

The World Political Forum
General Assembly, 2003
(Turin, October 23-24)

**The World of the XXI Century:
New Unity or New Fractures?**

Report

INDICE

The World of the XXI Century: New Unity or New Fractures?

Introduction..... 3

Structure 4

I.

Global Disequilibrium - The New World Disorder 5

From the Old to the New International Order 7

New Means for New Goals 8

International Law and the New Sovereignty 10

The Movement toward the Multilateral World 11

Regional Perspectives on Development 12

World Economic Development and Democratic Control 14

II.

Pilot Models, Pilot Failures 15

The Foundations of a New World Architecture 17

INTRODUCTION

The current international order has become unhinged and unstable. Supranational political and economic institutions are ridden with conflict and disagreement between their members. The hoped-for co-operation between states and the new world order at the end of the Cold War has failed to transpire. Rather, international affairs are now characterised by a world disorder as recent events exacerbate fundamental differences of opinion across the globe.

The World Political Forum seeks to examine how to arrange the best possible co-ordination of international institutions and what models for future order are desirable and achievable to reduce these imbalances and differences, in the search for a new political space where civilisations can meet and come to an agreement to manage the international disorder. This world disorder affects every civilisation, and can be solved by none alone. Only with a determined and concerted multi-lateral and trans-societal combined effort by international actors can this spiral of disorder be averted.

The World Political Forum, inspired by its founder and President, Mikhail Gorbachev, seeks to become a meeting point and crossroads for cultures, religions, and leaders, an open forum for the whole world that, through analysis and discussion, will give guidance and provide new solutions to global problems and strive toward a New World Civilisation and framework for a democratic international order.

At its founding conference in May 2003 and inaugural working session in October 2003, in the symbolic cities of Alessandria and Turin, in the Italian region of Piedmont, the World Political Forum defined the path for a new culture of global peace. Many world leaders, past and present, responded to the invitation of President Gorbachev and the Italian sponsoring committee, and assembled at the World Political Forum to seek out new solutions for the problems of the world, and to begin to construct the foundations for their resolution by examining what the causes of world disorder are and how best they can be managed or solved.

The debate examined the need for a new international architecture to avert a clash of civilisations, and the need to rejuvenate the United Nations. The state of the world was also examined and causes of concern were expressed over the Middle East, Africa, and for the future prospects of world disorder. It was resolved at the founding conference to continue the work of the World Political Forum in annual assemblies and regional sessions to seek to examine how the Forum could be of most assistance to world leaders in helping them seek a new path to a culture of peace.



Mr. Jan Mortier
Rapporteur for the World Political Forum



Dr. Andrei Grachev
Chairman of the WPF's Scientific Committee

STRUCTURE

The sessions of the annual assembly of the World Political Forum were held on October 23-24, 2003, at the Meridian Lingotto in Turin and the historic Palazzo Ghilini at Alessandria. The annual assembly spanned two days and sought to examine the state of the world in the 21st century in light of the recent imbalances. The conference sought to examine means to reconcile imbalances in the international order, and forecast new imbalances along with the means for the international community to address them.

The morning session of the annual general assembly of the World Political Forum was titled, “Redefining Peace”. This session was divided into two working sessions: “New World Disorder” and “New Means for New Goals”. The overall theme “Redefining Peace”, sought to scientifically analyse the state of world disorder using theory and structural models.

The participants examined new definitions of security and it was noted that security has varying degrees and definitions in varying cultures, and the emergence of the new world players, both in classical state powers, non-governmental organisations and asymmetric non-state groups, were acknowledged as all having an influence on the state of international affairs, and that new modes of governance would be needed to adequately compensate for the new players, and to manage the new threats to security.

The afternoon session addressed “New Limits to Sovereignty”, and it was noted that the end of the Westphalian order had been instigated by the American war on Iraq, as the war was in violation of the binding Charter of the United Nations. Sovereignty was also addressed in that it had changed as a concept, as states no longer have absolute dominion within their realms of sovereignty.

“Crisis Management and Crisis Prevention” were addressed as a way to learn from the best practices of that past and see what new methods could be sought to reduce crises in regions around the world, particularly between civilisations, where local conflicts could inflame wider tensions. “International Justice”, was examined, and an analysis of the International Criminal Tribunals and the rise of the new International Criminal Court were welcomed. International law and methods to improve the International Court of Justice were also touched upon by the participants in this session.

Finally, the United Nations was examined for its strengths and weaknesses in light of the Iraq war, and new means were sought to suggest ways to improve the organisation. The reform of the United Nations and international order was discussed in detail throughout the conference and this overriding prominence that the speakers devoted to the subject is reflected here in this report.

I.

