



WORLD DEMOCRATIC GOVERNANCE

International Conference
Democracy, Governance and Welfare in the
Global Societies - November 2003

Josep Xercavins i Valls

Professor and Coordinator of the Ad Hoc Secretariat, at the UPC, of the
World Forum of Civil Society Networks - UBUNTU



**UBUNTU
WORLD FORUM OF
CIVIL SOCIETY NETWORKS**



WORLD DEMOCRATIC GOVERNANCE

Josep Xercavins i Valls

Professor and Coordinator of the Ad Hoc Secretariat, at the UPC, of the World Forum of Civil Society Networks - UBUNTU

UBUNTU is an age-old African term for humaneness - for caring, sharing and being in harmony with all of creation. As an ideal, it promotes co-operation between individuals, cultures and nations.

Federico Mayor c/o Josep Xercavins i Valls
Ad Hoc Secretariat of World Forum of Civil Society Networks - UBUNTU
Technical University of Catalonia
Jordi Girona, 29 Nexus II Building
Barcelona 08034 (Spain)
Telf. 0034 93 413 77 73
Fax. 0034 93 413 77 77
E-mail: info.ubuntu@ubuntu.upc.edu
<http://www.ubuntu.upc.edu>
<http://www.reformcampaign.net>
<http://www.reformwatch.net>

Published by:

Ad Hoc Secretariat of the UBUNTU Forum

Manel Manonelles
Lluís Miret
Núria Molina
Oscar Sahun
Josep Xercavins - Coordinator

Author: Josep Xercavins i Valls

Design: Alba Mengual

Production: Silvia Urbán

Copyright: Ad Hoc Secretariat of the UBUNTU Forum.

This document may be reproduced partially or in its entirety, on condition that this copyright is quoted.

Legal deposit: B.5638-2004

First edition: May 2004

This publication has been possible thanks to the support and financing of Culture of Peace Foundation, Technical University of Catalonia, Open University of Catalonia, Generalitat de Catalunya, Diputació de Barcelona and Barcelona City Council.

WORLD DEMOCRATIC GOVERNANCE

Josep Xercavins i Valls

Professor and coordinador of the Ad Hoc Secretariat , at the UPC¹, of the World Forum of Civil Society Networks - UBUNTU²

Collaborating Professor of the UNESCO Chair at the UPC on Technology, Sustainable Development, Imbalances and Global Change³

SUMMARY OF THE PAPER

Almost 20 years after the "Washington Consensus" and nearly 10 years after the fall of the Berlin Wall, the system of international institutions has become polarised, split into two branches. On the one hand, there is the United Nations -UN- with, basically, the fruitful summits of the 1990s and the early years of the new Millennium, but with serious shortcomings as regards implementation of the results of these gatherings. On the other are the economic, financial and trade institutions (International Monetary Fund IMF World Bank WB World Trade Organisation WTO etc.) that have overseen the constant application of more and more neoliberal policies all over the world. The birth of the WTO in 1994 coincided with the period when so-called economic globalisation, to a large extent the result of these policies, was expanding most unstopably.

This unsustainable politically speaking institutional bipolarisation and recent events in the world arena (11 September 2001, unilateralism and the illegal war brought against Iraq by the USA, failures and blockage of WTO negotiating rounds at Seattle and Cancun, merely rhetorical results from the latest UN summits in Monterrey and Johannesburg) only serves to show just how completely outdated the system of international institutions, born after the Second World War, has become.

It is vital, then, for us to establish a new system of global democratic governance, and this entails, amongst other things, In-depth reform of the system of international institutions.

For some time now, as the above events have unfolded, world civil society has occupied a place as a new player concerned with the issue of governance.

For two reasons: as a response to the worsening standard of living endured by millions of citizens the world over, and as the positive fruit of other movements that have sprung up as part of the globalisation process. No system of global democratic governance can fail to take this into account.

Important preliminary note: This paper would never have been possible without the work carried out by the team from the Ad Hoc Secretariat at the UPC of the UBUNTU Forum (especially Manuel Manonelles, Lluís Miret and Núria Molina), the help of the institutions promoting the initiative (Foundation for the Culture of Peace, whose president is Federico Mayor; Polytechnic University of Catalonia) and the support of the Generalitat of Catalonia, Barcelona Provincial Council and Barcelona City Council.

This paper is the result of an invitation to take part extended by:



Conferencia Internacional
Democracia, Gobernanza y Bienestar en las
Sociedades Globales
Barcelona, 27-29 de noviembre de 2003



¹ Polytechnic University of Catalonia. (<http://www.upc.edu>)

² UBUNTU és una antiga paraula africana per designar humanitat - compartir, tenir en compte i estar en harmonia amb tota la creació; com ideal promou la cooperació entre individus, cultures i nacions. El Fòrum Mundial UBUNTU fou creat a Barcelona, en el període 2001-2002, responen a una crida realitzada per en Federico Mayor Zaragoza, recolzada per les institucions catalanes. <http://www.ubuntu.upc.edu>

³ <http://www.catunesco.upc.es>

CONTENTS OF THE PAPER

1.	The "Washington Consensus", the fall of the Berlin Wall and other antecedents to the present world political situation; certain essential, defining characteristics of the current world political situation-----	page 6
1.1	Certain essential, defining characteristics of the current world political situation-----	page 6
1.1.1	The worsening state of the world-----	page 6
1.1.2	Consolidation of a new world techno-socio-economic situation that has become known, rightly in my opinion, as globalisation-----	page 7
1.1.3	The world's leading superpower has become even more so (powerful and leading), although only comparatively, and has, at least at present, opted to act as such in a totally egocentric and, therefore, unilateral, way-----	page 7
1.1.4	A kind of "undeclared" bipolarisation affects the system of international multilateral institutions-----	page 7
1.2	Evolution of the international political situation in the 1990s; the not entirely coincidental effects of the "Washington Consensus" and the fall of the Berlin Wall-----	page 8
1.3	The "Millennium Development Goals" laid down by the UN Millennium General Assembly, the "Agreements of the WTO Ministerial Conference in Doha: the Development or Millennium Round, the "Monterrey Consensus" of the UN Summit on Financing for Development and the "Type 2 partnership agreements" formulated at the UN Summit on Sustainable Development in: INTERNATIONAL INSTITUTIONS' RECENT AND LATEST KEY PROGRAMMES-----	page 12
1.4	The key question: Is the WTO "Development Round", which is clearly and remains clearly in tune politically and ideologically with the "Washington Consensus", the right way to achieve the UN's "Millennium Development Goals" (MDGs)?-----	page 17
1.5	The WTO meeting in Cancun: first important defiance of the "Washington Consensus" by the developing countries!-----	page 19
1.5.1	Collateral reflection: globalisation, trade and sustainable development-----	page 20
1.6	Reflection in late 2003: has the system of international organisations become blocked?-----	page 21
2.	World democratic governance-----	page 22
2.1	Global democratic governance based on in-depth reform of the system of international institutions, restoring to it the responsibility, according to generally-accepted ethical principles, of defining the policies that should govern social, trade, economic, financial, etc., dynamics for the good of humanity-----	page 22

CONTENTS OF THE PAPER

- 2.2 The "World Campaign for In-Depth Reform of the System of International Institutions"----- page 23
 - 2.2.1 Why this campaign?----- page 23
 - 2.2.2 Campaign objectives----- page 23
 - 2.2.3 The "World Citizen Legislative Initiative"----- page 23
 - 2.2.4 The Campaign Manifesto----- page 24
- 2.3 About the campaign manifesto: a) "NO to only UN reform"; "YES to reform of the system of international institutions"; b) "NO to suprastructural reform led solely and exclusively by the States"; "YES to reform in which all players currently present on the world scene take part"----- page 26
- 2.4 What reform, what system of global democratic governance, do we want?----- page 29
- 3. From globalisation to world citizenship and cosmopolitan democracy---- page 31
 - 3.1 From globalisation to world citizenship; the global demonstration of 15 February 2003----- page 31
 - 3.2 From the global world and world citizenship to cosmopolitan democracy; or, for what world model?----- page 32
 - 3.3 With what policies? For the moment, those of a cosmopolitan social democracy!----- page 34
- 4. In memoriam: Manuel Vázquez Montalban and Miquel Martí i Pol----- page 35

1. The "Washington Consensus", the fall of the Berlin Wall and other antecedents to the present world political situation; certain essential, defining characteristics of the current world political situation

1.1 Certain essential, defining characteristics of the current world political situation

I shall begin this paper, which, in any case, has an essentially ideological and political character, rather than academic, by describing what are for me the essential, defining characteristics of the present world political situation.

1.1.1 The worsening state of the world⁴; at many levels, affecting both humanity and the planet itself, most importantly:

a1) increase in absolute terms (which might be logical, in view of rising population) but also of the relative number (and, therefore, a very important indicator) of citizens all over the world living in conditions we consider unacceptable: below poverty thresholds; in short, unable to satisfy their basic needs to any appreciable extent.

a2) increasing imbalances quantitative and qualitative gap between the rising numbers (however it is measured: almost always more than half, often considerably more, of total world population) described above and the population that, generally speaking, enjoys an ever improving standard of living, at least economically, in the "North".

a3) a quantitative and qualitative increase in violence and conflicts between people, which is, in my opinion very much linked to the situation described above in a process of cause and effect, though, naturally, this is not the only cause.

a4) increasing, serious negative impacts of human activity on the planet Earth (environmental unsustainability), of which we form an inextricable part and on which we logically depend absolutely, at least in the short and medium term.

