Dialogue Platform of the Thematic Social Forum
Capitalist Crisis, Social and Environmental Justice

Another Future is Possible*

"Come to Reinvent the World at Rio+20"

1. Ethical and Philosophical Foundations: Subjectivity, Domination, and Emancipation

Foundations for Biocivilization

Education in a World in Crisis

Knowledge, Science, and Technology

2. Human Rights, Peoples, Territories, and Defense of Mother Earth

Right to Land and Territory

Territories and Native Peoples

Sustainable Cities

For the Right to Water as a Common Good

Health Is a Universal Right, Not a Source of Profit

3. Production, Distribution, and Consumption: Access to Wealth, Common Goods, and Economies of Transition

Finance and a Fair and Sustainable Solidarity Economy

The Green Economy: A new Phase of Capitalist Expansion

Energy Transition Is Urgent and Possible

4. Political Subjects, Architecture of Power, and Democracy

The Commons: a Kaleidoscope of Social Practices for another Possible World

Civil Society Organizations and Social Movements

---

* Working Paper that is a compilation of all the proposals taken from the texts produced by the Thematic Groups at the Thematic Social Forum of Porto Alegre (January 24-29, 2012). Bringing together the thematic groups under four core themes is a proposal for articulating the different themes. Some groups can of course be connected to two or more core themes.

"Come to Reinvent the World at Rio+20"

Rio+20 will be a strong political moment and a unique opportunity to "reinvent the world" by pointing to alternatives to the dangerous path in which we are currently ensnared. Nevertheless, judging from the actions of the hegemonic actors of the international system and from the mediocrity of international agreements negotiated in previous years, their false solutions, and the non-application of the principle already agreed upon at Rio 92, we understand that although we should not give up on our attempt to weigh upon their actions, neither should we feed illusions about our influence being strong enough to launch a virtuous circle of negotiations and meaningful compromises intended to deal with the serious problems that are threatening humankind and life on the planet.

We believe that the necessary agenda for global democratic governance presupposes the end of the current situation, in which the multilateral arenas have been taken over by corporative interests. Change will inexorably require action by the greatest possible representation of social actors: a broad variety of networks, non-governmental organizations, and different kinds of social movements, including environmentalists, farmers and urban workers, women, youth networks, popular movements, indigenous peoples, ethnic minorities facing discrimination, solidarity economy networks, etc. We must build a new paradigm of social, economic, and political organizations, whose actions will be enhanced by learning from the experiences of the ongoing struggles in these sectors and from knowing that we already have the material and technological conditions to establish the new forms of production, consumption, and political organization that we need.

Is Rio+20 an opportunity?

The second phase of the capitalist economic crisis in progress—currently centered in Europe, but extending to all the core countries—is generating the perverse social effects of the severe recession triggered in 2008. At the same time, continued growth in China and other developing countries is requiring more and more natural resources. Both processes are having a brutal impact on the global environmental crisis and together, are producing increasingly punitive social inequalities and leading to new humanitarian crises. All of this requires urgent responses, and there is not a government that can provide them. All of this requires a major reform of the current economic, social, cultural, and political system—global capitalism and its institutions. All of this adds up to a crisis of civilization, and the fate of billions of human beings is tied up with it.

In the current global power structure, controlled by the vested interests of multinational corporations, the "developed" and "emerging" countries have no real intention to challenge the "business of development." There has, however, been an enormous change in global geopolitics. Global capitalism now works at two speeds, where the dynamics of accumulation in the core countries are disconnected from the so-called emerging markets, posing new problems for social transformation.

On the one hand, rich countries are being affected by stagnation and the crisis, even though corporations have maintained their capital accumulation and market speculators have their profits guaranteed. At the same time, the majority of the populations are suffering austerity policies, massive unemployment, the rise of inequalities, and the strengthening of

conservative political currents and right-wing policies, such as the racist Tea Party groups in the United States and the xenophobic groups in Europe

On the other hand, the major "emerging" countries continue to expand their economies in the framework of global capitalism. Exaltation of their growth, acclaimed by almost everyone, reveals complete ignorance of the problems lying ahead. The crisis in the "financial creativeness" of neoliberalism has stimulated the rebirth of developmentalism. Millions of people are improving their standards of living in Asia and Latin America, consuming a little more than they used to, but social inequality is also increasing almost everywhere. Economic growth is being accomplished with the escalation of its inherent contradictions: inequality and income concentration, over-exploitation and job insecurity, environmental degradation, concentration of land ownership, growth of slums, ever poorer social services. Nevertheless, the impact of the small improvements has been prevailing over the perception of these contradictions, and an "all is well" logic is obstructing the formation of a counter-hegemonic project.

As a result, three years after the deepest economic crises since 1929, three years after the rise in the prices of commodities and food due to speculation by financial giants, four years after the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC) warned of the urgency of a transition to a low-carbon economy, all the problems have dragged on with no solution in perspective and with "business as usual" as the only concern of established powers. No lessons have been learned and no structural change has been made: instead, the impasses of this suicidal trend have only grown in numbers and in intensity.

Failing a different civilization paradigm to challenge it, the capitalist machine is continuing to move, as it always has, toward its usual goals with its usual approach: more growth, expansion of exports and imports, production and consumption of more industrial goods, and conception and use of ever more, increasingly sophisticated services targeted to higher and higher numbers of people. As hundreds of millions of people enter society of mass consumption and pursue the lifestyle exported by American capitalism as an ideal of happiness, they are demanding increasing amounts of flashy goods, manufactured according to the logic of planned obsolescence, private use, waste, and disposability. And they are consuming more and more resources: energy, raw materials, food, and environmental services. This kind of growth is feeding new and future crises—fuel, raw materials, and food crises—and accelerating greenhouse-gas emissions and global warming. The only thing the world of capital can come up with is delusional promises that technological innovations will solve the problems. And to make sure that nothing keeps the system from prospering, democracy is being corrupted by the power of money or, whenever necessary, simply suppressed.

Indignant citizens are rebelling in many parts of the world, but the dynamics of the anti-system forces are still very fragmented, heterogeneous, unequal, and disarticulated, between continents and countries of the same region. There has yet to be an alliance among them, an articulation joining the diversity into a great irreversible movement.

The People's Meeting

Despite the demoralizing negotiations expected at Rio+20 within the framework of the UN, the Conference offers a real and symbolic opportunity for civil society to meet, present their proposals, and organize their struggles. Moreover, they can present a new paradigm of the economy, society, and politics that can face and eventually defeat the serious problems accumulated during this crisis of civilization, a paradigm that can strengthen the movements opposed to the system and be reinforced and developed by them.

To present proposals for another future that will allow us to bypass the blind alley into which the capitalist crisis is pushing humankind and the planet in this early twenty-first century, we have organized the proposals into four core themes according to which we have assembled the work done by the different thematic groups.

1. Ethical and Philosophical Foundations: Subjectivity, Domination, and Emancipation

2. Human Rights, Peoples, Territories and Defense of Mother Earth

3. Production, Distribution and Consumption: Access to Wealth, Common Goods, and Economies of Transition

4. Political Subjects, Architecture of Power, and Democracy

1. Ethical and Philosophical Foundations: Subjectivity, Domination, and Emancipation

Foundations for Biocivilization

It is an ethical imperative for humankind to reflect on the foundations of a new civilization and to embark on the long process of disarmament and the social reconstruction of culture, of the economy, and of power that this implies. The idea of biocivilization goes in the direction of seeking a new civilization paradigm. This is a monumental challenge of both a philosophical and political order because it consists in disarticulating the thinking and action assumptions that have become part of common sense and that, for this very reason, are the pillars of the industrial capitalist civilization—productivist and consumerist, sexist and racist—invading our lives, shaping our heads and ethical values, and organizing the economy and power in society.

