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Punctually, like the comet of Halley, the problem of the Security Council reform has appeared again on the horizon. And yet it continues to be formulated in a way that does not fit the most recent tendencies of international politics. The current structure of the Security Council was devised in an age of domination and inequality. At a distance of 60 years from the creation of the UN, the substance of the decision-making power in the UN is still concentrated in the hands of only five states out of 191. That structure has become wholly inadequate to present needs of the world and inconsistent with the goals of equality and justice in international politics. Hence the need to enlarge and transform it from the five big powers’ directory into a more representative body.

The traditional way to address this problem is to open the Security Council doors to the strongest states that have risen to prominent positions in the world power hierarchy and to entrust them the representation of the smaller states belonging to the same region. The decline in US international influence, as shown by the failure of the strategy of preventive war, suggests to entrust regional gendarmes (such as Germany, Japan, India, Brazil and a still-identified African country) with the responsibility of sharing the burden of maintaining the world order. This solution arouses the hostility of the states left out, particularly of those most qualified to a seat in that assembly. For instance, Pakistan is not willing to accept the candidacy of India, Argentina that of Brazil, Italy that of Germany and so forth. The bestowal of two new seats on the North and three on the South would indeed strengthen the representation of the South in the Security Council, but would also confirm the supremacy of the North and especially of Europe, which would get three seats, an entirely disproportionate weight, if we consider that the EU population amounts to 455 million inhabitants. In conclusion, this proposal reflects the principles of domination and inequality that have shaped the present Security Council structure, but are by now inadequate to meet the present needs of the world and incompatible with the objectives of equality and justice that are becoming paramount in international relations.

The best way to achieve an equitable reform of the Security Council is that involving the formation of regional groupings of states. The reorganization of the world order on the basis of groupings of states represents not only an alternative to the power hierarchies determined by the difference between states of varying sizes, but also to the world fragmentation into a cloud of small states and statelets, contrasted with very large states.

In fact, the huge disparity in size and power of member states represents the most serious shortcoming of the current structure of the UN. The constant increase in the number of member states (today they are approximately four times as many as in 1945) shows an alarming trend toward fragmentation and anarchy. It is necessary to let regional groupings form within the General Assembly, and increase their cohesion, so that they can later express themselves in the Security Council. The growing cohesion of the EU as a player in the UN is closely correlated to the degree of advancement in the unification process.
It is not to be forgotten that, in spite of the dramatic split of the EU brought about by the US attack on Iraq, member states’ decisions in the sphere of external relations show a high rate of convergence. This is true particularly in the field of economic, monetary and environmental policies, where Europe can speak with one single voice. In the WTO and the FAO the European Commission represents member states. But within the UN, the EU already acts in the great majority of cases as one single actor. For instance, in 1999 it took a common position in almost 95% of the General Assembly votes. Moreover, the forthcoming European Constitution, recognizing the international legal personality of the EU, creating the European Foreign Minister and promoting a single security and defense system through the “structured co-operations”, is destined to strengthen the international role of Europe. The weakness of Europe lies in the fact that its political decisions on foreign and security policy are to be made unanimously. This is the vacuum that has to be filled to make possible the entrance of the EU into the Security Council.

EU membership in the Council would also be an alternative to the hegemony of the three most powerful countries in the EU and to Germany’s demand for representation. It must be considered that the admission of Germany to the Security Council would encourage, in that country, the development of a foreign policy independent of that of the EU and thus provide a stimulus for the revival of German nationalism. If Germany’s reasons are recognized, how to ignore those of Italy, Spain, Poland and so on? If the Europeans decide to return to giving priority to national interests, the whole design of the European unity will be irretrievably damaged. Paradoxically this occurs when the ratification of the European Constitution is on the agenda.

A strong independent EU represents the first pillar of a renewed UN building based on regional groupings of states. The principal teaching that can be deduced from the history of international law and international organizations is that a well-functioning system of rules depends on a balance of power between the members of the states system. If one state is preponderant, it may afford to disregard the rights of other states. This means that the overcoming of the asymmetry that, due to the American hegemony, currently characterizes international relations, is the necessary step forward which can pave the way to the UN reform.

The integration processes under way in Africa, the Arab World, Southern Asia, South-East Asia and Latin America appear to be creating the conditions to attain the economic size required for the development of modern production techniques and to acquire the political weight needed to obtain a real independence from the great powers. If the European Union (which, having nurtured a process of economic integration, is now moving towards political union) can be seen as a pilot project, it is foreseeable that the other great regions which are taking shape in other parts of the world may, in the future, become the protagonists of the new multipolar world order.

The extraordinary novelty of the regional representation in the Security Council lies in the recognition of the rights of all the states of the EU to be represented in the Security Council, with no distinction made between permanent and non-permanent members. The achievement of this principle in Europe will open the way to its extension to the other great regions of the world.

The transformation of the Security Council into the Council of the great regions of the world will allow all the states to be represented in this body through their respective regional organization. This is the way to overcome the unjust discrimination between permanent and non-permanent member states. This is the way leading to the replacement of the right of veto with the majority vote.
Europe and the World

John Pinder

The European Union has moved quite far towards a federal system for its internal affairs, and the Constitution takes it significantly farther, though with notable exceptions in fields such as macroeconomic policy, the ceiling for the Union’s budget expenditure and the opt outs from the euro and from Schengen. But the institutional system for external relations remains predominantly confederal: intergovernmental and subject to the veto for foreign, security and defence policy; and with a variety of federal mixed with intergovernmental elements in other fields, mainly economic and environmental. The Union Minister for Foreign Affairs, as President of the Foreign Affairs Council, which is responsible for the former, and Vice President of the Commission, in which he is responsible for the latter, will have to ride simultaneously two quite different horses.

Examination of the causes of the sharp difference between the quasi federal character of the Union’s internal polity and the confederal character of governance of its external affairs may throw some light on the significance of existing federal elements and the potential for their further development. There are grounds to believe that the incremental creation of the internal polity has been driven by the response to the existential challenge that had been posed by World War Two, which made the founder members ready to share some sovereignty in order to ensure that the Westphalian system of sovereign nation states would never again lead to war among them. This fundamental motive has been largely ignored in much of the academic literature, because it kills the sacred cow of the realist and related schools, while the neofunctionalists were so fascinated by their spillover clockwork that they neglect the original motive which wound it up, as well as largely contributing to keep it in motion; while since their glory days, before the Second World War War crowded them out, the English speaking federalists failed to achieve substantial academic respectability.

It happened that the sharing of sovereignty also enabled the Community’s member states to manage their growing economic interdependence to their mutual benefit; and that led Britain, among others, to join. But the original motive remained powerful enough to drive member states through the phases of common market, single market and single currency, accompanied by the development of institutions in a federal direction all of which impinged significantly on sovereignty.

That motive, however, did not generally extend to the sharing of sovereignty with respect to the Union’s external policies, which were not seen as an essential element in ensuring peace among the member states. Nor, until recently, did merging that aspect of sovereignty seem necessary for their security, for the only apparent existential threat came from the Soviet Union; and the United States, leading the Atlantic Alliance, was able to look after that.

Now, however, global threats have intensified, involving the spread of weapons of mass destruction, wars, failed states, terrorism, global warming, monetary instability, mass
poverty and mass migration. The US as the sole superpower cannot cope with them. The US and China as the only superpowers in the not too distant future would be an unstable, unpredictable combination. The EU, with its economic weight, experience of creating its own peace system, worldwide relationships and capacity for partnership with the US and other major states, has the potential to be the world’s principal peace building, and prosperity generating, power. The member states and citizens are predisposed towards strengthening the global multilateral system, with third world countries, some of which are fast becoming major world powers, fully on board. Already in 1954, Jean Monnet envisaged that the Community could show how mankind could work together for a more peaceful and prosperous future. Surely the Union could, half a century later, and faced with global existential challenges, apply its institutions and instruments of external policy to help move the world in that direction. That is the perspective in which the following outline of federal and intergovernmental elements in its present arrangements for external policy, including provisions of the Constitution, is presented.

Trade, money, aid, climate change

The EEC Treaty provided effective federal elements for the Community’s commercial policy, with the common external tariff as its principal instrument and the Commission as its negotiator, responsible to the Council which was to move to qualified majority voting. Already in the Kennedy round of trade negotiations in the mid 1960s, this had a remarkable effect, with the Community proving itself an equal partner of the United States, which had hitherto been able to determine the results of previous rounds virtually unilaterally. The EU and the US have remained more or less equal partners in subsequent rounds as well as in the establishment of the World Trade Organisation, with its potential to bring the rule of law into the heart of the international economy. While the results have been generally liberalising for the advanced industrial countries, the Union has not yet used this federal power to bring third world states into the system as whole hearted participants.

Four decades later the lesson that a federal trade applied by institutions with essential federal elements can change the balance of power in the world has still not been learnt, for although the euro has the potential to outweigh the dollar as an international currency, the US still dominates the international monetary system and in particular the International Monetary Fund. Yet if the states participating in the euro were to combine their IMF quotas, and hence voting rights, as the existing Treaty and Article III-90 of the Constitution allow, and as some other groups of states in the IMF already do, the resulting federal instrument would give it greater voting power than the US. Both would have the right of veto, so would have to arrive at mutual accommodations, as they have done in the field of trade. In doing so, the EU is likely to be more inclined than the US to work towards a just and stable world monetary system, taking full account of the interests of third world countries.

Development aid is also particularly important in that, in addition to combating poverty, it can contribute to the development of pluralist democracies and market economies under the rule of law and thus help countries to become full participants with due influence in the world’s economic and political system. The EU provides some 55 per cent of the world’s aid, about one fifth of which is a federal instrument from the Union budget and four fifths comes from the member states. The Union’s aid to emergent market economies and democracies, particularly in the Central and East European accession states, has given it much useful experience; and the annual budget of over 100 million through the European Initiative for
Democracy and Human Rights is particularly relevant, in contributing to an essential basis for an eventual global community. But the target of 0.7 per cent of Union GDP for development aid is far from being achieved; and the Union’s share may not be substantially increased so long as the decision on the size of its budget remains subject to the unanimity rule, with a financial perspective probably not much above 1 per cent of GDP until 2012.

Despite the complication of mixed competences, with the Union having substantial powers in the field of the environment and the member states retaining them in crucial aspects of energy policy, the Union managed to lead a critical mass of states towards agreement on the Kyoto Protocol, embodying a significant, even if inadequate, measure to control emissions of greenhouse gases and hence to make a start in counteracting climate change and in particular global warming, which may well be the gravest of the existential threats facing humanity. But American opposition has weakened the Protocol’s effectiveness and prevented, so far, its entry into force. This has led to a proposal for a global climate community, which would bring together countries from North and South of the world to establish a group committed to reduce emissions by more than half by the middle of this century, with institutions embodying principles akin to those of the European Community in its early days and with substantial support for the technological adaptation of third world countries in order to ensure sustainable development. The initiative would have to come from the EU, with partners such as India, Brazil, South Africa, Japan and Canada as well as many others; and the intention would be to encourage those remaining outside to join the founder members, as has happened in the EU, which could be one way of approaching a global community system. Like Britain in relation to the European Community, the United States would be apt to join once the global climate community had been seen to work. Here again, the Union would surely need a more federal system, including for its financial resources, in order to be able to put such a policy into full effect.

The United Nations, Nato and European defence

The strengthening of the United Nations and its institutions is an objective shared by the Union’s member states, although a satisfactory reform of the Security Council to enable the Union to be properly represented doubtless remains a long way off. This reflects, of course, the refusal of Britain and France to renounce their status as permanent members, but also the early stage of the Union’s defence cooperation, with some steps being taken, but on a strictly intergovernmental basis.

If the Union’s policies in matters of soft security are to be fully credible, however, it will have to be able to undertake substantial military operations in fields such as crisis management, peace keeping and peace making, starting with the rapid reaction force. Nor, while it is unrealistic to envisage developing military power that could rival that of the United States, should the Union be inhibited from further incremental development of its own defence capacity, seen as complementary to the US in the Atlantic Alliance. This process will, in order to be effective, have to be facilitated in future constitutional reforms by introducing federal elements into the institutions relating to armed forces. If enough political will is generated, this would lead eventually to the integration of armed forces within a federal state.

Federal reform of the system for external policy

Thus the Union could develop an impressive external policy in the major fields of soft security and a certain capacity in hard security, even before any further constitutional reform.
The European Foreign Minister should have significant influence, both as a Vice President of the Commission, ‘responsible there for handling foreign affairs and for coordinating other aspects of the Union’s external action’, and, as President of the Foreign Affairs Council, contributing to ‘the development of’ and being required to ‘carry out’ the common foreign policy (Art. I-27).

Such evidence of the Union’s ability to work effectively for improvement of the world’s political and economic system could attract very substantial support for the vision of the Union as the world’s principal peace building power. Eurobarometer surveys have repeatedly shown that a substantial majority of citizens favour a common foreign policy; and the strength of feeling about such matters was shown by the millions throughout the Union who demonstrated in 2003 against the war in Iraq. So there is potential support for radical action to counter the global threats, which could provide a political basis for further constitutional reform.

The Constitution opens the way to this by giving the European Parliament the opportunity to secure the calling of a Convention to consider constitutional amendments (Art. IV-7); and the provisions for enhanced and structured cooperation offer a way for a core of states to put relevant arrangements into effect, even if others prefer to stand aside and reserve their right to join later. Thus Europeans have the opportunity to respond to the global existential challenges by developing federal structures to deal with the Union’s external policy, as they did in the 1950s with their response to Europe’s own existential challenge by developing an increasingly federal structure for its internal polity.

There are Judges in The Hague

Uri Avnery*

One of the Israeli newspapers, Haaretz, put the two events on the front page: the 100th anniversary of the death of Theodor Herzl, the founder of the modern Zionist movement, and the judgement of the International Court of Justice, which declared the Israeli Separation Wall illegal. This coincidence may seem fortuitous. What connection could there possibly be between a historical anniversary and the latest topical event? But there is a connection. It is expressed in one sentence written by Herzl in Der Judenstaat, the book that became the cornerstone of Zionism. This is what it said: “There (in Palestine) we shall be a sector of the wall of Europe against Asia, we shall serve as the outpost of civilization against barbarism.”

This sentence could easily be written today. American thinkers propound the “clash of civilizations”, with Western “Judeo-Christian” culture battling “Islamic barbarism”. American leaders declare that Israel is the outpost of Western civilization in the fight against Arab-Muslim “international terrorism”. The Sharon government is building a wall for the purpose, or so it says, of protecting Israel against Palestinian-Arab terrorism. It declares at every opportunity that the fight against “Palestinian terrorism” is a part of the struggle against “international terrorism”. The Americans support the Israeli wall with all their heart and their wallet. Even the semi-official name of the barrier – the “Separation Fence” – emphasizes this tendency. It is intended to “separate” between nations, between civilizations, and indeed to separate culture (us) from barbarism (them).

These are profoundly ideological reasons, mostly unconscious, for the building of the wall. On the surface, it seems to be a practical response to a real and present danger. An ordinary Israeli will say: “Are you nuts? What are you talking about? What has this to do with Herzl? He died a hundred years ago!” But there is a direct connection. This is also true for another aspect of the wall. In Herzl’s day a phrase was coined that became the slogan of the Zionist movement in its early years: “A land without a people for a people without a land.” That is to say, Palestine is an empty country.

Anyone who tours the length of the planned path of the wall is struck by one aspect that leaps to the eye: it has been determined without the slightest consideration for the life of the Palestinian human beings living there. The wall crushes them as a man steps on an ant. Farmers are cut off from their fields, workers from the workplaces, pupils from their schools, sick people from their hospitals, the bereaved from the graves of their beloved ones. It is easy to imagine the officers and settlers bent over the map and planning the path – as though through an empty space, with nothing there except settlements, army bases and roads. They argue about topography, tactical considerations and strategic objectives. Palestinians? What Palestinians?

The Israeli Supreme Court that handed down its decision last week concentrated mainly on this point. It did not contest the generals’ pronouncement that the wall is necessary. If the generals say so, the court stands to
attention and salutes. Neither did the court decide that the wall must be built on the Green Line, the internationally recognized border between Israel and the territories it occupied in 1967, which is also the shortest and most easily defended line. But it recognized the fact that the territories contain a Palestinian population and demanded that their human requirements be taken into consideration. During the week that has passed since then, it became clear that the army is ready to make some changes to the path of the wall, but not to change its basic concept. The “improved” path still creates enclaves for the Palestinians and limits their freedom of movement, if less than the former path. Some of the farmers will be reconnected with their land. Nothing more.

Now comes the International Court of Justice and announces principles that are much closer to those supported by the Israeli peace forces that have demonstrated against the wall. It says that the wall itself is illegal, except where it follows the Green Line. All the sectors built inside the occupied territories violate international law as well as conventions and agreements signed by Israel. The court says that those sectors of the wall must be removed, the situation restored to what it was before, and the Palestinian compensated for the damage inflicted on them. All the countries of the world are called upon to abstain from giving any aid to the building of the wall.

Will this have any impact on Israeli public opinion? I am afraid not. During the last few months, the official propaganda machine has been preparing the public for this day. The judges of the International Court, it was said, are anti-Semites. It is well known that all the nations, with the possible exception of the United States, want to destroy the Jewish State. Some years ago a jolly song was very popular: “All the world is against us / But we don’t give a damn...” So, to hell with them!