On the veracity of this assessment, I refer here only to UN Secretary General Kofi Annan's Report, published in January 2002, on the preparatory process for the Johannesburg Summit, under the highly revealing title of: "Agenda 21 and Sustainable Development -Good Plan, Weak Implementation" . I quote here, practically verbatim, some of the key statements in the press summary accompanying the report:

- Soil degradation affects at least two thirds of the world's agricultural land.
- Freshwater is becoming scarcer in many countries due to agriculture, which consumes 70%.
- About a quarter of the world's fisheries are over-fished and half are fully utilized.
- More than 11,000 species are now considered threatened and more than 800 species have already become extinct.
- There has been a net loss of 4 per cent of the world's forest in the last decade.
- Global consumption of fossil fuels increased by 10 per cent from 1992 to 1999.

But the report makes these points after speaking of population and poverty, in terms both well known to all and worrying, having begun by discussing the economy in the following terms:

- Most countries enjoyed economic growth during the first half of the 1990s. Not all countries benefited, however: the gap in the standard of living between Africa and other regions widened. Economic and social conditions in the transition economies were also deteriorated.

⁴ "De que hablamos cuando hablamos de desarrollo", Josep Xercavins i Valls; La Vanguardia 25-11-01, pp 34-35

⁵ <http://www.johannesburgsummit.org/>; the UN's official website on the Summit!

- Globalisation also proved to have an extremely volatile side. Financial crises in Mexico and East Asia.
- Official development assistance (ODA) flows fell during the 1990s.
- Foreign Direct Investment (FDI) flows to developing countries grew steadily, reaching a peak in 1994 before falling sharply until 1998, after which it slightly rebounded once more.
- Government subsidies have increased in all countries.

1.1.2 Consolidation of a new world techno-socio-economic situation that has become known, rightly in my opinion, as globalisation⁶, and with differentiating characteristics compared to the past, and which is taking shape and changing at unprecedented speed, causing a dramatically increased sensation and reality of complexity, uncertainty and changing models

b1) made possible, basically, by new technological possibilities, particularly in communications and information, but also in the field of production and the way the economy functions.

b2) leaving behind a period in which political players, the historic subjects, were very clear and, amongst them, the nation-state was fundamental. State frontiers have ceased to exist for many basic flows in our times: environmental, financial, information, etc.

b3) that has even helped to bring into being an important social movement, one more or less cohesive and structured, known as anti-globalisation, though there are attempts from within the movement itself to change this name to "alternative globalisation".

1.1.3 The world's leading superpower has become even more so (powerful and leading), although only comparatively, and has, at least at present, opted to act as such in a totally egocentric and, therefore, unilateral, way⁷

c1) the most serious manifestation of this policy to date is, without doubt, the decision, in view of the impossibility of reaching agreement within the UN Security Council, to start a war which was therefore, and quite justly, qualified as illegal. Events following this war have only served to drive home just how illegitimate it was!

c2) The present US administration's knee-jerk reaction to the terrible events of 11 September 2001 lead one to suspect that the attacks are being used to impose an "Orwellian" world both at home and abroad.

c3) all the evidence supports claims that the present situation is or at least this is the intention ruled by imperialism.

1.1.4 A kind of "undeclared" bipolarisation affects the system of international multilateral institutions

d1) the international multilateral institutions (more or less multilateral, needless to say) play different roles in each of the essential characteristics described above. This is the result of different considerations that I aim to discuss in the first section of this paper.

d2) but what my heading really seeks to affirm is that, in my view, we have witnessed this kind of undeclared bipolarisation take shape between, on the one hand, the UN system proper and, on the other, the world financial, economic and trade institutions (Bretton Woods IMF and WB and WTO). The UN system proper produces large and, I believe, good programme results, the fruit, fundamentally, of its world summits, but is now saddled with what has become known as the "implementation gap" and that we could almost call the absence of implementation. Meanwhile, the world financial, economic and trade institutions (Bretton Woods IMF and WB and WTO) have quietly gone about the work of deciding and, above all, establishing the neoliberalism that has reigned in the world for the last 20 years or more.

⁶ The Global Village; Noam Chomsky, Heinz Dieterich; Tafalla 1997; What is Globalization?; Ulrick Beck; Paidos 1998

⁷ "Open letter to President Bush: War on Iraq? The worst remedy for the world's grave problems"; UBUNTU Forum comunique of 4 February 2003: <http://www.ubuntu.upc.es/comunicat/index.php?id=irak&lg=eng>

As regards this paper, this last point is, without doubt, the one that requires the greatest elucidation and discussion. Let us do so, then. This discussion will be based, partly, on an assessment of the Johannesburg Summit and which, although it was written a year ago, I consider to be perfectly valid still⁸.

1.2 Evolution of the international political situation in the 1990s; the not entirely coincidental effects of the "Washington Consensus" and the fall of the Berlin Wall

With the help of Figure 2, compiled from various sources and revised and updated for this paper, I shall attempt to situate and compare the absolute and relative contexts of the summits in Rio (early 1990s: 1992; the first of a series of highly characteristic UN summits) and Johannesburg (10 years later: 2002; the last of these summits and the first +10 review of one of them: the Rio Summit, naturally). This seems to me to be an indispensable exercise, one that gives considerable help in clarifying matters.

Rio 92 took place, amongst other things, at a moment in history that, in spite of everything (the first Gulf War, for example), was without doubt quite exceptional. The fall of real communism and the bilateral world; what was undoubtedly the most important process of international distension in decades; what we might call lack of definition regarding the future of politics and the international situation that surely helped the United Nations system to play a stronger role than ever before in terms of deploying its internal resources (more characteristic and progressive programmes, more important officials, etc.). In short, they "permitted" the UN to do this.

Not knowing of any assessments that have reached conclusions to the contrary, I, at least, cannot but acknowledge the quantity, quality and importance of the agreements reached at Rio.

But, moreover, this is true, not only because of Rio in itself, but also because Rio was a stone thrown into a pond whose ripples spread until practically the end of the 1990s, the decade of UN progressive summits: Vienna and Human Rights; Cairo and Population; Copenhagen and Social Development; Beijing and Women; etc. All delivered important, progressive declarations and action plans, whose only though definitive drawback was in their application, as some were completely or partially left unimplemented!

And this last, clearly fundamental fact has also caused the UN as we can see at present, and occurred again even at Johannesburg to fall from one of its only upturns, one of the most important revivals of fortune since the Cold War, into one of its deepest troughs as regards the role many of us no doubt wish and hope it could and would play. UN member states do not comply with the measures they approve within the organisation.

But why did this happen, why is it still happening? Because the world's rich and powerful long turned off onto a different route. Reagan and Thatcher started a great conservative, neoliberal revolution which had much to do with the fall of real communism, but which did not fully show its face until well into the 1990s.

The instruments they used to implement the more international aspects of their policy which formed the majority, in fact did not include the UN status quo of the bilateral world or multilateral revival after the end of real communism but other "old" institutions, the Bretton Woods institutions, reincarnated in this case, however, to play a leading role. Fundamentally, the International Monetary Fund (IMF), with its structural adjustment, privatisation and deregulation policies making its loans to developing countries conditional on their agreeing to slim down their public sectors and policies. And, to a lesser degree, the World Bank (WB), laying down the guidelines for international cooperation based more on the private sector and on Direct Foreign Investment (DFI) than on the public sector, on Official

⁸ "Johannesburg, un pas endavant i dos passos enrere?" ("Johannesburg, one step forward, two steps back?") in the monograph "El llegat de Johannesburg" ("The Johannesburg Legacy") in the publication "Medi Ambient; tecnologia i Cultura", published by the Generalitat of Catalonia Environment Department; no. 33, December 2002, pp. 35-47

Development Aid (ODA). As is well known, these institutions are completely controlled by the rich and powerful nations (their decision-making is, basically, proportional to member countries' GDP) and they were, moreover, complemented a few years after these events, by the most controversial and despite its importance undefined of international organisations: the World Trade Organisation (WTO), established, in fact, in 1994 as an instrument to promote liberalisation in international trade.

The issues the WTO is concerned with are complex because they are many and by no means restricted to trade and because, in the current neoliberal international scenario, they are becoming largely according to plan those that "drive" all other developments. Broadly speaking, we can say, as one of the most important aspects of how the world works at present: if UN member states (in this context, the UN can be considered the "world public system") fail to meet their responsibilities as regards aid to developing countries (both Official Development Aid and Direct Foreign Investment have been falling in the developing countries over the last decade, as we have already seen pointed out by Kofi Annan⁵) and through world financial and economic institutions (International Monetary Fund and World Bank) require that states wishing to receive their aid should reduce their public deficits through neoliberalisation through privatisation and abolishing protectionist measures in as many economic sectors as possible. Then, the great transnational corporations, which are those that end up managing taking over these "local" economic sectors, will demand maximum commercial liberalisation of goods and services from the "world". It is no coincidence that the WTO was founded in 1994, during the most expansive period in the economic globalisation process.

The result of these policies is the type of economic globalisation we have seen, and which the development of ICTs (Information and Communication Technologies) have facilitated enormously, defining a context extraordinarily different for Johannesburg and for Rio.

To put it in the simple but easily understood terms of "European language": all over the world in the 1990s, a neoliberal framework, which began to take shape in the 80s, led by the Bretton Woods institutions (IMF and WB), was implacably put into place, rather than the more social-democratic or Keynesian framework formulated but not implemented by the UN. And although the results, particularly at "macroworld" level are truly alarming (larger absolute and relative imbalances than ever; more poverty than ever; more environmental problems than ever), we continue to witness the continuing expansion and domination of this neoliberal economic model in which the market and trade have ceased to be a tool for human development to become an end in themselves.

Although certain disagreement exists regarding the paternity and exact date when the term was coined, this entire neoliberal phase is also known as the "Washington Consensus". Briefly, for one salient reason: because it was a phase that clearly obeyed the dictates of the Bretton Woods institutions (IMF and WB) and which, as is well known, have their headquarters in Washington!

Moreover, an extract from one of the sources attributed with first coining and providing an explicit, public definition of the "Washington Consensus" is reproduced below, in Figure 1.