For biocivilization, it is not enough to color what we've got "green" and keep growing, feeding on social exclusion and the destruction of the natural commons. We need to recompose and rebuild our philosophical and ethical foundations in order to build a human civilization where the sustainability of all people—from which no one is excluded now or in future generations—and the sustainability of all of life, as well as of the integrity of the planet are the rule and not the exception.

The Ethics of the Integrity of Life and of the Planet

To be sustainable, human civilization needs to renounce anthropocentrism as philosophy, ethics, and religion, and to make a radical change in its view of nature and in its relationship with nature. Life, every form of life, has the fundamental right to exist; so do the complex ecological systems that are an integral, regulating part of planet Earth. This must be the founding principle, the condition, and the limit of human intervention in its relationship with nature and in the building of societies. The first task derived from this principle is to disable the current production "machine" designed to accumulate material and financial wealth. Development conditioned on growth is the capitalist machine. It combines the appropriation and limitless use of natural resources with the exploitation and domination of those who do the actual work, building on privatization, commercial exploitation, and industrialization, and stimulating unfettered productivism and consumerism, all in the name of capitalist

accumulation. The core ethical question is, in this case: How can we replace the values and lifestyle based on "greater having," producing more and more waste and destruction, with those of "greater being," with greater happiness, greater solidarity, greater awareness of our responsibilities to regenerate, reproduce, and preserve the integrity of our natural foundation, and to share it with everyone now and with future generations?

The Ethics of Care, Living Together, and Sharing

Care is imperative for us as humans and in our relationship with the biosphere. In a world without care, the atmosphere has been colonized by carbon emissions from large economic corporations, companies, the richest, and the most powerful due to their unbridled consumption. Today, humankind is threatened as a living species, as are all forms of life. A world without care has allowed the colonial undertaking to conquer peoples and their territories, and today there are still disputes over the natural resources of the planet. In a world without care, we are designing transgenic seeds in our search for greater productivity and destroying existing biodiversity. In a world without care, we are polluting our water, destroying life in our oceans, tearing our forests down, and making deserts. The truth is that it is impossible to even think about sustainability without care as a principle and ethical value.

We need to rescue care as a principle for the de-privatization of the family and the sexist domination that it thrives upon. Ultimately, this is where humankind's greatest common good is formed: with sons and daughters to give it continuity. At the same time, however, we need to build the principle of care as a core element of the new economy, the new management of this great home that is the symbiosis of human life with nature, indispensable community life where people live together and everything is shared, territories as a way of organizing to live according to the potential and limitations of the *locus* we are occupying, the economy and power that this leads to, from the local to the global.

The principles and ethical values of care, living together, and sharing must be at the core of how we rebuild our relationship with nature, where it is considered as the indispensable foundation for human life, for all of life. These same principles must also be at the core of the new economy and new power structure. Sustainable economy is only possible when based on care, which leads to respect for the integrity of nature, to use that neither destroys nor generates waste but instead renews and regenerates. Caring is extending the life of material goods, repairing them, and preserving them. Caring is sharing with nature, respecting it, and remaining within the ecological footprint that will protect its integrity for us and for future generations. Preserving natural species (seeds and animals)—biodiversity—means caring and, at the same time, setting up the conditions for living together and sharing.

The Ethics of Social and Environmental Justice

Never has humankind been as unequal as in the current context of abundance to the exclusion of the many, of outrageous wealth and unbearable poverty, and never has this truth been so evident in the struggle for justice and equality. Neither has humankind ever been more aware of the imperative need of equity and of the threat raised by social exclusion, poverty, and the different forms of inequality and social injustice in this context of crisis of civilization. It is fundamental to tie in the struggle for social justice with the struggle against environmental destruction, because the two depend on one another. To face social injustice it is fundamental to face environmental destruction and the injustice inherent to it. It is not one or the other; it is both at the same time. You cannot face up to environmental destruction without facing up to social injustice. Both occur in relationship to each other and this radically requalifies the social struggles of our times, with biocivilization in perspective.

The Ethics of Rights and of Human Responsibilities

There are no human rights without human responsibilities. Enjoying rights, any rights, is conditioned on acknowledging that everyone else is to enjoy the same rights. Human rights, as common goods, refer to these two sides of the political relationship of equality. In other words, to enjoy rights, everyone needs at the same time to be responsible for everyone else's rights. This is a shared relationship and as such, it is based on co-responsibility. This is why it is of the essence to bring this theme into the debate on the foundations of a new civilization. The growing awareness of human rights and responsibilities, in societies and in relation to the biosphere, brings to light the fundamental question of interdependence between the local and territorial level and the planetary one. Rights and responsibilities rely on the recognition of ecological and social interdependence as an indisputable condition to reestablish the foundations of the sustainability of life and of the planet.

The Ethics of Cultural Diversity for the Sustainability of Life and of the Planet

Culture is what individuality is grown from, just as it is also what engenders common humanity and cultural diversity, which is the condition for the existence of humanity in the interaction between emancipated human beings and between the latter with nature, the substratum of life, to be used, conserved, and regenerated. A vibrant culture is a culture of diversity, not the homogeneity imposed by the current overwhelming globalization. A diversified culture is what enhances the potential value of the people that constitute it, what makes it possible to envisage the sustainability of life and of the planet. This is another of the founding dimensions of society, of economy, and of power for biocivilization.

The Ethics of Democracy and Peace

Biocivilization is not possible without an ethics of peace. This is an essential condition for all the previously mentioned principles and pillars. Imperialism, nationalism, arsenals, wars, and violence, all of these internalized in our current culture, social structures, and ways of organizing power and the economy, are the supporting points of industrial, productivist, consumer civilization, which feeds on conquests, exploitation, the servility of debt, inequality, and social exclusion on a global scale, and on the intensive use of natural resources. Thus peace is not only an objective for biocivilization, but an ethical condition and incontrovertible strategy policy for sustainability and the continuity of all forms of life.

Democracy is guided by the principles and ethical values of freedom, equality, diversity, solidarity, and participation, all together and all at the same time, as a basis for democratic action and active citizenship. Action and ends are based on ethics. A methodological basis of this nature can turn everything that was previously stated about the foundations of biocivilization into a possible Utopia, where impossible changes are imagined, stated, and acted upon as possible.

In reality, the peace prerequisite and the method for democratizing democracy both constitute the ferment of change for what we have today into biocivilization. We will build the paths as we go, and there is no point in defining them beforehand for all the world's territories, with their natural and cultural diversity, for all the peoples seeking good living. Connected and having recognized our shared interdependence, we can build from the local to the global, with the methods of democracy and in peace, a new architecture of power for biocivilization.

Education in a World in Crisis

The global crisis is an opportunity for setting up new forms of collective action around the planet. The discourse that mainstreams these demonstrations is the democratization of power, economy, and education. Educators are not absent actors; instead, with students and communities they constitute a powerful expression of global citizenship. Conventional education and its institutions are in a substantive discussion. It is not just a matter of access and quality of school services, but of the inability to provide new answers to global challenges and to guide people and their communities toward a just and sustainable world.

The current global mobilization involves various types of subjects: indignant youth, grassroots activists, those excluded from the benefits of globalization and indebted, abused consumers, exploited temporary female labor, unemployed university graduates, chronically unemployed victims of delocalization processes of production and deterioration of regional economies, communities affected by the depletion of natural resources, indigenous populations that see how ecosystems are destroyed in which they develop their micro-economies and their ancestral culture, migrants and displaced persons, professionals aware of the climate crisis of the planet, and more.