Will it have an impact on world public opinion? Probably, though the court’s “advisory opinion” is not binding and the court has no army or police to enforce its decisions. There is no point in submitting it to the Security Council, where it will automatically be shot down by an American veto. At any time, and even more so on the eve of elections, an American administration will be loath to offend the pro-Israeli lobby, both Jewish and Evangelical. The US will ignore the court and go on financing the wall.

But in the veto-free UN General Assembly there will be a wide-ranging debate that will shine a spotlight on the real character of the wall. The propaganda machine of the Sharon government, aided and abetted by most of the world’s media, has produced an image of the wall as a necessary means for the prevention of suicide attacks inside Israel. The debate in the General Assembly may help to publicize the real purpose of the monster.

The day before the judgement I was in a big tent at A-Ram, just north of Jerusalem, a town that is one of the principal victims of the wall. A hunger strike of Palestinians and Israelis against the wall has been taking place there. The place has attracted pilgrims from all over the country. Inside the tent, the world premiere of a film took place. Its director, Simone Bitton, an Israeli of North African origin living in Paris, shows the wall as it is. In the film, Palestinians describe what the wall has done to them. A Jewish Kibbutz member calls it a disaster for Israel, a disaster of our own making. The Director of the Ministry of Defense, General Amos Yaron (who was relieved of his army command by the Kahan Inquiry Commission for his involvement in the Sabra and Shatila affair) explains that the Palestinians themselves are to blame for their suffering. After all, if they just stopped resisting the occupation, there would be no need for the wall. But the most moving sequence of the film was purely visual, a sequence without
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words. One sees green fields and olive groves stretching to the horizon, and occasional villages with their soaring minarets. A crane lifts a huge concrete slab into place on the wall. It hides a part of the landscape. A second slab is raised and hides some more. The third slab blocks the landscape entirely – and you realize that before your very eyes, another village has been cut off from life forever, with the huge, 8-meter-high wall enclosing the village from all sides.

But at the same moment a thought crossed my mind: After all, the same crane that puts the blocks there can also remove them. It happened in Germany. It will happen here. The decision of the judges of The Hague, coming from 15 different countries, has made a contribution to that. Perhaps it is an irony of history: the judges who represent European culture demand that the wall be removed. If Herzl had witnessed that, he would have been puzzled.

*This article was published in the Gush Salom website, http://www.gush-shalom.org/archives/article311.html
The Cyprus Referendum: My Personal Experience

Pavlos Liassides

During the last 40 days after the referendum in my small country which answers to the name of Cyprus, I have been asked repeatedly from friends from all over Europe to explain why we, the Greek Cypriots, have voted “No” to the solution of the Cyprus problem. Even though I may not be the most objective person to provide the answer, since personally I was a strong supporter for a “Yes”, I will try to give an interpretation of the result in the best way I can. I will try with this article to provide to my fellow European federalists, the main arguments that I had to fight against, and that are coming from ordinary people, simple citizens, not politicians, and which obviously I and many others were not able to overcome and convince for the contrary.

First of all we have to have in mind what was the target of the referendum and what was the problem that it was supposed to solve. The referendum of April 24th in Cyprus was the end of a very long way, and of a lot of effort by the international community to re-unify Cyprus before May 1st. The date of course was not accidental, it was the date of the EU’s enlargement, by which 10 new states became full members, among them Cyprus.

The re-unification of the island was an absolute necessity for the EU and the international community, since according to the accession treaty, the whole island was to become European soil and all legal citizens (Greeks & Turks) were to become equal European citizens. The continuation of the division was going to bring a number of complications for everyone. A part of Cyprus, and, as from May 1st, a part of Europe, was to remain under occupation by Turkey. A part of the people of Cyprus, the Turkish Cypriots, and as from May 1st European citizens, were to remain in political and economic isolation, without active and democratic participation in the Union.

We must also remember what had caused this division. The story started back in 1974 when Turkey invaded and occupied a substantial part of the island, claiming that the Turkish Cypriot minority was in danger, after an unsuccessful coup made by the Greek military regime (that was in power at that time) against the Government of Cyprus. During this invasion, the Greek Cypriot majority that used to live in the occupied area, was thrown away, and the Turkish Cypriot minority was concentrated in the North. A few years later, Turkish Cypriots unilaterally declared their independence and tried to make their own state, a state that has never been recognized by any country other than Turkey.

Since then and for the last 30 years, Turkey continues to occupy the Northern part of Cyprus with a huge military force, Turkish Cypriots live in total political and economic isolation from the rest of the world, and Greek Cypriots struggle to get back their homes, their land and their historic monuments (Christian churches, ancient Greek, Roman and Byzantine towns, cemeteries, etc.) that have been brutally destroyed by the occupants. After a number of unsuccessful efforts, last February there was a first agreement in New York. The New York agreement was proposing a new final effort, in three rounds, that would produce a draft for a comprehensive solution, which the UN
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was going to put in a referendum in the two communities before May 1st. This solution was going to be based on the idea of a bi-zonal, bi-communal federation.

The draft came at the end of March by the Secretary General of the UN and it is known as the “Annan Plan”. In many aspects the “Annan Plan” was a fair compromise, it could not provide an absolute satisfaction to any side, but it could satisfy the main objectives. Cyprus was going to be re-unified, the occupation was going to end, the Turkish Cypriot isolation was going to end, and the majority of the Greek Cypriots were going to get back their land, return to their homes, and their monuments were to be returned to the Cyprus Government. For those Greek Cypriots that were not permitted to return or obtain back their property, sufficient compensations were provided (even though with a very complicated mechanism that very few understood).

Everybody thought that this was the end of a long lasting international conflict. Everybody had it for granted that up to this point the obstacle for a solution was Turkey, and now the Greek Cypriots should be happy enough to vote YES for this solution. However, the outcome of the referendum turned to be a surprise. The Greek Cypriots with a vast majority of 76% voted NO. And the question is obvious. Why? What do the Greek Cypriots want? They decided that they do not want a solution any more? They don’t want to return back to their homes? Don’t they still want their properties back? Do they feel that now, that they are full members of the EU, they do not want to share it with the Turkish Cypriots and they do not mind any more for the occupation?

All these questions sound reasonable, but as I said earlier, being a strong supporter for a “YES”, and having engaged myself in infinite number of debates during the pre-referendum period, and having to answer to numerous arguments in favor for a “No”, I never heard a positive answer to any of the above questions. Where was the missing link then that made the Greek Cypriots say “No”?

The arguments were of course numerous, but all debates that I have participated in, or followed through TV talk show, had a common denominator. The plan was to be implemented in very long phases (for practical reasons it was going to take up to 15 years to have the full implementation). A crucial missing factor in the equation was the lack of any sufficient guarantees for the implementation. Having in mind the brief history of the Cyprus problem as I have described it above, there was no way to convince the people that Turkey was going to honor its signature. To the question that people were repeatedly asking “what if something goes wrong in the mean time?” there was no sufficient answer. And the people were too scared of the consequences “in case something was about to go wrong in the mean time”.

One of the counter arguments on the above fear was the fact that having Turkey in the doorstep of the EU, there was no way for them to break the treaty, because then this was going to be a confrontation with Europe. “And what if Turkey does not obtain a date in December, and what if they start using Cyprus to blackmail Europe?” Nobody could provide an adequate answer to this fear as well. The people were saying “yes, we do not want to enter the EU with a problem, we do not want to add another problem to our future partners, but by saying No are we adding one or are we preventing one?”

The biggest compromise the “Annan Plan” was suggesting was the remaining of a small force of Turkish troops and a large number of settlers permanently. And not only remaining, but also having the right to intervene unilaterally whenever Turkey felt like it. This was an issue that most of the people could not accept. Having the experience of the past in the minds of most Greek Cypriots this was a nightmare. They couldn’t accept under any terms the fact that
a European country could be forced to accept having foreign troops with intervention rights on its soil.

In conclusion, the first reason behind the “No” was simply fear. Fear for the implementation, fear for their security. But it was not just that. It was also something else, equally important. Something that was not promoted that much by the politicians, but has been debated very lively among ordinary citizens. It was the feeling that this plan was written more to accommodate the interests of others, rather than of the people of Cyprus, Greeks and Turks. And I will give one example that made Greek Cypriots very suspicious and again there was no adequate answer to the puzzle.

On the Southern coast of the island, the British have two military bases. These bases are sovereign. These bases were excluded from the accession treaty between the UK and the EU. In other words, even though they belong to a member state of the EU, even though they are on a country that is also a member state, their soil is not part of the Union. In addition to that, during the last few years there is sufficient scientific evidence that in the sea area between Cyprus and Egypt there exist huge supplies of natural gas and possibly oil. It was for this reason that a co-exploitation agreement between Cyprus and Egypt was signed recently. With the Annan plan, suddenly, and without having such an issue on the negotiations agenda, in one of the 10,000 pages of the plan, the British bases appear to have a shelf! In other words, the soil that is under the waters that surround Cyprus in the Southern part does not belong to Cyprus any more, but it belongs to the British bases. Definitely, nobody could convince the Greek Cypriots that this was a compromise made within the frame of the conflict that they have with the Turks.

Before ending my long article, since I am addressing fellow European citizens, I can not resist putting also a European dimension in the issue. What would have been the outcome of the Cyprus referendum, if Europe was able to speak with one voice? If Europe was able to promote its interest under a common foreign policy? Was it going to make any difference, if it could provide guarantees for the implementation of the solution? Was it going to make any difference, if it had the capability to defend its borders and soil? Was it going to make any difference, if during the talks in New York, it could raise a strong voice against Turkey which was trying hard to prevent its participation in the talks?
The bond issues denominated in euros have already exceeded in number those denominated in dollars. The euro-area is bound to extend itself towards the countries that have significant business relations with the EU. Transactions with them are still settled in dollars, as in dollars were settled the exchange payments among the same European countries before Europe’s monetary unification. The importance the euro has already achieved in the few years of its existence has created many enemies to the new currency. Among them I consider the most dangerous the few that dream of a euro-standard, bound to replace the dollar-standard, more than the many who earn a living simply defending the old order against the new one. In this article I intend to show how the euro-standard assumption: 1) should be rejected from an ideological point of view; 2) is highly questionable from a strictly economic point of view; 3) is treacherous for the North-Atlantic relations and for any hope for a legal governance of globalization.

1. As far as the first argument, the ideological one, is concerned, I refer here to “federalism as an ideology”. Mario Albertini (1919-1997) “started to elaborate a scientific criticism of the idea of nation that could lead to a radical negation of the national system and to building a theory of federalism conceived no longer as a mere constitutional technique, able to make possible a peaceful coexistence of a few independent and coordinated governments, but rather as an ideology which emphasizes the new significance of the course of history... The European federation then appears as the crucial event of our time, the first achievement of the federalist course of history, which will culminate in the realization of peace through a world federation”.

Europe has waited for the projects to unify it manu militari, put in place by this or that national state, from Napoleon to Hitler, slaughter after slaughter, to wear themselves out before starting the long and demanding process, with no victims however, of economic, monetary and finally political unification. The conscious heirs of European history are studying and elaborating the concept of hegemony only to defeat it, certainly not for reproducing it again on a wider scale. Quite another thing than “the sons of Venus”, as Kagan says! It could not be thought of any project more contrary to the federalist idea than that of proposing the euro, after the sterling and the dollar, to have its turn at the right of seignorage.

Even the United States of America, the first and biggest federal democracy in the world, the one the peace-loving European citizens have always taken inspiration from, has not been immune from nationalist and imperialist deviances. When in America nationalism is prevailing, they say that the United States is isolationist, and many clientes call for its economic and/or military intervention. When imperialism is prevailing, they complain instead of the unilateral choices and the muscular and inconsiderate actions it is carrying out. After the disappearance of the counterbalancing power of the Soviet Union and with the coming to power of the neo-conservatives, the second attitude is the more widespread. The cost of power politics, however, has undermined the financial foundations of the super-power. Survival of the system is
assured, in an ever more precarious way, only by the international acceptance of the dollar. All makes us believe we are at the last grasp. Quite another thing than “the sons of Mars”, as the same Kagan is pretending!

Of all this, two interpretations may be given. The first is the most widely shared, because it is linked to the common way of thinking: a federal and democratic system of government is no guarantee at all that the country that adopts it would withdraw from power politics; on the contrary, the motives of power politics will end up lowering the domestic level of democracy and federalism. It is the so-called primacy of foreign policy, theorized by European (mostly German) scholars of real-politik. Should such interpretation scheme be applied further, by simply extrapolating it the birth of the European Union would mark nothing else but the passing from the European system of states to the world system of states. Hence we should expect that between the euro and the dollar, between the European Union and the United States situations comparable with the old Franco-German rivalry could form again. The second interpretation has to do with something that is of greater concern to us than the intra-European wars of the 1800’s and 1900’s: the scientific revolution, interdependence, globalization, the new necessity to govern such phenomena; this line of thought leads us to rule out hegemony by one state as a form of stable world government, for sure not within the theoretical and practical horizon of politics during the millennium we have started to live in. This line of thought, which is the federalist one, opens up space to imagining forms of world government corresponding to the levels already attained by knowledge integration, by the speed of information exchanges, by mobility of capital and, less happily, of human beings.

I think I can conclude this first argument by stating that Europe is not born for imposing yet another world hegemony, but for adopting itself and proposing to the whole world a peaceful model for ruling international relations, and an institutional form for the democratic governance of globalization. I add, however needless to say, that without hegemony it is not conceivable that Europe may exercise any seignorage right.

2. From the economic viewpoint, it is possible to present a basic criticism of the thesis that the euro could replace the dollar as the world currency. I refer here to the Robert Triffin’s (1911-1993)”dilemma”. Already in 1968 the Belgian economist, then professor at Yale, pointed out how a country (the United States in this case) cannot create international liquidity but by accumulating debts towards foreign countries, in order to support a deficit of its own balance of payments meant to acquire goods, services and investments abroad, and also to militarily defend its possessions and to keep its influence (or complicity) in liberated (or occupied) countries. He denounced this system as “the international monetary scandal”. In the years just following the Second World War the United States had a surplus of its balance of payments and the world was suffering a liquidity deficit (dollar shortage); very soon, however, the United States became a debtor, generating an excessive creation of international liquidity (dollar inflation). This is Triffin’s dilemma. In such a regime, the world currency-creation is not regulated according to the needs of the world’s exchanges and development, but depends on the trend of the balance of payments of the hegemonic power; this is predictable, because the cost of maintaining a unilateral (imperial) world system leads by necessity to a growing financial instability of the system. Reading Triffin now, in the light of the events that followed, makes a strong impression. Today the US is the country with the biggest foreign debt in the world. Paradoxically, this makes it “fit” to exercise the role of creator of international currency. But beware if the trust that is driving today roughly $ 500 billion in capital account every year for paying the deficit of the US balance of current payments is going to vanish! Beware if the IMF would apply to the United States the same
rules so rigorously imposed to Argentina, to the South-East-Asian countries and to the most desperate countries of the world!

The main creditor countries are China, Japan, a group of oil-producing countries and finally the European Union. The most evident feature of the European balance of payments is its substantial balance. Hence the euro does not look fit, for the time being, to play the role of international currency. Of course the day is near when we will pay our oil bill in euros, as many suppliers (including Russia) already ask. This will imply a restructuring of the currency reserves and of the financial activities at world level, with an increase of the amount possessed in euros with respect to that possessed in dollars. This change is already underway, but it does not imply, by itself, any creation of international currency, in the absence of a significant deficit of the European balance of payments. I do not neglect the “currency creation” by banks. As I wrote on other occasions, I do not believe that the European bank system is ready to replace the American in playing such a role at the global level. Instead, as the first euro-currencies were issued in London with the aim to invest there the Jewish capitals fleeing Nazi Germany, after a suitable shearing, likewise there is to fear that the first world-euros will be issued in New York. *Pecunia non olet.* I prefer to limit myself to this simple connection between the financial and the real economy: in the power-policy scheme the issuer of international currency is the hegemonic/debtor power. Certainly it may be possible that the Union could one day have a negative balance of payments, either due to a competitiveness loss in some economic sectors in the face of emerging economies, or due to the development which will eventually take place in it. Will the Union be able to counter an eventual deficit by issuing euros, like it was done with the sterling first and the dollar later? In my opinion it will not. The famous “markets”, to which the new-cons attribute a wisdom far superior to that of whatever regulation, would not let the euro do what the dollar is let do. The difference lies, naturally, in the army, that is to say in the last display of military supremacy (the American) by one State over the entire world. I will deal with this argument in the third paragraph. To sum up this second argument: a) a process of creating international liquidity through a regional currency, this time the euro, would reproduce yet again the drawbacks denounced by the “Triffin’s dilemma”; b) before considering issuing euros, there is anyway the problem of how to use the dollar surpluses the creditor countries have; c) a deliberate deficit-policy of the Union’s payments could not be supported by an expansion of internal consumption, which for many years has been showing a saturation, and would cause further unemployment in the presence of a productivity-per-worked-hour rate higher in Europe than in the US; d) a deficit of the Union’s balance of payments could come, instead, from the necessity of making investments in some very advanced sectors of the new economy and of eventually participating in the costs of world security to a greater extent than the present one (actually world security and Europe’s unified military apparatus should reduce, not increase, those costs). However, I repeat that the use of dollar surpluses can be reckoned more than sufficient today to satisfy these needs, without arriving at a foreign debt situation for the euro. I do not add here the argument of the gold reserves which Europe has, maybe because there still is in me a residue of the Keynesian dislike of that metal (and above all of its holders).

