” They reiterated appeal to Iran to reject terrorism, desist from threats to the writer Salman Rushdie’s life and to play a constructive role in regional and world affairs. Additionally, they called on all countries “to avoid any collaboration with Iran which might contribute to the acquisition of a nuclear weapons capability.” Participants of the Lyon Summit expressed also satisfaction of the conclusion of the Memorandum of Understanding between Iraq and the UN on the implementation of UNSCR 986, at the same time calling on Iraq and Libya to fully implement all UNSC resolutions. They also appealed to North Korea to start talks with the South aimed at achieving long-lasting peace on the Korean Peninsula as well as to disclose all facts concerning its nuclear program. At the same time the international community was asked for a financial and political support for the KEDO. In Lyon was also issued the separate statement addressing the situation in Bosnia and Herzegovina, where G7 leaders stated that
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“We confirm our support for the Peace Agreement and the establishment of a democratic and pluralistic State of Bosnia and Herzegovina, composed of two Entities.”  

In order to support conclusions presented in the Peace Implementation Conference in Florence, G7 countries had taken various decisions in six areas: 1. Elections and Institutions, where was announced *inter alia* increase of assistance for the OSCE, which was supposed to monitor elections and for the IFOR, which forces were supposed to support the elections; 2. International War Crimes Tribunal, where the assistance flow was subjected to a cooperation of new authorities with the international community in implementing the Peace Agreement; 3. Consolidation Plan, which the goals, the means and the time frame should be elaborated by the Steering Board of the Peace Implementation Council in Florence; 4. Reconstruction, where was announced economic assistance for Bosnia and Herzegovina, but subjected to this country compliance with the peace process; 5. Refugees and the Rule of Law, where leaders demanded from all Parties assuring all the refugees and displaced persons free and safety return to their homes; 6. Regional and Security Issues, where *inter alia* was an appeal to accelerate works of the Working Groups on national and ethnic communities and minorities, and on questions of succession.  

The 1997 Denver communiqué was exceptionally extensive and included all questions discussed at the Summit. In the part “Political situations”, eight participants raised *inter alia* the issue of including Hong Kong under the Chinese jurisdiction and they stated that “We recognize the historic nature of China's imminent resumption of sovereignty over Hong Kong.” They expressed hope that would be maintain the high degree of autonomy, its fundamental freedom, the rule of law and its way of life, in accordance with declarations of the 1984 UK-PRC Joint Declaration and the 1990 PRC Basic Law. The G8 reminded also that still was unresolved the problem of Cyprus and gave its support for the UN Secretary General initiative toward governments of Greece and Turkey, calling this states for cooperation. G8 countries expressed also hope for normalization of the situation in Albania, which could be a threat to regional stability. However, the biggest concern to the Summit’s participants aroused the crisis in the Middle East peace process. They appealed Israel and Palestine to implement the Oslo Accords and to uphold the principles of Madrid. They also expressed hope for

---
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effective talks among Israel, Syria and Lebanon, stressing that “Economic growth and prosperity are critical to peace.” For that reason the G7 called for starting an economic cooperation among Iran, Iraq and Libya, underlying that thanks to conclusion of the UNCSR 986 Iraqi people could take advantage of humanitarian aid. Additionally, in the foreign minister’s “Progressive Report Denver Summit of Eight” was also raised question of the political situation in the Democratic Republic of Congo, Republic of Congo (Brazzaville), Haiti, Afghanistan and Myanmar. Moreover, in Denver was published the statement on Bosnia and Herzegovina in which leaders stated that “We, the Leaders of the Eight, reaffirm our commitment to full implementation of the Peace Agreement, and to the goal of Bosnia and Herzegovina becoming a single democratic, prosperous and multi-ethnic nation.” It was announced that full support from the G8’s side for all the parties would depend on their full implementation of all arrangements presented in the Peace Agreement. The G8 gave its support for the mission of Stabilisation Force (SFOR) and for the International Police Task Force. G8 countries warned that if the Parties were continued to slow down an adoption of relevant economic law and the IMF program, there would not have been any implementation of the full reconstruction plan and the debt reduction by the Paris Club. They announced the economic help for communities, which contribute to the return of refugees and displaced persons. They also reminded that the full access to economic and other assistance for Bosnia and Herzegovina, the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia and Croatia depend on fulfilling obligations under the Peace Agreement to cooperate fully with the International Criminal Tribunal for the Former Yugoslavia. The G8 noticed that Croatia and the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia do not strive enough to meet international standards on human rights, democracy, media, freedom and treatment of minorities and refugees. In the end, the Group assured that “The international community will maintain a long-term engagement in Bosnia and Herzegovina and in the Balkan region as a whole.” Moreover, leaders gathered in Denver elaborated one more statement, which was addressing the situation in Cambodia and in which they assured about their support for the French-Japan mission to that country.
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At the Birmingham Summit 1998, one could generally observe the continuation of the discussion on earlier issues. The heads of state and government noticed with satisfaction progress on peace implementation in Bosnia and Herzegovina, at the same time expressing concern that continuing violence in Kosovo could renew the war in Balkans. They stressed that “Peace and stability in Europe rest on the principles that borders are inviolable and that political change must come about through peaceful means.” They announced support for the full integration of the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia, however only when Belgrade would continue the political transition. Moreover, they also expressed hope for free and fair elections in Montenegro. Additionally, leaders expressed concern that agreements concluded in the Middle East peace process had been yet not implemented, what had happened the stalemate of this process. They stated that “A resumption of Israeli-Palestinian negotiations would build confidence in the region and help to restore momentum to the peace process as a whole.” They were also worried about recent upsurge of violence in Indonesia, to which contributed economic crisis. The Summit’s participants also harshly condemned nuclear tests carried out by India, which were contradictory with the CTBT and the NPT. They worryingly assumed that this could happen to an increase of risk of nuclear and missile proliferation in South Asia and elsewhere. They also called on Pakistan “to exercise maximum restraint in the face of these tests and to adhere to international non-proliferation norms.” In Birmingham, was published a special “Statement on Northern Ireland”, in which was expressed satisfaction of the Belfast Agreement reached on 10.04.1998. The G8 expressed hope that it would lead to political stability as well as to the economic development of Northern Ireland.

In the course of the debate at the Cologne Summit 1999, the Kosovo issue was raised once more. The participants of that meeting welcomed the adoption of the UNSCR1244 as well as the agreement between the NATO and Russia on the international security and the Military Technical Agreement: “In that regard, we insist that all parties to the conflict in Kosovo respect the cease-fire and fully abide by the terms of UNSCR 1244 and the Military Technical Agreement concerning the withdrawal of all Yugoslav and Serb military, police, and paramilitary forces from Kosovo and the demilitarization of the KLA and other armed
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Kosovo Albanian groups. As one of the priorities was set the safe and organized return of refugees and displaced people as well as the assuring of security for Serb and all other minorities in Kosovo. The G8 announced cooperate with the International Criminal Tribunal for the Former Yugoslavia and meetings of the international community to address assistance for Kosovo. Leaders stated that “We stress the importance of the civil implementation and, given the key role the G8 has played in the Kosovo crisis, we invite our Foreign Ministers to review on a regular basis the progress achieved thus far in this process and to provide further guidance.” In Cologne, was once more reiterated support for the Middle East peace process that according to G8 countries should be based on the principles of land for peace, adoption of existing commitments, UNSCR 242, 338 and 425 as well as the Madrid and Oslo Agreements. They called on Israel and the Palestinians to implement the River Memorandum to combat terrorism and violence, and to refrain from any actions that could have a negative influence on the Permanent Status negotiations. They also appealed to Israel, Syria and Lebanon to quickly conclude a peace agreement: “We equally underline the importance of resuming the multilateral track of the peace process and encourage the working groups and steering group to pursue their activities, supporting the bilateral negotiations and enhancing regional cooperation and economic integration.” The heads of state and governments reminded that the sustained economic development and better living standard for the Palestinians are important factors for peace and stability in the region. They expressed satisfaction of Jordan’s support for the Middle East peace process and announced economic assistance and debt relief for this country. Moreover, leaders appreciated introduction of democracy in Nigeria, confirming the necessity of international support for the process of the political and economic reform, which would help in total stabilisation of Nigeria. They expressed concern at the continuing violent conflict in Kashmir, calling on India and Pakistan to urgent stop of fights, to restore the Line of Control and to return to negotiations. G8 countries appealed to the UN Secretary General to call both sides of the Cyprus dispute to

789 G8 Statement on Regional Issues, http://www.g7.utoronto.ca/summit/1999koln/regional.htm, 30.01.2010

790 The Wye River Memorandum was an agreement negotiated between Israel and the Palestine Authority to implement the earlier Interim Agreement of 28 September, 1995. Brokered by the United States at the Aspen Institute Wye River Conference Centres near Wye River, Maryland, it was signed on October 23, 1998. The agreement was finally signed by Netanyahu and PLO Chairman Yasser Arafat at the White House, with President Clinton playing a key role as the official witness. With the outbreak of the Al-Aqsa Intifada in September 2000, and the counter-attacks by the Israel Defence Forces, the Wye River's understandings and goals remain un-implemented.
talks as well as they paid attention that leaders of both parties should commit themselves to the four principles: 1. No pre-conditions; 2. All issues on the table; 3. Continuation of negotiations until consensus is reached; 4. Full consideration of relevant UN resolutions and treaties. Moreover, the G8 expressed its full support for the “Stability Pact for South Eastern Europe” agreed on 10.06.1999 in Cologne. There was underlined that the EU would play the central role in implementation of this Pact and that “in order to achieve the goals of the Stability Pact, the countries of the region bear a primary responsibility.”

The aim of this Pact was giving support for countries of South Eastern Europe in their efforts to democracy, peace, respect for human rights and economic prosperity. At the same time was underlined that “A settlement of the Kosovo conflict is critical to our ability to reach fully the objectives of the Stability Pact and to work towards permanent, long term measures for a future of peace and inter-ethnic harmony without fear of the resurgence of war.”

In the framework of the Stability Pact’s mechanism leaders agreed to establish a South Eastern Europe Regional Table, three Working Tables and a Special Coordinator. In the separate document were also described single roles and cooperation between its participants. The G8 called on “the international donor community to undertake the necessary measures in order to give the countries in the region a strong signal of active international support and solidarity and to organize donor conferences as early as feasible.”

The same subject returned next year at the Okinawa Summit, where in the statement on regional issues the participants noticed that “We commend the co-ordination provided by the Stability Pact which is contributing to enhanced regional political and economic co-operation in South Eastern Europe. We also welcome the 2.4 billion Euros in pledges for quick-start projects in the fields of democratisation, economic development and security under the Stability Pact.”

Leaders called on all communities in Kosovo to stop violence and to contribute to municipal elections. They expressed concern at motives and possible consequences of the revision of the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia and harshly condemned restrictions on the free press in that country. The G8 reiterated support for democratically elected authorities of Montenegro and expressed its satisfaction of progress on democratization of this country. G8 leaders also stated that “In the Middle East, there is a real
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opportunity for the achievement of a comprehensive peace based on the UN Security Council Resolutions 242 and 338 and the agreements of Madrid and Oslo.” With satisfaction was noticed the decision of Israel and the Palestinians on continuation of talks. Summit’s participants reiterated the G8’s readiness of helping in the implementing of a peace agreement, stressed the importance of activity of the multilateral working groups and condemned any attempts to disrupt the peace process by terrorist and extreme groups. Moreover leaders expressed concern at continues tensions between India and Pakistan, calling on both states to implement the UNSCR1172 and to ratify the CTBT. They also called for peace in Africa, reiterating their “strong commitment to help”. In the same document was also written that “The failure of the two parties to resolve their differences and end the division of Cyprus remains a matter of serious concern to us.”

The heads of state and government appealed to both sides to intensify talks in the current round of negotiations. At the Okinawa Summit was also published the statement on the Korean Peninsula, in which was noticed: “We warmly welcome the Summit Meeting between the ROK and the DPRK held in Pyongyang on 13-15 June 2000 and underline the historic importance of this meeting.” The G8 expressed hope that this would start a new era of inter-Korean relations and would contribute to permanent peace on the Korean Peninsula. G8 countries once more called on North Korea for “a constructive response to international concerns over security, non-proliferation, humanitarian and human rights issues.”

Atmosphere of the Genoa Summit was harmed by heavy riots, in which one person was dead. In special statements issued on the first and second day of the meeting, G8 leaders expressed their sorrow of the death of this one person and called for the peaceful demonstrating. There was stressed that “It is of vital importance that democratically elected leaders, legitimately representing millions of people can meet to discuss areas of common concern.” Leaders announced the dialogue with the civil society and continuation of the debate on issues the most important for the world population and economy, with special attention to Africa. In the “Statement on Regional Issues” was expressed concern at the tense situation in Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, there was given support for the government of this country.
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and all armed groups were called to the voluntary disarmament. The heads of state and
government appealed also to North and South Korea to re-establish contacts at the ministerial
level. The North was also called to fulfil its obligations, which were announced in the
moratorium on missile launches.\(^{799}\) Moreover, participants of the summit asked for the
immediate cease of fire in the Middle East and for urgent implementation of the Mitchell
Report.\(^{800}\) A wider debate on political issues took place at the G8 foreign ministers meeting
before the Genoa Summit, where were discussed subjects connected with situation on Cyprus,
in Iraq, Indonesia, Afghanistan, South Asia, East Timor, Colombia and in Africa.

Already at the Genoa Summit was seen the tendency to limit the discussion of G8 leaders on
political issues and the shift of this debate to the forum of G8 foreign ministers. In the
Kananaskis Chair’s Summary, was shortly mentioned the Middle East peace process, where
leaders were in favour of vision of two states as well as there was announced a support for the
Transition Authority of Afghanistan and for efforts to combat opium production and
trafficking. Additionally, the heads of state and government called on Pakistan to stop terrorist
activity originating from its territory.\(^{801}\) In turn, G8 foreign ministers gathered at the meeting
in Whistler, before the G8 summit, published additional documents on situation in
Afghanistan, India-Pakistan, Balkans, the Korean Peninsula and Cyprus.

At the Evian Summit 2003, G8 leaders welcomed the unanimous adoption of the UNSCR
1483 and announced the calling of an international conference on the reconstruction of Iraq.
They expressed satisfaction of the decision of Israel and the Palestinians on acceptance of the
Quartet Roadmap as well as hope for reaching a peace agreement that would also encompass
Syria and Lebanon. They also called on relevant G8 ministers “to examine as soon as possible
the measures necessary to support a plan for the revitalisation and reconstruction of the
Palestinian economy, including the leveraging of private investment, within the framework of
the Middle East Peace Process.”\(^{802}\) The heads of state and government expressed concern at

\(^{799}\) G8 Statement On Regional Issues, [http://www.g8.utoronto.ca/summit/2001genoa/regionalissues.html](http://www.g8.utoronto.ca/summit/2001genoa/regionalissues.html), 30.01.2010

\(^{800}\) The Mitchell Report also known as the Sharm El-Sheikh Fact-Finding Committee Report, concluded on
Oct.17, 2000. It is a document that was created by an American fact-finding committee, led by former US
Senator George J. Mitchell, on the state of the Arab-Israeli conflict, during the first stages of the al-Aqsa
Intifada.

\(^{801}\) G8 Statement On Regional Issues, [http://www.g8.utoronto.ca/summit/2001genoa/regionalissues.html](http://www.g8.utoronto.ca/summit/2001genoa/regionalissues.html), 30.01.2010

\(^{802}\) Chair’s Summary, [http://www.g7.utoronto.ca/summit/2003evian/communique_en.html](http://www.g7.utoronto.ca/summit/2003evian/communique_en.html), 31.01.2010
the nuclear threat from North Korea and Iran side; reiterated support for the President Karzai’s Transnational Administration of Afghanistan as well as for the Afghan National Drug Strategy and the “Paris Pact” proposed by the UN. Leaders also expressed their sympathy for the Algerian people who were dead and suffered in earthquakes and announced an emergency as well as long-term assistance for this country. Additionally, they called on the Zimbabwe government to stop repressions against its citizens and to respect their right to peaceful demonstration. Moreover, G8 foreign ministers discussed on the situation in Colombia, Democratic Republic of Congo, Georgia, India and Pakistan, Sri Lanka and Iraq. They issued the separate statement condemning the hostage taking in Moscow, in which they appealed for the immediate and unconditional release of hostages and announced that “We are determined to fight terrorism decisively and unconditionally in all its forms and manifestations.”

The Sea Island Summit 2004 had a special political significance as next to G8 leaders in the meeting were participating the leaders from Afghanistan, Algeria, Bahrain, Iraq, Jordan, Yemen and Turkey. There was published the special statement on Sudan, in which the G8 expressed hope for the reaching of a comprehensive agreement between the government of Sudan and the Sudan’s People Liberation Movement. G8 leaders expressed also concern at humanitarian and political crisis in Darfur, calling on Sudan authorities to end human rights violations, to facilitate humanitarian access for all needed people and to disarm “Janjaweed” and other armed groups. In other statement the heads of state and government expressed satisfaction of the initiative of Israel Prime Minister Sharon giving perspective for withdrawing of Israeli forces from Gaza settlements and from parts of the West Bank. They reiterated that the Quartet Roadmap is the important basis to reach a stable peace agreement and to realize Palestinian national aspirations, stating “We support and commend all efforts,
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803 At the Ministerial Conference on Drug Routes from Central Asia to Europe held in Paris in May 2003 (Paris Statement), the international community subscribed to the principle of shared responsibility in the fight against opium and heroin trafficking from Afghanistan. The commitment became known as the “Paris Pact”, focussing on enhanced border control and law enforcement among countries affected by the trafficking of opiates from Afghanistan. A second Ministerial Conference on Drug Trafficking Routes from Afghanistan was held in Moscow on 26-28 June 2006 (Moscow Statement), which further promoted the Paris Pact process and recommended effective countermeasures against drug trafficking from Afghanistan.

804 Statement by G8 Foreign Ministers in Connection with Terrorist Hostage Taking in Moscow, http://www.g7.utoronto.ca/foreign/fm251002.htm, 31.01.2010

including those by Egypt, to resolve critical security issues relating to Gaza, and urge that this important work continue.”  

There was underlined the importance of revitalization of the Palestinian economy as well as hope that municipal elections planned by the Palestinian Authority would be fair and transparent and would contribute to further democratic reforms. Moreover, the G8 welcomed the unanimous approval of the UNSCR 1546, gave support for the new Iraqi government and announced help in Iraq’s reconstruction. Leaders also called on North Korea to dismantle its nuclear programs and on Iran to fulfil the NPT and IAEA obligations. Additionally, participants of the Sea Island Summit had contributed to establishment of the Partnership for Progress and Common Future with the Region of the Broader Middle East and North Africa aimed at carrying out political, social and economic reform in the region. In the framework of this Partnership was supposed to be create a “Forum for the Future” aimed at gathering together “G8 and regional Foreign, Economic, and other Ministers in an ongoing discussion on reform, with business and civil society leaders participating in parallel dialogues.”  