The whole map of subjects and content of change refers to the need of reshaping ways of doing politics and education. However, this is much more than legitimate indignation and resistance: it is a call to action, to work together for a society that will produce and distribute goods equitably and fairly, to develop sustainable consumption patterns, and to organize political coexistence based on real participatory democracy.

The "social movement of educators"

In this global context, what belongs to the contribution of the "social movement of educators" is being shaped by several key principles: the crisis leads us to propose new ways of understanding "human development": education is understood as a process of capacity building of individuals and their communities, which enables them to organize, express themselves, speak, associate, act in networks, understand the factors of the current crisis, and participate in the generation of a "global and local public opinion" that is critical and deliberative. Education should consider as a crucial issue the content of a paradigmatic transformation of social, political, and economic, thought to imagine and generate the cultural conditions of a new way to "set" the future. The future and social and planetary sustainability (eco-policy) are vital cores of an educational proposal in the present times of mobilization. This proposal involves developing a citizen pedagogy that empowers all people, young and adult alike, to express themselves actively. For this purpose, school and community institutions must be open to discover new ways of learning and of conceiving the classroom and the role of teachers, and the relationship between schools and their communities and eco-social environments.

Educators must have the capacity to bring forth a fair and sustainable society. Along with other social professions and volunteers, and activists, educators produce symbolic and cultural goods, which are undervalued in a neoliberal economy, which and are the basis for "good living," such as education in affection, solidarity, reciprocity, trust and dialog, respect for diversity, non-discrimination, and understanding human rights. This observation should strengthen the self-awareness of the power of transformation that teachers have and make it available to social movements by promoting the development of critical and active subjects who will be responsible for the present and future of societies and the planet.

Education is a complex task because of the diversity of cultural contexts in which it develops, the types of educational and non-formal institutions that implement it, the social actors

involved and the multi-cultural dimension of its purposes. This is why we are required to develop and enhance pluralistic pedagogies and to increase the number of teachers willing to enhance their professional practices, through communities and movements that systematize their knowledge and their challenges, and at the same time emphasize their self-belief in their fundamental role in the search for new biocivilization paradigms.

The educational dimension of global mobilization in all the regions of the world is providing the movement of educators with the lesson of the need to combine pedagogical thinking and teaching practices with the change-seeking movements of society. To our knowledge, this is a strategy to promote education that will contribute to the social redistribution of knowledge and power, and will enhance the sense of autonomy, solidarity, and diversity expressed by the new social movements.

Critical and Transformative Education

Critical and transformative education must be developed in all human spaces of socialization, and this requires: capacity building of educators in order to generate learning processes in various forms, with different types of individuals and communities, and in line with their cultural forms; understanding the current complex historical processes from a holistic, thoughtful, and ecological, point of view; and developing civic and cognitive resources to participate in public life, and exercise and defend their human rights.

The educational policies of countries and regions should be an expression of cultural and political processes of broad citizen participation. It is therefore necessary to strengthen citizens' movements, students and teachers working globally for the democratization of politics and the recognition of the universal right to inclusive education without exclusion or discrimination.

The priority of educational financial resources should be directed to the full inclusion of children, girls, and adults in educational public services, and to ensure the universal right to education and learning. It should require institutional processes of accountability and the existence of city councils to ensure inclusive and participatory orientation of educational policy.

The social demand for education in today's society cannot be expressed only in reference to school facilities, including access to new technological tools and communication networks, digital literacy, and strengthening community spaces as spaces of cognitive, civic, ecological, and humanitarian learning.

Educational activities should seek strongly to provide young people with a full education that will strengthen their sense and purpose of being, teach them to learn and to participate civically, to share knowledge and express themselves culturally, especially where they are subjected to abusive work at an early age, to sexist submission, to unemployment or to the power of criminal cartels and drug-trafficking. At this level, community education and popular social movements have a crucial role to play in generating networks of human rights, social protection and inclusion, citizen participation, and adult-education institutions.

An "education revolution"

The paradigm shift in education as a condition for progress toward a just and eco-sustainable society requires a change in the economic and technical approaches of the education policies in force. We can say that an "education revolution" is needed, as has been claimed by the Chilean and Colombian students' movements, demanding the right to learn "of all people throughout their life." This slogan should not be construed, however, as a call for permanent

training aimed only to meet the market needs and requirements of the old and new industries. It is a call for forms of education to develop the human capabilities that will allow "good living," including cognitive abilities, a sense of belonging and social participation, coexisting with others in diversity and difference, caring for and planning their lives with full respect and solidarity for the life of the eco-systems on which life grows.

We, educational organizations and global educators' movements, have a common task, which is to develop pedagogical and political routes depending on the educational requirements of specific areas, of their own cultures, their local economies and their relationship with global markets, of its own employment structures, of the burden capacities of their ecosystems and the unmet needs of their populations to enjoy eco-wellbeing.

"Moving the Future" is a global slogan that has an impact on educators, as it makes them responsible for the learning that communities need in order to create enough civic capital and citizens' power to be able to democratize politics and socially distribute power. "

Knowledge, Science and Technology

The Earth Summit in 1992 heralded the era of the so-called Knowledge Economy as governments began destroying the world heritage of knowledge on living systems. In 2012, certain governments are promoting the development of the so-called "green economy" that, if they get their way, will take control of sections of nature that have not yet been appropriated and claim the right to control planetary systems that are critical for our survival.

The 1992 Earth Summit also launched the decade of the world's indigenous people. In the following years, indigenous cultures and knowledge were attacked, denigrated, and hijacked. The twenty years that have passed since Rio have seen one of the biggest explosions of techno-scientific innovations in the history of humankind. This has gone hand-in-hand with the destruction of the irreplaceable knowledge and expertise held by indigenous people and small-scale farmers, knowledge relating to land, soil, climate, ecosystems, biodiversity, and sustainable farming. This damage is so great that we could say that our generation will be the first in the history of humankind to have lost more knowledge than it has gained.

Although Rio introduced the precautionary principle and the need to assess technologies into global discussions, since then the capacity to monitor and assess technologies that existed in the UN has been dismantled while science has become increasingly commercialized. Moreover, a large proportion of scientific and technological efforts has been transformed into tools to maintain corporate power and profits.

Public science has systematically been sequestrated by private interests, scientific education has been subordinated to industrial interests, and the fruit of public science has been systematically patented by global corporations. New risky and untested technologies, such as nanotechnology and synthetic biology, have flooded the markets with a total lack of regulation and prior assessment. The countries and industries that have caused and profited from climate change are now telling the world that they need to take control of the global thermostat and manipulate the climate with geo-engineering.

We need to put an end to the industrial monopoly over science and give it back to the people.

Rio+20 provides an opportunity to reaffirm the precautionary principle, identify and reject mistaken and distorted interpretations, and extend its application.

Scientific knowledge is one of the common goods belonging to humankind: it should always be publicly accessible and should be considered as a knowledge-based common good. In the same way, traditional indigenous and small farmers' knowledge is also a common good that, as Vía Campesina defines it, is the people's heritage at the service of humankind. This is why we reject all forms of intellectual ownership of life forms.

We call on the scientific and technological community to work for public awareness of these restrictions on knowledge-based goods and against the commercialization of science and knowledge.

We call on Rio+20 to establish a participative mechanism for prior social, environmental, economic, and cultural assessment of technologies in order to monitor, debate, and provide advice on the implications and alternatives in the fields of science and technology for consideration by societies. We also call on social organizations, particularly indigenous and small-scale farmers, to monitor and assess new technologies independently from governments.

Owing to the very high risks and the potential to destabilize the planet's systems, we also call on Rio+20 to establish a ban on geo-engineering, similar to the Comprehensive Nuclear-Test-Ban Treaty.

