
! margt1080e180Report on Global Governance initiatives, analysis of the field and recommendations

"You never change things by fighting the existing reality. To change something, build a new model that makes the existing model obsolete."

R. Buckminster Fuller

! "In the seventeenth chapter of Saint Luke it is written, 'the kingdom of God is within man' – not one man, nor a group of men – but in all men – in you, the people. You the people have the power, the power to create machines, the power to create happiness. You the people have the power to make life free and beautiful, to make this life a wonderful adventure.

"Then in the name of democracy let's use that power – let us all unite. Let us fight for a new world, a decent world that will give men a chance to work, that will give you the future and old age and security. By the promise of these things, brutes have risen to power, but they lie. They do not fulfill their promise, they never will. Dictators free themselves, but they enslave the people. Now let us fight to fulfill that promise.

pha

"Let us fight to free the world, to do away with national barriers, do away with greed, with hate and intolerance. Let us fight for a world of reason, a world where science and progress will lead to all men's happiness. Soldiers -- in the name of democracy, let us all unite! . . ."

final scene, The Great Dictator, by Charlie Chaplin, 1940.

"I am standing here with a degree of Doctor of Laws. That means that we live, in this country at least, in an age of law and an age of reason, an age in which we can get along with our neighbors. Now we must do that internationally. **It will be just as easy for nations to get along in a republic of the world as it is for us to get along in the republic of the United States.** Now, if Kansas and Colorado have a quarrel over a watershed, they don't call out the National Guard of each State and go to war over it. They bring suit in the Supreme Court and abide by its decision. There isn't a reason in the world why we can't do that internationally."

*Harry Truman, President of the United States of America,
University of Kansas City, June 28, 1945 (Truman Library)*

Report on Global Governance initiatives, analysis of the field and recommendations

Table of Contents

!

Introduction

The Global Governance universe

Constraints and bias of the information collection and research process itself

! Dimensions of analysis?

- ◆ Characteristic/dimension, Possible values
- ◆ SWOT analysis note
- ◆ Tip for strategy design

Some options to deal with other entities

What are the main threats to us, our cause and our goals?

- ◆ What we should avoid/what we should seek
- ◆ What to avoid
- ◆ What to do

Examples of competitors

- ◆ Generic
- ◆ sectoral

! um

! parThe first major problem: Political Schizophrenia

- ◆ Two competing paradigms
- ◆ A page from Albert Camus
- ◆ Fallacious Assumptions

! umThe second major problem: public myths

- ◆ Messianism
- ◆ The Human Nature Trap

Fighting the problems

A critique of Robert Kagan and Robert Cooper! par 0
Elites don't understand: global public opinion is a superpower

Recommandations for strategy of the GGG:

- ◆ Principles for a powerful and sustainable strategy
- ◆ What to do

- ◆ What to avoid
- ◆ Other specific recommendations

Table of selected initiatives

Other world parliament-related initiatives

Travaux théoriques sur la démocratie mondiale

! cgrid

IT and world democracy initiatives

Strategic issues and untapped opportunities on the horizon

- ◆ Corporate world citizenship
- ◆ Genetic engineering
- ◆ Diseases, epidemics and public health
- ◆ Corruption and world democracy
- ◆ Environment and world democracy

A few smart people to follow

A few excellent reasoned critiques

Scénarios de construction d'une démocratie mondiale : analyses et critiques

!

mInteresting past or future events

Some sources of information

Potential sources of funding (to be researched further)

A few valuable quotes

Post-report note

Introduction

!

There are more and more initiatives for world democracy and world citizenship, global governance and supranational institutions. But there is no comprehensive catalog of such initiatives and little connection between them. This offers large opportunities for synergies and for different activities. It also is a negative for everyone because few are considered serious and the best known ones from previous decades have lost credibility and impact.

This report is an attempt to catalog, classify, and make sense of these initiatives and to see what are the opportunities for competitive advantage. Intuitively, it would seem that the number of initiatives, though they are not very well known, means there would be little scope for originality or new activities.

! par Nevertheless, if one catalogues these activities according to a rational and systematic scheme, one sees that there are great opportunities as well as huge gaps.

One of the things I had to do was to determine the relevant mental categories. Since the structure of global governance is very much a function of the human intellect, our mental categories and landscape restrict and define what we believe is possible.

This is especially true in this field, where the basic structural framework and architecture of international relations has not changed for over 5000 years (when it was invented by the Kings of Ur, Lagash, Eridu and Kish).

Once that is done, it is possible to find out why there is so little clarity in the field. This is the major part of the report and though it may seem superfluous, it provides the fundamental ideological rock for our work. If that is well understood, then it is easy to teach and delegate broader research.

Many initiatives are contained in this report, but! there are more that will require additional work to catalogue and classify. Because of the small scale of this project, I was unable to classify all the initiatives according to the categories determined - though the exercise was useful.

The Global Governance universe

What is the universe of things and actors in the Global Governance (GG) field? How do we analyze all the GG “objects” (GGO) in that universe? How do we position ourselves in that universe versus all these objects and how do we reach the goal that we are striving for with the least effort?

This is the theme of this report.

! rd r We define the goal as a world at peace in which all humans are free and enjoy equal dignity and rights, and in which the fundamental structures of (global) public authority are based on values such as liberty, democracy and citizenship.

The structure of the GG “space” is complex. It is a multi-dimensional universe and the way to get from here to there in this space (i.e. to our goal) is not obvious. Intuitively, it is likely that the GG space looks like a space with “Great Attractors”, a term which describes points in that space towards which things tend to be moved - be attracted to. Such a space is not linear, which makes it more difficult to analyze and comprehend. But it helps us if we conceptualize the field of GG in a more accurate manner. Even if the GG space is not a Great Attractor space (which it probably is), the understanding we gain by using this approach is well worth it. For instance, it helps us ! understand how small, well-defined, well-executed actions can have a huge impact. Thus, we see more easily why, unlike conventional wisdom, world democracy is not something that has to wait hundreds of years, but can be achieved relatively quickly.

Constraints and bias of the information collection and research process itself

The information collected comes from 6 months of information collection and from the personal experience and records of the author who reads only European languages (French, English, German, Italian, Spanish, Portuguese).

Most of the additional research has been done in French and English, therefore information from parts of the world in other Spanish is not represented as it should be. In th! e future, it should be extended to German, Spanish, Italian, Portuguese, Russian, Arabic, Chinese, Japanese etc. While it seems to be a reasonable assumption that most objects in the GG space are in a few European languages, it still is a limitation which should be overcome in future research (including such smaller languages such as Greek, Dutch, Swedish, Finnish, Danish, Czech, Korean, Norwegian and African languages etc..)

Dimensions of analysis

For this part, I have tried to apply the same kind of rational paradigm and analysis we use in quantum physics: the aim is to determine the minimum number of qualities of the object observed to be able to determine it in full. In physics, these qualities are ! called “quantum numbers” and completely determine the state of knowledge we need. In other words, to ease understanding and minimize confusion, we seek to define any object in the most succinct way which defines it completely. An example is the fact that black holes (in addition to their location and movement) can be entirely defined by only 3 numbers (mass, spin and charge).

Similarly, I have tried to define the minimum numbers of independent characters which are needed to exhaustively define any “object” in the space of Global Governance (which I will from now on call GGO – “global governance object”). (The term ‘space’ is used because the criteria used to determine the GGOs are independent, and therefore each can represent a dimension. The 10 independent dimensions thus define a 10-dimensional space where every GGO can be

represented accurately by a 10-dimensional! solid).

Anything – an organization, a book, a conference, a person etc. – can be a GGO and needs to be accurately defined and categorized.

There are objective criteria which can be used to categorize GGOs. I have determined 10 such criteria which seem sufficient to completely determine any object in the GG space, and which are all independent of one another. They are the following, together with some of the possible values these criteria can take. Once we have enough 10-dimensional data points, we will be able to map the GG space more accurately, and determine our way in that space. Some dimensions may overlap.

! Characteristic / dimension	Possible values (some are discrete, most are continuous)!
Type of "object"	event/conference, book, article, initiative/project/campaign, proclamation/declaration
Host/physical substrate	nonprofit association/NGO, foundation, governmental, inter-governmental, corporate, individual, school/university!
Politics!	
Age and time	
Size/quantity	size of entity and number of people directly/indirectly involved
Impact/influencer	Extent/measure of influence with media, opinion-makers, intellectuals, general public, governments, corporations...!
Origin!	
Quality of people	Personal, ethical value etc. (not always correlated with reputation because of incestuous elitist circles, snobbism of elites, lack of transparency, successful cover-ups etc.)!

beginning, end; past/finished, present/ongoing, future/planned!

These values then enable us to determine other useful quantities, especially the efficiency or I/O (input/output), therefore the value or potential of the object. This is the equivalent of the ROI (Return On Investment) in business, and will help to determine where to focus efforts to partnerships, where the greatest threats lie etc. Obviously, to do all this very precisely requires much research, but this analysis framework is also useful in mental approximation and will help us hone our analysis skills. Our goal should be to ferret out in the most objective way what are the true undiscovered nuggets in this field, beyond the obvious objects that are good at self-promotion or are in a privileged position, but are not necessarily as objectively efficient as others.

It is in our interest to look beyond appearances and find the best and smartest people, organizations, initiatives etc..

SWOT analysis note

Highest Opportunities: the most helpful initiatives will be those with highest ROI and high-quality people.

Highest Threats: the most will be those that use much resources, but are led/associated with people with lower personal/ethical qualities

A dilemma arises when a high ROI is encountered with unethical people. This must be analyzed on a case-by-case basis.

Tip for strategy design:

To design a strategy, it is useful to divide the global population into several categories as follows, using three independent dimensions:

- ◆ Awareness
- ◆ Understanding
- ◆ Agreement

All three are objectively easy to quantify (via ordinary polls), though *Understanding* is the dimension that is most subjective (though also determined via polls). We define Understanding on a spectrum going from no to yes where yes corresponds to our own understanding of what world citizenship/democracy is. An example of lack of understanding from our point of view would be, e.g. the World Economic Forum when they speak about world citizenship (www.weforum.org)¹ or the League of Women Voters when they speak about global democracy (www.lwv.org/)².

Once we do that, we see that our job is to shift people from the “no” regions to the “yes” regions. We must recognize that there are some people that will not budge (i.e. most Christian evangelicals), but we must still confront their beliefs and fears, and seek to answer them on their own grounds (see the list for an example of a Christian defense of world government).

To achieve this, GGG will have to ally itself with others. Since there are limited resources, it is important to choose carefully in order not to waste time, money, and perhaps most importantly, reputation. Also, since there are many different types of GGOs, if we want to be successful, we have to make a conscious choice of behavior towards all of them.

Some options to deal with other entities (from least to most) are:

- Ignore
- Acknowledge
- Study and mention
- Cite/quote
- Invite to participate/endorse our ideas/projects/initiatives
- Ally for project
- Affiliate with, seek accreditation with them
- If possible, merge with them

palpha

What are the main threats to us, our cause and our goals?

1 See further down in this report for a detailed analysis of WEF’s laudable but intellectually shallow therefore ineffectual efforts.

2 Or the so-called Global Democracy Promotion Act of February 15, 2001 which is to save international family planning and has nothing to do with global democracy:

www.caral.org/alert_familyplanning.html

Most of the global governance “objects” I have come into contact with over the years share one or more characteristic of the first column “what to avoid” We should seek to do therefore what is in the second column.

<p>! <u>5</u> What we should avoid! 18</p>	<p>wd Descriptive, passive, “monitoring”</p>	
	<p>Abstract/theoretical! ltr</p>	
	<p>Content oriented</p>	
	<p>Elitist process and goal</p>	<p>Non-elitist process and goal</p>
	<p>Inter-national (global is linear sum of national)! drb</p>	
	<p>Remedial/reformist</p>	
	<p>Positive utilitarianism (minimize suffering)</p>	<p>Nega! tive utilitarianism (maximize happiness) (see below).</p>
	<p>Superficial, consciousness-raising of people, warm fuzzy feeling, entertainment-oriented “Opium of the people” (e.g. NGO and corporate initiatives to show people are one, “world is one” etc.</p>	<p>Deep, uses entertainment in conjunction with an! d to communicate a deep meaningful message, not as a palliative to avoid serious thought</p>
	<p>Strictly bottom-up approach,! redo the world by redoing local communities etc., global is bad</p>	<p>Sustainable local system cannot survive without sustainable global system</p>

ct!parStructural, systemic! rd Process-orientedWhat we should seek

Informational note: Karl Popper defends *negative* utilitarianism (the attempt to minimize the amount of misery, rather than, as with positive utilitarianism, the attempt t! o maximize the amount of happiness). The state, he holds, should concern itself with the task of progressively formulating and implementing policies designed to deal with the social problems which actually

confront it, with the goal of eliminating human misery and suffering to the highest possible degree. The positive task of increasing social and personal happiness, by contrast, can and should be left to individual citizens (who may, of course, act collectively to this end). They, unlike the state, have at least a chance of achieving this goal, but in a free society they are rarely in a position to systematically subvert the rights of others in the pursuit of idealized objectives.
<http://plato.stanford.edu/entries/popper/#Laws>

Typical example of descriptive initiatives:

Program for the Study of Globalization, Culture and Social Transformation

Centro de Investigaciones Postdoctorales (CIPOST), Facultad de Ciencias Económicas y Sociales, Universidad Central de Venezuela

[http://www.rockfound.org/display.asp?](http://www.rockfound.org/display.asp?Collection=1&context=1&DocID=538&SectionTypeID=0&Preview=0&ARCurrent=1#tag11)

[Collection=1&context=1&DocID=538&SectionTypeID=0&Preview=0&ARCurrent=1#tag11](http://www.rockfound.org/display.asp?Collection=1&context=1&DocID=538&SectionTypeID=0&Preview=0&ARCurrent=1#tag11)

Typical example of “global consciousness-raising” of the elite

Center for Policy Alternatives, Washington, DC

Eleanor Roosevelt Global Leadership Institute whose mission is to increase the global consciousness of U.S. political leaders.