3. The monetary argument, just discussed, and the other, which I am dealing with now, concerning the political governance for the sustainability of a globalized development, are inextricably linked together. I refer here to the fundamental claim of the American revolution, which should constitute a vested value for the whole world: *no taxation without representation.*

Among the public costs (and public goods) of the globalized capitalist development three items...
have an ever greater weight: environmental sustainability, security and cooperation. They are three matters tightly interconnected. They have in common, in addition, the feature of being manageable only at the world level. All of us, Americans, Chinese, Europeans, Japanese, Indians, Russians and even citizens of the poorest countries will have to accept sacrifices in order to meet these three necessities for the sustainability of human development on the planet. These sacrifices, if rebellions are to be avoided, shall be examined, explained, understood and agreed. Delegating these functions to a single country, the same country which refuses to ratify the Kyoto Treaty on harmful emissions and the treaty instituting the International Criminal Court, the same country that does not pay its dues to the United Nations and calls for its intervention after damage is done, the same country that is at the top of per-capita incomes at world level and is placed close to the last in aids to poor countries, well, delegating these functions cannot be done outside of a representative, tendentially democratic system. I do not say “tendentially” just to save my soul, but thinking that, as already happens for the European Union, there should be present from the start the germs necessary for the development of world democracy. As the Founding Fathers said, no taxation without representation.

I come to the connection between these three inextricable priorities (environment, security and cooperation) and the financial question. Toynbee, in his resumptive work in his old age, has insisted on the argument of the non-sustainability of empires, as the costs of defence grow more than the advantages of domination 6. The United States has reached this point. Not only the propelling thrust of its federal democracy has faded out, but its new imperial trend and its costs threaten to destroy the achievements of the American revolution. On the other hand, the world’s existential priorities must somehow be financed. Considering both the size of the investment and its very-long-term return, it is not a task that can be accomplished by the markets’ bustling alone, without any general direction. The time has come for a project of an institutional, non-hegemonic, cooperative world architecture, on the model of the one it was attempted to put in place in the first post-war period with the Bretton Woods agreements, but that only the European Union, thanks to its advanced political cooperation among its member states, has succeeded in realizing, with its supranational single currency, although at a regional level.

The Keynesian compromise in Bretton Woods consists in this: 1) the development of trade and direct investments abroad is supported by the stability of exchange rates, which can be modified by common agreement only in the presence of “fundamental unbalances”; 2) the freedom of every state to support its domestic demand through various means, including the extension of the welfare state, is shielded from the risk of flight of capital from one country to another, possibly considered less “socialist”, by a complex and strict system of bureaucratic controls over “speculative” capital movements (in practice anyone, except direct investments); 3) the creation of international liquidity is de facto assigned to the United States, on the basis of the promised convertibility of the dollar into gold.

We know how and why in 1971 Richard Nixon broke up this toy, which had assured anyway the reconstruction and the extraordinary development of the post-war period. A very deep reflection will be required among the European and the world federalists in evaluating, deepening and transforming into political action the proposal of “a new Bretton Woods” launched by Guido Montani, Secretary General of the Italian MFE, at the last WFM Congress. For the scope of the thesis discussed in this article (the euro must not and can not be proposed to play the role of world currency comparable to that played by the sterling first and the dollar
later), few and conclusive remarks will suffice: a) the scientific revolution and the ensuing globalization of economy have taken away from the national states the effective power of ruling welfare, their capacity of controlling capital movements and the fire power necessary to defend exchange rates from the markets; b) the birth of the euro has stabilized an important region of the world, whose aperture to the other great monetary areas does not exceed 10% of its GDP; c) significant financial crises keep occurring in the areas that have not yet reached the integration stage of the EU, but above all the integration between the various regions and the dollar area, which represents today the biggest risk of worldwide financial destabilization; d) the problem of the US foreign debt is getting more and more explosive due to the combination of its exponential growth and the ineffectiveness of the US unilateral (imperial) action carried out for ensuring its world order. In other terms: the American unilateral investment in “security” as a world public good looks disastrous; e) the EU must therefore propose a strategy for world security, linked to a responsibility towards the environment and equity towards any form of suffering; there should be a negotiation to allow the US to pay back its foreign debt leaving the security services, which make use of sophisticated technologies, to the UN, that could buy them by issuing documents of participation, the underwriting of which should be guaranteed by its creditor member states. The organization charged with managing this operation could be the NATO: its statute already provides that it can intervene only following a UN deliberation. However, among the NATO participants too many important regions of the world are missing for this idea to be effective. The NATO, then, should be transformed in a UN security agency, and progressively democratized; h) if this could become the real multilateral project, it becomes clear once again how any pretence to re-establish a monetary hegemony, this time by the euro, can only promote a growing, certainly ruinous, Euro-American rivalry.

To our brothers across the Atlantic, then, we have only to remind the principle they taught us: no taxation without representation.

---
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If one were a member of the Fur tribe whose house was burned, wife and daughter raped, farm animals killed and water well filled in with sand, the response of the UN and African Union would seem very slow and inadequate. If, however, one compares the speed and multiform response of the UN system, international NGOs, and African governments to Darfur with the low degree of political involvement in the two phases of the North-South Civil War in Sudan (1956-1972, 1983-2004) one is struck by the strong response. The development of the UN response merits analysing as it is a good example of cooperation between the human rights capacity of the UN, its humanitarian response, the role of NGO representatives, and the press. It also highlights the renewed willingness of African governments to act - just 10 years after the inaction concerning the genocide in Rwanda. Since both Darfur and the wider North-South Sudan conflicts are not settled as of this moment (30 September 2004), it is too early for us to cry “victory” and go on to other matters.

Briefly, a word of my interests in the Sudan conflicts. In the mid-1960s, I had done some work for the World Council of Churches in Geneva on the role of African churches in social development and the need for planning to meet new challenges. At the time, the African Conference of Churches - related to the World Council - was deeply involved in helping to negotiate the end to the first phase of the civil war which ended in a power-sharing agreement in 1972. I had met some of the negotiators in Geneva and became aware of the issues. When the 1972 agreement was signed, like many others, we wished Sudan well, and I started working on the issues related to the consequences of the drought in the Sahel - and the possibilities of ecologically-sound development for both pastoralists and agriculturalists - an issue which returns to the heart of the future of Darfur, which is basically a Sahel geographic area.

In 1992, as an NGO representative I had raised the Sudan civil war and its destructive nature in the UN Commission on Human Rights suggesting that confederal or federal structures could keep the unity of the country while granting autonomy to the populations of the south. I have stayed in contact with a good number of Sudanese political figures on these constitutional issues. In March 2004, I raised the Darfur situation in the UN Commission on Human Rights and did so again in August for the Sub-Commission. Thus, I can measure somewhat the degree of interest and knowledge between March and August 2004.

There seems to me to have been four UN paths leading to Darfur which I will outline as it may be important for dealing with other armed conflicts in Africa. I have no special information as to how decisions are made in the African Union and so will only indicate their current efforts.

The first path leading to Darfur relates to the courage of the UN humanitarian staff already in the Sudan and the staff of the office of the High Commissioner for Refugees in Chad. Often in other cases the UN humanitarian staff have been unwilling to speak out on human rights abuses for fear of endangering their ability to continue relief operations. In the Darfur case, Mukesh Kapila, the resident coordinator for
Sudan, spoke up clearly on the scope of the destruction, displacement of people and refugee flow. He was backed fully by Jan Egeland, the UN’s Under-Secretary for humanitarian affairs, declaring that the government’s Darfur allies were “using scorched earth tactics, deliberately destroying food and humanitarian supplies and attacking refugee centers in a program of systematic depopulation.”

UN humanitarian staff have continued with clear reports highlighting the wide use of Sudanese military planes to bomb villages before the final destruction by the militias - generally called Janjaweed.

The second path leading the UN to action has been the remarkable reports and activities of the Special Rapporteurs of the UN Commission on Human Rights and the leadership provided by the acting UN High Commissioner for Human Rights, B.G. Ramcharan. For the first time that I recall, the human rights Special Rapporteurs have made joint reports and appeals with in depth interviewing of refugees in Chad. The report of my former teaching colleague Jean Ziegler - now Special Rapporteur on the Right to Food - was very complete on the scale of deliberate destruction of the agricultural infrastructure and thus the inability of refugees to return home. The coordinated efforts of the human rights Special Rapporteurs marks a new avenue of UN effectiveness and sets a precedent for use in other occasions.

The third path has been the very effective intervention of NGO representatives and the press. Both Amnesty International and Human Rights Watch have had full reports on their websites which have been kept up to date. The International Crisis Group which has been following the overall situation in the Sudan for a number of years has done a good a good job of reporting on Darfur as well as interviewing refugees in Chad. Humanitarian relief organizations such as Doctors Without Borders have been active both on the ground and in building public awareness.

There have also been very telling reporting largely through interviewing refugees by Nicholas Kristof in the New York Times and Samantha Power, author of a good analysis on failures to prevent earlier genocides A Problem from Hell: American and the Age of Genocide. See her moving report “Dying in Darfur”, in The New Yorker, 30 August 2004.

These three paths led to the fourth - more an unpaved road than a path - the UN Security Council. The accumulation of reports, the high profile visits to Sudan of the Secretary-General Kofi Annan, the US Secretary of State Colin Powell, the appointment as a special representative for Sudan of Jan Pronk who had been both a minister of development in the Netherlands’ government as well as a UN civil servant all led the Security Council to take action in recalling the responsibility of the Sudanese government for the welfare of all its citizens and therefore the need to establish order in Darfur and to disarm the Janjaweed. The vote was 11 to 0, with China, Russia, Algeria, and Pakistan abstaining.

In addition, the Security Council called upon the UN Secretary General to create an international commission to determine whether the campaign by the militias against the agricultural tribes of Darfur is genocide. This is the first time that the 1948 Genocide Convention has been formally invoked.

I will return in a later article on the place of the Darfur conflict within the overall Sudanese situation and also on the genocide aspect. I have tried since the start of the conflicts in former Yugoslavia in 1991 to have the UN develop mechanisms to study serious accusations of genocide. We will have to follow closely this Darfur precedent. My aim in this article is to show how a new spirit of cooperation and courage within the UN system has led to significant action.
China at the Political Conquest of Africa

Jean-Paul Pougala

Africa and Europe: a relationship of misunderstandings

The historical relations and the geographical proximity between Africa and Europe could have led as a natural effect to a virtuous development of the two continents, to an integrated development of the two economies, to the formation of a common bloc on the international scene. But Europe has not looked at Africa other than as a source of low-cost raw materials. With this sole objective in mind, Europe has made sure to have in power here and there in Africa Presidents without any political or economic, and even less juridical, background, small dictators who have kept and increased the fragmentation of the continent made by Europe, trying to protect their power by spreading a false nationalism and going so far as to play with the powder-keg of ethnic divisions.

In all official speeches Europe seems to be willing to help Africa to develop, but in fact all has been done for preventing Africa from rising to its feet and for it to remain forever a source of the raw materials Europe needs for its industries. It is political short-sightedness, because a rich and prosperous Africa under Europe’s control would have been a powerful ally for strengthening the European economy and stabilizing the well-being of its people.

How Europe contributed to bring Africa’s economy to its knees

Although the Agreements of Yaoundé and Lomé have been considered by Panafricanists as a positive step towards a multilateral approach in addressing all together the problems of an integrated development between the two continents, all that has been turned in fact in a mere hypocrisy by Europe. On the one hand, Europe, by its policy of financing its agriculture, and most of all its export of agricultural products to Africa, has brought to its knees the biggest African economic sector, which provides a living to 70% of the population, and on the other hand the EU has granted Africa the freedom of access to its market; however, not to the products which could help Africa’s development, but to the agricultural non-processed products, that have no value. And even in this case, we can find contradictions that show that Europe has never been interested in Africa’s development. One example will illustrate this fact.

After the great African drought of the beginning of the 1970s, Europe financed with long-term loans several agricultural projects of rural development. But in parallel the same Europe caused the failure of these projects, with a huge bill to be paid back by generations of Africans. For example: Cameroon run heavily into debt for creating SODEBLE (Society for Wheat Development); they set up a first wheat plantation of 10.000 hectares, bought in Europe fertilizers, seeds, insecticides, herbicides, bulldozers, tractors, trucks and other vehicles. A few years later, when the harvest was entering its optimal phase, Europe, in order to avoid that its grain-production surplus upset market prices, raised the rebates to its farmers on the wheat exported to Africa, with the consequences it knew could be expected: Sodeblé’s plans to cover the entire Central African wheat market turned into a nightmare of debit balances; the
state of Cameroon had to come in, asking each year Europe for loans in order to keep Sodeblé alive, until its closure with all its hundreds of workers put out of work, some of them perhaps meeting again aboard an old boat to cross the Mediterranean.

Europe’s different handling of its relations with Africa and China

In its relations with Africa, Europe has behaved like an irresponsible partner, who only goes after his short-term interests. To the contrary, towards China we see a magnanimous disposition by Europe we have difficulty to find in its past relations with Africa. Delocalization, which is an obvious and appreciable means of revenue distribution at the international level, could have been used by Europe to make Africa develop, by moving to this continent the transformation of the products that Europe imports at a primary stage, like the treatment of hides, the roasting of coffee and the manufacturing of semi-finished products for European industries. That would have been a good aid to Africa’s development, an atypical delocalization whereby Africa’s natural resources were shipped to Europe no longer as raw materials but as semi-finished products. No, it’s impossible. No European entrepreneur could embark on such a concrete aid-to-development process, because he would immediately find himself stopped by the excessive customs duties for importing in Europe his semi-finished products. A finished product like a radio or television set comes from China and enters the EU market with a ridiculous custom duty of 1%. If the same entrepreneur delocalizes to a place one-hour-flying-time from Rome and goes to Tunis to produce the same television set, he will have to pay a custom duty of 40% to have his product enter Europe.

Looking at such a difference in treatment, one could think this is justified by Europe’s protection of its own farmers or breeders, but this conclusion does not hold, because after 2003 the Chinese agricultural products can enter Europe with no custom duty, even minimal. That’s why entire regions, like the Trento-region in Italy, are in despair for the entrance on the European market of Chinese apples, which have a price 10 times lower than Trento’s apples. Why then Europe closes its doors to delocalization to Africa and encourages that to China? Europe fears that Africa could wake up, and not because it could become a competitor like China, but simply because that would deprive Europe of the raw materials it needs.

The humanitarian colonialism

At the very moment the Africans are calling for more delocalization to Africa in order to give a concrete help for Africa to raise to its feet, to develop by exporting its resources as semi-finished products and no longer as raw materials, one observes that Europe has unleashed over Africa an armada of NGOs, all of them pretending to work for helping out Africa. All people in economics or otherwise are playing experts on Africa. All of them are organizations that are not informed at all about the real African expectations. They shift the attention from the real African expectations, and orient them towards simplistic and populistic themes, like the cancellation of debt. Africans never put at the top of their claims the cancellation of their debts. Africans want to be in the condition to generate enough resources to pay back their debts, because it would be an illusion to believe that cancelling their debts represents a solution, as the mechanism that led to this situation of indebtedness remains and it is on that that Africa wants to work, on the causes of its under-development and not on the consequences of them. The French President Jacques Chirac may well call for a tax over some world trade activities, but that remains a deceptive maneuver of pure political propaganda, whose sole aim is to attribute to himself at a minimum cost the patent of friend of the poor. If he really believed in such a proposal, he would have presented it first of all in the framework of the European Union, where he has concrete means
to act. There should be a world government which is granted the necessary authority for applying a tax at the world level... Only a world government will be able to cope seriously and globally with world problems. But until France itself is not ready to renounce its privileged seat in the Security Council, one of the main obstacles to UN reform, it cannot enchant us with its compassion for the world poor.

Without taking into consideration what Africans want for solving the problem of poverty in Africa, clearly explained through the “New Partnership for Africa’s Development” (NEPAD, www.nepad.org), the European NGOs are making unreal claims in the name of Africa and in their wake every European country announces ostentatiously that it is cancelling the debt for this or that African country. Five years after the first announcements, including those made by the G7, less than 10% of the debts have actually been cancelled as promised; but who cares, everybody has regained his virginity, everybody has again a good conscience. And be prepared for the next claims by the same European NGOs in the name of Africa. Ah, maybe the Darfur.

The Darfur is the new fashionable theme among the NGOs, a problem created after Sudan made a strategic choice centered on China as the major exploiter of its oil. A guerrilla warfare was born (with the financial and military aid of whom?) to claim what does not exist yet, because Sudan is still in the surveying stage of its oil production. They have overstated the violence between the government and the rebels, between the White Arabs and the Black Christians. They forgot that there are on the ground some African Union’s troops since more than one year, after an agreement between the guerrilla and the central government in Khartoum. Kofi Annan sent a mission to investigate on the alleged genocide, and later its report, stating that “the level of violence... has changed from large-scale assaults to individual attacks on a massive scale”, but that no genocide is under way, although measures should be taken to “prevent genocide from happening in the future”, made the American representative in the Security Council slam the door, something never seen before in the history of the UN. Then, who does not want to see the truth in Sudan? What are the interests concealed behind the outcry for a more resolute intervention or possible sanctions? Is Sudan going to be the next Iraq? Let us hope that the last UN resolution, ordering the Sudanese government to cooperate with the African Union (what it has been doing already for more than one year), will bring about an end to the violence and the humanitarian crisis, and that the African Union is supported in its five-year-long effort to bring peace in Africa, from Somalia to Sierra Leone, passing through the Democratic Congo and Liberia and Sudan. It is a long time since Africa has not had such a long period of peace.