2. Human rights, Peoples, Territories, and Defense of Mother Earth

The Right to Land and Territory

Rights (human rights and citizen rights) are a permanent and never-finished sociocultural construction. They have turned into a field of dispute regarding their conceptualization, their content, their practice, and their scope.

The problems that accompany this dispute are of a different order. The most significant of these have to do with the prevalence of a liberal (and neoliberal) and clearly Western view—and its claim to universality—of rights, seen only as related to the rights of individuals and not in their relationship to the social order, obscuring the fact that human and citizen rights are core political elements and that their violation constitutes an aggression against society. From this perspective, individual rights and collective rights are part of a comprehensive and complex view of the dispute for dignity and recognition. To consider rights as universal in their application without considering the recognition of differences as a dimension inseparable from equality accentuates inequality and exclusion and obviates the political, subjective, and paradigmatic consequences of diversity.

It is of the essence to assume the diversity of lifestyles, collective imagery, and worldviews not only for the many different social protagonists and actors who are struggling with insistence for their recognition, but also because this allows us to deconstruct homogenous visions of the state, the nation, democracy, and equality.

Struggling for territory is struggling for a collective right that stands up to the current extractionist, nature-predatory, capitalist development model being applied through neoliberal

globalization, demolishing the rights of communities and peoples, and destroying the very future of citizens' welfare in harmony with nature. Land and territory are linked to the worldviews of native peoples, to their memory, to their history as ancestral peoples. They are part of a struggle for survival as a people, as a culture, and also, in the ecological debacle we are facing, for the survival of the planet.

The right to land and territory is built and reproduced collectively. It is also pivotal for opening new dimensions of rights not considered in the traditional perspective, such as the ethnic racial dimensions of rights, and the dimension of the body as territory. All these are dimensions that cut across and structure the political horizon. It also brings in the dimension of de-patriarchization to oppose the exclusion of women from the right to land and territory. It is a struggle of enormous significance for imagining other development models aiming for harmony with nature and connected to the many other rights of benefit to all of humankind and at the core of the demands of social movements: the right to sustainable development, the right to water, to adequate nutrition, to non-use of genetically modified products, to a healthy environment, to decent housing, to work, to participate in issues of common interest, to association, and to equitable relations—social and sexual—between men and women.

Territories and Indigenous Peoples

It has been demonstrated that the shelters of life are the peoples' forests and territories, which are effective barriers against predation. This is why it is indispensable to change legislation and public policy to guarantee the demarcation of indigenous peoples' territories and their collective title to their territories as peoples, and also to support—not attack or marginalize—"Full Life" strategies, different from those designed to commodify nature. This is an efficient and effective strategy to reduce global warming and recover harmony with Mother Earth. To avoid climate change, the system has to be changed. It is therefore necessary to denounce the contradictions of global and national forest policies, which behind declarations, plans, and small "sustainable projects" are aggravating the predation, deforestation, and deterioration wreaked by the mining, hydrocarbon, and mega-hydroelectric industries, by extensive and intensive farming, soy crops, agribusiness, "agrofuels," colonization superhighways, genetically modified organisms, pesticides, protected areas superimposed on indigenous territories, biopiracy, and theft of ancestral knowledge.

In this context, the main proposals are:

- ⚐ to prioritize the demarcation, legalization, and legal security of indigenous territories to guarantee the preservation of biodiversity and genetic resources, and of ancestral knowledge;

- ⚐ to consolidate the Right to Prior Consultation and to Free, Binding, Previous and Informed Consent for access to the genetic resources of indigenous territories and of the traditional knowledge associated with them.

- ⚐ The genetic resources of the indigenous territories and ancestral knowledge constitute a collective natural and intellectual indigenous heritage that has been preserved over the centuries and passed down through the generations.

- ⚐ Access to ancestral knowledge and genetic resources must be submitted to fair and equitable distribution of the benefits as much of the

genetic resources—including derived products—as of the traditional knowledge associated with them.

> ⚜ Ancestral knowledge is not in the public domain; it belongs to the culture of indigenous people. States and international agencies (such as the Convention on Biological Diversity—CBD) must adopt sui generis legal regulations for its protection.

> ⚜ Ancestral knowledge must not be marketed, misused, or authorized for biotechnology patent claims.

Sustainable Cities

The world has been undergoing a rapid urbanizing process. Currently, more than half of the world's population lives in cities. Cities, with their rural surroundings, have become the basic units to manage the territory and society. In every city we find critical poverty situations, and the corresponding social programs need to identify each family, with a real address, and analyze the differential situations and necessary actions. The policies for basic sanitation, final destination of solid waste, soil recovery, access to the democratization of social policies, articulation of the city with its green belt, sustainable construction, planting trees, security, local communications, mobility, environmental education, sports, and so many others are undergoing integrated local policies.

Cities are networked are learning together. City consortia, hydrographic basin committees, and networks of cities with similar or complementary vocations are organizing nationally and internationally. Through these connections, we no longer discuss whether cities are more feasible or less feasible, as economic feasibility depends directly on the articulations formed. Multiple local powers in the planet are not a problem but an opportunity to generate a global cooperative process of articulated territories.

Proposals for the UN:

• The UN and national governments should promote decentralized funding policies, and fund local powers directly for sustainability projects.

• The UN and national governments should strengthen representation of the local authorities in the decision-making processes of the multilateral system.

• The United Nations should reinforce the Habitat function and give it a broader scope by organizing a system that will facilitate sharing scientific and technological knowledge so that cities can learn from one another in the field of building sustainability policies.

• The UN should move toward dynamic national and regional policies by structuring staff in integrated and sustainable local development.

• The UN should adopt local systems (and support their implementation on a world scale) for social, environmental, political, economic, and cultural indicators measuring the quality of life in the cities, enabling local populations to participate and evaluate the sustainability policies that have been implemented.

- The UN should make information available through open platforms, aiming at facilitating a democratic access to these, and promoting and supporting local systems for information and communications.

Proposals for national governments:

- to manage territorial occupation strategically in the direction of the sustainable use of natural resources and to ensuring quality of life for everyone;

- to shift from sectorial housing-rights policies to rights policies referring to the city as a whole ("building neighborhoods and cities, not just houses") related to poverty elimination, promoting social inclusion, reducing inequality, promoting health through the practice of physical and sports activities, and encouraging innovation (technological, management and participatory governance in the cities);

- to encourage the creation of integrated systems among the cities nationally, regionally, and at the city level;

- to design and implement policies for the different types of cities, characteristics, and forms of occupation existing in the territory;

- to promote the institution of participatory structures for city governance and the revitalization of urban centers;

- to articulate access to basic sanitation with actions for overcoming the housing deficit and health promotion;

- to implement national policies for urban and rural regularization of slums and other types of occupation;

- to improve funding, aid, and institutional arrangement mechanisms to reduce deficits and ensure inclusion and access to healthy cities;

- to increase the processing, disposal, and reuse of industrial waste, with a special focus on cities growing and expanding rapidly and on waste deriving from civil construction;

- to implement structured programs for selective collection and recycling, aiming at developing its chain production with the inclusion of collectors and cooperatives;

- to guide and structure growth and mobility in the cities, aiming at systems suitable for the different sizes and types of cities existing in the territory;

- to encourage use of the bicycle as a means of transportation and set up the conditions for them to be used safely (bike lanes, bike paths, and intermodal connections);

- to develop policies to replace the energy matrix based on oil by encouraging the adoption of cleaner fuel, prioritizing public transportation in the urban road system, and setting limits for the emission of pollutants according to the World Health Organization (WHO).