Most objections to World Democracy state that it is too difficult and too grand, too visionary and too idealistic. Therefore, skeptics say, we must progress incrementally, step-by-step, slowly. But the confusion here is between the *ambition* of the goal, and the *means*.

In our view, the goal, global democracy, is very ambitious. But once that ambitious goal is set, existing problems become very easy to solve as they fit into a coherent framework. The advantage of world democracy is that while it may be marginally more difficult to achieve than say solve one specific global problem, it will solve many problems at once. In fact, it may be easier to « sell » to the global public a true world democracy than a multitude of unrelated sectoral global governance schemes.

A very fashionable example of elitist technocratic proposal is the Global Public Policy Networks (GPPN) proposed by a few intellectuals and espoused by the World Bank³.

The main problems with this non-wholistic approach is a fundamental one : politics is the art of balancing competing claims in the public sphere. If there are in effect dozens of « mini-world parliaments » or sectoral world parliaments, this is a recipe for policy chaos. These proposals

³ “Given the lack of direct-democratic structures beyond the nation-state, networks have the potential to improve participation and transparency.”

! tx560x6160Shaping Globalization: The role of global public policy networks

Thorsten Benner/Wolfgang H. Reinicke/Jan Martin Witte

To be published in: Bertelsmann Foundation, *Carl-Bertelsmann Award 2002: Cooperation Responsibility Transparency* (Gütersloh: Bertelsmann).

www.gppi.net/cms/public/66332099a66e4e02b78fe3333903cf8cShaping%20Globalization%2007082002final.pdf

forget a key principle of sound political design: the fact that the natural instinct of the concerned parties in any particular field is not to limit themselves but to seek maximum political satisfaction. In normal parliamentary politics, the main function of representatives is to weigh and balance the competing on public resources. If instead of one legitimate global parliament which has the competence and authority to deal with many overlapping or competing issues, we have global policy networks or individual UN agencies. Therefore whatever policy proposals comes out of them is extremely or well-nigh impossible to coordinate with the other existing processes. This is what happens today and is a key cause of the inefficiency of UN global summits and of inter-governmental organisations (IGOs).

This forces IGOs when they want to be efficient, i.e. reach their goals, to use methods which are widely perceived as heavy-handed or undemocratic. Examples include the unaccountable 3-panel internal "world court" of the World Trade Organisation, and the Structural Adjustments Plans of the World Bank.

In other words, the lack of perceived legitimacy of global institutions taints their intentions and methods, however correct they may otherwise be.

It is well known that a politician with greater legitimacy (i.e. 70% votes in a free and fair election) will be able to push through many more unpopular measures than one with 51% votes. This is even worse if the institution in question has no electoral or democratic legitimacy at all.

Other big problems are

1. the opaqueness of the system, when dozens of global policy networks exist (who decides how many and their scope), which makes it easy for powerful interests to manipulate or corrupt them, and increases public skepticism and disaffection, and
2. the lack of legitimacy of the system, which is a combination of unaccountable transnational actors (NGOs, companies) and diplomats of national states, many non-democratic.

The existence of the dominant political schizophrenia suffocating independent thought means that if some decently sounding idea like the GPPN is championed or proposed, especially by a influential figure, it becomes picked up in the close-knit and incestuous circles of international and academic institutions, and either dies quickly or becomes fashionable.

Examples of competitors: there are two types: generic and sectoral!

GENERIC:

1. The Meridian International Institute On Governance, Learning, Leadership and the Future,

<http://meridianinternational.org/>

US Main Office: 41 Sutter Street, Suite 1039, San Francisco CA 94104 .(510) 526-5814 . Fax 528-3989

Canada: 255 Albert Street, Suite 802, Ottawa K1P 6A9 . (613) 237-0143, x 310 . Fax 235-8237

meridian 1.Great circle on the surface of the earth passing through the poles, used by

navigators to plot present and future position. 2. noon, midday, hence, the brightness of the sun at high noon. 3. the summit.

governance 1. the act or process of governing (from the Greek, kybernetes, helmsman or pilot, hence, governor) 2. the manner or method of governing. 3. a system of governing.

2. **global public policy institute** (GPPi). www.globalpublicpolicy.net

Recently, members of the GPP Project have created the global public policy institute (GPPi). The global public policy institute will be an independent, non-profit think tank based in Berlin, Germany. GPPi will explore and support innovative answers to complex governance challenges bringing together all key players of the globalization process: governments, international organizations, civil society organizations as well as businesses.

GPPi is ! committed to:

- Advancing policy research by building bridges between academia and practitioners
- Encouraging policy entrepreneurship through its consulting and training services
- Revitalizing the public space by enriching public debates on pressing public policy challenges

3. **One World Trust** (London), www.oneworldtrust.org

Global Accountability Project (coherent) and Charter 99 (incoherent)

SECTORAL:

Network Institute on Global Democratization (Finland), www.nigd.org, NIGD aims at promoting global democratization by producing and developing emancipatory knowledge for democratic movements, organizations and states. NIGD's work is based on the conviction that globalization as coming-together-of-humanity must be based on cross-cultural dialogue concerning both philosophical fundamentals and concrete reform proposals. NIGD projects are usually joint endeavours with a number of partners from the global south. (well-connected, but incoherent overall)

Global Governance Project www.glogov.org/about/index.html This project is a joint research programme of the Potsdam Institute for Climate Impact Research, the Free University of Berlin (Environmental Policy Research Unit) and Oldenburg University.

Within the larger context of earth system analysis, the Project investigates international institutions, political processes, organisations and other actors that influence the emerging system of global environmental governance.

The current focus is on ! questions of institutional and organisational effectiveness, learning processes in environmental policy, institutional inter-linkages, the role of private actors in governance systems, and models of global democracy. Major analytical tools are qualitative social science methods, including structured case studies, as well as legal analysis and integrated modelling. Project members represent political science, economics, international law, and integrated modelling.

“Si l’on refuse comme moi l’unilatéralisme Américain, il faut agir pour construire un multilatéralisme démocratique au service de l’universel! quote .

Alain Madelin, député Français libéral, Figaro Magazine, 18 Avril 2003

The first major problem: Political Schizophrenia

The major problem is not the inherent idea of a democratic global governance or of world citizenship. Most reasonable and educated people, if they take a bit time to get informed, easily agree with our ideas. Many political, business and intellectual leaders agree in private. But very few are ready to publicly defend these ideas.

The major problem is that these same people suffer from a crucial belief -which is also a delusion: that public opinion and the public in general is not ready, and therefore they are not willing to use precious political or reputation capital to defend what they do not believe will win them popularity points. And even those willing to put themselves on the line usually stay very general or express “des vœux pieux” and do not dare make concrete suggestions.

The most that they dare say usually stays within the confines of the “politically correct” of the last 20 years. This elitist fantasy of an empowered United Nations is the nightmare of millions of people who see this as a steady and unaccountable mission creep and the path to global dictatorship.

Within the paradigm of the global elite, which only considers as a true alternative, acceptance and promotion of the UN, reforming and empowering it (which is a true mental prison), simpler alternatives are not considered.

But there is a rational explanation for this reluctance which is based on at least one true, if unspoken, reality: nearly none of the politically correct schemes of global governance are of nature to arouse the enthusiasm of public opinion. So the global elite continues “cahin-caha” its slow building of an incoherent ! and fragmented global governance system behind the back of the global public, because it is incapable of formulating an alternative which could achieve true popular acceptance. But because it knows that, it does not dare say much publicly, except about safe reform options.

The speeches about global reform at the UN General Assembly are nearly all the same year after year, nearly all speak about the need to democratize the UN, to empower the UN, to strengthen the UN, to change Security Council to abolish the veto etc. The recent article in the NY Times on the topic of the UN is a perfect example of that harmony of thought (If the U.N. Were Being Created Today... 15 March 2003): (www.nytimes.com/2003/03/15/arts/15FORU.html?ex=1048741666&ei=1&en=7b1101a17711d3a7)

On the one hand, the NY Times seems incapable of asking a broader question than about the UN, though the term “create” is much better than “reform” and is a breath of fresh air, but the answers from members of the diplomatic and intellectual elite all come from within the same mental system. No one speaks in the same ways the founders of the great democracies of the past spoke, like the French or American philosophers or revolutionaries.

And since the very foundations of that system are skewed, improving it is an endless process of tweaking it, without ever achieving true stability. That endless process alienates the people (the same phenomenon is seen at the European level where European election participation has declined to less than 50% for the first time in the last election, despite increasing power of the

European Parliament).

The democratic deficit and popular disconnect which is evident at national and European level is many times worse at world level.

The true reason of the disaffection for global governance is the confusion between what GG is generally believed to be: an elitist scheme, and what it could be: a revolutionary paradigm shift in human thought with broad support among the peoples of the world.

But this revolution in human affairs is already old hat at the national level. The reason why people die today is not that there are not enough resources in the world, or not enough honest people., It is because the very nature, structure, foundation, architecture of the global system does not allow people to act or carry through on their good intentions to solve problems.

People are unable to correct the global structure because they suffer from what I have christened “Political Schizophrenia” Political schizophrenia is a psychological phenomenon which allows people to hold simultaneously in their heads two contradictory ideas, without realizing they are contradictory.

Rationally or medically defined, it could be called a sort of mass illusion, a mass hysteria.

Two competing paradigms

These two ideas are two fundamentally opposite paradigms which, for description's sake, we will call Paradigm A and Paradigm B. Paradigm A arose historically before Paradigm B and is about twice as old. Paradigm A is the military/diplomatic/foreign policy/rule of men paradigm which has dominated foreign policy from Sumerian City-States to today. In short, it is a ‘low-political bandwidth’ autocratic paradigm.

Paradigm B is the opposite: it is a high-political bandwidth democratic paradigm. It is the source of democracy, human rights, the rule of law, accountability and constitutionality.

Paradigm A was born about 5000 years ago in Sumer (Iraq today) and Paradigm B about 2500 years ago in Ancient Greece.

Schematically, the two paradigms are:

PARADIGM A = Might makes Right, enforcement by military/ fear/war; spy/diplomacy, arbitrariness, rule of men, autocracy, subjects/serfs, sovereignty from Kings (from the top), closed society and “proprietary” politics (= Old World Order)

PARADIGM B = Right makes Might, enforcement by police; coherence / ethical integrity, peace, legitimacy and accountability, freedom, constitutional rule of law, democracy, citizens, human rights, sovereignty from the people (from the bottom), open society and “open source” politics (or New World Order)

The growth of civilisation is the slow replacement over historical time of the “low-bandwidth” autocratic Paradigm A by the “broadband” democratic Paradigm B. It can also be described as the steady upgrade of political technology as the more advanced paradigm replaces the less advanced one on larger and larger geographical scales.

The reason why there is movement from A to B is that though A is much simpler and simplistic, as technology progresses, it becomes unsustainable because people revolt and want freedom. The alternative is a police state, fascism, or Brave New World.

Paradigm B is messy and difficult, but it is the only sustainable long-term choice.

The fly in the ointment is the completely dysfunctional, yet worse case of an absolutely totalitarian planetary dictatorship which would use genetic, nano-technology and information technology to create total control over a helpless population. Unfortunately, for the first time in history, this is possible today using present technologies, and will be even easier in the future.

The problem with Political Schizophrenia is that it leads to the splitting of hairs and to intellectually dishonest argumentation which puts people off and creates alienation. The most typical of that is the content of the well-known “bible” of the global governance movement, the *1995 Report of the Commission on Global Governance*, which states that, global governance, “does not imply world government or world federalism ” But then it goes on to describe a very elaborate and complicated system which does not look like a normal government with checks and balances, but which, for all practical purposes, endorses a creeping hidden unchecked system. As one critical article states:

“Although the difference between ‘world government’ and ‘global governance’ has been compared to the difference between ‘rape’ and ‘date-rape’, the system of governance described in the report is a new system. There is no historic model for the system here proposed, nor is there any method by which the governed may decide whether or not they wish to be governed by such a system. Global governance is a procedure toward defined objectives that employs a variety of methods, none of which give the governed an opportunity to vote ‘yes’ or ‘no’ for the outcome.” and

“The Commission's refusal to recommend taxing power for the UN while advancing dozens of global revenue-raising schemes is similar to declaring that ‘global governance’ is not ‘world government’.”

Political Schizophrenia means that we accept constitutional democracy as normative paradigm at the municipal, county, state and national levels, and that we accept with equal ease the “Ancien Régime” and the law of the jungle as the normative paradigm at the international or global level. Of course, there is a plethora of agreements that smooths the rough angles of the global system and constrains states, but this description is true structurally, and its fundamental truth becomes obvious in times of crisis like the Iraq war.