This is, in my view, at least a key element in a more in-depth explanation as to why the UN's progressive programmes of the 1990s and which, in the above-mentioned language, featured a large component of "social democracy", were not worth the paper they were written on.⁹ Returning to "European language": instead of shaping a more balanced world in all senses using cohesion funds policies the option chosen was, in effect, to allow the rich and powerful countries in the world the minority to continue accumulating wealth despite the further impoverishment of the world's poor countries the majority and the serious impact on the global environment that this caused.

Johannesburg was, then, viewed in this way, neither a success nor a failure, although there has been considerable discussion as to whether it was one or the other. However, it was another victory, for the moment, as I shall go on to explain, of the "world neoliberal framework world dominance and private management and market deregulation" over another possible model, the "world social-democratic framework world dominance and public management and market regulation" that, in principle, should be more respectful towards humanity and the planet that shelters us. At world level, the basic public actor under the second model would be we have no alternative at present the UN. For this reason, I shall refer to it, on occasion, as I do in Figure 2, as the "UN framework".

Figure 1: "The original 1989 Washington Consensus"

Fiscal Discipline

Large and sustained fiscal deficits contribute to inflation and capital flight.

Therefore, governments should keep them to a minimum.

Public Expenditure Priorities

Subsidies need to be reduced or eliminated. Government spending should be redirected towards education, health, and infrastructure development.

Tax Reform

The tax base "should be broad" and marginal tax rates "should be moderate."

Interest Rates

Domestic financial markets should determine a country's interest rates.

Positive real interest rates discourage capital flight and increase savings.

Exchange Rates

Developing countries must adopt a "competitive" exchange rate that will bolster exports by making them cheaper abroad.

Trade Liberalization

Tariffs should be minimized and should never be applied toward intermediate goods needed to produce exports.

Foreign Direct Investment

Foreign investment can bring needed capital and skills and, therefore, should be encouraged.

Privatization

Private industry operates more efficiently because managers either have a "direct personal stake in the profits of an enterprise or are accountable to those who do." State-owned enterprises ought to be privatized.

Deregulation

Excessive government regulation can promote corruption and discriminate against smaller enterprises that have minimal access to the higher reaches of the bureaucracy. Governments have to deregulate the economy.

Property Rights

Property rights must be enforced. Weak laws and poor judicial systems reduce incentives to save and accumulate wealth.

Font: "What Washington Means by Policy Reform" in John Williamson, ed., *Latin American Adjustment: How Much Has Happened?* (Washington: Institute for International Economics, 1990).

⁹ "Diez años de desgobierno mundial"; Josep Xercavins i Valls; La Vanguardia, 4-07-02, pp 34

Figure 2: Evolution of the international political situation

	UN framework	Neoliberal framework	Parallel key events
1980's		Reagan and Thatcher	Reagan and Thatcher
1982			International debt crisis
1989			Fall of the Berlin Wall
1990			Gulf War
1991			
1992	Rio - Earth Summit		
1993	Vienna - Human Rights		
1994	Cairo - Population	WTO founded	Chiapas / Mexican financial crisis
1995	Copenhagen - Social		Internet - WEB world
	Beijing - Women		
1996	Istanbul - Habitat		
1997	Kyoto / Rio+5		Asian financial crisis
1998			Russian financial crisis
1999		Seattle - WTC	
2000	Millennium Summit; MDG		Millennium Forum
2001	Durban - Racism		Porto Alegre / Genoa
11-9-2001	11-9-2001	11-9-2001	11-9-2001
2001		Doha - WTC	Financial crisis in Argentina
2002	Monterrey - Financing		Porto Alegre
	Johannesburg - Sust. Development		Lula
2003			Porto Alegre
15-2-2003	15-2-2003	15-2-2003	15-2-2003
Guerra Iraq	Iraqi war	Iraqi war	Iraqi war
2003		Cancun - WTC	

1.3 The "Millennium Development Goals", laid down by the UN Millennium General Assembly;¹⁰ the "Agreements of the WTO Ministerial Conference in Doha: the Development or Millennium Round"¹¹, the "Monterrey Consensus" of the UN Summit on Financing for Development¹² and the "Type 2 partnership agreements" formulated at the UN Summit on Sustainable Development in Johannesburg:¹³ INTERNATIONAL INSTITUTIONS' RECENT AND LATEST KEY PROGRAMMES

I should like to complete my description of the present world political situation by continuing in the vein of the previous section, glancing once more at Figure 2 (this time, more specifically, at the bottom rows).

By the turn of the new Millennium, broadly speaking, all the Summits + 5 to review those we have mentioned previously, considering them the most progressive summits in UN history have taken place. Generally speaking, each and every one was a disappointment. We saw at times complete failure to implement actions plans and approved declarations (such as, for example, the case of the Summit on Social Development in Copenhagen) and even, as the 1990s came to a close, U-turns (a case in point is the Beijing+5 Summit on Women in New York).

At the same time, globalisation and the realisation that, at the very least, the benefits it promises completely fail to arrive, on the contrary, the developing world is becoming clearly established as the new world socio-economic stage par excellence. From the environmental viewpoint, the failure to ratify¹⁴ and/or comply with the Kyoto agreements provide further indication of the way things are going.

One might say that, in this regard, the 20th century ended in Seattle with the failure of the WTO meeting there, linked to the "official" birth of the "anti-globalisation" movement. Both things, though, have older origins including, in 1994, the establishment of the WTO and the uprising in Chiapas.

2000 was the year of good intentions. And the UN had its own! Watered-down, but still... In its declaration, the UN Extraordinary General Assembly the Millennium Summit approved the well-known "Millennium Development Goals", or MDGs. These are, in any case, no more than objectives, overly modest for some myself included and, as could be no different given the context in which we find ourselves and this is, in my view, always the most serious aspect, as I shall continue to argue in this section without identifying or specifying the means and paths (economic, institutional, etc.) needed to achieve them.

Let me now refer you to Figure 3.

¹⁰ <http://ubuntu.upc.es/pag.php?lg=cat&sec=biblio&p=intro>

¹¹ http://www.wto.org/wto/english/thewto_e/minist_e/min01_e/mindecl_e.htm

¹² <http://www.un.org/esa/ffd/0302finalMonterreyConsensus.pdf>

¹³ <http://www.johannesburgsummit.org/>

¹⁴ See the UBUNTU Forum's press release on Environment Day 2001; <http://www.ubuntu.upc.es/comuni.php?id=ambient&lg=eng>

Figure 3: UN Millennium Development Goals¹⁵

<p>1</p> <p>Eradicate extreme poverty and hunger</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Reduce by half the proportion of people living on less than a dollar a day. - Reduce by half the proportion of people who suffer from hunger.
<p>2</p> <p>Achieve universal primary education</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Ensure that all boys and girls complete a full course of primary schooling.
<p>3</p> <p>Promote gender equality and empower women</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Eliminate gender disparity in primary and secondary education preferably by 2005, and at all levels by 2015.
<p>4</p> <p>Reduce child mortality</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Reduce by two thirds the mortality rate among children under five.
<p>5</p> <p>Improve maternal health</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Reduce by three quarters the maternal mortality ratio.
<p>6</p> <p>Combat HIV/AIDS, malaria and other diseases</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Halt and begin to reverse the spread of HIV/AIDS. - Halt and begin to reverse the incidence of malaria and other major diseases.
<p>7</p> <p>Ensure environmental sustainability</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Integrate the principles of sustainable development into country policies and programmes; reverse loss of environmental resources. - Reduce by half the proportion of people without sustainable access to safe drinking water. - Achieve significant improvement in lives of at least 100 million slum dwellers, by 2020.

¹⁵ <http://www.un.org/millenniumgoals/>

Develop a global partnership for development

- Develop further an open trading and financial system that is rule-based, predictable and non-discriminatory. Includes a commitment to good governance, development and poverty reduction-nationally and internationally.
- Address the least developed countries' special needs. This includes tariff- and quota-free access for their exports; enhanced debt relief for heavily indebted poor countries; cancellation of official bilateral debt; and more generous official development assistance for countries committed to poverty reduction.
- Address the special needs of landlocked and small island developing States.
- Deal comprehensively with developing countries' debt problems through national and international measures to make debt sustainable in the long term.
- In cooperation with the developing countries, develop decent and productive work for youth.
- In cooperation with pharmaceutical companies, provide access to affordable essential drugs in developing countries.
- In cooperation with the private sector, make available the benefits of new technologies-especially information and communications technologies.

Entire books will be needed for years to come if we are to begin to assimilate the year 2001. From the explosion of the so-called social movements (the first Porto Alegre forum under the slogan "Another World is Possible", the events of Genoa, amongst others, linked to the "anti-globalisation" movement, etc.) to the most explicitly important failure of a UN Summit, the Durban Summit on Racism (to which we must add the as-yet unevaluated but none the less important rupture within the NGO movement), ending with the world-shaking, tragic events of September 11 in the USA.

But, just a few weeks after those events, so important in so many ways (amongst other things for their demobilisation effect on society), in Doha, a city in the United Arab Emirates pretty well isolated from the rest of the world, ministers from the WTO member states reached the agreement they had failed to achieve in Seattle. **The "Agreements of the WTO Ministerial Conference in Doha" are, precisely, an agreement to reopen a more liberalising world trade round, the most important ever launched. Apart from goods trade, moreover, this round of negotiations includes practically everything (ranging from agriculture to such essential services as education and health, as well as such fundamental economic areas as financial investment and the access of transnational corporations to all state public tenders). The new negotiations are known as the Millennium Round but, above all, the "Development Round"! To gain a quick idea of the range of these talks, see Figure 4, below, which contains the contents of the Doha Declaration work programme for the round.**

The Doha Agreements themselves are not very well known, yet are those most quoted in the texts of official UN summits held subsequently! According to Doha, the intensification of the world trade liberalisation process is the cornerstone behind the new direction to be taken by world economic policy.