And one day China came

China wants to replace Europe in the hearts of Africans, and it is going to attain its objective with an amazing ease. It has created an annual China-Africa Forum, gathering in Beijing once a year all of the African countries. In this Forum the African countries make a list of the potential projects to be developed together in 1 or 5 or 10 years. Where in the past Europe was sending its first-job-seekers to be apprenticed in medicine, China has built a huge children hospital and a cancer center. Today almost all African universities are twinned with Chinese universities and the exchanges are very intense. Where Europe had left community development to its NGOs in search of a generosity patent for Africa, China has instituted the practice of twinning cities and villages, and today almost every African town is twinned with a Chinese town, and most of the community-development projects are carried out within the framework of such twinnings. Africans seem to be quite eager for this new form of cooperation. Sport facilities are being built here and there in Africa, and at the next Olympic Games in Beijing in 2008 there should be Africans excelling in disciplines...
in which usually they are not expected to.

In exchange, what does China want? All this generosity is certainly not guided by philanthropy only. China is, like Europe, attracted by the natural resources Africa abounds in, but it operates trying to present itself to Africans in a guise totally different from Europe’s. China seems to be saying to Africans that it will not be like Europe, which limits itself to take African resources and creates the paradox that in the end it is Africa that has to pay debts to Europe, still remaining poor. Apparently China moves avoiding some recurring mistakes in Europe’s attitude. In several countries China buys raw materials at prices that have nothing to do with those in London’s exchange of the products called, ironically, colonial. The priority in its relations with Africa is given to oil-producing countries. In Sudan, the new Eldorado for oil in Africa, China acts in a quasi-monopoly position. Angola, which spent months asking Europe for a loan, without getting it, for relaunching its economy after years of civil war, has had a 3 billion dollars loan granted by China, without interests and without any condition interfering in Angola’s internal affairs. This charm-dispensing operation is going to have a great success for Chinese diplomacy, which sees in Beijing a parade of political leaders from the African continent.

The Chinese and African businessmen conference is held in Africa (Addis Ababa) in parallel with the ministerial conference of the Cooperation Forum held in Beijing on the same days. In just two meetings, judging from the enthusiasm that can be found in several African capitals, China has gained the lead over Europe in the hearts of Africans, due to the remarkable content of the agreements reached:

1. Since December 2003, all of the African countries can export their products to China without any customs duty, whatever product with no distinction, whereas the ACP-EU Agreements have shown their limits.

2. The 2004-2006 action plan has been adopted, in which the two parties commit themselves in many cooperation areas, covering in practice the whole economic, political and cultural life of a nation: transport, telecommunications, energy and the supply of water and electricity. And, in addition, there is the cancellation by China of the debts of 31 African countries, the appointment of 8 more of them as countries of touristic destination, allowing them to profit from the godsend of new Chinese tourists, eager to spend so much more as their standard of living goes up.

3. Africa, which was lagging in the area of telecommunications, is today experiencing an exponential growth of new telephone lines, thanks to Chinese technology.

4. Whilst the African countries have been invited to several G8 Summits after Genoa, with never-kept promises on the realization of Nepad projects, China is going to provide a financial and material assistance, and also to strengthen its cooperation with Africa in the priority areas identified by Nepad, like infrastructures, the prevention and cure of transmissible and infectious diseases like Aids, paludism and tuberculosis, and the development of human and agricultural resources.

5. While Europe is taking care of Africa’s development through the NGOs dealing with this or that socially-urgent matter, China is committed to create together with Africans the ideal conditions for allowing Chinese enterprises of all sectors to settle in Africa. And on December 17, 2003 in Addis Ababa 17 Chinese enterprises signed 460 million dollars worth of agreements for building factories (producing cement, sugar, textiles), hydroelectric power plants and pharmaceutical companies with Ethiopia, Nigeria, Cape Verde, Rwanda, Uganda, Sudan and Tanzania. At the signing ceremony the Cape Verde Economy Minister Dr. Avelino Bonifacio stated that these concrete projects are the ones that “mark the difference between Africa-China
cooperation and that between Africa and the other world countries (ACP-EU)“.

6. China has launched a quite strange initiative: helping the African countries which are not members of the WTO to join the organization, in order to struggle together for making the rich countries stick to the rules that are more and more sidestepped by these same countries, which should be the guarantors of liberalism in the exchanges among countries. That is how the problem of African cotton may find a possibility to be solved.

In Africa the wind has shifted, the era of institutionalized beggary is going to end.

Conclusion

Africa is a continent of 800 million people, and also consumers, at the gates of Europe. In the next 10 years there will come to power in Africa a new ruling class, people born after the European colonization, after the independence of the 1960s, people who do not have the same psychological conditioning of their parents and grandparents, people who, supported by the new information technologies, are very well-informed on whatever is going on in the world, and can properly frame their national interests, no longer basing them on the sentimental feelings with Europe their ancestors had. They are people with a very good education in all cultural, scientific and technical matters, which they have studied or are presently studying in the best universities in the world. With this generation Europe shall learn how to play fairly if it wants to remedy the mistakes of its former leaders and its public opinion. Africa has today an average economic growth rate of 5%. With such a rate, in the next 20 years Africans will start to consume as much as the Chinese today, with a population that will have gone up to about 1,2 billion people. It will have by necessity to consume most of Africa’s natural resources. How does Europe prepare itself for this phase of scarcity of raw materials? Europe shall learn to consider Africa as a real partner with whom to create initiatives of mutual interest for the two continents, not a mere and perpetual aid beneficiary one would only address for reasons of philanthropic ethics. Will it still have the time to do it? Will it still have the means?
Roberto Palea

It took as long as seven years for Russia to decide to subscribe to the Kyoto Protocol on the reduction of greenhouse gas emissions. The Russian Government has recently approved the necessary bill which has been passed by the State Duma.

With the Kyoto Protocol 160 countries decided in 1997 to implement an action plan aimed at reducing the greenhouse gas emissions, deemed responsible for the Earth temperature rise. These gases include carbon dioxide (CO$_2$), mainly generated by processing and energy production industries and by motorcar exhaust gas, but also methane (CH$_4$), nitrous oxide (N$_2$O) and fluorocarbons. The Protocol sets precise objectives to reduce the emission of these gases in the atmosphere, to be achieved over the 2008-2012 period, and based on the emission levels measured in 1990 for each country. The Protocol states that it can become effective only after it has been ratified by a number of countries producing at least 55% of the worldwide emissions of carbon dioxide.

Following the “No” from the U.S.A., responsible for 36,1% of the emissions, Russia’s ratification is crucial. Indeed, the 125 countries that ratified the Protocol (among which the EU) reach, as a whole, 44,2 % of the greenhouse gas emissions; hence only the support of Russia, which produces 17,4 % of the total emissions, allows to exceed the minimum threshold set by the Protocol, thus achieving 61,6%.

Although the Kyoto objectives are deemed insufficient to fight efficiently against global warming caused by human activities, Russia’s subscription to the Protocol on the limitation of toxic gases is a first victory for the environmentalists. Not only for the European but also for the American environmentalists who will now have an additional weapon to press upon Bush and see to it that environmental issues become part of the electoral debate.

But Russia’s adhesion, made possible by long, enduring and patient negotiations led by the Brussels Commission, is, more than anything else, a victory for the European Union. The EU showed that it could condition Putin with its own significant economic “weight”, using it to influence both the negotiations on the price of Russian gas and on the entrance of Russia into the WTO. Acting as an economic power, the EU has proved its ability to negotiate with equal dignity with the world’s major powers and to be listened to.

This is enough to show what the role of the EU could be if its economic weight could be placed at the service of a truly common foreign policy; and if the member states lost for good the illusion of being able to remain strong on their own, without Europe.
Guantanamo: A Victory for Human Rights Everywhere in the World

Anna Sarotto

The Center for Constitutional Rights (CCR) is a non-profit legal and educational organization dedicated to protecting and advancing the rights guaranteed by the US Constitution and the Universal Declaration of Human Rights. Founded in 1966 by attorneys who represented civil rights demonstrators in the South, CCR is committed to the creative use of law as a positive force for social change.

CCR became world-famous because it successfully brought the Guantanamo lawsuit before the Supreme Court. In early 2002, CCR served as lead counsel in the case of Rasul v. Bush, challenging the US government’s practice of holding foreign nationals captured in connection with its war on Afghanistan and al-Qaida in indefinite detention, without counsel and without the right to a trial or to know the charges against them. On June 28, 2004 the case was decided. In a historic ruling, the Supreme Court ruled that detainees in Guantanamo Bay are allowed to pursue claims under ATCA (Alien Tort Claims Act), citing that ATCA “explicitly confers the privilege of suing for an actionable tort committed in violation of the law of nations or a treaty of the United States”. Adopted in 1789, the ATCA was one of the first laws of the new American republic. It grants U.S. courts jurisdiction in any dispute in which it is alleged that the “law of nations” is broken, thereby allowing foreign victims of serious human rights abuse abroad to sue the perpetrators in U.S. courts. According to Jennie Green, Senior Attorney for the CCR, “The Court has rejected the efforts of the Bush Administration and multinational corporations to eliminate the most important law that gives human rights victims their day in court. This is a victory for human rights everywhere.”

In 1979, the CCR represented the father and sister of Joelito Filártiga, a seventeen-year-old who had been tortured to death in Paraguay. CCR broke new ground when it used ATCA against Joelito’s torturer, who was living in Brooklyn, New York, at the time. In the Filártiga case, the Second Circuit Court of Appeals ruled that ATCA allows victims to sue in U.S. courts for serious violations of international human rights law. This established the precedent that is now before the Supreme Court. “For the purposes of civil liability, the torturer has become, like the pirate and the slave trader before him, hostis humani generis, an enemy of all mankind,” the circuit court wrote in its landmark ruling. Since then, the CCR has made use of ATCA in dozens of human rights cases and brought together the ATCA Defense Project with a coalition of human rights organizations. The group has organized amicus briefs and will provide testimony from prominent clients who have benefited from ATCA (http://www.nosafehaven.org).
European Parties 2004: beyond the Constitution

Ernesto Gallo

European elections and European parties

Is there any Europe-wide party system? We might say that there are (at least, formally) European parties, but what about a system? If by system we mean a stable set of rules which structure a political struggle in order to take on power, many doubts may arise.

Despite the recent enlargement and the chance to get the first pan-European Constitution, most parties’ campaigns have been run at national levels and focusing on national issues. No great surprise, however. In many cases, European parties are still quite weak federations of national parties, which aim mainly at domestic goals and concentrate on getting power where power currently resides. Despite recent choices by Mr Barroso and Monti, which show the increasing attractiveness of a role in the Commission, a minister in a national executive is still usually considered more important than the chance to fight for a new, and different, power in Brussels.

European parties and European groups

Let’s however have a look at more optimistic data. Since 1979 the European Union has widened from 9 to current 25 Member States, with different histories and political cultures. In the meantime however the number of effective European parties has fallen. The total seat percentage of the three main groups (EPP, PES, and ELDR) has risen from 63.4% in 1979 to current 75.96%. One-party groups, still 6 in 1994, have disappeared. It seems plausible to say that a kind of relatively structured and stable Europarty system is slowly emerging. With some very important distinctions, anyway, especially for us federalists.

On the one hand, parties still show a clear lack of collective identity and institutionalization. Few people across EU countries could identify the leaders of current European parties and their structures are still mainly rooted in national politics. On the other hand, things change if we consider Groups in the European Parliament. Over the last years their members showed a growing identification with European politics and issues and developed an encouraging attachment to their European role. Data reveal an increasingly strong cohesiveness in voting behaviours and it has been remarked that groups constitute the core of EU parties. For us federalists, good news and a good tool where to start from.

European parties, European groups and European federalists

EP groups, in a way, can be seen as a vanguard of less-integrated European parties. Having developed a stronger European identity, they could play a role in fostering a greater involvement of the still fragile EU party federations. They could show them problems and issues which can be solved only at a European level, and promote the creation of a centre of power which should be the proper place where to struggle for Leftist or Rightist ideals in the XXI century, as Spinelli suggested more than sixty years ago.

We federalists of course can play a significant role in this process. Groups and parties will
mobilize if they will feel a strong and constant demand for Europe, and it’s up to us to let them feel that demand. They will definitively choose to struggle for a stronger and fully democratic European power if, and when, we will show them that European citizens really support our requests. Lobbying activities on parties presuppose a wider involvement of active citizens at many levels, from municipalities to Brussels.

**European federalists and the federalist intergroup**

We should already have one ally: the newly constituted Federalist intergroup in the European Parliament. If EP groups are the vanguard of European parties, the intergroup can act as a vanguard of the groups themselves. Its members have realized that their different goals can be accomplished only if the battlefield is brought to the European level. This is however not enough. Resistances on governments’ side, both from older and newer Member States, appear to be still quite strong. We have to convince intergroup’s members that the match deserves to be played.

To achieve the last goal we should be brave enough to suggest aims which deserve a deep political effort and commitment. Europe needs majority voting in fields such as fiscal and monetary policies, let alone the whole matter of Foreign and Security Policy. Long-lasting problems, from widespread unemployment to terrorism’s threats, require proper answers as soon as possible. The intergroup could be the arena in which to suggest federalist answers to the shortcomings of the Draft Constitution, especially as far as unanimity voting in the above mentioned matters is concerned. As EP groups are the core of European parties, and the intergroup gathers the most advanced among MEPs, we might create a common front (art. 46, by the way, offers us the chance to collect one million signatures to “mobilize” the Commission), in asking Governments to convene a new Convention to deal with unsolved and most urgent problems, such as the ones concerning economic and security matters.

Some Governments might be sceptical about the need to rethink in the short run the issue of voting procedures in some fields. What would really be crucial, to my mind, is the need to reach, as far as these matters are concerned, a kind of “agreement to disagree”. As it has already happened with the Euro, with Schengen Agreements etc., the states which are in favour of majority voting in Foreign and Economic Affairs should have the opportunity to implement it, while the other ones could, if they wish so, join them later, while at the same time enjoying the benefits of the European Constitution. Current Europe- and world-wide problems are increasingly urgent: a settlement according to which some states could pursue similar goals in different ways, or with a different pace, but still in a common constitutional framework, might be a good exercise of democracy and an adequate answer to several current challenges, as recently stated by the Greek Premier Mr Karamanlis. Such scenarios however require a strong commitment on many sides: we federalists, EP groups and the intergroup can all play an important role, but only if we join our forces and aim at ambitious, long-term goals.
The UN is in urgent need of reform to meet the challenges of the 21st century. The global governance system in the UN must be made more efficient and more democratic. Decisions on the global level influence the daily lives of people everywhere, whether it concerns the economy, the environment, security issues or health policy. The current UN system is basically the structure of the founding year 1945. The world has changed dramatically in the last 60 years. It is unacceptable that the allied powers of the second world war and China can still veto every decision. It is also unacceptable that only governments and executive bodies have full representation at the UN level.

The UN needs the participation of civil society and the representation of the member states’ parliaments. The democratic deficit in the UN must be overcome. Governments are not necessarily representing the people of their country. They do not represent the opposition and other forces of society. They must be democratically accompanied and controlled by a citizens’ chamber in the UN. The voice of the citizens is not only an additional voice on the international scene. The voice of the citizens is a qualitatively different power. Governments very often embody the competition between states and act according to the raison d’état. A people’s assembly would act more directly towards people’s interests and human development.

One important element of any UN reform must therefore be the establishment of a parliamentary assembly in the UN system. This world parliament could be constituted, according to art. 22 of the UN Charter, by a simple majority of the general assembly. The parliamentary assembly could start as a consultative body with a delegation from each national parliament. The parliament assembly would deal with all topics discussed in the general assembly. It would organise itself as a plenary, in committees and political groups.

The European Parliament could be a good example how this process can start off and how it might continue. The early Coal and Steel Community of 1951 between six European states (Germany, France, Italy, Belgium, Netherlands, Luxembourg) and the European Community of 1957 started with a parliamentary assembly which had a purely consultative status. The national parliaments sent their delegations to this European assembly. Already in the sixties, however, a broad public debate began, calling for legislative power for the parliamentary assembly and for direct elections of its members. The Union of European Federalists (UEF) has been in the forefront of a broad coalition of forces promoting the transformation of the parliamentary assembly into a real European Parliament and the direct election of the European parliamentarians. This campaign is a success story which continues until the present day. In June 1979 the first direct elections to the European Parliament were organised.

On June 13th, 2004, the Europeans elected the 6th European Parliament. 450 million people from 25 member states could vote for 736 deputies in this European people’s assembly. The European Parliament has step by step acquired more powers. The first European Constitution, signed on June 18th, 2004 by the heads of state
and government of the 25 member states, will give the EP nearly the full range of powers of an elected parliament. The Constitution states the rule that European laws will be made by a two-chamber system: the citizens, represented by the European Parliament, and the states, represented in the Council of Ministers. The European Parliament will get full control over the EU budget and is entitled to elect the president of the European Commission which is the government of the European Union. After the federal parliament of India, the European Parliament represents the second largest democracy in the world. It is the first supranational parliament on this globe.