This leads to what Camus wrote right after he helped my father, Garry Davis, interrupt the UN General Assembly at the Palais de Chaillot and call for a world constitutional assembly to create a world democracy (19 November 1948). At the moment of the founding of the UN

already, Camus exhibited his usual lucidity (it is a full page but it is well worth reading in its entirety):

“Nous savons donc tous, sans l’ombre d’un doute, que le nouvel ordre que nous cherchons ne peut-être seulement national ou même continental, ni surtout occidental ou oriental. Il doit être universel. Il n’est plus possible d’espérer des solutions partielles ou des concessions. Le compromis, c’est ce que nous vivons c’est à dire l’angoisse pour aujourd’hui et le meurtre pour demain. Et pendant ce temps, la vitesse de l’histoire et du monde s’accélère. Les vingt et un ! sourds, futurs criminels de guerre, qui discutent aujourd’hui de paix échangent leurs monotones dialogues, tranquillement assis au centre d’un rapide qui les entraîne vers le gouffre, à mille kilomètres heures. Oui, cet ordre universel est le seul problème du moment et qui dépasse toutes les querelles de constitution et de loi électorale. C’est lui qui exige que nous lui appliquions les ressources de nos intelligences et de nos volontés.

Quels sont aujourd’hui les moyens d’atteindre cette unité du monde, de réaliser cette révolution internationale, où les ressources en hommes, les matières premières, les marchés commerciaux et les richesses spirituelles pourront se trouver mieux redistribuées ? Je n’en vois que deux et ces deux moyens définissent notre ultime alternative. Ce monde peut être unifié d’en haut, comme je l’ai dit hier, par un seul Etat plus puissant que les autres. La Russie ou l’Amérique peuvent prétendre à ce rôle. Je n’ai rien, et aucun des hommes que je connais n’a rien à répliquer à l’idée défendue par certains, que la Russie ou l’Amérique ont les moyens de régner et d’unifier ce monde à l’image de leur société. J’y répugne en tant que Français, et plus encore en tant que Méditerranéen, mais je ne tiendrai aucun compte de cet argument sentimental.

Notre seule objection, la voici, telle que je l’ai définie dans un dernier article: cette unification ne peut se faire sans la guerre ou, tout au moins, sans un risque extrême de guerre. J’accorderai encore, ce que je ne crois pas, que la guerre puisse ne pas être atomique. Il n’en reste pas moins que la guerre de demain laisserait l’humanité si mutilée et si appauvrie que l’idée même d’un ordre y deviendrait définitivement anachronique. Marx pouvait justifier comme il l’a fait, la guerre de 1870, car elle était la guerre du fusil Chassepot et elle était localisée. Dans les perspectives du marxisme, cent mille morts ne sont rien, en effet, au prix du bonheur de centaines de millions de gens. Mais la mort certaine de centaines de millions de gens, pour le bonheur supposé de ceux qui restent, est un prix trop cher. Le progrès vertigineux des armements, fait historique ignoré par Marx, force à poser de nouvelle façon le problème de la fin et des moyens.

Et le moyen, ici, ferait éclater la fin. Quelle que soit la fin désirée, si haute et si nécessaire soit-elle, qu’elle veuille ou non consacrer le bonheur des hommes, qu’elle veuille consacrer la justice ou la liberté, le moyen employé pour y parvenir représente un risque si définitif, si disproportionné en grandeur avec les chances de succès, que nous refusons objectivement de le courir. Il faut donc en revenir au deuxième moyen propre à assurer cet ordre universel, et qui est l’accord mutuel de toutes les parties. Nous ne nous demanderons pas s’il est possible, considérant ici qu’il est justement le seul possible. Nous nous demanderons d’abord ce qu’il est.

Cet accord des parties a un nom qui est la démocratie internationale. Tout le monde en parle à l’O.N.U. bien entendu, mais qu’est-ce que la démocratie internationale ? C’est une démocratie qui est internationale. On me pardonne! era ici ce truisme, puisque les vérités les plus évidentes sont aussi les plus travesties.

Qu’est-ce que la démocratie nationale ou internationale ? C’est une forme de société où la loi est au-dessus des gouvernants, cette loi étant l’expression de la volonté de tous, représenté par

un corps législatif. Est-ce là ce qu'on essaie de fonder aujourd'hui ? On nous prépare, en effet, une loi internationale. Mais cette loi est faite ou défaite par des gouvernements, c'est-à-dire par l'exécutif. Nous sommes donc en régime de dictature internationale. La seule façon d'en sortir est de mettre la loi internationale au-dessus des gouvernements, donc de faire cette loi, donc de disposer d'un parlement, donc de constituer ce parlement au moyen d'élections mondiales auxquelles participeront tous les peuples. Et puisque nous n'avons pas ce parlement, le seul moyen est de résister à cette dictature internationale sur un plan international et selon des moyens qui ne contrediront pas la fin poursuivie." "Démocratie et dictature internationales" (novembre 1948).

In Camus, Albert: *Actuelles*, Paris Gallimard, 1950. p 160-166.

There is no legitimate and permanent avenue for global political dialogue (anyone who knows the UN knows that dialogue is impossible, as it is a setpiece for diplomacy), or for dialogue between warring politicians (the tragedy of President Musharraf and Prime Minister Vajpayee sitting a few meters from each other at a regional meeting in Kathmandu, but refusing to speak to each other at a height of the Kashmiri crisis last year is an example). Diplomacy enshrines protocol. Protocol ! is based on the opposite of open communication: pre-determined procedures and secrecy. Because of the stifling nature of protocol, opaqueness is a necessary evil. Thus, the structure of the system itself creates the conditions which prevent simultaneously honest discussions and the necessary openness that could create buy-in and reduce the democratic deficit.

Since the world obviously does need a system of "political management", the global elites, who don't have the collective understanding or courage to honestly say that some sort of public debate about how to create a world democracy is needed, aggravate the suspicions of ordinary people by creating super-clubs to meet, discuss, decide and make top-level decisions (though never acknowledged). It is common knowledge that meetings in Davos were the genesis of key processes for world peace and security, including the Conference of Madrid etc.

The best known of those super-clubs are :

- the World Economic Forum (www.weforum.org)
- the Trilateral Commission (www.trilateral.org/),
- and the now quasi-defunct less exclusive State of the World Forum (www.worldforum.org/), which spawned the Commission on Globalization
- the infamous though not widely known Bilderberg Club. (no known site ; see unofficial site at www.bilderberg.org), and on the policy side,
- the Royal Institute on International Affairs (London) (www.riaa.org)
- and the Council on Foreign Relations (NY) (www.cfr.org).

Though I do not believe in conspiracies, the bad habits of the elite give credence to the fears that these groups are trying to dominate the world and install a secretive, elitist, undemocratic global government.

The World Citizen Foundation has been on the forefront of some of these issues. A key one is that global corporations have a vested interest in adopting the idea of world citizenship (see *Appel à une Démocratie Mondiale*, Troy Davis, 1998). Since 2002, the World Economic Forum

has adopted the idea - though without really understanding it. It even defines itself today by using the idea: "The World Economic Forum is an independent international organization committed to improving the state of the world. The Forum provides a collaborative framework for the world's leaders to address global issues, engaging particularly its corporate members in global citizenship." (see below too).

The problem with diplomats, politicians and academics is that they have forgotten two fundamental truths of politics:

1. politics is a human invention
2. political innovations don't survive if they don't awaken public fervor or gain broad support

! auto

Constitutional historians are well aware of the first truth, and NGO and religious leaders often quote such leaders as Mahatma Gandhi and Martin Luther King to demonstrate the second truth.

But few today combine both the understanding and political and personal courage as did such people as Madison, Jefferson or Hamilton (in the American Revolution) or Mirabeau, La Fayette, or the Abbot Emanuel Sieyès (in the French Revolution).

Other examples of the lack of intellectual rigor of diplomats which is so common in the GG discourse is the following:

"The former State Secretary of the German Federal Foreign Office and current German ambassador to the United States, Wolfgang Ischinger, has recently emphasized the necessity to develop new tools for global governance: "States no longer hold an effective monopoly in responding to global problems and crises. As a result, it is necessary to develop 'global governance', [...] Not only governments will have to play an important role in this context. International organizations, and most of all the UN system, will have to play a more proactive role. However, the other 'global players', transnational NGOs as well as transnational companies, have to be included as well."" (Ischinger 2001).

The term 'global governance' might be misleading, however. Although it is suggestive of exclusive global solutions implemented by a quasi world Government, the term 'global' is much broader in this context, suggesting rather a global perspective. Based on the challenges sketched out above, global governance primarily requires multi-level approaches to governance. Collaboration may be required at a global level, but the efficacy and success of such initiatives requires national, regional and local involvement."⁴

Of course, the hair-splitting about GG and world government is meaningless because the purported objections against equating GG with world government, i.e. requiring "multi-level approaches to governance", does not constitute a valid objection to world government.

4 in *Shaping Globalization: The role of global public policy networks*

Thorsten Benner/Wolfgang H. Reinicke/Jan Martin Witte

To be published in: *Carl-Bertelsmann Award 2002: Cooperation Responsibility Transparency* (Gütersloh: Bertelsmann)

The statement “the efficacy and success of such initiatives requires national, regional and local involvement” has absolutely no relevance logically to the statement “Global governance implies global government” To state that the involvement of lower levels of government is needed to make global government work cannot, by any law of logic, be used to deny that global government is needed.

This reasoning is an age-old logical fallacy unworthy of contemporary political debate and of educated and allegedly intelligent people. It is a shame that such nonsense is the dominant GG discourse, is taken at face value and is not immediately rejected for the bad reasoning it is.

Why is this so? all these people are not unintelligent, nor member of some vast conspiracy to hide something. No. The explanation is simpler: it is the peculiar mental illusion of political schizophrenia, the widespread suffering of the dominant international relations paradigms and the lack of understanding of what politics and democracy truly mean internationally.

Fallacious Assumptions

The underlying fallacious assumptions seems to be the following:

GG perforce belongs to either of two broad categories (which is not true):

1. **world government** (as assumed or fantasized, i.e. some kind of unitary world-state or world federation)
2. **! phaan undefined system** where transnational actors have a key role in addition to national actors

Since most people in the world elite have been affected ideologically in the last 40 years, even unconsciously, by the American Right’s diabolization of the very idea of world government, they reject, in a near-reflex manner, anything which suggests that world government is the desirable or logical outcome.

Therefore, they always falls back on the second alternative, and come up with general abstract statements or ones that make very little practical sense.

At the beginning, it is funny to see the intellectual contortions that very intelligent people go through to reject the very conclusion they have been brought to by their very own thought processes, and the denial of world government that they express. A stark! example is George Soros or even Professor Joseph Nye, the inventor of “soft power” and Dean of the Kennedy School of Government at Harvard⁵. But once in a while, there is an honest and clear discussion. This occurred in the magazine Worldlink of the World Economic Forum when Joseph Nyw argued against a world government (naming it by name) or a world parliament, and Professors

5 <http://ksgnotes1.harvard.edu/degreeprog/courses.nsf/wzByDirectoryName/JosephNye>

Strauss and Falk answered him⁶. Unfortunately, Falk and Strauss only give a relative answer, i.e. an answer which rests on an incremental policy and which is discredited by the latest insights of European history (which they use as support). A better argument would be to mention the European scenario as only one of several possible scenarios. Falk and Strauss open themselves to easy rebuttal, which because they are widely perceived as the most articulate proponents of a world parliament, is a danger to all of us.

But after a while, it becomes frustrating as it is clear that it is this lack of intellectual clarity that is the cause of the misery and death of millions.

It is important to understand how this state of affairs came about. World ! government was not feared until the MacCarthy era of 1950s when it became associated with Communism. The red-baiting of McCarthy was based on the scare-mongering that the goal of Communism was to set up a unitary world socialist state. This is in fact still today the stated fear of conspiracy theorists and many evangelical Christians.

Unfortunately, the global cultural dominance of America and of the English language has fed this fear. Even the World Federalists, after being clear advocates for world citizenship, a world constitution, a world parliament etc. changed their tune once they were taken over by a mere half-dozen strong Anglosaxon “ideological mafia” (US, Canadian English, British). The rank and file still believes in the more fundamental ideas, as do European and Asian world federalists, but the top half-dozen officials are all of the same mould and have completed the ideological takeover so thoroughly that discussion on these topics is systematically shunned, ridiculed, discredited, stopped or even worse.

How can this be fought? For world federalists, probably only when their HQ moves back to Europe where it was after the war. More broadly, I surmise that if GG were understood adequately, there would be many less fears about it.

In fact, Nye and co. are talking about world government without admitting it, but because world government is basically equated with a unitary world state, it is quasi-taboo, and therefore it must be shunned at all costs.

Of course, this is untrue, and while we must recognize the negative connotation of world government with some people, we must also see that the answer is not to use absurd arguments which obviously do not fit, but to say: “No, World Democracy is NOT about the sort of world government which has been traditionally feared, and it is NOT about the growing mission creep from the present unaccountable global system. It is about extending and protecting fundamental rights and ! freedoms globally”.

The true reason why nationalists have a field day against globalists is that globalists, instead of focusing on the extremely simple-to-understand issue of creating a global democratic process (and not worrying about content), have mostly obviated the process question and have bored deeper and deeper into issues and content. The UN and global civil society are so lost in

6 Parliament of Dreams [www.worldlink.co.uk/stories/storyReader\\$1088](http://www.worldlink.co.uk/stories/storyReader$1088)

Not a Parliament of Dreams [www.worldlink.co.uk/stories! /storyReader\\$1152](http://www.worldlink.co.uk/stories! /storyReader$1152)

the millions of details of what “we should do” (which they themselves decided with the benefit of any global democratic process), that they have lost track that the very way in which they operate is counter-productive.

The perverse result of decades of such dynamics is that at the end, the sheer amount of content created (e.g. by global UN conferences and many other intergovernmental processes) pushes countries to want to implement them. But since politicians are still too timid to discuss the fundamental issues, the democratic divide simply grows and grows. The anti-globalization protests of the past years are a direct result.