The market, more deregulated than ever at present, will be the frame in which the world's problems (poverty, the environment, development, cultural diversity, etc.) will be resolved.

Figure 4: Work programme for the Doha Declaration, which opens the development round¹⁶

- Implementation
- Agriculture
- Services
- Market access
- TRIPS
- Trade and investment
- Trade and competition policy
- Government procurement
- Trade facilitation
- WTO rules
- Dispute settlement
- Trade and environment
- Electronic commerce
- Small economies
- Trade, debt and finance
- Trade and transfer of technology
- Technical cooperation
- Least-developed countries
- Special and differential treatment
- Organisation and management of the work programme

Five months before the end of a mythical decade, Rio-Johannesburg, the last preparatory step in the UN context took place: the World Summit on Financing for Development in Monterrey, which produced or, perhaps, better, tried to produce the so-called "Monterrey Consensus".

The Monterrey Summit was, in fact, a mandate for the Millennium Summit precisely to specify the resources, instruments and ways to finance development. What I have often stressed as, in short, the basic question: how to implement? How to achieve? In this case, the MDGs (Millennium Development Goals). And what is this so-called, or alleged, consensus (which rose up from the ashes of September 11 and the Doha trade concerns)? The headings of the main sections in the final summit document make this pretty clear:

- Mobilising international financial resources for development: foreign direct investment (FDI) and other private flows.
- International trade as an engine for development (that is to say, full speed ahead on the Doha liberalisation path).
- Increasing official development assistance (ODA) to 0.7% of GDP of the developed countries (doesn't this sound rather familiar? Although it is obviously indispensable and no doubt still completely insufficient!).

¹⁶ http://www.wto.org/spanish/thewto_s/minist_s/min01_s/mindecl_s.htm

Apart from the use of a slightly more progressive language on debt issues, the so-called "Monterrey Consensus" is, in fact, the ratification of the international neoliberal model. The third heading above is, today, pure rhetoric from the past. And the other two principal points are nothing more than the adaptation of development cooperation issues to the neoliberal model, making them subsidiary to the Doha Round, that is to say, to the intensification of trade liberalisation.

Exactly the same thing happened soon after Johannesburg. What, then, is the main criticism that we can and should make of the Monterrey action or implementation plan and after Johannesburg? Well, precisely that it is not what they say it is!

We find ourselves time and again, and particularly in the case of Johannesburg, before a long list of objectives, always long-term (10-15 years, over which so many things happen that many can be considered excuses should the goals not finally be met, even though the true reason may have been that no efforts were really made to achieve them), practically always with no quantification of objectives and always, above all, with absolutely no clear and explicitly financial and institutional commitment.

What the Johannesburg action plan does once more is to pass onto the market with no intention of regulating it, what is more the responsibility for solving the world's main social and environmental problems! The states, particularly the rich and powerful states, evade all financial or institutional commitments within the UN system, whilst the international economic and financial institutions, the World Trade Organisation above all, and private resources become, practically exclusively, the only framework for tackling challenges (who knows with what guarantee that they will even do that tackle the problem and with no chance for anyone to demand an explanation from anyone if it turns out not to be the case).

Aware as I am of just how strong my accusations in the previous paragraph sound, we should perhaps go a little deeper into the subject. Perhaps, here, the subject of the Type 2 Partnership Agreements may prove helpful. It is probable that in the future even the terminology used to refer to this subject will be different: as it stands at present, it is much too revealing to be allowed to pass down into history. Type 1 agreements at a summit are those approved as such by the summit: the political declaration, the action plan, etc. Type 2 agreements are summit agreements, listed and considered outcomes from the summit, but not explicitly approved by it, that is to say, by the corresponding extraordinary UN General Assembly plenary session.

Some 300 partnership proposals were presented at Johannesburg as part of the official summit programme, and we can still find these on the summit's official website, explicitly listed as outcomes from it! As the fine word itself suggests, these are agreements between partners, usually but not necessarily all together governments, companies, international organisations, universities, NGOs, etc. to submit projects in the general direction of the summit, in this case on sustainable development.

Sounds wonderful, doesn't it? And the answer would certainly be "yes" if not for... If not for the fact that they do not form part of Type 1 agreements, that is to say, it is not made clear anywhere what the relation is nor whether there should even be such a relation between the goals (political declaration and action plan) approved at the summit and the goals these Type 2 Partnership Agreements pursue. If not for the fact that they are answerable to no one, neither at the beginning (so, why this project and not another, perhaps a higher priority but perhaps not so beneficial to certain partners) nor at the end (whether goals have really been met, any collateral impact, etc.). If not for the fact that, when the action plan says that additional funding should be found, the following possibility is, de facto, being posited: the possibility of sinking such funding into these partnership agreement rather than in funds subject to public institutional "control" of any kind. Too much, in my view, not to be clearly seen as the opening up of a new path for the neoliberal option as practically the only reference framework for international policy these days. A new step, let there be no doubt about it, towards privatising "international cooperation for sustainable development".

1.4 The key question: Is the WTO "Development Round", which is and remains clearly in tune politically and ideologically with the "Washington Consensus", the right way to achieve the UN's "Millennium Development Goals" (MDGs)?

In 2002, then, we witnessed another step towards the hegemony of what we call here the international neoliberal model. Taking its lead from Doha, between Monterrey and Johannesburg, the UN the only current existing body of global problem management system allowed this step to be taken. Not only do we not have a new consensus as was claimed at Monterrey but the "Washington Consensus" has become consolidated and is being imposed paradoxically, in my view with ever growing force.

We have given enough consideration to the above claim, and need not insist more on this point. However, as it stands or is explained here, one might reach the conclusion that the UN itself was responsible for this situation, and that is not the case.

The UN is an international organisation and, under the present state of affairs, its member states enjoy absolute sovereignty! The results of a UN summit are the fruit of long, complex negotiations amongst these states. It is clear, however, that not all states are equal or have the same muscle. Recently, it has been usual to see three-sided negotiations within the UN, between the US, the EU and the G77, occasionally with the active participation of such countries as the Scandinavian nations, Switzerland, Canada, Australia, etc., and though simplification always leaves something out, little more. But, in fact, the European Union (EU) ends up playing a truly minor role, the result, according to the experts, of the Community's well-known lack of unity as regards foreign policy. In practice, therefore, the real negotiations take place between the US (and, amongst other things, its active unilateralism) and the regrouped but weak and contradictory G77 (which brings together more than 120 developing countries) plus China. **And, though I will not say that the G77's negotiating position expresses, generally speaking, its explicit objections to moving forward within the neoliberal framework, I will say that it expresses, generally speaking and in a fairly "elementary" way, its urge to escape from the predicament it is trapped in, and from which the group's members see no release if the international political situation continues its present course of development.**

In short, I believe that there can be little doubt, at present, of the continuing hegemony of the US (which also, indirectly, favours the EU's "more economic and financial interests") and its positions regarding international policy, based, primarily, on consolidating it as the sole world power. The US promotes international structural reforms necessary to further the interests of its economic and financial sectors, which need to expand continuously in order to continue reaping profits. In other words, they need an ever bigger market, particularly for their products and investments, which can also thereby benefit from less strictly controlled social, environmental and fiscal conditions and, therefore, enjoy larger profit margins.

Now, a more or less clearly hegemonic framework notwithstanding, reality is still reality. And another characteristic trend in the global world is that, despite all, such an intervisible and interdependent world as ours cannot renounce, nor renounce the attempt to meet, the Millennium Development Goals. The MDGs express, at the very least, the international community's response to the inhuman conditions in which over half the world's population is forced to live. We can summarise the analysis we have made up to this point by saying that the UN is well able to define these goals but has not, to date, been able to take into its hands the keys needed to meet them. The world's rich and powerful nations have steered the last two summits, those in Monterrey and Johannesburg, to leave the UN bereft of operational results means. The world's rich and powerful nations continue to ratify and to impose the "Washington Consensus". At present, they plan to continue imposing it through the latest round of negotiations opened up by the WTO: the "Development Round".

The key question is, then: Is the WTO's "Development Round", which is and remains clearly in tune politically and ideologically with the "Washington Consensus", the right way to achieve the MDGs?

Although, at this point in this paper it no longer even needs saying, clearly, in my view the answer is: NO! Because of all the arguments listed here, but also one in particular: How, after nearly 20 years of a policy that has led to a world whose problems make it absolutely essential to draw up the Millennium Development Goals described in Figure 3, can we expect the same policy that has caused many of these problems to now solve them? It is obvious that the same need that drove us to establish the new goals should make us change our policy in order to achieve them surely, it cannot be the same policy that has generated the problems we now seek to resolve!

1.5 The WTO meeting in Cancun: first important defiance of the "Washington Consensus by the developing countries!

The history of the World Trade Organisation (which, in fact, goes much further back than its recent official creation in 1994, dating back to the "Negotiating Rounds" on world trade issues that took place after the Second World War) is a continuous succession of negotiations, with successes and failures, advances and setbacks whose positive or negative assessment depends on the question (manufactured goods, primary goods, agriculture, services, etc.) and the party (US, EU, developing countries, civil society organisations, etc.) making the assessment.

At the Doha meeting, a few weeks after 11 September 2001, unlike what occurred at Seattle, it was agreed to begin negotiations on important new issues with a view to achieving further liberalisation. The negotiating round launched, known as the development round, is due to close by early 2005 and is, historically speaking, one of the most ambitious. Cancun was planned as a meeting to review the state of negotiations and where, according to expectations, practically no significant agreements were to be reached. What is more important is to look at the level and the parties within the context of the disagreements.