GLOBAL DISEQUILIBRIUM - THE NEW WORLD DISORDER

The opening working session of the World Political Forum in Turin on October 23, 2003, addressed the pressing issue of the new world disorder. The session was inaugurated with the call for a need of a retrospective analysis of historical events to understand reasons for the present situation. It was noted that the old world found its place in the historic rationale of a system of sovereign states based on the treaties of Westphalia that had emerged in Europe in the 17th century. The analysis of the session traversed the historical aspect of the balance of power up to the 20th century, and then the international order resulting from World War II and the precarious strategic equilibrium of the Cold War.

The chairman pointed out that Mikhail Gorbachev, the President of the World Political Forum, was the first world leader to call for the building of a new global order at his speech to the United Nations in 1988, where he said, “that further global progress is only possible through a quest for a universal political consensus”. The discussion centred on the fact that the world had drastically changed from the era of optimism and hope at the end of the Cold War and that today, international affairs are characterised by an era of insecurity presided over by a mega power in a unipolar world.

There is a new global division and inter-civilisational tension that has arisen. It is characterised by a new political East and a new political West. The advance of Western civilisation with all its successes and faults is evoking a backlash in the political East and particularly within the global South. The factors causing this world disorder are numerous and varying in degrees of severity, but all need to be addressed resolutely if we are to avert the seemingly inevitable spiral of world disorder and the disastrous implications that this entails.

Themes addressed by the participants as causes of inter-civilizational tensions, were the division of the world into classifications of degrees of order, economic disorder, new security threats, and religious and cultural tensions between civilisations. It was noted by some participants that the general long-term trend is towards a post-modern, globalising world, and that the present world consists of three distinct worlds: the pre-modern, the modern, and the post-modern societies. The post-modern world is networked by globalisation and interdependence. This world is pluralistic and enjoys ever closer union, as barriers to trade and exchange are lowered as International Sovereignty develops. In this world there is a premium placed on transparency, information sharing, and communication. The post-modern world promises conflict resolution and diplomacy based on confidence building.

Despite the emergence of the post-modern world, international society is still characterised by the modern world, which adheres to Westphalian principles of sovereignty and realpolitik.. Here, balance of power, secrecy, and the use of force or its threat, remain

important to preserve the national interest and to deter conflict among powers that retain a different strategic outlook or political position.

For all its faults, the multilateral world order has kept the world free from major war over the past half century, and has fulfilled its primary objective of saving generations from the scourge of war. The democratic basis on which interstate affairs have been run so far has contributed to the willing participation of all nations, irrespective of power projection or ideology, in the management of global affairs and ushered in a new sense of global community this last century.

It was noted that disorder and chaos have always been the starting point for new self-organisation, and this was compared to a recognition that the collapse of the old bipolar world order has led to the emergence of a new global disequilibrium, in which, the US has seized the predominant role, without adequately formulating the rules of the new order, thus fostering further world disorder. The UN Secretary General's comments were reiterated; 'that America cannot arrogate itself the right of unilateral action which it denies to others'.

Yet, the discussion outlined that the origins of the global disequilibrium do not lie solely in the foreign policy of the United States, but rather also lie in the disintegration of the Westphalian order, and the inability of the international community to establish new modes of global governance and security to manage the decline of the old order.

As a progenitor for an international structure of peace, the North Atlantic Treaty Organisation (NATO) was addressed in the discussion and its new expansion and role were examined in the discussion. It was suggested that NATO, even in its quasi-reformed role could not guarantee the peace of all Europe without fully, and openly, engaging in military and political co-operation with all key neighbouring states. It was also noted that although the NATO-Russia Council was a step in the right direction, it would not be sufficient without a credible process of arms reduction.

The participants from the European members of NATO have expressed concerns that Europe could be drawn into an unforeseen conflict as the USA embarks on a series of increasingly diverse and distant conflicts. It is therefore in the interest of both the Europeans and the United States, to re-examine the transatlantic relationship and seek ways to find a new common ground before relations deteriorate any further. A principal means to do this would be the construction of new systems of European and global security in tandem with the United States, in whose interest it would be, to foster the preconditions for this development in a multilateral manner with the foresight that not all security threats can be managed single-handedly.

One participant at the World Political Forum pointed out that the post-modern method of diplomacy through non-military means and the promotion of confidence building and transparency could be a promising approach. For instance, Europe's success in the Helsinki process could be a model to emulate in other areas.

The pre-modern world remains in existence in outposts of the globe and is a realm of existence furthest from the light of civilisation. In such areas, sources of political

legitimacy are vastly different from the post-modern and modern dimensions of politics. The most basic political and human rights are denied to the inhabitants of this world by feudal structures, fundamentalist currents and warlords. It is here that terrorism has its roots and breeding ground.

FROM THE OLD TO THE NEW INTERNATIONAL ORDER

Maintaining order in the modern world while dealing with the challenges of the vestiges of the pre-modern world, has become the strategic challenge of this era of international order. It has become particularly complex as pre-modern groups lash out at the modern world using globalised post-modern technology, communication and finance. However, the discussion concluded positively and agreed that out of this chaos and division it is possible to distinguish a new multilayered international order emerging and that the conceptualisation of the pre-modern, modern, and post-modern worlds will have some relevance in formulating everyday policy.

Since the end of the Cold War; there are new types of conflicts with new actors. It was raised at the session of “New Means for New Goals” that the differing agendas are often linked to the New World’s divides and the frustration provoked by globalisation, nationalism and fanaticism, organised crime and interest networks rather than ideology. Such conflicts in the twenty-first century have a global reach and possibly civilisational consequences. Civilians are often the major victims of the new conflicts. The international media have now sanitised conflicts to the point of a clinical and desensitised representational display to the public that seeks to mask the eternal horror that is war. New conflicts are also characterised by the attempt to manipulate world opinion by all sides.

The defence of basic human rights remains a concept at the very heart of the United Nations, yet they are still denied to many people around the world. At the same time there have been examples of instrumentalisation of the conception of human rights for issues not related to cases of their mass violation to the point of bringing the term human rights into disrepute. It was noted by a participant that no country can regard itself as civilised if it does not grant its citizens the unfettered rights of free expression and free assembly, and at the same time realise the legitimate social expectations of decent housing, healthcare, and education. It was noted that the United Nations should become better equipped to employ sanctions that are effective against tyrannical regimes, perhaps in the form of withdrawal of voting rights or even membership of the organisation. A suggestion from an earlier working session proposing a United Nations embargo on the sale of arms to regimes abusing human rights was commended by the discussants.

It was additionally suggested that new security and political structures would be needed as the water tables in key regions of the world begin to fall to critical levels, and

that water and energy wars will characterise the major conflicts of the twenty-first century unless systems of management are implemented soon.

NEW MEANS FOR NEW GOALS

The session of “New Means for New Goals” raised the point that supranational political and economic institutions, most of which have been created after the Second World War, are ridden with inefficiency and internal conflicts. The World Political Forum has set as its goal to examine how to arrange the best possible co-ordination of international institutions and what models for future order are desirable and achievable. The purpose proclaimed by the World Political Forum is to reduce imbalances and formulate different approaches in the search for a new political mould in which different civilisations can meet and come to an agreement to manage the evolution of the international situation in the interests of all nations.

The United Nations is the only international institution to which all the world’s states subscribe. Despite its deficiencies, the United Nations does have a positive role to play in maintaining international order and all states have an interest in seeing it succeed. The organisation’s mandate ranges from securing international peace to the fight against poverty, environmental degradation and the protection of human rights.

The United Nations system includes some twenty-five plus agencies and has had notable and recognised important achievements like the World Health Organisation’s containment of the SARS virus; the World Food Programme feeds more than seventy million people annually and the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees continues to help millions of displaced people the world over. The organisation’s ongoing successes include peacekeeping operations, disarmament, landmine clearance, electoral assistance, and post-conflict reconstruction around the world. The UN also recently created the International Criminal Tribunals for Rwanda, Sierra Leone and for the former Yugoslavia. These tribunals have introduced international investigation on behalf of the international community, for war crimes committed in these countries and have made commendable progress. Therefore, an evaluation of the United Nations in fulfilling its mandate should be appreciated in this full spectrum of its global activity.

For all its shortcomings, real or perceived, the UN remains the only source of international legitimacy of collective peacekeeping actions and the foremost forum, with the experience and personnel to deal with a wide range of challenges. Its responses to these challenges, such as humanitarian relief, promoting human rights, the rule of law, conflict management, and post-conflict peace building, have been and remain absolutely essential to reducing world disorder. The United Nations may not be the perfect institution but it does embody certain fundamental values basic to any democratic community.

Firstly, the United Nations embodies rules and norms for acceptable international conduct, establishing thereby an international rule of law between states. Likewise, the principle of sovereign equality enshrined in the UN Charter recognises that while states are not equal in terms of state power, they are nevertheless entitled to equal treatment within the community of nations. This emulates the equality before the law principle that is central to every democratic structure. The United Nations also seeks to de-legitimise the unilateral use of force in settling international disputes, which also emulates civic law, where punishment can only follow due process. It is, by its nature and statute, a multilateral organisation.

The Iraqi crisis gripped the world's attention as the most recent issue challenging the United Nations in its mandate to secure international peace and security. The members of the Security Council failed to reach consensus on a workable multilateral response to Iraq's defiance of its resolutions. The Iraq war called into question the role of the UN, the system of multilateral co-operation and norms for international conduct that are embodied in the UN Charter. The greatest threat to multilateralism and thus the fabric of the United Nations is the thesis of preventative wars carried out unilaterally or in ad hoc coalitions without any mandate from the Security Council.

It was noted by participants at the World Political Forum that the United Nations should be reformed to reflect the significant evolution of the international situation since the end of the Cold War. If the United Nations is to remain a viable institution in the world of the twenty-first century, then member states are going to have to consider significant alterations to its structure, particularly to the Security Council, which clearly and urgently needs reform in its structure, size and composition. The Security Council should be enlarged to include more permanent members and the new centres of political and economic power should be represented. It was also noted that the rules of decision making within the Security Council have to be modified. The power of a single member's veto impedes the work of the Council and, at worst, portrays it as ineffective.

However, there is a chasm between this acknowledgement and putting it into practice. Significant change in the international governance architecture has previously only taken place following major catastrophes such as the two World Wars. The World Political Forum advocates that international society has reached a point of sophistication where such destructive catalysts are no longer necessary to change the status quo.

A participant noted that if the United Nations ignored perceived security threats and continued to operate on the abstract theoretical basis of attempting to alter the reality of the unipolar world into a multipolar one, then it will fail, and this in turn will lead to tension and conflicts endangering world peace. The European Union was also praised as an unprecedented historical success, where states volunteered to peacefully merge their sovereignties to facilitate good governance and supra-national management, with the goal of establishing a realm of peace.

The United Nations is well placed to tackle the future challenges of new threats to international security, international conflicts, violation of human and civil rights, oppression of national and social minorities, poverty, demographic challenges, inequality in access to education and information, food, water, and community services, environmental degradation, and the management of scarce resources. The co-operation and unity of all nations will be required as never before in order to work collectively to redress these imbalances and limit the significant effects of international disorder that challenge the well-being of mankind and undermine the prospect of a better future for all humanity.

INTERNATIONAL LAW AND THE NEW SOVEREIGNTY

One of the greatest challenges to the efficiency of United Nations today, is the issue of the international use of force infringing upon national sovereignty. The discussion that took place at the two sessions of the World Political Forum held in 2003, was divided into two principal opinions. The first, that state sovereignty is an inviolable concept and that sovereign equality among nations is fundamental to peace and stability in the current international order. A participant noted that at the Millennium Summit the world leaders reaffirmed their commitment to the purposes and principles of the Charter of the United Nations as timeless and universal, and that this included the doctrine of national sovereignty. The second opinion held that there is a new sovereignty, a sovereignty that is qualified by the treatment of citizens at the hands of their governments.

The last Iraq War can be understood in terms of the announced end of the Westphalian order. This order was most visibly questioned with the 1999 NATO intervention in Kosovo, that was launched without the mandate of the United Nations, where the traditional conception of sovereignty clashed with the new approach, implying the state's responsibility for the observation and respect of the human rights of its citizens. It was agreed that this new approach is not yet legalised by international conventions and is far from being shared by the majority of state leaders across the world. This is an era of unpredictable flux and potential crises that are beyond the management of states and the current system of international order. This era as a changing paradigm of order is at a point of instability furthest from its known equilibrium, posing the greatest danger while simultaneously providing a window of opportunity for the greatest change.

The doctrine of absolute national sovereignty is challenged by those who believe that military intervention is permissible to remove or replace the leadership of rogue or failed states. The right of self-defence formulated in Article 51 of the UN Charter is being replaced by the potentially unlimited doctrine of pre-emptive action, which implies that the most powerful member state of the United Nations might ignore the binding status of the United Nations Charter. The theory of pre-emptive self-defence is a conception that could destabilise the corpus of international law and international security. If this doctrine were

to be emulated by other states, the world would soon experience disintegration into lawlessness and endemic unilateralism.

There is a dangerous permissiveness to war as a means of settling issues between states. States around the world are now increasing their military budgets in an era of insecurity at the expense of their populations, and the danger of a new international arms race is present.

The world must re-examine and redefine the role of national sovereignty and self-defence in the twenty-first century. Large scale abuses of fundamental human rights that 'shock the moral conscience of mankind' need to be codified as threats to international peace and security.

It is necessary to review the UN Charter, both in its theoretical founding principles and in its practical aspects. It is necessary to establish principles that clearly define when the civil population or human and civil rights of individuals or national minorities are in danger. Unless these considerations are included in a review of the Charter, the use of illegal force in international affairs will increase.

THE MOVEMENT TOWARD THE MULTILATERAL WORLD

Concerted action to manage world disorder need not wait until the United Nations is reformed; it should proceed as and when the need transpires. It is quite possible to work in this way with the current structure of the organisation. The situation in international affairs has greatly altered since the great hopes expressed in the meetings held at the United Nations in the 1990s. To improve this situation, a logical solution would be to attempt to re-launch a multilateral system. A participant observed that the world is faced either with a choice between a multilateral international order, or an order that will continue to disintegrate into disorder, as the neo-conservatives antagonise the rest of the world's capitals. The issue at hand is to find equilibrium between states, a common ground and congenial political space in which to legislate and enforce law. This task must primarily be borne by democratic states, as democracy is the source of legitimacy in twenty-first century international affairs.

The shape of things to come articulated at the World Political Forum, with regard to the world economic order over the next half century, forecast that the United States of America will continue to exercise its unchallenged power projection in technological, economic, and military spheres. Europe will emerge as a quasi-state and work towards a continental union; there will be a continuous expansion of the market economy system around the world, accompanied by the extension of democracy and political freedoms worldwide. State borders will increasingly become porous in the realm of economics and culture.

Globalisation will need conscious management to steer its course onto an ethical path and to reduce the imbalances causing disorder. Globalisation has become a negative phenomenon, condemned by many people. The world needs another kind of globalisation, a globalisation that has a sense of responsibility, ethics, and common destiny for our world. The world needs an 'ethicalisation' of world economics.

The World Bank recently polled 2600 decision makers and seventy percent agreed that the extreme poverty of a thousand million people is a serious threat to world peace. Poverty alleviation is one of the basic goals of world economic development and with the continuous development of the economy; the amount of wealth in the world has risen sharply. Globalisation has benefited many countries namely China, India, and the region of East Asia. For the rest of the world it has left a wealthy West presiding over failed and falling states, and the gap between the rich and poor is widening to unprecedented and potentially cataclysmic proportions.

The unbalanced development of the world economy, the serious polarisation between the rich and the poor, and the aggravation of poverty, have become problems of such magnitude to the international community that if left unaddressed will invite catastrophe within this century. There is no credible way of keeping peace in this global village of such vast inequality. The total property of the 225 wealthiest persons in the world is \$1.3 billion, which is comparable to the total income of over half of the world's population. On an individual level, this means that the wealth of one of these persons included in this list of 225 is equal to the annual wages of 30 million people.

Such disparity of incredible wealth compared to the incredible human suffering of those in absolute poverty is unconscionable to the universal aspirations of civilisation and the right to human dignity. The world cannot accept that an accident of latitude or longitude determines whether a child will live or die. Poverty on a global scale is reaching critical levels, if populations continue to increase at their current rate, and their poverty remains the same, state structures may see a backlash of their populations, and likewise states against the international financial architecture. It is a priority to avert this backlash by reforming the international financial architecture and ensuring that absolute poverty on the global scale is reduced, and in time, eradicated.

The challenges of globalisation require open dialogue and democratic participation of all varieties of humanity existent in the world today. The human family must address above all the great inequalities that exist in the current order to establish its common home. The Forum continues to address work on the reduction of global poverty in its annual general assembly on October 2004.

REGIONAL PERSPECTIVES ON DEVELOPMENT

In considering the situation of the world in continental regions, the World Political Forum found that it is apparent that those regions where the state invests sufficiently in education and training have the ability to overcome the situation of poverty. For those in countries where their daily choices are about survival, globalisation is at best a dream and at worst a lie.

It is apparent that Africa as a continent does not have states that invest in adequate levels of education and training, barring a few exceptions. In Africa 7,000 lives are lost each day because people cannot get access to medicines for HIV/AIDS that those in the West can. Global research into health is aimed at the diseases of the rich nations rather than those of the poor and this has caused a great imbalance.

Many civilisational tensions, particularly in Muslim and Christian communities, are merely the result of economic disparity. The solution lies in poverty alleviation, in empowering vulnerable groups - including women - by promoting education, that leads to understanding and tolerance of a globalisation that opens doors rather than closes them to young people.

The debate on development went on to suggest that the debt of the poor states is unjust and that the world cannot hold the grandchildren responsible for the debts of the grandparents. It was proposed that the world needs an international insolvency procedure for nations. The West cannot continue the protectionism of its industries by denying poor countries access to its markets, and dumping its surplus on the struggling economies. If the world continues to exclude and exploit people from models of development, eventually they will choose another system or worse, seek to undermine it. It was noted that the fires of extremism are stoked by poverty and despair.

Despite its promise of benefits for all, globalisation contains no inherent principles of order and justice. It is a facet of the new world disorder, different from the old world disorder of the Cold War. It is a disorder that is the result of disputes over trade and environmental rules, and it is these disputes that have caused the promise of sustainable development to be broken. It was noted in the working sessions addressing the growth of the world economy that, together with the growth of positive globalisation, there will be the inflammation of the negative aspect of globalisation; principally the poverty of the majority of the world's population, which if left unaddressed has the potential to become critical world disorder.

There is also the forecasted scarcity of oil and water reserves, set to decline over the next fifty years to critical levels, and which may result in large-scale military conflict between states. The international community needs to act now to prepare for the management of these impending crises and create the structures to alleviate their impact on the international system.

The global community has become so interdependent for trade and investment that to solve problems related to climate change, eradicating poverty and fighting terrorism, every state and institution will have to work together to transform global insecurity into global responsibility. Multilateralism can be undermined when states are selective in

choosing which policy suits their needs best at any particular given moment. On the other hand, multilateralism does share burdens, promotes trust and provides legitimacy for actions taken, particularly with regard to threats to international peace and security.

The world needs a two-tier solution, which simultaneously has a global and regional approach. This applies as much to the economic sector as to the political. The world needs international organisations managing its global evolution, but it also needs institutions at the regional level, able to accelerate integration and steer the regions toward parity. Integration as a 'top-down' approach, is very difficult to implement and inherently unstable. It was demonstrated by a participant at the World Political Forum that such an approach would be essential in the development of regional economies to synchronise with other regions in advance of a global system. In addition to the regional free trade agreements, the World Trade Organisation is essential in allowing the rules of free trade to operate on a global level.

As model for integration, the European Union was praised as an unprecedented voluntary association of states that have relinquished a portion of their sovereignty in the knowledge that integration through economics and politics fosters peace and security. The European Union, in its long process of economic and political integration is becoming a new sovereignty that has the potential - over time - to expand eastward to the Russian borders and to the south, to find ways of association with the Mediterranean region. The model and experience of the European Union can serve as an example of how to promote economic growth and political freedoms, while managing imbalances of disorder within the zone of sovereignty and influence. Emulating this integration process throughout the economic and political regions of the world would clearly reduce the imbalances that cause regional and world disorder.

WORLD ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT AND DEMOCRATIC CONTROL

There is a new political terrain caused by globalisation that operates without democratic regulation. If trade liberalisation is to continue, then the international community must address the non-trade agenda of globalisation, encompassing political rights. It was suggested by a participant at the World Political Forum, that this could be done by nurturing democratic processes and increasing the relative strength of the non-trade international agreements on issues such as human rights, poverty, the environment, demographics, and democracy.

The principle of democracy requires that reforms suggested to state governance and state power obtain public approval. It follows, then, that as state power is altered by international trade agreements, states and institutions will have to integrate legitimate civil society in the ongoing reform dynamic brought about by trade liberalisation. This will

require more transparency, more accountability and political involvement in what was previously a bureaucratic affair.

The success of the international trade agenda will depend on the ability of countries to address the non-trade agenda that is affected by trade policy decisions. These issues are now becoming part of the agenda, in so far as they impact on the future of the economic development of the world. These are climate change, depletion of commercial resources, stratospheric ozone depletion, the desertification of agricultural lands, and the shrinkage of the economic base of the world economy as natural resources are destroyed at an exponential rate.

The inclusion of legitimate civil society in multilayered processes of involvement in the consideration and implementation of international trade agreements is essential to ensuring the balanced development of the world's economy. There is a democratic gap that could be filled by participation of civil society in the governance processes, through solutions such as parliamentary commissions and executive branch consultations. Securing the participation of civil society at the supranational level will not only confer added legitimacy on the supranational processes, it will find new potential allies, who would be willing to assist in the implementation and funding for the non-trade agenda.

II.

PILOT MODELS, PILOT FAILURES

The World Political Forum sessions held at Alessandria on October 24, 2003, sought to build on the exchange of knowledge and solutions proposed to reduce inter-civilizational tensions. Iraq, the Balkans and Afghanistan were the pilot models that drew the most analysis and debate.

The discussion on pilot models and pilot failures featured a comparison between the contemporary state of order in Iraq and Afghanistan. Hopes and concerns were expressed for both models. Not only is the situation within Iraq and the Middle East of great importance, but it is significantly revelatory of international tensions on the world stage. The divisions in the international system that have arisen out of, or been revealed by, the Iraq issue are deeper than the abstentions on the Security Council.

It was noted in the discussion on Iraq that if the international community were to remain divided on Iraq then this would have terrible consequences for the Iraqis themselves. The twenty-five million citizens of Iraq are suffering; they have suffered under the brutalisation of Saddam Hussein, from decades of authoritarian regimes before that, from wars initiated by Hussein and the neighbouring states, and they are now suffering under the mismanagement of the coalition in Iraq.

Another aspect of the division of the political world order over Iraq is the agenda of remaking the world, or building nations through the use of military force. While the democratisation of the Middle East is an admirable aim of self-initiated development in the long term and indeed a right of the people, it was noted that the means to go about this should not involve the use of illegitimate force, but rather through constructive engagement, capacity building, and peace building. It was further noted that if Iraq was intended to become a base from which to fight terrorism, then the prospects so far are not that positive, as the US presence in Iraq has drawn terrorists hateful of democracy from all over the world, flooding into the country and causing as much havoc as possible in fighting the coalition forces.

It was suggested that a provisional representative and sovereign government should be installed in Iraq, which can then enter into contractual relations with foreign troops, who, through a new UN Security Council resolution, would have been transformed from an occupying force into a multinational peacekeeping force. Secondly, that a constitution and elections need not take priority in the early stages of administration of Iraq, as, in a premature atmosphere, more damage can be done to long-term democracy if implemented too early. It was suggested that a better approach would be to enact such measures after order has been restored and when the country has had a period to normalise for some years.

It was observed that democracy is a long process and that the Middle East is in a stage of political development akin to Europe many centuries ago, and that the difficulties there now should be viewed in light of this historical process. The discussion at the World Political Forum working session on Pilot Models called for the international community to send a new message to the Iraqis: a message that Iraq will no longer be the tool of various agendas, but that the international community will act in a united manner and in the best interests of the Iraqi people.

Afghanistan was brought up as having a significant relevance to the New World Civilisation, in so far as it had been the definition of disorder in the pre-modern world under the misrule of the Taliban. As a pilot model for a world in change, Afghanistan was noted in the discussion as being particularly relevant, since the removal of the Taliban from power and the appointment of the Karzai administration, society has taken steps in the direction of pluralism, tolerance, and democracy. The discussion was concluded on an optimistic note that foreign and UN sanctioned intervention in this case had benefited Afghanistan. This was the view of an Afghan participant, who also stated that Afghanistan is today a society with hope for its future and one that is now offered the prospect of participation in the international community, and that, as an encouraging pilot model, it needs continued support from the international community to enable it to participate in the New World Civilisation.

The central element to a clash of civilisations seems not only to focus on the epicentres of conflict but on the broader theme of religion. The debate focused on the desire for tolerance between cultures and religions, and the pre-modern tendency to wish

for reciprocity. It was noted that the fusion of religion and politics throughout history has only ever served to divide civilisations and increase intolerance.

The World Political Forum rejects the perspective of the inevitability of the clash of civilisations and seeks to bring together cultures and religions to resolve their differences. It was noted that the Muslim world is not monolithic and nor is the Christian world. Both civilisations are multifaceted and have had an intimate common history in the preservation and development of knowledge, language, and science.

A moving appeal from the Islamic world was made at the close of the working session on Global Challenges that, barring the majority of the insane, those moderate and tolerant groups can co-exist peacefully and that war need not be inevitable. The solution lies in the empowerment of local groups, the reduction of poverty and in promoting education. Religions can and do promote tolerance and peaceful coexistence, and there can be a universal *Pacem in Terris*.

Pilot models and pilot failures for human rights were also analysed. It was noted that large international or civilisational conflicts and tensions have their roots in smaller localities. A tension between Islam and the West for instance, is fermented by the local conflicts between the Serbs and the Kosovars, the Taliban and the West, the Israelis and Palestinians and the troubles of the Caucasus region. The ethnicity and religious or cultural identity becomes an increasingly important factor in these conflicts as the conflict is prolonged. In many cases, this leads to the destabilisation of entire regions, the justification of political oppression, radicalisation on all sides and, at times, the expulsion or execution of people and minorities.

The persecution of minority human rights must irreversibly become an increasing focus of attention for the international community. In addition, it is foreseeable that the world will have to find different methods of conflict resolution from the ones that are employed now. The world needs to examine what can be done to avert the transition from a local underlying tension into a humanitarian catastrophe, and seek methods of unarmed intervention before the situation becomes a crisis.

Germany was commended for its commencement of dialogue with China, known to be sensitive about criticism of its human rights record and occupation of Tibet. The dialogue focuses on what functional institutions and structures a state requires to function to develop its society and economy. China's engagement in the dialogue was welcomed by the participants of the World Political Forum. Hopes were expressed for further similar processes around the world, and it was suggested that such efforts could become an important agenda of the United Nations.

THE FOUNDATIONS OF A NEW WORLD ARCHITECTURE

If humanity is to promote democracy and development sustainably, the world must confront the monstrous irresponsibility of military spending. War and preparation for war is one of the greatest obstacles to human progress, fostering a vicious cycle of arms races and poverty. The world's total combined military spending is fourteen times the amount governments spend on foreign aid and development. Five members of the United Nations Security Council are responsible for eighty percent of arms exports throughout the world. Many participants at the World Political Forum expressed great disappointment that these five members have not taken stronger steps to ensure humanitarian controls on these arms transfers. True security is linked to the fight for economic justice; true security is linked to the fight against famine and disease.

Globalisation in its current form is unjust and on an unsustainable course that is already leading to world disorder. This is a world we cannot accept in silence. The participants appealed for a new ethic for the new millennium. The World Political Forum has convened under an ethical imperative, the participants were impelled to meet to steer human society towards a new morality that acknowledges the plight of those who are hungry, sick, or socially marginalized. Globalisation is an objective process; it is part of our world irrespective of opinion on its merits. The question is how states and civil societies can minimise the negative aspects of globalisation. Integration and legislation are the most effective instruments for this aim.

Culture is basic to mankind's development. We need to break down our wall of indifference. We must adapt our institutions to an ethical model fit for a World Civilisation, so that they become tools of development. We have a choice of either working to create a global village, where everyone benefits from the progress of others, or a world with islands of prosperity that will be forever insecure against a sea of destitution.

Poverty and insecurity cannot be eradicated overnight; only by building a new political and economic order in the world can we solve the global problems from the root. This new order requires great effort, a true leadership, and a rejection of some old ways and assumptions. The course of the twenty-first century has yet to be determined; the World Political Forum rejects pessimism and a pre ordained history. The participants of the World Political Forum urge the world to take this opportunity to choose a new path, a path that will lead to a new culture of understanding, economic justice, and sustainable peace.

The spirit of the New World Civilisation would be best suited to managing international affairs if it were to encompass the reform and improvement of the current international order by the democratisation of the varying structures of governance, and encourage their interconnection in an interdependent and co-operative architecture. The involvement of civil society, populations, and industry should be encouraged to reflect the new actors on the international stage. A framework for multilateral and multifaceted co-operation mechanisms between all the centres of power is essential to international affairs.

The nature of tomorrow's challenges are beyond the power of human reason to forecast; only the means with which the world addresses and overcomes these challenges lies within our grasp. The participants at the World Political Forum entreat the world to

rededicate itself to peaceful means in international affairs; Goethe once said that ‘freedom must be reinvented in every generation’ The international community as a whole must reinvent freedom in this new age. It must be a freedom of relations and a freedom from fear between states at the supranational level in the multilateral effort of managing the world’s political and economic affairs.

We need a reference point, a ground zero for a new civilisation that can serve as a minimum acceptable ethic of world order. Pragmatism as a doctrine in trade and politics affects the human condition, so therefore must be anchored to a universally endorsed foundation. It is important to lay this cornerstone to build the new world, as its composition now will affect the course of its evolution and the destiny of mankind. This foundation stone is the universal right to human dignity itself.

The New World Civilisation seeks, in the knowledge of this foresight, to avert these impending crises by bridging the divide between civilisations and cultures, and promoting co-existence with all civilisations by assisting in resolving the causes for inter-civilizational tensions. The New World Civilisation will be characterised by a changing world. It will be a world of new political actors on the international scene, a world of incredible technological advances that offer the prospect for new paths of development and societal change.

The dawn of the twenty-first century has been characterised by the last century’s development of technology and communication which has broken down barriers in time and space. The development of the globalised world has overtaken the development of politics and the obligation to protect humanity in the process. The World Political Forum heralds a new age and seeks to lay the foundations for the realignment of development and technology to restore politics to oversight, so that the protection of people can once more become the central dynamo of progress.

In its proclamation of the dawn of a new age and the establishment of a path to a culture of peace, the World Political Forum seeks to avert a clash of civilisations, traverses the lost horizons of the future and heralds the genesis of an enlightened New World Civilisation as the shape of things to come.

The challenges of globalisation require open dialogue and democratic participation of all the varieties of humanity in the world today. The human family must address above all the great inequalities that exist in the current order to establish its common home.

The World Political Forum calls upon the leaders of the world to establish a new system of institutional politics, fit for a new world culture in its progress toward the New World Civilisation. Victor Hugo once wrote, ‘the future has many names; for the weak, it is unreachable; for the timid, it is unknowable; for the brave, it is an opportunity.’