But what is the basis for the strong claim that diplomacy is fundamentally incapable of playing the role that everyone expects it to play, i.e. help the countries of the world arrive at binding agreements to solve common problems? It is because the basic rules of diplomacy have not changed for over 5000 years. Today, as 5000, or 2000, or 1000 years ago, a diplomat has no independent power. A diplomat must follow the instruction of the executive branch, and plays a totally different role than a parliamentarian. A directly or even indirectly elected representative has more legitimacy than a diplomat who derives his legitimacy from a delegation of power from the executive, itself not always elected in a legitimate manner (in most countries). A diplomat must follow instructions, in a much stronger and more formal way than a parliamentarian follows party discipline. A parliamentarian can switch parties, vote according to his/her conscience, all acceptable things which are not for a diplomat. That is why some people advocate electing the UN representatives, a step forward assuredly.

Still today, leaders do not understand the power of democracy and fear the participation of the people.

The first aim of any successful global governance initiative should be to do everything to debunk and break the dominant mental paradigm. Just as, for example, at the end of the 19th century when a young doctor fought against the dominant paradigm that the cleanliness of the hands of surgeons had nothing to do with infections in hospitals.

As for any mental revolution, the idea is first derided, then it is gingerly accepted, then it wins, and then it becomes evident.

In less than 20 years, people will probably ask themselves how was it possible not to agree to world citizenship and world democracy, to a world constitution which protects the right of human beings everywhere, to a world parliament which represents the citizens of the world.

There are two processes by which this is most likely to happen : a slow “raising of the political temperature” until either suddenly someone with stature has the courage to publicly state the obvious, or someone does it right now because they are more courageous than the norm. It is a paradox of paradigm changes that as we strive to move from Messianism to Democracy globally, we need at the beginning powerful or courageous personalities to start or publicize the process.

The probability that the tipping point occurs is a function of the “temperature” of the public coupled with the determination/reputation of the champion(s).

However, nothing here should be construed as deterministic. Technological evolution and revolution, in genetic engineering, nano-technology, information technology etc. have shuffled the historical cards.

Unfortunately, a benign world democracy is not inevitable, and therefore the global elite's sneaky step-by-step plans for global governance are inherently dangerous, as they quietly allow the worst nightmare of conspiracy theorists (assuming that in fact, there are no conspiracies): the hijacking by some powers of global reform processes.

Because of the innate opaqueness and complexity of the global governance process, in spite of increased transparency in last decades, it is not difficult to use the very complex international system to push through special interests. This is exactly what happens today with the USA and the EU in the UN, the WTO, the IMF etc.

In other words, the fragmentation of the global system benefits the most powerful, and is an "alienation generator" that creates despair and kills hope.

The second major problem: public myths

! a

It is the consequence of the first, intended or not. It is the general (fallacious) attitude that "things cannot change", that "people will always fight wars". It is what I call the "Human Nature Trap" and the solution people usually give is what I call "Messianism".

Messianism

Messianism occurs whenever people say "If only we had honest, decent, good politicians". "If our leaders were moral, we could solve problems." "Nothing or not much is wrong with the system ; all that is needed is political will, and our leaders lack that." In French, we call it waiting for "l'homme providentiel" - the man that Providence (i.e. God) sends us.

Messianism is extremely dangerous for many reasons:!

- It tills the soils for strongmen and potential dictators, who, throughout history, have proclaimed: "Trust me, I will bring you peace and order and security. You only have to trust me and give me your rights."⁷
- It discourages people from finding the truth (that the ! problem, and hence the solution is systemic) and thus furthers misery, takes away resources from solving the problem
- In the worst case, it encourages people to make Big Governments bigger and more intrusive, judging the private morality and religious or non-religious beliefs of citizens. This is a logical consequence of the statement that "Our leaders should be moral" This induces a political process where candidates wear their religion on their sleeve, and try to

⁷ "By forcing on mankind more and more lethal weapons, and at the same time, making the world more and more interdependent economically, technology has brought mankind to such a degree of distress that we are ripe for the deifying of any Caesar who might succeed in giving the world unity and peace." Arnold Toynbee, eminent British historian.

out-moral each other, and naturally, many then vocally start to critique minority groups for their alleged immoral behaviours. Disliked groups are then made scapegoats for calamities. This has happened in history time and again, whether against Jews, Chinese or Indians. In modern times, the statement of Jerry Falwell that 9-11 happened because of ‘the sinful lifestyle of gays and lesbians’ is a typical! example of the phenomenon.

uto

In general, messianism is a throwback to the old days of absolutist rule of Kings, instead of the rule of law. It is messianism which Montesquieu and the American Founding Fathers rejected when they insisted upon separation of powers. To paraphrase a conservative: “The US constitution was made for genius so that even idiots can run it”.

Under the dominant mind-culture of political schizophrenia and the human nature trap (see below), the only logical conclusion for world peace is for some person with “superhuman” qualities. Basically, this frame of mind says if that our world leaders were only like Mahatma Gandhi or Nelson Mandela, we would be fine. Apart from the fact that we have no idea if Gandhi or Mandela would be as wise in a global role, it is dangerous to assume any particular qualities from our politicians, and better to design the system while assuming the worst. !

The design of a political system must assume the worst and have built-in safeguards. It should also not rely on the personal qualities of politicians⁸.

! ng2057The Sumero-Westphalian system would work perfectly if we were ruled by angels. Simple observation shows this is not true.

The Human Nature Trap

The Human Nature Trap is the statement that things cannot and will not change because people are bad ; they have always fought and always will.

It is based on the following *two intellectually confused statements*, and on one *correct* and one

⁸ “Ambition must be made to counteract ambition. The interest of the man must be connected with the constitutional rights of the place. It may be a reflection on human nature, that such devices should be necessary to control the abuses of government. But what is government itself, but the greatest of all reflections on human nature? If men were angels, no government would be necessary. If angels were to govern men, neither external nor internal controls on government would be necessary. In framing a government which is to be adminis! tered by men over men, the great difficulty lies in this: you must first enable the government to control the governed; and in the next place oblige it to control itself. A dependence on the people is, no doubt, the primary control on the government; but experience has taught mankind the necessity of auxiliary precautions. This policy of supplying, by opposite and rival interests, the defect of better motives, might be traced through the whole system of human affairs, private as well as public” Federalist Paper No. 51 by Alexander Hamilton or James Madison.

The Structure of the Government Must Furnish the Proper Checks and Balances Between the Different Departments, Friday, February 8, 1788.

incorrect observation:

- ! 0 that wars are of the same order of things as personal violence and disagreement, and that because personal violence and sanctioned violence both stem from masculine nature, that the answer is the same in both cases.
- that the cause of war is personal animosity, violence etc. and therefore non-war (peace) implies non-personal violence⁹
- the correct insight that the international system is based on personal relationships rather than the rule of law
- the incorrect observation that people have always fought and therefore always will (untestable fallacy)

I wish to comment on some of the above in order.

The probably true statement that private violence (i.e. men beating up women, rape etc.) and that public mass violence (i.e. wars) have the same origin, led most people to a wrong conclusion simply because ! they suffer from political schizophrenia (see above).

There is only one common answer to both problems that can be logically made: that both should be addressed by law. Instead of that common-sense insight, there is a very large school of thought that promotes another statement: that both should be addressed by affecting human nature¹⁰.

This disregards one fundamental truth: that public! mass violence is not only the result of personal aggressivity (of males mainly), but most of all of the real fact that the international system itself sanctions and encourages war, since there is no international rule of law. The system provides perverse incentives for war as the international realm is the one where Heads of State have the most power, where the heritage of absolute kings is the strongest, and where every President is still like a King.

This explains the predilection of Heads of State for international summits where they are seen with other Heads of State, because in the collective unconscious, we associate them with true “leadership” only when we see them operating beyond the domestic paradigm, and within the global paradigm of international anarchy. Here every President, instead of being the mere highest servant of the state in domestic politics, becomes elevated to the mythical status of the Hero, the Warrior, the emb! odiment of the Nation, against every other Nation, in a Global Far West.

The archetype of the rugged individualist fighting against the bad guys is thus repeated, an

⁹ Even if we assume the initial statement to be true, this is a non-sequitur, a common logical fallacy called “Denying the antecedent” www.datanation.com/fallacies/deny.htm

¹⁰ To “affect” human nature via education is legitimate and fine, but not with education that kills the sense of initiative and energy; with the use of drugs to “treat” allegedly over-active children, and definitely not by any permanent means of affecting human nature, whether via non-inheritable modifications – brain treatments, permanent hormonal changes etc. - or worst of all, by genotype alteration/genetically inheritable modifications.

archetype which comes from Sumerian times when the King was the Guardian of Order against Demons and chaos (at the price of absolute submission).

The first line of defense against private violence is the rule of law under a legitimate constitutional democratic system. It is a testimony to the hold of political schizophrenia also on the minds of women advocates that they do not see that the same line of defense ought to apply against public international violence, instead of these advocates endlessly repeating of the Messianic principle (our politicians must be moral, must show political will etc.).

The Human Nature Trap is dangerous for similar and additional reasons in relation to Messianism:

- ! ightChange can only happen if “you change personally” and is not a matter for the system. Since personal change for all practical purposes is a never-ending quest, this conveniently diverts the attention of the people from political change onto their personal spiritual fulfillment. It leads people away from action which can really change things.
- It allows the status quo to survive unscathed, and provides a convenient “opium of the people”, whether religious or otherwise
- ! 20It encourages the dumbing down of society, i.e. that we should all pretend that “tout le monde il est beau, tout le monde il est gentil” (which understandably makes conservatives cringe and over-react in racist ways), and discourages healthy debate and disagreement. For instance, the personal energy or passion or combativeness of some people is condemned in many circles as being of the same nature as the phenomenon which creates real wars. Hence, it is condemned and politics is personified, and it justifies ad hominem attacks that divert from the real issues at hand.
- Equating personal disagreements and strong or even violent discussions is of course a blatant insult to the millions of victims of wars, but it is v! ery widespread. It also fails to understand democracy. Much better to have elected representatives scream at each other in the formal setting of a parliament, than have rival armies kill and maim scores of civilians and each other.
- In general, the Human Nature Trap also contributes to feeding conspiracy theories, since the usual answer to world problems is the oft repeated mantra that “We are all One” (or some variation thereof), which is the philosophical underpinning of absolutist systems. It is exactly this fear which Christian Evangelicals stoke by correctly pointing out that to the hundreds of “feel-good” groups in the world that emphasize the unity of the world, the human race etc. We obviously should use the scientific facts of human unity and of the natural world to emphasize what the American Founding Fathers said: that freedom and the yearning thereof is universal, and that all people have equal dignity. But it should not go further, and we should especially steer clear and say so openly and strongly, that we do not accept or condone or approve of any spiritual “we are One” movements, and that we strictly stay within the political realm, and strongly emphasize the freedom of individual citizens (in addition to group freedoms).

- In the worst case, since human nature is the cause of our misery, then the only solution is to change human nature. This leads to all kinds of totalitarianism, and today, to the worst possible one of all: genetic totalitarianism, where people will be genetically engineered for docility (Orwell's Brave New World). Unfortunately, this is no longer a fantasy. Science advances so quickly that to seek to avoid this is one of the most potent arguments for a urgent and legitimate world democracy. A leading American liberal woman once told me that since violence and war is the result of too much testosterone in men, the solution to world problems is to genetically engineer men to reduce their hormones.

We must tirelessly, consistently and systematically explain, expose and denounce the present international Ancien Régime paradigm which is the root cause of the dangerous illusions of the Human Nature Trap and of Messianism.

! engrave Débat télévisée sur 'La 5', émission Ripostes sur le thème "21 avril: un an après", dimanche 20 avril 2003.

"Ce que je souhaite c'est qu'il faut trouver un moyen pour demain de démocratiser la mondialisation. Est-ce que la mondialisation va être décidé par tous les peuples du monde de manière démocratique ou par un seul peuple parce qu'il est le plus riche et le plus fort ?"

Philippe Séguin, ancien ministre, ancien Président de l'Assemblée Nationale, ancien président du RPR, France

"Les grands enjeux du monde sont-ils encore à l'échelle de la démocratie nationale ou pas ? Le grand enjeu de ce 21^{ème} siècle est de bâtir une puissance politique à l'échelle de ce monde."

François Bayrou, Président de l'UDF

"La citoyenneté est la solution de la crise du 21 avril. Elle doit être une citoyenneté, également Européenne et du monde. Nous sommes des citoyens du monde avec des droits et des devoirs. Les dizaines de millions de personnes qui ont manifesté contre la guerre en Iraq était l'expression d'une citoyenneté mondiale. Il faut construire des nouvelles institutions mondiales, c'est là un beau combat pour des démocrates."

! Jean Glavany, ancien Ministre, Député, Parti Socialiste

Fighting the problems

What is needed (and will be very appealing to the world public) is that ordinary decent morality should be just as valid in international relations as personally or nationally. To remind the world public that morality does not exist in international relations, and to argue that there should be coherence in moral values at all levels of society and government, is both right and should be widely popular. Shortly put, TV and the internet should kill Macchiavelli.

Political schizophrenia is evident in the writings ! of the ideological guru of US interventionis conservatives, Robert Kagan, who argues with his British colleague Robert Cooper that the world should be divided into 2 parts: one civilized, which is dealt with through law, and the other, uncivilized, which must be dealt with by force. In effect, Kagan is proposing and promoting a sort of global apartheid, a two-class world system: a world divided between citizens and barbarians.

