



The Federalist Debate

Papers on Federalism
in Europe and the World

- EDITORIAL
- COMMENTS
- BORDERLESS DEBATE
- FEDERALIST ACTION
- BOOK REVIEWS

Contents

EDITORIAL

- The EU and the Reconstruction of the International Order *Lucio Levi*
4

COMMENTS

- We Need More Europe, not Less. Farewell Remarks *Mario Draghi*
6
- 2019: The Resilience and Strength of European Institutions *Mario Telò*
10
- Identity Nationalism and Globalization. The Murderous and Suicidal Logic of “Them” and “Us”
Giampiero Bordino
13
- Proposal for Legal Incentives for Transnationalization of Political Parties *Pierre Jouvenat*
16
- Peace and Harmony, Will They Ever Be Achieved? *Visvanathan Muthukumaran*
21
- Albert Thomas: The ILO Centenary *Rene Wadlow*
23
- Inadequacy of the Dollar as a World Currency: an Anglo-American Reflection *Antonio Mosconi*
25
- The Celebration of Democracy in Sri Lanka *James W. Arputharaj*
27
- African Solutions to African Problems: United Nations – Africa Partnership for Conflict Prevention
and Resolution *Andrea Cofelice*
30
- A “Colossal Danger” for the World. Interview with Mikhail Gorbachev *Giampiero Bordino*
33
- Immanuel Wallerstein: Ah, We Were Once Both Young and Hopeful! *Rene Wadlow*
35
- Harris Wofford (1926 – 2019), a Planetary Patriot *Tad Daley*
37
- Pope Francis: “The Nations Must Participate in the Edification of the Common Good of Humanity”
42

BORDERLESS DEBATE

THE FIGHT AGAINST CLIMATE CHANGE AT THE REGIONAL AND GLOBAL LEVELS

Mario Draghi and the EU's Fiscal Capacity *Alberto Majocchi*

43

Federalism and Climate Change: towards a European and Global Green Deal *Domènec Ruiz Devesa*

45

Born of Young People a Cosmopolitan Movement against Global Warming *Roberto Palea*

47

Climate Change in India and the World *Suchismita Pattanaik and W. James Arputharaj*

49

FEDERALIST ACTION

The Green New Deal Narrative Fueled by the "New Deal 4 Europe" Campaign *Nicola Vallinoto*

52

The COPLA Campaign at the United Nations General Assembly *Emilia Ismael*

54

A Global Campaign for a World Citizens' Initiative

55

BOOK REVIEWS

70 Years of the Council of Europe. The Longest Period of Peace in Europe's History *Ulrich Bohner*

56

An Appeal to the European People to Dare the Impossible *Michel Herland*

57

Jeremy Rifkin: "A Global Green New Deal" *Roberto Palea*

58

Federalism against Federalism *Maurice Braud*

60

CONTRIBUTORS

64

The EU and the Reconstruction of the International Order

Lucio Levi

While the Cold War had promoted the unification of Europe within the framework of the Atlantic Alliance and had broken the East-West agreement which paved the way to the construction of the UN and the Bretton Woods organizations, it prevented any progress towards world unification. The antagonism between the blocs left no room for any initiative in that direction. The end of the Cold War and the clear inability of the United States to continue to play the role of the world's policeman and banker have contributed to the emergence of new players on the international scene. In the unipolar world, formed after the end of the Cold War, Washington used its dominance in international institutions to perpetuate its hegemony. In today's emerging multipolar world the United States has chosen to follow the path of nationalism, to dismantle the architecture of global institutions and to bring down multilateralism and international cooperation. American nationalism has had a contagion effect on the rest of the world and seriously damaged the functioning of international organizations. Consequently, States are once again seeking their security in armaments. We are thus witnessing a resumption of the arms race.

How can we stop this dangerous trend which can lead to the return of the war? The United States is no longer in a position to support the weight of security of the Western world. This represents a decline comparable to the declaration of inconvertibility of the dollar into gold in 1971. The EU, while remaining an avant-garde in the world for its productive system, for its social model, for its democratic institutions,

for the quality of life of its inhabitants, for its heritage of scientific and technological knowledge, if it does not manage to acquire the means to guarantee its own security, it will be destined to an inevitable decline and to the subordination to the giant States which dominate on the international political scene. As we read in the Schuman Declaration, European unity was designed not only to make pacification between national states irreversible, but also to use its international influence to change the balance of power within the international system of states, to release tensions between the great powers and promote peace in the world. The phases of European unification are all stages in the construction of peace. The first – the formation of the European Community – represents the clearest evidence that, from Franco-German reconciliation onwards, the era of world wars was over. The second – the enlargement of the EU and the unification of the two Europes, for the first time in history by peaceful means, which includes most of the former communist countries of central and eastern Europe – represents the definitive overcoming of the cold war. The third – the formation of the Euro-Mediterranean Community, and more precisely the Euro-Mediterranean Partnership (EUROMED) – is a failed project to resume from beginning to end and put back on the agenda as soon as possible.

At Europe's borders two regional organizations have developed: the African Union (AU) and the Euro-Asian Economic Union, intended to occupy the place of the Soviet Union. In the jargon of Community

legal texts they are defined as “neighborhood zones”, with which the EU has an interest in promoting the growth of two pillars of the new world order. To develop this policy, it is necessary to go beyond the bilateral approach and adopt the regional approach. The priority objective is the stabilization of these regions, which includes the renouncement of the use of force in the solution of international conflicts, which is the prerequisite for tackling the problems of economic cooperation and the protection of human rights. In other words, it is a matter of adopting the approach of the Helsinki Conference on security and cooperation in Europe in the areas covered by the “three baskets” of security, cooperation in sectors of the economy and the environment and human rights. In particular, the EU-AU partnership is the framework in which three main objectives can be pursued:

- financing a development plan that will allow to tackle the root causes of Africa’s economic backwardness and the problems posed by the imposing migratory flows which are heading towards Europe;
- tackling in a coordinated way the global challenges, like climate change, terrorism, security and peace;
- strengthening the unity and independence of the African continent and democratizing the AU institutions.

On the other hand, the Euro-Asian Economic Union aims to fill the power vacuum created by the dissolution of the Soviet Union in accordance with the universal tendency to the formation of regional unions of states whose integration is based on economy. The preliminary objective that the EU must pursue is the reestablishment of a climate of confidence with Russia after its violations of international law accomplished by the annexation of Crimea and the invasion of eastern Ukraine, and the EU and NATO enlargement to the East, which have been perceived as a threat to Russia’s security and fostered Russian nationalism, militarism

and authoritarianism. After achieving these goals, it will become possible to develop

- first, conditions for international stability within the framework of the Council of Europe and the OSCE;
- second, economic and technological cooperation to emancipate Russia and its Euro-Asian partners from their exclusive dependence on fossil fuels and raw materials, diversify their productive system and make a long-term investment plan to pursue economic and technological innovation.

New forms of foreign policy no longer obey the imperatives of territorial conquest and the use of violence to resolve international conflicts. After the end of the Cold War and the start of the globalization process, the role of military power, understood as the crucial resource for solving international problems, has gradually weakened. Two factors play a crucial role: globalization and nuclear weapons. Because of the destructive potential of nuclear weapons, war, a which cannot but cease with neither a winner nor a loser, would be reciprocal suicide. Because of globalization and its consequences – the erosion of state sovereignty – economic power has greatly increased in importance and weakened the role of power politics.

In other words, the world is facing the problem of strengthening and democratizing the international institutions established at the end of the Second World War, which are no longer suited to the needs of our time. The emergence of the EU as a global player – for the moment only in the monetary and commercial sectors, together with the rise of new protagonists in world economy and politics – China, India, Brazil, will allow the international balance of power to evolve towards multipolarism and multilateralism. This is the condition for granting the United Nations the role of guardian of international order based on law, instead of force. The Conference on the Future of Europe that will gather in May is supposed to address the global challenges the EU is facing.

We Need More Europe, not Less. Farewell Remarks*

Mario Draghi

This year marks two decades of monetary union, which is by any measure a momentous anniversary. Not so long ago, the euro area economy was scarred by a level of unemployment probably unseen since the Great Depression, and fundamental questions were being asked about whether the euro would survive. Today 11 million more people are in work. Public trust in the euro has risen to its highest level ever. Across the euro area, policymakers are reaffirming that the euro is irreversible.

But I see today more as an occasion to reflect than to celebrate.

The euro is an eminently political project, a fundamental step towards the goal of greater political integration, which found its economic justification in the parlous state of European economies in the mid-1980s. Unemployment had risen from 2.6% in 1973 to 9.2% in 1985 and growth had slowed significantly in the 12 countries that would go on to form the euro area.

What the visionary leaders of that era saw, however, was that Europe had a powerful tool at its disposal to raise growth: to transform its common market into a single market. Removing existing barriers to trade and investment could reverse the decline in economic potential and bring more people back into work.

Yet the Single Market was always about more than just this. It also aimed to protect people from some of the costs of the changes that would inevitably arise. Unlike the wider process of globalisation, it allowed Europe to impose its values on economic integration – to

build a market that, to the extent possible, was free and just. Common rules would create trust between countries, give the weak recourse against the strong and provide safeguards for workers.

The Single Market, in this sense, was a bold attempt at “managed globalisation”. It combined competition with levels of consumer and social protection unseen in the rest of the world.

But there was one type of unfair practice that the Single Market could not prohibit: competitive devaluations. That prospect would undermine the mutual trust that was critical for the Single Market to survive and for the project of greater political integration to progress.

Freely floating currencies were therefore not an option, and fixed exchange rates would not work as capital became more mobile within Europe, as the ERM crisis in 1992-3 proved.

The answer was to create a single currency: one market with one money.

This construct has been largely successful: incomes across the continent have materially increased, integration and value chains have developed to an extent unimaginable 20 years ago, and the Single Market has survived intact through the worst crisis since the 1930s.¹

But the past 20 years have taught us two vital lessons for a successful monetary union.

The first concerns monetary policy.

When the ECB was established, its dominant concern was to keep inflation down. The ECB was a new central bank with no track record, so its policy framework was expressly designed to build strong anti-inflationary

credibility. It achieved this quickly, and it is to the tremendous credit of the ECB's early leaders that its first decade went so smoothly. But no one could have foreseen that the environment facing monetary policy globally was soon to abruptly reverse: that inflationary forces would turn into deflationary ones.

In all advanced economies, this called for a new paradigm for central banking, which comprised two elements: the determination to fight deflation as strongly as inflation, and flexibility in the choice of instruments to do so.

In our case, the ECB has proven that it will not accept threats to monetary stability caused by unfounded fears about the future of the euro. It has shown that it will fight risks to price stability on the downside as vigorously as those on the upside. And it has established that it will use all the tools within its mandate to secure its mandate – without ever exceeding the limits of the law.

The European Court of Justice has affirmed the legality of the measures we have taken, and it has confirmed the ECB's broad discretion in using all its instruments in a necessary and proportionate way to achieve its objective.

This judgement was crucial, because at stake was the essence of the central bank that the ECB has become, and that most people in Europe want to see: a modern central bank able to deploy all its instruments commensurate with the challenges it faces, and a truly federal institution that acts in the interests of the whole euro area.²

The second lesson concerns the institutional construction of EMU.

The euro area is built on the principle of “monetary dominance”, which requires monetary policy to be single-minded in its focus on price stability and never to be subordinate to fiscal policy. “Monetary dominance” does not preclude communicating with governments when it is clear that mutually aligned policies would deliver a faster return to price stability.

It means that alignment between policies, where needed, must serve the objective of monetary stability and should not work to the detriment of it.³

Today, we are in a situation where low interest rates are not delivering the same degree of stimulus as in the past, because the rate of return on investment in the economy has fallen. Monetary policy can still achieve its objective, but it can do so faster and with fewer side effects if fiscal policies are aligned with it. This is why, since 2014, the ECB has gradually placed more emphasis on the macroeconomic policy mix in the euro area.⁴ A more active fiscal policy in the euro area would make it possible to adjust our policies more quickly and lead to higher interest rates.

In our monetary union, national policies play the main role in fiscal stabilisation – much more so than state-level policies in the US. But national policies cannot always guarantee the right fiscal stance for the euro area as a whole. Coordinating decentralised fiscal policies is inherently complex. And uncoordinated policies are not enough, because the spillovers between countries from fiscal expansions are relatively low.

This is why we need a euro area fiscal capacity of adequate size and design: large enough to stabilise the monetary union, but designed not to create excessive moral hazard.

There will be no perfect solution. When risks are shared, moral hazard can never be reduced to zero, though it can be greatly contained by proper design. At the same time, we should also recognise that sharing risks can help reduce risks.

The building of a capital markets union, which would lead to greater risk-sharing in the private sector, would considerably reduce the fraction of risks that need to be managed by a central fiscal capacity. And a central fiscal capacity would in turn reduce risks for the whole union when national policies are unable to play their role.

In other regions where fiscal policy has played a greater role since the crisis, we have seen that the recovery began sooner and the return to price stability has been faster. The US had a deficit of 3.6% on average from 2009 to 2018, while the euro area had a surplus of 0.5%.⁵

In other words, the US has had both a capital markets union and a counter-cyclical fiscal policy. The euro area had no capital markets union and a pro-cyclical fiscal policy.

The road towards a fiscal capacity will most likely be a long one. History shows that budgets have rarely been created for the general purpose of stabilisation, but rather to deliver specific goals in the public interest. In the US, it was the need to overcome the Great Depression that led to the expansion of the federal budget in the 1930s. Perhaps, for Europe, it will require an urgent cause such as mitigating climate change to bring about such collective focus.

Whichever path is taken, it is plain to see that now is the time for more Europe, not less. I mean this not in an axiomatic way, but in the truest traditions of federalism. Where results can best be delivered by national policies, let it stay that way. But where we can only deliver on the legitimate concerns of the public by working together, we need Europe to be stronger.

For us Europeans, in a globalised world, a true sovereignty that meets people's needs for security and prosperity can be achieved only by working together.⁶ As Chancellor Merkel has said, "we Europeans have to take our destiny into our own hands if we want to survive as a community".⁷

Working together allows us to protect our interests in the world economy, to resist the pressures of foreign powers, to influence global rules to reflect our standards, and to enforce our values on global corporations. None of these can be achieved to the same degree by countries acting alone. In a globalised world, sharing sovereignty is a way to regain sovereignty.

But recognising that we need to exercise what President Macron has termed "European sovereignty"⁸ to be effective does not mean that we already have the political infrastructures to do so today. Awareness of their necessity is growing quickly, however.

We saw this emerging in the most recent European Parliament election, which was perhaps the first such election fought mainly on European questions. Even those who were seeking to slow down European integration did so by contesting the EU institutions rather than rejecting their legitimacy outright.

This is only a start, but it suggests our union is moving in the right direction. I am confident that it will continue to do so, because it is ultimately the self-interest of individual countries that lays out our future path towards a European sovereign.

The actions of many committed Europeans, at both the national and EU levels, have helped us to reach this point. There are three groups whose contributions I would like to single out. The first is the staff of the ECB and the national central banks.

There were many occasions during the crisis where the ECB found itself in truly uncharted waters. We faced, by any measure, an incredibly complex economic situation, with new challenges appearing the moment old ones were resolved.

Those years were intense for you and your families. But your dedication, the success of the measures you designed, and the competence you displayed across the Eurosystem in implementing those measures, will make those years worth remembering.

These policies are now available to all future policymakers to meet similar challenges. This is a legacy of which all Eurosystem staff can be proud. So, let me express my gratitude for all your remarkable efforts, which have truly served the ECB through this unprecedented time, and in doing so the people of Europe.

The second group I would like to highlight

are my colleagues on the Executive Board and Governing Council – both past and present. You have enacted a series of measures over the past eight years in extraordinary circumstances. The bedrock of those decisions has been your consistent and unconditional commitment to our mandate.

You have been unwavering in your determination both to deliver our mandate and to stay within its confines – to never accept failure. You can look back with satisfaction on what you achieved in extremely testing conditions, and in the knowledge that you have improved the welfare of many people.

What unites the Governing Council has always been – and will always be – much greater than anything that might divide it. We all share the same devotion to our mandate and the same passion for Europe. I trust that this shared conviction will continue to serve the ECB and Europe in the years to come.

The third group is Europe’s leaders.

We had to take measures that sometimes appeared controversial at first and whose benefits were only revealed slowly. Our determination never wavered as it was founded on the solid work of our staff, nourished by empathy for the people who were suffering, and strengthened by the conviction that the policies would improve their situation.

But in such times – and especially in a multi-country currency union – political leaders

who transcended national perspectives when assessing our monetary policy, and who acknowledged the euro area perspective and explained it to their domestic audience, provided an essential bulwark for our independence.

I am grateful that we have had such leaders in Europe, and for your steadfast support and encouragement throughout the crisis.

President Macron, President Mattarella, Chancellor Merkel: you have stood beside us unfailingly in the European Council and in global forums, at a time when other major central banks have faced increasingly vocal political pressure. You have pushed back strongly against illiberal voices that would see us turn our back on European integration.

And, at critical moments, you have taken the steps needed to safeguard the euro and protect the heritage that was left to us: a united, peaceful and prosperous Europe.

The time has come for me to hand over to Christine Lagarde. I have every confidence that you will be a superb leader of the ECB.

My goal has always been to comply with the mandate enshrined in the Treaty, pursued in total independence, and carried out through an institution that has developed into a modern central bank capable of managing any challenge.

It has been a privilege and an honour to have the opportunity to do so.

*Speech delivered by the President of the ECB at the farewell event in his honour in Frankfurt am Main, 28 October 2019.

¹ See speech by Mario Draghi entitled “Europe and the euro 20 years on” on accepting the Laurea Honoris Causa in economics from the University of Sant’Anna, Pisa, 15 December 2018.

² See speech by Mario Draghi entitled “Twenty Years of the ECB’s monetary policy” at the ECB Forum on Central Banking, Sintra, 18 June 2019.

³ Speech by Mario Draghi entitled “Policymaking, responsibility and uncertainty” on accepting the Laurea Honoris Causa from the Università Cattolica, 11 October 2019.

⁴ See speech by Mario Draghi entitled “Unemployment in the euro area” at the Annual central bank symposium in Jackson Hole, 22 August 2014.

⁵ Average cyclically adjusted primary balance as a percentage of potential GDP.

⁶ See speech by Mario Draghi entitled “Sovereignty in a globalised world”, on accepting the Laurea Honoris Causa in law from Università degli Studi di Bologna, Bologna, 22 February 2019.

⁷ Speech by Chancellor Angela Merkel to the European Parliament, Strasbourg, 13 November 2018.

⁸ Speech by President Emmanuel Macron to the European Parliament, Strasbourg, 17 April 2018.

2019: The Resilience and Strength of European Institutions

Mario Telò

One aspect that is not often mentioned since the European elections in May 2019, or since the appointments of the members of the new Commission in July and the formation of the new Commission in September, is that we are witnessing an obvious demonstration of the strength of the European institutions.

Against the widespread radical pessimism, the conformism of the media and the intellectuals, which means that we can no longer speak of the EU without using the words crisis, decline, failure, end, collapse, etc.; against a defeatist political climate dominated by nationalist sovereignists, very poorly contrasted by European leaders, elected officials with no ideas, worn out and exhausted, a climate that allowed even the person in charge of relaunching Europe to declare “the existential crisis of the EU”; despite this “Spenglerian” intellectual climate which no longer allows the publication of books which do not contain in their title the announcement of the imminent death of the Union, its institutions have shown their vitality, almost like a replica of the film “The Revenant”.

The European elections by universal suffrage, with an increasing participation rate, not only stopped the national-populist wave at a threshold below 20%, but also blocked the attempts at a new alliance between the EPP and the sovereignists, with the consequence of dividing the front of the sovereignists between the proponents of the “Exit” (the British, isolated), the members of the EPP (like for example Viktor Orban), the Polish nationalists, and the extremists (Le Pen and Salvini), who abandoned the idea of leaving the EU and

the euro area. The Italian “5 Stars” MEPs even voted in favor of President Ursula von der Leyen. Admittedly, the social-democratic forces suffered significant losses in France and Germany, even if the crisis of the “yellow vests” seems to be overcome and the meteoric rise of AfD to be blocked. In general, there should be no illusions that nationalism is defeated forever, but it suffered anyway two historically significant blows in 2019.

Brexit, often seen as one of the forms in which the EU crisis manifests itself, can be considered, as Prof. Gamble of Cambridge recently defined it, as “a political crisis of the party system, of the institutions of democracy, of the international role, the cultural identity and the very unity of the United Kingdom”. Boris Johnson got what Theresa May did not get because of the clarity and simplicity of his populist message: putting Brexit into practice, but offering no credible project for the future of the United Kingdom, that risks turning itself into a dis-united Kingdom (centrifugal thrusts in Scotland and Northern Ireland). What does it offer to young people? 700,000 young people demonstrated for the EU in London. Admittedly, the UK’s exit is a serious matter for the EU and for its global role; however, not only has no contagion occurred yet, but Brexit is now a bad example in the eyes of Europeans and it has pushed towards institutional advances impossible to have with Great Britain (the EU Defense Union, started in 2018, for example). It is up to the EU to offer the United Kingdom a new place in the European institutional architecture of which it is the center.

The European institutions have shown a

remarkable capacity for renewal: the S&D-EPP parliamentary majority had to open up to the Liberals after the success of Emmanuel Macron, and elected an Italian anti-Salvinist (David Maria Sassoli) as President of the European Parliament. Macron played a key role: two women at the top, at the Commission (Ursula von der Leyen) and at the European Central Bank (Christine Lagarde), Charles Michel at the Presidency of the European Council. The succession to the Presidency of the Commission has seen the failure of the *Spitzenkandidaten* method and of sometimes obscure negotiations, but finally led to a good-quality agreement on a very pro-European woman, “ordo-liberal” but open at the same time to social issues and to the environment. And finally, through its Vice-President Frans Timmermans and the Green Family Commissioner (big election winner) confirms the new president’s commitment to sustainable growth. The *Financial Times* has rightly pointed out the strong response expected by the new Commission in relation to Donald Trump’s economic challenge: the Vice-President Margrethe Vestager to catch up on digitalization, the French Breton to the internal market and industry, and Joseph Borrell to foreign policy. The opposition by part of the S&D to the Commission - which has more socialists than ever, including two vice-presidents of great political weight and intellectual strength like Timmermans and Borrell, an expression, these two appointments, of the excellent electoral results obtained by their two respective parties - can only be explained by internal dickering. The EP has resumed its central role, desired by Spinelli throughout his life, with the hearings of the Commissioners and the rejection of three candidates, including the powerful Sylvie Goulart.

As for the future, if we really want to reduce the nationalists’ propaganda margins, we will need concrete results and good communication. The odd Dombrowski /Gentiloni couple will have to

face the difficult challenge of building a new dynamic balance between the rules of rigor and the strong commitment to sustainable growth and a policy for employment. No illusion: combating excessive public debts remains a priority (in the interest of indebted states and young generations), but, with the help of the ECB, we can pursue this objective by encouraging investment in research and innovation. It is not more “flexibility” that is needed, but new shared rules and, first of all, a reform of the Stability and Growth Pact.

Europe has fostered very significant national developments, thanks to an increasingly interdependent and constraining institutional system. Greece and Portugal, contrary to the anti-European rhetoric, emerged from the crisis boosting their economies and normalizing their political systems: we observe a democratic alternation and the defeat of the fascists in Greece, with the opposition guided by the ex-populist Tsipras at 30%, anti-nationalist and more social-democrat; we should also note the good performance of the left coalition government behind the unexpected success of the Portuguese model. Social democracy in the Scandinavian countries shows that it is possible to curb the advance of the national-populists through policies of effective integration of the immigrants and of reforms of the welfare state. In East Germany, the SPD and CDU parties prevented the AfD from becoming the first party. In Austria, the national populists are excluded from the government. There are anti-nationalist successes in Slovakia and other eastern countries. Finally, the radical change that took place in August in the government of the third economy of the Euro zone, Italy, under the paradoxical appearance of continuity of the Prime Minister, Mr. Conte. The defeat of Salvini, betrayed by his own tactical error, now marginalized and ally of the fascists in the opposition, despite the polls still giving him the lead, is only the result of a simple change of alliances, in any case

constitutional in parliamentary republics. The transition - thanks to the evolution of the “5 Stars” movement and the participation of the Democratic Party - from the most sovereignist government to one of the most pro-European governments in the EU, and the political defeat of Salvini – who had become the hope and symbol of the success and sovereignist ambitions in Europe – is the result in Brussels and Strasbourg of the favorable vote of the “5 Stars” movement to the election of President von der Leyen. Romano Prodi was even hopeful for an “Ursula coalition” in Italy.

To conclude, I would say that the conditions for a European spring are partly present. The risk? That, once the danger has passed, we continue with the inertia of muddling through, that nothing changes in the EU, that the strong political responses to the three major challenges on the agenda will once again be missed: a European policy of immigration and integration, overcoming the Dublin agreements; a sustainable, digitalised European growth policy; a EU’s proactive role vis-à-vis its neighborhood (in the relations with the Arab world, Russia and especially Africa) and

the ongoing confrontation between the United States and China. An effective and coherent foreign policy and a revival of multilateralism could broaden the internal consensus for the EU. The priority given by the Commission and the Council (with the contrary vote of Poland) to the “Green Deal” shows a political will to move forward and to reconcile an avant-garde cultural project, an idea for the economy of the XXI century and a good step forward in the re-legitimization of the EU among young people. Contrary to the functionalist model, it is institutionalism that is coming back in force: the European institutions do integrate, socialize, change the behavior of national actors. The strength of the institutions has allowed the biggest and longest crisis in the EU to be largely behind us. But beware: without concrete results and a common vision, without strong, mobilizing ideas, the nationalists will come back even stronger than before, both at national and European level.

The civic duty of the world of communication is to emphasize and deepen the scope, complexity, and dramatic urgency of these challenges.

Identity Nationalism and Globalization. The Murderous and Suicidal Logic of “Them” and “Us”

Giampiero Bordinò

1989, as is well-known, is the year of the fall of the Berlin Wall, the end of the cold war, and the beginning, at least in hopes, of a new phase of European and world history. But the walls, broadly understood as more or less armed barriers to the free movement of people, have since then, according to a study by the University of Quebec carried out in 2016, at least tripled, from 15 to 63 on all continents, Europe included, involving 67 states as a whole. After 2016, the situation has further deteriorated: new walls are continuously taken into consideration or set up, in the most diverse forms, to separate “us” from “them”. President Trump, in the United States, hopes and strives to complete the construction of the wall along the border (3200 km long) with Mexico. In Asia, a fortified frontier separates India and Bangladesh, and more generally the whole continent excels in the “race for walls” in progress in the world. A European example, somehow original and unprecedented, is the “water wall” represented by the Mediterranean, which separates Africa from Europe. Thousands of people die each year trying to sail across this particular wall, certainly built by nature and not by men, but equally certainly made lethal by their hypocrisies and their omissions.

Walls, in their various and in some cases unforeseeable forms, are the most obvious and recurrent expression of conflict in human history. Like the animals, of which, anyway, men are objectively (not a value judgment, but simply a fact) close relatives, they “mark their

territory”, delimit its boundaries, act according to the logic of “us” and “them”. Already in the seventeenth century the French philosopher Blaise Pascal in one of his most famous “Pensées” recounts, and denounces, this logic, which is, as we shall see later, inevitably murderous and at the same time suicidal, in a brief imaginary conversation between two characters: “*Why do you kill me?*”. “*Well! Don’t you live on the other side of the water? If you lived on this side, my friend, I would be an assassin, and it would be unjust to slay you in this manner. But since you live on the other side, I am a hero, and what I do is just.*”

More precisely, to make a specific reference to the contemporary era, walls are the most complete expression of identity-related nationalism, which marks the most recent history not only in Europe, and which has become even more lethal and pervasive in the context of the ungoverned globalization in which we are increasingly immersed in the new century and millennium. As the American political scientist Stephen M. Walt wrote, maybe in a “politically incorrect” but certainly very effective way, in *Foreign Policy*, “the most powerful force in the world is not the nuclear armament, the Internet, God or the bond market. It is nationalism”.

The political leaderships that, throughout the history of the twentieth century, and now also in the new global century, have used and use this “force” to achieve popular consent and take over power and then control it in an autocratic way, are both

opportunistic and, more or less consciously, at least potentially criminogenic. Today it is no longer a question of leaderships that are expression of “hypertrophic” forms of the national state arisen in Europe in the twentieth century (Orban in Hungary, to cite one case), but of leaderships expression of various and multiple forms of identity-related tribalism, based essentially on ethnic and / or religious characteristics, present and active on all continents. To give just a few examples: the Hindu and anti-Islamic nationalism of the Indian leader Narendra Modi; the various forms of Islamist tribalism established in the Middle East (al-Qaeda, etc.) and also present in Africa, such as the Boko Haram movement in Nigeria, feeding transnational terrorism in Europe and throughout the world. Xi Jinping’s identity-based neo-nationalism in the context of the Chinese authoritarian capitalism, managed by a party that continues to define itself as communist and which has placed itself at the helm of campaigns of patriotic education and of repression of ethnic and religious minorities (the Uighurs, Turkic-speaking and of Islamic religion, for example, that a recent law aims to “Chinesize” within 5 years). Putin’s Russia, for whom “liberal ideas are obsolete” and “no one wants migrants”, and by whom support and money to European neo-nationalist and populist movements are given, in a paradoxical but also explicit agreement with Trump, whose goal is *America First*, hence the European Union is an enemy to destroy, as the Russian leader also thinks. In addition, concluding this quite partial list, the radical and violent Buddhism in Myanmar and Sri Lanka, aimed above all at the repression and elimination of local Muslim communities.

As we can see, nationalisms and identity-based tribalisms of twentieth-century origin did not end with globalization, but rather became somewhat more diversified,

extensive and pervasive. There are, in my opinion, at least two reasons that explain this process. The first reason is related to the economic, social, cultural and therefore, in a broad sense, political changes, which the neo-liberist ungoverned globalization has led to. The growth of inequalities, the crisis of the middle classes, the uncertainty in working and living conditions, the crisis of social protection systems determined above all by capital mobility, which makes redistributive fiscal policies difficult, the anthropological and cultural disorientation, the loss of identity in a world increasingly dominated by transnational and global flows (of people, goods, capital, signs, etc.) that cross the territories, all this has given rise to societies in which, as the Bulgarian political scientist Ivan Krastev wrote in 2017, “anxious majorities” are increasingly formed, marked by widespread phenomena of existential anxiety. Precisely on this ever-expanding new world of interests and emotions make leverage the opportunistic and nationalistic leaderships on the rise. Trump, leader of the last world super-power, today in decline, is a significant example of that: a billionaire entrepreneur, master in tax avoidance and evasion, who presents himself as representative of the excluded, as the guarantor of popular interests, “we” (the people and its leaders) against “them” (the migrants, the minorities, the global elites of which Trump himself is obviously part). One can easily understand why in this process, in America as in Russia and in Europe, even anti-Semitism is back in fashion, as a historically relevant reference model, the most significant of the twentieth century, for every form of opposition between “us” and “them”.

The second reason for the increasing spread of nationalism and identity-based tribalism in the age of globalization is linked to the great scientific and technological revolution,

above all in communications and transport, underway in the last decades. This revolution has above all made the level of interdependence between the various parts of the world grow in an extraordinary way, while in the past it was strongly limited by the barriers of time and space. As a result, nationalisms and tribalisms travel more easily across countries and continents, and experiences and actors are more easily exchanged. Secondly, this great transformation has, so to speak, set the individuals free, through the network and social media, from the traditional intermediaries of public debate (educational bodies, political parties, associative movements, etc.). But this liberation is fraught with ambiguity and danger: individuals who are ever more alone and culturally defenseless travel the "ocean" of the network and risk more and more often "drowning", that is, falling victim to opportunistic leaderships, even explicitly criminogenic, present and active in the world. Identity nationalism is sold by these leaderships on the political market, for the purpose of conquest and maintenance of power, as "a kind of antidepressant" (as defined by the French-speaking semiologist and psychoanalyst Julia Kristeva). A drug to be taken in increasing doses, even at the risk of total addiction, until complete recovery. It can be useful, to better understand the processes in progress and conclude, to take a step back. We shall bring memory back to

life, in an age like ours in which amnesia, the loss of memory, takes the shape, throughout Europe and throughout the West, of a "disease of the soul" and of a condition which favors the rebirth, in new forms, of tribalisms and identity nationalisms. The twentieth century, as is known, has theorized and practiced the logic of the clash between "us" and "them", up to the extreme experience of Hitler's "final solution". If "they" are a mortal danger to "us", and if "they" do not make themselves available to become like "us", there is nothing left to save us but physical elimination. So believe, in essence, the Islamist terrorists, the Hindu nationalists, the Buddhist nationalists of Myanmar, the white American supremacists, and all the others who accompany them, of the most diverse cultures and belongings.

But we must also know, and the historical experience of the twentieth century teaches that, that the logic of "them" and "us" is not only murderous, but also suicidal. In fact, "they" and "us" often switch roles in history, with fatal outcomes for contemporaries, or in other cases for their children and grandchildren. In the latter case, it is an unwanted and undeserved gift to descendants on the part of the political leaders who hold power and guide peoples: to give two examples, remember the year 1945 in Germany and in Japan. We have known for a long time that after the antidepressant there is no healing, we simply die.

Translated by Lionello Casalegno

Proposal for Legal Incentives for Trans-nationalisation of Political Parties

Pierre Jouvenat

This article is the the second part of a piece entitled « Towards a European Political Space », the first part of which was published in our review's November 2019 issue.

The sole purpose of this paper is to formulate a specific proposal on the voting system for European elections that is compatible with the long-term vision of emergence of transnational parties. It will only deal with legal incentives that are considered appropriate, taking into account the particular context of the EU, as recalled above. The legal framework, electoral law in particular, largely determines the form that a partisan system takes. The strategy chosen is the development of synergies between national parties and Europarties.

A. Electoral Act of the EU

A recent attempt to “europeanise” European elections through a reform of the electoral law failed. One of the EP’s key proposals was to make it compulsory that “The ballot papers ... shall give equal visibility to the names and logos of national parties and to those of the European political parties” to which they are affiliated. The Council of the EU, for its part, maintained the status quo: “ Member States may allow for the display, on ballot papers, of ...”, thus showing its opposition to any change. National parties will remain the sole masters of the game.¹

However, even the EP’s proposal would have been insufficient for a real impact on citizens’ perception of this election. And the

main concern to develop synergies between national and Europarties was lacking. We must therefore be more ambitious.²

One of the proposals of the experts auditioned by AFCE is perfectly in line with the perspective of transnational parties. This is the so-called “double proportionality” method³, which consists in allocating seats among political families directly at European level (Europarties, i.e no longer national parties) and among States according to preordained quotas. The many advantages of this method will be discussed below, but it must be noted at the outset that it differs from the proposal for transnational lists in that it makes the elections europeanized for all seats. There is no need for a new single constituency. The quality of public debate is not a matter of constituency; it rather depends on which message is conveyed and by whom.

In practice, ahead of the elections each political family (the Europarty and its national counterparts) defines a programme (the European manifesto adopted in Congress). The selection of candidates and the conduct of electoral campaigns are then carried out by the national parties within national or regional constituencies. This is already the case today, but we have seen that national parties have ignored the European manifesto and instrumentalised elections for national purposes. What’s new then? Over and above the obligation to display the names and logos of both the Europarty and the national party on ballot papers, more importantly votes are cast for the Europarty, no longer the national

party. Thus, in Germany, for example, within the national constituency a voter casts his/her vote for EPP, not for CDU/CSU. Strong psychological shock guaranteed. Seats are then allocated, on the one hand, to the various Europarties according to electoral results achieved at EUROPEAN level, in conformity with the principle “one citizen, one vote”, and on the other hand, within each Member State according to the results of competing political forces in that State, within its preordained seat contingent. The double entry table (Europarties and Member States) is thus constituted. This mathematical formula is well established (for instance in Swiss cantons).

There are many advantages (see box below). Two of them must be highlighted as there is a direct relationship with the emergence of transnational parties:

- Drawing programmes and conducting electoral campaigns requires a genuine partnership between parties in the same political family. This is fully in line with the logic of synergies between national parties and Europarties.
- Since votes are cast for Europarties, integrating into a transnational structure becomes a serious matter as it becomes visible to the electorate. As a result, true political affinities structure the European public debate. Unlike post-election alliances within parliamentary groups, affiliations inevitably take place ahead of the elections, thus enhancing transparency of the electoral competition. Finally, in the long run, political parties will have precedence over parliamentary groups, as in all national democracies.⁴

The manifold advantages of double proportionality

- Increased visibility of partisan affiliations at European level, thus encouraging groupings

according to true political affinities, unlike current alliances of convenience;

- Electoral campaigns designed and coordinated at European level, under the aegis of Europarties, hence pan-European in nature, then implemented in a decentralised manner by national parties, thus developing synergies between all parties of a political family;
- Electoral propaganda necessarily based on the European manifesto⁵, thus clarifying what is at stake; voters finally understand that the question of sanctioning the national government in place is irrelevant and they are less influenced by the positioning of a party on the national scene;
- MEPs identified with Europarties granted with European legal personality, no longer with a multitude of national parties, thus strengthening the legitimacy of the EP;
- Homogeneity of the EP preserved, all MEPs being elected with the same procedure;
- Maintenance of local constituencies, thus ensuring MEPs’ proximity with citizens; preferential voting remains possible since party lists contain a reasonable number of candidates;
- Single (European) legislation for the submission of an electoral list under the aegis of the Europarty, thus facilitating access to elections for new transnational organisations such as PACE, Volt...

While the proposal is more ambitious than the transnational lists, it is however politically more acceptable. States keep their constituencies and quotas. There is no sliding of a supranational nature. Nothing top-down, bottom-up only: European manifestos are adopted by the grassroots, MEPs remain close to citizens, national parties orchestrate electoral campaigns. Member States must only admit that, in the context of European elections, and in the absence of European party federations, existing European actors, i.e. the Europarties which are no less than the European partners

of national parties, have a legitimate role to play and must be in the forefront. Finally, with the Lisbon Treaty, MEPs are no longer “representatives of the peoples of the States brought together in the Community” but “representatives of the Union’s citizens”. The election of MEPs under the aegis of Europarties is in the spirit of this new mandate.

Induced benefits

1. Clarity of the European political landscape

The increased role and visibility given to a limited number of Europarties is likely to promote, in the long term, greater homogeneity of the ideological offer at European scale, or at least limit its fragmentation. This will facilitate pan-European public debate and encourage the emergence of a transnational party system (see box on page 2). These are important factors in European integration.

2. Legitimacy of the EP

The Bundesverfassungsgericht contested the democratic legitimacy of the EP, admittedly mainly because of the violation of the principle of electoral equality, which is jeopardized by the attribution of EP seats according to national quotas, with a very strong discrepancy between the electoral weight of citizens from different Member States. However, while the issue of “degressive proportionality” is not resolved here, the negative perception of national quotas decreases once MEPs are identified with Europarties and no longer with a multitude of national parties - in the spirit of their status as representatives of all EU citizens - and once the allocation of seats among political families is based on the principle “one citizen, one vote” applied at European level. The Court would undoubtedly see this as an increased legitimacy of the EP.

3. Transnational lists

Transnational lists, which are controversial, lose their main *raison d’être*. The objective of europeanising the debate will have been achieved. All the better, because notwithstanding commonly made criticisms (disconnected MEPs, two-tier parliament⁶, problematic selection of candidates, mechanism favouring countries having electoral weight, lists necessarily limited to a small number of seats...), this proposal is in no way compatible with a long-term vision (see box below).

Transnational lists: a first step?

Supporters of transnational lists frequently put forward the tactical argument that these would be a first step towards a pan-European debate. However, this is a bad strategy. The coexistence of European and national lists would be counterproductive in two respects. Firstly, this runs counter to the objective of creating transnational parties: transnational lists would divide Europarties and national parties, rather than bring them together, each one running for its own list. Secondly, the electoral impact is very risky: voters could make a distinction between candidates with a European vision (transnational lists) and candidates supposed to defend national interests within European institutions (national lists for the vast majority of seats). This would strengthen the national character of these elections, undoubtedly to the benefit of populist and Europhobic parties. The opposite of the objective pursued.

“First step” also means starting with a small number of seats to be allocated that way, the ultimate objective being electing half or even the entire parliament with transnational lists. However, transnational

lists cannot be generalized to all seats. Can we imagine closed party lists with more than 700 names?

This is a false good idea.

It is surprising that federalist activists support a proposal that in no way corresponds to the principles of federalism: transnational lists imply a single constituency, symptomatic of a centralized State; everything is top-down, while federalism is a bottom up process. Nevertheless, double proportionality and transnational lists are not incompatible. The latter can be the “icing on the cake” that broadens the voter’s choice to include strong and well-known European personalities. However, there is a prerequisite: all MEPs must be elected under the aegis of the Europarties so that voters have learned to distinguish between European and national issues.

Considering that transnational lists will probably remain politically unacceptable, it is better to encourage a “transnationalisation of national lists” by including non-national EU citizens. In order to reap the full benefits, the current residence requirement must be removed and preferential voting must be generalised.

4. *Spitzenkandidaten*

The *Spitzenkandidaten* process becomes fully effective with all votes being cast for Europarties. Separate transnational lists are no longer needed. Obviously, fully recognized Europarties will be led by personalities embodying their political family in its European dimension. It follows that these real party presidents will be the natural candidates for the presidency of the Commission, just as in Germany the leaders of the trans-Länders (!) parties are running

for the chancellery, with full awareness of voters. In accordance with the Treaties, the European Council will task the leader of the party which came first to form a majority in the EP. If he/she fails, the leader of another party will be designated to do so.

B. Legislation on political parties

Since the need has emerged to define what a Europarty is and to regulate its existence, AFCO’s work from the Tsatsos report in 1996 to the Giannakou report in 2011 has not really succeeded in clarifying conceptual issues such as the nature, role and positioning of Europarties within the European political space. As a result, the current regulation⁷ remains largely focused on conditions to access European funds.

However, a few provisions are in line with the trans-nationalization of parties as envisaged in this paper. Two examples: (1) Now that Europarties have been endowed with European legal personality, they “... shall enjoy legal recognition and capacity in all Member States”. A provision which has not yet achieved full understanding in Member States! (2) As from the most recent amendment, only political parties, and no longer individuals, may sponsor the registration of a Europarty.

However, we are still far from a legislation that would promote synergies between all parties in the same political family. While a single European law⁸ or a uniformization of national laws on such sensitive issues are not conceivable, European legislation must nevertheless evolve in favour of a “mutualization” of the missions of European and national parties. A difficult task while so far, Member States have even opposed the participation of Europarties in referendum campaigns on European issues and in the selection of candidates for the European elections⁹.

The European legislation will also have to introduce a distinction between the conditions to access European funds and the minimum conditions required to participate in European elections, so as to allow new parties demonstrating a European dimension (PACE, Volt, European Spring ...) to join the European political scene. A homogeneous political space should not mean a closed space.

Conclusion

It is brief: Creating a European political space requires a trans-nationalization of political families. This must start with the strengthening of synergies between national parties and Europarties. Any initiative, particularly regarding the election of MEPs, must contribute to this concern.

¹ In accordance with its mandate under the Treaties (Art. 223 TFEU), the EP has initiated a reform of its electoral procedure aimed at “drawing up a procedure that is based on principles common to all the Member States”. Its resolution of 11 November 2015 was considerably narrowed by the Council decision of 13 July 2018. Only one important provision remains: the establishment of a minimum threshold of 2 to 5% in the event a list system is used in constituencies with more than 35 seats. At the time of writing (June 2019), the reform had not yet been ratified by all Member States.

² The author of this paper is aware that the following proposal has no chance of being accepted by Member States in the context of a new electoral reform undertaken in isolation (which is not on the agenda). The immediate intention is to put it on the agenda for discussions on possible institutional changes and, at the same time, to open a debate that goes beyond the single and recurrent proposal for transnational lists, which now appears to be deadlocked.

³ Kai-Friederike Oelbermann and Friedrich Pukelsheim, Future European Parliament Elections: Ten Steps Towards Uniform Procedures (https://pdfs.semanticscholar.org/39ca/fd74d8153b20937321ef09ee26114c01bc1e.pdf?_ga=2.26612093.1350236513.1580322230-135962773.1580322230) and Reinforcing uniformity in the European election act: gentle interim arrangements in 2019; Towards systematic double-proportionality in 2024, pp.18-25 of the document (<https://www.kai-friederike.de/materialien/papers/2014PukelsheimOelbermann.pdf>). These documents were presented at the AFCO hearings on 4 December 2014. The proposal was not adopted by the rapporteurs, who had considered that it should rather be examined in the context of a future treaty revision.

⁴ Voting for a Europarty has occasionally been criticised on the ground that this could prevent emerging national parties from participating in the elections. However, we believe that the opportunism of small parties or groups without a European project but seeking visibility must be ended. Small parties that wish to go beyond the national sphere and stand for European elections must necessarily integrate into a credible transnational structure. This is possible, as demonstrated by the pirate parties that founded the European Pirate Party in 2014.

⁵ This does not prevent national parties from highlighting specific elements of the European manifesto, according to national priorities and local sensitivities, or even from outbidding with more precise or ambitious proposals that their MEPs will defend within their political family in the EP. What remains essential is the absence of contradiction with the common manifesto.

⁶ The comparison with the election method to the Bundestag is misleading. The voter has two votes to combine

1. a uninominal majority poll in single-member constituencies (the Direktkandidaten) and

2. a proportional list vote, which takes place at Länder level (Landesliste). There are no trans-Länder lists in Germany! Nor is there a significant example of a single constituency in the world.

⁷ Regulation of 22 October 2014 on the statute and funding of European political parties and European political foundations, and its amendment of 3 May 2018.

⁸ In Switzerland, for example, all levels of political parties, including the cantonal and communal sections, are governed by the federal law, the Swiss Civil Code.

⁹ Even more symptomatic of this resistance to party transnationalisation is the recent failure of the European Commission to introduce into the Regulation a provision requiring a Europarty seeking funding to provide evidences that its national member parties publish the political programme and logo of the Europarty on their websites. The final text is not very binding in this respect. Yet, it should have gone even further: encouraging various forms of interaction between national and Europarties, and between sister national parties (such as thematic working groups to promote common policies; mutual support in national elections; joint campaigns on pan-European issues, etc.), to develop synergies both horizontally and vertically.

Peace and Harmony, Will They Ever Be Achieved?

Visvanathan Muthukumar

Serendip (from which “serendipity” derived, meaning the occurrence of beneficial happenings by chance) is the old name of the island of Sri Lanka. But nothing beneficial happened to this beautiful country on Easter Sunday in April 2019, when churches and hotels were attacked killing 250 people.

One wonders what motivates the hate-filled minds to commit such gruesome crimes against so many innocent lives. Those attacks are a crime against humanity in our society. Those attacks underscore the destructive energy spawned by hatred.

Even among the so called religious leaders there is this religious, racial, linguistic and political bias, cultivated in their blood from their childhood, which continues to prevail in their own personal, family, community and religious group. That’s why their sectarian attitude is hidden to outsiders. The proper way to follow a religion is to lead a godly life, is leading one’s life with values and ideals. One can’t love God without loving and respecting his fellow human beings, irrespective of their religion. In the whole world, however, I think that no religion is safe in the hands of priests. The conditions for this extreme religion-based hatred stem from our homes and our own communities. This can be countered only by strengthening our relationships and challenging any extremism tooth and nail.

The bulk of terror attacks in the past, worldwide, even those claimed by the Islamic State (IS) on religious sites, were lower in number than to those on targets such as government and military installations. The world community must collectively respond to the challenge

of the growing religion-based terrorism that threatens the global community. Of course, a vast majority of people wish to live in Peace with tolerance and amity with their fellow co-religionists. Today, this terrorism has become an ideology that is not bound by any border and has become a global threat.

Peace building is not simply about the support to a society emerging from a conflict or from gruesome terror attacks, but the long-term initiative of educating the community, especially the youth and young children, on the importance of peace and religious harmony. Then the aim of education should not be a purely academic pursuit, but the pursuit of moral wisdom. The most important part of this education is education to non-violence and harmonious living, which ultimately develops the quest for mutual understanding. We need to be aware of the fact that young children are picking up the ignorance, prejudice and hatred they see in society and on electronic media, and are carrying this virus into schools and classrooms. They are not at fault. But we can’t absolve ourselves of the blame. The education to peace should be given top priority in the primary school level, which should help us to lead a peaceful and harmonious living at least in the 21st century. Further, I think that global institutions like UNESCO, the UN and the United Religions Initiative (URI) should give more attention to preparing the future generation against religion-based violence and hatred.

I am sure that common people across the world remain touched or disturbed by the divisive forces and hatred, but remain humble

Comments

and sympathetic human beings. I can give an example: in Kerala (one of the southern states of India) the world-famous Thrissur Pooram Festival, which is a Hindu festival, is celebrated every year; in it more than 30 elephants take part and they are decorated with marvelous caparisons made by Christians for more than 100 years now: here there is no religious hindrance. All our efforts towards religious amity and peace is just hypocrisy if we fail to fill our hearts with pure compassion.

Religion-based terrorism is one of human kind's biggest enemies, and I hope that the resilience and wisdom in our global society will prevail over the forces of division and hatred based on religion. It's not just tolerance, but acceptance toward other faiths and secularism that reduces pro-violence attitudes. Religion has increasingly become

important in conflicts worldwide, used as a medium for violence.

Those of us who really think that we can contribute to harmony and peace among the community should take great care in dividing friend from foe, and have a genuine, friendly mind and heart in approaching others. I subscribe to what Mr. N. Modi, Prime Minister of India, said in his speech at the 74th Session of the UN General Assembly. He said that terrorism is humanity's biggest challenge and it's not a challenge to any country, but to the entire world. That's why we voice our concern to alert the world about this Evil which must be met with seriousness and determination. It's imperative that the world unites against Terrorism and stands as one.

I hope that there will be in the world a new dawn and a brighter tomorrow.

Albert Thomas: The ILO Centenary

Rene Wadlow

Ralph Waldo Emerson, the New England philosopher, wrote that “an institution is the lengthened shadow of a man.” This is certainly true of the International Labour Organization (ILO) whose centenary was celebrated in Geneva at the start of its annual conference in May, 2019. Albert Thomas, the first Director General, set in motion nearly all the elements that were developed later.

Albert Thomas (1878 -1932) was a French socialist close to Jean Jaurès, who was assassinated on the eve of the First World War by a French Nationalist who thought Jaurès was too active trying to prevent a war with Germany. Thomas was brought into the French government as the war began, largely as a sign that not all socialists were pacifists. He was quickly given a newly-created Ministry: the Ministry of Armaments. In this position, he met many French industrialists who were making arms and that he would see again as the representatives of French industry when Thomas was Director General of the ILO.

Thomas was very aware of the socio-political situation in Russia. He had widely traveled there as a university student, and returned in 1916 as Minister of Armaments. He returned in 1917 after the April revolution which had made Alexandre Kerensky Prime Minister.

Thomas saw the possibility of similar revolutions in other countries if labor conditions were not improved and if cooperation between workers and owners was not developed. Thus, the background of labor unrest leading to a Soviet-style revolution was in the minds of many of the 1919 negotiators that led to the Treaty of Versailles. Without mentioning the Russian Revolution in public, the negotiators, especially the English and the French, saw the need for

an organization that would bring together in a cooperative spirit the representatives of government, industry and labor.

The French and English negotiators were the most active in these labor cooperation issues and divided the structure of the administration of what was to become the ILO between the two States. The U.S.A. had already indicated that it would not join the League of Nations; Russia, become the Soviet Union, was not invited, and Germany, as the defeated power, was also excluded. Thus a Frenchman, Albert Thomas, became the founding Director General, and the British Harold Butler became his deputy. In practice, all the important posts were divided among the French and the British.

The ILO has a three-part structure of equality among the representatives of governments, trade union federations and employers' associations. The ILO has a philosophy of dialogue and compromise. However, Thomas began a tradition of strong leadership and expert knowledge by the secretariat. Thomas stressed that *“The governments must be told what they have to do, and told in terms so far as possible, of their own constitution and methods”*. He insisted on what he called “letters of principle” in which the duties of governments were carefully set out and a method for their performances suggested. This approach has led to the widely used ILO practice of setting out “Recommendations”, which creates standards but need not be ratified by national parliaments as must be ILO Conventions, which are treaties which need to be ratified in the manner of other international treaties. Thus there are many more ILO Recommendations than ILO Conventions.

Comments

From his early days in French politics, Thomas had developed an interest in cooperatives and in rural workers, both of which were usually outside the interests of trade unions and employers' association, which focused on industry. Under Thomas' leadership, the ILO took on a fairly broad view of what is "labor". He was also concerned with the role of women, though it was only a good bit later that the ILO became concerned with "unpaid labor" and the informal sector. In many countries the work of wives as "unpaid labor" is still outside employment statistics.

On 21 June 2019, a new Convention and accompanying Recommendation to combat violence and harassment in the world of work was adopted by the ILO Conference. Manuela Tonei, Director of the ILO's Work Quality Department said "*Without respect, there is no dignity at work, and without dignity there is no social justice.*" This is the first new Convention

agreed by the International Labour Conference since 2011 when the Domestic Workers Convention (Convention 184) was adopted. Conventions are legally binding international conventions while Recommendations provide advice and guidance.

Also linked to his political background, Thomas knew the importance of personal contacts. Thus, he traveled a good deal to meet officials and explain the role of the ILO. He traveled a good bit in Asia, especially China and Japan, two countries outside of colonial control, as well as to North and South America. Thomas was an intensive worker, often traveling in difficult conditions. He did not take into consideration his own health needs – suffering from diabetes. He died suddenly in 1932 as the ILO was facing the consequences of the world-wide depression. He was only 53. He left a strong legacy on which the ILO has been able to build.

Note

For a biography and analysis of the start of the ILO written by a close co-worker and high official in the ILO Secretariat see: E.J. Phelan. *Albert Thomas et la Création du B.I.T.* (Paris: Grasset, 1936) translated into English as Edward J. Phelan. *Yes and Albert Thomas* (1936).

Inadequacy of the Dollar as a World Currency: an Anglo-American Reflection

Antonio Mosconi

Mark Carney

The growing Challenges for Monetary Policy in the Current International Monetary and Financial System

Speech at the Jackson Hole Symposium, 2019¹

The current American nationalist policy, threatening the operations of international organizations promoted by the United States itself at the end of the Second World War, has rekindled the debate on the “exorbitant privilege” constituted by the use of the dollar, a national currency, as an international currency. The 75th anniversary of the founding of the International Monetary Fund, now that the Bretton Woods order has been abandoned for half a century, was the occasion for several contributions to the reform of the international monetary system, some of them quite important.

Mark Carney was already known for his reflections on the green economy and finance. In 2015, he brought attention to the problem of stranded assets in relation to fossil fuels. As chairman of the Financial Stability Board (until 2018), he helped establish the Task Force on Climate-Related Financial Disclosures for understanding the financial risks related to climate change. In 2018, at the One Planet Summit in New York, he announced that climate-disclosures are becoming a dominant trend.

The speech given by him on August 23, 2019, at the Jackson Hole Symposium as Governor of the Bank of England and former Governor of the Bank of Canada, is exemplary in several respects: his fruitful blend of an economist’s theory with a central banker’s practice; his

differing thought from that prevalent in the American financial world; the continuity and development along the lines indicated by Keynes (the bancor), Triffin (firstly the Special Drawing Rights of the International Monetary Fund (SDR), then the euro) and their successors for the adoption of an international currency not tied to a single State.

Mark Carney brings to the “Triffin dilemma” an argument supported by very interesting data: the dollar cannot serve as international currency because its financial use is disproportionately greater than the United States’ interdependence with the real economy of many other countries, so that the dollar’s financial exchange rate, when applied to the real world trade, causes painful distortions in particular to emerging and developing countries. The United States’ share in world trade is 10% and in the world’s gross product is 15%. Instead, 1/3 of the countries officially anchor their currencies to the dollar, 50% of the invoices in world trade are denominated in dollars, as well as 2/3 of the emerging countries’ foreign debts, of the official monetary reserves and of the global bond-issues. Finally, 70% of the world gross product uses the dollar as the anchoring currency.

While the world economy has seen a realignment of the weight of the different regions, the dollar retains the same importance it had at the time of the collapse of the Bretton Woods system (1971). The role of the dollar has created a gigantic “liquidity trap”. Emerging countries have accumulated huge reserves in safe US dollar assets to protect themselves, in the absence of an adequate global safety net.

Comments

The dimensions of sustainable international imbalances and of a potential global economic growth have been reduced. In the short term, central bankers can make use at best of the flexibility allowed by inflation targeting. In the medium term, the structure of the current international monetary (non-) system can be improved. In the long term, however, we need to change the rules of the game. We cannot replace one hegemonic currency with another, because every unipolar system is inadequate in a multipolar world.

The current international monetary and financial system is based on two anachronistic hypotheses: that fluctuating exchange rates will absorb the global shocks and shield employment and domestic products from external developments; and that in such circumstances international cooperation can bring very limited benefits. These hypotheses are outdated due to three fundamental reasons: the impetuous growth of international interdependence, the abnormal weight of the dollar in invoicing (five times the amount of

US imports), and finally the stress to the global economy caused by the growing asymmetry at the very heart of the international monetary and financial system.

The definitive solution to this problem, according to Mark Carney, can only be found in the adoption of an international currency independent of any sovereign state, such as Keynes' *bancor*. However, regrettably, he never mentions the euro, let alone its predecessor, the ECU (the Brexit climate has an impact also on the most serious analyses). Nor does he state that a basket of currencies, such as the one based on the IMF's Special Drawing Rights, could initially bring us closer to the international currency. Carney, instead, is inspired by the announced creation of *Libra*, proposed by Facebook and linked to a basket of currencies, and proposes a global electronic currency that "would need new rules". We may add that many rules already exist, but an essential one should be added: the guarantee of the ratio 1 *Libra* = 1 SDR, to be provided by a global system of central banks.

Translated by Lionello Casalegno

¹ Paper available at <https://www.bankofengland.co.uk/-/media/boe/files/speech/2019/the-growing-challenges-for-monetary-policy-speech-by-mark-carney.pdf?la=en&hash=01A18270247C456901D4043F59D4B79F09B6BFBC>

The Celebration of Democracy in Sri Lanka

W. James Arputharaj

Where else can you watch people coming outside their homes in the evening of the Election Day to wave at the vehicles carrying the ballot boxes?

The Sri Lankan electorate is unique in many respects among the 7 South Asian neighbours. A very high literacy rate (96.3%) and highest score in the human development index (Sri Lanka has been classified under the “High Human Development” category, with a Human Development Index value of 0.770), top among the South Asian countries. While India ranks 130th (*Economic Times*), Bangladesh 136th and Pakistan 150th (medium HD category) amongst the 186 countries, Sri Lanka ranks 76th, far above the other south Asian neighbours. (Lanka Business online, 2017)

The IMR of Sri Lanka is 8.4 deaths/1000 live births, while for India, it is 39; MMR for Sri Lanka is 30 (deaths per 1000) while for India it is 174. In 2011, the poverty levels of India was 21.9% of the population, while for Sri Lanka it is 6.7%. Comparably, Sri Lanka is much better off in the social indicators.

I thought I would write my observations after I had participated in the 2019 Presidential Election process as an International Election Observer sponsored by the ANFREL (Asian network for free elections) and given official EC Id. It was a sheer joy to watch the eagerness with which people participated in the election process. It was for the first time in the Sri Lankan history that no one lost life, except for one incident of gun fire near Mannar, the elections were held free and fair, thus peaceful. In 2005, while living in

Sri Lanka, we launched a campaign through PAFFREL (People Association for Free and FAIR Elections) called “Ballots not bullets” as there was a lot of election related violence then. The Asia Pacific Forum on Women, Law and Development did a research in 2003 and found out that though Sri Lankan literacy is high, the participation of women in the governance as members of local governance bodies and Members of Parliament was hardly 7%, mainly due to fear of gun-related violence during elections.

The recent Presidential election held on 16th November 2019 recorded 80% votes. In some polling booths the percentage of votes were as high as 97% and by noon half the ballots were cast. While campaigns in various forms happened on every single day, on the whole there were fewer cut-outs and advertisements due to environmental awareness. The people on the election day showed a lot of enthusiasm and fought to get their votes registered. In one case, when their photo ID was rejected by the Senior polling officer, a small group went to the Government agent (collector) office to get temporary ID and came back and voted. Rarely the polling stations were deserted.

The Chief of Polling stations- the senior polling officer (SPO), 30 minutes before the polling opened, briefed the staff and party agents on the procedure that would be followed. All the party agents and staff were present well in time for the voting beginning at 7 am. The SPO turned the ballot box upside down to demonstrate that it is empty and sealed it in the presence of the agents and staff. The party agents pasted their id inside

Comments

the boxes before they were sealed. The first polling officer (PO) checks the ID, the second checks the name on the voters list (he shouts the serial number and name so that the agents can tick off). The third one applies the ink, the fourth one hands over the ballot paper and the fifth officer stamps the ballot paper. The APO ensures that the ballot is stuffed into the box after the voter affixes the seal.

In the evening again the SPO checks if everyone agrees on the time 5 pm to close the polls. In the presence of others he closes and seals the ballot box. The SPO hands over the boxes to the Returning officer at the counting centre (located at a different place), while the agents check if this was the same box. Though the voting is completed at 5 pm, the counting process starts at 6 pm and by midnight the results trickled in.

When the ballot boxes are carried by buses (vans in some cases) the agents follow the vehicle and the people in large numbers come outside their houses and wave at the vehicle. This is truly a celebration of democracy, with transparent process and participation of the people.

This was indeed a paradoxical election. The candidate who won campaigned for "security" and one wonders who would attack a small country like Sri Lanka devoid of oil reserves. The recent bombing of churches on Easter sent shock waves among the people and they were reminded of the war days, therefore they wanted to vote for a "strong" Government. The President was informed of the likely attack by the intelligence wing but failed to convey to the Government headed by the Prime Minister. Though it was not the fault of the UNP Government, people voted against this ruling party candidate.

Though one would argue that security of any country is of paramount interest, it is equally important to focus on attracting foreign investments by creating a climate of peace and tranquillity. Unemployment is rising and

the economy is in doldrums. Sri Lanka had taken a large loan from China and unable to pay it, so had to pledge part of Sri Lanka, the Hambantota port, to China on a lease. About 80% of GDP goes towards debt servicing. During my exit interview many youth opined that jobs and investment in health care are of major importance to them than security. Butter versus Guns was the issue.

A group of Tamils were also dissatisfied with the Government as it did not fulfil the promise of devolution of power in the North and Eastern provinces, where the majority of Tamil Hindus and Muslims reside. Among the Sinhalese, there is no one following Hindu or Muslim faith. The majority community follow Buddhism (70.1%), followed by Hindus (12.6%), Muslims (9.7%) and Christians (7.4%). When asked about the devolution of power to an MP of the ruling party, he answered that his party, though implemented some kind of devolution of power, did not fully do so as the Sinhala majority would not like them to do so. It would amount to Sinhalese handing over power to Tamils, he said. When TNA (Tamil nationalist alliance) declared that they would vote for UNP candidate, the opposition campaigned that if Tamils are for UNP, Sinhalese should vote for them. Interestingly the new President took oath in Anuradhapura, where the Sinhala king defeated a Tamil Chola King. Therefore the devolution of power in the North and East would ever remain a myth. Even to this day not even one Tamil works for the Sri Lankan airlines and the discrimination of Tamils in employment with the Government continues.

I also had the privilege of meeting and discussing with the Buddhist Monk of the famous Kalutara Buddhist temple. I posed a question to him as to why the Sri Lankan Government does not want to invite His Holiness Dalai Lama. He answered that the

Government does not want to hurt Chinese Government in any way, indicating that relationship with China is more important than anything else.

About 5 years back the people of Sri Lanka voted out the family rule of Rajapaksa, but they chose his younger brother in the hope that the family would have realised their mistakes in the earlier regime. But even before many of us as international observers could reach our homes, the news came out that Gota Rajapaksa's brother Mahinda was appointed as the new Prime Minister.

About 18 Million USD was spent on the Presidential election by the 5 main candidates according to CMEV (Centre for monitoring election violence). Unfortunately unlike India, Sri Lanka does not have any ceiling for election spendings and therefore the EC does

not monitor. At the same time, the EC does not monitor the media nor the campaign for hate speeches if any. The Sunday Observer (Govt owned) daily commented on the day of election that "Padman" faces the "Terminator" in the elections.

Gotabaya Rajapaksa won by 52,25% of votes while Sajith Premadasa received 41.99%.

The Parliament elections are likely to be on 25 April 2020 and who knows whom the people may choose? But on the whole Tamil community continues to feel let down and the Muslim community feels alienated. While the majority of Sinhalese voted for Gotabaya, the other minorities voted for Sajith. Thus it is a divided verdict. It is doubtful that any leader would rise above as a statesman and unite the diverse communities in Sri Lanka.

African solutions to African problems: United Nations – Africa Partnership for Conflict Prevention and Resolution

Andrea Cofelice

Chapter VIII of the UN Charter represents the legal basis for the involvement of regional organizations in maintaining international peace and security, a task which is (or should be) the main purpose of the UN Security Council. However, its provisions, as well as many other provisions of the Charter, have been largely disregarded throughout the Cold War period. It was the collapse of the bipolar system, with its corollary of new challenges to global security and increased local and regional armed conflicts, which determined a renewed interest in regional organizations and their role in maintaining peace and security.

After initial and sporadic contacts during the 1990s, it is only in the last twenty years (in particular when transnational terrorism has clearly emerged among the new global threats) that the relations between the Security Council and regional organizations have begun to assume a more stable and systemic character. In the broader framework of relations between the UN and regional organizations, the Council is currently giving priority to cooperation with three regional actors: the OSCE (the first organization to be consistently associated with the Council's work since 2001), the African Union (since 2007) and the European Union (since 2010). Among the aforementioned partnerships, the most structured is undoubtedly the one between the Security Council, on the one hand, and the African Union and sub-

regional African organizations, on the other. In addition to several annual meetings at the highest levels, it is endowed with two ad hoc strategies (the 2017 *Joint United Nations-African Union Framework for Enhanced Partnership in Peace and Security*, and the 2018 *African Union-United Nations Framework for the Implementation of Agenda 2063 and the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development*) and with specific institutions. To date, the UN-Africa partnership has been built on three main pillars: strengthening the capacity of African regional actors to prevent and autonomously respond to peace- and security-related challenges in Africa (based on the principle “African solutions to African problems”); operational cooperation through joint peace missions; UN funding of AU peace missions. The most promising results have been undoubtedly achieved under the first pillar dealing with capacity building. The political will of the AU to deploy peace operations has often been undermined by the lack of “skills” in key sectors, including staff training, logistics and specific military techniques. Consequently, several technical cooperation programmes were launched jointly by the UN Secretariat and the African Commission with a view to overcoming these gaps, by promoting the participation of AU staff in UN training programs and field missions; facilitating personnel exchanges; drafting military operation manuals, etc.

The strengthening of the institutional

framework is as much noteworthy. On the one hand, the UN are technically and financially supporting the development of the *African Peace and Security Architecture* (established by the AU in 2002), especially those bodies charged with implementing forms of preventive diplomacy, namely the *Continental Early Warning System*, the *Observation, Monitoring and Mediation Unit* and the *Panel of the Wise*. On the other hand, they have set up two ad hoc offices to deal with the AU: both “on the ground” (i.e. the *UN Office to the African Union*, established in 2010 in Addis Ababa), and at the UN headquarters (the *Office of the Deputy-Secretary General for Africa* within the *Department of Political and Peacebuilding Affairs*), with the mandate to provide unified, strategic, political and operational support to the African Union on conflict prevention and resolution.

At the operational level, the primary objective is to establish a joint decision-making mechanism between the Security Council and the African Commission, allowing to plan and authorize AU peacekeeping and peacebuilding missions under Chapter VIII of the UN Charter, set their mandate and monitor their effective deployment and results. In this regard, a first proposal was presented by the UN Secretary General in 2017 (doc. S/2017/454): nevertheless, the Security Council just took note of it, without taking any executive decision. In the meantime, the development of field cooperation between the UN and African organizations appear rather uneven.

Empirical evidence shows that, in general, the success rates of this cooperation tend to increase as long as crises maintain a local or sub-regional dimension. This is exemplified by the cases of Liberia and Guinea Bissau in West Africa. In the latter case, the lengthy political crisis affecting the country was resolved on the basis of a road-map jointly managed by the UN, ECOWAS, AU, the Community

of Portuguese-speaking countries and the European Union, which led to regular legislative and presidential elections in 2019. Although the overall political situation remains fragile and unstable, significant progresses have also been reached in Central and East Africa, where the UN, AU and sub-regional organizations (namely the Economic Community of Central African States and the Intergovernmental Authority on Development) have worked together to consolidate the peace processes taking place in the Central African Republic (which culminated in the 2019 *Bangui Political Agreement for Peace and Reconciliation*) and South Sudan. On the contrary, there is no evidence of joint efforts by the UN and African organizations when “external interference” (or “conflicts by proxy”) are intensive, as in the case of Libya and Somalia.

Finally, the most sensitive political issue causing major frictions in the Security Council deals with the proposal to establish a regular financing scheme for the AU peace missions. It is a fact that, to date, all AU peacekeeping missions had to rely on external donors or partners for their effective deployment. The financing scheme for the *African Peace Facility*, established in 1993 by voluntary contributions from AU member states, increased from about 5 million dollars in 2016 to 89 million in 2018, but is still largely underfunded if compared to the 2021 target of 400 million dollars set by the African Commission as the minimum threshold to become effective. Since 2016, therefore, Security Council’s African members have repeatedly requested to make use of the UN ordinary budget to finance the AU peacekeeping missions. The main UN contributors, however, remain particularly reluctant to commit part of the Organization’s budget to this purpose. The United States, in particular, openly refused to consider this option (threatening to use its veto power), unless the AU adopts adequate benchmarks to guarantee full financial transparency,

Comments

and to monitor the conduct and discipline of the military personnel engaged in these missions, as well as their respect for human rights. However, it is likely that this issue will remain at the top of the agenda of the next Security Council meetings dealing with the cooperation with the AU.

Generally speaking, the case of the UN-Africa Union partnership sheds light on the increasingly important role played by regional organizations in the UN collective

security system. It is legitimate to assume that such organizations will seek, in the future, formal recognition for their role at the political-institutional level. This will create the momentum for a serious debate on the possibility to establish, if not “regional” seats in the Security Council (a topic which now is out of the agenda), then at least a global forum for coordination, information exchange and trust-building between the UN and regional organizations.

A “Colossal Danger” for the World. Interview with Mikhail Gorbachev

Giampiero Bordino

In an interview with the BBC on November 4, 2019, Mikhail Gorbachev, the last leader of the Soviet Union before its dissolution in 1991, defines the current international situation, and more specifically the current presence and spread of nuclear weapons, as a “colossal danger” for the world. Gorbachev is the reformist communist who made an important agreement in 1987 with the American President Reagan for the reduction and control of nuclear weapons. The leader who promoted and made possible the fall of the Berlin Wall, and made a decisive contribution to the end of the cold war. Lastly, he proposed the project of a “common European house”, destined to fail first of all due to the “imperial” American choices of the Bush era, when the United States was under the illusion, after the end of the USSR, to be able to control and govern the world alone. Gorbachev, who is 88 now, has no longer had a significant political role in his country for a long time, but he is certainly the authoritative (and “thoughtful”, unlike other old and new world leaders) witness of the historical era that he lived as a protagonist. It should be remembered that according to an authoritative source such as SIPRI in Stockholm (see SIPRI Report 2019), nine states in the world today have nuclear missiles and weapons, a total of almost 14 thousand atomic warheads (decreasing in number, but with increasing power and precision), of which 3750 deployed and operational and 2000 kept in a state of maximum operational alert; more than 90% of them are held by the United States and Russia. World military

spending has exceeded 1800 billion dollars, with the United States in the first place, with an expenditure of \$649 billion by the Pentagon alone, and of more than 1000 billion dollars if we take into account also other military-type expenses managed by other subjects, for example the CIA or the Department of Energy. Overall, this is a level of expenditure that has never been reached since the end of the Cold War, with an increase of more than 76% in real terms compared to 1998.

Some new factors of instability and crisis have to be considered in this general framework of expenditures and armaments, capable, according to some analysts, of leading the world towards a possible and catastrophic third world war. Among these, some strategic choices of the Trump presidency, in particular the February 2019 decision to unilaterally suspend the 1987 Reagan-Gorbachev agreements (which were banning medium-range terrestrial nuclear missiles) and, as regards specifically the relations with Iran, the US unilateral withdrawal in May 2018 from the nuclear weapons agreements signed in 2015 with the government of Tehran by President Obama and the European countries. As Gorbachev himself points out in the BBC interview, the problem of nuclear weapons is decisive for “our salvation and that of the planet”. It is completely illusory to think that these weapons, seen, according to a widespread but at the same time also “naive” opinion, as deterrence tools aimed at preventing wars, are really able to prevent them, or that these same weapons can never be used given their extraordinarily lethal

Comments

nature. In fact, as we know, they have already been used (Hiroshima and Nagasaki, August 1945) and may still be used (by choice or even by mistake), given that they exist and are operational in at least nine States of the world, in some cases (just think, for example, of the India of Modi, or of Pakistan and North Korea) governed by strongly nationalist and fundamentalist political leaders. Given the play of interests and the undoubted spread of stupidity in the human species (just look around ...), the danger is, as Gorbachev says, truly "colossal".

The United States, Russia, China, India and other countries are the protagonists in this "colossal danger" scenario, due to both their demographic and economic weight, and their military weight. The absence, among these protagonists, of Europe, still lacking

a real political unity and a common foreign and defense policy, is an extraordinary sign of the widespread stupidity present also in continents of ancient civilization. Under these circumstances, individual European states, even those equipped with nuclear weapons (France, Great Britain), are completely inadequate, and destined to be subjected to the decisions made by others, as in fact already happens in Europe's so-called "backyard" (the Middle East, the Mediterranean, Africa, etc.). The "colossal danger" of which Gorbachev spoke, therefore, regards primarily Europe, which could play a decisive role in promoting the pacification of the world (that is in its interest, given that in case of war it has much more to lose than other countries and continents) and yet it remains "voiceless" and severely impotent to act.

Translated by Lionello Casalegno

Immanuel Wallerstein: Ah, We Were Once Both Young and Hopeful!

Rene Wadlow

Immanuel Wallerstein (28 September 1930 - 31 August 2019) the political sociologist best known for his writings on the “world system” and I were friends in the mid-1950s. Perhaps not friends but at least both student activists in the world federalist – world citizen movement, especially in their international dimension. We shared a common analysis of situations and were largely in agreement as to the short-term steps to be taken. We did not influence each other, but rather shared a common approach coming from different directions. We shared an interest in Africa as the early 1960s brought independence and later there was a focus on what Manny (as he was known by his friends) called the “world system” and I “the world society.” After the late 1950s, we rarely saw each other, but exchanged offprints of our articles instead of Christmas cards at the start of the year.

We were roughly at the same stage in our university education. Although Manny was four years older, he had spent 1951 to 1953 in the U.S. Army. So when we started working together in 1954, I was a student at Princeton and he was finishing an MA at Columbia in New York City. He wrote his MA thesis on McCarthyism and the negative role that Senator Joseph McCarthy had played in American life, especially his negative role on intellectual freedom in U.S. academic life. We agreed that McCarthyism was to be combated strongly and that university students could take a lead in keeping open discussions in university life.

Our main focus of common action was the international student movement. Shortly after

the end of the Second World War in 1945, the Soviet Union helped to organize a number of international student and youth movements and largely took control of them. The student movement was called the International Union of Students (IUS) and the broader youth movement was called the World Federation of Democratic Youth (WFDY). For about three years, Western European and U.S. youth groups had tried to participate fully but were less well organized than the Soviet and Eastern European movements. Thus, after 1948 and the Communist government coming to power in Prague, Western and U.S. students broke away and created rival international unions. The Western students formed the International Student Conference with its headquarter in Leiden, Netherlands, and the broader youth grouping was the World Assembly of Youth (WAY). In 1954 when Manny and I started working together, I had been elected President of the Young Adult Council (YAC) of the National Social Welfare Assembly. YAC was a coalition of U.S. youth groups and of youth-servicing organizations such as the YMCA. YAC was the U.S. member of WAY. Manny was elected Vice-President of WAY in 1955. Thus, both of us became involved in the international student movement, providing an alternative view to the Communist line of the rival movements and yet not being a voice of the primitive anti-communist vision that McCarthy had symbolized, but McCarthy’s approach was relatively wide-spread in U.S. government circles.

It was only in 1967 that information concerning the financing of WAY through

Comments

YAC by the CIA became public knowledge. I did not know it. The funds came through a New York-based foundation related to a large manufacturing firm that could have had the sort of money that we were sending to the WAY headquarters. I knew the director of the foundation well, an intelligent man who often attended our council sessions. A few years later, he became the director of a well-known modern art museum in the south of France, probably without CIA money. However, at the time, the Soviets considered modern art as subversive of “socialist realism in art” – painting of happy tractor drivers, so one never knows!

Through the international youth movements, both Manny and I became interested in the socio-political currents in the African colonies that were on the eve of independence. WAY was the only international NGO that had the African colonies as full members. In WFDY the colonies were only associate members. Manny wrote his PhD thesis contrasting the policies of Ghana and the Ivory Coast, an English and French colony of similar size and geographic location.

The leader of the Gabonese section of WAY became the first Minister of Education when Gabon became independent, and he asked me to come work with him. I did so until he was pushed out of the government in 1963 and replaced by a personal enemy. I left for Geneva to help set up a program to train African civil servants – a program loosely related to the University of Geneva.

Manny published a good number of articles on African political currents. I was helping to edit an academic journal on modern Africa *Genève-Afrique* and would send some

articles to Manny for his evaluation prior to publication.

By the early 1970s, both Manny and I came to realize that the new African States were not going to change the world system in a positive direction. We had come full circle in our focus to where we had started in the world federalist-world citizen movement with a need to look at the world as a whole.

In 1976 Manny created the Fernand Braudel Center for the Study of Economics, Historical Systems and Civilizations at the University of New York at Binghamton, a center he directed until he retired in 1999. Manny was a good organizer, and the Braudel Center became a “cottage industry” for books with a World System approach, not only I. Wallerstein’s *The Modern World System* (New York: Academic Press, 1974) but a whole series of books using the same approach. From our YAC days in the 1950s, André Schiffrin, who had represented the International Socialist Youth Movement in YAC, became a well-known New York publisher first at Pantheon and later at the firm he created The New Press. Most of Manny’s more recent books were published at the New Press, including in 2000 *The Essential Wallerstein*. André died a couple of years ago, so I guess that there will never be “The Essential Wadlow” at The New Press.

Looking back at our parallel lives as activists and writers, there was probably a certain growth of “realism” as we saw movements from which we had expected more being weaker, more divided, and often manipulated from outside than we had first thought. So comes to mind a line of Manny’s sometimes quoted “*People resist exploitation. They resist as actively as they can, and as passively as they must.*”

Harris Wofford (1926 – 2019), a Planetary Patriot

Tad Daley

“Count no man happy until he dies,” declared Sophocles 24 long centuries ago, in the immortal final line of *Oedipus Rex*. The sages of ancient Greece understood that the purpose, the meaning, the verdict on a life couldn’t be rendered until after it had run its course – and perhaps not until decades or centuries later.

The obituaries in *The New York Times* and *The Washington Post* for Harris Wofford Jr., who died on January 21st at 92, focused mostly on his high profile participation in American politics. His actions as a key player in both the 1960 Kennedy presidential campaign and then the Kennedy White House. His creative role as one of the inventors of the Peace Corps, and his subsequent lifetime commitment to national volunteer service. His upset election to the U.S. Senate in 1991 over former U.S. attorney general and Pennsylvania governor Richard Thornburgh on a platform advocating “national health insurance” – a win that portended both Bill Clinton’s victory the following year and the agonizing American debates over universal health care for the next three decades (and counting).

But it may turn out in the very long run that more historically important than any of these was what Harris told me was “his first love in the world of ideas,” and the first great cause of his life. Because in 1942, during the darkest days of the Second World War, teenage Harris Wofford founded a nationwide movement called “The Student Federalists” – which proclaimed that after the end of that war the human race could abolish war, by creating a “United States of the World.”

The 1940s Youth Movement For A World Republic

I met Harris only seven years ago, in January 2012. He was speaking at an Ethiopian history event in Washington D.C. (He had served in the early 1960s as the first director of Peace Corps programs in Africa, where he became quite close to longtime Ethiopian Emperor Haile Selassie.) I approached him afterwards, told him I knew a bit about his even more remote personal history with the Student Federalists, and asked him, well, if he still believed any of that stuff. “It’s totally still how I think about the direction of history,” he replied. “And you’re the first person to ask me anything about it in maybe 25 years.” So he invited me to come by for a visit sometime in his Foggy Bottom apartment. I did. And I invited myself back many times thereafter, pretty much every two or three months for the next seven years, to interrogate him about the almost completely forgotten movement in the 1940s to bring about One World.

One night early in 1941, Harris told me, as WWII raged prior to America’s entry, he was sitting in the bathtub in his family’s home in Scarsdale, New York, simultaneously trying to complete his Latin homework and listen to Mr. District Attorney on the radio. The crime drama reached its denouement, and the radio station switched to talking heads at the Waldorf-Astoria. “Had the contraption been within reach,” he said, “I would have quickly turned the dial.” But the captive audience of one, instead, was forced to listen to a panel including New York Tribune columnist

Dorothy Thompson, Nobel laureate author Thomas Mann, and future congresswoman Clare Boothe Luce. They were proselytizing for something they called “A World Federal Union of Free Men.” “Democracies must do what our 13 states did long ago,” said Luce, “unite to face a common peril, form the nucleus of a world government ... and expand around the world until it becomes the United States of all mankind.”¹ Harris later wrote that “prophets and visionary statesmen had proclaimed the idea of a Federal World Republic for centuries ... But for me the idea was born that night.”² Harris recounted this origin tale in his 1946 book *It’s Up To Us: Federal World Government In Our Time* – written while he served in the U.S. Army Air Corps at age 19, published by Harcourt Brace, and edited by the legendary publisher Robert Giroux. It was well told again in Gilbert Jonas’s 2001 iUniverse book *One Shining Moment: A Short History of the American Student World Federalist Movement 1942-1953*.

One year later Pearl Harbor brought America into the war, and moved 15-year-old Harris to act. One evening early in 1942, he and classmate Mary Ellen Purdy set out on their bicycles. They rode all around Scarsdale, knocked on doors, missed their suppers – but enlisted themselves and eight other classmates as the inaugural chapter of the Student Federalists. “Those of us who would later come under Wofford’s charismatic spell,” wrote Jonas, “know full well how difficult it must have been for his peers to resist.”³

Harris Wofford’s Scarsdale home became the outfit’s bustling headquarters. A perpetual conclave of teenage girls and boys in the living room, backyard and kitchen was mostly tolerated by his equanimous parents. His grandmother – who had taken 11-year-old Harris on an around-the-world tour in 1937 – endured misadventures like a couple of stumbling young men bursting into her bedroom while she was undressing because

“we thought this was the supply closet.” Nevertheless, magnanimously, she began to contribute \$5 per month.

And the Student Federalists began to spread far beyond the boundaries of Scarsdale. Funds were raised. Speaking tours were organized. Literature was crafted and printed. Essay and poster contests were launched. A “Model World Constitutional Convention” was undertaken just a few weeks before D-Day (long before the familiar “Model United Nations” of today). TIME magazine published a major article on the organization and its founder on November 20, 1944.⁴ And within the space of a few years, the Student Federalists had enlisted several thousand members – many of them battle-tempered WWII veterans –, opened ten regional offices, and established chapters on 367 high school and college campuses around the country.⁵

It must be admitted that the Student Federalists were hardly a model of diversity. Most of the members were white, well-off, and privileged. Harris made a point of telling me this the very first time I visited him at his home.

But that same fundamental flaw was not evident when it came to gender. The Jonas book is full of photographs of young women right in the thick of things. The Wellesley College Student Federalist chapter alone boasted 200 members.⁶ Indeed, one of the organization’s earliest and most important leaders was a champion high school debater from Minnesota, named Clare Lindgren, who went on both to serve as third president of the Student Federalists and to marry Harris in 1948.

The Larger Movement For A World Republic

John F. Kennedy famously said: “The Chinese use two brush strokes to write the word ‘crisis.’ One stands for danger, the other for opportunity.” Although some Chinese linguists dispute JFK’s assertion, perhaps

never in history was the synergy between infinite peril and vast promise more apparent than it was after the shock of Hiroshima and Nagasaki. For a brief but incandescent moment following the end of WWII, a movement started to emerge far beyond the Student Federalists -- insisting that world government was the only possible solution to the new problem of nuclear weapons and the primeval problem of war itself.

The idea of a world republic was avidly discussed in dormitories, cocktail lounges, dinner parties, and symposia of every sort. The National Debate Tournament topic for all American high schools in 1947 was: "RESOLVED: That a federal world government should be established." The chancellor of the University of Chicago, Robert Maynard Hutchins, assembled a group of eminent scholars from Harvard, Stanford, Princeton and St. John's College, and designated them "the Committee to Frame a World Constitution." (Harris, by then a Chicago undergraduate, served as assistant and advisor to the Committee.) A 1947 Gallup poll showed that 56% of Americans supported the proposition that "the UN should be strengthened to make it a world government." Prominent figures of the day who publicly advocated world government included E.B. White, Dorothy Canfield Fisher, Oscar Hammerstein II, A. Philip Randolph, John Hersey, Carl Sandburg, John Steinbeck, Albert Camus, Bertrand Russell, Arnold Toynbee, Ingrid Bergman, Henry Fonda, Bette Davis, Jawaharlal Nehru, Mahatma Gandhi, Winston Churchill, and Albert Einstein.

The idea even attracted formal American legislative support. No fewer than 30 state legislatures in the U.S. passed resolutions in favor of world government! And a 1949 joint resolution in the U.S. Congress, which declared that "it should be a fundamental objective of the foreign policy of the United States to support and strengthen the United

Nations and to seek its development into a world federation," was cosponsored by 111 representatives and senators, including giants of the later American political landscape like Gerald Ford, Mike Mansfield, Henry Cabot Lodge, Peter Rodino, Henry Jackson, Jacob Javits, Hubert Humphrey, and John F. Kennedy.

And a half dozen thriving world government advocacy organizations -- the Student Federalists among them -- combined to form the "United World Federalists" (UWF) in 1947. One of the leading brokers of the merger, by all accounts, was 21-year-old Harris Wofford. Before the end of the decade it had established 720 chapters and enlisted nearly 50,000 members. The organization has remained in continuous existence ever since, and is known today as Citizens for Global Solutions (CGS).

A Brilliant Young Man's Thinking About A World Republic

Two years after his 1946 book, Harris wrote a sequel monograph called *Road to the World Republic*. The foreword was written by Stringfellow Barr, longtime president of St. John's College in Annapolis (and founder with Wofford's own great mentor Scott Buchanan of the Great Books Program there), who had resigned from St. John's to become president of a new "Foundation for World Government." In these two works, Harris Wofford demonstrated that he possessed more than just the personal magnetism that Gil Jonas described, but a deep and probing intellect as well.

With the new United Nations only a few months old, Harris illuminated both its impotence and undemocratic character. "We should work to develop the General Assembly into a world law-making body by delegating its real powers ... Assembly delegates should be elected directly by the people of the respective nations."⁷

He emphasized the bedrock federalist idea that world government would not eliminate local institutions or identities. "By becoming a world citizen, we maintain citizenship in our city, province, and nation, (but) gain a higher and more precious title ... This means a world government that is federal, that has power in all fields truly international in scope but with lower levels each continuing in the fields it can govern best. Only such a federal union can protect the diversity in the world and still secure the needed unity."⁸

Yet at the same time it might enact and enforce universal principles within states as well. How? "A World Bill of Rights should include freedom of religion, thought, speech, press, assembly, elections, and fair trials. The world government must assure these rights to all its citizens everywhere, with no prejudice to race, nationality, class, or sex."¹⁰ His first sentence is quite similar to the Universal Declaration of Human Rights which came into force two years later – though of course without any world government to enforce it. When I pointed out to Harris that his second sentence would be greeted today as politically preposterous, he immediately agreed. But the alternative, he insisted, was to resign ourselves forever to the dismal fate of women in so much of the Muslim world, and of gay people in so many African nations, and of political dissidents in Russia and China and so many other lands.¹¹

He recognized that what he proposed would mean epochal historical transformation. "World federal government would be the greatest political step ever taken by man. The idea of moving from the national to the world level of citizenship is the most revolutionary proposal in history. A whole new world would open to man once he moved from his present confining nationalism into this great, truly global civilization."

And he called unapologetically for philanthropists to step up. "Modern Carnegies

and Nobels are needed. There must be some men and women who will leave their millions to this cause instead of to private schools, libraries, or homes for stray cats. A share in building world federation would be the greatest memorial anyone could seek. And if federation is not achieved, none of the lesser memorials will stand."¹¹

A couple of ancient episodes moved Harris Wofford still. In *It's Up To Us*, he related that one classmate would shout "Union Never" whenever passing a Student Federalist in the hallways of Scarsdale High.¹² This, Harris told me, is what he yearned to reawaken. A genuine debate about whether something like a world union might actually be a desirable destination, or whether instead it's something that would on balance do more harm than good for the human condition. He very much lamented that the topic, in both the high school hallways and the digital public squares of today, had become conspicuous only by its complete absence from the political debates of the early 21st century.

Another was the tale he told in *Road to the World Republic* of Duncan Cameron. He was an 18-year-old boy who refused induction into the British Army, "preferring prison rather than violence in support of national interests." But Cameron was no pacifist. He declared his "determination never again to serve in the army of a nation-state," but simultaneously announced "his readiness to serve in a World Police Force to enforce world law." British authorities put him on trial for treason. Young Harris Wofford called it instead "loyalty to the world community."¹³

The Road to the World Republic

"The living owe it to those who no longer can speak," said the great Polish poet Czeslaw Milosz, "to tell their story for them." That seems especially true when a Harris Wofford dies at a time when so many demagogues, both here

and abroad, seek to divide our one humanity by race, class, gender, religion, and nation. In the seven years after he and I met, Harris proved his enduring commitment to the dream of a politically unified human race. He coauthored two articles with me about it for *The Huffington Post and the Public Interest Report* from the Federation of American Scientists. We worked on them together for weeks, and at age 88 he haggled with me over every word. He and I also made three joint speaking appearances together about it – at the Brearley School in Manhattan (which had maintained a thriving Student Federalist chapter seven decades earlier), at the Woman’s National Democratic Club in Washington, DC, and before the University of Chicago Alumni Club.

And just about a year ago, he reengaged with the organization he did so much to create, *Citizens for Global Solutions*. CGS focuses much today on global governance innovations which might be achieved as soon as the 75th anniversary of the United Nations in October 2020, such as the proposal to create a United Nations Parliamentary Assembly. For the first 15 years or so of this century, however, CGS chose talk about “responsible and cooperative foreign policy” over even UN reform, let alone any hint of the eventual goal of a world republic. Last year, however, I told Harris that CGS had decided to return to its roots, and now once again called for “a democratic federation of nations,” with the power to enact “enforceable world law to abolish war,

protect universal human rights, and restore and sustain our global environment.” In response, he immediately agreed to join a newly reconstituting CGS Advisory Council. Nineteen-year-old Harris Wofford dedicated *It’s Up To Us* “To Jim, Tom, Bruce, Dwight and all the sons of a fighting earth, who died so that democracy might live and mankind have a chance to move forward in our time to the United States of the World.” Classmates at Scarsdale High, all dispatched by their country to war but never returned. Dwight and Jim were killed in Germany, Bruce on Iwo Jima, and Tom on the USS Indianapolis –, likely drowned or devoured by sharks in one of the most horrifying episodes of a horrible war -- after delivering to Tinian Island the atomic bomb that would be detonated a week later over Hiroshima, Japan.

These young men all died in their early 20s, while their classmate Harris Wofford, solely by whim of the gods, lived until his early 90s. And as someone who saw him regularly during the last seven years of his life, I can promise you that Harris died with the hope in his heart that the daughters and sons of our still fighting earth, today, might once again ignite a new youth movement for global citizenship and planetary patriotism and human unity. Might mount a campaign to save succeeding generations from the scourge of war. Might produce a few more Duncan Camerons. And might someday generate a historical current mighty enough, so that their own daughters and sons will be born into a united world.

¹ Harris Wofford, *It’s Up To Us: Federal World Government In Our Time*, New York: Harcourt Brace, 1946, p. 4.

² Wofford, *It’s Up To Us*, pp. 4-5

³ Gil Jonas, *One Shining Moment: A Short History of the American Student World Federalist Movement 1942-1953*, New York: iUniverse, 2001, p. 3

⁴ Jonas, p. 16

⁵ Jonas, pp. 12 and 18; Wofford, *It’s Up To Us*, p. 39; Harris Wofford and Tad Daley, “JFK, *One World or None, and a New Effort to Achieve World Law*,” *The Public Interest Report, Quarterly Journal of the Federation of American Scientists*, Summer 2014

⁶ Jonas, p. 24

⁷ Wofford, *It’s Up To Us*, p. 128.

⁸ Wofford, *Road to the World Republic*, p. 44; Wofford, *It’s Up To Us*, pp. 113-4.

⁹ Wofford, *Road to the World Republic*, p. 45.

¹⁰ Wofford, *Road to the World Republic*, pp. 25-26; Wofford, *It’s Up To Us*, p. 115

¹¹ Wofford, *Road to the World Republic*, p. 73

¹² Wofford, *It’s Up To Us*, p. 25.

¹³ Wofford, *Road to the World Republic*, p.

Pope Francis: “The Nations Must Participate in the Edification of the Common Good of Humanity”

We publish an excerpt of a speech given by Pope Francis on 2 May 2019 at the Pontifical Academy of Social Sciences.

“The way in which a nation welcomes migrants reveals its vision of human dignity and of its relationship with humanity. Every human being is a member of humanity and has the same dignity. When a person or a family is compelled to leave their homeland they must be welcomed with humanity. I have said many times that our duty to migrants can be articulated around four verbs: welcome, protect, promote and integrate. Migrants are not a threat to the culture, customs and values of a receiving nation. They too have a duty, that of being integrated into the nation that receives them. Integrating does not mean assimilating, but sharing the way of life of their new homeland, while they themselves remain as individuals, with their own biographical history. In this way, migrants can present themselves and be recognized as an opportunity to enrich the people that integrates them. It is the task of public authorities to protect migrants and to regulate migratory flows with the virtue of prudence, as well as to promote welcome so that the local populations may be formed and encouraged to consciously take part in the integrative process of the migrants who are to be received.

The migratory issue too, which is a permanent fact of human history, revives reflection on the nature of the nation state. All nations are the result of integration of consecutive waves of migrating individuals or groups, and tend to be images of the diversity of humanity while being united by values, common cultural resources and healthy customs. A State that arouses in its people nationalistic sentiments against

other nations or groups of people would fail in its own mission. We know from history where similar deviations have led; I am thinking of Europe in the last century.

The nation-state cannot be considered as an absolute, as an island with respect to the surrounding circumstances. In the current situation of globalization not just of the economy but also of technological and cultural exchanges, the nation-state is no longer able to procure on its own the common good of its populations. The common good has become global and nations must affiliate themselves for their own benefit. When a supranational common good is clearly identified, it necessitates a specific, legally and concordantly constituted authority capable of facilitating its fulfilment. Let us consider the great contemporary challenges of climate change, of the new forms of slavery and of peace.

The state is called to a greater responsibility. While maintaining the characteristics of independence and sovereignty, and continuing to seek the good of its own population, today it is its task to participate in the edification of the common good of humanity. This universal common good, in its turn, must acquire a heightened legal significance at the international level. Of course, I am not thinking of a universalism or a generic internationalism that disregards the identity of individual peoples: this, indeed, must be appreciated as a unique and indispensable contribution in the largest harmonious plan. I ask you to cooperate with me in spreading this awareness of renewed international solidarity with respect for human dignity, the common good, with respect for the planet and the supreme good of peace.”

Mario Draghi and the EU's Fiscal Capacity

Alberto Majocchi

There is now a broad consensus that if Europe is to move along the path to sustainable development, carbon pricing is needed which could both promote the global choice to limit fossil fuel consumption and create the conditions for reforms needed to endow the EU with an autonomous fiscal capacity.

While this project may seem important, it is only intended to manage the problem of limiting carbon dioxide emissions; however, it may actually produce even more significant effects if it becomes the first step in a process aimed at realising the historic plan of regaining the continent's autonomy by founding a European federation. In this context, the 3 May 1950 Memorandum which Jean Monnet submitted to the French government in view of the construction of the ECSC is particularly relevant. Monnet defined his strategy as follows: "There is only one way out of this impasse [in the Franco-German relations on the coal and steel problem]: with concrete, resolute action on a limited but decisive point which will trigger fundamental change on this point and progressively change the actual terms of the problem as a whole." He added: "Profound, real, immediate and dramatic action is needed which will change things and make a reality of the hopes people are on the point of giving up on."

This guiding principle is important in defining a strategic approach that can lead Europe towards the institutional leap needed to achieve a federal structure. In Monnet's time, the problem was the management of coal and steel resources; however, today the key issue for the European Union is the

availability of adequate resources to finance the policies needed to ensure a future of growth for Europe. In terms of priorities, it is a question of: guaranteeing internal and external security in a world where the US has failed to guarantee European security; managing migration flows by financing a *Growth Plan with Africa* in agreement with the African Union; ensuring adequate resources to stabilise the European economy in the face of general or asymmetric shocks that may affect it in the future; promoting research and technological development, and creating European champions in cutting-edge sectors; and financing a *Social Green New Deal* which will set Europe on a path to an environmentally, economically and socially sustainable development.

The strategy outlined above gives the optimum pathways to contribute to the effective governance of Europe and the world. Today, conditions seem to be favourable. The *Green Deal* is at the core of Ursula von der Leyen's programme. Defence and security policy is at the heart of governments' concerns in the face of devastating improvisations in American foreign policy. It is more urgent than ever that new relations with Africa be forged to manage the migration problem differently and with solidarity, sustainably developing African resources in the face of the dramatic trend in migration flows and the conditions of poverty in many countries, aggravated by climate change. The mobilisation of public opinion on the subject of climate change is a favourable condition for making incisive decisions; it is thus a question of identifying

the right instrument to tackle these problems. The idea that European carbon pricing would lead to the creation of new own resources needed to strengthen the EU budget is increasingly convincing. In addition, profound institutional reform would set the EU on a path: first to European federation and, in the long run, to multilateral world governance that guarantees peace and economically, socially and environmentally sustainable development. These considerations were strongly developed by Mario Draghi in his remarks¹ at the *farewell event* in his honour in Frankfurt at the end of his term as president of the ECB. Draghi noted that “the road towards a fiscal capacity will most likely be a long one. History shows that budgets have rarely been created for the general purpose of stabilisation, but rather to deliver specific goals in the public interest. In the US, it was the need to overcome the Great Depression that led to the expansion of the federal budget in the 1930s. Perhaps, for Europe, it will require an urgent cause, such as mitigating climate change to bring about such collective focus.” From this observation he drew important political conclusions: “Whichever path is taken, it is plain to see that now is the time for more Europe, not less. I mean this not in an axiomatic way, but in the truest traditions of federalism. Where results can best be delivered by national policies, let it stay that way. But where we can only deliver on the legitimate concerns of the public by

working together, we need Europe to be stronger.”

Draghi’s reflections are perfectly in line with Jean Monnet’s thinking and clearly identify the way forward. The creation of the EU’s fiscal capacity requires that problems be addressed that can only be solved by allocating public goods at the European level. The good in question is combating climate change, and considerable resources are required to ensure an ecological transition that is both efficient and socially just.

Carbon pricing, as recently argued by the IMF in the *October 2019 Fiscal Monitor*², is the “most powerful and effective” instrument to reduce CO₂ emissions. On the one hand, the carbon dividend could be used to launch a tax reform that shifts the weight away from taxing natural resource consumption, which would also significantly reduce tax charges on lower income classes and facilitate measures in favour of classes and territories disadvantaged by lower fossil energy production. On the other hand, the new resources allocated to the European budget would make it possible to finance investment in infrastructure and the search for new renewable energy sources. In this way, the “second arm” of the EU, i.e. the fiscal arm, could finally be set up alongside the monetary union, until the process that must lead to a federal Union is completed by allocating powers in the field of defence and security policy.

¹ <https://www.ecb.europa.eu/press/key/date/2019/html/ecb.sp191028~7e8b444d6f.en.html>

² <https://www.imf.org/en/Publications/FM/Issues/2019/09/12/fiscal-monitor-october-2019>

Federalism and Climate Change: towards a European and Global Green Deal¹

Domènec Ruiz Devesa

The main goal of Federalism is to achieve global peace, but there cannot be peace without a habitable planet. In addition, peace is not just the absence of conflict, but a harmonious “living together” in a multi-ethnic, multi-cultural, cosmopolitan society.

Thus, political federalism aims to achieve civil and international peace. However, we can also see environmentalism as a way of achieving peace between humankind and the planet, by stopping the human aggression on Earth. This implies reversing climate change, cleaning the air and waterways, and preserving biodiversity. Therefore, in terms of their respective goals, there is an interesting link between federalism and environmentalism.

According to the EU program Copernicus, June 2019 was the warmest June ever registered: temperatures have been 2 degrees above normal. Not surprisingly, the latest heat waves (in July 2019 Brussels experienced 41 degrees C..!) have coincided with the news that CO₂ emissions are at a record high.

It is imperative to move fast to climate neutrality at the global level. According to the United Nations, there are only 10 years left to act: 2030 will be too late. Since global warming is by definition a cross-border, transnational issue, it requires regional and global governance.

Thus, Federalism also offers a solution for this civilizational challenge: national governments alone cannot tackle it. Only voluntary cooperation among nations will not be enough, as the Kyoto Protocol or the Paris agreement, with Trump’s USA getting prepared to betray, have shown.

That is why we have, in the field of climate change, or better said, climatic crisis, to go

beyond cooperation into integration: the Federalist solution. Only if Nation States pool together the resources and the decisions would we be able to save the Planet.

The president of the European Commission, Ursula Von der Leyen, declared her determination to make the Union climate neutral by 2050. Therefore, she has proposed a number of measures: a *Green Deal for Europe* composed of a 10 year *Transitional Plan for the Industry*, a *European Bank for Climate*, the introduction of a *Carbon Border Tax*, and the extension of the *Emissions Trading System*. The aim is to reduce emissions by at least 50% by 2030.

This *Green Deal*, that goes back to the *New Deal 4 Europe* proposal launched in 2014 by several European federalist organizations² under the leadership of Lucio Levi, has been endorsed by progressives in the US (Representative Ocasio-Cortez), and in Europe (Nouvelle Donne in France, the Spanish Socialists³ (PSOE), Diem25), and now it is official policy of the European Commission.

Such a plan makes a lot of sense from a number of perspectives. First, carbon neutrality is a survival imperative. Second, it provides incentives to advance our technological development. Third, it is a source of investment, economic growth, and jobs.

Let’s not forget that the European economy, in 2020 is not operating at full employment. Growth is rather low, like inflation. Therefore, we need to find new sources of growth that is less intensive in producing non-durable goods. We can scale-up our investments in clean, renewable energy, bio-industries, electric cars and batteries, public rail transportation,

Borderless Debate: The Fight against Climate Change at the Regional and Global Levels

house insulation, carbon capture and storage, and recycling, all of which will boost the gross national product and employment. This is fundamental for the survival of liberal democracy and European integration, since joblessness, poverty and economic inequality foster national-populism and xenophobia.

The *Green Deal* makes also a lot of sense from a financial point of view. In order to finance the ecological transition in Europe, we need from a minimum of 300 billion euros per year (as estimated by the EU Commission), to 1 trillion (as estimated by the European Court of Auditors). It is a lot of money. Nevertheless, the official interest rate in the Eurozone is 0 per cent. Thus, it makes a lot of (financial) sense to launch a large issuance of long term Green Bonds by the European Union through the European Investment Bank (EIB)⁴, which could in turn – most of them – be bought by the European Central Bank, which in September 2019 resumed its Asset Purchase Program in order to avoid deflationary tendencies. Then, the EIB or the new European Climate Bank could lend at very low rates to Member States in order to finance massive investments in energy efficiency and building insulation, as proposed by Pierre Larrourou and its *Pacte Finance Climat*⁵.

Beyond Europe, we need to promote regional integration in all continents in order to develop the carbon neutrality agenda not just on a voluntary-cooperation basis, but by managing many other transnational issues as well, such as migration, international development, and global inequalities.

These regional blocs could one day form the world federation: EU, Mercosur/CELAC, African Union, ASEAN, etc. These regional organizations should become more politically

integrated and be able to set similar climate goals as the ones proposed by the European Commission for the European Union.

This action at the continental level should be replicated at the global level. Beyond the Paris Accord, which is just the bare minimum (holding the increase in temperature below 2 degrees Celsius), and even the 2030 SDGs, we need a climate neutral planet goal and a *Global Green Deal* sponsored by the UN. On 22 July 2019, the UN Secretary General Guterres called on all Member States to commit to carbon neutrality by 2050, and on 23 September 2019 he convened in New York the Climate Action Summit.

But again, only intergovernmental cooperation will not be enough to achieve it. We need a more political United Nations. First and foremost, we need to set up the United Nations Parliamentary Assembly (UNPA), as proposed by Andreas Bummel and Jo Leinen⁶, and the World Federalist Movement overall. We should also call for the long overdue review of the UN Charter, as proposed by Shahr-Yar Mahmoud Sharei.

One can imagine such a body agreeing faster on an ambitious and binding climate agenda than the UN General Assembly. Even if the UNPA resolutions were not binding at first, they could contribute to move a global, progressive, agenda forward.

My party, the Spanish Worker's Socialist Party (PSOE), supports both the Green Deal and the UNPA. I believe that the EU should make regional integration in other continents, and the creation of the UNPA, key elements of its foreign policy, alongside its commitment to carbon neutrality at the global level. The European Parliament has endorsed the UNPA in several resolutions. Now it is the turn of the European Commission and of the Council of the European Union..

¹ This is the corrected and improved version of the lecture delivered at the "Climate Democracy & Justice Training & Summit", in Epirus (Greece), on 26 July 2019, see: <https://cuncr.org/research-seminars/international-environmental-laws-and-climate-change/climate-democracy-justice-training-summit/> [accessed on 22/09/2019].

² See <http://www.newdeal4europe.eu/en/> [accessed on 22/09/2019].

³ See <https://www.psoe.es/media-content/2019/05/20190506-Programa-PSOE-elecciones-europeas-26M.pdf> [accessed on 22/09/2019].

⁴ See <https://www.psoe.es/media-content/2019/05/12medidaseuropasocial.pdf> [accessed on 22/09/2019].

⁵ See <https://www.pacte-climat.eu/en/> [accessed on 22/09/2019].

⁶ See <https://en.unpacampaign.org/> [accessed on 22/09/2019].

⁷ See <https://cuncr.org/research/book-review-global-commentary-and-forum/upholding-the-san-francisco-promise-the-roadmap-to-a-constitution-alised-united-nations/> [accessed on 22/09/2019].

Born of Young People a Cosmopolitan Movement against Global Warming

Roberto Palea

Young Swedish activist Greta Thunberg's statements – which have circulated around the world and sparked off the protest of hundreds of thousands of young people from hundreds of countries all over the world against government inaction on global warming – reminded me of Andersen's Danish fairy tale about the emperor's new clothes, in which the voice of an innocent child who dared to shout: "the king is naked" spoke the truth to the multitude of complacent or just gullible subjects.

Addressing her parents, peers and world leaders, one of the things Greta said was: *"Maybe one day my children will ask me about you. They will ask why you didn't do anything, while there still was time to act. You say you love your children above all else, and yet you're stealing their future in front of their very eyes. You are not mature enough to tell it like it is. (...) Politics is also responsible to tomorrow's voters. (...) Governments must sign and implement the Paris Agreements, taking into account the IPCC recommendations, which set the limit not to be exceeded at +1.5 °C" above pre-industrial levels to avoid environmental disaster.*

With these watchwords, millions of young people and very young people have stepped out into the world as key players to remind people that we are running out of time: either we change our development model, still based on fossil fuels and not on renewable energies, with no urban and industrial waste recycling and a great waste of water and natural resources (by definition "finite"), or we risk compromising the very existence of the human race.

In the short term, we risk being plunged into a worse financial and economic crisis than the last in 2008, and experiencing even worse violence than that of the wars we are witnessing, because the unequal consumption of natural resources and migrations generated by the progressive soil desertification will further aggravate conflicts and tensions among peoples.

Suddenly, Trump's statements that the US has used up all its available energy sources to support its economic growth, as well as the statements from all world governments, including those from both the developed and non-developed world, reiterating that the fight against climate change should start elsewhere, certainly not in their own country, sound irresponsible, and laden with guilt towards their own citizens and future generations.

The *#FridayforFuture* protesters marched with banners bearing slogans with similar declarations and demonstrating a truly commendable level of awareness and information. They showed to be entirely unfettered by the constraints of political parties, and avoided all the hierarchies in the various levels of government, collectively addressing world governments and blaming their inaction or inadequate action in the face of environmental disaster.

With their constant reference to the December 2015 Paris Climate Agreements and the December 2018 IPCC special report, they show their willingness to interface directly, at a global level, with the UN and in particular with the UNFCCC (United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change) Secretariat,

Borderless Debate: The Fight against Climate Change at the Regional and Global Levels

which presides over intergovernmental climate negotiations, recognising the “global” nature of climate change that should be tackled together by all the countries of the world.

Greta Thunberg continued this action by attending the United Nations Climate Summit on 23 September. In front of the UN Assembly, Greta delivered what is destined to become an iconic speech: “We are at the beginning of a mass extinction. And all you can talk about is money. How dare you?” Greta then went to Madrid, to the UN COP 25 on climate change, which brought together almost two hundred countries to talk, once again, about the implementation of the Paris Agreement of 2015. But Greta’s cry fell on deaf ears: COP 25 ended without any meaningful results. None of the countries are prepared to make the radical choices that are needed, for fear of upsetting their electorates and proposing measures that could put their national economies at risk in the short term.

In clear contrast, and with courage and conviction, the European Parliament and the newly elected European Commission, chaired by Ursula von der Leyen, have confirmed their firm intent to make the EU the first zero-climate-impact continent by 2050, also because Europe has the responsibility to show the other continents the path that needs to be taken. They have also committed themselves to reducing carbon emissions by 55% by 2030 (well above the limit of 40% previously set by the EU), while announcing the launch of an ambitious Green New Deal for the EU.

The first response to the youth movement is, therefore, coming from the EU.

Now the EU should set up an Agency for the Environment and Energy based on the model of the 1951 European Coal and Steel Community (ECSC) and endowed with supranational powers as well as adequate financial resources. With a considerable degree of autonomy and under unified management, it would enable the implementation of effective policies to reduce polluting emissions, develop renewable energies in order to let the EU achieve energy self-sufficiency and launch a circular economy. Not to mention the more effective commitment that the EU must make to the migration phenomenon and in favour of Africa’s economic development, in partnership with the countries concerned, by providing its technologies, first and foremost, to produce electricity in the solar-rich countries, which is a key factor for the growth of agriculture, handicrafts and industry.

The proposed Agency for the Environment and Energy could finance its activities by imposing a *carbon tax*, as we have discussed several times, and in accordance with the procedures already specified.

The cosmopolitan movement against global warming can find a direction and a programme in support of this proposal which, if implemented, would increase the EU’s strategic role by giving it the strength to extend its initiatives to the whole world and ensure that the global environmental policy makes at last the qualitative leap it has been lacking so far.

Climate change in India and the world

Suchismita Pattanaik and W. James Arputharaj

Climate change is not just an environmental concern, rather it has emerged as the biggest developmental challenge for humankind. The dependency on energy to sustain life and the ever increasing human wants are keys to climate concerns. The South Asian countries are vulnerable to climate impacts and India in particular is one of the worst-hit countries, given its varied climatic zones and its long coast. Some industrialized countries have managed to de-link sulphur dioxide (SO₂) emissions from economic growth, i.e. emissions have fallen even as national income has risen. But optimum levels of carbon dioxide (CO₂) emissions reduction could not be achieved. The per capita CO₂ emissions remain closely related to a country's level of economic development, and thus to its standard of living. This clearly suggests that growth cannot be de-linked substantially from CO₂ emissions. Every human being contributes to the CO₂ concentrations in the atmosphere. However, a person's lifestyle decides the amount that is emitted. The more prosperous a country's economy is, the higher its fossil fuel consumption, resulting in higher greenhouse gas emissions. Developed countries still emit GHGs at higher rates to sustain their growth. In contrast, developing countries have only recently set out on the path of industrialization. That is the reason why their per capita emissions are still comparatively low. In late 1997, after years of protracted negotiations, the world agreed to first the Kyoto Protocol, followed by the landmark Paris Agreement in 2015. Under the Kyoto agreement, the industrialized world agreed to cut off its emissions by just 5.2 percent relative to 1990 levels by 2008-

2012. The pledge made by the countries like India in the Paris Agreement 2015 may not be sufficient to contribute to reducing global climate change to the required level, but they make the necessary provisions for achieving their targets. For meeting the goal by 2030, India would need to "more than double its current rate of forest-cover expansion", along with other efforts. Under the Paris Agreement, India had committed to creating a cumulative carbon sink of 2.5-3 billion tonnes of carbon dioxide equivalent by 2030. Currently, India's forest and tree cover is about 24 percent of its geographical area, according to India's State of Forest Report 2017 and India has repeatedly highlighted that it wants to bring at least 33 percent of its total area under green cover. The draft of India's National Forest Policy 2018 also mentions that to achieve the national goal for eco-security, the country should have a minimum of one-third of the total land area under forest and tree cover.

It is important to note that the world is nowhere close to achieving this level of reduction. Not only has the world's largest emitter – the US – walked out of the global agreement, but also Europe is finding it difficult to reach the agreed target. A review by UNFCCC has found that CO₂ emissions of all industrialized countries declined by 1.3 percent between 1990 and 2006. During this period, CO₂ emissions of key polluters increased: the US registered an 18 percent increase and Australia a whopping 40.5 percent. The top four emitters in 2017, which covered 58 per cent of global emissions, were China (27 per cent), the US (15 per cent), the European Union (10 per cent) and India (7 per cent), according to the projection by the Global Carbon Project. The rest of the world

Borderless Debate: The Fight against Climate Change at the Regional and Global Levels

contributed 41 per cent last year. Even most European countries have seen an increase in their emissions. The only countries that have cut CO₂ emissions are Sweden, the UK and Germany. But it is noteworthy that emissions in the UK and Germany are increasing again. The reason is simple: the UK partly gained its emission reduction by moving to natural gas from coal, and this is beginning to change. Germany gained big time because of the reunification between the industrialized West and the economically depressed East. Now new answers have to be found for the current increase.

India forcefully, and rightfully, made development and poverty eradication key issues within the climate change negotiation. India, one of the fastest growing economies of the world, faces the challenge of making available the energy needed to fuel this impressive economic growth. Of India's more than one billion population, more than 800 million people (79.9 percent of the population) still subsist on less than US \$ 2 per day. More than 700 million people still cook on traditional cooking stoves using crop waste and animal residue. More than 400 million people still don't have access to electricity. India stands at the 128th position in the World Human Development Index. No country in history has improved its level of human development without a corresponding increase in per capita use of energy.

Over several decades, India has pursued policies and publicly funded programs focused on energy conservation and deployment of renewable energy technologies. The CO₂ intensity data for India is better than that of Germany and the same as that of Japan, that is universally cited as the world's most energy-efficient economy. Traditionally, India has been highly vulnerable to climate-related events like floods, droughts and cyclones. India has many publicly funded programs to address the direct impacts and prevention and control of climate

risks, and has mainstreamed climate policies into its development policies and processes at both national and sub-national levels. India's National and State Action Plans on Climate Change have incorporated provisions to reduce emission intensity across sectors. Industry, infrastructure and agriculture are key sectors for India.

Globally, 25% of GHG emissions are contributed by electricity production, 21% is contributed by industry, 24% is contributed by agriculture, 24% by transportation, 6% by buildings and 10% by other activities. Coal power plants, rice paddies and cattle are major sources of emissions in India. India's total GHG emissions in 2014 were 3,202 million metric tons of carbon dioxide equivalent, totaling 6.55% of global GHG emissions. In India, 68.7% percent of GHG emissions come from the energy sector, followed by agriculture, industrial processes, land-use change and forestry, and waste, which contribute 19.6 percent, 6.0 percent, 3.8 percent and 1.9 percent respectively to GHG emissions. In the agricultural sector, various factors like change in land use and vegetation cover, application of fertilizers and manures, production of flooded rice, rearing livestock are the major contributors to CO₂ and CH₄ emission. In the case of India, the CO₂ emissions from the food sector are below those of the developed countries. Most of the carbon emissions in the food sector in developed countries come from packaging and processing. Traditionally, Indian population has relied on fresh food products, but with changing lifestyles the processed and packaged food consumption is on the increase. With the right policy measures put in place, India's energy intensity is due to go down. The majority of the modeling results suggest that it will continue to decline. It is a welcome trend that India's GDP growth rate of above 7% per annum is accomplished at no more than 3.7 percent increase in energy use in the recent past.

Like any other developing country, India's concerns about economic growth and poverty eradication are legitimate and must be fully respected in any global climate regime, as indeed stated unequivocally in the UNFCCC and the Bali Action Plan. The cause of climate change is largely attributed to unsustainable emission of developed countries. They have to assume greater leadership roles to drastically reduce their emissions and this would mean modification of their life styles. The proposals made by India (and other developing countries) in respect of the future climate justice under the Paris Agreement are constructive and must be given serious consideration in the implementation of the agreement. There is a stock of greenhouse gases in the atmosphere

built up over centuries in the process of creating wealth of nations. It is a natural debt these countries owe to the planet. This has already made our climate unstable. Poorer nations will now add to this stock because of their economic imperatives. This is clearly reflected in the common but differentiated principle enshrined in the UNFCCC negotiations. The international agreement has to be adhered to, in letter and spirit, to enable this planet to sustain future generations. The role of the developed countries in achieving a sustainable planet, and at the same time in providing elbow room to developing countries to give a better quality life to their citizens and create a better tomorrow for the current and future generations, is crucial.

The Green New Deal Narrative Fueled by the “New Deal 4 Europe” Campaign

Nicola Vallinoto

The American economic and social theorist Jeremy Rifkin cites the “New Deal 4 Europe” Campaign as the first citizens’ campaign launched by EU political activists to promote the Green New Deal. In his last book titled *“The Green New Deal. Why the Fossil Fuel Civilization Will Collapse by 2028, and the Bold Economic Plan to Save Life on Earth”*, Jeremy Rifkin underlines that “A new vision for planet’s future is quickly gaining momentum. Facing a global emergency, a younger generation is spearheading a global conversation around a Green New Deal and setting the agenda for a bold political movement with the potential to revolutionize society. Millennials, the largest voting bloc in the country, are now leading on the issue of climate change”.

In the “Power to the people” chapter, Jeremy Rifkin explains “where we stand at this inflection point in history”. He explains: “There is a growing sense that we are paying a terrible price for the fossil fuel civilization that we built and exulted in for more than two centuries, and that is now taking us into a series of climate-changing events and a new reality that we can barely fathom. Humanity is experiencing a great awakening of a different kind. We are beginning to see ourselves as a species and just beginning to ponder our common fate on a planet where nature’s rhythms and patterns are becoming alien. A younger generation is coming forward with an intimate sense of the darkness that is unfolding around them, and a steely

determination to break through the lethargy that has allowed us to slip to the very edge of a planetary crisis.”

“They are angry, determined, and motivated, and unwilling to listen to why we can’t do this and can’t do that, mulling over what’s realistic and what’s not, at a moment when realism itself seems so unrealistic and inadequate to the mission ahead of us. However, we are not totally in the dark and without possibilities. There is a way forward. A path has been laid across the EU and the PRC, and even here in the USA, that can take us on a new journey away from a death driven Second Industrial Revolution and into a life-affirming Third Industrial Revolution.”

In the chapter, Rifkin describes how the EU political activists launched the Green New Deal: “By 2007, Europe had surpassed the US and become the idea factory and deployment engine for decarbonizing society. That year, the EU was finalizing its 20-20-20 formula, binding the EU member states to the Great Disruption that would bring about an ecological age. These new protocols required all the EU member states to increase their energy efficiency by 20 percent, reduce their global warming emissions by 20 percent, and increase their generation of renewable energies by 20 percent by the year 2020, making the EU the first major political power to establish a formula, legally binding commitment to address climate change and transform the economy of hundreds of citizens.[...] In 2009,

the European Greens picked up the theme of a *Green New Deal for Europe: towards a Green Modernization in the Face of Crisis*. The report was the policy document that the European Greens took into the 2009 EU elections as their playbook, and it was championed by the EU's most prominent green leaders, Claude Turmes and Daniel Cohn Bendit."

"[...] A few years later, the European Federalist Movement took the Green New Deal forward with a petition titled *"New Deal 4 Europe: Campaign for a European Special Plan for Sustainable Development*

and Employment", and used it to launch a 2015 European-wide Citizen Initiative to mobilize support for a transition into a zero-carbon green economy. The Green New Deal narrative continued to gain momentum over the years, becoming a theme in the 2019 European elections.

To sum up, ground had been laid for a Green New Deal movement over a period of a decade. That movement is now coming to fruition with the ascendance of a powerful, new, Millennial- and GenZ-driven political revolution in both the European Union and the US."

The COPLA Campaign at the United Nations General Assembly

Emilia Ismael

For the third time, the campaign that promotes the creation of the Latin American and Caribbean Criminal Court against transnational organized crime (COPLA) was mentioned at the United Nations General Assembly. It was the former president of the Argentine Republic, Mauricio Macri, who sustained the fight against organized crime as the axis of his government plan during the 2015 – 2019 period.

In his speech, he emphasized the progress he made to dismantle narco-criminal networks and reduce homicides linked to drug trafficking throughout the Argentine territory. This country, in contrast to the sad Latin American reality, is an exception because it is the second in South America with the lowest homicide rate. But this does not resemble what happens in the remaining countries of the region where organized crime exerts a greater influence than in other regions of the planet. Unlike Asia and Europe, the economic growth experienced by Latin America in recent decades was not accompanied by a reduction in violence, and today, Mexico and Brazil, the two leading countries in the region, have been the main contributors to the homicide rate increase globally.

Therefore, from the beginning of his term, Mauricio Macri supported the campaign that seeks to fight against criminal organizations.

In his presentation at the last two General Assemblies of the United Nations – those that took place in 2018 and 2019 – he stressed that he continues *“working with the Latin America and the Caribbean governments to achieve the necessary consensus for the creation of a regional legal body capable of confronting transnational organized crime”*. This had also been mentioned by the former vice president of Argentina, Gabriela Michetti, one of the main promoters of this initiative even before serving as president of the Senate: *“Redoubling the international commitment to tackle this scourge [drug trafficking] is essential. In this sense, we are working to find the consensus to constitute a Latin American tribunal against organized crime in our region”*.

The fact that the COPLA campaign is presented internationally is one of the most important milestones that it reached since its creation in 2013. As of today, the initiative has the support of the Argentine Congress, the Paraguay’s Chamber of Deputies and numerous regional declarations by the Mercosur Parliament, the Ministers of Security, Interior and Justice of Mercosur, EUROLAT and the groups of Argentina and Ecuador of *“Parliamentarians of Global Action”*. Today, the NGO *Democracia Global* – promoter of the campaign – continues to work hard to obtain declarations of support from Brazil, Colombia, México and Chile.

If you would like to join the COPLA campaign, please visit: www.coalicioncopla.org

A Global Campaign for a World Citizens' Initiative

Over 100 civil society groups, united under the umbrella of 'We the Peoples', are calling on the United Nations (UN) to consider a World Citizens' Initiative. The instrument would enable citizens to put proposals on the agenda of the UN General Assembly for consideration.

The Campaign for the World Citizen's Initiative was formally launched at a meeting opposite the UN headquarters in New York on Thursday, November 14, 2019. Initiated by Democracy Without Borders, Democracy International and global civil society alliance CIVICUS, 'We The Peoples' aims at bringing citizens' concerns closer to the UN. According to a joint statement of the campaign's supporters, "the UN legitimacy, relevance and ability to tackle contemporary challenges can be enhanced by making it more open and accessible to ordinary citizens."

A legal study presented at the launch event concludes that the proposed instrument is "feasible" under the UN rules and could be established by the UN General Assembly. The study suggests that initiatives that get the support of more than five million citizens from a specified number of states in all world regions should "be placed automatically on the agenda of the General Assembly or the Security Council". Either of them would then

have to "draft a resolution in response to the proposal and then vote on the resolution."

"Similar participatory instruments already exist in many cities, regions and countries across the world. A key example we draw upon is the European Citizens' Initiative, that allows European Union citizens who have managed to gather one million signatures in at least seven member states to propose legislation to the European Commission," said Caroline Vernailen, who is responsible for global community building at Democracy International.

According to Andreas Bummel, Executive Director of Democracy Without Borders, "The 75th anniversary of the UN in 2020 represents a perfect opportunity for the international community to establish a World Citizens' Initiative as a way to tackle the democratic deficit of global governance."

CIVICUS' Chief Programmes Officer, Mandeep Tiwana, stressed: "It's time to give a direct voice to citizens at the UN to realize the promise of the UN Charter, which begins with the words 'We the Peoples of the United Nations'.

The campaign intends to gather more support from civil society groups and individual citizens, and to officially present its proposal to the UN early next year.

The Campaign website is: www.worldcitizensinitiative.org

70 Years of the Council of Europe. The Longest Period of Peace in Europe's History

Ulrich Bohner

Europe: A Human Enterprise – 30 stories for 70 years of History,
Council of Europe editions, Strasbourg,
ISBN 978-92-871-8973-8, 20 €, 40US\$
Artisans de l'Europe – 30 témoignages pour 70 ans d'histoire 1949 – 2019, Editions
Conseil de l'Europe, La Nuée Bleue,
Strasbourg, ISBN 978-2-7165-880-3, €20

On 5 May 2019, the Council of Europe, the oldest political institution on our continent became 70 years old. The event has been the subject of commemorations, in the beginning of October, with the presence of French President Macron and the new Secretary General of the Organisation, Marija PEJCINOVIC Buric, former Minister for Foreign Affairs of Croatia. The organisation covers today 47 member States, from the Azores to the Pacific, and from the Polar Circle to the Caucasus and the Mediterranean Sea. The specific interest of the book resides in the fact that it is neither a legal presentation nor a publicity for the achievements of the organisation. It is a collection of short stories written by those who have gone through the practical life of this institution, with no makeup or false pretensions.

The book is therefore pleasant to read, with small stories contributing to the making of History.

The authors have been contributing to the making of Europe. They bring forward their commitments, their attachment to the values, to human life, to humanism, to human rights, to democracy, to peace.

Beyond the pleasure of reading, and the historic interest, we may wonder today why, as federalists, we should be interested in this institution that has been largely marginalised by the setting up of the European Union.

First of all, the Council of Europe is the direct result of the fights for a federal Europe, in particular of the European Congress of The Hague in 1948. It is also the first international organisation that has created, right from the start, besides its classical intergovernmental setup, a parliamentary representation, the Parliamentary Assembly. It has also created, a few years later, a representation of regions and municipalities, the «Congress of Local and Regional Authorities». Through the adoption of the European Convention on Human Rights as soon as 1950, it has set up an organ that could be qualified as «federal». The European Court of Human Rights has indeed the capacity of adopting judgments against member States, including Russia, Turkey as well as the United Kingdom.

The major transformations Europe has experienced after the fall of the Berlin Wall and the collapse of the Soviet Union have brought forward a new dynamic for the Council of Europe in the 1990s.

Beyond all institutional aspects, it should not be forgotten that the Council of Europe has played a pioneering role in creating, as soon as 1955, the symbols of European unity: the European flag and the European Anthem. They are more and more successful today, not only within the European Union that has adopted them for itself, but also with citizen's movements fighting for democracy, the rule of law, human rights, social justice and peace.

A book pleasant to read for all.

An Appeal to the European People to Dare the Impossible

Michel Herland

Michel Dévoluy

Osons enfin les États-Unis d'Europe [Let's finally dare the United States of Europe]

Vérone Éditions, Paris, 2019

Michel Dévoluy, University professor, holder of a Jean Monnet Chair in European economics, in his new book launches an appeal to the European people to mobilize themselves for the implementation of the Federation announced so long ago (Kant, Hugo) and never really achieved. If the readers of *The Federalist Debate*, or the UEF militants, do not need to be convinced of the necessity of this federation, professor Dévoluy's short but dense book has the merit of dotting the I's on many subjects.

For example, the fact that the construction of Europe is not only necessary in the name of the ideals of peace and fraternity: Europe, "an economic giant but a political dwarf", has an urgent need to better defend its interests in a world where the United States (of America) impose their laws shamelessly (see the aggressive judgments against European companies), while China pushes its pawns everywhere and Russia remains in ambush. Another strong idea of the book: the federalists must have the lucidity to recognize that a truly political union at 27 is not on the agenda.

It must be admitted that the Federation will only be built on a narrower basis, made by sufficiently homogeneous countries.

Mr. Dévoluy considers that the Euro Area has the appropriate dimension and that it is true that the presence of a common currency is already a major step forward, which, anyway, logically needs to be completed by the political union. Let's accept it, even if one wonders whether the recurring difficulties of the eurozone are not a sign of excessive heterogeneity.

Mr. Dévoluy shows also very well, on the one hand, the link between the refusal of the federation and liberalism (fiscal and social dumping, etc.), and, on the other hand how on the contrary the federation is the necessary, if not the sufficient, condition for the advent of the social Europe expected by the European people. And this is, of course, the argument that federalists must constantly put forward to mobilize the public opinion.

Mobilizing public opinion to put pressure on the European Parliament, which will, in turn, put pressure on the European Council, is the path advocated by Mr. Dévoluy. It is useless to wait for the Heads of state and government to spontaneously offer their prerogatives on the altar of Europe. M. Dévoluy recalls that the Council is a "spontaneous" creation (in 1974) of the Heads of state concerned about the growing importance of the European institutions, which, however, became itself an official institution of the European Union only with the adoption of the Lisbon Treaty (in 2007). While all kinds of challenges (strategic, economic, social, environmental) accumulate, which make the federation more and more necessary, the federalists are not able to let themselves be heard, perhaps because they do not know what to say. The "little" book of Mr. Dévoluy is thus the guide they need to set off again on campaign.

Translated by Gabriele Casano

Jeremy Rifkin: “A Global Green New Deal”

Roberto Palea

Jeremy Rifkin

“The Green New Deal. Why the Fossil Fuel Civilization Will Collapse by 2028, and the Bold Economic Plan to Save Life on Earth”
St. Martin’s Press, 2019

The latest book by Jeremy Rifkin, the renowned economist and futurologist from Cornell University in New York, President of the Foundation on Economic Trends in Washington, and adviser on environmental and climate matters to the European Union, China and other public authorities, whose work focuses on the relationship between the evolution of science and technology and economic development, the environment and culture, is entitled “A Global Green New Deal”.

As our readers will know, Rifkin has worked with the Federalists – also through his close Assistants, such as Angelo Consoli, based in Brussels – in numerous debates and public seminars on the effects of global warming

In the subtitle of his most recent book, Rifkin says he will look at “Why the Fossil Fuel Civilization Will Collapse by 2028, and the Bold Economic Plan to Save Life on Earth”.

This book is also very interesting because it provides a description of the proposal

made by a large group of representatives of the US Democratic Party (among them Bernie Sanders and Alexandra Ocasio Cortez, who are running for the democratic candidacy in the next US presidential election) for the launch of a global Green New Deal in the US, accompanied by impressive documentation supporting their arguments.

Rifkin bases his assertions on the certified opinions of the world’s leading research institutes and independent investment banks, such as Lazard, according to which the levelized production costs (depreciation, useful life, zero marginal cost) for industrial-scale solar installations have plummeted to 36 US dollars/megawatt hour, while wind has fallen to 29 US dollars/megawatt hour, making them cheaper than gas, coal and oil plants, and nuclear reactors.

And this decline in the production costs for solar and wind installations is set to become so steep that within eight years solar and wind will be far cheaper than fossil fuel energies, and this will be clear for all to see.

As a result, the free market and free competition will drive entrepreneurs and investors out of the fossil-fuel-based sector of the economy into the alternative energy sector.

This will lead to the risk of the bursting of a massive carbon bubble, because institutional and non-institutional investors, led by pension funds (with 25,400 billion US dollars managed by US pension funds), will rapidly abandon the traditional energy sector to enter the green economy.

Anyone who remains invested in the fossil fuel industry when the carbon bubble bursts will suffer incalculable financial losses.

Fossil fuel power plants will become stranded assets. We can already see the signs of this (consider the change in attitude to alternative energy sources by the big “oil companies” such as ENI, ENEL, and TOTAL; the proposed merger between FCA and PSA aimed at the production of electric vehicles; the stock exchange listing of Saudi Aramco and the sale on the market of 1% of its capital to be invested in solar power installations).

This is why governments need to immediately promote a Green New Deal by investing, over the next 20 years, in infrastructure for the green revolution and the organization of a just transition for this transformation (which will involve massive employment of semi-skilled, skilled and professional labour and will affect every sector, from mobility, to the upgrading of buildings, to urban restructuring for the creation of smart cities).

The Green Revolution will need to involve all the countries of the world, which means that the Green New Deal will need to be Global. Civil society movements around the world are mobilizing, and among them Rifkin cites the European Federalist Movement, with which he has built up a successful partnership since the year 2000.

The EU will be the institution that will need to guide the industrial transition to the use of renewable energy, because it has shown its willingness to do so since the adoption of the 20-20-20 Directive of 2007, whose goals have, overall, been fully met.

According to Rifkin, the Green Revolution will require radical changes in the infrastructure sector.

The entire nuclear energy and fossil fuel infrastructure will need to be dismantled and transformed, adapting it to the needs of

solar, wind and other renewable energy.

The outdated centralised electricity grid will need to be reconfigured and become an internet of renewable, digital, distributed, smart energy.

The transportation and logistics sector will need to be digitized and transformed into a GPS-guided and autonomous Mobility Internet, made up of smart electric and hydrogen vehicles powered by renewable energy and running on intelligent road, rail, and water systems.

Buildings will need to be retrofitted to increase their energy efficiency and be equipped with renewable-energy-harvesting installations to become micro power-generating plants, which also incorporate energy-storage technologies.

An Internet of Things platform will be created on top of these internet networks that will connect the human and natural environment in a global distributed intelligent network, through trillions of sensors.

Ownership of the physical infrastructure will be mixed: public/private at every level of government, starting with the cities, held by public entities and private and social capital.

This public-private sharing will prevent social inequalities, rent seeking, and the accumulation of wealth in the hands of the few, promoting a fairer distribution of wealth.

Finally, Rifkin draws up a Plan for the United States, consisting of twenty-three key themes and initiatives that need to be enjoined simultaneously to begin the ecological transition.

These include the imposition of an across-

the-board aggressive rising carbon tax; the elimination of fossil fuel subsidies; a series of incentives in the form of tax credits and/or long-term financing by the federal, state, municipal, and county governments to support the transition to the use of renewable energy, through market mechanisms; and finally, in the 23rd point, the proposal that the US government join the European Union, the People's Republic of China and all other nations willing to work together to agree on a set of universal codes, regulations, standards, and incentives and penalties to enable global interconnectivity and transparency in the joint creation of the local and global green economy.

Rifkin's book is certainly interesting, although it also contains a number of overly futuristic proposals, which do not take into account the inevitable resistance from the extremely powerful "oil company" lobbies and from the countries' governments, which tend to have a "short-term" outlook that favours the interests of their respective national communities over the general interest of the citizens and of future generations.

Indeed, the fate of any ecological transformation of the economy will be determined by the countries of the world.

Is Rifkin optimistic about the future?

I leave to the readers to make their own judgement, bearing in mind that, in concluding his 23-point Plan, Rifkin states that the new President and US Congress elected in 2021 should enact the laws to implement that Plan (clearly counting on the fact that Trump will be defeated and the democratic candidates will be victorious in the next presidential elections).

Federalism against Federalism

Maurice Braud

Georges de La Loyère

Alexander Hamilton 1757-1804. Père du dollar, Fondateur des Etats-Unis (in French)
Editions Temporis, Paris, 2019
(and Valéry Giscard d'Estaing's preface to this book)

We surely remember the work of Michel Albert. After the fall of communism in the Central and Eastern Europe countries and in what was still the Soviet Union, he contemplated the existence, for the years to come, of two opposed dominant models of capitalist economy in the world, the Rhenish model – which he preferred – and the New American or Anglo-Saxon model.¹

As we were commemorating the 30th anniversary of the fall of the Berlin Wall, I had all these things in mind, when I delved into the latest issue of the review *Commentaire*. It published the preface written by the former President of the French Republic Valéry Giscard d'Estaing for a recent work by Georges de La Loyère, *Alexander Hamilton 1757-1804. Père du dollar, Fondateur des Etats-Unis*.² In the preface, the former president compared two historical experiences of a federal nature.

In the United States, the biographies of

Alexander Hamilton and the editions of the *Federalist Papers* are innumerable. More recently, since 2015, the musical *Hamilton* is a huge Broadway success, as much as *The Lion King* or *Mamma Mia*. It has been played without interruption and it is known all over the world.³ And in France? Nothing!

My good friend Bernard Voyenne, in his old work on the history of the federalist idea, perfectly described the Jacobin inebriation that initially led to the annihilation caused by the Terror of the first French Revolution, which had a federative nature, and then to its definitive eradication with Bonaparte.⁴ Hence probably the fact that, with rare exceptions and only for short moments, federalism, as a theoretical corpus and as a principle of organisation of human societies, has never been truly integrated into the French political culture. The workers' and socialist movement itself occulted from its history and its idea the original federalist elements, present in its Proudhonian roots. Nonetheless, some of the unions (and all major confederations) and political organisations (the Socialist Party being, until recently, a national federation of departmental federations) are built on federal principles.

We must welcome the work of Georges de La Loyère, a very useful one, who has proposed to the French audience its various facets as well as the theoretical and political contribution of Alexander Hamilton. We will come back to this later.

For the time being, it is interesting to focus on the preface of Valéry Giscard d'Estaing, in particular on the comparison that he attempts. At the time of writing, he is an elderly man, the reconciliation between France and Germany (VGE was born in Koblenz, Germany) and the European creation have

always been the core of his public action, as well as the one of his brother Olivier and, before them, their father Edmond.

VGE openly expresses admiration for the American federal model and its founders who, coordinating around George Washington, institutionally organised the Thirteen Colonies. These colonies became independent under a constitution that was fiercely defended, illustrated and promoted with talent by authors disguised under the pseudonym of Publius, the first of whom was Alexander Hamilton.

Valéry Giscard d'Estaing, at the time a young financier in the wake of General de Gaulle, perceives a parallelism between Alexander Hamilton's journey and his own. He says about Hamilton: "*son histoire a un goût d'inachevé si on raisonne en termes de succès électoraux, mais elle traduit la cohérence d'une volonté et d'une action dont les effets demeurent*".⁵

Valéry Giscard d'Estaing then develops what he believes to be the relevancy of Hamilton's thinking in the economic and monetary field, in particular with the creation of the US dollar and the implementation of a uniform tax system in the newly-created federation.

Once more, the parallelism is evident with himself, who believes - with good reason - to be one of the creators of the European single currency (the ECU, now the EURO).

All this personal, not to say intimate, thoughts make his observation of the European Union's situation even bitter, and is defined by VGE as "at the base of the cycle". He regrets that no political "leader" can or wants to efficiently and successfully reopen the debate on the future of the Union.

Like some of us, including myself, he considers that there are some possible convergences between member States, in particular between France and Germany, especially regarding the issue of security and defence on the one hand, and taxation on the other.

However, together with the search for providential women or men, he wonders how to find “a Washington” assisted by “a Hamilton” capable of giving a new start to *Europa*.⁶

I do not agree with this last point. There is no shortage of talented men and women in Europe. The issue is rather one of identifying the social and political forces capable of developing and preparing the necessary stages, of bringing them to life in the public debate and, when the time comes, to support them and bring them into the European mobilisation campaigns with a leader who will not fail to maintain her or his position.

It is interesting to measure how VGE himself, during his years of activity at the top of French and European affairs, had little interest towards those who were, already back then, largely inspired by Alexander Hamilton, even in their practice, to bring out a contemporary European consciousness and action by constituting and creating militant or opinion-forming events, actions and movements. He does not cite any of them.

A few months ago, I had the opportunity to talk about Mario Albertini, a real theorist and man of action. In addition, how not to mention Altiero Spinelli who, as a coherent “Hamiltonian”, has always promoted a federalist and trans-European constitutional project, from the 1940s, and

during all the functions he has exercised. He has done so when he was European Commissioner, and then, in the European Parliament, at the head of a constitutional commission that he helped to create. Is it a coincidence that today in Brussels one of the most emblematic buildings of the European Parliament bears his name?

The difficulty of considering and allying with other actors, individual or collective, who were nonetheless contemporary with him, remains one of the great limits of Valéry Giscard d’Estaing. This limit partially explains the failure of his initiatives, both during his seven-year term and later at the head of the Convention for Europe, resulting in the draft of the Constitutional Treaty.

The text published in the review *Commentaire* is the preface to Georges de La Loyère’s work on Hamilton, who in France – I repeat! – would benefit from being more studied and discussed as a major author and practitioner. In his preface, Valéry Giscard d’Estaing is mainly interested in Hamilton’s story especially because it allows to highlight the current immobilism regarding the in-depth exploration of the European Union and besides to carve his own statue for the future. Nonetheless, he is part of a liberal political and economic tradition.

For my part, I must stress how much, to be complete and without detracting from the theoretical and practical contribution of Alexander Hamilton and other American federalists of the end of the 18th century, federalism cannot be reduced to the mere organisation of national or supranational States. Federalism is a much larger theoretical corpus, which embraces all aspects of human and social life.

Indeed, Bernard Voyenne had dedicated

the second volume of his *Histoire de l'idée fédéraliste* to Pierre-Joseph Proudhon, and the third one to what he nicely calls "The Proudhonian lines".⁷

Today the federalist theoretical corpus makes it possible to consider all human and social relations, from the local to the international organisation level, up to building the perpetual peace project identified by Emmanuel Kant and tirelessly pursued ever since by the federalists.

Besides, this allows us to think about economic, social and labour relations in a very Proudhonian filiation. Around Alexandre Lipiansky, also known as Alexandre Marc, and the *Centre international de formation européenne* (CIFE) that he had created, those who support an "integral" or "global federalism" tried to develop concrete proposals for a "statutory minimum wage" open to all (I can think of Marc Heim, in particular) from a spiritual perspective relating to personalism.

While climate change, migration and environmental crisis are topics that currently control our news, and therefore, all of our contemporaneity, the federalist Denis de Rougemont had already thought of ecological federalism in the 1970s (in particular in *L'avenir est notre affaire*, Stock Editions, Paris 1977).

Valéry Giscard d'Estaing and the review *Commentaire* do the right thing by trying to bring the American actors and theorists of federalism out of the shadows (who are nonetheless descendant of the Enlightenment!). However, the federalist theoretical corpus is infinitely richer and more varied, and it is undoubtedly the only one that is presently able to respond comprehensively to the insoluble questions

and problems that all of humanity has to face. Now it's the time!

Translated by Cecilia Mellana

1 Michel Albert, *Capitalisme contre capitalisme*, Editions du Seuil, Paris 1991.

2 Valéry Giscard d'Estaing, « De la Fédération américaine au projet Europa », *Commentaire* n. 167, Automne 2019, 659-663.

3 The author here refers to the paperback *Alexander Hamilton* by Ron Chernow (Penguin Books, London and New York 2004), the one used for the musical.

4 Bernard Voyenne, *Histoire de l'idée fédéraliste*, vol. 1, *Les sources*, Presses d'Europe, Paris - Nice 1976, in particular, 215-255.

5 "If we think in terms of electoral success, [Hamilton's] story looks unfinished, but instead it reveals the coherence of will and action whose effects endure". VGE, *op. cit.*, 661.

6 VGE, *op. cit.*, 663

7 See Bernard Voyenne, *Histoire de l'idée fédéraliste*, vol. II, *Le fédéralisme de Pierre-Joseph Proudhon*, Presse d'Europe, Paris-Nice 1973 and vol. III, *Les lignées proudhoniennes*, Paris-Nice 1981.

Contributors

W. JAMES ARPUTHARAJ

President of South Asian Federalists; Former EC member of WFM; Coordinator for India for the Campaign for UN Parliamentary Assembly; Senior Fellow, Institute of Social Sciences, New Delhi

ULRICH BOHNER

Honorary President of the Strasbourg Europe House. Former Secretary General of the Congress of Local and Regional Authorities of the Council of Europe

GIAMPIERO BORDINO

Professor in Contemporary History and Political Analyst. President of the Einstein Center for International Studies

MAURICE BRAUD

National Secretary of the French Socialist Party. Member of the Executive Committee of the European Movement-France. President of the Jean Monnet Association

ANDREA COFELICE

Research Fellow at the Centre for Studies on Federalism, Torino, Italy

TAD DALEY

Director of Policy Analysis at Citizens for Global Solutions. Speechwriter, policy advisor, or coauthor for two Democratic members of the U.S. House and two more Democratic U.S. senators.

MARIO DRAGHI

Former President of the ECB

MICHEL HERLAND

Economist, honorary professor at the Universities of Aix-en-Provence and at the University of the Antilles and Guiana, member of the UEF-South France (PACA) and member of the editorial board of *Fédéchoses*

EMILIA ISMAEL

Executive Coordinator of Democracia Global

PIERRE JOUVENAT

Former UN/WTO senior official and active member of UEF-France

LUCIO LEVI

Member of UEF Federal Committee, Former President of UEF Italy

ALBERTO MAJOCCHI

Emeritus Professor of Finance at the University of Pavia and Vice President of the Centre for Studies on Federalism

ANTONIO MOSCONI

Research Department, Robert Triffin International

VISVANATHAN MUTHUKUMARAN

Member of the Asian Youth Centre; Executive Committee Member, United Religions Initiative, South India-Sri Lanka Zone

ROBERTO PALEA

Member and former President of the Centre for Studies on Federalism

SUCHISMITA PATTANAIK

PhD, Post-Doctoral Fellow of ICAR-National Rice Research Institute, Member of WFM

DOMÈNEC RUIZ DEVESA

Member of the European Parliament; member of the Executive Bureau of the UEF; Vice President of UEF-Spain

MARIO TELO'

Professor of International Relations at Université Libre de Bruxelles and LUISS of Rome.

NICOLA VALLINOTO

WFM Council member

RENE WADLOW

President, Association of World Citizens