Well then, from 10 to 14 September 2003, the 5th WTO Ministerial Meeting took place in Cancun. Apart from the context described above, the importance of the meeting was clear if one took into account, for example, that, as we have mentioned time and again, the UN's 2002 summits, such as those in Monterrey on Financing for Development and in Johannesburg on Sustainable Development, in fact transferred to the WTO and to this negotiating round most of the real responsibility for implementing the action plans approved at them. This is as surprising as it is paradoxical, since the WTO is not part of the UN, nor do its complex dynamics and rules and regulations offer similar democratic safeguards, nor does international human rights legislation necessarily form the preliminary basis for the agreements it reaches.

Cancun ended with disagreement and failure for the WTO meeting, making the objective of advancing on the negotiations launched at Doha in 2001 and completing them in January 2005, appear practically impossible. Apart from this, though, seemingly very important new developments, questions and concerns appeared on the international stage.

The first interesting new development in Cancun was the appearance of a new player in negotiations: the G20 (20 countries that together account for over 50% of world population and 63% of global agricultural production: China, India, South Africa, Argentina, ... and Brazil). Brazil led and, without doubt, organised the group politically in what was perhaps President Lula's first important incursion into international politics. Since agriculture was a key issue at the Doha negotiating round, the G20 came together, really, on one single but transcendental point: that of finally putting an end to subsidies for agricultural production in rich countries' for its exportation, that was doing so much harm to agriculture in the developing countries.

The ongoing negotiating round includes other issues, four of them known as the "new issues" or the "Singapore issues": trade and investment, trade and competition policy, transparency in public procurement and trade facilitation. Another battlefield sprang up around these issues at the Cancun meeting. Advancing on them was the essential objective of the US, Europe and other rich countries: achieving practically unlimited capacity for penetrating the developing countries on the part of private transnational economic and financial players. More than 70 of these countries publicly repeated time and time again their objections to this, arguing that they were already suffering the negative effects of economic neoliberal globalisation quite enough without stoking them up to unknown extremes of magnitude and effects.

Although it is little recognised in public, what has been in question so far and will be at the end of this round of negotiations is an agreement based on mutual concessions over the two main themes mentioned. This would be possible if those who claim that the disagreements are not so important were right. But the "north-south" divide and political and economic confrontation is constantly escalating as a consequence, needless to say, of increasing imbalances of all kinds between these "two worlds". The "north" seeks to maintain its standard of living at the expense of the "south", whilst the "south" (supported by most world civil society movements) is beginning to become seriously rebellious.

In my view, then, and I repeat this purposely, almost 20 years after the "Washington Consensus" and its disastrous consequences for the "south" and for the planet, and whilst the UN works to achieve an alternative consensus, as the "Monterrey Consensus" in 2002 was intended to be, or, at least, to meet the Millennium Development Goals of 2000, the rich and powerful countries** are becoming entrenched in the international organisations they best control (IMF, WB and WTO) in order to maintain the policies that they have benefited so much from, and continue to benefit from. But many developing countries are beginning to tire of the results and, logically, the policies of these last 20 years. This, for me, explains the most important confrontation of these countries with the world's rich and powerful nations within a multilateral international organisation.

As the World Forum of Civil Society Networks -UBUNTU says in its latest communiqué¹⁷, and as a way of introducing the second part of this paper, what is needed is: *"The restructuring of the WTO in the heart of the UN to deal with trade issues under the coordination of a UN body responsible for economic, social and environmental matters, which, at the same time, must be under the political guidelines of the General Assembly. This is a step towards an in-depth reform of the system of international institutions, whose final aim must be the placing of human beings, and not economic interests, at the heart of its objectives and actions."*

1.5.1 Collateral reflection: globalisation, trade and sustainable development¹⁸

Trade has been at the base of many of the most positive advances in the history of humanity. Conceptually and ethically, there can be no objection to the idea of exchanging what one person does best and most efficiently for what someone else does best and most efficiently.

An extraordinary increase in world trade is one of the characteristics, perhaps even the defining characteristic, of what we have come to know as globalisation.

However, when trade becomes more speculative than real (for example, when it means, in fact transferring a product amongst its different and most beneficial in terms of profit margin production zones), or when it causes important collateral impacts (for example, trade over long distances entails, amongst other things, energy consumption that, if energy prices "spoke the truth", would make the transaction unfeasible), or when "trade aid" is not really aid (for example, when it takes the form of surplus production of subsidised crops in the rich and powerful countries, and which devastate weak local primary sector economies in the poor countries) it then becomes one of the most unsustainable sometimes socially, others environmentally activities that form part of that controversial phenomenon, globalisation.

¹⁷ Latest communiqué, 2-10-2003, by the UBUNTU Forum: "Refounding the WTO within the UN"; <http://www.ubuntu.upc.es/comunicat/index.php?id=cancun&lg=eng>

¹⁸ Globalisation & The Crisis of Sustainable Development; Martin Khor; Third World Network, 2001

1.6. Reflection in late 2003: has the system of international organisations become blocked?

Only time can reveal the answer to this question, this reflection.

But if, as regards, firstly, peace and security issues, the UN and, more specifically, its most important body in the 20th century, the Security Council, has become thoroughly blocked in a way that does not appear to be a passing situation as a result of the Iraqi war; and if, secondly, the WTO, in whose hands lie the most substantial decisions regarding the world's financial, economic and trade, also appears to continue submerged in a state of blockage that goes much deeper than that of a tactical negotiating position: then...? Time will tell!

** Author's note:

Obviously, this is a paper that, basically, in this first part but, in the final outcome, throughout, attempts to analyse the situation in the world today but, in this case, taking into account fundamentally the role the system of international organisations plays in it.

That is why I have opted to make certain simplifications, such as, for example, when I speak of the "north-south" dichotomy which is far from homogeneous these days and no doubt requires a great many qualifications or do not differentiate between rich and powerful countries and truly rich and powerful sectors obviously a very important distinction. All this, not due to unawareness or failure to realise how important these questions are, but not to be distracted from the main thrust of this paper: global democratic governance, from the institutional point of view.

2. World democratic governance

2.1 Global democratic governance based on in-depth reform of the system of international institutions, restoring to it the responsibility, according to generally accepted ethic principles, of defining the policies that should govern social, trade, economic, financial, etc., dynamics for the good of humanity

The fact is that there are few possible summaries of the by no means short first part of this paper, except as follows: a system of international institutions resulting from a particular period in the history of humanity that following the great wars of the 20th century attempts to face very different situations, possibilities and circumstances such as those arising in the 1980s and 90s and, particularly, in the early years of the 21st century. For a host of different reasons, it is not up to the job and ends up "permitting", amongst other things, the following well-documented states of affairs: a) that much of humanity lives in conditions that do not satisfy even their basic needs; b) that violence amongst people forms part of the daily bread in many parts of the world; c) that we are beginning to pay a high price for our mistreatment of the planet we form an inextricable part of; d) that the gap between rich and poor, powerful and weak, grows wider every day, not due to any natural phenomenon, but as the result of policies applied; e) that a small group of the world's most rich and powerful are exercising more and more power and dominance over the rest, and with more and more impunity and in ever more arbitrary fashion.

And since, in fact, the way these few rich and powerful rich have steered the planet's fortunes and, particularly, the way they have managed the new context we have come to know as globalisation having decided, basically, to use it to deregulate, privatise, etc., allowing the injustices we describe here to increase leaves only one possible alternative or path (if we except, needless to say, that of turning back (?), something history has always shown to be impossible). This alternative is, precisely, that of ensuring the democratic governance of globalisation. Such a measure is, clearly, intimately-linked to the need for in-depth reform of our present system of international institutions, basically, so that this system can articulate, formulate, "rehabilitate" this democratic governance, radically reversing the current trends and circumstances described here, and which are causing so much damage.

What we need, then, to respond to policies that seek to transfer wholesale to the market from the institutions themselves (but, remember, from certain institutions more than from others) the responsibility for resolving and managing the world's problems, is to restore to these institutions, once they have been suitably reformed (some, again, more than others) the responsibility, according to generally accepted ethical principles, to draw up policies to govern world social, trade, economic, financial, etc., dynamics so that human beings (the most intrinsically and least instrumentally human) can take up a central place once more, becoming the real subject of such policies. Year after year, day after day, the need for market regulation is becoming an ever more unquestionable need if we want truly to advance towards a fair, more equitable, diverse, free, peaceful world.

This is the view of a new initiative which is beginning to emerge in civil society: the World Forum of Civil Society Networks - UBUNTU. Having become firmly established, this movement is now channelling its energies precisely into a "World Campaign for In-Depth Reform of the System of International Institutions". I reproduce the principal texts behind this campaign below.

2.2 The "World Campaign for In-Depth Reform of the System of International Institutions"¹⁹

2.2.1 WHY THIS CAMPAIGN?

Humanity is facing particularly grave problems and challenges at present: we still have not achieved peace and security based on justice and freedom in the world; huge numbers of our planet's inhabitants live in deplorable conditions of poverty; the rich countries continue to be shackled to a model of economic growth whose impact on the environment jeopardises the sustainability of life for future generations; loss of cultural diversity is impoverishing, perhaps irreversibly, one of humanity's most important characteristics.

The globalisation process intensifies interrelations and interdependence between the world's problems and challenges. As a result, what happens on a global scale has a decisive influence locally, on what affects the life of all the citizens in the world. Moreover, globalisation is leading to a weakening of political authority: whilst markets become more and more global, the influence of political institutions necessary to ensure that these operate in a democratic, equitable, efficient way diminishes with every day that passes. Faced by such a situation, people all over the world are beginning to reclaim their democratic right to take part in decisions that affect their lives so directly. World civil society is called on to play a key role in promoting the democratisation of the system of international institutions.

In such a context, the break-down of the international system for peace and security which became evident in the recent war in Iraq and the unilateral course of action embarked upon by the world's leading power have caused widespread turmoil with serious consequences for the system of international institutions, particularly the United Nations. Unilateral action in the field of peace and security has become part of the global equation, making in-depth reform of the world institutional system even more necessary and urgent.