We (western) citizens live in the modern world and barbarians live in the pre-modern one. This echoes the Community of Democracies idea of Madeleine Albright and George Soros, which was rightly shot down by the moderator at the 1999 annual meeting of the World Economic Forum in Davos (when Soros presented it).

Dixit Kagan/Cooper: “The challenge to the postmodern world,” Cooper argues, “is to get used to the idea of double standards.” Among themselves, Europeans may “operate on the basis of laws and open cooperative security. ! ote But when dealing with the world outside Europe, “we need to revert to the rougher methods of an earlier era — force, preemptive attack, deception, whatever is necessary.” This is Cooper’s principle for safeguarding society: “Among ourselves, we keep the law, but when we are operating in the jungle, we must also use the laws of the jungle.”

We all agree that the progress of civilization is replacing power with principle, force with law, Hobbes with Kant, Machtpolitik with idealistic politics. But law is only sustainable if it is perceived as legitimate, fair and democratic, especially today. Europeans have a deep interest in devaluing and eventually eradicating the brutal laws of an anarchic, Hobbesian world where power is the ultimate determinant of national security and success.

! tx6720

In books and articles, Kagan explains his views that we need to apply double standards in the world. Or, as he puts it: “...global security and a liberal order — as well as Europe’s “postmodern” paradise — cannot long survive unless the United States does use its power in the dangerous, Hobbesian world that still flourishes outside Europe.” After a beautiful penetrating analysis, he comes to exactly opposite conclusions that we would. Kagan says “So what is to be done?” The obvious answer is that Europe should follow the course that Cooper, Ash, Robertson, and others recommend and build up its military capabilities, even if only marginally.” This has become a mantra heard in the media all the time by politicians across Europe, an article of faith which must be exposed for the fallacy it is.

Kagan’s must-reading article *Power and Weakness* in Policy Review 113 (June 2002) is a superb analysis which relies much on another powerful thinker, the British Robert Cooper (but who

makes the same key mistake): www.policyreview.org/JUN02/kagan.html

“In an anarchic world, small powers always fear they will be victims. Great powers, on the other hand, often fear rules that may constrain them more than they fear the anarchy in which their power brings security and prosperity.”

They fear it perpetuates a Hobbesian world in which they may become increasingly vulnerable. The United States may be a relatively benign hegemon, but insofar as its actions delay the arrival of a world order more conducive to the safety of weaker powers, it is objectively dangerous.

Yet Kagan himself admits that: “The United States is a liberal, progressive society through and through, and to the extent that Americans believe in power, they believe it must be a means of advancing the principles of a liberal civilization and a liberal world order. Americans even share Europe’s aspirations for a more orderly world system based not on power, but on rules — after all, they were striving for such a world when Europeans were still extolling the laws of *machtpolitik*.”

And that: “It is precisely America’s great power that makes it the primary target! , and often the only target.”

Like many other great thinkers (e.g. Francis Fukuyama), Kagan does an excellent job at analysis, but fails to see the obvious conclusions: that it is not power as such, but the propensity to use power using double standards that makes America hated. It is, once again, the consequence of the lack of global constitutional constraints, of global and legitimate rules of fair behavior for all.

Kagan is smart enough to recognize that “This is what many Europeans believe they have to offer the world: not power, but the transcendence of power. The “essence” of the European Union, writes Everts, is “all about subjecting inter-state relations to the rule of law”

Within the confines of Europe, the age-old laws of international relations have been repealed. Europeans have stepped out of the Hobbesian world of anarchy into the Kantian world of perpetual peace. European life during the more than five decades since the end of World War II has been shaped not by the brutal laws of power politics but by the unfolding of a geopolitical fantasy, a miracle of world-historical importance: The German lion has laid down with the French lamb. The conflict that ravaged Europe ever since the violent birth of Germany in the nineteenth century has been put to rest.

The means by which this miracle has been achieved have understandably acquired something of a sacred mystique for Europeans, especially since the end of the Cold War. Integration was not to be based on military deterrence or the balance of power. Quite the contrary. The miracle came from the rejection of military power and of its utility as an instrument of international affairs — at least within the confines of Europe.”

This is what many Europeans believe they have to offer the world: not power, but the transcendence of power. The “essence” of the European Union, writes Everts, is “all about

subjecting inter-state relations to the rule of law,

But unfortunately, Europeans, as Kagan points out, apply their own rules only within Europe. They are as guilty of Kagan of applying double standards and of political schizophrenia outside of Europe. Europeans have started surmounting that schizophrenia within the confines of the European Union, but have not understood their own lessons for the world though there are many¹¹.

The crux of the issue of GG is recalled by Kagan: “Kant had argued that the only solution to the immoral horrors of the Hobbesian world was the creation of a world government. But he also feared that the “state of universal peace” made possible by world government would be an even greater threat to human freedom than the Hobbesian international order, inasmuch as such a government, with its monopoly of power, would become “the most horrible despotism.” How nations could achieve perpetual peace without destroying human freedom was a problem Kant could not solve.”

Elites don't understand: global public opinion is a superpower

That problem is solved today because one no longer needs a powerful world state with a world army ! to impose world peace. Global public opinion is more powerful than anything. Even the recent Iraq war proves this as Bush and his people had to spend months and millions to convince the world and were forced to find a fig-leaf coalition to cover themselves. If a world parliament had existed which truly was legitimate, and thus respected, global public opinion, “congealed” in the parliament, would have solved the problem, as Saddam Hussein too appealed to the same values etc. as Bush.

Hobbes dies with the internet. With a bit of imagination, even the problems of Iraq and North Korea can be solved in a peaceful non-Hobbesian way. (See other papers of the author)

The Kagans and Coopers of this world forget one thing: the necessity of power in a Hobbesian world exists only because of their own defence of the very structure of the global system. The reliance on power politics is a self-fulfilling prophecy since power corrupts whatever shreds of law exist and prevents the emergence of true! legitimate world law.

¹¹ The main one which is now accepted among the elite but is still not widely understood is that the very process of European integration, which worked splendidly, is now totally inappropriate, because it is an elitist inter-governmental process, what I call a “stealth” process. For one, the stealthy nature of this process feeds conspiracy fears. Secondly, it is the cause of the European democratic deficit. The present constitutional process for Europe is only slightly better, because though the members of the Convention on the Future of Europe come from all EU countries and even accession countries, there is no widespread popular discussion about it. The irony is that a process created to remedy the democratic deficit of Europe itself is done in an esoteric way. The lesson for global governance is that any corresponding global process should be done much more openly and with more popular participation, however difficult that may be. The uneasiness of Europe with its own process, which Kagan points out, is because Europeans have not assimilated simple truths and are still victims of political schizophrenia.

If the U.S. spent a tiny fraction of its military spending on a global participatory process to define a constitutional world democracy based on the same principles as those of the U.S. Declaration of Independence, the resultant Kantian system would obviate the need for the U.S. to spend hundreds of billions of dollars per year to create full-spectrum dominance.

The Iraq war was useful in many ways, not the least of which was to finally make people realize that world public opinion is a superpower in its own right. It is this new fact enabled by technology which allows the emergence of a benign world democracy, with no need of a world army, as long as it maintains the greatest legitimacy compared to other bodies.

The Swiss or Swedes have not fought wars for hundreds of years. The French and German, after fighting 3 wars from 1870 to 1939, two culminating in world wars, have not fought for 60 years, and it! is unthinkable they would now. What has changed? Human nature? Do Swedes and Swiss have different genetic codes? Have the French and German changed their human nature in less than a generation?

Of course not. It is the system that is different.

The fallacy of the present path on which the global elite has put us on is that fundamentally, things are eventually going to be fine, and that some kind of world government is both inevitable (however long it will take), and that it will be benign. So the corollary of that hidden and often unconscious substratum is that however badly things are in the short term, and whatever hurdles and hiccups on the way (war, famine, dictatorship etc.), we will muddle through and eventually reach Nirvana, freedom, democracy etc.

Unfortunately, this is not the end of history and the scenario of global tyranny is also possible.

As Erwin Laszlo and others have said, we are at a bifurcation in history and the future is not likely to be functional and humane if we do not consciously seek to redesign the global architecture to engineer world democracy. Waiting for it to happen on its own is not enough. This is also a recipe to allow super-elites in their own clubs to make decisions, since politics abhors a vacuum as much as nature does.

The blindness and schizophrenia of the global elite is also fodder for reasoned critique from some Christians about world citizenship: www.crossroad.to/text/articles/ctfgc9-98.html, which cannot be answered except by using a different, non-elitist approach.

Recommandations for strategy of the GGG:

Principles for a powerful and sustainable strategy

A “scale-invariant approach ” or “fractal approach” (the strategy should be valid and make sense at whatever scale it is looked from)

A systems / cybernetic approach, taking into account feedback loops

A multi-dimensional approach (political, psycho-social, marketing)

An approach which uses the power of a phenomenon which is related to several ideas:

- Reflexivity in the language of George Soros
- The observer effect in Quantum Theory
- The emergent properties of feedback loops

Focus on the process, not on content (for Popperian reasons).

Occam's Razor (which is daily violated by globalists everywhere and elites hard at work at inventing complicated opaque mechanisms and treaties)

The KISS principle (this might seem to contradict the first ones, but it does not, as the KISS principle does not apply to the generating thought process, but to the outcome, which can still be simple, but scale-invariant or multi-dimensional).

What to do:

- ! develop very clear intellectual and rational basis for work, based on history and fundamental rights; promote a scientific way of working
- take into account the fundamental changes in communications and consciously shift from a elitist to a democratic paradigm
- reappropriate the vocabulary we need to communicate our ideas
- emphasize the political consequences of technological progress on sovereignty (redefine it), the national interest (= the global interest), etc.
- don't endorse directly at the beginning, but point out fallacies and myths, ask questions, sketch out scenarios; let people come via their own powers of reasoning to the logical systemic change
- seek to convince by the power of reason,¹² but use well-chosen emotional arguments as well to communicate the power of the idea
- answer head-on the seductive but wrong, therefore dangerous, thesis of "reference-intellectuals" (like Robert Cooper and Robert Kagan).
- have a two-pronged approach: top-down (convincing multipliers, intellectuals and opinion-leaders) and bottom-up (direct media contact)
- consciously try to create a "tipping point" and learn from strategies to do so (see *The Tipping Point: How Little Things Can Make a Big Difference*, Malcolm Gladwell)

¹² "I have addressed myself purely to your judgments, and have studiously avoided those asperities which are too apt to disgrace political disputants of all parties, and which have been not a little provoked by the language and conduct of the opponents of the Constitution. The charge of a conspiracy against the liberties of the people, which has been indiscriminately brought against the advocates of the plan, has something in it too wanton and too malignant, not to excite the indignation of every man who feels in his own bosom a refutation of the calumny." Federalist Paper No. 85. Alexander Hamilton

- repeatedly emphasize the dimension of risk, its management, and the safeguards needed to minimize the worst risk: the case of planetary tyranny.
- explicitly adopt and advertise an anti-totalitarian Popperian view
- Try to turn potential competitors into partners or at least neutralize them using the Microsoft standards strategy (Embrace and Extend)
- Determine a system of performance measurements to maximize the return on effort and investment, and to determine competitive opportunities and untapped “markets”.

Some of the recommendations above are derived from the concept of open society from Karl Popper, one of the foremost philosophers of science and a theoretician whose insights are especially to avoid totalitarianism. “The open society can be brought about only if it is possible for the individual citizen to evaluate critically the consequences of the implementation of government policies, which can then be abandoned or modified in the light of such critical scrutiny - in such a society, the rights of the individual to criticize administrative policies will be formally safeguarded and upheld, undesirable policies will be eliminated in a manner analogous to the elimination of falsified scientific theories, and differences between people on social policy will be resolved by critical discussion and argument rather than by force.”

<http://plato.stanford.edu/entries/popper/#Soci>¹³

What to avoid:

- “democratic fundamentalism” that says everything must be democratic
! just right
- the political correctness that the organisation itself must be totally democratic, as mental and physical revolutions are made by a more dedicated, focused and clear-minded small group
- the insidious trap of the drunk searching his keys under the light, i.e. the very common trap of promoting one more elitist process or initiative, not because it is fundamentally what should be made, but because it is what people can wrap their heads around, and what people believe is doable (and what a foundation will fund as a discrete project).

0

Other specific recommendations:

- Develop an ongoing documentation and analysis effort of initiatives and groups in the field, making most results except the most sensitive analysis web-available

¹³ It is interesting to note the answer of George Soros to a question from the author, after Soros, in a meeting of the Community of Democracies in Warsaw said that what was needed was a global open society. The author asked: “Does a global open society imply a global democracy?”. Mr. Soros answered: “Of course.” Prodded about whether a global democracy means a world parliament or something of the sort, he denied it. Soros is the archetypal man who exhibits political schizophrenia, for the reason explained before, that he is afraid of looking like a kook, since the only way he can even imagine global governance is via elite processes.