There was also agreed a Plan of Support for Reform, which was supposed to help in promotion of democracy, education, social and economic reforms. At the Gleneagles meeting 2005, its participants once more admitted that “our common goal remains a final settlement of the Israeli/Palestinian conflict based on the creation of a viable, democratic Palestinian state living in peace, dignity and prosperity side-by-side with a secure, universally recognised Israel.” They gave support for the plan of James Wolfensohn (Quartet’s Special Envoy for Disengagement) to help the Palestinians in an economic reconstruction and in further governance reform as well as for his imitative to rise a global contribution of up to $3 billion per year over the next three years. Leaders called on both sides of the conflict to engage in implementation of Wolfensohn’s plans and added that “We underline our resolve to support both sides in meeting their Roadmap commitments and call on others to do the same.” In Gleneagles, was also published the separate statement on Iraq.
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in which the G8 expressed its support for the democratically elected Iraqi Transnational Government and announced help to complete the process of transition foreseen in the UNSCR 1546. Leaders appealed to the UN to enhance its commitment in Iraq as well as to Iraq “to adhere to the political timetable specified in the Transitional Administrative Law, culminating in the holding of national elections by 15 December, 2005 for a government under a new constitution.” 811 They condemned all terrorist acts, including the murder of the Egyptian Ambassador to Baghdad as well as promised to help Iraq in building its security forces, to reduce its debt and to support its efforts to join the WTO. Moreover, they announced assistance for Iraq in the reconstruction of the country and appealed to states “to disburse unreleased portions of their pledges from the 2003 Madrid Conference and to provide further contributions to Iraq's reconstruction.” 812 G8 countries together with present in Gleneagles leaders of Africa issued the special statement on Sudan, in which they reiterated hope “to see an end to the crisis in Darfur – a crisis that has seen thousands killed, some two million displaced and fearful to return home, and that threatens to undermine a hard-won peace agreement for Southern Sudan, itself the scene of over twenty years of brutal civil war.” 813 The G8 stressed that the African Union is the proper forum to solve this conflict and called on all parties to cooperate on reaching a peace agreement. Leaders welcomed the signature of the Declaration of principles by the sides, appealing to them to comply with the UNSCR 1539, which was calling for cooperation with the International Criminal Court. There was admitted that “The African Union is playing a vital role in enhancing security on the ground, protecting civilians, allowing the humanitarian response to function and giving the political talks a chance of success. The troops are having a positive impact.” 814 G8 countries announced further financial and other support for the African Union as well as for victims of the Darfur crisis. They also called on the Sudan government and rebels to make possible a free flow of humanitarian aid and works of humanitarian agencies. There was expressed satisfaction of the initiative of France, the UK, Germany and the EU aimed at solving a problem with Iran’s nuclear program. Moreover, once more participants appealed to North Korea to abandon its nuclear weapons-related programs. Additionally, in the Chair’s Summary were mentioned
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such discussed subjects as situation in Afghanistan, Lebanon, Zimbabwe, Haiti and hard situation of victims of the huge tsunami in the Indian Ocean.\footnote{Chair's Summary, http://www.g7.utoronto.ca/summit/2005gleneagles/summary.html, 31.01.2010}

The St Petersburg Summit 2006 was devoted, to large extent, to issues connected with human security. The only separate statement addressing world’s conflict were the Statement on the Middle East, in which participants expressed “deepening concern about the situation in the Middle East, in particular the rising civilian casualties on all sides and the damage to infrastructure.”\footnote{Middle East, http://www.g7.utoronto.ca/summit/2006stpetersburg/mideast.html, 31.01.2010} As the cause of the crisis were indicated actions of extremist forces \textit{inter alia} of Hamas in Gaza and Hezbollah in Lebanon attacking Israel. At the same time, leaders called on Israel to “exercise utmost restraint, seeking to avoid casualties among innocent civilians and damage to civilian infrastructure and to refrain from acts that would destabilize the Lebanese government.” The G8 called for the return of the Israeli forces in Gaza and Lebanon unharmed; end of the shelling of Israeli territory; end of Israeli military operations; the withdrawal of Israeli soldiers from Gaza; and for the release of the arrested Palestinian ministers and parliamentarians. G8 countries asked the Lebanese authorities for the implementation of the UNSCR 1559 and for start of the dialogue with Israel, promising their economic and humanitarian assistance for the Lebanese people. In reference to the Palestinians they stated that “All Palestinian parties should accept the existence of Israel, reject violence, and accept all previous agreements and obligations, including the Roadmap.” Additionally, leaders called for ending the terrorist attacks against Israel and proposed actions aimed at “an immediate end to the current violence, a resumption of security cooperation and of a political engagement both among Palestinians and with Israel.”\footnote{Ibidem} In the end, they appreciated the positive efforts of Egypt, Saudi Arabia, Jordan and others as well as they reiterated the Quartet is a central actor in the Middle East peace process.

At the Heiligendamm Summit 2007, its participants returned to the question of Sudan-Darfur: “While the Comprehensive Peace Agreement (CPA) of January 2005 has led to an end of hostilities in the South, a persistent delay in the implementation of crucial elements of the agreement is threatening to undermine efforts aimed at creating a united, peaceful, and prosperous Sudan based on the rule of law.”\footnote{G8 Summit Statement on Sudan/Darfur, http://www.g7.utoronto.ca/summit/2007heiligendamm/g8-2007-sudan.html, 31.01.2010} They condemned violent actions of the Sudan
government and the rebels, calling on both sides to respect international humanitarian law and to make the safe humanitarian access possible to all in need. Leaders stressed that the conflict in Darfur may be solved only by peaceful means and for that reason they fully supported the Special Envoys of the UN and the African Union in their efforts to bring the parties to negotiations. They also expressed concern at the deteriorating humanitarian situation in Chad and in the Central African Republic, underlined that the conflict in Darfur is a threat to whole region and announced that “If the government of Sudan or the rebel movements continue to fail to meet their obligations, we will support appropriate action in the Security Council.”

An important event at the Heiligendamm Summit was the debate of G8 countries with the leaders of Brazil, China, India, Mexico and South Africa, which was described as “an important step towards an equal and enduring partnership for building the framework conditions of a globalized and competitive world economy.” The inaugurated dialogue with these major emerging economies was named the Heiligendamm Process and was supposed to focus on four areas: 1. Promoting and protecting innovations; 2. Enhancing freedom of investment; 3. Defining common responsibilities for development with special regard to Africa; 4. Sharing knowledge for improving energy efficiency and technology cooperation with the aim to contribute to reducing CO₂ emissions. The OECD was asked for providing a platform for this dialogue and the IAEA for cooperating in the field of energy efficiency. The results of that forum were supposed to be presented at the G8 summit in Italy 2009. Additionally, the heads of state and government discussed on a future status of Kosovo; conflict over Nagorno-Karabakh; nuclear threat from the side of North Korea and Iran; positive developments in Colombia; increase of suicide attacks in Afghanistan; and they reiterated their hopes and worries related with the Middle East peace process.
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Chapter VIII
HUMAN SECURITY SECTOR

While the fundament of calling the G6/G7 meeting were the economic crisis, from the very beginning was seen an interest in the situation of developing countries. Already in the Declaration of Rambouillet one may read: “A cooperative relationship and improved understanding between the developing nations and the industrial world is fundamental to the prosperity of each.”823 At the beginning, assistance for developing nations was based only on the economic help. However, in Puerto Rico 1976, leaders admitted that cooperation with developing countries should be based on mutual respect and efforts of both sides should be supportive: “Our efforts for international economic co-operation must be considered as complementary to the policies of the developing countries themselves to achieve sustainable growth and rising standards of living.”824 Definition of the sustainable growth will occur very often in G7/8 documents and will be one of the priorities of the Group with regard to developing nations and Africa. From the start, the G7 relied on the UN as the organization, which plays the central role in process of helping the most needed countries. It was mentioned already in Puerto Rico, where the Summit’s participants expressed satisfaction of positive results of the UNCTAD. In the same declaration was stated: “Our common goal is to find practical solutions which contribute to an equitable and productive relationship among all peoples.”825 As at the beginning the idea of summits embraced only economic issues, in first documents of summits were described North-South relations mainly in the context of economic help for developing countries.826 In the Appendix to the final Declaration of London Summit 1977, in the part devoted to North-South relations, were described plans of economic assistance as well as were announced actions to increase help “particularly to the 800 million people who now live in absolute poverty”.827 There was strongly underlined that
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developed and developing countries are bound with each other, and prosperity of the world economy depends on the growth in developing countries.

In the Declaration of Bonn 1978, authors focused on assistance for developing nations, but at the same time they stressed that the human being is a very important issue for them. Leaders expressed concern at the world-wide high unemployment, which economic costs are high but “its human cost higher still”. In similar tone they had their say in the energy area where they stated that “In energy development, the environment and human safety of the population must be safeguarded with greatest care.”

At the Venice Summit, leaders announced works on relations with developing countries in the framework of the UN as well as the crating of a new International Development Strategy, at the same time declaring that “our object is to cooperate with the developing countries in energy conservation and development, expansion of exports, enhancement of human skills, and the tackling of underlying food and population problems.” The heads of state and government also announced cooperation and support for the World Bank and FAO in their efforts to improve grain storage and food handling facilities. Moreover, they paid attention to the problem of population growth; the necessity of wider participation in the new Food Aid Convention; the securing of at least ten million tons of food annually; and the need of participation in help for developing countries of communist and oil-exporting countries.

At the Ottawa Summit 1981, its participants reiterated support for developing nations “to promote their economic and social development within the framework of their own social values and traditions.” They announced works on the increasing of public understanding for the importance of help for the poorest countries as well as cooperation with the UN in its Conference on the Least Developed Countries. There was reiterated the necessity of ensuring food security for the most needed and of tackling with implications of population growth, stressing that this last question should be considered with regard of respect for human values and dignity. Leaders confirmed their readiness to cooperate with international financial organizations and once more appealed to the Soviet Union to increase its engagement in
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development assistance. Moreover, the G7 underlined that the lasting peace is possible only if is based on “respect for the freedom and dignity of nations and individuals.”

In the Declaration of Versailles 1982, leaders set as a goal the launching of global negotiations aimed at establishing international cooperation to help developing countries in creating economic and political wellbeing. As the basic areas of help were mentioned programs connected with food and energy production. In Versailles President Mitterrand presented the report, in which he described chances and threats connected with technology, employment and growth. He reminded that while the economic crisis is unfavourable and perceptible for citizens of G7 countries, still “In the countries of the South, conditions of survival have worsened: nearly thirty million human beings have died of starvation.”

In his opinion, the technological development is positive for the human but biotechnologies should focus on actions leading to the reduction of famine, disease and overpopulation. In the part devoted to combating the North-South imbalances, Mitterrand underlined the G7 countries have obligation of help in transferring technologies to the South countries: “We must consider not only the means to transfer our technologies to them by suitably adapting them, but also the creation of conditions to encourage the development of technologies that focus directly on their own realities; it is on this condition that the independent development of their agriculture, their industry and their services is possible.”

It was the first time, when the assistance for developing countries was treated in such extensive way. In the report was stressed that there should be assured conditions not only “for survival in dignity” but they also should concern protection of the environment and natural resources as well as the fight against results of an urban concentration.

In the next year, at the Williamsburg Summit, leaders shortly mentioned only about debt relief for developing countries, but wider the subject of help for the most needed countries was discussed at the 10th Summit in London 1984. In the declaration of this meeting occurred for
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the first time in the G7 history declaration from the leaders’ side of helping developing countries in the fight with draught and poverty: “We attach major importance to the special action program for Africa which is being prepared by the World Bank and should provide renewed impetus to the joint efforts of the international community to help.”

In the 1985 Bonn declaration, “Towards Sustained Growth and Higher Employment”, in the part devoted to relations with developing nations, the heads of states and government expressed concern at the critical situation of African people suffering from famine and draught. They welcomed the fact of giving assistance by different governments and organizations, including private groups, as well as establishment by the World Bank the Special Facility for Sub Saharan Africa. There was decided not only to continue emergency food aid but also to support African countries in the development of their own long-term food strategy and economic potential. The G7 announced supplies of pesticides, seed and fertilizers within agricultural development projects and the improvement of the existing early warning systems. G7 countries underlined that political contradictions should not be a handicap to deliver food to the hungry. They appealed to examine the establishment of a research network on dry zone grains as well as to intensify cooperation with African countries on the fight against desertification.

To the fact that human security concept was close to the G7 ideology may testified the reference of Bonn “Political Declaration on the 40th Anniversary of the End of the Second World War”, where was noticed: “So, as we look back to the terrible suffering of the Second World War and the common experience of forty years of peace and freedom, we dedicate ourselves and our countries anew to the creation of a world in which all peoples enjoy the blessings of peace, of justice, and of *freedom from oppression, want and fear (from author)*; a world in which individuals are able to fulfil their responsibilities for themselves, to their families and to their communities; a world in which all nations, large and small, combine to work together for a better future for all mankind.”

In the 1986 Tokyo Economic Declaration leaders expressed satisfaction of the improvement of food situation in Africa, but at the same time they added that still a lot of countries in that

---
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region need emergency aid, “we continue to recognize the high priority to be given to meeting the needs of Africa.” They announced the implementation of measures agreed by G7 foreign ministers in the Report on Aid to Africa; cooperation with the Special Facility for Sub Saharan African Countries; adoption of a new Structural Adjustment Facility of the IMF; and the use of IDA. Moreover, the G7 declared its effective participation in the planned UN Special Session on Africa, which was supposed to contribute to the long-term development of Africa.\footnote{Tokyo Economic Declaration, http://www.g7.utoronto.ca/summit/1986tokyo/communique.html, 01.02.2010}

At the Venice meeting 1987, its participant discussed a lot on economic and financial support for Africa, on the debt relief for the countries of this region, but also for the first time in the declaration had occurred the reference to issues connected with human security such as: education and its future role in the society; the HFSP (Human Frontier Science Program) aimed at basic research on biological functions; or bioethics conferences aimed at the review of the ethical implications of developments in life sciences. In Venice was also for the first time raised the question of AIDS. In the “Chairman’s Statement on AIDS”, leaders admitted that it is one of the two biggest health problems in the world and they added that “National efforts need to be intensified and made more effective by international cooperation and concerted campaigns to prevent AIDS from spreading further, and will have to ensure that the measures taken are in accordance with the principles of human rights.”\footnote{Ibidem} There was agreed that there is no necessary to create new organizations, but the existing organizations should received proper support and the organizations that should be an international forum of cooperation on fighting AIDS is the WHO. As a vaccine or cure does not exist, the best way to prevent and combat AIDS is education of the public about prevention, spread and results of the disease. In order to achieve that, leaders announced the calling of an international conference at the ministerial level on public education about AIDS. Moreover, they declared the intensification of collaboration on basic and clinical studies on prevention, treatment, and the development of a successful vaccine. The G7 also welcomed the proposal made by the President of France of creating an international committee on the ethical issues raised by AIDS.\footnote{Chairman’s Statement On Aids, http://www.g7.utoronto.ca/summit/1987venice/aids.html, 01.02.2010}

\footnote{Ibidem}
In the declaration of the Toronto Summit 1988, was presented a new economic division of countries: next to developing countries were mentioned also middle-income countries and the subgroup of the poorest developing countries, in which were included African countries. At this meeting, leaders discussed mainly on economic support and the debt relief for these countries. The Summit in Paris 1989 also raised the question of the poorest and most indebted countries, but above all through the prism of financial help. In the Economic Declaration, the heads of state and government paid attention to the fact that in accordance with arrangements of the Venice Summit (1982) had been established an International Ethics Committee on AIDS, which gathered members of the Summits, the EC and the WHO. In Paris was also issued the Declaration on Human Rights that was the peculiar ideological manifest of the Group. In that document was underlined the necessity of protection of human rights, democratic principles and freedom. There was also noticed that “Extreme poverty and exclusion from society violate the dignity of everyone enduring them. Those who suffer or are in need should be supported.” Moreover, G7 countries added that “We hold that the right of each individual to physical integrity and dignity must be guaranteed.” These views are convergent with the wide understanding of human security and were announced already in 1989, five years before the UN report. In the 1991 London declaration, leaders underlined that “Africa deserves our special attention.” They admitted that there was a progress in many African countries in the economy as well as in democracy but they owe this, in large extent, to the G7 support through “stimulating development of the private sector, encouraging regional integration, providing concessional flows and reducing debt burdens.” Leaders noticed with satisfaction that the Special Program of Assistance for Africa, aimed at helping over 20 African countries in the economic reform, bring effects. G7 countries announced also humanitarian aid for the most
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touched parties of Africa and called on the UN to relevantly reform its structures, in a way that they could be more effective.\footnote{849}

In the 1995 Halifax communiqué were presented actions to promote the sustainable development and to reduce poverty: “An overriding priority is to improve the plight of the world’s poor.”\footnote{850} Sub Saharan Africa was indicated as the area that needed the most an international help. The G7 announced in cooperation with relevant international organisations to focus concessional resources on the poorest countries, especially in Sub Saharan Africa and to direct an increase participation of their resources to basic social programs.\footnote{851}

In the 1996 Lyon final communiqué, the fourth part of this document was titled “Implementing a New Global Partnership for Development: An Ambition For The 21st Century”. It was aimed at establishing a global partnership between developing and developed countries and multilateral institutions, what would enable all developing countries, no matter at which level of development, to share and participate in the benefits of globalization. As the goals of this Partnership were mentioned: reduction of poverty and social inequities; the respect of internationally recognized labour standards; protection of children; a strengthened civil society; the protection of the environment; and improved health and education. The heads of state and government called for creating indicators measuring progress in such areas as extreme poverty; infant, child and maternal mortality; and primary education. There were described the roles of particulars participants of the Partnership, stressing inter alia that developing countries have “a fundamental responsibility for promoting their own development.” At the same time there was reminded that “Democracy, human rights and good governance are indispensable components of development.” Developing countries should in the first place focus on the funding of social and economic development programs and promoting of regional cooperation. In turn, developed countries have an obligation to support developing countries “in a spirit of common purpose and efficiency.” They should create an environment, which would induce trade and private financial flows to move toward developing countries. For multilateral development institutions was foreseen the central role “in promoting development and encouraging the developing countries to reduce poverty, to

\footnote{849}{At summits in years 1992-1994 there was nothing about human security, debates referred mainly to questions of economic assistance and ideology.}

\footnote{850}{Halifax Summit Communiqué – Reducing Poverty, 
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implement sound economic policies and to improve capacity.” For they could act in that way, the financial engagement of their members was necessary. In the framework of the Partnership were set out four complementary goals: 1. Concentration of financial means on countries that are the most needed and that would be able to use them in effective way; 2. Adequate ODA funding of seven sectors such as health and education, basic infrastructure, clean water schemes, environmental conservation, micro-enterprises, agriculture research and small scale agriculture; 3. Support of private sector in developing countries; 4. Further integration of the least and less developed countries into the global economy. In the Political Declaration leaders raised also the question of the review of the UN structure and goals, stating at the same time that “We continue to regard the United Nations as the cornerstone of an international system whose success or failure is increasingly significant for human security (from author- for the first time in official G7 document), including development within countries and partnership among countries.” In the other place of this document the heads of state and governments noticed that “People should be the focus of our policies”, stressing results of destructing environment to human health. Another issue that belong to human security area and was raised by G7 countries were consequences of fast development of information and communication technologies and services. They announced efforts to a universal access to these technologies, particularly to make it possible for developing countries to benefit from these new solutions. They also admitted that information and communication technologies and services “have important potential to meet basic human needs, develop human resources, promote economic growth, encourage participatory democracy and a free media. They should promote cultural and linguistic diversity, as well as dynamic competition.” Leaders discussed also on infectious diseases such as HIV/AIDS, malaria, cholera, ebola, and antibiotic resistant strains of tuberculosis and pneumonia that “pose an unacceptable threat to people of all nations, disproportionately affecting the populations of the poorest nations.” The G7 called for cooperation on creating not only mechanism of prevention, detection, surveillance and response to the diseases but also on research, accessible health care services and diagnostics in the treatment and control of the diseases. In the end, leaders announced works on extending various assistance programs for countries mostly hit by HIV/AIDS and other infectious diseases as well as they expressed
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strong support for works of the WHO and the UN Program on AIDS in fighting global epidemics.\cite{854} 

The Denver Summit 1997 was the first full meeting of the eight countries and it devoted a lot of space to the debate connected with human security. Though in earlier documents was stressed the importance of influence of the environment on human health, nevertheless it was the Denver communiqué where for the first time occurred the statement: “Our governments will explicitly incorporate children into environmental risk assessments and standard setting and together will work to strengthen information exchange, provide for microbiologically safe drinking water, and reduce children's exposure to lead, environmental tobacco smoke and other air pollutants.”\cite{855} Leaders returned also to the question of the fights against infectious diseases which, as was underlined, cause a one third of all deaths in the world and threat not only to health but also to world’s security and financial resources. The G8 announced special efforts in the next year to intensify cooperation in this field as well as works on a global surveillance network and on building public health capacity to prevent detect and control infectious diseases globally. The heads of state and government admitted that while works on different methods of prevention and treatment are important, still the priority should be given to creation of “safe, accessible, and effective vaccines against AIDS”. They also called on all states and relevant international fora to engage in cooperation on AIDS vaccine research. Moreover, leaders discussed on the issue of human cloning, stating “We agree on the need for appropriate domestic measures and close international cooperation to prohibit the use of somatic cell nuclear transfer to create a child.” For the first time in the summit’s document was devoted so much space to the Africa question. In the part of the communiqué titled “Africa: Partnership for Development”, leaders declared that “we aim to translate the principles of that Partnership into new concrete action to support the efforts of African countries to participate fully in the expansion of global prosperity and to spread the benefits throughout their societies.” They noticed with satisfaction that there are visible the positive developments such as democratic and economic reforms in many Sub Saharan countries. They announced further support for African governments in implementing transparency of governments, democratic principles and human rights. The G8 admitted that prosperity to large extent depends on the private sector-led growth and integration into the global economy, for that reason leaders announced further assistance from their as well as form international
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financial institutions side in promoting foreign direct investment and domestic capital formation. G8 countries also stated that “We each will continue to improve, through various means, access to our markets for African exports.” They called African countries for further liberalization of trade in the framework of the WTO and for regional cooperation. Moreover, leaders admitted that in achieving the sustainable development by Sub Saharan countries the main role would play flows of ODA but they must be coordinated with appropriate policies. They also announced the deepening of the dialogue with African partners in order to ensure well-targeted assistance, which would include: “support for democratic governance, respect for human rights, sound public administration, efficient legal and judicial systems, infrastructure development, rural development, food security, environmental protection and human resource development, including health and education of their people.” They reiterated that the central role in the development of Africa plays the UN and its development funds and programs. The G8 welcomed the African Information Society Initiative and gave support for plans of establishing information networks among African countries as well as between them and the rest of the world. Additionally, the heads of state and government announced support for African peace building and conflict prevention initiatives, particularly by the OAU (Organisation of African Unity) and called on the UN to support African countries in this area. In the end, leaders appealed to their officials to present in the next year a report of progress of the Partnership.