For the Right to Water as a Common Good

In the past 20 years, we came nowhere near reaching the objectives agreed on in Rio with respect to the universal access to water. On the contrary, the alternative of privatizing (sometimes through public-private-partnerships–PPPs) drinking water and sanitation services, which was presented in the nineties as a solution to accelerate access to water, turned out to be inadequate for addressing an issue that demanded public investment and administration in the public interest (not in the financial one), with social and democratic oversight. We have observed that in the past years, social and ecological crises have aggravated this issue, and concern with the lack of access to drinking water has grown both in terms of quantity and quality, according to the criteria of the UN Resolution regarding the right to water and sanitation, these being big causes of mortality, especially for children in our poor countries.

We want to promote a culture of "water is life" which emphasizes ethical values, cultural aspects, sacred dimensions, and the symbolism of the cosmic vision of traditional and native people. We affirm that defending the right to water is a strong vector for uniting social movements. We express our repulsion to all forms of unrightful appropriation of water in industrial and agricultural use, to the detriment of its free circulation to nurture populations. We also express our concern regarding the existing and potential conflicts between people caused by controlling water to the detriment of the poor.

We also highlight the increasing levels of pollution of seas and oceans from the contamination of rivers and the uncontrolled dumping of garbage and sewage. In this sense, we also reject the processes of desalinization of sea water that do not respect precautionary principles and that are environmentally unsustainable.

We express a critical vision of the marketing of the green-economy concept and we oppose the commodification of water and all forms of privatization of this vital element. We fight against the deep social, economic, and cultural inequalities that produce social water shortages. We consider water as a common good that is essential to life, which is at the origin of cultural and ethical systems of populations, and we reject the market solutions proposed by the green economy. We propose the adoption of local, national, regional, and international policies that guarantee the UNIVERSAL RIGHT TO WATER AND SANITATION, by preserving the resource at its origin, rationalizing its use, and distributing it under the principles of social equity.

Challenges and Strategies

- Fight against private financing of investments in the water sector and, consequently, fight for the reinvention of forms of public financing, with the purpose of emancipating communities and public institutions from dependence on private capital

- Fight against the privatization of water and against concessions that are using public resources to finance private companies in the water sector

- Raise awareness and increase knowledge on this theme together with national and international civil society, through campaigns and actions designed to aim at common objectives for Rio+20

- ⚲ Fight for access to information and for free communication, education, and citizenship regarding water issues
- ⚲ Social oversight and participation in all aspects related to the common good of water in a broad sense
- ⚲ Fight for the right to water and sanitation and fight for a sustainable environment, achieved by means of harmonizing public policies in the administration of common goods (water, earth, air)

Health Is a Universal Right, Not a Source of Profit

In almost all countries, health systems are being attacked by privatization an increasing commodification, exacerbating North-South inequalities, as well as internal inequalities within each country.

The poorest populations are the first victims of the reforms demanded by the financial markets, and health and drug corporations. Around the world, women are suffering from the consequences of such policies.

- In Europe, we have noticed the simultaneity and acceleration of attacks against the rights of populations through privatization and destruction of social welfare. Reducing public deficits is used as a pretext for political austerity to destroy social benefits. Yet rescuing the financial system and profits has increased an illegitimate debt and is used as a pretext for the majority of governments to destroy our public health systems.

- In the Maghreb/ Mashriq, the destruction of health systems as a consequence of the implementation of neoliberal policies is being planned, including structural adjustment programs. Applied in the region, these aim to destroy most of the state's responsibility, and enter into the market logic.

- In Latin America, although progress has been noticed in several countries thanks to the influence of people's mobilization, health systems are still inadequate, highly unequal, and dominated by the commercial sector.

- Sub-Saharan Africa remains in a dramatic situation that has led the region to concentrate half of the deaths in the planet of children under 5 years old (4.4 million out of 8.8 million each year).

- Around the world, the constant search for productivity gains (exacerbated by the crisis) has led to deteriorate health at work in huge proportions (160 million new cases of occupational diseases each year in the world - ILO)

Proposals:

- ⚲ The construction of international trade unions and social movements with "health without borders" in their unions or social movements
- ⚲ An alternative system of social welfare without borders, a system without boundaries based on the existence of indivisible economic, social, civic, and political rights.

- ✍   A health system guaranteeing universality, accessibility, and quality.
- ✍   A unified system based on needs and not on resource management, which should be mainly under the state responsibility
- ✍   Independent public research and state polices integrating drug research, production and control, in order to face all the populations' needs.
- ✍   A genuine policy of prevention and health
- ✍   Statutory and healthy work conditions for health professionals, and training to ensure quality of care and caring.
- ✍   A system based on the Democracy of health and determination of populations' needs by the people and health workers, based on state funding: collective health cannot be a source of profit.

3. Production, Distribution, and Consumption: Access to Wealth, Common Goods, and Economies of Transition

Finance and a Fair and Sustainable Solidarity Economy

Neoliberal policies, by extending the productivist model to the entire planet, have increased and accelerated pressure on our resources to a point never previously imagined. This has also generated a new balance of power among countries. Traditional dependence of the countries of the South on those of the North may have subsisted in many areas, but dependence has also in part indisputably changed sides: economic and financial dependence on emerging countries, greater dependence on raw materials that are tending to run out, etc. Economic globalization has paradoxically made evident the limits of global capitalist expansion. The current crisis is much more than an economic crisis: it is a crisis of economic domination over the whole of social and political life.

This crisis shows that capitalism is not just a way of organizing the economy. It is in itself a form of civilization, or rather of de-civilization, that entails certain ways of daily living, certain representations and, in particular, a very particular relationship with nature and with work. It is this "civilization" that we need to get out of, and fast.

Global finance

The goal to be reached consists in getting the world out its subordination to global finance and to give societies back control over credit, currency, and finance. Currency has been confiscated by the economic and financial powers: it is in fact a social institution, a common good that needs to be de-privatized.

The proposed measures have to do with regulating the financial markets, prohibiting speculative practices, and exercising control over finances. But they will only make sense if the scope of financial activity is reduced and regulated, especially where the financialization of agricultural and food goods are concerned, as well as of the common goods that are essential to life (water, biodiversity, air, energy, land), the social common goods (health, education), and

the common goods of knowledge. Finally, it is necessary to put an end to shareholder dictatorship and to move toward economic democracy.

Proposals:

- ⚖ socialize financial institutions and banks: separate investment banks from lending banks; prohibit derived products; recognize and support social and complementary currency, and have solidarity finance deployed by local and regional authorities and under social solidarity economy;

- ⚖ prohibit tax havens and persecute all forms of corruption and financial piracy;

- ⚖ integrate the international financial institutions into the United Nations system and subordinate these institutions to social, ecological, and political rights as defined within this framework;

- ⚖ carry out a citizens' audit of the global debt;

- ⚖ increase public funds; tax financial transactions; make differentiated state contributions to public funds mandatory, have these managed within the United Nations framework in order to put an end to the financialization of natural resources (soil, forests, water, biodiversity), and commence the ecological and social transition;

- ⚖ regulate agricultural and food markets and prohibit derived products;

- ⚖ define rules to get common goods out of their domination by finance;

- ⚖ set up an international court to judge ecological and social crimes, and non-compliance with these rules.

Wealth – Distribution – Needs – Good Living and Temperance

Global economic growth, including green growth, is the problem, not the solution: although it can lead in the short run and at the microeconomic level to reducing monetary poverty, it generates unbearable global inequalities, uses up non-renewable resources and engenders wars to control them, locks work and nature into a productivist system, and denies the rights of peoples, in particular those of indigenous peoples submitted to extractivist policies. The societies we want are those of good living, of temperance, and of the collective and democratic definition of their needs and limits.

Our proposals:

- ⚖ apply the principle of a minimum income and a maximum income;

- ⚖ give priority to development of collective consumption in order to improve, in particular, the living conditions of the most precarious populations and to guarantee ecological sustainability: transportation, housing, education, health, energy, and culture.

- these goods and services will be guaranteed by the states as well as by grassroots communities within the framework of social and solidarity economy;

- define new rights to guarantee access to fundamental goods; these rights can be guaranteed by making these goods free or practically free up to a certain amount, then through progressive rates depending on consumption.

Sovereignty – Deglobalization – Demonopolization – Relocation

- Globalization destroys the diversity of societies and their capacity to build themselves autonomously. As a consequence, international cooperation has regressed dramatically and left behind it the temptation to withdraw into nationalism or identitarianism.

- In order to recover the political capacity to choose paths for the transition into international solidarity and its construction, the following is necessary:

- recognition of food sovereignty: peoples and communities must once again be able to manage for themselves what they grow, and decide on how they will grow it and on their nutritional choices;

- recognition of energy sovereignty: implementation of temperate energy systems and fight against energy insecurity; recognition of the right to quality, non-polluting energy services as a fundamental and inalienable human right; a publicly managed, relocated, and decentralized energy system, as well as energy options decided democratically; promotion of renewable energy and implementation of simple and appropriate technology instead of moving toward geoengineering and artificialization of the Earth;

- relocation of activities according to the subsidiarity principle: priority to everything that can be produced locally or regionally;

- promotion of local and regional trade and bringing free-trade agreements into question; promotion of fair and equitable trade;

- social management of land; the right to access land for farmers; the right to access land for women;

- protection of traditional knowledge and promotion of simple and appropriate technology.

The Green Economy: A New Phase of Capitalist Expansion

In the 1980s, faced with a crisis of profitability, capitalism launched a massive offensive against workers and peoples, seeking to increase profits by expanding markets and reducing costs through trade and financial liberalization, flexibilization of labor, and privatization of the state sector. This massive structural adjustment became known as the Washington Consensus.

Today, faced with an even more complex and deeper crisis, capitalism is launching a new attack that combines the old austerity measures of the Washington Consensus—as we are witnessing in Europe—with an offensive to create new sources of profit and growth through the Green Economy. Although capitalism has always been based on the exploitation of labor

and nature, this new phase of capitalist expansion seeks to exploit and profit by giving a price value to the essential life-giving capacities of nature.

The Rio de Janeiro Earth Summit of 1992 institutionalized important foundations for international cooperation on sustainable development, such as "polluter pays," common but differentiated responsibilities, and the precautionary principle. But Rio also institutionalized the concept of "sustainable development" based on "sustainable growth." In 1992, the Rio Conventions acknowledged for the first time the rights of indigenous communities and their central contributions to the preservation of biodiversity. But, in the same documents, the industrialized countries and corporations received the guarantee that the seeds and genetic resources that they gained through centuries of colonial domination would be protected through intellectual property rights.

In 2012, the plunder continues. The Green Economy is an attempt to expand the reach of finance capital and integrate into the market all that remains of nature. The Green Economy aims to do this by giving a "value" or a "price" to biomass, biodiversity, and the functions of the ecosystems—such as storing carbon, pollinating crops, or filtering water—in order to integrate these "services" as tradable units in the financial market.

The Green Economy is an ambitious global project that seeks to disassociate economic growth from environmental deterioration through a three-dimensional capitalism that includes physical capital, human capital, and natural capital (rivers, wetlands, forests, coral reefs, biological diversity and other elements). For the Green Economy, the food crisis, the climate crisis, and the energy crisis share a common characteristic: the failed allocation of capital. As a result, the Green Economy treats nature as capital—"natural capital." The Green Economy considers it essential to put a price on the free services that plants, animals, and ecosystems offer to humanity in order to "sustainably manage" biodiversity, water purification, pollination of plants, the protection of coral reefs, and regulation of the climate. For the Green Economy, it is necessary to identify the specific functions of ecosystems and biodiversity and assign them a monetary value, evaluate their current status, set a limit after which they will cease to provide services, and concretize in economic terms the cost of their conservation in order to develop a market for each particular environmental service. For the Green Economy, the instruments of the market are powerful tools for managing the "economic invisibility of nature."

The main targets of the Green Economy are the developing countries, where there is the richest biodiversity. The "zero draft" even acknowledges that a new round of "structural adjustments" will be necessary: "developing countries are facing great challenges in eradicating poverty and sustaining growth, and a transition to a green economy will require structural adjustments which may involve additional costs to their economies . . ."

But the Green Economy is not a fiction of the future: it is already here. As the zero draft states, "We support policy frameworks and market instruments that effectively slow, halt and reverse deforestation and forest degradation." This is referring to REDD (Reducing Emissions through Deforestation and Forest Degradation), an initiative of the UNFCCC which consists of isolating and measuring the capacity of forests to capture and store carbon dioxide in order to issue certificates for greenhouse-gas-emissions reductions that can be commercialized and acquired by companies in developed countries that cannot meet their emission reduction commitments. We have already seen that the market for carbon credits based on forests will lead to: a) noncompliance with effective emission-reduction commitments by developed countries; b) the bulk of resources being appropriated by intermediaries and financial entities and rarely benefitting countries, indigenous peoples, and forests themselves; c) the generation

of speculative bubbles based on the sale and purchase of said certificates; and d) the establishment of new property rights over the capacity of forests to capture carbon dioxide, which will clash with the sovereign rights of states and the indigenous peoples that live in forests.

The postulates promoted under the Green Economy are wrong. The current environmental and climate crisis is not a simple market failure. The solution is not to put a price on nature. Nature is not a form of capital. It is wrong to say that we only value that which has a price, an owner, and brings profits. The market mechanisms that permit exchange among human beings and nations have proven incapable of contributing to an equitable distribution of wealth. The main challenge for the eradication of poverty is not to grow forever, but to achieve an equitable distribution of the wealth that is possible under the limits of the Earth system. In a world in which 1% of the population controls 50% of the wealth of the planet, it will not be possible to eradicate poverty or restore harmony with nature.

The Green Economy is a cynical and opportunistic manipulation of the ecological and social crises. Rather than addressing the real structural causes of inequality and injustices, capital is using "green" language to launch a new round of expansion. Corporations and the financial sector need governments to institutionalize the new rules of the Green Economy to guarantee them against risks and to create the institutional framework for the financialization of nature. Many governments are willing partners in this project as they believe it will stimulate a new phase of growth and accumulation.

About action

Stop the Green Monster! "The future we don't want!"

A bottom-up international campaign against the Green Economy

The zero draft for Rio+20 named "The Future we want" was published in January 2012 with the main purpose of promoting the "Green Economy." In the zero draft, this concept of the Green Economy remains deliberately vague: there is no clear definition provided and no clarity on the usage of this term. In reality, it promotes the further Commodification and Financialization of Nature with the introduction of new market mechanisms. Carbon Markets were first introduced 10 years ago through the Kyoto Protocol and via REDD (Reduced Emissions from Deforestation and Degradation) programs which involved giving a monetary price to carbon storage in forests. But a broader concept of Green Economy was fully developed in November 2011 in the "Green Economy Report" published by the UNEP (United Nations Environment Program).

There are several obstacles in achieving this objective. Firstly, and most importantly, there will be the resistance of the affected peoples, the indigenous communities, the small farmers, the poor countries, etc., and the Climate Justice Movements. Secondly, within the UN there are also differing positions: some countries do not want to give nature a monetary value nor have nature controlled by the market; another group of countries is concerned with the internalization costs of externalities; while another group of countries are reluctant to give a price to nature which could open the door for a world market on carbon gas emissions. We can stop this Green Economy project if we are able to begin a worldwide campaign quickly: "Stop the Green Monster! The Future we don't want!" This campaign can target the Rio+20 Conference with national actions and mobilizations, and an international mobilization during the conference itself between the 15th and the 23rd of June 2012.

A Energy Transition Is Urgent and Is Possible

The key element in any decarbonization strategy seeking **to promote sustainability has to be an initial and massive extension of renewable energies and their necessary infrastructure.** In addition, to ensure an effective transition from fossil to renewable energies, efforts must not focus exclusively on the quantity of new energy produced. Changing energy sources is a slow process, held back by technological, cultural and institutional inertia. Sustainability can only succeed if this technological effort goes hand in hand with a gradual but deep-reaching change in wasteful lifestyles, especially in industrialized and recently industrialized countries, making energy savings and energy efficiency a real possibility.

It is vital that countries that are planning to use or increase use of nuclear energy abandon these projects as soon as possible. The risks of nuclear installations have already been fully proven and it is impossible to overlook the still unresolved problems of final storage and the danger of uncontrolled proliferation. Existing installations must be replaced by renewable technologies or simply closed down as soon as possible. Naturally, the gradual but accelerating elimination of nuclear energy must not be compensated for by an increase in energy from fossil sources, particularly coal-based sources.

We need **to implement public policies that stimulate investments in industry, technology and research into renewable energy sources.** In parallel, subsidies to businesses producing fossil energy should be abolished and their taxes should be raised. States can use their purchasing power to influence prices so that they favor businesses producing renewable energy and penalize those producing energy based on fossil sources. In support of these technological and industrial developments, states as well as businesses and social and solidarity economy organizations need **to implement industrial or circular ecology** mechanisms that foster synergies between productive processes. Similarly, we need to promote new businesses that offer functional services for meeting housing, transport, communications and other needs that do not require burdensome installations, but that **promote a functionality economy** wherein the accent is on free-flowing service rather than onerous machinery and infrastructure.

This industrial, technological and institutional coordination requires the development of a broad-based space by means of **a transnational reconfiguration of territories** that corresponds to new renewable energy sources. The key element here is the linking up of various sources that require an integrated supply system for wind, photovoltaic, solar, thermal, tidal and biomass energy, among others. This "energy territory", as we could call it, would extend far beyond national frontiers.

Climate protection is absolutely key to sustainability. This is why **global decarbonization goals need to be established straight away and met before the end of this second decade**. A sustainable world can only be built with new energy sources and climate protection. We also need to take special care to ensure the survival of systems comprising other natural assets, such as fertile land and biological diversity.

Nonetheless, we cannot overlook the fact that **the drastic and accelerated reduction of carbon emissions can only succeed if it is based on a shared objective applied simultaneously in most parts of the world. And herein lies the weak link in the chain.** Neither governments, anchored in a state system delineated by frontiers and interests that do not correspond to ecosystem-related factors, nor transnational corporations, focused exclusively on their specific strategies, are capable of meeting the challenges of energy transition, climate protection and the planet's sustainability.

It is therefore important to take a firm stand and implement energy policies right away with a number of goals:

achieve fully decarbonized energy systems by 2050 at the latest. World demand for final energy should not increase and should not rise above the levels vital to life and the planet by 2050. This challenge is a crucial imperative. Without seeking to be alarmist, there is plenty of scientific and empirical evidence proving that humanity has exceeded the limits of our ecosystems' physical viability;

during this period, prioritize **access to renewable energy for over three thousand million people** currently living in conditions of energy poverty;

channel urban development away from accelerated urbanization and toward **sustainable urban policies**;

ensure that use of **land and fishing resources** respects conditions compatible with climate protection, particularly forestry and farming;

as regards land use, **land grabbing must be curbed** and the priority given to putting a rapid end to deforestation and damage to forests and fostering low-carbon agriculture;

support research into sustainable technologies and promote the international transfer of low-carbon technologies;

encourage education that is respectful of life and the planet, especially for the children and young people who are the planet's future and will be the inhabitants of a sustainable world.

4. Political Subjects, Architecture of Power, and Democracy

The Commons

A Kaleidoscope of Social Practices for another Possible World

The commons (some call it common goods) are not simply shared "goods." The term refers to social practices based on the principle of commoning (the making of a commons). The goals of a commoning process are clearly different from the typical practices of the state / market duopoly. Furthermore, the commons are a useful conceptual framework to analyze the future that we want. The commons functions like a different operating system at the level of community and probably (here is where the challenge lies) for the entire society, provided we devise appropriate institutions and policies. Hence, the construction of this conceptual framework is a dynamic process. It requires everyone to listen to what each social movement understands to be a commons. It is necessary to know more about the specific practices of commoning, whether they are embodied in indigenous and peasant communities, local seed banks, non-market-based initiatives of urban housing, or communities of developers of digital culture and software. We must understand the similarities of enclosure that each field is suffering, the silent as well as the well-known ones. This mutual awareness can help us to find a way to overcome crippling dualisms like public and private, state and market, individual and collective. In this way we aspire to create new settings that are structured according to creative principles of governance that arise from the bases.

Resistance and Construction: Commons, Commoning

The processes of enclosure face resistance. And most of them can be analyzed from a commons perspective. The resistance is also propelled by proposals for alternatives that emanate from the social practices of the commons. These practices form an alternative framework for the transformation of daily life as well as for the design of new public norms and policies that recognize self-management as the central element for a necessary social transformation.

Some examples of the variety of experiences, innovations and productions based on the commons are, among many others: strategies of collaborative consumption associated with barter and the practice of sharing; systems of community management of shared resources like forests, waterways and fishing grounds; and numerous initiatives that are building digital commons. Together these commons constitute a rich kaleidoscope of working models based on self-determination and collective management of shared resources. The social practices related to this paradigm naturally vary and yet they also have common features. A principal one is that they exemplify the idea that one's self-fulfillment depends on the fulfillment of the others, and vice versa, and that this mutual concern blurs the borders between individual and collective interests.

Contradictions, concerns and challenges

Obviously, during this process of building a Commons Sector, the challenges are manifold. One of the most recurrent is the tension between the local, the regional and the global. It is impossible to think of commoning without thinking about a social subject, a "community." It is therefore easiest to think about the commons paradigm at a local level. But thinking about the commons at a global level is a great challenge, and even impossible to escape because there is only one earth and we have not only the right but the responsibility to share it. Confronted with this challenge, it is fair to ask: What should be the role of a state that conceives itself as a defender of the commons?

Even while these explorations must proceed, it is necessary to name the commons in order to consolidate alternatives to the current state/market model and to visualize and communicate the alternatives. Nevertheless, our language is so permeated by the terminology of the state/market system and that of ideologies having a different mindset that a major challenge is to develop a new vocabulary that truly describes the world we want. Resolving the conundrum of "common goods that are not goods" cannot be a closed process. This is why we invite you to help us build this vocabulary collectively in a way that we can adapt to the diversity of contexts in which we each act.

The commons are right before our eyes. Together we will find methods for naming them and, even more important, for converting them into a diversity of governance systems based on the principles of commoning.

Civil Society Organizations and Social Movements

The Rio Conference in 1992 was a milestone with regard to the emergence of civil society organizations and relevant actors in international negotiations on environment and development. Since then, its presence in areas of global governance has increased significantly, organizing campaigns and advocacy strategies to influence government decisions and multilateral commitments, monitoring or charging more effective arrangements for the promotion of social and environmental justice.

The incidence power of these new global actors was only possible thanks to its ability to combine direct experience with environmental and social community problems in different regions of the globe with the development of networks and forums nationally and internationally, integrating the specific demands of groups in broad agendas of universal values such as human rights, equality and diversity, democracy and common goods.

To the extent that their ability to focus and criticize governments policies increases, civil society organizations and social movements are also increasingly attacked by campaigns of delegitimization and criminalization. The lack of adequate legislation and government-transparency mechanisms, especially in the global South, favored the misuse of NGO legal status for illegal transfers of public resources. Organizations in the North also come to be questioned on the basis of the technocratic logic of value for money, which creates difficulties for political action in partnership with organizations and social movements in the global South.

In this context, besides the thematic networks and movements (focusing on women's rights, children and adolescents or indigenous peoples, the struggle against AIDS, racism, fair trade or agro-ecology, for example), associations or platforms of non- governmental organizations have come to play an important political role, affirming the legitimacy of these organizations as promoters of social transformation in the perspective of social and environmental justice.

The Official Development Assistance is now the object of criticism and alternative proposals by non-governmental organizations and trade unions on all continents. ODA are donations made by a small group of 34 OECD member countries (which economically dominate the others) to support development projects, humanitarian aid, grants or debt relief for poor countries. Although such assistance may in part result from a genuine solidarity of citizens of these countries in relation to communities living in extreme poverty and oppression in the South, the fact is that this practice has always been contaminated by the dominant logic of the productivist/consumerist capitalist system, the authoritarian logic of imperialism, expropriation, concentration of resources and market expansion.

Civil-society movements and organizations are often subjected to, but are increasingly challenging the limits of the imperialist logic of Official Development Assistance, rejecting mere palliative provision of basic services, and trying to act on the causes of poverty and socio-environmental disasters. These organizations are increasingly adopting the perspective of social, economic, political, and environmental rights, and require nation states and multilateral public policies that are able to secure them in their entirety. Not only are they undertaking innovative experiments in the social, political and economic organizations in the community level, but civil society movements are also increasingly articulated in global citizenship movements for democracy, social justice and environmental sustainability.

The worsening of poverty and inequality in the North, on the one hand, and the willingness of emerging economies to share successful social technologies with partners in the South or the North favored greater horizontal relations of cooperation between countries. However, the economic and political expansionism of the emerging nations is now much less subject to social oversight by the democratic countries of the North. Emerging economies are making progress, but continue with social, environmental, and political issues that are being exported on a growing scale.

For democracy, solidarity and respect for life to prevail against the expansionist and authoritarian logic of capitalism production-consumption, which generates inequality and

destruction around the planet, in the North and South, as well as in emerging economies, the organizations and civil society movements call for:

- ⚕ the right of free association and expression;

- ⚕ the right of access to legitimate public and private resources, in a safe and enabling legal framework;

- ⚕ increased social participation in formulating, implementing, monitoring and evaluation of public policies, including the foreign policies of countries and multilateral agencies;

- ⚕ the expansion of funding for promoting democracy, social and environmental justice and international cooperation, including through new mechanisms such as taxation of financial transactions and of large fortunes;

- ⚕ the end of the so-called tied aid and conditionalities in international cooperation policies;

- ⚕ submission of foreign policy, trade, and international economic investment to democratic ownership in the countries involved, to the principles of solidarity, justice and respect of life.

Governance and the Architecture of Power

The need for a paradigm shift

It has become evident that we have reached a historical stage in which a deep change of the system of governance is urgent. This is not only about an institutional change, setting up a Council or other institution for sustainable development. We need to change the paradigm, not to continue with obsolete visions that claim they can respond to the new challenges by setting up institutions that will be born with their hands tied.

Need to rethink our ethical foundations

In order to not limit ourselves to purely institutional reform it is essential for us to rethink the ethical foundations of the new architecture of world governance. The ethical dimension is vital. By exploring and taking full account of the ethical foundations that have sustained civilizations we will learn to overcome our differences. How can we reconstruct what is universal from civilizations?

The new principles of governance

The new principles must go beyond national borders and make states, companies, and also citizens responsible, each according to their possibilities, in their individual and collective responsibilities to the general interest, that of the planet and of its inhabitants. These principles imply new requirements regarding the legitimacy of collective action, citizenship exercised in respect of human rights, and the resolution of tensions between the local, the national, and the global.

Self-determination and the Sovereignty of peoples

Today like yesterday, it is imperative to reaffirm that the self-determination and the sovereignty of peoples, and the absence of discrimination among peoples constitute the

founding pillars of international relations. Any reform of the United Nations system must be guided to protect them, reinforce them, and demand their justiciability. In order to guarantee these principles, world peace and security are essential conditions.

Building a new world architecture of governance

At the same time it is evident that the governance of relations among states as regulated by the United Nations system after World War II, and in the later decolonization period, is no longer valid. Twenty years have gone by since the 1992 Earth Summit in Rio. The world has continued to change, deeply, quickly, and the challenges are not only still pending, they have become urgent. Added to deep social inequalities are the planetary risks of an irreversible deterioration of life and of the planet caused by the systematic crisis of the dominant capitalist model, a regime based on the appropriation and private control of production and on consumption guided to maximizing profit.

Any reform of the United Nations system must be genuinely democratic

In this perspective, Rio+20 is an opportunity in the short run. We must take advantage of it to the utmost, but knowing that the new architecture of democratic governance is a long-term process. Against this background, any reform of the United Nations system that will open new democratic spaces is an urgent necessity. But the important thing is that the reforms do not only seek to reduce the fragmentation related to the agencies concerned with the social, economic, and ecological pillars, but that, above all, it is imperative to make sure that the social representation of non-state actors and movements are neither monopolized or confined to a few already established NGOs or corporations. Representation must be democratized by giving forums to delegates elected from the different territories and regions and from the different networks and articulations of indigenous peoples, workers, fishermen, women, young people, local and territorial authorities, consumers, migrants, inhabitants, and other democratically organized social actors on a global scale.

World governance must be considered as a common good

Any reform of the United Nations system must be financed. It must therefore be supported in terms of financial and other resources, by all the actors: states, companies, and citizens, in proportion to their responsibilities and possibilities. On this basis, development aid must completely be rethought and oriented to a fair redistribution of wealth and to political solidarity among the states. Financing for common goods, including to reform the United Nations system, must come from a deep reorganization of the international financial and monetary system. It is necessary to face the tyranny of financial and speculative capital once and for all, and to channel the resources to finance global public goods. This also entails channeling resources to finance the change of the redistribution model, as well as of the energy matrix by implementing an effective decarbonization strategy and making the massive extension of renewable energies a priority. New indicators of sustainability and social justice are needed to guide and monitor these priority goals.

Rethinking and changing the international security system

These proposals for the democratization of the United Nations agencies related to sustainability issues will inescapably have to be defined and implemented in the issues related to international peace and security. A democratic rebalancing of the balance of power in the

Security Council and its opening to new actors, not only to states that will remain marginal, but in addition to social actors and organizations from the different territories and regions, as well as to networks and organizations at a global scale, will also have to be part of the bodies that watch over the security of life, of the peoples, and of the planet. Thus sustainability and peace will be the two legs with which humankind will be able to keep moving forward in this transition phase we are crossing.

The exigencies of a radicalization of democracy require deeper changes than reforms of the institutional UN systems. Inventing the new political systems able to express democratically all the energies of the peoples and of each citizen in the 21st century has become a historical task. This challenge calls for a politically committed Utopia and creative thinking so that, as in the periods of historical change that have come up in all civilizations, today at the beginning of the 21st century, we, the citizens and peoples of the world, can build the new social and political instruments that will make it possible to solve the deep problems of this age.