- Develop an enterprise and business strategy, taking as point of departure the growing movement for global corporate citizenship (see Davos 2003)
- Organize an Annual Summit of like-minded groups and initiatives, not to seek to unify them or collar them into one mould, but simply so that people get a chance to talk and interact, and know each other etc. Butterfly-catchers have annual meetings. Why not those in the field of democratic global! governance? This should not be difficult to fund as it has an obvious and logical appeal, and it can be argued that it will create synergies, reduce duplication, promote partnerships and perhaps even mergers etc.
- Develop scenario-planning exercises (this can be linked to the business programme since businesses understand and appreciate these types of programmes, starting e.g. with Shell which pioneered scenario planning in 1970s).
- Expose and debunk dangerous common myths and fallacies about global governance in simple language (i.e. that democracy at any given level of society is the linear sum of the democratic levels underneath it, or the Candide Syndrome – All’s well that ends well in the end, it will turn out fine whatever problems are encountered in the meantime ; or that we should focus on content, thereby losing sight of process, for theoretical and practical reasons, and since public acceptance will depend on process, not well-intentioned content, process is more important)
- explicitly link world democracy etc. with other novel ideas that have a powerful symbolic appeal: the need for a global social contract (un contrat social mondial), or the need to fight the present global situation which can be likened to a global apartheid (20% light-skinned rich rule over 80% darker-skinned poor), or that it is the concrete mechanism needed to implement global inter-generational equity etc.
- Emphasize synergies with potential and unusual partners (eg CAHDI or Venice Commission of the Council of Europe)
- Publish a simple booklet entitled something like “Everything you always wanted to know about world democracy but were afraid to ask”
- Appear above the fray by providing resources and linking everyone
- Develop the theory of democracy engineering and train world citizenship and world democracy consultants (for companies, governments, inter-governmental bodies, foundations, NGOs)
- Cultivate good relations with key actors, i.e. the Comité des conseillers juridiques sur le droit international public (CAHDI). “Le CAHDI est un comité intergouvernemental qui réunit les conseillers juridiques des ministères des Affaires étrangères des États membres du Conseil de l’Europe et un nombre important d’États et organisations observateurs.” www.coe.int/T/F/Affaires_juridiques/Cooperation_juridique/Droit_international_public/G9n9ral/C_PresidentsetVicepresidents.asp#TopOfPage

In general, emphasize that global democracy is the best way to implement what both Kissinger and Joseph Nye agree on: “The test of history for the United States will be whether we can turn our current predominant power into international consensus and our own principles into widely accepted international norms.”

Table of selected initiatives (the ones we should connect with are marked with (+) or (++). Two + mean true emergent global governance, one + means not true global governance, but linear sum of national ones)

! t-180Examples of initiatives	Personal meetings! rdrs
World Movement for Democracy www.wmd.org/ (+)	Carl Gershman
! fpat19 Fondat ion des Citoye ns du Monde www.worldcitizen.org and World Democ racy Campa ign, World Constit ution Project (++)! trautofi t1	
! mInternational Ethical, Political and Scientific Collegium (no site yet, in preparation, unofficial site www.blednet.org/) ¹⁴ (++)tsWidth3	Sacha Goldman, Michel Rocard, Edgar Morin! rdr
Comité d'Action pour un Parlement Mondial www.parlementmondial.com (dormant)	Olivier Giscard d'Estaing, George Berthoin! 8
UBUNTU, World Campaign for In-depth Reform of the System of	Federico Mayor

¹⁴ 5 October 2002 Statement of Kofi Annan given by Danilo Türk, Assistant Secretary-General to the UN is typical of the lack of vision and of « langue de bois” , though in a private conversation with the author, Mr. Türk fully agreed to the idea of world democracy and seemed more open than Mr. Annan: www.un.org/apps/sg/sgstats.asp?nid=96

International Institutions (++)? http://ubuntu.upc.es/world_camp_eng.htm	Zaragoza, Josep Xercavins i Valls
! -180Width3Global Democracy and Human Rights project, World Policy Institute, (++)? www.worldpolicy.org/projects/globalrights/index.html ¹⁵	None
! addr108Council for a Community of Democracies, (+) www.ccd21.org/about.htm	John Richardsonowd
! One World Trust: Global Accountability Project and Charter 99 www.oneworldtrust.org/ (+)! vertalt clbrdr	
The Parliamentary Network on the World Bank, www.pnowb.org ¹⁶ see also the two comments at the end of this section. (+)	Jean-Christophe Bas! rdrw45
EarthAction, and e-Parliament The e-Parliament, now being developed, will be a “democratic global “think-tank” centred on the world’s elected members of parliament and congress, which can feed into global policy-making.	Nick Dunlop!
St-George’s House : What kind of New World Order?, www.new-worldorder.org (++)?	Peter Ashby
! trftsWidth3Network Institute on Global Democratization www.nigd.org , see below as well for comment. (++)?	! x1120x6720Teivo Teivainen, Katarina Sehm Patomäki, Leena Rikkilä
Mouvement CiTerrien www.citerre.org , to analyse	None
! 58 Global Education Associates www.globaleduc.org/	None !
! umCommission on Globalization, (+) www.commissiononglobalization.org/	Jim Garrison! clftsWidth3
State of the World Forum, www.worldforum.org/	Jim Garrison
! Mary Robinson Foundation:Ethical Globalization initiative, www.eginitiative.org ²⁶ (+)	None
! w45Commission on Global Governance, Our Global Neighborhood	Wangari Maathai! 1
World Constitution and Parliament Association Association, www.wcpagren.org	Phil Isely, Eugenia Almand

! rdrw45Simon Burall, Titus Alexander! ard

15 This project has a good description: “In the absence of regional and global democratic institutions, a democratic deficit is opening up as more and more decisions are made by elite international bodies that are not elected by the people whom their decisions affect. The Project explores issues of democracy and human rights in the context of globalization. It identifies problems, and points to solutions, with an emphasis on multilateral approaches. Ultimately, the solution to the problems of globalization is to expand democratic institutions and the rule of law to the regional and global levels”

16 The green shoots of global democracy? The high priests of globalisation at the World Bank & the IMF are facing new democratic pressures. Faisal Islam, Sunday March 16, 2003 www.observer.co.uk/worldview/story/0,11581,915396,00.html

brdrf8 World Council for Corporate Governance, www.wcfcg.net/ (+)	None! dr108
! 0Finnish Government, Helsinki Conference, (++) www.helsinkiconference.fi/ The Government of Finland has committed itself to advancing a multi-stakeholder dialogue on necessary changes within the structures of global governance, and to finding new ways of solving the most urgent global problems. (Precursor conference held in Summer 2000 and organized by NIGD. Proposing a global summit on global governance after 2005).	! rin0Martti Ahtisaari, Nitin Desai, Anna Lindh, Clovis Maksoud, Nigel Martin, Kumi Naidoo, JF Rischard, Sirpa Pietikäinen, Andrew Strauss, Yash Tandon, Erkki Tuomioja
! 10rdrtAlliance for a Responsible, Plural and United World, Assemblée Mondiale constitutionnelle pour 2008/2010, (++) www.alliance21.org	Pierre Calame, Gustavo! Marin
! ltrbGlobal Truth & Reconciliation Commission www.thewarpxperience.org/partyforpeace/globaltrc	
! lbrdrftsWidth3World Federalist Movement, www.wfm.org and World Federalist Association (USA, the largest in the association) plusses ??? ++	Peter Ustinov, James Ritchie, John Anderson, Bill Pace, Keith Best!
! dctlparATTAC, field www.attac.org , “Attac promeut une citoyenneté mondiale” ¹⁷ (+)	Bernard Cassen, Dominique Plihon! ght
! lbrdrblftsWidth3Tavola per la Pace (++) , www.tavoladellapace.it for a UN of the People! brdrf8	
Global Peoples Assembly/Millennium Peoples Assembly Network (dormant), www.ourvoices.org	Rob Wheeler, Sue Zipp
! sCCC-UN, UN Citizens Assembly, INFUSA (International Network for a Second Assembly) www.camdun-online.gn.apc.org/citizen.html (dormant)	Harry Lerner
! utofit1Registre International des Citoyens du Monde (créé par Garry Davis en 1949). Les Citoyens du Monde historiques ont élus des représentants à l'Assemblée Mondiale des Peuples, un proto Parlement Mondial. (en train de se réveiller) http://citmonde.free.fr/Organisation.htm et	Renée and Guy Marchand (décédés), Daniel Durand
! rdw45rdrcf8 CCC-UN, UN Citizens Assembly, INFUSA (International Network for a Second Assembly) ! www.camdun-online.gn.apc.org/citizen.html (semi-dormant)	H. Lerner, J. Winchester, B. Bogen, J. Spivack..
! brdrf8 None cltxlrthMarche Mondiale des Femmes demande: Une organisation politique mondiale, non monolithique, ayant autorité sur l'économie, avec	Dianne Matte! rtb

17 Entretien avec René Passet, p. 274, Les Nouveaux Utopistes du Développement Durable, Anne-Marie Ducroux, Collection Mutations, Autrement (Paris 2002), Passet est l'auteur de « Eloge du Mondialisme par un anti présumé », Fayard 2001

représentativité égalitaire et démocratique entre tous les pays de la terre (parité entre pays pauvres et pays riches) et représentativité paritaire entre les femmes et les hommes.

www.ffq.qc.ca/marche2000/fr/cahier/liste.html

World Civil Society Forum, emanation of UN Millennium NGO Summit, which was supposed to be a Millennium People's Assembly (dixit Kofi Annan) until Annan bowed to the will of some powerful member states.

Sebastian Ziegler,
Robbie Wheeler,
Cyril Ritchie! r108

Commentaire de Alain Liepietz, membre du Réseau parlementaire sur la banque Mondiale: http://lipietz.net/article.php3?id_article=71
In table ?

Steering committee Parlementaires-Banque mondiale

Cette réunion, financée par la Banque Mondiale, regroupait les organisateurs de la rencontre de La Haye qui avait rassemblé l'an dernier une soixantaine de parlementaires, essentiellement européens, plus quelques parlementaires du Sud. Le but était de consolider un réseau mondial de parlementaires.

PRAGUE, le 23 septembre 2000

La réunion a été essentiellement consacrée à définir ce réseau, ses rapport à la Banque Mondiale, et à préparer le prochain événement. Raisonnablement, on ne peut (actuellement) imaginer un " parlement mondial " contrôlant formellement les Institutions Financières Internationales (IFI). Le but est plutôt de créer une d'intergroupe composé de parlementaires motivés, dans une double direction :

Une exigence de " democratic accountability " (avoir à rendre compte devant les citoyens) adressée au IFI. Une mission d'" advocacy " (de plaider la cause) de la coopération et de l'aide au développement, vis-à-vis des autres parlementaires.

Le bureau des relations extérieures-Europe de la Banque Mondiale a eu un rôle actif dans les premiers pas de ce " steering committee ". La Banque Mondiale, dans le cours de son actuelle évolution, cherche à refonder sa légitimité sur un meilleur rapport avec les ONG, et aussi avec les Parlementaires, ce qui d'ailleurs n'est pas conforme à ses statuts (la Banque Mondiale est responsable devant les exécutifs : elle est donc plus libre de discuter avec les ONG qu'avec les Parlements et elle a un intérêt à la constitution d'une initiative parlementaire.)

En revanche, il n'est pas bon qu'un comité de suivi de la Banque Mondiale soit entièrement financé par celle-ci. Une subvention a donc été demandée au gouvernement néerlandais, hôte de la première réunion. Enfin, le Comité envisage d'étudier le champ de ses préoccupations à l'ensemble des IFI.

Une réunion semblable à celle de la Haye (sur laquelle existe une publication) est envisagée pour février à Londres.

Conversation de Troy Davis avec Jean-Christophe Bas de la Banque Mondiale, responsable du réseau parlementaire: Le ! but ultime du réseau parlementaire est effectivement de

devenir un vrai parlement mondial, et de s'étendre au FMI, OMC etc. Notons que J.C. Bas est Alsacien, qu'il a failli être mis à la porte après que les Américains aient hurlé et demandé sa tête, mais qu'il fut protégé par son supérieur hiérarchique, Mr. Jean-François Rischard, le seul Vice-président hors de Washington (à Paris depuis 1998). Comme par hasard, le père de Jean-Christophe connaissait bien Garry Davis et fut un des premiers parlementaires français après 1945 à organiser une rencontre de parlementaires franco-allemande.

! Other world parliament-related initiatives

r

In addition to the ones in the table, the Director General of UNCTAD has said that it seeks to be the World Parliament of globalization, the European Parliament passed a Resolution for the UN to create a World Parliament (1984).

Jacques Attali, patron de PlanetFinance (www.planetfinance.org/) appelle dans Libération à un Parlement Mondial pour gérer la mondialisation et lever un impôt mondial sur l'énergie fossile, Président Vaclav Havel dans son discours à l'ONU en 2000 propose d'élire à terme un parlement mondial. La Marche Mondiale des Femmes (basée à Montréal demande un parlement mondial à moitié du Nord et du Sud et à moitié d'hommes et de femmes.

Historically, the Parliamentarians for Global Action were for a world parliament, as was the Interparliamentary Union, and the UN General Assembly as the UN was being defined. Even China accepted a world government, as did the US, but the USSR and its satellites would not.