This campaign aims to promote a series of reforms of international institutions with a view to installing a global system of democratic governance through representative procedures involving the participation of all the actors of the world scene. Its key objective is to contribute to establishing a consistent, transparent, responsible and effective global architecture based on developing international legislation whose democratic value and legitimacy is widely accepted. At the heart of this system would be a stronger, more democratic United Nations Organisation, a UN with effective control over all its bodies and agencies and over world multilateral organisations. Such an institutional system would be empowered to contribute to building a fairer, more equitable, diverse, sustainable and peaceful world.

2.2.2. CAMPAIGN OBJECTIVES:

- *To launch a process for in-depth reform of the system of international institutions.*
- *To involve all world players in this process: international institutions, different government levels and civil society in its broadest sense.*
- *To draw up agreements with civil society over the conceptual and methodological bases for such reform.*

2.2.3 THE "WORLD CITIZEN LEGISLATION INITIATIVE":

In the different representative democratic systems found all over the world, legislative power is held by the parliament. Nonetheless, there are often procedures by which citizens can play a more direct role in

¹⁹ <http://www.reformcampaign.net>

decision-taking. These procedures include citizen legislative initiatives and the possibility of proposing constitutional amendments, as long as certain requirements established in constitutions are complied with. In such cases, citizens require their parliament to consider or at least study a particular legislative proposal.

For example, the constitutions of most European countries and the US provide mechanisms for citizen participation in legislative processes. Moreover, many countries in Europe and the rest of the world provide citizens with the possibility of submitting legislative initiatives to the relative authority, which takes the final decision over whether or not to convert the proposal into legislation. The established procedure generally requires a certain number of signatures to be collected from citizens in support of the legislative initiative.

No equivalent procedure exists at world level. However, citizens' desire to participate on the global level, to have their say in the decisions of international organisations that affect their everyday life, requires us to come up with and explore new, more imaginative forms of democratic participation in the decisions taken by international institutions.

Taking the UN General Assembly to be our most democratic and representative body at world level, we can imagine a process enabling citizens all over the globe to address that body directly and not only through their respective national institutions to call on it to launch, for example, a reform process of the type we aim to achieve with the World Campaign for In-Depth Reform of the System of International Institutions.

This, then, is the idea behind the "World Citizen Legislative Initiative": that the world's citizens should petition the UN General Assembly, calling on it to launch a process for the reform of the system of international institutions.

As such a procedure is not provided for or regulated, we ourselves, all those taking part, will have to do it for ourselves. We are preparing for a longish haul as we set out, probably about three years. Our aim is to ensure that pledges of support are representative of all the world's citizens, and we will be looking to collect signatures from all the states and countries in the world. And, needless to say, although impossible to guarantee technically nowadays, we shall make all efforts to ensure maximum credibility for all the signatures we collect.

2.2.4. THE CAMPAIGN MANIFESTO

We, citizens of the world, determined to safeguard future generations from war, poverty, injustice, cultural uniformisation and environmental degradation,

NOTE the particular gravity of the problems and challenges that face humanity today, in view, particularly, of the following:

- That the globalisation process is increasing the interdependence and complexity of world problems and widening the gap between rich and poor. Whilst markets are ever more global, the influence of political institutions necessary to ensure that they function in a democratic, equitable and efficient way diminishes by the day. More than ever, the policies applied by world economic institutions favour the market and the large corporations in detriment of policies that seek sustainable human development, whose desirability was agreed at UN summits in the 1990s and in the new millennium;

- That the weakening and marginalisation of the system of international institutions as regards questions of peace and security has led to the unilateral use of force in recent armed conflicts (Iraq...). The result of this tendency, rather than promoting collective conflict resolution through the processes and protocols established by the UN, is that military superiority is used to impose the interests of the world's leading power.

Rejecting this state of affairs, we citizens proclaim that a fairer world is possible and reclaim our democratic right to participate in global decisions that affect our everyday lives. To this end, we

PROPOSE in-depth reform of the system of international institutions towards a true system of world democratic governance guaranteeing:

- Democratic control and regulation of globalisation processes to contribute to the solution of the grave problems and challenges facing the world. This entails placing people and environmental protection rather than trade and economic interests at the centre of international institutions' priorities. In short, this means giving priority to human rights over all other international legislation;

- Eradication of poverty and the promotion of a more equitable development model based on solidarity and full respect for cultural, natural and gender diversity. To achieve these goals, institutional mechanisms must be put in place to reduce social and environmental imbalances in the world and to foster a more ethical world economic model. The action required to this end may include establishing taxes on international financial transactions and regulating the activities of transnational corporations;

- World peace and security, embracing human and environmental security, based on justice and freedom. This requires a system of international institutions governed by democratic principles, which respects and promotes peace culture and collective values and interests, and which is provided with mechanisms and means to ensure respect for international rules and agreements. A universal system of justice is an indispensable requirement for achieving this goal;

- Mechanisms enabling the worlds' citizens and civil society organisations to be directly represented and to take part in global decision-making processes within the framework of the international system.

The pursuit of these goals requires a stronger, more democratic UN, placed at the centre of a consistent, democratic, responsible, effective system of international institutions. More specifically, we need to democratise the composition and decision-making procedures of UN bodies; to strengthen the UN General Assembly, placing all its bodies and agencies, as well as world multilateral organisations, under its effective, democratic control. To achieve these objectives, we seek to

FOSTER a process of:

- Reflection and analysis by world civil society about ideas and proposals for international institutional reform;

- Mobilisation of world public opinion to promote and participate actively in the reform process;

- Promotion of intersectoral dialogue at world scale on the need for and nature of this reform;

- A "world citizen legislative initiative", based on the support for this manifesto pledged by citizens and organisations worldwide. The manifesto will then be submitted to the United Nations General Assembly, calling for the organisation, with the participation of all actors on the world scene, of a World Conference on Reform of the System of International Institutions.



2.3 About the campaign manifesto: a) "NO to only UN reform"; "YES to reform of the system of international institutions "; b) "NO to suprastructural reform led solely and exclusively by the states"; " YES to reform in which all players currently present on the world scene take part "

To speak of reform in the terms we speak of it here is not, in principle, particularly original. However, a glance at the depth behind the analyses, principles and objectives that drive this campaign soon shows the quantity and quality of differences between what is proposed here and other current initiatives for reform of the international institutions.

We could, for example, provide an exhaustive review of what has been proposed in the past. This is not the moment, nor is there space here to do so, but we can mention that such a study formed one of the starting points taken particularly into account when the campaign vision and mission were being drawn up. One of the pillars the campaign rests on, moreover, is a website²⁰ that enables users to consult a large range of resources on the subject of reform of the system of international institutions, as well as actors, events and documents related to the sub-themes described below (see Figure 5).

Before the campaign was launched, moreover, a series of studies and reports were drawn up and these can be found on the other campaign website²¹.



Documents on campaign content issues

- Global Democratic Governance and the Reform of International Institutions
Presented at the second plenary meeting of the UBUNTU Forum in April 2002, where it was decided to launch the campaign. The document was drawn up by a team of researchers linked to the International Centre for a Democratic Culture (CICD, Mexico), coordinated by CICD president **Jorge Nieto Montesinos**.
- Futures Beyond Threats
Document presented at the GO2 Forum, Global Governance 2002, organised by the International Forum in Montreal in October 2002. Futures Beyond Threats was a discussion and debate document for the UN Track, Civil Society and Global Governance, and was drawn up by **John W. Foster**, Principal Researcher, Civil Society, The North-South Institute, Ottawa, Canada
- Summary of proposals to Reform the System of International Institutions
This document, which was presented at the first meeting of the Campaign Organising Committee in December 2002, attempts to bring together the most important proposals for reform of the system of international institutions. It was compiled by the UBUNTU Forum and Campaign Ad Hoc Secretariat, and its principal author is **Núria Molina**

²⁰ <http://www.reformwatch.net>

²¹ <http://www.reformcampaign.net>

Figure 5: Portal on reform of the system of international institutions²²

Topics	Actors	Events	Documents	New search
General Approach	Search for actors, events and documents by TOPIC			
UN Reform	This section enables you to search for actors, events and documents related to each of the themes in the menu on the left, broken down as follows:			
IFIs and Trade	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • General Approach to Global Governance • UN Reform <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ General Assembly ○ Security Council ○ ECOSOC ○ Programmes ○ Agencies • Reform of Finance, Trade and Economic Institutions <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Reform of the Bretton Woods Institutions ○ WTO Reform ○ Currency Transactions Tax (CTT) ○ Debt • International Law and Human Rights • International Justice and World Courts • Peace and Security: Institutional Aspects • Environmental Governance • Global Commons • Sovereignty • Global Democracy • Civil Society and Global Governance • Regional Governance <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Regional Governance ○ Africa ○ Asia and Pacifico ○ Europe ○ Latin America ○ North America 			
International Law				
International Justice				
Peace and Security				
Environment				
Global commons				
Sovereignty				
Global Democracy				
Civil Society				
Regional Governance				

Introduction

The Portal and the Campaign

Who are we?

Resources

Actors

Events

Documents

Topics

Participation

Contribute

Give us your opinion

Links

UBUNTU

Campaign

Generally speaking, however, we can summarise and simplify by saying that previous proposals gathered and studied always strictly concerned UN reform (practically never going beyond this) or, separately, one or other of the Bretton Woods institutions. Practically always, too, these proposals have been aired only within the institutions concerned or, at most amongst certain specific states or political actors closely-linked to them (the Scandinavian countries or the International Socialist, for example, or NGOs founded very specifically to engage with the subject in itself).