The story of the European Parliament could be a basis for similar developments in other continents as well as on the UN level. It is interesting to see that the newly created African Union (AU) will set up its own parliamentary assembly very soon. Similarly the Latin American association of Mercosur is debating a parliamentary assembly. The time has therefore come to push for a parliamentary body also in the UN system.

For the democratic development of global governance, it would be best to have one single parliamentary assembly and not one for every UN organization (WTO, World Bank etc.) as it is debated here and there. The resources of parliamentarians are not as big as to make such a disaggregation feasible. A single people’s assembly could also ensure the coherence of policies and decisions within the UN. The number of parliamentarians in the people’s assembly should be below 1000 in order to facilitate debates and efficient decision-making. Every country should have a minimum of two parliamentarians and be represented according to its population by up to 18 MPs for the largest countries.

For a start, an amount of 100 to 120 million Dollars would be enough to provide for plenary sessions, committee meetings and a general secretariat. Compared with the 1.000 billion dollars spent on weapons every year, the necessary financial resources to achieve global democracy should not be an argument against the world parliament. Of course there are undemocratic countries in this world and there are doubts regarding the character of their parliamentary envoys. Yet, Freedom House have calculated that among the 192 member states of the UN there are 117 democracies, a clear majority. There is the hope that parliamentary debates in the new assembly would be a political and educational help for undemocratic countries to develop democratic cultures of their own. In my opinion it is necessary to start with parliamentarians from all UN-members to preserve the equality of the states and their population in this world.

A world parliament is an instrument for a world citizenship. The representation of the citizens in this assembly would increase the identity with global problems. The opening phrase of the UN-Charta “We the people” could finally fulfil its true meaning. The parliamentary assembly would also be an invaluable push for the development of a global civil society. NGOs are very important but by definition they do not have the same democratic legitimacy as parliamentarians emerging from direct and general elections. With the world parliament, NGOs and civil society would have a clear focus and a strong partner in the UN.

How is it possible to realize a parliamentary assembly in the UN? A world wide campaign of citizens, organisations, parliamentarians and governments will be necessary to achieve this goal. Civil society has a special role to promote this idea because those who have the power are reluctant to change and do not want to share power. We therefore cannot wait for governments and national parliaments to start this process. There is of course a famous success story in recent years for a global coalition to promote UN-institutions. The World Federalist Movement (WFM) coordinated about 4.000
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NGOs in favour of the International Criminal Court (ICC). I would like to see WFM or another coalition to unite world citizens for a world parliament.

The San Francisco People’s Assembly 2004 was a starting point for such a global campaign. Let’s get going to have first results next year, when the world community will be meeting for the 60th anniversary of UN. I will do my utmost so that the newly elected European Parliament will be a strong partner for this important idea and this innovative project. We are living in one world. The citizens of this globe need direct representation: a world parliament is a necessity for the 21st century.

Created in Germany a Committee to Democratize the UN

Together with a strategy paper on the UN reform the “Committee for a Democratic UN” (CDUN) presented itself to the public on 3 September in Berlin. The all-party initiative was founded earlier this year in Germany. The paper titled “Developing international democracy” denounces a democracy deficit at the international level. “Foreign policy processes are exclusively in the hands of government executives and their officials”, said CDUN-Chairman Andreas Bummel.

The CDUN campaigns for the establishment of a Parliamentary Assembly at the United Nations (UNPA). In a first step such an institution could be brought into being as consultative body of the General Assembly. It would be composed by national parliamentarians. Later on direct election of the UNPA delegates would be conceivable. The assembly would be “an important hinge between the UN, the organizations of the UN system, governments, national parliaments and civil society”, said CDUN-Vice-Chairperson Claudia Kissling.

The Social Democratic parliamentarian Petra Ernstberger explained that the Committee initially strives for resolutions of the German Bundestag and the European Parliament which endorse the establishment of a UNPA. Additionally, the strategy paper would be introduced “into the reform debate at the UN”. Besides of scientists and NGO-representatives, parliamentarians from all groups in the German Bundestag, as well as parliamentarians from the European and Swiss Parliament, belong to the Committee. The CDUN is under the patronage of the prestigious Club of Budapest. (a.b.)
Moving Towards a World Democracy Forum

Fernando A. Iglesias

Even if the democratic paradigm has attained a worldwide support and the national governments have assumed a more democratic character than in any other age of human history, the perception is growing all over the world that economic and social inequalities are increasing at an exponential rate, that human rights are subject to unacceptable discriminations and that the existing political institutions are ineffective in promoting and defending equality, justice and democracy at the global scale.

While the planet becomes ever smaller because of the ever larger scale of technological and economic powers, human beings face a global explosion of social inequalities, an accelerated increase of the number of people with unsatisfied basic needs, recessions and financial collapses, a fast degradation of the biosphere and a depletion of non-renewable natural resources, a biotechnological menace to human reproductive mechanisms, an expansion of new planetary plagues, a lack of control of mass-destruction weapons, the rise of non-territorial terrorist and mafia networks, authoritarian threats to civil rights and belligerent projects that put the world peace in danger; that is to say: we are confronted with the disruptive emergence and fast worsening of global crises that mutually make each other more damaging and affect the whole human kind, and in front of which we completely lack the institutional mechanisms capable of putting into place rational and democratic measures.

In a world where the slogans about Globalization are repeated hollowly, the democratic-representation powers are still strongly attached to national institutions, organizations and patterns, while the inter-national system born from the ruins of the Second World War is being questioned for its lack of democracy, representation, legitimacy and accountability. Thus globalization, reduced to a worldwide extension of technology and communication networks and economic and financial markets, is perceived by millions of human beings as mere negativity, as a disruptive irruption of the economic logic into areas formerly reserved to politics, culture and personal human relationships.

Even if in a confusing way, the social global movement born in Seattle in 1999 has expressed its vision. It has pointed to three basic elements of the world political situation: 1) a firm refusal of a one-dimensional, unidirectional and anti-equalitarian globalization, 2) an extreme distrust in the capacity of the existing political institutions to control it and to counter its negative effects, 3) a strong rejection of the actions by the WTO, the IMF, the G8, etc., that is to say: of the intervention of an elitarian international order. After many mobilizations against international institutions, the No-Global movement could express its positions in a more articulated way through the World Social Forum, whose three previous meetings (Porto Alegre, Brazil, in 2001, 2002 and 2003) have seen an increasing participation and attracted the interest of the world public opinion.

Meaningfully, the World Social Forum is held simultaneously with the World Economic Forum, the meeting in Davos (Switzerland) that since 1971 has gathered the main personalities
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of international politics and economy. The appropriation of the key political issues of the global agenda by an economic and a social forum expresses what has been correctly called “the delay of politics”. The emergence of Davos and Porto Alegre and their increasing importance in the global information space confirms the communicative and planetary character that human society is reaching and the increasing need of raising and discussing a global political agenda. At the same time, the non-existence of a specifically political and democratic forum where to discuss how to extend representative democracy above the national level, indirectly reflects the institutional lack of democracy at the global level.

To democratically solve the huge challenges that globalization raises to human civilization and have the interests and rights of most human beings taken into consideration in global affairs, the world society cannot do without the efficiency of its economic system, neither without the full respect of the principles of justice and equality of its democratic political systems. A reconciliation between the economic and the social visions, between maximization of profits and Human Rights - that is to say: between Davos and Porto Alegre - has become necessary, although difficult.

An increasing number of activities, forums, initiatives try to close what is perceived as the “democratic deficit” of the so called “multilateral” international structure. Global meetings, web forums, international conferences and world summits flourish all over the world, connecting the emerging world civil society with the functionaries of the UN system and other international institutions. But the “democratic deficit” cannot be solved in this way, since both actors (NGOs and international institutions) are affected by the same lack of democratic representation, and hence of legitimacy and accountability.

There is no point in continuing this useless discussion. How could a global order be democratic when none of the main actors of the global scenario (financial markets, transnational corporations, international institutions, civil society organizations) can declare to be vested with democratic representation? So, if the United Nations and the NGOs are very committed in the development of democracy at the global level (the so-called “global governance”), their basic objective should be just one: how to reform the present structure of global governance in order to make it democratic, representative, legitimate and accountable. How to create a global governance structure informed by the basic principle of modern societies, that is to say: democratic representation.

Every attempt at facing global crises, every intent to reconcile the needs and claims of social actors with the realities of technological, economic and financial systems requires the intervention of political democratic institutions, enlarged to as global a scale as that assumed by the most dynamic social activities. The lack of such a national, continental, or international institutional frame is leading us to a concrete risk of a worldwide collapse. What we need is democratic representation in each sphere of human activity.

The World Democracy Forum will be a key contribution to the global debate on this matter, decisive for the future of human society. Its basic goal should be to promote innovative proposals on how to reformulate the continental, international and global institutional order, with the declared aim of contributing to its democratization. The WDF method will base itself on an open global discussion on the practicable reforms of the current political institutions and on the creation of feasible new ones, whose main objective should be to reduce the growing gap between the golden magnificence of the global world and the material and symbolic poverty of most human beings who live in it.
The World Democracy Forum will be open to: 1) Political organizations (parties, groups, governments, associations, politicians, members of Parliament); 2) NGOs and trade unions; 3) Academic world (both institutions and individuals).

The organizational structure of the WDF will respect the procedures and habits of each one of the spheres of activity, and, at the same time, will make easier the interchange of ideas among them, and the elaboration of common proposals and conclusions.

The only and determining factor that legitimates the participation in the WDF is the presentation of a detailed reform proposal of the institutional global order, according to the democratic values the WDF is founded on. The criticism of the existing organizations and the diagnosis of the global situation will be accepted only if short and necessary to support a concrete project of reforms. We do not propose to continue the discussion on global affairs among ourselves, unelected members of the so-called world civil society, but to create a new democratic, representative frame where those matters can be managed and solved by democratic representatives of the citizens of the world.

Many global political leaders and intellectuals have expressed their concern over the deficiencies of the current global order (see the quotations below), and have called for more democracy, transparency, legitimacy and accountability in the global decisions that affect the life of millions of human beings. The number of organizations that work in developing the embryos of a future world democracy are getting uncountable.

In spite of all this, there is not a venue where to gather the global political leaders, the best minds of the academic world, the stakeholders of the emerging world civil society, in the task of creating a really democratic institutional order. There is no forum able to focus the attention of humankind and the world public opinion on the central topic of the global age: the problem of how to create a real world democracy.

The road to a real respect of Human Rights of every citizen of the world must pass through a comprehensive reformulation of the political institutions responsible for taking global decisions and intervening in global crises. The development of a participative debate on the necessity, possibility and modalities of a new world democratic order has become a condition for human survival and a basic need for avoiding the risks of an emerging non-democratic elitarian global order.

The World Democracy Forum should become a public arena for a planetary, open debate on the statutes and principles on which the world civil society emerging from globalization can democratically be founded.

Quotations on a world democratic order by famous intellectuals

“It is high time to think publicly and in a loud voice about a new world order, capable of rescuing the few values that, in any case, continue to be our common human patrimony, and of reconciling the universality of political principles with the diversity of cultures”

Jean Daniel

“We face the planetary necessity of a democratic power capable of an ethical control of Globalization. We must go towards a world-society. Yet, we lack a real sense of our common destiny, of our universal belonging to the same world and of a concrete awareness about the deep dangers that threaten the planet”

Edgar Morin

“The real debate associated with globalisation is, ultimately, not about the efficiency of markets, nor about the importance of modern technology. The debate, rather, is about the inequality of power”

Amartya Sen

“Democratic policies must be reformulated at most levels -local, national, regional and global-,
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because each of them is appropriate for different public problems”

David Held

“It is highly probable that, in the near future, there will be new global forms of democratic representation adopted, similar to those that were used inside the national states”

Anthony Giddens

“It would have been better if globalization of economy had started after the creation of a World Federation, capable of promoting a global welfare state, that is to say: a supranational government that could guarantee a certain level of Justice and Equality among nations and within them. Unfortunately, the global economy became a reality before it was possible to create what Tennyson called ‘The Parliament of Man, the Federation of the World’”

Richard Rorty

“The Republic is the only alternative to the blind, elementary, erratic, uncontrolled, divisive and polarizing globalization forces. We need political institutions effective at the planetary scale, equivalent to those of transnational powers”

Zygmunt Bauman

“We need a global government and the procedures to build it should be carefully considered. The first thing is to modify the general rules of international institutions”

Charles Taylor

“The question of Globalization is, above all, a question of Democracy. Similarly to what happened in the past, we should have reached some kind of World Federation before the globalization of Economy”

Gianni Vattimo

“Unfortunately, we lack a world government responsible in front of the peoples of all countries and with a real capacity of supervising the globalization process in a way similar to that which was used by national governments in their processes of nationalization”

Joseph Stiglitz

“In the present technological and economic frame, the creation of a World Parliament is no longer a utopia. Over the next years, the constitution of supra-national democratic institutions will be the only relevant task for Politics”

Juan José Sebreli

“We have still to cover a long distance towards the building of a world civil society, and it would be better if we immediately start to cover it”

Ralf Dahrendorf

Quotations on a world democratic order by political global leaders

“The issue is not how to stop Globalization. The issue is how we use the power of our community to combine it with Justice. If Globalization works only for the benefit of the few, then it will fail and will deserve to fail”

Tony Blair

“Perhaps the biggest problem the world faces is the discrepancy between the global dimensions reached by many human activities and the basically-national dimensions of the democratic rules and institutions”

Giuliano Amato

“It is not possible to have a global trading system without a global economic policy, without global environmental, education and health policies, and without a global agreement on security”

Bill Clinton

“Every day it becomes more evident that a global market requires a global citizenship”

Kofi Annan
The Cardoso Report on International Democracy

William R. Pace

The WFM judgement of the Report of the Panel of Eminent Persons on United Nations - Civil Society Relations, best known as the Cardoso Report, is a mixture of support and concerns. The World Federalist Movement welcomes the Secretary-General’s reform initiatives and applauds the Panel’s effort to enhance the engagement of civil society in the United Nations. Likewise, we support the spirit of inclusiveness in the Report and the recommendations for participation of all relevant stakeholders in the United Nations. WFM is devoted to advance the positive aspects of the report in the forthcoming follow up process.

WFM has been supportive of the UN since our organization was founded in 1947 and has actively participated in UN processes both through our consultative status with ECOSOC and our information exchange with DPI. We have partaken in many civil society networks and assumed leadership roles of numerous civil society processes such as the Coalition for the International Criminal Court, The Hague Appeal for Peace, International NGO Task Group on Legal and Institutional Matters, the Earth Summit as well as the issue of extending consultative rights beyond traditional international NGOs.

Throughout our participation in UN processes, we have valued the integrity and solidness of resolution 1996/31 on the relationship between the UN and NGOs in consultative status with ECOSOC. However, we regret that in revisiting the framework for NGO involvement at the UN, the Cardoso Report did not acknowledge how resolution 1996/31 (and its predecessors) embraces the idealism and best practices of NGO engagement as well as the privileges and responsibilities encompassed within it.

In continuation of this, we are concerned with the Panel’s emphasis on the participation of other actors such as the business sector without outlining a framework for the rules of engagement for these actors. We do not object to the access and participation of for-profit organizations but we find it crucial that legitimate rules of engagement are established for these actors, similar to the principles outlined in resolution 1996/31. We thus called upon the Secretary-General Kofi Annan to ensure that specific rules and principles of engagement in support of the UN are instituted with regards to the participation of for-profit entities in UN decision-making processes.

Overall, WFM supports the Panel’s steps to facilitate greater involvement of parliamentarians in UN processes and approves of the initiative of Global Public Policy Committees. However, we have some concerns regarding the need for more inclusiveness in consulting with parliamentary associations. WFM has had a parliamentary dimension to our organization throughout its six decades and while we welcome the emergent role of the Inter-Parliamentary Union with the General Assembly, we have substantive recommendations on how to improve this relationship.

WFM endorses the Panel’s reintroduction of the issue of non-state actors’ participation in
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the General Assembly. In the capacity as Chair of the International NGO Task Group on Legal and Institutional Matters, WFM has worked on this issue for many years and drafted in consultation with hundreds of NGOs a proposed General Assembly NGO Resolution in 2000. This Resolution was endorsed by Amnesty International, Greenpeace and many NGOs from both the North and the South. WFM rightfully respects and wishes to protect the integrity of the General Assembly and we maintain that the provision for participation of NGOs should only be consultative. Accordingly, we call for an extension of the modalities of ECOSOC to limited consultative arrangements for NGOs to the General Assembly including the right for accredited NGOs to attend open meetings, receive documentation and be able to make their reports and written documents available. We do not advocate extending the ECOSOC speaking rights nor the privileges to have translation and circulation of written statements, but we do request our right to observe. Given the research and knowledge that WFM holds on this issue, we would welcome the opportunity to share our expertise with the UN Secretariat.

WFM welcomes the proposal for one single accreditation unit, given that it will improve the application process and facilitate a faster and less resource intensive evaluation procedure for the UN Secretariat and governments. In agreement with the Panel’s observation of the current accreditation process as being too politicized, WFM advocates an enhanced role for professional evaluations of applications.