At the Birmingham Summit 1998, its participants stated that the one of “the major challenges facing the world on the threshold of the 21st century” was integration of the poorest developing countries into the world economy and enable them to take advantages from the globalisation. The G8 announced cooperation with these countries in order to achieve goals noticed in the OECD’s 21st Century Strategy: “We shall therefore work with them to achieve at least primary education for children everywhere, and to reduce drastically child and maternal mortality and the proportion of the world’s population living in extreme poverty.”

Next to the necessity of financial support, leaders paid attention to the need of enhanced cooperation on infectious and parasitic diseases between the G8, the WHO and the African poorest countries. They announced support for a new initiative “Roll Back Malaria” aimed at iner alia significant reduction of the deaths from malaria by 2010 as well as further efforts to
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develop AIDS vaccine, prevention and therapy. The heads of state and government asked G8’s experts for issuing as soon as possible an opinion on possibility of the entry into force the French proposal for the “Therapeutic Solidarity Initiative”. Moreover, they underlined the necessity of strengthening Africa’s ability to prevent and resolve conflict and to rebuild their political, economic and social systems in the post-conflict phase. In regard to this last question, leaders decided that next to humanitarian aid it is necessary to give technical and financial assistance and relevant debt relief mechanism. They focused not only on the most needed but they also considered how in the best way could be used abilities of G8’ citizens: “All our people, men and women, deserve the opportunity to contribute to and share in national prosperity through work and a decent standard of living.”858 In Birmingham, was also published the “Response by the Presidency on Behalf of the G8 to the Jubilee 2000 Petition”, in which was presented program of debt relief for poor countries and in which leaders stated that “We will work with the others concerned to ensure that all eligible countries get the relief they need to secure a lasting exit from their debt problems.”859

One of the subjects of the Cologne meeting 1999 was the investing in people, which in the effect brought elaboration of the “Köln Charter. Aims and Ambitions for Lifelong Learning.” As motives of this document effects of globalisation were mentioned, where flexibility, change and mobility would become indivisible conditions of human life. Leaders noticed that “In the future, the passport to mobility will be education and lifelong learning. This passport to mobility must be offered to everyone.”860 They underlined that knowledge skills and qualifications are necessary to achieve an economic success. According to the G8, the government, the private sector and industrials should invest more in education and trainings, maintain three rules. Firstly, everyone should have access to learning and basic education should be free. Secondly, everyone should have an opportunity to continue learning through their lives. Thirdly, there should be help for developing countries to establish comprehensive and efficient education system. Leaders paid attention to the fact that “As we move into the next century, access to knowledge will be one of the most significant determinants of income and the quality of life.” There were also mentioned essential elements of lifelong learning
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such as: high quality early education; primary education that teach children reading, writing, arithmetic, IT and basic social skills; secondary education that develops the aptitudes and abilities of all students; vocational training convergent with the needs of the labour market; higher education with financial support to ensure access for everyone; and adult skill acquisition including high-quality work-based learning systems. At the same time leaders stressed that at these six above mentioned levels should be paid special attention “to the importance of creativity, entrepreneurship and education for democratic citizenship, including respect for the political, civil and human rights of all people, the value of tolerance and pluralism, and an understanding and respect for the diversity of different communities, views and traditions.”

Moreover, G8 countries admitted that while education systems have their own national characters, nevertheless there are areas common for different countries, which should be particularly observed. They were encompassed in eight building blocks, where was underlined inter alia the key role of teachers in modernizing and promoting high standards in education, and the greater role effective and modern IT networks. In the Cologne communiqué, the heads of state and governments reiterated their support for the goals described in the Köln Charter and called on the OECD and the UN to examine “how different countries are attempting to raise education standards, for example by looking at best practices in the recruitment, training, compensation and accountability of the teaching profession internationally.” They also committed to help developing countries in using technologies to address learning e.g. through distance learning. Moreover, there were important words concerning improvement of ability to prevent crisis: “Effective crisis prevention and management must address the root causes of these conflicts (author’s bold) These causes include the political manipulation of ethnic tensions, economic and social inequality, and extreme poverty as well as the absence of democracy, the rule of law and good political and economic governance.” In the same document, the G8 reiterated its engagement in the fight against AIDS by elaborating a strategy of prevention, vaccine development and therapy as well as in combating infectious and parasitic diseases such as malaria, polio, tuberculosis and their drug resistant forms. Leaders also invited the OECD experts to talks with G8 personal representatives on implications of biotechnology and other aspects of food safety.

Additionally, in the final document of the G8 foreign ministers’ meeting in Gürzenich, before
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the Cologne Summit, one could find the direct reference to the G8 position of human security. In the third part of that document, titled “Human Security”, was written that “The G8 is determined to fight the underlying causes of the multiple threats to human security, and is committed to creating an environment where basic rights, the safety and the very survival of all individuals are guaranteed. We emphasise that crucial cornerstones of human security remain democracy, human rights, rule of law, good governance and human development.”

The Okinawa Summit 2000 was aimed at inter alia defining new principles for the 21st century because of the existing new challenges. One of the areas that played the major role was IT subject, as it has “immense potential for enabling economies to expand further, countries to enhance public welfare and promote stronger social cohesion and thus democracy to flourish.” In the document, “Okinawa Charter on Global Information Society”, was noticed that “everyone, everywhere should be enabled to participate in and no one should be excluded from the benefits of the global information society. The resilience of this society depends on democratic values that foster human development such as the free flow of information and knowledge, mutual tolerance, and respect for diversity.” There was stressed that the huge role in development of IT networks plays the private sector and the government’s role is to create transparent policy and regulatory but at the same time IT friendly environment. The heads of state and government announced actions to protecting intellectual property rights for IT related technology, facilitating cross border e-commerce and privacy protection in the network as well as all actions aimed at secure cyberspace. They underlined the importance of eliminating the digital divide in and among countries inter alia through widening network access or IT education, and it was particularly important in regard with developing countries. The G8 decided to establish a Digital Opportunity Taskforce (DOT force), which was supposed to work in the following areas: fostering policy, regulatory and networks readiness; improving connectivity; increasing access and lowering cost; building human capacity; and encouraging participation in global e-commerce networks. Moreover, leaders reiterated the need of help for the poorest people, as a goal setting reduction of the

---

864 Conclusions of the meeting of the G8 Foreign Ministers, Gürenich/Cologne, http://www.g8.utoronto.ca/foreign/fm9906010.htm, 02.02.2010
867 Ibidem
number of people living in extreme poverty to half its 1990 level by 2015. They welcomed
fact that, according to the Report on Poverty Reduction by MDBs and the IMF, in the past
century many countries had made big progress: “From their success, we have learned that
poverty can best be overcome in resilient, peaceful, and democratic societies with freedom
and opportunity for all.” For the first time in the Summit’s document was directly raised the
issue of health: “Only through sustained action and coherent international co-operation to
fully mobilise new and existing medical, technical and financial resources, can we strengthen
health delivery systems and reach beyond traditional approaches to break the vicious cycle of
disease and poverty.” Thanks to engagement of substantial resources, the G8 announced that
in cooperation with the international community had been gained control over polio, guinea
worm and onchocerciasis. As had increased awareness that “health is central to economic
development”, leaders underlined the necessity of closer cooperation with the WHO,
international organisations, industry, academic institutions, NGOs and other relevant actors to
achieve three UN targets: 1. Reducing the number of HIV/AIDS-infected young people by
25% by 2010; 2. Reducing TB deaths and prevalence of the disease by 50% by 2010; 3.
Reducing the number of people suffered from malaria by 50% by 2010. In order to achieve
these goals it was found as necessary inter alia to mobilize additional resources (although
with satisfaction was noticed the decision of MDBs to triple IDA financing for HIV/AIDS,
malaria and TB). In the same document leaders admitted that must be continued support for
basic education, because “in some developing countries access to education is limited,
particular for females and the socially vulnerable.” They promised increase of efforts and
closer cooperation with various international organisations and private donors in order to
achieve the goals of universal primary education by 2015 and gender equality in schooling by
2005. They also called for creating strategies, which would let in the best taking advantages of
benefits of IT as well as for speeding actions in this area: “Without accelerated progress in
this area, poverty reduction will not be achieved and inequalities between countries and
within societies will widen.” Moreover, G8 countries paid attention to the progressing aging
of population, what force people in power to change the traditional concept of three stage life
cycle of education, employment and retirement. As the basic task in this field, promotion of
“a culture that values the experience and knowledge that come with age” was recognized. The
OECD was indicated as a leading organization in works on ageing population, food safety and
development of biotechnology. Special meaning leaders attached to the importance of last two

issues to developing countries and declared that “We will work to strengthen our support for their capacity building to harness the potentials of biotechnology, and encourage research and development as well as data and information sharing in technologies, including those that address global food security, health, nutritional and environmental challenges and are adapted to specific conditions in these countries.”

In the Genoa 2001, leaders talked a lot about help for the poorest countries agreeing that “The most effective poverty reduction strategy is to maintain a strong, dynamic, open and growing global economy” but at the same time they stressed that “Open, democratic and accountable systems of governance, based on respect for human rights and the rule of law, are preconditions for sustainable development and robust growth.”

The heads of state and government raised a lot of financial and economic solutions but they also discussed on initiatives to promote health, education and food security. They referred to the decision from the Okinawa Summit, where was decided to intensify efforts against infectious diseases, what was reflected in the establishment ,with the UN Secretary General, of the Global Fund to Fight HIV/AIDS, Malaria and Tuberculosis. The Fund was planned as the public-private partnership with a budget of $1.3 billion, however the G8 called on other countries as well as public and private subjects for financial support and for shared expertise. Promoting of integrated approach and operation “according to principles of proven scientific and medical effectiveness, rapid resource transfer, low transaction costs, and light governance with a strong focus on outcomes” was set out as the goal. Moreover, leaders indicated on two important elements in the effective response to infectious and parasitic diseases: strong national health systems and society-wide actions beyond the health sector. They also expressed satisfaction of the fact of the wider accessibility of drugs: “we will work with the pharmaceutical industry and with affected countries to facilitate the broadest possible provision of drugs in an affordable and medically effective manner.” The next important issue discussed in Genoa, was education that was described as a “central building block for growth and employment.” G8 countries agreed that the universal primary education and equal access to education at all levels for girls should be the priority in the development and poverty reduction strategy. There was announced help in elaborating assessments systems to measure progress, help in the teacher training through the use of IT technology and cooperation with
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the ILO in fighting child labour. Additionally, leaders decided on the establishing of a task force of senior G8 officials, which was supposed to give them recommendations how in the most optimal way could be realized goals concerning education in cooperation with developing countries, relevant international organisations and others stakeholders. The G8 reminded that according to the 2001 World Food Summit, over 800 million people is malnourished, including at least 250 million children, so adequate food supplies and efforts to enhance agricultural productivity and rural development should be crucial in the poverty reduction strategy. An important role in this field was reserved to biotechnology: “Among other things, the introduction of tried and tested new technology, including biotechnology, in a safe manner and adapted to local conditions has significant potential to substantially increase crop yields in developing countries, while using fewer pesticides and less water than conventional methods.” As the most food-insecure regions were indicated Sub Saharan Africa and South Asia. Leaders also paid attention to the fact that of the results of biotechnology became people’s insecurity with regard to food safety. For that reason they announced actions to inform society on food safety basing on “independent scientific advice, sound risk analysis and the latest research developments.” In Genoa was also published the “Genoa Plan for Africa”, in which was stated that “Peace, stability and the eradication of poverty in Africa are among the most important challenges we face in the new millennium.” The heads of state and government welcomed the New African Initiative that based on principles of responsibility and ownership but at the same time it stressed the importance of such rules as democracy, transparency, good governance, the rule of law and human rights. The new partnership with Africa presented in Genoa was supposed to support goals of the New African Initiative such as: democracy, prevention and reduction of conflict; human development, including action for health and education; IT technology; economic and corporate governance; fight with corruption; stimulation of private investment; increase of trade within Africa as well as between Africa and the world; eradication of hunger and increase of food security. In order to accelerate this process, G8 countries decided that each of them would delegate its high level personal representative, who together with the committed African leaders and under the guidance of Canada would create a concrete Plan of Action and would present it at the next G8 summit. One of the important documents of the Genoa Summit
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was the “Report of the Digital Opportunity Task Force (DOT Force) including a proposal for a Genoa Plan of Action”. There were presented subjects analyzed by the DOT Force such as “the underlying causes of the digital divide, the poverty-reducing and empowering potential of new technologies, and the complex mix of strategies, policies, investments, and actions required to create digital opportunities for all while addressing key development imperatives.” There was admitted that IT could in the significant way influence on reduction of social and economic inequalities “But misapplied, they can result in marginalisation of the poor and the unconnected.” In the three-part document, the first one considered possibility of the eliminating of the digital divide, which is the most disadvantageous for the poorest countries. Leaders admitted that IT could in the significant way help indirectly and directly to realize agreed by the international community seven international development goals.

In the second part was underlined that in order to achieve goals of this document would be needed a regular process encompassing a lot of participants and a lot of integrated initiatives. There were described roles of governments and the private sector as well as once more was stressed that huge responsibility for success of this plan laid on developing countries and their readiness to implement proper reforms. In the third part were presented nine action points aimed at enabling developing countries to achieve IT-enabled developments such as: 1. Help in establishing national eStrategies; 2. Improvement of connectivity, increase of access and lower costs; 3. Enhance human capacity development knowledge creation and sharing; 4. Foster enterprise and entrepreneurship for sustainable development.

---


\[875\] The 7 IDGs are:

- Reduce the proportion of people living in extreme poverty by half between 1990 and 2015
- Enrol all children in primary school by 2015
- Make progress toward gender equality and empowering women by eliminating gender disparities in primary and secondary education by 2005
- Reduce infant and child mortality rates by two-thirds between 1990 and 2015
- Reduce maternal mortality ratios by three-quarters between 1990 and 2015
- Provide access for all who need reproductive health services by 2015
- Implement national strategies for sustainable development by 2005 so as to reverse the loss of environmental resources by 2015
-
economic development; 5. Establish and support universal participation in addressing new international policy and technical issues raised by the Internet and IT; 6. Establish and support dedicated initiatives for the IT inclusion of the Least Developed Countries; 7. Promote IT for health care and in support against HIV/AIDS and other infectious and communicable diseases; 8. National and international effort to support local content and applications creation; 9. Prioritize IT in G8 and other development assistance policies and programs and enhance coordination of multilateral initiatives.\(^{876}\) Among documents of the Genoa Summit was also the “Italian Presidency Document (Beyond Debt Relief)”, in which was presented series of propositions concerning the removal of trade barriers for the poorest countries, the promotion of private investments there as well as these addressing health and education.\(^{877}\)

Before the Kananaskis Summit 2002, G8 foreign ministers gathered in Whistler were occupied with the conflict potential of environmental and resources issues, particularly the question of cooperative and sustainable management of shared water resources. They admitted that already one-sixth of the world do not have access to drinking water and one-third lacks sanitation, and if this trend continued, then “According to World Bank projections, by 2050 40% of the global population are likely to face some form of water shortage, with one in five suffering severe shortages. Global climate change could further exacerbate the problem.”\(^{878}\) Ministers underlined that the subject of water scarcity should be considered in the context of three principles: prevention – sound water policies would reduce the risk of conflict; respect for sovereignty of states directly involved; cooperation – mutual and beneficial. At the Kananaskis Summit was published the extensive document “G8 Africa Action Plan”, which was created after the meeting of the G8 with African leaders, and which should be “the G8’s initial response, designed to encourage the imaginative effort that underlies the NEPAD (New Partnership for Africa’s Development) and to lay a solid foundation for future cooperation.”\(^{879}\) In the debate on the NEPAD took part present at the Summit the Presidents of Algeria, Nigeria, Senegal, South Africa and the UN Secretary General. G8 leaders admitted that in spite of hitherto help, Africa still is not able to ensure proper level of living for its people. However, NEPAD was a special document, as these were

\(^{876}\) Ibidem

\(^{877}\) Italian Presidency Document (Beyond Debt Relief),

http://www.g8.utoronto.ca/summit/2001genoa/pres_docs/pres1.html, 03.02.2010

\(^{878}\) G8 Initiative on Conflict and Development, http://www.g8.utoronto.ca/foreign/fm130602e.htm, 03.02.2010

African leaders who contributed to its creation and who announced taking responsibility for its realization, and what more “NEPAD recognizes that the prime responsibility for Africa's future lies with Africa itself.” G8 countries decided that each of them would establish a partnership with African countries, which would like to realize arrangements of the NEPAD but which would be able to present measurable results: “While we will focus particular attention on enhanced-partnership countries, we will also work with countries that do not yet meet the standards of NEPAD but which are clearly committed to and working towards its implementation. We will not work with governments which disregard the interests and dignity of their people.”

Created by the G8 Action Plan focused on eight areas, in which the Group assessed, that is able to add value. First one concerned “Promoting Peace and Security. Leaders announced here support for resolving main armed conflicts in Africa; technical and financial help to increase capacity of African countries in prevention and peacekeeping; support for African and the UN’s efforts to eliminate the flow of illicit weapons to and within Africa; assistance in actions to remove antipersonnel mines; help in tackling the problem of armed conflict connected with the exploitation of natural resources; cooperation on creating more effective peace building support; and strengthening African capacities to protect and assist war-effected people, especially civilians, women and children. The second area addressed “Strengthening Institutions and Governance” and promised support for the NEPAD’s priority political governance objectives; reinforcement of the capacity-building programs related to economic and corporate governance in Africa; support for African peer-review arrangements; help in promoting gender equality, empowerment of women and human rights; and assistance in combating corruption, bribery and embezzlement. Third area included actions to “Fostering Trade, Investment, Economic Growth and Sustainable Development”. Here were announced: assistance for Africa in drawing investment (within Africa and from abroad) and in implementing economic growth policies; transfer of expertise for the development of infrastructure projects; the improving of greater market access for African products; the establishing of trade-related technical assistance and capacity-building programs; support for the advance regional economic integration and intra-African trade; and the improving of effectiveness of the ODA. The next area of cooperation concerned the promise of the debt relief for the poorest countries, including help through the HIPC Initiative. The fifth area was titled “Expanding Knowledge: Improving and Promoting Education and Expanding Digital Opportunities” and addressed: support for Africa countries...
to improve quality of education at all levels and ensuring the equal access to education by women and girls; increase of assistance to Africa’s research and higher education capacity in enhanced-partnership countries; creation of digital opportunities; and help in using IT to promote sustainable economic, social and political development. The sixth area concerned “Improving Health and Confronting HIV/AIDS”. Here was promised: assistance to Africa in fighting results of HIV/AIDS; help in building sustainable health system, which would enable effective disease interventions; acceleration of elimination and mitigation of polio, river blindness and other diseases; and the support for health research on diseases prevalent in Africa. The next area was aimed at increasing agricultural productivity through: making support for African agriculture a higher international priority; improving sustainable productivity and competitiveness as well as food security in Africa. The last area announced help in improving the water resource development and management. Leaders committed to implement the above mentioned Action Plan individually and collectively as well as through international institutions and to assess a progress at the next summit.881 In Kananaskis, was also published another document addressing human security, mainly “A New Focus on Education for All”. There was reference to arrangements of the world community meetings in Dakar-Senegal 2000, the Genoa Summit 2001 and the 2000 Millennium Declaration and to the Report of the G8 Education Task Force. There was reminded that education is the necessary condition for better life and democratic societies but to large extent the problem of access to basic education is the biggest in Africa, where it is additionally deepened by violent armed conflict and HIV/AIDS epidemic: “Completing primary education of good quality is the indicator of success, and almost 90 countries are not on track to achieve this.”882 In the Report G8 Education Task Force, was noticed that to achieve goals of the EFA (Education for All) three conditions are necessary: the need for developing country commitment; the response required from developed countries; the need for better assessment. Precondition in this area is a political commitment of a developing country where the primary education will be a top priority as well as the significant share of domestic budget should be devoted to that. Responsibility for developing and implementing sound education plans, and for proving relevant funds lies on developing country government. These plans should have the following features: they should assure the access for all with special attention for girls; in them should
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be included measures for disadvantage children such as AIDS-affected, working children and children with special needs. Affected by conflict and in rural areas; they should have high quality; they must address the impact of HIV/AIDS on education systems; they must be comprehensive and must integrate the primary education into an overall education policy. Leaders noticed that when first condition is reached, very important becomes the response from developed countries that is based on well defined targeted-financial assistance: “We will significantly increase the support provided by our bilateral aid agencies to basic education for countries with a strong policy and financial commitment to the sector.” To make the EFA process effective, it is necessary to fulfil third condition: better assessment and monitoring, which on the basis of inter alia data from developing country will gather the World Bank and the UNESCO Institute of Statistics. 883

The Evian Summit 2003 was totally devoted to “the challenges of promoting growth, enhancing sustainable development and improving security.” 884 Next to G8 leaders in that meeting participated leaders of emerging and developing countries (Algeria, Brazil, China, Egypt, India, Malaysia, Mexico, Nigeria, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, South Africa), the President of the Swiss Confederation and the representatives of the World Bank, the UN, the IMF and the WTO. G8 countries agreed that the priority should be attached to internationally agreed Millennium and Johannesburg Development Goals in such areas as: Africa – the G8 decided to widen the dialogue to other Africa’s countries on the NEPAD and the G8 Action Plan; famine – there was promised an improvement of the prevention mechanism and food security; water – the G8 had adopted a special Action Plan; health – here was announced an extra funding and enhanced international cooperation against new epidemics such as SARS. Moreover, the heads of state and government, next to debate on economic and financial help, took note of the report of the Commission on Human Security and adopted an Action Plan on science and technology for sustainable development. In Evian was also published the “Implementation Report by Africa Personal Representatives to Leaders on the G8 Africa Action Plan”, in which was presented an assessment of previous actions and plans for the next years. There was reminded that the NEPAD and the G8 Africa Action Plan are interlinked and was expressed satisfaction that the NEPAD which “presents a bold and clear-sighted African vision of how Africa is assuming responsibility for its development and full integration into
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the world economy”, was indicated by the UN as the indicator of international community’s relationship with Africa. The report welcomed progress of implementation of the NEPAD by Africa countries *inter alia* by launching the African Union or peaceful resolution of armed conflicts on African continents, however there was underlined that still in many African countries progress is insufficient. As G8 leaders paid great attention to reach peace and security throughout Africa, in the annex to the report was presented joint Africa/G8 Plan to Enhance African Capabilities to Undertake Peace Support Operations aimed at technical and financial support in order to by 2010 establish, equip and train multinational and multi-disciplinary stand by brigade capabilities at the AU and regional level available for UN-endorsed missions; to develop capacities to provide humanitarian, security and reconstruction support; and to develop institutional capacities at the continental and sub-regional level to prevent conflict through mediation facilitation, observation and other strategies. In the report was also stated that “Human security, in particular in war-affected areas is a common concern of the G8 partners. Japan intends to give greater priority to Africa in initiatives supported by the Trust Fund for Human Security (US$203 million). Canada's five foreign policy program priorities for advancing human security - support for public safety, protection of civilians, conflict prevention, governance and accountability, and peace support operations also retain a significant focus on Africa.” The Evian Summit elaborated also “Water - A G8 Action Plan”, in which leaders stressed that “lack of water can undermine human security” as well as they called for intensification of international community’s efforts to achieve goals of the Millennium Declaration and the Plan of Implementation of the World Summit on Sustainable Development. From their side G8 countries announced actions aimed at: promoting good governance and capacity in recipient countries to implement appropriate water policy; financial helping through the ODA and mobilization of domestic resources, public-private partnership and international financial institutions; support in creating water and sanitation related infrastructure by empowering local authorities and communities; strengthening water monitoring, assessment and research; and reinforcing engagement of

---
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international organizations, where the UN plays the key role in the water sector. Similar structure possessed the next G8 Action Plan published in Evian addressing health. The heads of state and government presented their planned actions, in cooperation with developing countries, the private sector, multilateral organisations and NGOs, to reach success in six main areas: 1. Fight with HIV/AIDS, TB and malaria – here was reiterated engagement in combating these diseases according to arrangements of Okinawa or the Declaration of Commitment on HIV/AIDS as well as was stressed the role of the Global Fund to Fight AIDS, Tuberculosis and Malaria and the importance of increasing funding for this aim; 2. Help developing countries in reinforcing their health systems; 3. Facilitation of the availability of medicines for the poorest – here was expressed satisfaction of the decision of pharmaceuticals companies to provide “essential medicines at substantially discounted prices to developing countries”; 4. Encouraging research into diseases mostly affecting developing countries; 5. Eradication of polio by 2005 – it was connected with G8 commitment of Kananaskis and leaders decided to allot additional $500 million; 6. Cooperation on fighting new serious threat SARS – here was stated: “Strengthening international co-operation is key to containing, treating and eventually eradicating this disease.” Moreover, at the Evian Summit G8 leaders decided to faced with another important challenge, mainly food insecurity. In the document titled “Action Against Famine, Especially in Africa: G8 Action Plan”, they admitted that millions of people is at risk of starvation, of which over 40 million live in Africa but they also added that “This situation derives not only from climatic conditions and natural disasters but from more structural causes, such as chronic poverty, lack of an enabling environment and appropriate support for agriculture, HIV/AIDS prevalence, an increasing number of conflicts, poor governance and economic management and trade related issues.” Because of that it is necessary, next to present humanitarian aid, to elaborate long-term solutions against food insecurity, in which the G8 announced its help in cooperation with the UN Secretary General basing on the G8 Africa Action Plan. To meet the need of developing countries as well as the international community, G8 countries announced the following actions: delivery of emergency food
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assistance to address urgent food shortages; improvement of assessment capacities, warning and crop forecast systems and prevention mechanisms; increase of aid flexibility and efficiency; support for long-term initiatives to tackle the root causes of hunger and malnutrition and to ensure food security. In the end, leaders promised: “Building on the work of the G8 Contact Group on famine, we will work actively to take this Action Plan forward in all relevant international fora.”

In Sea Island 2004, again representatives of G8 countries met with African leaders from Algeria, Ghana, Nigeria, Senegal, South Africa and Uganda. The result of the talks was launch of a G8 Action Plan on Expanding Global Capability for Peace Support Operations and a G8 Action Plan on Applying the Power of Entrepreneurship to the Eradication of Poverty as well as the establishment of a Global HIV Vaccine Enterprise to accelerate HIV vaccine development. The G8 committed to close the funding gap to eradicate polio by 2005 and to launch new initiative on Ending the Cycle of Famine in the Horn of Africa, Raising Agricultural Productivity, and Promoting Rural Development in Food Insecure Countries. In the G8 Action Plan addressing peace support operations was stressed that “Africa is facing greater peace support needs, and the international community recognizes the importance of more comprehensive measures for ensuring peace.” The G8 countries reminded that they undertook actions in this area already in Kananaskis and Evian, where were presented plans of help for African partners in building peace security structures. In Sea Island were presented previous actions of the EU and single G8’s members to greater peace and stability in Africa as well as was announced better coordination of actions in this field: “By playing an active part in the AU-hosted annual consultation, setting up donor contact groups in African capitals (as foreseen in the Evian plan), and conducting coordination meetings with interested parties, we will more fully coordinate assistance by G8 members and others related to peace support operations and their related activities.” In order to achieve that, the G8 decide to create a clearinghouse, which was supposed to help in exchanging information and coordinating all actions in Africa. Summit’s participants issued also the separate communiqué “G8 Commitment to Help Stop Polio Fever”, where was reminded that thanks to funds gathered in the Polio Eradication Initiative was possible the realisation of worldwide immunisation
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campaigns and the significant limitation of this disease occurrence. However, to reach the goal – eradicate polio in all countries by 2005- it is necessary to close the financing gap for 2004-2005. Leaders reiterated that polio is still present in six countries and has re-emerged in nine African countries as so they committed to take all necessary steps in order to close the 2005 financing gap by the 2005 G8 Summit. The heads of state and government discussed also the ways of combating worldwide HIV/AIDS pandemic. In the document “G8 Action to Endorse and Establish a Global HIV Vaccine Enterprise”, they appreciated efforts of the Global Fund to Fight AIDS, Tuberculosis and Malaria, the WHO and UNAIDS but at the same time they noticed that “the human and economic toll of the AIDS pandemic demands that these activities be complemented by accelerated efforts to develop an HIV vaccine.”

Leaders admitted that the best way to accelerate works on HIV vaccine is organisation of a complementary cooperation of scientific and other stakeholders, what had been proposed by an international group of scientists in article of “Science” magazine. The G8 decided to support this initiative and called for creating a Global HIV Vaccine Enterprise, which should be based on a strategic plan “that would prioritize the scientific challenges to be addressed, coordinate research and product development efforts, and encourage greater use of information sharing networks and technologies.” In its foundation the plan should include six questions: 1. Development of a number of coordinated global HIV Vaccine Development Centres; 2. Development of increased dedicated HIV vaccine manufacturing capacity; 3. Establishment of a standardized preclinical and clinical laboratory assessment; 4. Expansion of an integrated international clinical trials system; 5. Optimisation of interactions among regulatory authorities; 6. Encouragement of greater engagement by scientists from developing countries. The US was indicated to call later this year a meeting of all stakeholders to clarify implementation of this strategic plan. Additionally, G8 countries expressed hope that this conference would become an annual event.

In Sea Island, another Action Plan aimed at finding solution for disaster of famine in the Horn of Africa was also published. G8 leaders declared that “We are united in our belief that famine is preventable in the 21" century.”
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The cooperation in the framework of the NEPAD and the Evian Famine Action Plan brought the significant progress in delivering emergency food aid in the Horn of Africa, however still was necessary to promote rural development and to raise agricultural productivity in food insecure countries. To that end, there were proposed three new initiatives. First one was aimed at breaking the cycle of famine in the Horn of Africa and implied *inter alia* the cooperation with a New Coalition for Food Security in Ethiopia to give unified support to the government’s reform program which goal was attaining food security for 5 million chronically food insecure people by 2009; support for Ethiopia’s land reform and rural infrastructure development as set out in Ethiopia’s Poverty Reduction Strategy Paper. Leaders called also on other countries in the Horn of Africa to develop comprehensive food security and famine prevention programs. The second initiative addressed the improving of the worldwide emergency assessment and response systems. Here was announced cooperation with the WFP (World Food Program), the FAO, leading NGOs and UN agencies in order to increase effectiveness of emergency assistance. The last initiative was aimed at boosting agricultural productivity: “Together we will advance a vision of a "second green revolution" adapted to African conditions that would raise agricultural productivity, promote hardier crops for healthier people, and make food insecurity in Africa a thing of the past.” Moreover, in Sea Island, was announced the G8 Plan of Support for Reform of the Middle East, in which next to the political solutions such as the establishing of a Forum for the Future, economic such as the launching of microfinance initiative, was also announced support to impart literacy skills to 20 million people by 2015 and to halve the illiteracy rate over the next decade. Additionally, in the part devoted to “Deepening Democracy and Broadening Participation in Political and Public Life” was announced assist in actions widening women’s participation in political, economic, social, cultural and educational fields as well as in enhancing their rights and status in society.899

In Gleneagles 2005 a lot of space in the debate was devoted to political situation in Africa. In the document titled “Africa” leaders admitted that while in last five years had been made political and economic progress in many Africa’s countries, still Africa “is the only continent not on track to meet any of the Goals of the Millennium Declaration by 2015.”900 The G8 renewed its commitment to support Africa’s effort; however the heads of state and government reminded that the responsibility for the further progress lays mainly on African
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leaders and people. As the basis of any actions to development is peace, G8 countries announced help for Africa’s states and the AU in their efforts to prevention, mediation and resolving conflicts through inter alia reinforcing African peace-building capacity, developing continental Early Warning System and combating the illicit transfer of small arms and light weapons. There was announced greater focus on reconstruction and reconciliation in post-conflict countries as well as on improvement of the timeless, predictability, effectiveness and availability of humanitarian assistance. Leaders welcomed the African commitment to promote and enhance good and responsive governance, democracy and human rights. In order to help the African partners in fulfilling these commitments, the G8 announced support for the efforts inter alia in favour of greater transparency in public financial management, prevention and combating corruption; implementing the African Charter on Human and People’s Rights; and enforcing laws against bribery. G8 countries did not forget about goals connected with the improvement of health, education, food security, access to safe water and sanitation. In areas of health and education was announced eagerness for realizing arrangements of the UN Millennium Declaration in order to by 2015 all children have access to free and compulsory primary education of good quality as well as access to basic health care. Moreover, leaders declared further efforts to create an AIDS-free generation in Africa by supporting the Global Fund to Fight AIDS, Tuberculosis and Malaria, the G8 Global HIV/AIDS Vaccine Enterprise and works to establish an International Centre for Genetic Engineering & Biotechnology in Africa. They also decided on additional quotas of financial support for Africa continent as well as announced their assistance for economic development strategies of African countries including inter alia projects creating stronger investment climate, building Africa’s capacity to trade, developing micro-finance, supporting youth employment, building infrastructure, supporting enterprise development and innovation. Participants of the Gleneagles Summit admitted that to effectively realize goals mentioned in this document it is necessary to strengthen the Africa Partnership Forum through twice a year meetings at an approximately high level, which should lead to the reviewing of “progress by all the partners involved in this joint undertaking not only by the G8 but also by Africans and other development partners.”

In attachments were presented also financing commitments of G8 individual members as well as G8 actions for Africa and the poorest countries. Fundaments of this document were recommendations of the Commission for Africa and conclusions of the “Progress Report by the G8 Africa Personal Representatives on Implementation of the Africa Action Plan”. In
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Chair’s Summary was reiterated willingness to help Africa in accelerating progress towards the Millennium Goals through a comprehensive plan to which were allotted extra resources. Moreover, leaders agreed to double aid for Africa by 2010: “Aid for all developing countries will increase, according to the OECD, by around $50bn per year by 2010, of which at least $25bn extra per year for Africa.”\textsuperscript{902} During the discussion with African leaders\textsuperscript{903} was paid attention to the fact that the implementation of measures set out in the presented comprehensive plan for Africa could: “double the size of Africa's economy and trade by 2015; deliver increased domestic and foreign investment; lift tens of millions of people out of poverty every year; save millions of lives a year; get all children into primary school; deliver free basic health care and primary education for all; provide as close as possible to universal access to treatment for AIDS by 2010; generate employment and other opportunities for young people; and bring about an end to conflict in Africa.”\textsuperscript{904}

At the first summit in Russia, in St. Petersburg 2006, could not lack traditional subjects related with human security such as the fight with infectious diseases, education or help for Africa, but there occurred also a new issue – the reduction of energy poverty. In the document titled “Fight against Infectious Diseases” was stressed that “A vigorous response to the threat of infectious diseases, the leading cause of death worldwide, is essential to global development and to the well-being of the world's population.”\textsuperscript{905} Leaders reiterated that still for a large number of infectious diseases there are no proper drugs, vaccines or other treatment and the situation may become even worse through the spread of new threats such as the avian influenza. In particularly bad position are the poorest countries, where are shortages in all aspects of prevention, treatment and other relevant resources such as nutrition, clean water or sanitation. In order to cope with these challenges, the G8 proposed the following actions: reinforcing the global network for surveillance and monitoring of infectious diseases by supporting existing global networks working under the WHO; improving cooperation between organisations and experts in the area of human and animal health at the national and international level; and accelerating scientific and clinical research. There were also proposed
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actions connected with the fight against the avian influenza and with the increase of global preparedness for a human pandemic. The heads of state and government admitted that in that time the biggest challenge would be creation of the response on outbreak of any human pandemic influenza. They welcomed efforts of the WHO, FAO and OIE in combating highly pathogenic avian influenza and gave support for the FAO and OIE initiative to establish a Global Crisis Management Centre for Highly Pathogenic Avian Influenza as well as for Russian proposition of establishing a WHO Collaborating Centre on Influenza for Eurasia and Central Asia. They also underlined that the important role in fighting avian influenza would play a close coordination of preparedness, prevention, response and containment activities among nations. Leaders reiterated that still the priority is the fight with HIV/AIDS, TB and malaria. They announced that in the fight with HIV/AIDS, the G8 took the following assumptions: promoting an comprehensive approach to tackle with HIV/AIDS; involving civil society, the private sector and people living with HIV/AIDS in the activities to tackle HIV/AIDS and to reduce discrimination against ill people; stopping the increase of the HIV sick rate among young people; establishing new comprehensive and innovative methods of prevention such as microbicides and vaccines against the diseases increasing the risk of HIV transmission; facilitating access to prevention, treatment and care the most vulnerable parts of population; and building the capacity of health care systems in poor countries. Moreover, was announced the replenishment of the Global Fund and willingness of the establishing of a Global HIV Vaccine Enterprise. Concerning tuberculosis G8 countries expressed concern that “In certain regions, it affects more people today than it did twenty years ago.” They reiterated the Genoa Summit’s assumption to halt the spread of this disease and called on all donors to support the Global Plan to Stop TB aimed at halving TB deaths by 2015 compared to 1990 levels. Leaders also talked about the fight with malaria because of which over 1 million die each year and what is important “Children who live in Sub-Saharan Africa account for at least 80% of those deaths.” In this subject were announced inter alia: cooperation with African countries, governments, private sector companies and NGOs on malaria control activities and programs; support for the development of effective drugs, for the creation of vaccine and for the promotion of prevention and treatment. The G8 called for financial support to close the funding gap for 2007-2008 of the Global Polio Eradication Initiative, as “There are sound reasons to believe that as a result of unprecedented measures taken by the international community, the world is now at the threshold of eradicating this disease.” Additionally, leaders announced intensification of efforts to fight with such diseases as pneumonia,
diarrhea, measles (here was promised support for the Measles Initiative and the Global Measles Partnership) as well as such neglected diseases as leishmaniasis, Chagas disease and onchocerciasis. They admitted that the precondition for fighting any diseases is an effective health system, which enable a universal access to means of prevention, treatment and care. For that reason the Group announced support for developing countries in Africa inter alia through the health sector assistance program. Moreover, G8’s heads of state and government appealed to the international community to pay attention to the increasing problem of antimicrobial drug resistance and to the possibility of elimination of import tariffs and non-tariffs barriers on medicines and medical devices for the poor. In the same document was underlined problem of health consequences of natural and man-made disasters as well as the role of the UN in the humanitarian emergency response, especially the OCHA (Office for the Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs). Leaders expressed satisfaction of the resolution of the 59th World Health Assembly on Emergency Preparedness and Response, which talked inter alia about the necessity of ensuring that the WHO is able to respond to emergencies and crisis or about the establishing of a monitoring of mortality rates in emergencies.906 Another document issued in St. Petersburg was “Education for Innovative Societies in the 21st Century”, in which was written: “Education is at the heart of human progress...We will promote the global innovation society by developing and integrating all three elements of the "knowledge triangle" (education, research and innovation), by investing fully in people, skills and research, and by supporting modernization of education systems to become more relevant to the needs of a global knowledge-based economy.”907 As education is actually indispensably connected with the innovation society, G8 countries announced the following actions in the education field: reaching education-related Millennium Development and Education for All Goals addressing high quality basic education, literacy and gender equality; building effective education systems; building diverse, efficient, sustainable and high quality higher education institutions; promoting lifelong learning based on the G8 Cologne Summit Charter on Aims and Ambitions for Lifelong Learning; cooperating with the private sector on research, innovation and new technologies; increasing exchanges at all levels of education; promoting high standards in mathematics, science, technology and foreign languages at all levels of education; and promoting social and economic integration of immigrants into host countries
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through education. First part of this document focused on the issue of developing a global innovation society and foreseen the following actions: creating research networks among higher education institutions, research centres and business; promoting investment in knowledge, research and development as well as the creation and dissemination of new technologies; cooperating with the private sector on the development of innovative, high quality higher education and R&D systems; promoting innovative alliances and international academic mobility at all levels; and increasing the exchange of ideas and expertise about university-based public-private partnerships in G8 countries. The second part concerned building skills for life and work through quality education. Here were supposed actions to: support lifelong learning; ensure the early childhood education; involve business community and NGOs in continuous education; use IT in education and modernization of G8 education systems. In the third part, “Education for All and Development” was noticed that “We will work to provide affordable, quality education and professional training accessible for all, regardless of social and economic background, age, sex, religion, ethnicity or disability...In addition to access, the content of student-learning and the quality of their learning outcomes are equally important.” Leaders underlined that a special attention in this area should be paid to the poorest countries. They should be helped in creating sound national education strategies and in implementing the EFA Fast-Track Initiative. The last, fourth part addressed the advancing social cohesion and immigrant integration through education in order to help combating intolerance and discrimination as “Inclusive, respectful and equitable societies provide the most conducive conditions for acquiring skills and knowledge, promoting innovations, and driving economic and social success.” The St. Petersburg Summit issued also the “Update on Africa”, in which was reviewed the progress in six areas mentioned in the statement of Gleneagles on Africa as well as were described further plans for the next year aimed at creating “a democratic, prosperous and peaceful Africa...” Additionally, at this meeting the G8 elaborated the “St Petersburg Plan of Action: Global Energy Security” which encompassed seven chapters and one of them was devoted to reducing energy poverty. This problem was mentioned in the UN Millennium Development Goals and addressed possibility of better access to energy for the poorest countries. Leaders noted that “It is impossible to drastically reduce general poverty, support health services, provide clean drinking water and sanitation, promote more productive agriculture and food yields, and secure investment in
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job-creating enterprises in developing countries without addressing the challenge of energy poverty.”

There was admitted that without the international help in the framework of various bilateral and multilateral programs, any progress in this area would not be possible. For its side the G8 committed to the following actions: supporting the development of infrastructure to improve energy access; assisting in policy and capacity building for improving energy access, efficiency, conservation and diversification of energy sources; promoting renewable energy; encouraging rural electrification through grid and non-grid connected solutions; and developing human resources in cooperation with the private sector.

At the 2007 Heiligendamm meeting, its participants published the extensive summit declaration, “Growth and Responsibility in Africa”, in which were presented the next steps toward the sustainable development in Africa: “We will focus on promoting growth and investments in order to combat poverty and hunger, to foster peace and security, good governance and the strengthening of health systems, and to assist the fight against infectious diseases.”

In Heiligendamm, was for the first time paid attention to impacts of climate change on Africa’s problems. Leaders decided that the fundament for cooperation should be the good governance in all its aspects (political, economic, social, cultural, and environmental) and at all levels (from local to global) and for that reason they announce the further support of African partners in this area. To be able to supervise progress in development of Africa continent was established the African Peer Review Mechanism (APRM) that to function effectively demands the recognition and implementation of its results. The G8 announced its support for these countries which would implement sound policies based on the recommendations of the APRM and called on more African states to join the APRM. Leaders promised also assist for African countries in their efforts in favour of competent, transparent and accountable public financial management through, developed with African partners and endorsed at the Pre-Summit of finance ministers, the G8 “Action Plan for Good Financial Governance in Africa”. As G8 countries already had announced their support for any regional integration and trade, they supported building capacity of African
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Regional Economic Communities (RECs) as well as the NEPAD Infrastructure Short-term Action Plan (STAP) and the Infrastructure Consortium for Africa (ICA). Additionally, the Group offered its support in the economic sector by: trade capacity building assistance; support of the recommendations of the WTO’s Aid for Trade; support initiatives which would create the investment climate in Africa; strengthening the financial markets; and encouraging sustainable investment through African private sector networks. There was stressed that “Growth and investment patterns need to be shaped in a responsible manner; growth needs to be inclusive, allowing people to benefit in terms of employment and income; investment patterns should pay due attention to agreed social and ecological standards.” In an issue of energy security leaders paid a special attention to energy efficiency and the use of domestic renewable energy sources. In order to improve food security, the G8 announce support for the AU/NEPAD’s Comprehensive Africa Agricultural Development Program. There was also reiterated the G8 commitment in the “Education for All” and its 2002 Fast Track Initiative aimed at delivering universal primary education in the poorest countries. As the precondition for any actions in favour of the sustainable development are peace and stability, leaders announced that “It is the aim of the G8 to continue to assist the African Union and sub-regional organizations in developing their capacity for promoting and maintaining lasting peace and stability on the continent, including through the prevention and resolution of conflict...we will devote greater attention and efforts to conflict prevention and stabilization, reconstruction, reconciliation, and development in post-conflict countries.” There was promised the further support for the African Standby Forces (ASF) and the African Peace and Security Architecture. With satisfaction was noticed the proposition of the AU to create a rapid deployment capability and to achieve that was declared the financial and other support. Leaders announced that in cooperation with the AU they would try to build the AU’s capacities to plan and supervise the use of new ASF’s civilian component and help training of civilian police for post-conflict scenarios; create an additional capacity for the training of civilian experts; establish An African Volunteer Service, which would recruit experts for post-conflict and reconstruction operations; support a network of existing peacekeeping facilities and maximise their value in peace support operations. Moreover, there were also decided the conditions of cooperation between the G8 and the AU on fighting the illicit proliferation of small arms and light weapons as well as on drafting the African Convention on Small Arms and Light Weapons. The G8 committed also to the collaboration with African governments, the UN and other players to halt illegal resource exploitation and to promote regional
management of trans-boundary natural resources. The Group did not forget about the issue of threats connected with infectious diseases: “About 63% of all people in the world infected with HIV live in Africa. 72% of Africans who need ARV-treatment are still being left behind. Of particular concern are also the continuously rising HIV/Aids infections of women and girls. Every year, malaria kills nearly one million people around the world. Around 90% of these deaths occur in Africa, mostly in young children. Additionally, tuberculosis kills 5000 people every day, mostly young adults in their most productive years.” G8 countries admitted that thanks to their efforts as well as efforts of African leaders, multilateral institutions, the private sector and the international community was reached the significant progress in the fight with these diseases, but still it is far to achieve the Millennium Development Goals. They declared that they would “scale up their efforts to contributing towards the goal of universal access to comprehensive HIV/AIDS prevention programs, treatment and care and support by 2010 for all, and to developing and strengthening health systems so that health care, especially primary health care, can be provided on a sustainable and equitable basis in order to reduce illness and mortality, with particular attention paid to the needs of those most vulnerable to infection, including adolescent girls, women and children.” Leaders announced the replenishment of the Global Fund and its provision of the long-term funding. Moreover, they paid attention to an increasing feminization of the AIDS epidemic and for that reason they called for a relevant shift of the Global Fund’s resources. The G8 appealed also to all donors to increase efforts to reduce the funding gap of prevention of mother to child transmission programs. In the same document was reiterated the necessity of reaching the Millennium Development Goals on education, which improves the understanding for infectious diseases, promotes knowledge about sexuality, human rights of women and girls as well as it prevents sexual violence. A special attention was also paid to the issue of the fight with malaria, where was declared that “G8 members, in support of national malaria control programs, using existing and additional funds, will individually and collectively over the next few years work to enable the 30 highest malaria prevalence countries in Africa (contributing to at least 80 percent of the global malaria deaths) reach at least 85 percent coverage of the most vulnerable groups with effective prevention and treatment measures and achieve a 50 percent reduction in malaria related deaths.” Apart from that, leaders announced actions to enable African countries access to “affordable, safe, effective and high quality generic and innovative medicines in a manner consistent with the WTO.” Once more was reiterated readiness of the G8, all donors and other organisations to help Africa’s states in reinforcing
their health systems *inter alia* through the “Providing for Health” Initiative aimed at the sustainable and equitable financing of health systems and improving the access to quality health service.⁹¹³ In the annex for the above mentioned document could be found the “Summary of G8 Africa Personal Representatives’ Joint Report on the G8 Africa Partnership”, in which was underlined that “The G8 have a long standing commitment to Africa's development and Africa is again a priority on the agenda of the G8 summit in Heiligendamm.”⁹¹⁴ In the report was presented hitherto progress in the areas such as: promoting responsible governance; peace and security; promoting economic growth for the Africa; investing in people; management of natural resources; aid resources.

---
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Conclusions

Security in the G8 activity

The reason why the G7 had been established was an expectation that leaders of the most industrialized countries thanks to a meeting and discussion in informal atmosphere would find a solution of the difficult economic situation caused by the worldwide economic crisis in 70-ties of 20th century. There was fear that the crisis cause the closing of countries in economic nationalism, to avoid that the President of France, Valery Giscard, proposed to call a summit aimed at *inter alia* building mutual international trust and reducing tensions on US-Japan-Europe axis. First summit took place at Rambouillet, 1975 and as a main topic was discussed a necessity of international monetary system reform. Although results were very satisfied, in the final declaration one could find a suggestion that it was a one-time meeting which conclusions were supposed to be implemented by international institutions such as e.g. the IMF. However, not a long time passed when Americans called a meeting in Puerto Rico, to which Canada was invited and by this the G7 was finally constituted. But it was the 1977 summit in London that started regular annual meetings and set up institution of sherpas’ ‘follow-meetings’. Moreover, in London was finally explained the question of the EC participation, to which France at the beginning was opposed, but in the end general Giscard approved presence of the EC represented by the President of the European Commission and the head of government of the country holding the EC Presidency. First summit during which some time was devoted to political debate took place in Venice, 1980. The reason was Soviet invasion of Afghanistan and taking hostages in Iran. However, second series of summits 1979-82 had been still occupying mainly with economic subjects, specifically with the issue of holding down inflation. The most important results of these years were *inter alia* the 1981 establishment of the Quad, a group gathering trade representatives of the US, the EC, Japan and Canada as well as a decision took at 1982 67th ministers meeting about participation of the IMF Managing Director. But it was the third series 1983-88 in which influence of political issues was clearly seen. At 1983 Williamsburg meeting heads of state and governments for the first time discussed the matter of an East-West strategy. At the most productive summit of this series, in Tokyo leaders decided *inter alia* to transform the G5 into the G7 through representation of all seven finance ministers. Next series, 1989-93, took place under the banner of the end of the Cold War what has started changes in countries of Central and Eastern Europe. Leaders gathered in Paris, 1989, established a mechanism that was supplying
technical and financial support for the countries building democracy and introducing market economy rules - this was one of the reasons why the G24 was established. Next important decisions were the FATF creation and establishing the Brady Plan regarding debt reduction for the developing countries. In Paris, for the first time decisions were taken in the area of environment protection, what supposed to be the beginning of the G7 actions in that issue. Leitmotif of the fifth series 1994-97, was revision of international institutions in order to adjust them to new global situation. During this series one could observed growing role of Russia on the G7 forum: if in Naples, 1994, Russia was for a first time invited to participate in a political debate as a full member, then for 1997 Denver Summit President Clinton had invited Yeltsin not only to discuss political issues, but also to debate on some economic matters. An important result of that series was establishment in 1996 of so called the Lyon Group handling with an issue of international crime as well as creation of the Heavily Indebted Poor Countries program adapted by the IMF and the World Bank. In course of time, the summit process had been subjected to significant formalisation in spite of many trials to change that situation, not till the first summit of the sixth series in Birmingham 1998 brought simplification of the process. From that on, leaders started to meet separately – only in company of sherpas – and ministers of foreign affairs and finance ministers had their own meetings, on other date. The Birmingham venue was also the first one that was officially named as the G8 summit although Russia still did not take part in some economic debates as well as it started the series of meeting under the banner of globalization and development. An important result of the 1999 Cologne summit was President’s Yeltsin approval assent to the way of resolving hard situation in Kosovo and on the Balkans. Moreover, at the Cologne heads of state and government started works on an approach to ‘human security’, crisis prevention and violation of human rights. A millennium summit in Okinawa found expression in history as the first one that had included in process of pre-summit consultations representatives of NGOs. Equally ‘memorable’ turned out to be the next summit in Genoa, which unfortunately was accompanied by massive protests in which one person was killed. In Italy huge role was played by topics related with an improvement of a hard situation in Africa – it was the issue that seemed to be more and more present on the G8 agenda. This tendency was however a little bit slow down by the 9/11 attacks. Leaders gathered at the 2002 Kananaskis Summit began the series of meeting where leitmotif was the fight with terrorism and its roots. As a result, it was established in 2002 the G8 Partnership against the Spread of Weapons and Materials of Mass Destruction. The 2003 Evian venue was the first in which
Russia, from the very beginning, took part in the whole debate, but it also stand out because of wide discussion on situation in Africa. Development issues were also discussed in Sea Island, 2004, where was established the Partnership for Progress and Common Future in the Region of the Broader Middle East and North Africa, Forum for the Future, and Democracy Assistance Dialogue. During the history of the Group’s activity there has been worked out a specific way of taking decisions as well as pre-summit preparation process. It was also created an institution of sherpas and sous-sherpas and there were regulated works in ministerial fora. All this has been influencing not only the G8’s activity but also its cooperation with international organisations, especially with the EU, the UN, NGOs and civil society groups. However, the goal of the thesis is not only to present an evolution of the Group, but to analyse its decisions from the angle of security. Nature of the security term needs to be more precisely defined as security meanings were evolving from realism, through Cold War to globalization era. In the realism rules the balance of power approach which is supposed to authenticate an anarchic international environment. In 60-ties of 20 century, the neorealism allowed the fact that state interest could be driven by not only military origins but also for example by economic factors. End of 80-ties and the beginning of 90-ties brought in the debate on security studies a new approach in which it was underlined the necessity of the broadening of a definition of national security *inter alia* through the inclusion of environmental, demographic or technological factors. Moreover, the end of the Cold War caused the emergence of new actors in the international environment such as NGOs what had heated up disputes on the role of states in securing safety. One of the concepts that played an important role in security studies is an approach presented by Barry Buzan, Ole Wæver and Jaap de Wilde in the book ‘Security: a new framework for analysis’ which is a methodological base of this work. They divided the security area into five sectors: military, environmental, societal and political. That classification is used in analysis of the G7/G8 actions from 1975 till 2007. However, regarding the scope of issues discussed on the group’s forum that classification seems to be insufficient. For that reason to get a wider view of the subject I used additionally the human security approach introduced in 1994 by the UN Human Development Report. Main assumption of that concept is the broadening of perspective of the referent object, where next to a state stand also individuals. Proponents of the human security approach underlie the fact that human security is not a replacement or an alternative for national security but should be considered as a significant part of security policy. Authors of the UN report stressed that in

---

915 For more details on cooperation between the G8 and international organisation, see Chapter I.
their mind human security includes 2 main aspects: freedom from fear (from physical violence) and freedom from want (from poverty). In this report were also presented clear definition and split between human security and human development.\textsuperscript{916} The 1994 UN document had started a vigorous debate on human security meaning. Different scholars were presenting various definitions of human security depending on the scope of issues researched by them. Generally, could be noticed adherents of wide and narrow approach to human security. First one involved freedom from fear as well as freedom from want and the second one is focused only on one of these two aspects. The human security concept has evolved to such extent that by some countries such as Canada or Japan had incorporated that approach to their foreign policies. Union of human security and the concept proposed by the Copenhagen School allows to present whole spectrum of issues discussed by the G7/G8 over a span of 32 years.

The first kind of security issues that the Group was handling with is military security. This is the oldest way of definition identified with security policy. In this area, in the G7/G8 activities may be noticed 3 main spheres: non-proliferation, arms control and terrorism. First of them, regarding risk of nuclear technology proliferation and of using nuclear weapons or materials in a way endangering to world safety, has appeared in the G7 debate already in 1977 when leaders underlined their support for an increase of nuclear energy production (\textit{inter alia} in connection with world oil-crisis) but in the same time they announced actions aimed at limiting nuclear weapons proliferation. Huge role in this area was signed to the IAEA which turned out to be a principal international organisation dealing with an issue of nuclear technology. Significant event that had contributed to invigorate debate on nuclear safety was the 1986 Chernobyl disaster. Also after the end of the Cold War the G8 countries, bearing in mind this catastrophe, were offering support for countries of Former Soviet Union and in the CEE aimed at securing safety of nuclear power plants. An important aspect of the G8 activity was enticement of all states to accept the Convention on Nuclear Safety, Convention on the Safety Radioactive Waste Management, Convention on the Physical Protection of Nuclear Materials; establishment of the Program on Preventive and Combating Illicit Trafficking in Nuclear Materials and the Fissile Material Cut-Off Treaty. G8 heads of state and government at every turn stressed the necessity of obeying the IAEA comprehensive safeguards; their support for the NPT as well as for every measure aimed at preventing trafficking in nuclear technology and materials. The next subject in the debate on the military safety was the issue

\textsuperscript{916} Human development is wider concept than human security.
of arms control. In the 1983 Williamsburg declaration G7 states stressed that “our arms will never be used expect in response to aggression” and expressed hope for cooperation with the Soviet Union on arms reductions. Topic of the US and the USRR nuclear weapons reduction appeared in G7’s talks almost every year, similar to issues of limiting strategic defensive arms as well as destructing and non-producing of chemical weapons. Summit called all countries to sign Chemical Weapons Convention, Biological Weapons Convention and to join the MTCR in order to control missile proliferation. Year 1991 brought a breakthrough in issue of arms control as the political situation in East Europe and the Gulf crisis had shown the danger connected with uncontrolled flow of chemical, biological and nuclear weapons as well as with excessive holdings of conventional weapons. G7 states underlined also their support for START I, START II, the CTBT, Treaty on Open Skies, the ABM Treaty as well as for all actions taken inter alia by the UN and the IAEA. After Russian access to G7, the Group even stronger has stressed the necessity of actions against WMD proliferation, their delivery means and related material but also the necessity of cooperation on identifying track and freeze financial operations associated with WMD proliferation. Coordination of 8 states activities was especially important by presenting the common stance towards inter alia DPRK nuclear testing or Iran, Libya, Pakistan actions in that subject. Third very important issue discussed in the G7/G8 was terrorism. That topic had occurred very early in the debate because already in 1978 in Bonn was published a statement on air-hijacking in which G7 leaders announced intensification of “their efforts to combat international terrorism.” Hijacking question had been appearing also in later years inter alia in Venice, however a single “Statement on Terrorism” was published in Ottawa, 1981 where was clearly condemned the hijacking as well as hostage taking and attacks on diplomatic and consular personnel. From the very beginning G7 leaders had stressed that terrorism “must be fought relentlessly and without compromise” 917 and they called all countries to cooperate especially on the forum of the UN, ICAO or IMO. Terrorism issue was companied by the topic of international cooperation on producing, trafficking and financing illicit drug trade and money laundering. G7 states gave support to the UN Convention on Illicit Trafficking, the UN Fund for Drug Abuse Control as well as they called for ratification of the Vienna Convention on Illicit Traffic in Narcotic Drugs and Psychotropic Substances. In 1994 in the Naples statement leaders claimed an important sentence that terrorism and narcotics are “a threat to political as well as economic

917 op.cit., http://www.g7.utoronto.ca/summit/1986tokyo/terrorism.html
and social life”. Heads of state and government noticed also an increasing danger from the side of TOC and in 1997, in Denver, they stressed that the fight with TOC will be the priority for G8 actions in next years. In 2000 to the list of dangers was added also cyber-crime. However the 9/11 attacks were the event that in the significant way had influenced on presentation of international terrorism as the no. 1 problem in the area of military security. At the Kananaskis Summit 2002, was established inter alia the G8 Global Partnership against the Spread of Weapons and Material of Mass Destruction, to which the US allotted $20 billion for the next ten years. G8 leaders announced help for countries that will decide to implement rules set by the UNSCCTC in the area of counter-terrorism legislation or export control and illegal arms trafficking. They also stressed the necessity of the fight with a radiological terrorism publishing in 2003, “Action Plan on Securing Radioactive Sources”. Important project created by the G8 was 2004 SAFTI Action Plan, which presented 28 proposed actions in 4 main areas: 1. document interoperability through international standards; 2. international info exchange; 3. MANPADS threat reduction; 4. capacity building and collaboration. G8 states called all countries also to implement the International Convention for the Suppression of Acts of Nuclear Terrorism and they underlined the crucial role of the UN in the fight against terrorism.

However, it cannot be forget that the main reason why first summits had been called was the hard world economic situation caused inter alia by oil price’s increase. It had especially bad repercussion on the European economy where additionally already hard situation was worsen by strong protection trends. In the declaration of first summit in Rambouillet could be found leaders’ assertions on cooperation on the fight with high unemployment, inflation and energy problems as well as announcement of actions in aid of international trade liberalization and a reform of international monetary system. Representatives of the biggest world economies declared also cooperation on reducing developing countries’ deficits underlying fact that they are fully aware of the necessity of collaboration between developed and developing countries in order to achieve worldwide growth. In discussions on economic matters leaders always stressed the importance of international institutions – such as the WB or the IMF - for which they expect the leading role in the process of economic changes implementation. Next oil crisis caused that at the 1979 Tokyo Summit the most important subject was the reduction of oil construction and development of other energy sources. G7 leaders were also engaged in

918 op.cit., http://www.g7.utoronto.ca/summit/1994naples/chairman.html
919 op.cit., http://www.g7.utoronto.ca/summit/2002kananaskis/arms.html
implementation of the GATT (and then the WTO) negotiations’ resolutions stressing the necessity of the fight with protectionism as well as benefits of international trade liberalization. In the Venice Declaration appeared for the first time a plea to new group of economies, so called NIE (newly industrialized economies), for taking responsibility for the international economy **inter alia** through joining the Uruguay Round, thereby liberating their own trade. Another group of new actors in the world economy constituted CEE countries that had appeared on the international scene after the 1989/90 revolution. G7 heads of state and government announced political and economic support for these countries as well as they underlined the necessity of liberalization of all markets in the CEE. G7 claimed also its acceptance for the EBRD and the G24 activity in the CEE region. An important issue in the debate of summits participants was the question that for the first time had appeared at the 1995 Halifax Summit, namely adaptation of existing international institutions to global changes. Leaders declared the crucial role of existing IFIs such as the IMF or the WB, especially in areas where there were no actions of private sectors but at the same time they called for actions aimed at increasing IFIs’ efficiency. 21st century had become for the G8 an occasion to stress results of globalization as well as fast pace of technological changes. At the Okinawa Summit leaders agreed two important documents: one of them was establishing the Digital Opportunities Task Force and the second (Charter on the Global Society) was bridging the gap between international information and knowledge. Heads of state and governments as a goal set also the reduction of the share of the world’s population living in the extreme poverty to half its 1990 level by 2015, announcing at the same time further help through **inter alia** HIPC and ODA. Summits’ participants next to strict economic issues discussed also actions connected with actions against harmful tax competition, corruption, bribery and financing terrorism, promising their help for all institutions fighting with these dangerous phenomena.

Term “environmental security” had occurred quite early in the summits’ debate because already in the 1978 Bonn Communication, although for many years it had not been developed. There were stressed such questions as the necessity of environmental safety, necessity to develop solutions against higher pollution level but it was not earlier than in 1985 were in the declaration one could find a separate section devoted to environmental policies. In that documents G7 leaders underlined the must of international cooperation on such issues as acid deposition; air pollution; climate change; depletion of ozone layer; management of toxic and hazardous wastes; protection of tropical forests; pollution of soil fresh water and the sea.
They stressed the crucial role of the UN in this area, especially UNEP. Summits’ participants emphasized the necessity to provide for aspects of environmental protection in the industrial as well as in agricultural sector in order to balance the economic growth with environment safety. At the Paris Summit 1989, the leaders published special economic incentives for developing countries caring for the environmental safety and in 1990 they also proposed to start working on a global forest convention or agreement that would stop deforestation and desertification thereby would safe biological diversity. Heads of state and governments declared their strong support for IMO actions aimed at counteracting marine pollution, oil spills and overfishing. The issue of environmental security had been also occurring in the context of post communist countries from the CEE region as well as poor developing countries to which the G7 had offered additional financial and technical support. Next to constant and strong support for activity of international institutions such as UNEP or CSD, the Group had worked out also their own plan of actions as for example the 1998 G8 Action Program on Forests describing domestic activities in the G8’s countries. Among summits’ participants were discussions not only on issues relating exclusively G8’s states but also on important international projects such as the Kyoto Protocol. At the 2001 Genoa Summit, leaders admitted that despite the existing disagreement on the Protocol they will work on finding solutions to reduce greenhouse gases emission. Subject of the environmental security was also the leitmotif of G8 Environment Ministers meetings. One of the most important results of these venues was a document called “The Banff Ministerial Statement on the World Summit on Sustainable Development’ which was presenting a more comprehensive approach to the environment issue. Worth to notice was also the ‘3r’ initiative (Reduce, Reuse and Recycle) published at the Sea Island Summit aimed at “more efficient use of resources and materials”.

From the very beginning could be noticed that states gathered in the G7 had a common ideology that during the Cold War was clearly visible in compare to the USRR ideology. After the USRR disintegration and revolution in CEE countries still one could have found notations in summits’ documents which were indicative of basic rules that leaders were obeying. Already in the first declaration from Rambouillet heads of state and governments noticed benefits of respecting rule of individual liberty as well as democratic society. Popular in leaders’ statements was the underlying of cooperation for “the wellbeing both of our own
countries and of others”

For now as well as for better future. In relation to the USRR, the G7 stressed the willing of progress in détente and in collaboration in the area of economic relations, arms and WMD stock reduction but at the same time the Group did not hesitate to say that the Afghanistan occupation is against the law of Afghan people for national independence as well as against the UN Charter. The G7 called also the USRR and its partners for taking responsibility for hard situation of developing countries while respecting their law to self-determination. It was already in 1981, at the Ottawa Summit, when was published a separate part of declaration regarding East-West relations. There was stressed readiness of G7’s countries to cooperate but at the same time countries underlined their unease for increase of USRR arms, calling for peace respect and for peaceful solutions of any disagreements. It is worth to notice that no earlier than in 1982, in the report “Technology, Employment and Growth”, for the first time G7 leaders clearly stated that they are aware of the fact that as seven the richest states of the world they should care not only about economic prosperity but also about broadly understood development of all countries, including the gap reduction between the North and the South. Very often in summits’ declaration appeared an attachment of G7’s countries to such values as democracy, individual freedom, human dignity, personal development, justice and peace. They stressed the fact that despite of individual differences among their countries they have common ideology. 1984 document, “Declaration on Democratic Values”, in a wide way described the Group’s beliefs and ideology counting values that according to the declaration should be respected. There was underlined inter alia faith in democracy, necessity of broad cooperation among countries to achieve these values as well as to fight with hunger and poverty. At the Venice Summit 1987, heads of state and governments for the first time clearly condemned the apartheid policy and announced help for its victims. The G7 had also noticed the fact of release former communist countries from the USRR surveillance and promised its help expressing at the same time hope for an effective cooperation with Russia. G7 leaders decided to help Russia in conducting reforms through individual and collective technical and financial support. In the 1991 declaration of the London Summit, heads of state and government announced actions that were supposed to underline a crucial role of the UN in peacekeeping, protecting human rights, maintaining peace and security, preventing crisis, protecting minorities as well as in preventing diplomacy and post-conflict peace building. Summits that were held in circle of eight countries, next to above mentioned issues, were handling also with results of

op.cit., [http://www.g7.utoronto.ca/summit/1977london/communique.html](http://www.g7.utoronto.ca/summit/1977london/communique.html)
globalization process stating that one of the G8’s goals should be bestowing “human face” upon globalization. Leaders put also attention to necessity of cultural diversity promotion and to importance of IT solutions contributing to increasing people’s awareness.

Political issues during the first summit, as the US Secretary of State Henry Kissinger had mentioned, were discussed “at the fringes of the meetings”. One of the first non-economic questions that appeared on the G7 forum was problem of refugees. However, already in Venice 1980, was published a separate statement regarding political issues in which leaders condemned the Soviet occupation of Afghanistan. Documents form next summits had either form of separate statement describing single topics as e.g. the 1982 Statement on Lebanon or form of summary of the whole political debate as e.g. the Chairman’s Summary on Political Issues (1987, Venice). Very often in the Group’s debate had appeared issue of complex situation in Near and Middle East, but definitely it was conflict in former Yugoslavia and Kosovo that had shown summits’ power of influencing on the world politics. Since 2006 could be seen strong shift of the G8’s debate into the direction of subjects that could be classified as human security. Leaders discuss a lot about issues connected with education, health or poverty trying to fight with its causes and not only visible results.

Use of human security approach by the Group could be clearly noticed in its relation towards developing countries. From the very beginning, because already in the Rambouillet declaration, the G7 defined its strategy towards developing countries, stressing the fact that hard situation in these countries influence also on prosperity of the industrial world. Leaders underlined many times that one of the Group’s priorities is to reach sustainable growth but at the same time they were pointing out on the crucial role of the UN in helping the most needing countries. In first years of the G7’s activity, context of help for the developing countries had mainly an economic character and was provided inter alia through ODA or IDA. However, already in the declaration of 1980 Venice Summit could be found declaration that one of G7’s priorities is cooperation with the developing countries in energy conservation and development; expansion of exports; enhancement of human skills; food and population problems. Issue of food security was occurring very often in debate on support for the most needing countries inter alia through the Group’s declaration of support for the WB or FAO in handling facilities and storage. The first document in which help for the developing countries was widely threatened was a 1982 report presented by the President Mitterrand. He stressed necessity of giving help from the G7 side for the poorest countries in introducing new

921 op.cit., http://www.g7.utoronto.ca/summit/1976sanjuan/kissinger.html
technologies, what would result inter alia in reduction of famine, diseases and overpopulation. Very large part of the Group’s help was dedicated above all for African people suffering from hunger and draught. In the 1985 Bonn Declaration, leaders underlined their engagement not only in emergency food aid but also in the developing of a long-term food strategy for Africa. What is worth to stress is fact that in the Political Declaration on the 40th Anniversary of the Second World War was found statement that one of G7’s fundamental assumptions is creation of such world that would guarantee to individuals “freedom from oppression, want and fear.” This declaration was stated on the Group’s forum already in 1985, so it was much earlier than official publication of the UN Report on human security. An important summit in terms of human security was the meeting in 1987, in Venice where was issued a separate statement on the AIDS problem announcing intensification of actions against fighting but also preventing AIDS. Significant step in support for the developing countries was the establishing in Lyon, 1996, of a New Global Partnership for Development, which was promising inter alia protection of children; improved health and education systems; reduction of poverty and social inequities. Another important sentence was written in the Political Declaration from the Lyon Summit, where leaders stated that: “We continue to regard the United Nations as the cornerstone of an international system whose success or failure is increasingly significant for human security, including development within countries and partnership among countries.” To questions connected with human security was dedicated to wide extent the 1997 Denver Summit. Heads of state and government heralded intensification of efforts in fight with infectious diseases and efforts for the building of public health capacity. Separate document was devoted to plans aimed at economic and political help for Africa. Leaders declared their support but at the same time they stressed that the main role in developing Africa belongs to the UN and its programs. It was also noticed the necessity of internal actions of African countries, videlicet regional cooperation as well as African peace building and conflict prevention initiatives. An important element of human security is education and that issue was widely discussed in 1999 Köln Charter, where heads of state and government noticed that in 21st century “access to knowledge will be one of the most significant determinants of income and the quality of life.” Also in the final communiqué from this meeting could be found significant statements as an allegation that every preventive action “must address the root causes of (...) conflicts.” G8’s attitude to the human security concept was clearly presented

922 op.cit., http://www.g7.utoronto.ca/summit/1985bonn/political.html
923 op.cit., http://www.g7.utoronto.ca/summit/1996lyon/chair.html#global
also in a document from the G8 foreign ministers’ meeting in Gürzenich, before the 1999 summit, where in the third part of the document titled “Human Security” was written: “The G8 is determined to fight the underlying causes of the multiple threats to human security, and is committed to creating an environment where basic rights, the safety and the very survival of all individuals are guaranteed. We emphasise that crucial cornerstones of human security remain democracy, human rights, rule of law, good governance and human development.”

At the Okinawa Summit pervading subject was significance of IT technologies, especially for developing countries, but also some time leaders devoted to discuss health security stressing that “health is central to economic development” and it means not only fight with infectious diseases (e.g. through the Global Fund to Fight HIV/AIDS, Malaria and Tuberculosis) but also challenge of progressing aging of population. In 2002, at the Kananaskis Summit arrived three representatives of African countries to meet G8 leaders in the result was published wide document “G8 Africa Action Plan” that was describing inter alia rules of cooperation through the NEPAD program on 8 areas: peace and security; institutions and governance; economic issues; debt relief; education and IT; health; agricultural productivity; water resource development and management. This Plan was supposed to be implemented individually and collectively by members of the Group. African leaders were also present at the next meeting in Evian, 2003, where they – together with representatives from emerging and developing countries – discussed on issues connected with human security. An important result of similar venue in Sea Island 2004 were 2 Action Plans that were aimed at expanding capabilities for peace support operations as well as eradicating poverty and global HIV vaccine enterprise.

**Milestones after 2007**

Ongoing trend of focusing on human security matters could be visible also after 2007. At the Hokkaido Toyako Summit, were established 2 important separate statements: on Global Food Security as well as on Counter-Terrorism. The first one was part of discussion on development and Africa, which has been continued for some time. Leaders underlined they commitment in reaching Millennium Development Goals (MDGs) and in ODA: “We also stressed the importance of various approaches in achieving these goals, namely, enhancement of human security and promotion of good governance, private sector-led growth and a

924 op.cit., [http://www.g8.utoronto.ca/foreign/fm9906010.htm](http://www.g8.utoronto.ca/foreign/fm9906010.htm)
participatory approach to involve various stakeholders.”

They agreed to establish the Toyako Framework for Action based on G8 experts’ report that set up actions in area of health, water and education in developing countries. As a new goal it is worth notice the G8 commitment to control/eliminate neglected tropical diseases (NTDs) next to their actions against HIV/AIDS, tuberculosis, malaria and polio as well as further financial help for health and education programs. At Hokkaido Toyako Summit was continued tradition of meeting with African leaders that was started at Kananaskis Summit 2002, but it were also started meetings of G8 agricultural ministers in relation to supervise implementation of the Global Food Security program. It is worth to notice that leaders discussing on political issues underlined not only the most critical issues connected with peace military security matters but they strongly stressed necessity of all actions strengthening human rights/humanitarian situations e.g. they called Myanmar to release political detainees including Aung San Suu Kyi. This situation has clearly shown that the Group is caring not only for holistic solutions or for improving security of countries, groups as well as is conducting dialogue with organisation or institutions but it also trying to help individuals. At next summit, in Italy, were taken decisions that could be described as continuation of earlier meetings. One of the most important things was the establishment of the Heiligendamm – L’Aquila Process (HAP) by the G8, Brazil, China, India, Mexico and South Africa: “Countries adhering to this Process are committed to strengthening their mutual understanding and translating this common ground into tangible results, thereby contributing to enhance global governance and jointly shaping the future.”

Part of debate was devoted to climate change. Leaders agreed on reducing global emissions by at least 50% by 2050 but what is worth to notice was the fact that during the broader session among the 16 Leaders of the Major Economies Forum on Energy and Climate, the European Commission, Sweden, Denmark and the UN Secretary General, were approved key commitments of the Copenhagen climate deal. This is the proof that next to the summit venue are hold also wider meetings that ended up with very important results. In Italy, the G8 talked also with representatives of African countries and “For the first time, Leaders issued a joint G8-Africa statement, expressing their determination to build a stronger partnership to increase access to water and sanitation.” but they also agreed to

---


allocate 20 billion USD in the L’Aquila Food Security Initiative that was aimed at helping in rural development of poor countries.\textsuperscript{927}

The G8 did not forget that that was and still to some extent is responsible for economic security but in document form Muskoka Summit leaders noticed an important role of G20 in the world economy. In the same time they also repeat that they have all one shared vision and stated that: “We must also ensure that the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction, terrorism and organized crime, as well as many other challenges faced by states to address their security vulnerabilities, including climate change, remain at the forefront of public policy. We, the G8, are determined to exercise leadership and meet our obligations.”\textsuperscript{928} What is important to stress is fact that more and more often in G8 documents has been occurring statements that confirmed G8’s support and engagement in human security. At Muskoka was established the Muskoka Initiative aimed at accelerating progress on fulfilling MDGs, especially in relation to “significantly reduce the number of maternal, newborn and under five child deaths in developing countries.”\textsuperscript{929} As earlier also in that matter leaders underlined the necessity of collaboration with the UN and other international organisation in implementing their main goals. At the Muskoka Summit significant part of the discussion was devoted to issues connected with military security: “We, the Leaders of the G8, remain deeply concerned about serious threats to global peace and security. We are all affected by threats from the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction, terrorism, international organized crime (including drug trafficking), piracy and from political and ethnic conflict.”\textsuperscript{930} Leaders called all states to obey rules of non-proliferation and they also raise issues of security threats during talks with African leaders (traditionally present at the summit) as well as representatives of Colombia, Haiti and Jamaica what has resulted in annex titled “Strengthening Civilian Security Systems”: “These initiatives will aim to reduce the intensity of conflict-related instability, protect civilians in situations of armed conflict, counter terrorism, combat piracy and transnational crime and help establish an enabling environment for growth, investment and democratic development.”\textsuperscript{931}

\textsuperscript{927} Ibidem
\textsuperscript{929} Ibidem
\textsuperscript{930} Ibidem
\textsuperscript{931} Ibidem
Estimated directions of the Group’s development

The Group of Eight is a specific form of international collaboration that is still, despite of significant change in this aspect, barely known to wider audience. It cannot be forgotten that the Group was created in 1978 as a result of meeting of in fact 5 members, during its 36 years history it was widen of only 3 new participants (moreover 2 at the beginning of its establishment - Canada and specific member: the EU): “These 8 nations have only 13 percent of the world’s population, but they produce almost two-thirds of the global GDP (gross domestic product) and generate 43 percent of world trade. Within the G7-states (the G8 without Russia), we can find 79 of the 100 largest transnational companies and 8 of the 10 biggest banks. The G8 claims 75 percent of all patents.”932 In spite of these impressive numbers, some researches undermine sense of existence of the G8 in the current shape. In relevant literature could be found 2 trends describing possible development of the Group: G8 +5 (G13) and L20. Name G13 could be split into 2 components: current G8 countries and the Plus Five, called also the Outreach 5 (O5), five states to which belong: China, India, Brazil, South Africa and Mexico. Leaders of these emerging countries are since 2005 regular guests at the G8 summits and their presence was noticed in piles of common statements. During 2008 Sapporo Summit in joint political declaration was used for the first time the name: the Group of Five (G5). It could be observed that proponents of widening the G8 about the O5 are inter alia France and Great Britain. It was nobody else, but the UK Prime Minister Tony Blair, who in 2006 proposed to include the O5 into the Group, however he was opposed by Germany and the US.

The very beginning of the O5 could be bounded with the 2003 Evian Summit, where the President of France Jacques Chirac invited to discussion on growth and cooperation leaders of 11 countries: Algeria, Brazil, China, Egypt, India, Malaysia, Mexico, Nigeria, Saudi Arabia, Senegal and South Africa justifying his decision at the next 2004 Sea Island Summit in the following way: “We cannot discuss major economic issues nowadays without discussing these issues with China, with India, Brazil, Mexico and South Africa... That is exactly what I tried to do in Evian last year, by establishing an enlarged dialogue to establish a link between these leaders and set in train a habit that we should have of working with them.”933 Goal of the 2005 Gleneagles Summit was to look effectively for solution of global warming and greenhouse gases emissions mainly by the US and the emerging economies. At this meeting,

933 International Affairs, vol. 84, no. 3 (2008), A. Payne, The G8 in a changing global economic order, p.530
leaders decided that they will continue debate on climate change, clean energy and sustainable development in the configuration ‘G8+5’. Next milestone in the process of G13 was the 2007 Heiligendamm Process, which assumed some kind of regular cooperation (in next two years) on 4 areas: 1) promoting and protecting innovation, 2) enhancing freedom of investment, 3) promoting development in Africa and 4) “sharing knowledge for improving energy efficiency and technology cooperation with the aim to contribute to reducing CO₂ emissions.”

However, structure “G8+5” for proponents of perceiving the G8 as an instrument of global governance seemed to be still too limited. In response *inter alia* to such queries the Prime Minister of Canada Paul Martin proposed establishing of “L20” (leaders 20) that was supposed to include G8 countries and emerging economies and should meet on the level of presidents and prime ministers and which goal was: “establishing broader and more effective base around which to rebuild ‘global governance’ after the Asian financial crisis.”

Chretien’s proposal found objections of *inter alia* the US side and after the Canadian Prime Minister dismissal it was actually dead. However, some supporters of that concept such as Dries Lesage draw attention to the fact that nowadays there is a lack of multilateral institutions which could play important global governance functions: “(...) crisis management, coordination of domestic policy of important countries in relation to global public goods, surveillance of coherence in global governance between different policy domains and the steering of global governance. These global governance functions are not adequately delivering in the contemporary world.”

To smoothly perform these 4 functions institutions would have had 8 features: “(...) presence of the most powerful states, legitimacy, a limited number of members, a set of common interest and values, meetings at the level of heads of state, prime ministers, and ministers, informal and flexible procedures, a permanently operational diplomatic infrastructure and good public documentation of the decisions.”

These above mentioned criteria, according to some researchers, meet currently the G20 which “is comprised of industrialized nations as well as emerging economies (...) and reflects the changes in international economic patterns and serves as a platform of peaceful dialogue.

---


935 op.cit. International Affairs, vol. 84, no. 3 (2008), A. Payne, The G8 in a changing global economic order, p.529

936 Global Society, vol.21, no. 3 (2007), D. Lesage, Globalisation, Multipolarity and the L20 as an Alternative to the G8, p. 345

937 Ibidem, p.347
between developing and developed countries.” The G20 was established in late 1990s as a result of the Asian financial crisis. Nowadays, it includes 19 countries and a political entity – the EU and has one crucial feature – cross-regional reach that in some way bind the North and the South. These 20 countries represents “almost 88 percent of the world’s GDP (2009) and (...) almost two-thirds of the world’s population.” Fundamental reason of the establishment and existence of the G20 is its economic function. As has been already mentioned, the G20 is a result of late 1990’s crisis but it gained on importance thank to a second 2008-09 crisis. At the beginning its members were only prime ministers but since the G20 initial summit in Washington DC (Nov. 2008) in the meeting take part nest to prime ministers also presidents: “the G20 has moved into the putative position of premier forum for global economic governance. The immediate impact of the G20 as a ‘crisis breaker’ has been palpable.” Primary task of the G20 is the same as it was in case of establishing the G7 – financial and global economic issues, however with focus on finding consensus between the North and the South. It is connected with a well seen trend of moving focal point in global economy to so called emerging-market democracies. It is also worth to underline that in the G20 are present representatives of the EU, IMF and the World Bank. From non-G8 countries point of view, the biggest complaint against that form of government was a fact that they belonged to the most crisis-affected countries and they did not have possibility to influence on international finance system. So wider form of representativeness of states as the G20 is, in not only academic discussions, could count on wider support and stronger legitimacy of its actions rather than the G8. In an evolution process of the G20 is clearly visible that despite the fact that fundamental activity of preliminary meetings and annual conference is aimed at finding agreement on key global economic issues, over time the G20 agenda has been expanded and it includes such topics as: aid effectiveness, debt relief, energy security or demographic shifts. However, several researchers underline limits of the G20. One of them is relatively low effectiveness of work connected with low frequency of meetings (once a year)

938 Beijing Review, 08.07.2010, Zhou Maoquing, From G8 to G20, p.12
939 5 members from Europe (UK, France, Germany, Italy, the EU), 5 from Asia (China, India, Indonesia, Japan, South Korea), 2 from North America (Canada and the US), 3 from Latin America (Argentina, Brazil, Mexico), 2 from the Middle East (Saudi Arabia, Turkey), 1 from Africa (South Africa), 1 from Pacific (Australia) and 1 from Eurasia (Russia)
941 International Affairs vol. 86, no. 3 (2010), A.F. Cooper, The G20 as an improvised crisis committee and/ or a contested ‘steering committee’ for the world, p.741
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as well as lack of permanent secretariat. Another one is lower range of members in comparison to the G8 but also lack of defined limits for the scope of issues discussed on the G20 forum.\(^{942}\) Legitimacy of the G20 is also a controversial issue as there is no clear criteria how to become a member of that institution: “It is not simply the world’s 20 largest economies. Saudi Arabia (the world’s 23rd largest economy), Argentina (30th), and South Africa (32nd) are formal members while Spain (9th), Netherlands (16th) Poland (18th) and Belgium (20th) are not. Invitations are issued arbitrarily, and there is no mechanism for objective adjustment.”\(^{943}\) Another questionable thing is lack of representatives of the OPEC organisation and there are oil prices that are critical factor in global economy.

An important part of the success of any institution is sharing of common values what is quite difficult as different countries perceived as crucial different values. In case of the G8, consistency factor of common values is very high in spite of to some extent different interests of Russia (see chapter on social security), however in the G20 interests of the North and the South are quite different and because of that it is harder to find a consensus. The G20 seems to more effective solution than ‘G8+5’ though because of the reason that configuration of the G13 is perceived by the O5 countries as a situation in which they have second-bars status and what is more they do not want to be members of the ‘G8+5’: “China has observed the awkward, even humiliating, way in which Russia was offered a kind of probationer status before eventually being fully admitted into the counsels of the G8 and is thought, in good part as a result of its disinclination to risk being treated in the same way, to be reluctant to be co-opted singly into a G9.”\(^{944}\)

Among researches occurred also other proposals of configuration of emerging economies such as BRIC (Brazil, Russia, India, China) perceived as the most dynamic economies, but some pay the highest attention to CHINDIA (China and India) and others to these two countries add one state -South Africa, creating CISA or two states creating CIBS (China, India, South Africa and Brazil). However, those who are focusing on BRIC countries propose to expand that by adding South Africa, ASEAN countries and Mexico creating acronym BRICSAM.\(^{945}\)

\(^{942}\) *Global Governance*, no. 15 (2009), M. Beeson, S. Bell, *The G-20 and International Economic Governance: Hegemony, Collectivism, or Both?*, p.77

\(^{943}\) *Survival*, vol. 52 no. 2 (2010), D. Shorr, T. Wright, *The G20 and Global Governance: An Exchange*, p.188

\(^{944}\) *International Affairs*, vol. 84, no. 3 (2008), A. Payne, *The G8 in a changing global economic order*, p.532

\(^{945}\) *International Affairs*, vol. 84, no. 3 (2008), A. Payne, *The G8 in a changing global economic order*, p.526
Attachment 1

TEN KEY PRINCIPLES FOR INTERNATIONAL FINANCIAL INFORMATION EXCHANGE

Ten Key Principles for information exchange to improve financial stability through greater international cooperation were announced by G7 Finance Ministers meeting in London today.

Commenting on the meeting, Chancellor of the Exchequer Gordon Brown said:

"Given the UK's past experiences with BCCI and Barings, the UK has been a longstanding advocate of improving co-operation between supervisors of internationally active financial institutions.

Today's report by financial experts from all G7 countries - in a group chaired by the UK - marks a significant step towards improving financial stability. The Ten Key Principles which they have developed establishes a clear framework for international cooperation and sets standards to which G7 Ministers believe all countries should aspire and which we shall promote throughout the world.

Recent events in Asia have highlighted the need for such cooperation and emphasised its urgency. So we are especially pleased that the G7 has made so much progress on this issue since we met in Denver a year ago."

The Ten Key Principles set out in the report from G7 Ministers to heads of government cover:

1. authorisation to share supervisory information with foreign supervisors
2. the sharing of information by supervisors from different sectors of financial services
3. cooperation in identifying and monitoring the use of management and information systems, and controls, by internationally active firms
4. the sharing of objective information of supervisory interest about individuals such as owners, shareholders, directors, managers or employees of supervised firms
5. information sharing between exchanges
6. confidentiality of shared information
7. the use of formal agreements and written requests for information exchange
8. reciprocity requirements
9. the use of information for law enforcement in cases which further supervisory purposes
10. the removal of laws preventing supervisory information exchange.
Interview with Sir Nicholas Bayne

1. Could we say that according to your categorization the leitmotif of the seventh series of summits (in a period from 2002 till 2007) is fighting terrorism and its causes?

This is a good categorization of the G8 summits up Gleneagles 2005. I am not sure that it applies to later summits.

2. Is there any necessity of the G8?

The G8 summit is not strictly necessary, but it has proved useful over the years, in providing political leadership, reconciling domestic and external pressures and providing collective management to the world economy. However, while it can still meet the first objective, it has been less effective in the second recently and no longer has the right membership for the third.

3. Could we separate economic functions of the G8 and shift them into the G20?

This could be done, but there are two drawbacks. First, the G8’s membership is still not ideal for political issues, since China, a permanent member of the UNSC, is missing. Second, it is not always easy to separate political and economic issues.

4. Should the G8 be formalized or it should return to the more informal character?

The G8 summit is becoming swamped by its apparatus, while its documents are too long and imprecise. The G8 should choose a limited agenda each year – two or three items only – and aim to provide impulses to other institutions rather than trying to act itself.

5. Should Russia be treated in this forum as a serious and full partner despite its policy e.g. in respect for human rights?

I think that it was a mistake to admit Russia, which was done for political, not economic reasons. But now it has been admitted, it must be treated as a full partner.

6. Is there any possibility of exclusion of any member or its self-exclusion? In such case, would it be any reason to continue the G8 summitry?

Each year’s summit is composed of those countries the chair decides to invite. In principle, a chair could decide not to invite one or more members, provided those who
were invited agreed with this. I think this is very unlikely, as it would alienate the country excluded. Similarly, a G8 country could decide it no longer wanted to attend. This is only likely to happen with the United States; if the US stayed away, that would bring the G8 to an end.

7. Should the G8 clearly define its security policy e.g. according to the UN human security approach?

I hesitate over this question, as I am not a security expert. I do not think the G8 would want to be bound in advance by any approach, but to preserve flexibility. But it would only want to make recommendations to the UN that could prove acceptable to the UN membership as a whole.

8. To what extent the G7 had been leading security policy in different areas in the past?

The G7 and later the G8 have played a leading role in nuclear non-proliferation issues over a long period, going back to the 1970s. It has also been influential in terrorism, both in the mid-1980s and more recently. Other security issues have been treated more sporadically, without much system and thus with limited impact. But this is the view of a non-expert in security issues.

9. Do you think it is possible that G8 can play a central role in response to emergencies or be treated as a last resort?

Because the G8 summit requires careful advance preparation, it is not suitable for emergencies, except for those that occur just as it is meeting, like the Chernobyl disaster in 1986 and Indian nuclear tests in 1998.

10. Is the G8’s extension possible in the near future?

At present, the G8’s future seems in doubt. If it continues with its existing membership, its influence will shrink, so that heads of government, especially the US, may no longer think it is worth attending. But its recent attempts to engage other countries, like the Outreach 5 (Brazil, China, India, Mexico, South Africa), have not worked, because these countries consider they only have second-class status. The best option would be if the G8 offered these countries the chance to take part on their own terms, as a sort of joint venture. In a recent lecture at the LSE (attached separately), I have called this the G6+7 (Russia, as a BRIC member, being in the 6). But I am doubtful that this will happen.
Interview with Prof. Peter Hajnal

1. Could we say that according to your categorization the leitmotif of the seventh series of summits (in a period from 2002 till 2007) is fighting terrorism and its causes?
   It certainly has been a major preoccupation for the summits in this period, but this has not precluded their attention to other major issues (climate, health, trade, the economy, North-South issues, etc.)

2. Is there any necessity of the G8?
   There are various schools of thought. Some observers see the need for a continuing role for the G8, particularly on issues other than finance and the economy (those have now been taken over by the G20). Other observers believe that the G8 has outlived its usefulness and must be replaced by the G20 or some other forum.

3. Could we separate economic functions of the G8 and shift them into the G20?
   This process has already been put in place at last September’s Pittsburgh G20 summit, but there are some residual issues remaining for the G7 (rather than the G8) countries.

4. Should the G8 be formalized or it should return to the more informal character?
   There is virtually no chance that the G8 can be formalized in the sense of having a charter and a secretariat. It was designed and maintained as an informal forum.

5. Should Russia be treated in this forum as a serious and full partner despite its policy e.g. in respect for human rights?
   This is a controversial point. Some have questioned its place in the G8 club. But there are issues (such as security, energy, climate, health, etc.) where Russia has a stake, so it is better to have them in the club.

6. Is there any possibility of exclusion of any member or its self-exclusion? In such case, would it be any reason to continue the G8 summitry?
   No country has ever been uninvited once it has become a member, and this is not likely to happen. Self-exclusion remains a hypothetical possibility but it is very unlikely.
7. Should the G8 clearly defined its security policy e.g. according to the UN human security approach?

G8 approaches to classical as well as human security can be deduced from its declarations and other documents. Usually, there is reference to the UN but the G8 functions very differently, and collectively carries considerable weight. I am not sure how effective the G8 has been in this field – I am not an expert.

8. Do you think it is possible that G8 can play a central role in response to emergencies or be treated as a last resort?

If the G8 survives, it will continue to play an important role. I would not say “last resort” but it can be one resort, along with NATO, UN, etc.

9. Is the G8’s extension possible in the near future?

Some would like to see the G8 expand, to incorporate the “G5” of China, India, Brazil, South Africa and Mexico (or one or two other major developing country), but this is not very likely to happen, particularly with the rising G20.
Interview with Mr Duncan Walker, Political Military Officer at the American Embassy in Warsaw, Poland

1. How has changed the character of the G8 summits from 1975 till now?

The main reason for an establishment of the G6 was the deep oil crisis that had occurred in 1973. At the beginning it was an ad hoc group that was supposed to answer the hard situation, tackled with one problem- economic crisis. Now situation is a little bit different, the G8 is mainly a calendar driving group which tackles with an earlier prepared list of subjects to discuss. Definitely, there is a big change also in a scope of subjects- now there are lots of political, environmental, security etc. issues.

2. What about famous informal atmosphere between participants of summits- is it still present?

The whole course of a meeting is formally arranged. This is Sherpa’s task. Sherpa is a person who knows very well a choreography of world politics- he is responsible, above all, for the visual of the policy- not for its content.

3. Are the G8 summits a priority for the President of the USA?

It depends on subjects discussed at the meeting. If there are issues which are important for domestic policy and are political priorities for the President, then that summit would be very important for the President. We cannot forget that it is always a great opportunity to present oneself on the international forum, which is still a widely acknowledged elite club.

4. Is the G8’s extension possible in the near future?

There are opinions that such forum without China or Brazil is not representative. Some countries as France or the UK are in favour of such move, but we should answer the question if the extension will not bring powerlessness. It is such a difference as between the Security Council and the General Assembly- the first body is much more effective and able to act.

5. If we cannot talk about extension- can we talk about exclusion of any member?

I suppose that you think about Russia? The main reason to make Russia the member of the Group was will to help this country to overcome communist regime and transform it into
an open market democracy. The G8 can act only if there is a universal agreement in how we see the world and current Russian ideology is quite arguable... But of course, political consequences of such action could be dramatic.

6. *Is it any problem with a fact that European countries are more represented than others?*

It is a fact that Europe is represented by France, Italy, Germany and 2 representatives of the EU but we do not see any problem in that. As long as we share the same values, there is no danger for the G8 existence.

7. *Do you think it is possible that G8 can play a central role in response to emergencies or be treated as a last resort?*

Definitely not. The G8 does not have any measures to act like that. It plays rather a steering role in the international relations. It does not have any formal mechanisms and has to cooperate with other, more adequate, international organisations.

8. *Is there any chance that the US will adapt the human security as a leitmotif of its foreign policy like Canada or Japan did?*

I do not think so. First of all, we believe in more traditional meaning of security- military security. Secondly, American people have different approach to the issue of helping the most needed than European people. We are more focused on practical programs of aid, according to the rule: “We give them fishing rods, not fish”. We do not feel guilty about the poorest as most European do. We are ready to help and we do it always when there is an emergency, as for example an earthquake in the North Iran, which is by the way not very friendly with the US.

9. *What do you think about Polish chances to join the G20? Do we have American support in this area?*

I must say, that cooperation between the US and Poland is very good. You did a lot during the last ten years in the field of economy. We will support you in your efforts to join the G20 but only if you meet all objective conditions. When you are not institutionally ready, than we cannot talk about your accession to the G20.
## Attachment 3

### Table of summits’ documents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sector</th>
<th>G7/G8 documents</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Issue</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Military</td>
<td>Appendix to Downing Street Summit Declaration</td>
<td>1977</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Declaration, Bonn</td>
<td>1978</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Declaration, Tokyo</td>
<td>1979</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Declaration, Venice</td>
<td>1980</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Declaration, Ottawa</td>
<td>1981</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Statement on the Implications of the Chernobyl Nuclear Accident</td>
<td>1986</td>
<td>1. Non proliferation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Political Declaration: Securing Democracy</td>
<td>1988</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Declaration on East-West Relations</td>
<td>1989</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Statement on Transnational Issues</td>
<td>1990</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Safety of Nuclear Power Plants in the New Independent States of the Former Soviet Union and in Central and Eastern Europe</td>
<td>1992</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Political Declaration: Shaping The New Partnership</td>
<td>1992</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Russia and the Other Countries in Transition</td>
<td>1993</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Nuclear safety</td>
<td>1994</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Moscow Nuclear Safety and Security Summit Declaration</td>
<td>1996</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Chairman's Statement [Political Declaration]: Toward Greater Security and Stability in a More Cooperative World</td>
<td>1996</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Foreign Ministers' Progress Report</td>
<td>1997</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The Birmingham Summit 15-17 May 1998 Communique</td>
<td>1998</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Conclusions of G8 Foreign Ministers, London</td>
<td>1998</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>G8 Communiqué Köln</td>
<td>1999</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>G7 Statement</td>
<td>1999</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Conclusions of the meeting of the G 8 Foreign</td>
<td>1999</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minsters, Cologne</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G8 Communiqué Okinawa</td>
<td>2000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conclusions of the meeting of the G8 Foreign Ministers' Meeting</td>
<td>2001</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chair's Summary</td>
<td>2004</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G8 Action Plan on Non-proliferation</td>
<td>2004</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gleneagles Statement On Non-Proliferation</td>
<td>2005</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Global Energy Security</td>
<td>2006</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statement on Non-Proliferation</td>
<td>2006</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joint Statement by George Bush and Vladimir Putin</td>
<td>2006</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chair's Summary</td>
<td>2007</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heiligendamm Statement on Non-Proliferation</td>
<td>2007</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statement At Williamsburg [Declaration On Security]</td>
<td>1983</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Declaration On East-West Relations And Arms Control</td>
<td>1984</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Political Declaration on the 40th Anniversary of the End of the Second World War</td>
<td>1985</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chancellor Helmut Kohl's Concluding Statement</td>
<td>1985</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Political Declaration</td>
<td>1988</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statement on Transnational Issues</td>
<td>1990</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Declaration On Conventional Arms Transfers And NBC [Nuclear, Biological And Chemical] Non-Proliferation</td>
<td>1991</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Political Declaration: Shaping The New Partnership</td>
<td>1992</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chairman [German Foreign Minister Klaus Kinkel]'S Statement</td>
<td>1992</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Tokyo Summit Political Declaration: Striving For A More Secure And Humane World 1993
Chairman's Statement 1995
Statement on CTBT 1996
Chairman's Statement [Political Declaration]: Toward Greater Security and Stability in a More Cooperative World 1996
1997 Denver Summit Communiqué 1997
Conclusions of G8 Foreign Ministers 1998
The Birmingham Summit 15-17 May 1998 Communiqué 1998
Political Statement - Regional Issues 1998
G8 Communiqué Köln 1999 1999
G8 Communiqué Okinawa 2000
Conclusions of the meeting of the G8 Foreign Ministers' Meeting 2000
Conclusions of the meeting of the G8 Foreign Ministers' Meeting 2001
Canadian Chair's Statement 2002
Non-proliferation of Weapons of Mass Destruction: A G8 Declaration 2003
Summary of the G8 Presidency 2003
G8 Action Plan on Nonproliferation 2004
Gleneagles Statement On Non-Proliferation 2005
Statement on Non-Proliferation 2006
Heiligendamm Statement on Non-Proliferation 2007
Statement on Air-Hijacking 1978
Press Release on Air-Hijacking 1979
Statement on Hijacking 1980
Statement on the Taking of Diplomatic Hostages 1980
Ottawa Summit Statement on Terrorism 1981
Declaration on International Terrorism 1984
Statement on International Terrorism 1986
Statement On Terrorism 1987
Political Declaration 1988