Travaux théoriques sur la démocratie mondiale

Schizophrenic global governance studies:

! 11206720 Center for the Study of Global Governance www.lse.ac.uk/Depts/global
Network Institute on Global Democratization www.nigd.org

Global Democracy Initiatives: The Art of Possible (2002)

Heikki Patomäki, Teivo Teivainen and Mika Rönkkö

Political Initiatives to Democratize Globalization (2001)

Coherent global governance studies:

! in567 Prof. Falk et Andrew Strauss proposent une Assemblée Mondiale des Peuples et un Parlement Mondial

Prof. David Held parle de démocratie cosmopolite

Civitas International explore la théorie de la démocratie mondiale (bras de recherche de la Fondation des Citoyens du Monde)

Professor Ben Barber explore global democracy in his CivicWorld initiative (personal communication), "Currently, I would say that globalization is a force that works against democracy. However, the response is not to deglobalize, but rather to also globalize democracy, or perhaps, to put it differently, to democratize globalization"

St-George's House: What kind of New World Order do we want? www.new-worldorder.org, Peter Ashby

Network Institute on Global Democratization www.nigd.org
 Constraints for Global Democracy?
 Draft Treaty on Global Currency Transactions Tax (2002)

Unserious initiatives:

Research Centre for Global Governance,
 Earth Government, Germain Dufour, <http://members.shaw.ca/earthgov/>
 Global Nation, Amadeus Rockefeller (nearly a parody though he was very serious in our email exchange)

! IT and world democracy initiatives

Name	Web site!
! Bodies Electric	www.bodieselectric.com , democratic solutions for a wired world! th1889
Global Democracy Experiment rbrdrb	www.tgde.com . We believe that another world is possible. But what does this new world look like? The GDE is not just against the current world order, it is a positive vision of a fully democratic world, in which everybody will take part and have a say.! h108
Sammondano	www.sammondano.org Creating Global Constituent Processes through Participatory Networking Software for Transnational Citizen Groups (indirect offshoot WCF)
! 10 airVivarto.com and Global Democracy Now	www.vivarto.com/globaldemocracynow/policy_making.html

! 0

Strategic issues and untapped opportunities on the horizon:

Corporate world citizenship

Most GG initiatives are anti-corporate, either explicitly and by design, or indirectly via IMF and WB critique etc.

On the other end of the spectrum, a few elitist processes have managed to coopt TNCs, but at the cost of becoming bland and similar to many other non-GG initiatives. The so-called Global Corporate Citizenship initiatives simply relabeled their old corporate social responsibility programs. They left out completely the dimension of “citizenship” which defines it; the existence of the “polis”, in this case, the global polis.

!

Therefore, these initiatives are easy targets for activists and are not very credible outside the global elite. The best example of this is the Commission on Globalization, inheritor of the State of the World Forum, a creature led and manipulated by Jim Garrison, a shady, politically ambitious former minister from California who leveraged a relationship with Gorbachev to build

his organization. After saving his empire by convincing a credulous IT entrepreneur to bail him out to the tune of 1M \$ (a man who is known to believe in extra-terrestrials), he closed down the main activity of the State of the World Forum (the annual conferences) and jumped on the globalization bandwagon. But he quickly lost focus. A bit has been regained this year with an upcoming conference (see conference section).

Apart from the World Democracy Campaign which explicitly targets companies, there are few, if no, campaigns that target companies.

The WCF invited and informed the WEF to become member of the WD Campaign in 1999, and continued with correspondence with Klaus Schwab and Claude Smadja, suggesting that the WEF theme should be "The democratization of globalization and the globalization of democracy" This suggestion was not heeded, but in 2001, the World Economic Forum decided to adopt world citizenship as a core concept for its member companies. It even made global corporate citizenship one of the main themes of the 2003 meeting.

But what is most noteworthy is the profound lack of theoretical understanding of what world citizenship is or means for a company. The unrelated hodge-podge and incoherence of the initiative, which basically recycles all the old corporate social responsibility of the 80's and 90's, is the reason why after 2 years, the WEF and Klaus Schwab, with its incredible persuasion and resources, have only convinced 40 of its over 1000 member companies to sign on. This uninspiring statistics makes the WEF the least efficient of all such initiatives, when measured in I/O performance.

From the WEF site: www.weforum.org/corporatecitizenship:

Global Corporate Citizenship Initiative

To facilitate good corporate citizenship amongst its members, the World Economic Forum has established the Global Corporate Citizenship Initiative. The Initiative was launched in Geneva, Switzerland on 24 July 2001. Participation consists of more than 40 Forum member companies committed to corporate citizenship, as well as representatives from other organizations and initiatives with specific knowledge in the area. Through cooperation with leading business leaders and by discussing corporate citizenship at various Forum events, the Initiative hopes to increase businesses' engagement in and support for corporate social responsibility as a business strategy with long term benefits both for the companies themselves as well as society in general.

Companies supporting the Statement: ABB, Abbott Laboratories, Abril Group, Accenture, Ahold, Anglo American, Anglovaal Mining, Aramex International, Arthur D. Little, Artoc Group, Ayala Corporation, Bajaj Auto, Boots Company, Budimex, Carlson Companies, The Coca-Cola Company, Codelco Chile, DHL Worldwide Express, Deloitte Touche Tohmatsu, Deutsche Bank, Diageo, Electricité de France (EDF), Empresas Polar, Fleetboston Global Bank, ING Group, Infosys Technologies, Lafarge, MTR, McDonald's Corporation, Merck & Co., Organizacoes Globo, Phillips - Van Heusen, PricewaterhouseCoopers, Renault, Rio Tinto, S.C. Johnson & Son, Siemens, Statoil, Thames Water, Transnet, UBS, WMC Resources Limited, Xenel Industries

Other similar non-coherent Global Corporate Citizenship initiatives

The incestuous nature of global corporate associations is shown by the spread of the concept of global corporate citizenship by a small group of cadres in various organizations who climbed on this latest fad, as it sounded real good, in spite of its intellectual limitations.

This is a strategic opportunity for a coherent initiative to target corporations, who would probably rather be presented with a coherent framework than with unconnected and unrelated dots simply relabeled.

World Economic Center global corporate citizenship

<http://www.wec.org/icsr> the fact this web page is gone is an illustration of the lack of staying power of the concept. Note that the original name of the page was “international corporate social responsibility”, which was quickly relabeled global corporate citizenship, without any real in-depth understanding.

! 0The 2003 Leadership Conference on Global Corporate Citizenship, Transparency: The New Rules of the Game

The Waldorf-Astoria, New York, NY, Feb 10-Feb 11, 2003

www.conference-board.org/conferences/conference.cfm?id=368

“Corporate citizenship: In 2003, look for more US companies to sign on to the big definers of citizenship practice on the global stage, such as the UN Global Compact and the Global Sullivan Principles. Due mostly to concerns over potential legal liability and hesitation over agreeing to globally respect collective bargaining by workers, many large US firms remain noticeably absent from these defining global movements. For competitive and other reasons this non-involvement is probably unsustainable and so we should look for some resolution to be worked out. More than ever, corporate engagement with society is a strategic concern not only of philanthropy, but of the corporation as a whole. In 2003, this correlation will continue to intensify.” David J. Vidal Director of Research - Global Corporate Citizenship at The Conference Board, New York, and Publisher of "Across the Board" magazine.

The same conference is promoted by the Prince of Wales International

Business Leaders Forum. <http://www.iblf.org/csr/csrwebassist.nsf/content/fl.html>

Here too, the Prince of Wales Forum is first and foremost the Corporate Social Responsibility Forum.

The rare companies that publish Global Corporate Citizenship Reports repackage their environmental or social statements: Motorola, Siemens

(<http://www.motorola.com/EHS/environment/reports/>)

Genetic engineering and world democracy

Genetic engineering is a Pandora's box which will affect the entire world, and possibly the very

foundations of what we believe and the very foundations of the entire human rights superstructure.

Technology has advanced to the point that humans are able to radically change the planetary environment, endangering an unknown number of species and possibly altering the very character of Humanity, as well as endangering the survival of Humanity itself.

This is a recent development and the philosophies of past millennia have rested on a fundamental bedrock of certainties which have been shattered. The conservative thinker Francis Fukuyama, most famous for his book *The End of History and the Last Man* explains in his latest book *The Post-Human Future: Consequences of the Biotechnology Revolution*, the danger and puts it as follows: „The more science tells us about human nature, the more implications there are for human rights, and hence for the design of institutions and public policies that protects them.“ And he argues for more regulation.

The Futurist Society in its special report *Forecasts for the next 25 Years* predicts that „parents will design their ‚ideal‘ child‘ by 2012.

In a recent issue of Wired magazine, a book review explains why designer children are a bad development for society. (The end of Human Nature www.wired.com/wired/archive/11.05/play.html?pg=3)¹⁸. It seems a popular topic as at the same time, the Village Voice has the same topic on its cover (Coming Soon: Genetically Enhanced People, www.villagevoice.com/issues/0317/baard.php)¹⁹

Soon, technology will allow us to modify what it is that makes us human: through cloning and the genetic engineering and creation of „enhanced“ human. This could lead to a „biological divide“, to social unrest of the unenhanced humans, of several classes of citizens which would destroy the very core of the principles of human equality which are the base of human rights and the US Declaration of Independence etc..

Obviously, society needs to discuss these developments and come to some understanding and

18 “Bill McKibben understands genetics - but he knows poetry, too. In his brave and luminous book, *Enough: Staying Human in an ! Engineered Age* (Times/Holt, \$25), McKibben plays the part of the mariner, forecasting a frightening catastrophe brought on by human obliviousness. *Enough* indicts germline technology, the so-called designer baby science that aims to let parents improve their offspring by pasting desirable genes into their kid's DNA. What's so bad about that? McKibben explains: By ordering up athletics-enhanced, music-enhanced, optimism-enhanced children, you are not merely urging them in some direction - all parents do that; you are wiring your own tastes into their genes, literally twisting their minds and bodies into the shape you have chosen. And this staggering arrogance is bound to be futile because the technology will get better over time.”

19 “With this new knowledge comes new power, the ability to shape our fundamental form—and, one day, to better it. Within our lifetime, scientists say, we will see the advent of genetically enhanced human beings, babies who might look like all the others in the nursery but will grow up to jump higher, learn faster, live longer. Powerful and privileged, they could also become a vulnerable minority, as much subject to prejudice as primed for success.”

agreement on what should be done, if anything. Even doing nothing should be a conscious decision. But who decides? Here again, these decisions are potentially so momentous, and so heavy for the future of Humanity, that whatever comes out of the process, will only be listened to if the global population believe! in the legitimacy of the process.

This brings us right back to the need for a legitimate global democracy.

Diseases, epidemics and public health and world democracy

The SARS epidemic which in just a few months has caused hundreds of deaths and tens of billions of dollars of economic damage is just the latest illustration of the need to create legitimate global institutions. Imagine a terrorist group « enhancing » the SARS virus, or deliberately getting infected, then flying to New York, and walking in as many crowded places as possible until the bio-terrorist himself collapses ?

This is the easiest of the poor's quasi-WMD that is a potential threat already today. One infected individual spending a few days in fancy and crowded department stores at Christmastime could decimate the NY upperclass, or the US government if it were in the Washington Metro.

Epidemics like that expose the natural tendencies of closed governments like the Chinese and have a wonderful opening effect. In effect, the SARS virus has already created an antiseptic effect against Chinese governmental secrecy and created a precedent which China cannot ignore.

A world democracy is needed to have the legitimacy to take measures that otherwise would be very contested, and to minimize protests and sabotage of those measures (assuming they are well-intended), thus minimizing the spread of the epidemic. Without a legitimate world democracy, a vicious circle can set in : people protest the process by which the decision was taken (even if it is a sound decision), willfully or not sabotage the medical measures decided to limit the epidemic, the epidemic spreads and authorities must take even stronger liberty-limiting measures. If the epidemic is global, the worst case of a global crackdown is not difficult to see. A Global Epidemics Council set up under the World Health Organization might be given emergency global powers, amounting to an unconstitutional world dictatorship.

Terrorism and world democracy

Terrorism as a human « artificial » phenomenon can amplify and magnify the other natural problems. Terrorists can only succeed really if they are emotionally or ideologically supported by large swaths of public opinion. The Islamic world for example feels disenfranchised and humiliated. If a world parliament existed where a billion Muslims could express themselves, it is likely that terrorists using fundamentalist Islam (in this particular example) would encounter less success and have less support.

Corruption and world democracy

The issue of corruption is one vastly underestimated for its popular appeal. Its appeal is demonstrated by the fact that most peoples critique democracy if it is seen to go hand in hand with corruption, as is often seen in newly democratic regimes. Though there is no direct cause (the reason is that both democracy and corruption are caused by greater freedom, and that usually new democratic regimes are poor and have weak governance structures), people often yearn for the return of a “strong hand”.

There is here another untapped issue with vast potential.

Transparency International, the leading international NGO fighting corruption, is a member of the World Democracy Campaign, and Jeremy Pope, their executive director, is member of the Provisional Steering Committee (dormant).

Environment and world democracy

Global environmental issues are a natural for world democracy. If we believe that global warming is one of the largest potential threats to human civilisation, then one worse-case scenario might be that to save the human species, some sort of global green fascism may rise. It is not difficult to imagine scenarios where global environmental catastrophes, coupled with economic recession!, and possibly wars (and maybe earthquakes in globally sensitive economic regions such as California or Taiwan or Japan) could create chaos and a breakdown. Times of crisis are always dangerous for democracy and if there is no global democracy yet, and no legitimate process, then in the name of the survival of the species, a global dictator might arise.

World Democracy is an insurance policy against such worst cases. It is irresponsible and dangerous to rely on best case scenarios and wishful thinking when planning global politics.

The UN Environment Programme today is merely a “programme”, ie the poor stepchild of the UN system. That is why many propose turning it into a World Environment Organization, which would effectively make it into the Environmental Protection Agency of the world. That would concretize the worst fears of the anti-globalist crowd, since it is relatively easy to impose innocuous sounding rules in the name of some obscure scientific rationale which few people understand.

par

In this case again, it is absolutely vital that a global EPA not be a disconnected and unaccountable agency (except to its own mini world parliament called the Governing Council), but it is accountable to a broader global body with unchallengeable legitimacy (compared to any other body).

France, under pressure from the French world citizens (created by Garry Davis in 1949) has officialled called for a World Environmental Authority. Jacques Chirac went even further and called for this Autorité Mondiale de l'Environnement (World Environmental Authority) to have global powers “because pollution does not stop at the borders”²⁰.