We question the degree of depoliticization which would be accomplished by moving the accreditation mechanism to the authority of the UN General Assembly and recommend that the main part of the accreditation process is performed by professional staff at the UN. Accordingly, we highly support a continued discussion on how to depoliticize the process while respecting the intergovernmental legitimacy of the UN and the sovereignty of the Member-States.

In line with the Panel’s proposal for Public Hearings, which WFM endorses in principle, we recommend that the Secretary-General or Deputy Secretary-General consider convening public hearings to discuss the Report with governments, civil society and other sectors. Since the release of the Report many substantive, legal, political and practical questions have been raised by all actors indicating a need for an inclusive follow up process where such questions could be attended to. Given that the Report is addressing the issue of civil society engagement in the UN, WFM finds it especially vital that a follow-up framework with modalities for input and participation of civil society is established.

Lastly, we wish to emphasize the importance of ensuring the preservation of Article 71 of the UN Charter as well as Resolution 1996/31. The proposals suggested by the Panel must, if implemented, in no way compromise the rights and privileges conferred on NGOs by the UN Charter which has developed constructively since the first years of the UN.

Half of the World has Joined the ICC

In October 2004, three more states – Burundi, Guyana and Liberia – ratified the Rome Statute establishing the International Criminal Court. It is to be stressed that Burundi and Liberia join the ICC after suffering the worst atrocities and see in the Court the way leading to a more peaceful and just world. With these three new ratifications, the total number of countries who have joined the ICC has now risen to 97, more than half the member states of the United Nations.
For Another Europe: the Democratic and Federalist One*

The goal of this paper is to draw an overview about the issue of democracy and federalism. By this way, we try to match the first point of the document “Constituent Movements: a Chart for a pacifist, social, democratic and federalist Europe”. The final aim is the starting of a permanent Campaign for another Europe: the democratic and federalist one.

Introduction – Peace as the founding value of Europe

The Europe we aim at recognizes peace as the founding value of the European citizenship. Europe will have to be a subject of peace for all the citizens around the world. As Bobbio stated, “Human rights, democracy and peace are three necessary steps of the same historic moment: without recognized and protected human rights there is no democracy; without democracy there will not be the minimum conditions for a peaceful solution of conflicts. Democracy is citizens’ society, and subjects become citizens when some fundamental rights are recognized to them. There will be stable peace, i.e. a political situation where the war cannot be an alternative to the peace, only when the citizens will not belong to this or this other state, but they will belong to the entire world”.

The democratic Europe

Europe can be an alternative on the path to a different world, just by assuming a democratic management of the common resources by all peoples of the world as its foreign policy’s main goal. Europe can be an alternative to the American imperialism by building a world based on social justice, democracy and rights, where the war will no longer be the instrument to solve international conflicts.

Germany and France’s opposition to the permanent war imposed by the USA after September 11 is not sufficient. It is necessary to build a political Europe, open to the rest of the world; this is the first step towards a democratic, multilateral and multilevel world governance. To build the political Europe means superseding the evident democratic deficit through citizens’ participation and through the involvement of new social actors in the European constitutional process.

The euphoria for the EU enlargement towards Eastern European countries can not dim the necessity to modify those institutions working for a limited number of countries. It is necessary to avoid the dissolution of the EU into a mere free exchange area and to favour the process towards the political unity of the continent in order to reach the European federation that Altiero Spinelli dreamt of during the fascist internment in Ventotene island. This represents the answer to war and to nationalisms.

Europe, through a good mixture of instruments of representative democracy and of multilevel participatory democracy, must give back to citizens the power to decide over the policies that concern them directly. Active citizenship must be exercised at all levels, from the neighbourhood to the world, and obviously passing through Europe.

The first battle of the social movements is to
build a democratic Europe. We cannot leave in the hands of national governments, gathering in the European Councils, and of multinational corporations, the management and the control of decision making processes that concern us directly in the field of political, social and economic life. We must demand to give to Europe a democratic and federal Constitution: a European Parliament, with full legislative power, and a European political government that has to be democratically accountable and responsible to European citizens.

In this way it’s possible to create a direct connection between the will of the citizens and a European democratic government. The lack of this connection did not permit the realization of the will of peace showed during many large demonstrations all over the world. The 15 February 2003 and 20 March 2004 demonstrations, which have seen million of persons in public squares all over the planet, have been important because they have seen the birth of the so called “world people”. They are not directly linked to political parties, to religious beliefs and nationalist forces or a particular class. A cosmopolitan and postnational citizenship is moving its first steps towards supranational and democratic institutions which can supply a representation to this people asking for peace.

Nowadays the Europeans have experienced the costs of a divided Europe: it has not succeeded to prevent a foolish and dangerous war for the future stability of the Middle East and of the entire world, neither to give voice to its citizens, in greatest majority contrary to the war. In Europe there is the concrete possibility to overcome the very meaning of national state. It is necessary to expand democracy, in all its articulations: participation, representation and equality at supranational level.

We, European citizens, must have the opportunity to exercise our rights and duties at all levels, from local to global. In order to do this we have to start acting within a European public space where we can exert our sovereign power beginning with the construction of a new cosmopolitan citizenship, post-national and based on the residence. A political Europe should insert the right to peace and the repudiation of war as an instrument to solve international disputes in the first articles of its Constitution. In this way we shall actively contribute to the rising of an alternative for a world of peace and the building of democratic world government.

Multilevel democracy

The birth of a European public space leads to the development of a multilevel democracy, federalism being its control tool through the dislocation of power on different levels and through the participation of citizens in the political life. In particular, the concept of subsidiarity allows the management of problems at higher levels only when those problems can not be efficiently solved at lower levels.

The existence of different levels of power (from the neighbourhood, to the city, the region, the state, the continent, the world) determines increased democracy (representative and participative) and therefore increased freedom. In fact, citizens do not have in front of them a single centre of power, a power that in the historical experience of the European national states was always a monolithic and an authoritarian power (citizen subjected to it); rather they have a plurality of powers subjected to reciprocal balancing. People’s freedom, as well as the opportunity to express different values and sociality, experimental spaces, etc., would benefit from this because power would be dislocated on different levels, each level being autonomous in its competences, but coordinated with the other levels.

If multilevel democracy, thanks to federalism, had already achieved a worldwide dimension, we would already have the extinction of war (as conflict between states). Power would therefore lose the strongest instrument for coercing human beings into dominating human beings.
(ordering to kill). Through time, it would become more and more a question of the “governance” of the public thing subjected only to the dynamics of social conflicts and no longer subjected to the rules of the “raison d’état”.

Multilevel democracy consists of three aspects that have to be developed in parallel. Each of them is necessary for the construction of the other Europe.

**Participative democracy**

Actions coming from the lower level and participative democracy, solid self-governance, municipality, etc.

**Representative democracy**

The European Parliament must be placed at the centre of the institutional triangle. The European Parliament must exercise the legislative power in all the decisive matters at European level. The Council of Ministers must become a second Chamber, representing the States, in order to structure a real federal and supranational system. The Commission becomes the government of the Union and must be elected and subjected to the vote of confidence of the Chambers, following the scheme of the Spinelli project.

**Egalitarian democracy**

It is necessary to favour the real and active participation of women at all levels and in every aspect of social and political life.

**Glocal democracy**

Without global democracy there can not exist local or national democracy. On this basis it is not enough to think global and to act local. We must act globally.

The role of the movement

Our role is therefore the building of a new inclusive polis, multi-polar and multilevel, starting from the neighbourhood to reach the entire world; a new inclusive polis allowing for the solution of small local problems and of important global problems, operating a synthesis between representative and participative democracy. It should be a sort of glocal democracy able to protect cultural differences, to respect local needs and, at the same time, to offer a global place where to peacefully solve worldwide conflicts and where to manage democratically the goods belonging to all human beings. We must become promoters and active members of the birth of those new constituent actors which want and which must build these forms of multilevel democracy.

**The role of Europe**

Europe must facilitate the development of democracy in all continents following local attitudes (beginning with existing structures such as the African Union and Mercosur). Europe must not “export democracy” but has to favour the development of integrated regional areas. Only in this way will it be possible to start-off an autonomous economic development, avoiding the logic of liberism and independently from the multinational corporation policies. The development of a multipolar world is in Europe’s own interest. By diminishing the differences between rich and poor global regions it is possible to favour the cooperation and the integration, the comprehension and the respect of different cultures. This is the main tool to eliminate the background of war and terrorism. Only with that will it be really possible to think of a large democratic reform of the UN, based on the direct election of a World Parliament by the people of the world. This is a great task for the European federation!

**Permanent campaign for another democratic and federalist Europe**

We would like to propose in the next European social forum that will take place in London, a
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permanent campaign for another democratic and federalist Europe with the following principal objectives: to cancel the veto power of national governments and to give to the European Parliament the exclusive legislative power.

With this aim the next European Parliament must elect a European constituent assembly in order to give the answers the European citizens are waiting for; to give answers to the instances of the movements; in particular to adopt a European democratic Constitution based on:
• the aim of a European federation;
• the principle of popular sovereignty;
• the values of peace, solidarity and equality and the principles of participatory, representative and egalitarian democracy;
• the principles of a social Europe based on the equality of right of its citizens;
• the repudiation of war as an instrument to solve international conflicts; the respect and reinforcement of the UN Charter in order to guarantee a new economic, social and political world agreement based on democracy and on peaceful cooperation among citizens:
• the fairness in the North and South global relationships, in the respect to the local and global ecological balance and the extension of rights to all the peoples of the planet;
• the guarantee of sustainable development (with particular reference to the protection of the atmosphere, the fight against every kind of exclusion and poverty, the respect of the future generations),
• the protection of the fundamental rights enrolled in the Charter of Nice and the adhesion to the international instruments for protection of fundamental rights such as the International Criminal Court;
• the European citizenship extended to non-EC residents;
• the implementation of a federal institutional framework for a European democratic government;
• a budgetary system financed by a common federal fiscal system;
• the definition of the Union’s frontiers and the relations with the neighbouring countries in Europe and the Mediterranean;
• the procedures of constitutional amendments throughout the direct participation of the citizens, according with the possible use of the European referendum.

This document wants to contribute to the debate on the constituent process. We ask to participate in the discussion with the aim to elaborate a common program for achieving the construction of another Europe.

1 This article was submitted as a Paper for the European Social Forum’s Assembly on the European Constituent Process, Rome, 22 - 23 May 2004, by the Working group “Democracy”. It mainly derives from the contributions by Nicola Vallinoto, Antonio Longo and Paolo Acunzo.

1 Monbiot, G.: “Luiz Inacio Lula da Silva, president of Brazil, has won the last presidential elections mainly on the promise of supplying basic services to the poorest fringes of society by developing policies to fill the gap between rich and poor. It is not sufficient to have good local policies and intentions while the current global system is oriented towards policies aimed at enriching developed countries and rich sectors of many countries. We also have to act globally”. Monbiot has therefore launched during the Mumbai World Social Forum the proposal of a worldwide Parliament whose representatives will be elected by the citizens of all countries and who will be publicly responsible for the decisions that they take.
Proposal for a Social and Economic Reform of the UN System*

The present process of economic, financial and commercial globalization takes place in the total absence of a political venue which might act as a clearing house for the many political and economic conflicts among States and within States, caused by the deep inequalities present on the planet; they are due to the speed of the economic-system transformations we have observed in the last two decades, among which a very strong financing of the economy, and also to the persistence of structural problems in the developing countries, first of all the never-solved drama of their foreign debt.

The creation of such a clearing house cannot take place but within the UN system, reversing a trend which has seen the economic and financial powers (like the institutions created in 1944 at Bretton Woods, i.e. the World Bank and the International Monetary Fund) operating in an ever more autonomous way, albeit they are UN specialized agencies, up to the creation in 1994 of the third pillar in trading, the World Trade Organization (WTO), totally outside of the UN system. Such an approach has led to a structural unbalance in the system of global governance to the advantage of the economic paradigm only, drenched for the last twenty years with the neo-liberist ideology, which is embodied in these three institutions; they have been making less and less reference to the political priorities defined in the UN circles, thanks to the fact (in particular in the case of the Bretton Woods institutions) that they are endowed with a mechanism of direct financing by governments or international markets.

Such an international economic system has gone in practice well beyond the already remarkable, albeit still partial, success of the international community in progressively defining a body of international rights in matters of environment, health, social and labour rights, first of all the fundamental human rights written down in the Charter and in the founding Conventions of the UN system, subscribed by the entire international community.

It is necessary, therefore, to give the political center stage back to the UN, in order to achieve this social, environmental and economic compensation (according to the three founding pillars of the concept of sustainable development) through a new democratic and transparent decision-making mechanism as to how to manage the resources adequate to reach that goal.

It is to be noted that the 1990s have seen the creation of many inter-governmental trust funds, the managing of which has gone in the end into the hands of the World Bank, although other programs or UN agencies were participating in the same funds. The Bank and the Fund, despite they acknowledge the importance of the Millennium Development Goals (MDGs) defined by the international community and call for more funds for implementing policies to this end, in reality aim at carrying out a strategy that considers more and more the private sector as the main actor of development, and do not concentrate their resources on those who are and will inevitably remain out of the global market.
The Proposal

It is necessary to bring back under the aegis of the UN the resources already allocated by the international community, aimed at solving the environmental and social emergencies of the planet and fulfilling the MDGs. Presently the UN ECOSOC Committee, charged with the task of dealing with economic, social and cultural matters, has difficulties to function and in practice has no resources available. It is necessary to transform the ECOSOC into the Human Development Council (HDC), whose main task must be to finance all actions necessary to implementing the environmental, social and labour rights spelled out by many Conventions and international treaties signed in the last decades in the framework of the fundamental human rights sanctioned by the conventions and founding pacts of the UN system. To this end there is to note the position of the French government, in favour of the creation of an Economic and Social Security Council within the UN system, a position which has already met a strong interest by many European political bodies.

All the resources, then, of the trust funds managed by the World Bank (WB) and by other economic institutions must be brought back under the direct control of the HDC. The same International Development Association (IDA), a special WB counter for poor countries, which receives funds worth many billion dollars every three years, must be brought back under the HDC, outside of the WB group. With these resources, which could amount to several billion dollars each year, the HDC will give priority to actions promoting the global public goods, to be defined year by year with the support of the various UN agencies and specialized programs, in the framework of meeting the Millennium's development objectives.

At the same time the HDC will have to find out innovative financing mechanisms for increasing its own resources, which should go beyond the usual creditor/debtor dynamics typical of the Bretton Woods system, starting with the authority to introduce direct global taxes to avoid distortion practices, like financial speculation or pollution of the planet.

Finally, it will be essential for the HDC to decide on the creation of an innovative arbitration mechanism as to how to solve the problem of the developing countries' foreign debt, with the legal support of the International Court of Justice. It is necessary in any case to think about an innovative and democratic functioning for this new political UN body, which shall balance efficiency and democracy. Since the last WTO Ministerial Summit in Cancun onward, we witness a new political protagonism of the world’s South, which has to be balanced in its various emerging components. Representation on regional basis may be envisaged, which could also foster the coordination and political-integration processes on regional scale currently under way.

*First draft of a document circulated during the Peace Round Table Seminar, held in Perugia on September 17-19, 2004. The document had this subtitle: “Creation of the Human Development Council, for guiding the economic globalization and placing again the Bretton Woods institutions (the World Bank and the International Monetary Fund) and the WTO under the fundamental objectives of the UN Charter”.*
Despite strong reservations over proposed new global taxes by the United States, Japan and Germany, the United Nations is set to take centre-stage in the longstanding controversy over new sources of innovative funding for the world’s poorest nations. There is an urgent need for a critical mass of new resources to deal with a wide spectrum of human hardship and UN Secretary Kofi Annan has warned that unless current development assistance is doubled to 100 billion dollars annually, the world’s 132 developing nations will fail to meet their Millennium Development Goals. These goals are aimed at reducing poverty, improving education and health care, eliminating diseases, and preventing environmental degradation all by the 2015 deadline set by the UN General Assembly in 2000. The debate on new resources has already entered the United Nations and the department of economic and social affairs has been requested to study the different proposals.

One of the most recent ideas in order to support development in the world’s poorest nations is that of an International Financing Facility (IFF) proposed by the United Kingdom. The IFF would be a temporary financing mechanism to provide additional resources for disbursement to the poorest countries. The IFF would be financed both by donor countries and through bonds issued in the international markets. Borrowing would be subjected to economic tests and be repaid in the years following 2015, the deadline fixed by the Monterrey agenda. Finance from the IFF would certainly help put poor countries on a sustainable and lasting path to poverty reduction and participation in the world economy. However, it does not represent the right way to go. Two main critiques can be made to this proposal.

The first one is that the IFF’s disbursement would hinge on economic criteria. The IFF would decide how to distribute resources to different projects on the basis of their profitability and not also on the basis of their social utility. The second one is that the IFF would require the repayment of the borrowing. This means that the economic efforts in fighting poverty would be dumped on the poorest nations themselves.

International taxation offers an approach that would also promise lasting resources for development. International taxation would however be consistent with the principle according to which the most obvious way to finance the management of global issues - such as development assistance and humanitarian aid - is to tax global assets - such as the air in the case of the carbon tax - or globalised activities - such as movements of foreign currency in the case of the Tobin tax. Moreover, taxation is inspired by criteria of solidarity and redistribution of wealth.