3. Terrorism
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Drug Issues</td>
<td>1989</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Declaration on Terrorism</td>
<td>1989</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statement on Transnational Issues</td>
<td>1990</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Houston Economic Declaration</td>
<td>1990</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chairman [German Foreign Minister Klaus Kinkel]'s Statement</td>
<td>1992</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chairman's Statement (Political)</td>
<td>1994</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G7 Summit Communiqué- Cooperation against transnational crime and money-laundering</td>
<td>1994</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chairman's Statement</td>
<td>1995</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chairman's Statement [Political Declaration]: Toward Greater Security and Stability in a More Cooperative World</td>
<td>1996</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Declaration on Terrorism</td>
<td>1996</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1997 Denver Summit Communiqué</td>
<td>1997</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Birmingham Summit 15-17 May 1998 Communiqué</td>
<td>1998</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conclusions of G8 Foreign Ministers, London</td>
<td>1998</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G8 Communiqué Köln 1999</td>
<td>1999</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G8 Communiqué Okinawa</td>
<td>2000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communiqué, Genoa</td>
<td>2001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cooperative G8 Action on Transport Security</td>
<td>2002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G8 Recommendations on Counter-Terrorism</td>
<td>2002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G8 Justice and Interior Ministers' Meeting</td>
<td>2002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G8 Foreign Ministers' Progress Report On the Fight Against Terrorism</td>
<td>2002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chair's Summary</td>
<td>2003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economic</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Global Partnership Against The Spread Of Weapons And Materials Of Mass</td>
<td>2003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Destruction A G8 Action Plan</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building International Political Will And Capacity To Combat</td>
<td>2003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Terrorism A G8 Action Plan</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-proliferation of Weapons of Mass Destruction</td>
<td>2003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Securing Radioactive Sources: A G8 Action Plan</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G8 Secure and Facilitated International Travel Initiative</td>
<td>2004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G8 Action Plan on Nonproliferation</td>
<td>2004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secure And Facilitated International Travel Initiative: Summit</td>
<td>2005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Progress Report</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gleneagles Statement On Non-Proliferation</td>
<td>2005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G8 Statement On Counter-Terrorism</td>
<td>2005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G8 Summit Declaration on Counter-Terrorism</td>
<td>2006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G8 Statement on Strengthening the UN's Counter-Terrorism Program</td>
<td>2006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Report on the G8 Global Partnership</td>
<td>2006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chair's Summary</td>
<td>2006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G8 Summit Statement on Counter Terrorism</td>
<td>2007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Global Partnership Review,</td>
<td>2007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Declaration of Rambouillet,</td>
<td>1975</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joint Declaration of the International Conference</td>
<td>1976</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Declaration: Downing Street Summit</td>
<td>1977</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appendix to Downing Street Summit Declaration</td>
<td>1977</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Declaration, Bonn</td>
<td>1978</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Declaration, Tokyo</td>
<td>1979</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Declaration – Introduction</td>
<td>1980</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Declaration – Inflation</td>
<td>1980</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Declaration – Energy</td>
<td>1980</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Declaration – Trade</td>
<td>1980</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Declaration of the Ottawa Summit – The Economy</td>
<td>1981</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Declaration Of The Seven Heads Of State And Government And</td>
<td>1982</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Representatives Of The European Communities</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reported issues: 1) fight with inflation and high unemployment; 2)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>energy problems; 3) international trade liberalization; 4) reform of</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>international monetary system; 5) reduction of developing countries'</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>deficits</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>299</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Title</td>
<td>Year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposals for a Concerted Development of the World Economy</td>
<td>1982</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Declaration Of The Seven Heads Of State And Government And Representatives Of The European Communities</td>
<td>1982</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Declaration On Economic Recovery</td>
<td>1983</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The London Economic Declaration</td>
<td>1984</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economic Declaration - Multilateral Trading System and International Monetary System</td>
<td>1985</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economic Declaration - Relations with Developing Countries</td>
<td>1985</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economic Declaration - Cooperation in Science and Technology</td>
<td>1985</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tokyo Economic Declaration</td>
<td>1986</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economic Declaration - Trade</td>
<td>1987</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economic Declaration – Agriculture</td>
<td>1987</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economic Declaration – Developing Countries and Debt</td>
<td>1987</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economic Declaration - Introduction</td>
<td>1988</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economic Declaration - International Economic Policy Cooperation</td>
<td>1988</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economic Declaration - Newly Industrializing Economies</td>
<td>1988</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economic Declaration - Developing Countries and Debt</td>
<td>1988</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economic Declaration - Introduction</td>
<td>1989</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economic Declaration - International Economic Situation</td>
<td>1989</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economic Declaration - Improving Economic Efficiency</td>
<td>1989</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economic Declaration - General Problems of Development</td>
<td>1989</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Press Release From Presidents Abdou Diouf, Mohamed Hosni Mubarak, Carlos Andres Perez, And Prime Minister Rajiv Gandhi</td>
<td>1989</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Title</td>
<td>Year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Houston Economic Declaration – Introduction</td>
<td>1990</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economic Declaration - Economic Policy</td>
<td>1991</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economic Declaration – Energy</td>
<td>1991</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economic Declaration - Developing Countries and Debt</td>
<td>1991</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economic Declaration: Working Together For Growth And A Safer World</td>
<td>1992</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economic Declaration - World Economy</td>
<td>1992</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economic Declaration - Developing Countries</td>
<td>1992</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economic Declaration - Central and Eastern Europe</td>
<td>1992</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strengthening G7 Cooperation To Promote Employment And Noninflationary Growth</td>
<td>1993</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economic Declaration - World Economy</td>
<td>1993</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economic Declaration – Trade</td>
<td>1993</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economic Declaration – Developing Countries</td>
<td>1993</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1994 G7 Communiqué: Jobs and Growth</td>
<td>1994</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1994 G7 Communiqué: Trade</td>
<td>1994</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1994 G7 Communiqué: Developing Countries</td>
<td>1994</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economic Communiqué: Making a Success of Globalization for the Benefit of All</td>
<td>1996</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finance Ministers Report to the Heads of State and Government on international monetary stability</td>
<td>1996</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1997 Denver Summit Communiqué</td>
<td>1997</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Confronting Global Economic and Financial Challenges: Denver Summit Statement by Seven</td>
<td>1997</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Birmingham Summit 15-17 May 1998 Communiqué</td>
<td>1998</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ten Key Principles For International Financial Information Exchange</td>
<td>1998</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conclusions of G7 Finance Ministers</td>
<td>1998</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G7 Initiative On Harmful Tax Competition</td>
<td>1998</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G8 Communiqué Köln 1999</td>
<td>1999</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Report of G7 Finance Ministers on the Köln Debt Initiative to the Köln Economic Summit,</td>
<td>1999</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G7 Statement</td>
<td>1999</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G8 Communiqué Okinawa</td>
<td>2000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Okinawa Charter on Global Information Society</td>
<td>2000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G7 Statement</td>
<td>2000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communiqué, Genoa</td>
<td>2001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G7 Statement</td>
<td>2001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strengthening the International Financial System and the Multilateral Development Banks</td>
<td>2001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statement by G7 Leaders: Delivering on the Promise of the Enhanced HIPC Initiative</td>
<td>2002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statement of G7 Finance Ministers</td>
<td>2002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Action Plan to Combat the Financing of Terrorism</td>
<td>2002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statement of G7 Finance Ministers</td>
<td>2003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chair's Summary</td>
<td>2003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fostering Growth and Promoting a Responsible Market Economy: A G8 Declaration</td>
<td>2003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Co-operative G8 Action on Trade</td>
<td>2003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fighting Corruption and Improving Transparency: A G8 Declaration</td>
<td>2003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finance Ministers’ Statement</td>
<td>2003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G8 Leaders Statement on Trade</td>
<td>2004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chair's Summary</td>
<td>2004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Global Economy And Oil</td>
<td>2005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chair's Summary</td>
<td>2005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reducing IPR Piracy And Counterfeiting Through More Effective Enforcement</td>
<td>2005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Global Energy Security</td>
<td>2006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Petersburg Plan Of Action Global Energy</td>
<td>2006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Security</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fighting High-Level Corruption</td>
<td>2006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Combating IPR Piracy and Counterfeiting</td>
<td>2006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trade</td>
<td>2006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Growth and Responsibility in the World Economy</td>
<td>2007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G8 Trade Declaration</td>
<td>2007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Declaration, Bonn</td>
<td>1978</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Declaration, Tokyo</td>
<td>1979</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Declaration of the Ottawa Summit – The Economy</td>
<td>1981</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Declaration On Economic Recovery</td>
<td>1983</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The London Economic Declaration</td>
<td>1984</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economic Declaration - Environmental Policies</td>
<td>1985</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tokyo Economic Declaration</td>
<td>1986</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economic Declaration – Environment</td>
<td>1987</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economic Declaration – Environment</td>
<td>1988</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economic Declaration – Environment</td>
<td>1989</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economic Declaration – Environment</td>
<td>1991</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economic Declaration – Environment</td>
<td>1993</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summit Communiqué</td>
<td>1994</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Halifax Summit Communiqué</td>
<td>1995</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chairman's Statement [Political Declaration]:</td>
<td>1996</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Toward Greater Security and Stability in a More Cooperative World</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communiqué</td>
<td>1997</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G8 Action Programme on Forests</td>
<td>1998</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Birmingham Summit 15-17 May Communiqué</td>
<td>1998</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G8 Communiqué Köln</td>
<td>1999</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G8 Communiqué Okinawa</td>
<td>2000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Reported issues: 1) acid deposition; 2) air pollution; 3) climate change; 4) depletion of ozone layer; 5) management of toxic and hazardous wastes; 6) protection of tropical forests; 7) pollution of soil, fresh water and the sea; 8) overfishing.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Document</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>Communiqué, Genoa</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>The Kananaskis Summit Chair's Summary</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>Banff Ministerial Statement on the World Summit on Sustainable Development</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>Science and Technology for Sustainable Development: &quot;3r&quot; Action Plan and Progress on Implementation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>Climate Change, Clean Energy and Sustainable Development</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>St. Petersburg Plan Of Action Global Energy Security</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>Growth and Responsibility in the World Economy</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Societal**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Document</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1975</td>
<td>Declaration of Rambouillet</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1976</td>
<td>Joint Declaration of the International Conference</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1977</td>
<td>Declaration: Downing Street Summit Conference</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1980</td>
<td>Declaration – Introduction</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1980</td>
<td>Political Topics (Afghanistan)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1981</td>
<td>Declaration of the Ottawa Summit – Introduction</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1981</td>
<td>Declaration of the Ottawa Summit – Relations With Developing Countries</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1981</td>
<td>Declaration of the Ottawa Summit – East-West Economic Relations</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1981</td>
<td>Declaration of the Ottawa Summit – Conclusion</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1981</td>
<td>Chairman's Summary Of Political Issues</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1982</td>
<td>Declaration Of The Seven Heads Of State And Government And Representatives Of The European Communities</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1982</td>
<td>[Translation:] President Mitterrand's Statement To The Press At The Conclusion Of The Versailles Summit</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Reported issues: 1) relation with the USSR; 2) common rules and values; 3) results of globalization; 4) cultural diversity promotion; 6) IT solutions.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Declaration Of The Seven Heads Of State And Government And Representatives Of The European Communities</th>
<th>1982</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Declaration On Economic Recovery</td>
<td>1983</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statement At Williamsburg [Declaration On Security]</td>
<td>1983</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>President Reagan's Dinner Toast, Rockefeller Folk Art Centre</td>
<td>1983</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interview With President Reagan</td>
<td>1983</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Declaration On Democratic Values</td>
<td>1984</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>London Economic Declaration</td>
<td>1984</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Declaration On East-West Relations And Arms Control</td>
<td>1984</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Political Declaration on the 40th Anniversary of the End of the Second World War</td>
<td>1985</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tokyo Economic Declaration</td>
<td>1986</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statement On The Implications Of The Chernobyl Nuclear Accident</td>
<td>1986</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statement On East-West Relations</td>
<td>1987</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chairman's Summary On Political Issues</td>
<td>1987</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economic Declaration – Introduction</td>
<td>1988</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Political Declaration</td>
<td>1988</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Declaration On East-West Relations</td>
<td>1989</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Declaration On Human Rights</td>
<td>1989</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Text Of The Letter Sent By Mr. Mikhail Gorbachev To The President Of The French Republic</td>
<td>1989</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Houston Economic Declaration – Introduction</td>
<td>1990</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Political Declaration: Securing Democracy</td>
<td>1990</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Political Declaration: Securing Democracy</td>
<td>1990</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Houston Economic Declaration – The Soviet Union</td>
<td>1990</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Political Declaration: Securing Democracy</td>
<td>1990</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economic Declaration – The Soviet Union</td>
<td>1991</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economic Declaration – Developing Countries and Debt</td>
<td>1991</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Title</td>
<td>Year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economic Declaration – Migration</td>
<td>1991</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economic Declaration: Building World Partnership</td>
<td>1991</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Political Declaration: Strengthening The International Order</td>
<td>1991</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economic Declaration: Working Together For Growth And A Safer World</td>
<td>1992</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economic Declaration – Developing Countries</td>
<td>1992</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economic Declaration – New Independent States of the Former Soviet Union</td>
<td>1992</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Political Declaration: Shaping The New Partnership</td>
<td>1992</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tokyo Summit Economic Declaration: A Strengthened Commitment To Jobs And Growth</td>
<td>1993</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tokyo Summit Political Declaration: Striving For A More Secure and Humane World</td>
<td>1993</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statement by President Boris Nikolayevich Yeltsin of the Russian Federation</td>
<td>1993</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Russia and the Other Countries in Transition</td>
<td>1993</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chairman's Statement (Political)</td>
<td>1994</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Halifax Summit Communiqué - Promoting Sustainable Development</td>
<td>1995</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Halifax Summit Communiqué - Preventing and Responding to Crises</td>
<td>1995</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economic Communiqué: Making a Success of Globalization for the Benefit of All</td>
<td>1996</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economic Communiqué: Making a Success of Globalization for the Benefit of All - Enhancing The Effectiveness Of Multilateral Institutions For The Benefit Of Development</td>
<td>1996</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economic Communiqué: Making a Success of Globalization for the Benefit of All - Toward Successful Integration Of Countries In Transition</td>
<td>1996</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Document Title</td>
<td>Year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Into The Global Economy</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Denver Summit Communiqué</td>
<td>1997</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conclusions of G8 Foreign Ministers</td>
<td>1998</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G8 Communiqué Köln 1999</td>
<td>1999</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G8 Communiqué Okinawa</td>
<td>2000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G8 Miyazaki Initiatives for Conflict Prevention</td>
<td>2000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conclusions of the meeting of the G8 Foreign Ministers, Attachment 1: Progress On The Miyazaki Initiatives</td>
<td>2001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conclusions of the meeting of the G8 Foreign Ministers, Attachment 2: G8 Roma Initiatives On Conflict Prevention</td>
<td>2001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communiqué, Genoa</td>
<td>2001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Russia's role in the G8</td>
<td>2002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G8 Conflict Prevention: Disarmament, Demobilisation and Reintegration</td>
<td>2002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partnership for Progress and a Common Future with the Region of the Broader Middle East and North Africa</td>
<td>2004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statement by the G8, the Leaders of Brazil, China, India, Mexico and South Africa, and the Heads of the International Organizations Represented at Gleneagles</td>
<td>2005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partnership For Progress And A Common Future With The Broader Middle East And North Africa Region</td>
<td>2005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G8 Declaration on Cooperation and Future Action on Stabilization and Reconstruction</td>
<td>2006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>News Conference by Henry Kissinger, U.S. Secretary of State, and William E. Simon, U.S. Treasury Secretary</td>
<td>1976</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Statement Of The Summit On Indochinese Refugees</td>
<td>1979</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Political</td>
<td>1980</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Political Topics (Afghanistan),</td>
<td>1980</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chairman's Summary Of Political Issues</td>
<td>1981</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statement On Lebanon</td>
<td>1982</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>President Mitterrand's Statement To The Press At The Conclusion Of The Versailles Summit</td>
<td>1982</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Iraq-Iran Conflict (Statement By The Chair),</td>
<td>1984</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Political Declaration on the 40th Anniversary of the End of the Second World War</td>
<td>1985</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statement On Iraq-Iran War And Freedom Of Navigation In The Gulf</td>
<td>1987</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chairman's Summary On Political Issues</td>
<td>1987</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chairman's Summary On Political Issues</td>
<td>1988</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statement On Southern Africa</td>
<td>1989</td>
</tr>
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Abstract

As security belongs to the most important natural human needs, many international organisations have security in the centre of their interest. One of the significant forms of international cooperation is the Group of Eight (G8). The G8 is not a typical organisation, as it has no formalized structure and since 1975 it exists as informal meeting of the leaders from the most developed countries of the world.

Scope of subjects discussed on the Group’s forum pertain a lot of issues connected with security. The goal of the thesis is to present the G8 as a player, who in significant way influences widely defined international security – not limited only to military security.

Here is presented an understanding of security according to the Copenhagen School represented by Barry Buzan, Jaap de Wilde and Ole Wæver. In a book titled “Security: A New Framework for Analysis” they have presented five categories of security: military, economic, environmental, political and societal. However, because of wide scope of summits’ topics, the above mentioned methodology was supported by the human security approach.

In the first chapter was described the G8 history, from its origins in 1975 till 2007. Reasons and roots of first summits together with evolution of members are presented according to approach presented by professor Bayne (7 series defined in the way depending on their leitmotsv). Here is also described decision making as well as preparation process and Group’s relations with important international organisations such as the UN, the EU or IMF.

Second chapter was devoted to methodology used in the thesis. In detailed way were described categories of security proposed by B. Buzan, J. de Wilde and O. Wæver as well as human security idea popularized by the UN. Human security differently than other concepts of security put a man not a state in the centre of the consideration. Its main goal is to achieve freedom from fear and freedom from want.

Chapters 3 to 8 include detailed analysis of G7/G8 documents basing on six categories of security: military, economic, environmental, political, societal and human security approach. There were analyzed available published documents and reports produced during meetings from 1975 till 2007.

Conclusions are the last part of the thesis. They were complemented by the most significant decision made after 2007 as well as assumptions related to the possible future evolution of the Group. Researchers of the G8 summits stressed the fact of growing importance of the G24 in the area of the world economy as well as a bigger role of the developing countries in the
international policy. Similar suggestions are visible in interviews – their authors are underlying still significant role of the G8 in international relations.
Zusammenfassung

Da Sicherheit eine der grundlegendsten menschlichen Bedürfnisse ist, ist sie von Interesse vieler verschiedener internationaler Organisationen.


Das Spektrum der Themen, welches auf dem Forum der G8 diskutiert werden, umfasst viele Fragen der Sicherheit. Der Zweck der Dissertation ist es, die G8 als Global Player zu präsentieren, der die globale Sicherheit beeinflusst und sie weit mehr als eine militärische Sicherheit versteht.


Weiter wird der Entscheidungsprozess und die Vorbereitung der Gipfeltreffen, sowie die Beziehungen mit den wichtigsten internationalen Organisationen wie der EU, UNO und IMF beschrieben.


Kapitel 3 bis 8 ist eine detaillierte Analyse der sechs Sicherheitskategorien der G7/G8: Die militärische, wirtschaftliche, ökologische, politische, soziale und human security. Die Analyse
beinhaltet veröffentlichte Dokumente und Berichte über Sitzungen die 1975 bis 2007 veröffentlicht wurden.

Der letzte Teil ist eine Zusammenfassung der Arbeit, die wichtige Beschlüsse des Gipfels nichtens nach dem Jahr 2007 und eine Überlegung über die Zukunft der G8 beinhaltet.
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