20 Appel de la Haye de François Mitterrand de créer une Autorité Mondiale de l'Environnement (1991), repris par! M. Jacques Chirac, discours du 50ème anniversaire de l'IUCN

A few smart people to follow (category to expand on)

Mike Moore, former head of WTO and Peter Sutherland, his predecessor: “The real question for Moore, having rehearsed the good news as well as the bad in a broad swathe of social and economic fields, is whether the present state of global governance is up to the job. Despite his three years leading a new institution, his answer is no. He supports the concept of a "voluntary global democratic caucus", involving national parliaments holding to account multilateral institutions.” In Financial Times Book review by Peter Sutherland: A frustrated global governor
Published: April 21 2003 19:24.

A World Without Walls: Freedom, Development, Free Trade and Global Governance, by Mike Moore, Cambridge University Press, \$30.

<http://news.ft.com/servlet/ContentServer?pagename=FT.com/StoryFT/FullStory&c=StoryFT&cid=1048313912735>

! autoBill Joy, cofounder and Chief Scientist of Sun Microsystems²¹, and the author of a very widely read article in Wired magazine which is absolute reading for all those in our field: *! Why the future doesn't need us*. “Our most powerful 21st-century technologies - robotics, genetic engineering, and nanotech - are threatening to make humans an endangered species” Issue 8.04 - Apr 2000 (www.wired.com/wired/archive/8.04/joy.html).

! to

A few excellent reasoned critiques (category to expand on)

1. Of “cosmopolitan citizenship”

The Cosmopolitan Illusion By Lee Harris, Policy Review, Hoover Institution, April 2003, www.policyreview.org/apr03/harris.html

! spnum

2. Of the schizophrenic nature of global governance initiatives and the Commission on Global Governance. www.sovereignty.net/p/gov/gganalysis.htm

! ght

“The recommendations of the Commission, if implemented, will bring all the people of the world into a global neighborhood managed by a world-wide bureaucracy, under the direct authority of a minute handful of appointed individuals, and policed by thousands of individuals, paid by accredited NGOs, certified to support a belief system, which to many people - is unbelievable and unacceptable.”

Scénarios de construction d’une démocratie mondiale

Voici les 4 scénarios généraux possibles de création d’une démocratie mondiale. Il seraient bon de comparer les propositions existantes et de la mettre dans la catégorie appropriée.

(Fontainebleau, 1999, participation de l’auteur)

Proposition initiale du Registre des Citoyens du Monde français.

21 www.sun.com/aboutsun/media/ceo/mgt_joy.html

!

Scénario dépendant d'institutions existantes: l'ONU, l'OMC, l'Union Inter-Parlementaire, les autres unions parlementaires, etc.

Scénario inter-étatique indépendant d'institutions existantes: par exemple, confédération d'états démocratiques, création d'un "bloc" démocratique ("Communauté des Démocraties", proposition de Soros, Albright etc.)

Scénario de genèse par les ONGs (Forum Mondial de la Société Civil, Forum Social Mondial etc.)

Scénario indépendant: le plus radical mais probablement le meilleur car le plus propre et donc le plus apte à mobiliser les peuples à grande échelle sans souffrir le poids du passé. Les scénarios dépendants sont tous basés sur l'ancien paradigme de l'élite (étatique ou ONGs) et aucune institution existante ou groupe d'institutions existantes n'a assez de prestige mondialement.

Interesting past or future events

International Democracy and Global Governance, 24-26 March 2001, Venice, Venice International University

Global Governance 2002: Civil Society and the Democratization of Global Governance, October 13-16, 2002 www.fimcivilsociety.org/g02/

The 2003 Leadership Conference on Global Corporate Citizenship:
Transparency: The New Rules of the Game
The Waldorf-Astoria, New York, NY, Feb 10-Feb 11, 2003

www.conference-board.org/conferences/conference.cfm?id=368

! 0

Sixth Session of the Provisional World Parliament, convening in accordance with Article 19 of the Constitution for the Federation of Earth.

www.wcpagren.org/cnfdeart.dir/article19.html

23rd-28th March 2003, Puk-Tian Resort Hotel, Phetchaburi Province, Thailand

"National Sovereignty and Universal Challenges"

18-20 June 2003 - Brussels

http://www.commissiononglobalization.org/homelinks/ce_nationalsov.htm

Some sources of information

8950!

4e470d0a1a0a000000d49484452000002bc00000052080300000081b5f7aa00000004674
14d410000d904dcb2da0200000060504c5445ffffff0b5b5e9e9e9cc00004848917575aad9

3d3dd9d9e03838868888b8f2f2f2fffffe57e7e111170f7d7d7de5858f8f8f8edededababc8b
bbbd6dfdfeacbcdb9b9d0fcfcfcfefefeeef59999c1212179cfefefcf0f0fd21f1f000066bb
53413b0000000970485973fffffffffffff01ca4ef51700001d4849444154789ced9d0b77ab
aa12804d8aa9da98f88cafb6fcff7f79670650407c25da9e9e7b66edb59b280286cf611806f4
3efe9355e2fd8454d58f14f3af91df86e2afc8af36520d54d7491425559524c924e170a64ad2
334a1ac13f1248af5f50d73f50df9f92df86e2afc84fb5474da45589040f79ada2732f291c40f
c128f52a411120ba0e2a1f4ac492ad98d12a2b546ee31c339762b7c362a43e69e9567ef70bf
ac7ea6e9af1725d7832e5897cda9ff7e396dcb69bf5f7c566a2030a98119803191c79228458
9549aeabc5ed2148187ff00e3050aeb8444004ca027f4fccc2be592ab8996439d93a79050d
4b3e4fa7ab949385c6e54dc9655d5e9b2f5897cdb5fffeb6f1a1d8ebf7d645d264c2817a368
d48e34552e546e665c90678073dbc581b84978c8df41c09c58fda7b5fd58b596177821f777
8265e414397d3750045d072bd4d43b428
www.theglobalist.com/

Global Governance: A Review of Multilateralism & International Organizations, Published by the Academic Council on the United Nations System (ACUNS) and the United Nations University (UNU). Main office at University of Alberta. Liaison offices at the Ralph Bunche Institute for International Studies, the CUNY Graduate Centre, and the Centre for International Studies, Oxford University www.arts.ualberta.ca/globalgovernance

Potential sources of funding (to be researched further):

Stanley Foundation, <http://www.stanleyfoundation.org/GG.shtml>
Rockefeller Brothers Fund, <http://www.rbf.org/securityprog.html>
Ford Foundation, <http://www.fordfound.org/program/govern.cfm>
Aventis Foundation, <http://www.aventis-foundation.org/>
Bertelsmann Foundation www.bertelsmann-stiftung.de/index.cfm?lan=en
UN Foundation, <http://www.unfoundation.org/>
Rockefeller Foundation <http://www.rockfound.org/>
Ted Turner Foundation (seriously reduced commitments recently)
Fritz Thyssen Stiftung, <http://www.fritz-thyssen-stiftung.de/>
Soros Foundation, <http://www.soros.org/>
Charles Stewart Mott Fndtn, www.mott.org/programs/programs.asp
William and Flora Hewlett Foundation, www.hewlett.org/
David and Lucile Packard Foundation,
MacArthur Foundation www.macfound.org/programs/gss!/GC.htm Henry Luce
Foundation, www.hluce.org/index.html
John Templeton Foundation, <http://www.templeton.org!/>
Hitachi Foundation, www.hitachifoundation.org

A few valuable quotes (more available)

“You need a global and democratic system of political decision making” ! ar Thabo Mbeki,
President of South Africa, Saturday, 3 June 2000,
World Summit of left leaders, Reuters

"We need to move toward a more ethical globalization and find a way to have "civic"
democracy on an international level”.

Mary Robinson, former President of Ireland, UN High Commissioner for Human Rights, World
Economic Forum 2002, New York City, 3 February 2002

“World Democracy: With this in view, the concepts of democracy, world democracy, solidarity,
reaches their full meaning. If nothing is done to lead the world towards democracy, no good
will come of it and we will be living in a totalitarian system. If nothing is done to adhere to a
code of moral values and principles, citizenship and a new conception of solidarity, this will
reduce the individual to nothing and destroy societies and identities. Given the future prospects
of international life, we should start to promote democracy globally. We need to keep in mind
that to have a true meaning, democracy must be exerted in each and every area of authority: at a
national level, of course, but also international, and nowadays, supranational. Because
democracy is not only a form of government of the State or between States. Democracy should
be the way of exerting any authority, whatever its form, within the contemporary international
society. Unmistakably, the globalisation of the economy should go together with the
globalisation of democracy. This international task could only be carried out if something is done
at all levels of authority in the ! international society.”

Boutros Boutros-Ghali, former UN Secretary General,
Secretary-general, La Francophonie, FAO, 1997

“Large problems simply cannot be solved by individual nation states. They, therefore, have to
renew the oaths they took upon independence, peace and solidarity hundreds of years ago --
they must renew the oath to peace, not just within one country, but to peace throughout the
world... For one of the consequences of globalization is that we are becoming increasingly
dependent on one another... Today, the problems of the few become problems for the whole
world, problems for us all... Globalization is not a specter that we should be afraid of or that
we have to fight... its is neutral. But we must not just leave it to economic and technological
forces, we also have to use it and drive it forward as a political and cultural vehicle. **World
Citizenship !** that is a dream that we all share and one that we wish to continue working towards
beyond this National Day and this camp... ”

Moritz Leuenberger, President, Switzerland, World Scout Assembly, Interlaken, Swiss National
Day, 1 August 2001, www.uvek.admin.ch/gs

“Within each country, we have witnessed a strengthening of democratic ideals over the last few decades, especially after the end of the Cold War. However, democracy is everywhere an open-ended process, even in those countries where it was established long ago... Moreover, in the international arena, challenges are arising that threaten the exercise of **democratic, global citizenship**. The growing global importance of economic processes has not been matched by a proportional improvement in international governance structures.. As a result, even as globalization broadens the opportunities available to mankind, it simultaneously represents a genuine challenge to democracy. **We must squarely confront the fact that there is a deficit of democratic citizenship at the international level and insist that progressive governance expand beyond the domestic scene.**”

Fernando Henrique Cardoso, President of Federative Republic of Brazil, Challenges to
Citizenship in the Era of Globalization

“How far can we go in the direction of increasing transnational flows and growing international interdependence without ! a proportional development of governance structures? Is there not a governance deficit in a world that becomes every day more “globalised”, but in which international cooperation fails to address some of the serious problems? And governance - either domestic or international - cannot be built solely on power. It has to be built on legitimacy and responsibility, which can only be achieved through participation and dialogue - and not only among the seven or eight most powerful countries.... **Here, again, there is a governance deficit in international politics. And here, again, the issue is not about power, but about legitimacy.... What we have here is the foundation of a truly cosmopolitan perspective**, in the sense expressed by the German philosopher Immanuel Kant, when he argued for a style of international politics that reflected not merely a balance of power among different nations, but also a higher standpoint: that of the! whole human kind. Some might call this utopia. I call it ethics. And I am convinced that one of the most important developments in international relations over the last decades has been precisely the strengthening of this ethical dimension. This is the real challenge of governance at the international level.”

Fernando Henrique Cardoso, President of Federative Republic of Brazil German Society for
Foreign Affairs, Berlin, 5 October 2000.

(Rare) example of Christian rationale for World Government from the web site called **one grain of salt**, www.onesalt.com by Maj. Christopher C. Currie, (ret.) curriec@onesalt.com

Example 1: “worshipping and subordinating one's ideals to "national sovereignty" and it's promises of "absolute power" is in many ways like worshipping and subordinating one's ideals to Satan himself! As we will see in my commentary on the Book of Daniel (which, as it is turning out, will take me a few more months to complete), the inherently evil! and temporary nature of the "absolute power" promised by the national sovereignty system is one of the major issues addressed by the authors of Daniel.”

Example 2: The most important lessons of 2002. Our government still wants to gamble American lives on teachings of Satan. (Nov-Dec 02)

1. Regarding the issue of war: The ultimate moral depravity of our government's present policies is so classically predictable, that it's been a recurring theme among writers throughout recorded history. Consider the 2nd chapter of Matthew, for example.

CONCLUSION: The world's present "national sovereignty system" is not only obsolete; it is downright dangerous for EVERYBODY (including American citizens at home and abroad)! What the world needs is a CIVILIZED approach to solving such problems (i.e. the establishment of a true world government to effectively deal with such problems on a world-wide scale). MOST American businesses would benefit tremendously from such an approach. But the Bush Administration has instead been following the "logic of national sovereignty" by employing a loose-cannon-superpower approach that will inevitably lead to large-scale bloodshed and still not fundamentally solve any of the problems described above. Unfortunately for everyone, our political leaders in the Democratic Party have dismally failed to offer the American people a viable alternative to such approach.

Post-report note: This report is a useful foundation to continue analyzing the field of GG. To have a comprehensive view will take more time and effort, which means more funding. To continue this research and analysis should be a top priority for obvious reasons, also because it will help us leverage funds.

Maintenant qu'un certain défrichage intellectuel a été réalisé, il sera plus facile de demander à d'autres personnes de faire des recherches en profondeur, y compris pour capturer dans notre nouvelle base de données les "naissances" et développements dans le domaine, et de classer ces développements d'après les critères et dimensions proposés ici. Ceci nous permettra de démultiplier les efforts et de valoriser à moindre coût l'investissement de ce rapport.

The World Citizen Foundation and its research arm, Civitatis International (www.civitatis.org), would be happy to continue this ! work under conditions to be agreed. Troy Davis, democracy engineer, President/CEO, World Citizen Foundation/Fondation des Citoyens du Monde