Well, if I had to sum up, in one or two reasonably short sentences from the manifesto the core thinking behind the campaign and that which makes it, as I have said and always in my opinion profoundly original, apart from, needless to say, more necessary than ever, I would choose these two:

1) The first can be seen as a summary of the entire campaign manifesto:

The pursuit of these goals requires a stronger, more democratic UN, placed at the centre of a consistent, democratic, responsible, effective system of international institutions. More specifically, we need to democratise the composition and decision-making procedures of UN bodies; to strengthen the UN General Assembly, placing all its bodies and agencies, as well as world multilateral organisations (IMF, WB, WTO, etc.) under its effective, democratic control.

This is what I would emphasise under heading a) of this section: "NO to only UN reform", "YES to reform of the system of international institutions".

If the "undeclared" bipolarisation that affects the system of multilateral international institutions, a situation described in the first section of this document, is one of the most important problems facing the UN, then reform limited only to the UN would be a serious mistake. Such restricted reform could only lead, in present circumstances, to further weakening of the UN, turning it into "merely" a humanitarian agency.

²² <http://www.reformwatch.net/index.php?lg=eng&pg=21>

Any reform proposed and, above all, effectively put into practice, should aim to radically remedy the UN's inability to wield a democratising influence on global financial, economic and trade policies. In other words, as the paragraph from the campaign manifesto that we highlight here insists, the key reform is that which places world economic, financial and trade institutions under the real political control of the UN which should itself also be reformed, of course. Only in this way can we build a system of international institutions in which there is not a divorce not to say conflict between political programmes and their implementation.

2) The second summarising sentence, also reflected in many other campaign texts and approaches, is as follows:

We propose in-depth reform of the system of international institutions towards an authentic system of global democratic governance that guarantees the existence and effective functioning of mechanisms enabling the worlds' citizens and civil society organisations to be directly represented and to take part in global decision-making processes within the framework of the international system.

This is what I would emphasise under heading b) of this section: "NO to suprastructural reform conducted solely and exclusively by States"; "YES to reform in which all players currently present on the world scene take part".

There are certain indispensable points we must make here:

2.1) To date, the subject of reform of the international institutions has only been considered, or at least only in-depth, within the organisations themselves. With certain honourable exceptions, mentioned here, and completely understandably if we take into account what were the leading, practically only, political actors on the world stage until quite recently: the nation-states. Here, we must remember, moreover, that the international institutions were designed and structured largely for this purpose: to deal with international questions, that is to say, relations between states.

Finally, it is clear that very few real reforms have been possible over the course of history as the result only of the position adopted and participation of actors from within, in this case, the nation-states.

2.2) In the age of globalisation, however, there exist fundamental flows, activities and situations that go far beyond the states, making them insufficient and even inadequate for managing the new subjects on the world agenda. As has occurred so often in history as regards, for example, the economic situation, a change scale (from state to transnational) that we have still not been able to digest and that, in fact, clearly points, once more, to the imperious need for global democratic governance has happened. Our worst environmental problems at present are also at a planetary scale leading to the same conclusion.

2.2.1) However, another consideration has emerged, one that, moreover, bears close and intimate relation to the previous point: the appearance though some are still at the emerging stage of new political actors or subjects: the transnational corporations themselves; the megalopolises; etc.; and the world or global citizenry we shall talk about later on.

2.2.2) As a result, it is as logical as it is inevitable and indispensable for future proposals to reform the system of international institutions should not only take these new actors into account, but that these new actors should play a leading role, at times the leading role, in reform processes and, needless to say, in the structural results produced by reform.

2.3) Only a strategy, therefore, that involves all actors and creates in this case more than ever a state of world opinion and public participation favourable to such a reform as that proposed can, in the current situation, lead to a satisfactory outcome, in which the path to achieve it will, as always, be as important as the goals themselves.

To conclude this section, we should briefly touch on the latest action in this direction undertaken by the UN itself. As recently as November 2003, the UN Secretary General appointed a high-level panel to study new threats to global security and reform of the international system²³. A most laudable initiative, one that is clearly driven (and here we may mention that it would benefit from a broader viewpoint) by events affecting peace and security in 2003 and that, in diplomatic language, does not exclude proposals for wider-ranging reform, of UN bodies, even. This is an important qualitative step by the UN Secretary General, particularly if one takes into account that his latest proposals²⁴ went even further in the direction of administrative reform to seek improved internal efficiency that had, moreover, understandably in the present context, certain elements of "structural adjustment"! We shall need to follow the work of the panel closely in future.

2.4 What reform, what system of global democratic governance, do we want?

The path of the campaign I have described here helps to take us forward. We soon learned that we cannot stay at the level of formulating the ideas discussed in this section of the paper, even though I at least continue to think that reaching a first consensus at this level is indispensable and forms a first, important step forward. However, the road to global democratic governance requires more specific operational proposals to be constructed to give better shape and form to the general ideas already outlined.

Here, however, we must gauge our methods very carefully, and each actor must find their own. One cannot say at the moment that civil society has developed and reached consensus over its proposals. Proposals exist, more and more, but not all coincide, even in the basic principles. There is a wealth here, then, but therein also lies a challenge. In order even to achieve consensus at a level of broad principles, however, we need to be able to visualise specific aspects of proposals. To do so at present, in the opinion of the UBUNTU Forum, requires placing on the table a range of possible scenarios allowing us to open up a broad, plural debate that, rather than generating opposing positions, enables us to begin identifying points of consensus that, from the level of concretion, also serves to consolidate it at the level of principles and basic ideas.

However, personally, I should not like to leave out of this paper a description of certain specific proposals that, in my view, illustrate, in the form of a possible, concrete scenario, the general ideas presented here. My goal here is not so much to defend this scenario but to stimulate debate about it. The scenario is outlined below, in Figure 6.

²³ <http://www.un.org/News/Press/docs/2003/sga857.doc.htm>

²⁴ <http://ods-dds-ny.un.org/doc/UNDOC/GEN/N02/583/29/PDF/N0258329.pdf?OpenElement>

Figure 6: A Possible Scenario

SCENARIO	
UN GENERAL ASSEMBLY	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Two-chamber system representing UN states and the world's citizens (see World Parliament) - Unification of general assemblies and conferences into a single institution with a central role in the system: UNGA (*)
UN SECURITY COUNCIL	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Supervision by General Assembly - Representative composition - Abolition of veto - Voting by qualified majority for certain questions
UN ECOSOC	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - ECOSOC revamped and converted into the Economic, Social and Environment Security Council with effective control over BWIs, WTO and agencies engaged in these fields
IFM	
WB	
WTO	
UN AGENCIES AND PROGRAMMES	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Dissolution of general assemblies and conferences of agencies other than UN (*); creation of specific assemblies (**)with the presence of actors from all the relevant sectors
INTERNATIONAL JUSTICE	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Interconnected world legal system embracing both civil and criminal law, with executive mechanisms from local to world level
WORLD PARLIAMENT	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - A WP with UN chamber representing the world's population - With UNGA, part of a two-chamber world legislative system (*)
WORLD REFERENDUMS	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Binding world referendums
CIVIL SOCIETY	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Effective participation, along with other actors, in specific assemblies (**)
DEBT	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Cancellation of external debt
TAXATION	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Elimination of tax havens - Interconnected world fiscal system
DEVELOPMENT	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - World cohesion funds for development
STATE SOVEREIGNTY	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Transfer of sovereignty to system of global democratic governance See Section 3.2.
UN CHARTER REFORM	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Yes, but first -and most important- reforming the BWI and WTO foundation agreements

3. From globalisation to world citizenship and cosmopolitan democracy

3.1 From globalisation to world citizenship; the global demonstration of 15 February 2003

After analysing the present world political situation in the first part of this paper, and discussing the proposal for a system of global democratic governance linked to in-depth reform of the system of international institutions as described in the second part, we are left with at least a couple of important questions: What world model? With what specific policies?

In fact, these questions are partially answered in our analysis of the world political situation where, naturally, we have taken sides. And, in fact, the proposal for institutional reform is far from neutral. Nevertheless, no doubt we need more explicit reflection on the questions that head this section of the paper so as to close it with a modicum of internal coherence.

To this end, we should begin by going back to the analysis of globalisation as a new, fundamental context for humanity's "affairs" on planet Earth. Whilst the focus in the first part was more on economic questions, emphasising more negative results of this aspect of globalisation, making it clear, too, that there are other results that may also turn out to be greatly damaging (those affecting the sustainability of cultural diversity, for example), there are also certain aspects to globalisation that go to shape what is at least a different world. I believe it may even be a better world though I will not expand on this personal perception here and that, therefore, we need to study and conceptualise it as it is at least this, different.

This is an ever more intervisible and interdependent world where more and more citizens have access to more information, more relations, more experiences, etc., with places, problems and people from other places on the planet from where they habitually live physically. Although we cannot generalise here either, we are seeing more and more significant examples that this is the case. And this leads us to identify clearly with what we might conceptualise as the emergence of a new global or world citizenship, that is to say, a citizenship of people aware that they are citizens of the world!

The global demonstration of 15 February 2003²⁵ "For Peace, Stop the War" was a historic moment that has as yet been little studied, one which marks a turning-point with regard to the reflections in the above paragraph. Never before had a state of world opinion been so clear, so broad, so important as was created at that time on a particular issue: that of the war in Iraq.