Lastly, taxes are levied on certain activities, and not earmarked by national government, to finance public goods. Therefore, international taxes - once agreed upon - would become compulsory and would circumvent the current difficulty of voluntary contributions from governments. International taxes could provide the UN with an autonomous balance from national governments enhancing its autonomy and initiative capacity.
Many alternative proposals have been presented on international taxation. The most interesting ones are those that can also be used as useful policy instruments to correct economic distortions and externalities by inducing a change in the behaviour of economic agents. Some externalities are global by nature, thereby justifying a response at a global level. This is the direction in which an international carbon tax or the Tobin tax certainly go.

The carbon tax represents a way of internalizing the negative environmental effects of carbon dioxide emissions. This tax would induce emitters to choose an efficient, cost-minimizing pattern of abatement. The Tobin tax is a tax on foreign exchange transactions that was conceived by the Nobel Prize winner James Tobin to discourage short-term speculative capital flows. Independently of its effect on exchange rate volatility, the application of a Tobin tax has been supported by a number of NGOs and governments (for example the Canadian, French and Finnish) as a potential source of funding the UN. In fact, past studies demonstrated that the Tobin tax would be able to generate high proceeds. Conservative estimates showed that a 0.05% tax (Tobin suggested 0.5%) could generate in a year proceeds sufficient to eliminate the worst forms of poverty in the world.

However, some important critiques have been moved to the Tobin tax. The most relevant one is that the higher cost of currency transactions due to the Tobin tax would be felt by developing countries’ economic agents, that rely on foreign trade and cannot use their own currencies in their operations, rather than developed countries’ agents. Therefore, an alternative proposal worth investigating is that of a specific tax for funding the UN, which would be levied on trading executions on financial markets or capital gains on financial assets. This kind of tax should directly be collected by financial intermediaries that execute the order on the market according to the withholding tax system and then paid directly to the UN. This kind of tax could also provide the UN with not only a greater balance but also autonomy from national governments. Moreover, its independence along with its initiative capacity would be enhanced without the risk of penalizing real economy and trading in real goods.

In order to set international taxes, it would be necessary to recognise the competence of the UN in defining tax provisions and collecting and controlling the revenues. The UN should be provided with an extended mandate and competence on international taxation. The UN reform, which is currently under discussion, should also take into account this specific point. Providing the UN with an autonomous balance and competence in taxation, however, presupposes also a democratisation of this institution. If the UN is expected to become an effective supranational governing system with limited but real powers necessary to solve problems on a world-wide scale as well as with an autonomous financial funding, then the UN Security Council must be reformed according to the democratic principle of representation. The Security Council must be transformed into a supranational institution within which the main areas in the world are represented and relations are regulated by the acceptance of common rules and not by balance of power.

The request and obtainment of a single seat in the Security Council by the EU as a whole would certainly represent an important step in this direction. Moreover, obtaining a single seat for the EU in the Security Council would also be an important reference for projects of integration in other regions of the world and work towards a more democratic UN in which all the major area in the world are effectively represented.
The United Nations Reform Through Weighted Voting

Joseph E. Schwartzberg

UN Secretary General, Kofi Annan has declared emphatically that major reforms in the United Nations system are needed. To further that end he appointed in November 2003 a high-level commission of experts to make specific reform recommendations. Chaired by Anand Panyarachun, a former Prime Minister of Thailand, the commission’s sixteen distinguished members represent all major parts of the world. This monograph is addressed to them and to all others who wish to promote a more representative, effective, and universally respected UN.

Among the most needed changes are: reform of the decision-making system in both the General Assembly (GA) and the Security Council (SC), a more robust peacekeeping system, greater use of the International Court of Justice, institutionalizing other measures for conflict prevention, and a more adequate funding system. But additional funding and other reforms will not likely be forthcoming until basic flaws in the present decision-making system are corrected. To be specific, the one nation - one vote system of decision making in the GA is unrealistic, bearing no relationship to the actual distribution of power in the world. Hence, GA decisions are only recommendatory rather than binding. Additionally, the method of allocating seats in the more powerful SC is neither fair nor representative. Finally, the SC’s moral authority in dealing with many important issues is compromised by the anachronistic special status of the five permanent members, in particular by their being endowed with the power of the veto. The fact that many nations see themselves as marginalized by the present system contributes to anti-Western sentiment and leads to questioning the very legitimacy of the UN system. This study analyzes the shortcomings of the GA and SC, shows why and to what extent they have increased over time, points out realistic ways by which the shortcomings can be corrected, anticipates and responds to objections that certain countries may have to the reforms proposed, and suggests the specific wording for two Charter amendments, one for the GA and the other for the SC.

Under the present rule in the essentially powerless GA, the votes of scores of states with populations of less than a million and/or paying the stipulated minimum of only 0.001% of the total UN budget, count as much as the vote of China or the United States. I suggest instead that the GA be empowered to make needed binding decisions in carefully defined spheres of concern and that the voting system be rationalized and made more congruent with the global realities of power. Instead of each country having one vote, regardless of its population or economic influence, there would be a system of weighted voting. The weighted vote of each would depend on its population, its financial contribution as a percentage of the total UN budget, and its unit share of the total UN membership. In other words, a country’s weighted vote would be the average of three fundamental factors and would be determined by the following simple formula: \[ WV = \frac{(P + C + M)}{3}. \]

WV here represents a nation’s weighted vote, the average of: P, its percentage share of the total population of all UN members; C, its financial contribution as a percentage of the total UN budget; and M, its share of the total UN membership (i.e., 1/191, or 0.524%). This
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formula embodies three fundamental principles: democratic/demographic, economic, and legal (the sovereign equality of nations).

Were it in place today, the proposed system would give the USA a weighted vote of roughly 9.1%, China 7.7%, Japan 7.3%, India 6.0%, Germany 3.8%, France 2.6%, the UK 2.3%, etc. At the opposite extreme a number of microstates would each have a WV of 0.17%. In all, 33 nations would gain under the proposed system. While not a large proportion of the UN’s membership, those states include almost all significant actors on the world stage, contain roughly 79% of the world’s people, and account for 92% of the contributions to the UN budget. While 158 countries, 83% of the total, would lose some degree of power, the system would remain strongly biased in their favor in that they would still have 38% of all votes, while accounting for much smaller shares of the world’s population and budgetary contributions. Reasoning that 38% of something – an empowered GA – is much better than 83% of nothing, most small states should recognize the benefits to them of the proposed reform. Additional benefits of the proposal are that it would: a) provide an incentive for countries to pay their assessed dues; b) result in a rough balance between the power of the world’s major economic blocs, the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD) and the so-called “Group of 77”, which will necessitate creative bargaining and compromise between the two; and c) substantially increase the voting strength of the relatively free nations of the world.

In respect to the SC, the number of seats allocated to nonpermanent members, six prior to 1966 and ten thereafter, has never been adequate. Moreover, seventy-seven member nations have yet to serve a single term; and only eight have served more than 20% of the total number of years since they joined the UN. Japan, with 16 years of service (34%), leads this group. Yet, several microstates have occupied SC seats; and Mauritius, with only 1.2 million people, has served four years, no fewer than Indonesia, which, with 211 million inhabitants, is the world’s fourth most populous nation. This remarkably arbitrary situation might not be so bad if nonpermanent SC members were willing and able to represent the interests of the vast and diverse regional blocs from which they were elected. But they can’t and don’t even try.

The idea of specifying permanent seat holders has led to such wholly unrealistic situations as having Taiwan, formerly regarded as the legal embodiment of China, hold a seat in the SC for twelve years. Permanent SC seats, along with the attendant veto, should be abolished and membership should be based on objective eligibility criteria. The proposed WV formula provides a means of doing so. I suggest that any single nation with a WV of more than 4%, or any self-formed caucus of like-minded nations with a combined WV of more than 4% would be entitled to a seat, up to a total of seventeen seats in an eighteen-seat SC. Presently, the United States, China, Japan, and India would individually qualify. Terms would be for three years. Given the contemporary distribution of regional organizations and political interests, one may reasonably anticipate formation of twelve or thirteen bloc seats in addition to the four going to individual nations. Any remaining seat(s) would then be filled by the GA voting among candidates nominated at-large from non-bloc nations. Various methods for selection of bloc representatives are suggested. The proposed system would enable representation in the SC of more than 90% of the world’s people at any given time, far more than has ever occurred to date. Additionally, the need for consultation and cooperation within bloc caucuses should lead to a variety of regional benefits.

One need not assume the necessity of adopting the proposed voting reform for the GA as a precondition for implementing the proposal set forth for the SC and vice versa. Even if the GA were to remain as it is at present, country weights could still be derived for each UN member nation and applied in determining SC
eligibility for individual nations and blocs.

While some opposition to the changes suggested would be inevitable among nations fearing a diminution of their present influence, it would be possible to mitigate their concerns by implementing the proposed changes over a transitional period of up to fifteen years. This would allow time for adjustment to new political realities.

The potential benefits of the reforms proposed here are enormous. They would provide the GA with needed binding powers and impart a sense of realism and fairness in the allocation of power within that body. They would also make the SC a much more representative and efficient body and enhance the legitimacy of its decisions. Despite the difficulty of Charter amendment, there is reason to believe that once people recognize the extent to which the benefits of change outweigh the risks, enlightened public opinion will come to see major reform as necessary. The world’s people deserve no less.


---

**Gorbachev Launches a Campaign Against Weapons of Mass Destruction**

On September 23, 2004, in London Mikhail Gorbachev launched a campaign against weapons of mass destruction (WMD) put together by several NGOs including Greenpeace, the Campaign of Nuclear Disarmament (CND) in Britain and Medact, a group supporting health issues in conflict areas.

The leader of the former Soviet Union had been called naïve in 1986, he said, when he appealed for elimination of nuclear weapons by 2000. “There were two reactions to that,” he said. “One, that it was all propaganda. Two, that it was an illusion. But we were able to eliminate whole classes of nuclear weapons.”

Gorbachev explained his campaign against WMD in this way: “If they exist, sooner or later there will be disastrous consequences. They can fall into the hands of terrorists. It is not enough to safeguard them, they must be abolished.”
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Welcoming the New MEPs in Strasbourg
Successful Federalists’ Action in Front of the European Parliament!

Last Monday and Tuesday, 19th and 20th of July 2004 the opening session of the European Parliament took place in Strasbourg. JEF didn’t miss the opportunity to campaign for a United Federal Europe and JEF-Italy, JEF France and JEF Europe together with UEF organized a big event at the entrance of the EP. Over 200 Jeffers and UEF people coming from various European countries -especially Italy and France- welcomed the new MEPs with slogans like “European Federation, yes, yes, yes!” or “Costituzione Europea Subito!”. Behind the slogans there were many European and federalist flags and banners. Jeffers handed out a leaflet calling for a Visionary Parliament.

The results of the event were:
- Big media coverage: many Jeffers were interviewed by radios and TV channels.
- Raising awareness among the MEPs about JEF and the federalist movement: We talked to MEPs such as Daniel Cohn Bendit, Jo Leinen, Monica Frassoni, Josep Borrell, Alain Lamassoure, Thomas Mann, Sylvana Koch Mehrin and many others.
- Handing out of 3000 leaflets written in English, French and German.
- Many new Jeffers had fun while realizing that the federalist way is the way forward.

You can find the pictures of the event as well as the text of the leaflet that was handed out on the JEF Europe website www.jef-europe.net. The event was a big success and let’s hope it means the beginning of a successful campaign for JEF in the next years! (j.m.s.)

UEF President elected Chairman of the Committee on Constitutional Affairs of the EP

The UEF President Jo Leinen has been elected Chairman of the Committee on Constitutional Affairs of the EP (for the term July 2004 - December 2006). All federalists should feel proud of this.

Leinen started his mandate proposing a resolution, subsequently approved by the assembly, in which the European Parliament demands that the European Constitution is ratified by all the member states in the same day. This should give a real European dimension to the debates on ratification. In many countries, including France and the UK, the ratification will be in the hands of the citizens, which shall approve (or reject) the Constitution by means of a referendum.
The Union of European Federalists,

A. Assessment of the Constitution adopted by the Heads of States and Governments

1. Welcomes that the Heads of States and Governments of the 25 member states have come to an agreement on the European Constitution at their summit in June 2004;

2. Underlines that the adoption of this Constitution is an act of great political importance and a symbol towards the political unity of Europe;

3. Is of the opinion that the Constitution represents a considerable progress when compared to the Nice Treaty and that the European Convention made a very decisive contribution to the Constitutional process;

4. Regrets, however, that the final text of the Constitution adopted by the Heads of States and Governments falls a long way behind the Convention’s draft Constitution;

5. Welcomes in particular the following achievements of the Constitution;

   a. the incorporation of the Charter of Fundamental Rights thus making it legally binding,

   b. the clarification of the values, principles and objectives that form the common ground for the Europeans,

   c. the simplification of the legal and political foundations of the EU construction as well as the clarification of the competences of the EU,

   d. the strengthening of the democratic legitimacy of the EU by giving the European Parliament the right to elect the Commission President and the co-decision-power in most of EU legislation,

   e. the creation of the post of a European Foreign Minister and a European diplomatic service,

   f. new mechanisms for common activities in the field of security and defence,

   g. considerable progress on justice and home affairs.

6. Nevertheless criticizes that the Constitution falls short of what is needed in many respects, mainly

   a. by not abolishing the unanimity rule in many important fields where more effective decision making and thus majority voting would have been necessary, in particular in foreign, security and defence policy and for the multi-annual financial framework,

   b. and by not introducing a procedure which makes the entering into force of the Constitution possible when all but one or two member states have ratified the text.

B. Ratification of the constitutional Treaty

7. Insists on the need to make known this important move forward to the European citizens and to the parliaments of the member states, with a view to the national ratifications and especially the referenda to be held in several member states;

8. invites the European Parliament to give its assent on the Constitution before any national
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ratification;

9. invites the European Parliament and the national parliaments to convene a “Congress of the parliaments of the EU” to help to ensure that the Constitution enters into force;

10. asks the member states to coordinate the dates of the national ratifications by the parliaments and the peoples of the member states in order to stimulate a genuine transnational debate;

C. Federalists involvement in the ratification process

11. commits itself to actively take part in the campaign for the ratification of the Constitution;

12. calls upon the activists of the UEF constituent organisations to form a broad coalition together with elected representatives on local, regional and national levels and civil society organisations, including political parties, to promote the achievements of the Constitution;

D. Revision of the Constitution and transformation of the EU into a European Federation

13. calls upon the Heads of State and Government of the member states to

a. create a framework for a democratic and transparent public debate on the Constitution;

b. commit to convening another Convention no later than 2008 to revise the Constitution and adopt further reforms to strengthen the democratic legitimacy of the Union and the effectiveness of its instruments;

14. repeats its demand that if only one or two member states are unable to ratify the text, the other member states should proceed nevertheless with the entering into force of the Constitution;

15. calls upon the European Parliament and the parliaments of the member states to pass political resolutions in favour of the revision of the Constitution by a new Convention no later than 2008.

*Declaration adopted by the UEF Bureau at its meeting on 18 July 2004

JEF and UEF Call for a Single European Seat in the UN Security Council

According to two resolutions adopted by their European assemblies, both UEF and JEF joined the call for a single European seat in the UN Security Council, which they see as the only way to enable Europe to speak with one voice, and as a necessary step towards a reform of the UN on the basis of great regional Unions of States.

Both resolutions react to the request for a German seat made by the German Government, which contradicts the very spirit of the upcoming European Constitution, which contains some provisions aiming at a Single European Foreign and Security Policy. The JEF resolution calls for a grass root campaign on the issue, to be promoted jointly by JEF, UEF and WFM (f.f.)
A World Federalist Institute will Support Citizens for Global Solutions

Scott L. Hoffman

Citizens for Global Solutions, a new organization created by the consolidation of two United States WFM member organizations, the World Federalist Association and the Campaign for UN Reform, began operations in January, 2004. While recognizing the necessity of first tackling issues important to globalists that are both feasible and essential as short-term targets, Citizens for Global Solutions remains true to the long-term principles of its founding organizations. As its vision statement proclaims, it “envisions a future in which nations work together to abolish war, protect our rights and freedoms, and solve the problems facing humanity that no nation can solve alone.” A key component of the organization, the World Federalist Institute (WFI), was created at the same time as Citizens for Global Solutions as a whole to search for possible routes to such a future.

WFI’s own mission statement announces the purpose of exploring “the values, concepts and principles of world federalism.” The Institute’s functions will include exploring strategic goals and suggesting new projects for Citizens for Global Solutions.

Since February, 2004, the author has worked with an Advisory Board consisting of Citizens for Global Solutions members Thesil Morlan, Ron Glossop and Steve Damours, and more recently with WFM leader and WFI steering committee chair-designate Lucy Webster, to create an initial structure and agenda for the Institute. Much of WFI’s activity will take place in two internet forums – one a general discussion center for Citizens for Global Solutions’ members and friends, including members of other WFM member organizations – and a second more focused planning body for volunteer Fellows who will serve by invitation, present and discuss policy papers, and consider policy questions being explored by Citizens for Global Solutions. The Institute will be governed by a steering committee of 6-10 who will advise the Director in important operational decisions and in policy recommendations to Citizens for Global Solutions.

The World Federalist Institute will be a voice of inspiration as well as a forum for long-term planning. It will keep before Citizens for Global Solutions and its audiences the reminder that our most fundamental objectives include the abolition of war, global citizenship and allegiance to humanity.
The Ventotene International Seminar Reaches 21st Edition

Ernesto Gallo

The 21st edition of the Ventotene International Seminar, “Federalism from Europe to the world”, organized by the Altiero Spinelli Institute with the help of JEF-Italy, took place on September 4-9. It involved participants from 14 different countries (Italy, Czech Republic, France, Germany, Greece, Latvia, Malta, Moldova, Russia, Slovenia, Spain, Switzerland, Turkey, United Kingdom), among which youngsters coming from both “old” and “accession” European countries, right in the year of the first round of the Eastern enlargement.

As far as speakers are concerned, they represented the several different levels of the organized federalist forces: WFM, UEF, JEF, plus the European Youth Forum; let alone the presence of two Italian MPs (Mr Basile and Mr Spini), two MEPs (Mrs Napoletano and Mr Zappalà), and the Italian Minister for European Affairs and appointed Vice-president of the European Commission, Rocco Buttiglione. A wide range of topics was covered, during conferences and debates: from the role of Europe in the new global order to other political, institutional, economical, social issues; from the themes of enlargement and European citizenship to the chance of federalism as a new political commitment and the proposals for the strategy of the federalist organisations in the short and medium term; from the European social model to the opportunity of the EU as an actor of peace and link among cultures. Some speakers came from academic institutions; some others were young European citizens; the mix proved to be interesting, and important for the exchange of political and cultural experiences, not to mention the chance to compare different feelings about Europe across generations.

The organization of working activities was always smooth, also thanks to the attitude of the participants, and the Seminar was once again an occasion for both lively political debates and entertainment. Ventotene is the spiritual homeland of European Federalism: the Seminar plays a decisive role in promoting federalist values and fostering federalist education at a European level, and decisively contributes to the emerging of new activists and leaders in our organizations. Moreover, it offers the chance of a crucial political appointment to discuss current issues and strategies, both within and outside the federalist organizations: in this sense, it might seem reasonable to involve more representatives of political institutions and civil society, also in the light of the incoming European Constitution and the more powerful role which could be played, in the near future, by European parties.
“War appears to be as old as mankind, but peace is a modern invention”. With this quotation from Sir Henry Maine, Michael Howard, a scholar on the problems of war and peace and Professor Emeritus of military history at Yale University, begins his important book *The Invention of Peace.*

In reviewing the history of international conflicts in Europe from 800 to 2000, Howard points out how at the end of the 18th century an important change in evaluating international conflicts took place, due to some thinkers who, shading the light of reason on old traditions, challenged the statement that peace can only be a consequence of war, of which it is the conclusion.

Peace is not a natural phenomenon; on the contrary, it is “artificial, intricate and highly volatile”, and for it to be realized a precise act of will is required. If peace is considered an objective to be pursued, war appears “illegitimate and not necessary”, and not, as Saint Augustine defined it, “a necessary element of the divine or natural order”, or, as the Romantics and Nationalists of the 19th century were thinking, a factor of progress and modernization.

Howard gives us a very sharp picture of the Nazi-Fascist ideology, underlining its essential elements: it was setting “the community against the individual,... intuition and emotions against reason, nationalism against internationalism, will and action against rational discussion and peaceful cooperation”. It was marked by xenophobia and anti-Semitism, and was based on a hegemonic order: “the order of a marching army, the vision of the world was that of hegemony maintained by a continuous conflict... Peace did not exist in the fascist dictionary, except as an unbecoming or sneering term... War was considered a highly desirable activity”. Nationalism is antithetical to the cosmopolitical ecological and pacifist project.

In the appeal that Altiero Spinelli addressed in 1943 to the Europeans with the “Manifesto for a free and united Europe”, he stated that, after the terrible damages of war, the dividing line between progressives and conservatives does not separate any longer those who want to improve the political conditions of their country and who oppose it; it cuts across and separates those (be they in the left or in the right) who look for national solutions to the great problems and those who look for such solutions at the international level. Therefore, we have to place among the conservatives not only the nationalists and neo-fascists, but also those national reformists who oppose, as happened in the Convention that drafted the European Constitution, any transfer of sovereignty upwards, to Europe, and downwards, to Regions and to local bodies. On the line of progress is who, in the left and in the right, willing to build Peace among the
European states and to renew democracy, chooses the solution at the supranational level, and the European Federation.

Peace must be seen, the author says, as the building effort to create “an international order in which war plays no part”. But Howard goes further and finds in Immanuel Kant’s thought the statements he cherishes most: “Peace can only be stable if it is secured,... and only the State remains... the only efficient mechanism by which peoples can govern themselves”. A positive peace then implies, according to the author, the presence of a social and political order like the State. In the face of the globalization process, the international institutions and organizations like the United Nations are not, in his opinion, sufficient to ensure it. “The weaker a State is, the more likely it is that its sovereignty is challenged”. Hence, only by strengthening the state authority is it possible to fight against the emptying of sovereignty from above, by the big economic and financial multinational companies, and from below, by the smaller bodies that are trying to break it into pieces.

Howard, however, never goes deeply into the matter of which state form is suitable for assuring peace at the global level. And yet the matter is not one of lesser importance. The task of researchers cannot limit itself to describing the facts and finding out the problems, but has to put forward proposals for solving the questions they examine and discuss. It is a risky choice, which exposes itself to harsh criticism.

As in many other cases, even in this interesting essay one can note that the tesseras of the mosaic are all there, the pieces of the puzzle are complete. The author analyzes in depth the features of the globalized world; he emphasizes the dangers coming from above and from below, that are threatening the stability of the State; he observes that free-trading and a self-rulled market “not necessarily assure peace”; he underlines that “there still are many regions in the world where the Western values and the modernization process, linked to those, are considered culturally foreign, a threat to social cohesion and local values”; he stresses that “peace also assumes social peace,... impossible where there remain high levels of permanent unemployment... or racial conflicts”. But although he says that a stable civil society can hold only if there is a state structure capable of reconciling all these requirements and is founded on cultural homogeneity, an efficient bureaucracy, shared moral values, he does not tell us which form of state is the most suitable.

As many learned people recall, Kant in 1795, only seven years after the birth of the United States of America, was recommending the World Federation as the vehicle to universal peace. All the more reason for recommending this goal today, in the era of economic and technological globalization, of the shaping up of regional international organizations in Latin America, Asia, Africa and above all in the presence of Europe’s integration process. In Europe 25 States have decided to submit to common rules written down in a Constitutional Chart. And although the European Union is not yet a Federation with a democratic government, one cannot underestimate the importance of such an act, an example for the rest of the world sprung from the will not of 13 small republics, as happened for the United States, but of 25 historically well-established States. Moreover, it is important to consider that a large Movement of the world civil society has formed, which claims the right to Peace.

All these elements are witnesses not only to the necessity, but also to the possibility of not limiting oneself to analyze the status quo, but to push further on and put forward concrete proposals for building a better and more equitable world.
The thread connecting the essays in these two books (and indeed the two books to each other) is the role of myths, images and narratives in constructing cultural identifications and thus shaping or determining one’s relationship to space and territorial politics. Ostensibly this theme applies to two utterly different contexts. On the one hand, “Europe” – more of a concept than a territorial entity, with undefined, open-ended borders; more of a political project still in the making than an actual “homeland”, conceived and initiated precisely to counteract the baleful effects of the homeland mystique, and perhaps for this very reason often perceived as “abstract”, often accused, rightly or wrongly, of being frigid, devoid of “poetic power”, unable to touch the imagination or warm the heart of those who should constitute her “people”. On the other hand, a constellation of homelands, most of which are sites of ethnonational conflicts – Israel/Palestine in the first place, but also the Balkans, Northern Ireland, or South Africa. In these cases the perception is, instead, of an “excess” of identity. An identity resting moreover on “ascriptive” elements (ethnos, race, language, religion, culture, etc.) construed in an essentialist sense, on myths believed somehow to be history, and on a relentlessly dichotomous opposition with an Other contending the same narrow ground, with whom no compromise is possible and who must be vanquished. In reality the issues underlying both sets of problems are deeply interconnected, as reading the two books together shows.

Figures d’Europe is divided up into three parts. The first deals with “Europe’s Need for Myths”, and comprises essays of a more general or theoretical cast written by such leading scholars in the fields of Cultural or European Studies as Luisa Passerini, Stuart Hall and Hartmut Kaelble. The second investigates “Symbols for Europe”, from Europa and the Bull to the representation of women in European cartography, from the European flag to the European hymn. The third focuses specifically on “The Euro, a New Symbol” and on its implications for European identity. The overall picture that emerges out of this volume is one of marked tensions and contradictions, which, however, intimate potential change and possibly prelude it. To be sure, there is a “symbolic deficit” in the construction of “Europe”, preventing collective emotional involvement to the European project. But then, such involvement cannot be detached from the scope and terms of the European project itself. If it is limited to an association of states, and undistinguishable in substance from the Western “way of life” or the globalized culture experienced by Europeans anyway, the need for particular European symbols will not be felt, and those few symbols which are now available will remain distant from collective consciousness. On the other hand, if it pursues deep changes in the present social and political relationships, then all that which
Re/Imagining Europe, however, has an official dimension as well, which turns out to be the particular site of tensions, contradictions and compromise between different needs and viewpoints. For instance the “parcours et paradoxes de l’hymne européen” (the title of the essay by Esteban Buch), resulting in the adoption of Beethoven’s Ode to Joy as the European hymn, show the apparent contradiction between the rooting of European symbols in the symbolic tradition of national states, and the will to emphasize the difference and singularity of the European experience in relation to national states. However, the very fact that only the melody possesses official status, and not Schiller’s text, reveals a discontinuity in the tradition of hymnology in national states, which entails using a single voice to express a community of citizens. Far from representing a failure on the part of the symbol, this may well signify the openness of Europe, its refusal of adopting a fixed identity, and a rejection of nationalist discourses (far more problematic, of course, is the paradox that the task of composing the official European version of Beethoven’s melody was given to a former member of the Nazi Party like Herbert von Karajan). Yves Hersant’s essay on the flag of the European Union shows on its part the contentious nature of the politico-semiological debate that led to the adoption of the twelve golden stars, the diverging conceptions of Europe that underlay it (did the circle of golden stars signify the Miraculous Medal of the Virgin Mary?). Similar findings emerge in the essays devoted to the euro as European currency. There might potentially be tensions between the top-down approach and arguments of EU officials and the actual needs of the majority of European people, or between the intended
thrust of the euro as a “catalyst for integration” and its abstract symbolism, apparently too weak to communicate integration. On the other hand, it may well be this “deliberately non-specific character” of the euro symbol, the bridges on its notes suggesting union and leading to nowhere, its doors and windows enticing to “look out” and “go beyond”, that best corresponds to the hybrid, many-stranded, open-ended identity of the Europeans, or rather, the way most Europeans seem to choose to imagine themselves and their collective identity. It is perhaps significant that despite alarmist warnings from many quarters and initial unpleasant side-effects, the euro has in fact been accepted by the public opinions of the countries involved, with little or no nostalgia for the old currencies. A sign of desire for integration, probably, or an invitation to rethink the relationship between money and collective identity.

Homelands is divided up into three parts too. The first and largest one discusses “Palestinian and Israeli notions of homeland”, in the light of an open, raging conflict which is the grim and tragic legacy in the present-day world of European antisemitism, racism and colonialism. All the essays in this section are written by Palestinian or Israeli/Jewish scholars – expressing one’s own point of view is indeed significant here, as a way both of taking seriously the subjectivity of the people involved in the conflict, and of testing the limits and possibilities of dialogue with the Other. The second part deals with “other homelands”, i.e. other crises and conflicts which are no longer so sharp and violent and which are now being transformed. The third one puts “the critical distance” at the core of its investigation of “homeland”, which covers the meaning of Heimat in the German-speaking area from mid-nineteenth century to 1945 in an essay by Rolf Petrie; the concept of home in etymological and philosophical sense in an essay by James Kaye (focussing in particular on Sweden and arguing that ideas of home underlie ideas of homeland); and the Swedish concept of homeland (hembygd) in the final essay by Bo Stråth. At the beginning of virtually all the conflicts and crises reviewed here is the experience of a collective trauma or, in the worst cases, catastrophe. The experience of losing one’s homeland, of witnessing huge loss of human life, of being under siege, uprooted, threatened in one’s very existence; the experience of becoming second-class citizens in one’s own land on account of one’s language, religion, culture, supposed ethnic origin, or the colour of one’s skin. The less tragic experience of displacement, when coming as immigrant to one’s own ethnic heartland from another state (where one belonged to an ethnic minority) only to be perceived as a “foreigner”. The experience of having one’s catastrophe belittled, misunderstood, ignored, denied or forgotten not only by the enemy Other, but also by the international community, whose agenda, interests and priorities are perceived to be worlds apart from those of the parties in conflict. Such experiences produce a peculiar relationship with homeland, charging it with “poetic power”. Important components of it are nostalgia; the idealization of a pre-catastrophe past and homeland; the imbuing of one’s case with the absolute or the transcendent (it is not by chance that these types of conflict are often accompanied by religious fundamentalism or integralism); the militant sacralization of the dead (a theme specifically investigated by Ron Robin apropos of the Middle East conflict); the repudiation of the actual (if enforced) condition of ethnocultural hybridity and pluralism lived by the community, whether at home or in the diaspora; the dream of a place without the Other, which can lead to terrorist violence or, if the community owns a state, to the establishment of an ethnic democracy excluding the Other from citizenship rights – and, in the elaboration of narratives, to the hurtful denial or trivialization of the Other’s catastrophe. Thus, unlike the European myths and symbols considered above, whose main function is to ground a socio-political project in the collective imaginary and whose weak “poetic power” is partly counterbalanced by its open-ended character, myths and symbols of the homeland must heal the communal traumas
and re/create the desired condition. They are necessarily highly selective, and this selectivity is apt to cause not only conflict with the narratives of the Other, as is obvious, but also tensions with other narratives from the same community.

This is illustrated most clearly in the first section, where most of the essays are devoted to the critical examination of communal narratives. Rema Hammami investigates the absence of women in the narratives of the 1948 Nakbe (catastrophe), or their reduction to mere symbol and abstraction—a fact that has been hardly changed by the appearance of urban, middle-class women in another type of narrative wishing to challenge the representation of Palestine as a monolithic peasant society, and instead emphasizing the aspect of “lost modernity”: in all cases, women mostly stand for something else, and do not speak in their own voice. The tensions between the reclaiming of an urban, modern “lost” Palestine and the dangers of nostalgia is the subject of the essay by Salim Tamari. Significant implications arise from the essay “Homelandscapes. Zionist Landscapes of a Hebrew Homeland: Three Cases” in which Maoz Azaryahu discusses the relevance of implanting symbols of modernity (like the water tower) in the representation of the landscape, with its underlying theme of the transformation of “wilderness” into civilization, and of the simultaneous effacement of the Arab presence—at most associated pictorially with the swamp or with the camel—and by way of the Hebraicization of place names.

Other essays in this section deal specifically with the issues of identity, nationalism, post-nationalism, inclusion and exclusion “in search of the routes that divide us” (from the title of Mark Levine’s contribution). Issam Nassar writes of the elusiveness of trying to pinpoint a “Palestinian past”, owing to precisely its entanglement into the conflicting strands of the cultural, geographic and political settings in the Middle-East. Ilan Gur-Ze’ev proposes mutual recognition of each other’s catastrophes as a way to work for reconciliation, in contrast with the parallel “normalizing educational systems” which are committed to the vindication of one’s side and the negation of the Other; Mark Levine starts from the multifarious and problematic borders criss-crossing the place, and the “clandestine” hybrid spaces of the borderland, to develop the notion of a post-nationalist multicultural homeland in lieu of exclusive Jewish and Palestinian nation-states; Ilan Pappe argues that an essential moment of the reconciliation process and the overcoming of the respective nationalism and ethnocentrism must be Israel’s recognition of its guilt in some events that took place at the dawn of its existence—events that are now as good as removed from Western consciousness. For Pappe there is a clear line dividing victims from oppressors which is not symmetrical. He also takes sides in some topical issues, like the formula “territories for peace” or the return of the Palestinian refugees, from a sympathetic standpoint to the Other’s point of view.

That post-nationalism, whatever it means, is, in the context of an ethnonational conflict, far from being the glib phrase that is made out to be elsewhere, is clearly apparent when, for example, Karma Nabulsi praises the 1988 Palestinian Declaration of Independence for its inclusiveness and ability to transcend geography and essentialism, whereas Ilan Gur-Ze’ev criticizes that very same text for its ethnocentrism and the straightforward relationship it assumes between land and people, and goes on to accuse post-modern intellectuals like Edward Said to reproduce in fact an updated and more acceptable version of a narrative unchanged in the substance. Such differences of perspectives remind us that the way out of the morasses of nationalisms and nation-states can never be taken for granted—it also involves engaging in a close dialogue with the Other likely to prove very unsettling, a detachment from One’s Own likely to prove very painful. It is here that a Europe “re-imagined” anew can help.
Happy surfing!
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