And this fact requires and permits us to make a series of considerations regarding the key questions that concern us here:

1) It was not an isolated event, but a culmination and one perfectly able to be repeated. It was the result of different, eminently interesting factors, including: a) the emergence of a clearly-spreading perception on the part of many citizens of the world who feel and identify themselves as such, as world civil society; b) the emergence of forms of organisation that, in fact, were able to find a place in society because, in one way or another, they are the expression of the previous factor. From what have become the "older" NGOs, though they are continually growing, both quantitatively and qualitatively, to the so-called new social movements that, above all, have collectively identified themselves with the World Social Forum's global and local idea that "another world is possible"; c) the experience, learning, maturity, etc., that these citizens and movements acquire whilst demanding and exercising, as and when they can, their right to take part in global decisions that finally also effect their own lives: Seattle, Porto Alegre, Genoa, Johannesburg, etc., (and, more recently, Cancun); c) the absolutely disproportionate stance taken by the US government over the Iraq question. Unlike, say, the situation in Afghanistan, for example, everyone could clearly see that Iraq was purely and simply about oil. This shows, too, that not even the ferocious control the dominant powers wield over the leading media can fool the people of the world who are, fortunately, capable of using other, alternative, means of communication and information, independent to a greater or lesser degree but, in any case, clearly identified with both the factor of globalisation that concerns us and with its main effect: that of creating a global citizenship, global movements, with their own opinions.

²⁵ http://www.infoshop.org/inews/f15antiwar_news.html

2) The worldwide, global nature of the demonstration. Never before had so many of the world's citizens coincided in the same cause and activity in so many different places all over the world or in numbers of people "taking to the street", or in the different ways they adopted to express one single will.

3) The political successes won by the demonstration. Despite what many opinions and, above all, perceptions a posteriori, alleged, the outcome of that demonstration was, in my view, an enormous success and a huge accumulation of "capital", from which we shall need to extract the appropriate yields and benefits. It is true that the war finally took place and that, therefore, the basic aim was not achieved. But it is also true that never before had many of the world's states and such a key international organisation as the UN "fed" off such a demonstration to proclaim their existence and their opinion, turning the empire's action into an illegal act against international law. It was and is becoming ever more so clear to the eyes and judgement of most of the world that this was an illegitimate act! And, although this is not the place to expand on it, let me also reaffirm my conviction that the UN emerged strengthened by that crisis!²⁶



Demonstration "For Peace, Stop War". 15 February 2003, Barcelona

3.2 From the global world and world citizenship to cosmopolitan democracy; or for what world model?

A lot of water has gone under the bridge since, some years ago, I first wrote my intuitive ideas on the subject²⁷, and many new situations and thoughts have emerged. Ulrick Bechó and David Held²⁸ are, for example, two of the best-known authors in the field and with whom I, personally, feel most identified when

²⁶ "¡Y la ONU ... va!", Josep Xercavins; La Vanguardia; Barcelona, 9 May 2003

²⁷ "Plataforma d'Opinió Política Global i Plataforma d'Intervenció Política Global per assegurar la participació de la societat civil a les decisions sobre problemes mundials"; Fòrum Català per Repensar la Societat, (Global Political Opinion Platform and Platform for Global Political Intervention to Ensure the Participation of Civil Society in Decisions on World Problems", Catalan Forum for Rethinking Society), 1998; http://www.novacis.org/bip/rps_res.cfm

²⁸ La democracia y el orden global ("Democracy and the Global Order"); David Held; Paidós 1997

Globalización/Antiglobalización; sobre la reconstrucción del orden mundial (Globalisation/Anti-Globalisation; on Rebuilding the Global Order); David Held and Anthony McGrew; Paidós 2002

formulating and ripening my ideas about a new global world²⁹, in the age-old tradition of the Stoics, the first Christians, Kant, Rusell, Peccei, etc.

We are in a world fast becoming global in a process that is bringing about in what is the most positive reactive element, as discussed in the previous section the emergence of what is becoming known as world civil society. This and why not admit it? in different, contradictory forms (NGOs, social movements, etc.) clearly affirms, as part of its collective identity, that another world is possible. For the first time, and again, as always, in my opinion, a possible, necessary, progressive alternative can become valid: **the construction of a true cosmopolitan or global democracy supported by a political structure that helps to shape this new, emerging world society, to which different nation-states will gradually cede certain types and/or levels of sovereignty.** The basic institutions in this future world political movement/structure will, probably, be those resulting from in-depth reform of the system of international institutions as described in the second part of this paper and illustrated by way of a possible scenario in Figure 6.

Having come this far we should remember that, at times, we are more afraid of calling a spade a spade than anything. Personally, I have no fear. But we need to tread carefully, needless to say. Why, throughout this paper, do we talk of "governance" and never of "government"? Well, because the latter is no doubt associated with the nation-state, where the government is the body with executive power within the state and also denotes the action of governing, what the government does. "Governance", on the other hand, denotes a much broader compendium of procedures, means, etc., that make a certain government not necessarily associated with that exercised by a government possible. For this reason, no doubt I am far from an expert on this or indeed any subject! when we speak of international, transnational or world issues, we are only permitted to coin and use the expression "governance". Because, if we understand that they are necessary, then the conditions, procedures, means, etc., must be built so that decisions can be taken and even put into practice at this scale too. Whilst world issues were, to a large degree, international questions between nations these dichotomies or disquisitions did not even take place. As transnational and global or world issues take on more and more importance, however, these nuances of language have also become ever more important.

Well, what I would speak of, with the necessary prudence, of course, is of world democratic governance (conditions, procedures, structures, means, etc.) built on a system of international institutions that has undergone the necessary in-depth reform in line, we insist once more, with that described in the second part of this paper that is capable of making democratic governance of world affairs possible, that is to say, governance capable of democratically taking and implementing decisions relating to areas of reality that are world or global in scale. This does not need the creation of a world state with its attendant world government. It does, however, require the provision of world or global (we'll find a word that doesn't strike fear into us) political structures and procedures, with an institutional system that guarantees the strictest democratic balance between the different powers and situations that exist and that is supported and moved, above all, by principles (with human rights at their base, because human rights are becoming ever more widely accepted, even if with certain differences in interpretation) and renewed contracts (social, cultural, environmental, political, etc.) on the world scale that, logically enough, embrace everything at this scale. All this, whilst also guaranteeing the principle of maximum possible subsidiarity at state, regional, sub-state or supra-local and local level and, inversely, minimum, strictly necessary levels at which sovereignty is ceded in the opposite direction. A more strictly democratic nature should be inherent to this political architecture, enabling us to speak of it as the new cosmopolitan or global democracy.

There are many and there will be more and more. But there is one particular example: global warming for me, yet another manifestation, in many senses, of what we have come to call globalisation that shows how absolutely necessary is the above-described political construction. The states cannot continue to exercise complete sovereignty in defining policies in this field. Our planet is in no condition to permit the positions such as those adopted at present and which are completely legal as things stand by the US and Russia, for example. Nonetheless, subsidiarity is indispensable for defining and implementing at local level the great political decisions taken at global level to reduce greenhouse gas emissions.

²⁹ El mundialisme (Globalism); Pere Fontan; Barcanova 1991

Clearly, the political construction we are speaking of should run parallel to the global civil society I have spoken of, parallel and I would even dare say ahead of it, improving and finding new forms of organisation and action that enable it to play both a participatory role and that of a nest of representative elements consubstantial to the required construction.

3.3 With what policies? For the moment, those of a cosmopolitan social democracy!

From the economic standpoint, the globalisation of the world no doubt entails a further phase of capitalist expansion, one, however, in its most neoliberal form and with truly negative effects on the social and environmental situation, if the analysis made in the first part of this paper is anything to go by.

For this reason, in the short- and medium-term at least, the basic policies that should be formulated and applied in a model such as that described in the previous section, are those that best guarantee that the world as a whole progresses towards higher standards of social well-being, reduced environmental impact and greater equity and justice. Taking the part of the model for European construction based on large-scale use of the cohesion funds, the cosmopolitan democracy described in the previous section can only be built through a world redistributive social-democratic policy that, precisely by making it more cohesive, can change the world and enable it to face the future with truly new confidence and collective efforts.

I believe that, in the final outcome, the key to many of the more neoliberal "local" fashions lies in the incapacity, of a state for example, to implement a progressive fiscal policy. The result is that large companies, obeying the most easily understandable internal logic, rush to locate elsewhere. In response, a political force in that state, obeying the most easily understandable internal logic, will quickly experience a facile tendency to adopt neoliberalism, turning into something positive their real incapacity to do anything else rather than something that would be automatically qualified as old-fashioned social-democratic policy. But these postulates become much less implacable if we move onto the planetary, the global level. The elimination of tax havens, followed by the enactment of a simple world fiscal policy beginning, for example, and no doubt popularly, with the more speculative financial transactions, would no doubt enable policies for a world cohesion fund to be implemented, thus beginning to achieve the goals discussed in the previous paragraph.

In other words, the model for cosmopolitan democracy would make little sense in the end if it did not have the real capacity to do "politics with a capital T". And, to conclude: in a global world, it will only be possible to do "politics with a capital T" at ever more global level, and, in fact, this is already occurring! However, with institutionalisation and a cosmopolitan model as proposed here, then no player can escape, each player has to co-exist, negotiate, agree, etc., with all the others. From this new level of co-existence, which is, in fact that which our very evolution should bring us to, should emerge and end to the exploitation of the weak by the strong and the birth of a more fraternal world. A world in which we are also able to restore a stable dynamic balance with the planet, based, all in all, on human beings valued for what they are rather than for what they have.

Barcelona, late-2003

4. In memoriam: Manuel Vázquez Montalban and Miquel Martí i Pol

The new historic subject of change is civil society

Manuel Vázquez Montalban, in his testimony to the World Social Forum of Porto Alegre 2002.

*There is everything to do,
Everything is possible today.
Let us make heard all around
The exaltation of the old desire for a better world.*

Miquel Martí i Pol



World Forum of
Civil Society Networks - UBUNTU
www.ubuntu.upc.edu
info.ubuntu@ubuntu.upc.edu



World Campaign for In-Depth Reform
of the System of International Institutions
www.reformcampaign.net
info.campaign@reformcampaign.net

Ad Hoc Secretariat
Universitat Politècnica de Catalunya
Nexus II building
Jordi Girona, 29
08034 Barcelona - Spain

Tel. +34 93 413 7773
Fax +34 93 413 7777

Promoted by:



With the support of:

