

Consultation for a Manifesto on Democracy and Sustainable Development: Taking Stock

*Background paper for FDSD/Salzburg Global Seminar Synthesis
Workshop: Schloss Leopoldskron, 12th-14th December 2012*



Help us start the ripple effect

political parties
local authorities
businesses
youth movements
parliaments
civil society
schools
media
unions
scientists

Find out more about
the world's first people's
manifesto for sustainable development,
add your ideas and register to stay in touch

www.fdsd.org/manifesto

 FOUNDATION FOR DEMOCRACY
AND SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT

Halina Ward
with additional contributions from Nicolò Wojewoda

December 2012 (and edited February 2013)

Table of Contents

Part A: Manifesto for a green and fair democracy, Mark 1

Our Vision.....p.5

Principles and Commitments.....p.6

Principle 1: Cultivate the basics of a flourishing democracy.....p.6

Principle 2: Commit to education and learning as foundations of change....p.7

Principle 3: Re-balance knowledge, participation and representation.....p.8

Principle 4: Separate democracy from unsustainable economic growth.....p.9

Principle 5: Ensure that people everywhere count, from the local to the global.....p.10

Principle 6: Take the long view.....p.11

Principle 7: Deepen democracy in strategic decisions on the infrastructure and technologies for sustainability; strengthen local capacities.....p.12

Part B: Analysis of Consultation responses and rationale for Mark 1 Manifesto

Background: why a Manifesto?.....p.14

Starting points for the Manifesto.....p.15

The consultation process.....p.15

Statistics.....p.20

What makes a good Manifesto?.....p.23

How to read the Mark 1 Manifesto.....p.24

The significance of ‘sign-on’p.25

The idea of the ripple effect.....p.25

Democracy, religion and values.....p.26

General consultation feedback (and our responses).....	p.27
Revising the Manifesto: feedback on vision, principles and commitments.....	p.31
Vision.....	p.31
Principles and commitments.....	p.31
Suggestions for additional principles.....	p.33

Part C: Principle by Principle analysis of consultation responses

Principle 1: Cultivate the basics of a flourishing democracy.....	p.34
Reactions to the consultation draft.....	p.34
Proposed commitments.....	p.40
Proposed resources.....	p.43

Principle 2: Commit to education and learning as foundations of change.....	p.43
Reactions to the consultation draft.....	p.43
Proposed commitments.....	p.47
Proposed resources.....	p.50

Principle 3: Re-balance knowledge, participation and representation.....	p.51
Reactions to the consultation draft.....	p.51
Proposed commitments.....	p.56
Proposed resources.....	p.57

Principle 4: Separate democracy from unsustainable economic growth.....	p.57
Reactions to the consultation draft.....	p.62
Proposed commitments.....	p.62

Proposed resources.....	p.66
-------------------------	------

Principle 5: Ensure that people everywhere count, from the local to the global.....p.68

Reactions to the consultation draft.....	p.68
Proposed commitments.....	p.75
Proposed resources.....	p.76

Principle 6: Take the long view.....p.76

Reactions to the consultation draft.....	p.77
Proposed commitments.....	p.77
Proposed resources.....	p.82

Principle 7: Deepen democracy in strategic decisions on the infrastructure and technologies for sustainability; strengthen local capacities.....p.83

Reactions to the consultation draft.....	p.84
Proposed commitments.....	p.88
Proposed resources.....	p.89

Tables and Boxes

Table 1: Consultation workshops and events.....	p.18
Table 2: Summary of individual consultation responses.....	p.22
Table 3: Summary of Consultation responses by type and event.....	p.24

Box 1: Inter-American Democratic Charter.....	p.43
Box 2: AmericaSpeaks.....	p.49
Box 3: Intelligence Squared.....	p.50
Box 4: Kubatana.....	p.50
Box 5: Experts engaging the public.....	p.57
Box 6: Energy democracy.....	p.67
Box 7: CASSE's Enough is Enough.....	p.67
Box 8: Civil, political, and social citizenship.....	p.71
Box 9: Museum of the Future.....	p.83

Part A: Manifesto for a green and fair democracy, Mark 1

Our Vision

We cherish democracy, the rule of the people by the people for the people.

Democracy has multiple forms, and a diversity in all of its different settings that befits our humanity. Yet we recognise that democracy can always improve and must always adapt. It is unfinished.

Democracy is essential if we are to find ways of ensuring that we can meet the needs of people now without compromising the ability of future generations to meet their own needs. Only true democracy promises a decision-making system that can unlock the innate potential of all human beings to flourish as equals and continually lend strength to marginalised voices.

Democracy should promote the health and wellbeing of the earth's natural systems, enhance the quality of relationships between people and nature, and secure fairness for all, now and in the future. All people are created equal, unique and beautiful with a right to a fullness of life.

We care deeply about the natural environment on which we all depend and of which we are part. We want to hand down to our children and their children a thriving natural environment and the wisdom, confidence and knowledge to live together joyfully and peacefully.

Democracy today must find ways to anticipate and cope with rapidly developing economic, social and environmental challenges in a crowded world. But it is threatened by conflict, apathy, exclusion, corruption, manipulation and dishonesty; weakened by wars waged in pursuit of economic interests not the interests of sovereign people; undermined by global decision-making that is driven by the short-term interests of individual nations, not our shared needs as human beings.

Financial hardship, natural disasters, lack of access to affordable energy and food, climate change and population growth - all of these challenges call for solutions founded in more, not less, democracy. More not less democracy is the right way to build strong and vibrant communities and enlightened leadership.

By signing this Manifesto we renew our commitment to democracy. We pledge to play our full part in creating systems of democracy that are inspired by the necessity of bringing

environmental social and economic fairness to the world's people, now and in the future.

We care deeply about unfairness and injustice between people who are alive today, no matter where they were born or where they live. We do not want the unfairness and inequality that exist in the present to be our legacy to future generations.

Democracy, and the shared human values needed to guide social and environmental justice, are at the heart of the way forward.

We the people must be the source of the change that we want. We must show our leaders the way so that they can lead. What we jointly create through our efforts to implement this Manifesto is part of our bequest to future generations. We have faith that we are not alone.

Principles and Commitments

Principle 1: Cultivate the basics of a flourishing democracy

Sustainable development needs democracy to flourish and reinforces the need for urgent action to address the multiple current problems in the practice of democracy from local to global levels.

Democracy is about much more than voting. Getting to flourishing democracy means a renewed commitment from all parts of society to enable vibrant and meaningful public participation and engagement in decision-making supported by providing citizenship education that empowers people with the knowledge and belief that they can make a difference; freedom from corruption; accountable politicians and elected representatives motivated by the public good and with backgrounds as diverse as the people who elect them; a free and independent media; wide rights of access to information and to justice; transparent decision-making; respect for the rule of legitimate law; deep commitment across all of society to upholding fundamental human rights; ensuring that the people as a whole, not economic or other vested interests are at the heart of democratic practice; and effective and continuous accountability of public decision-making to people affected.

Commitments

We will encourage our neighbours, our elected representatives, leaders of political and public institutions and of civil society around the world to adopt practices that demonstrate deep commitment to democracy with the people, not vested economic or other interests, at its heart.

We will call on civic leaders and elected representatives to show the leadership that is essential for democratic renewal to take place.

We will speak out to hold public officials and elected representatives accountable, and be active citizens.

We will aim to deepen cultures of democratic decision-making in the ways in which we interact with our neighbours near and far in both the real and virtual worlds, and encourage others to do the same.

Principle 2: Commit to education and learning as foundations of change

Education, whether it is formal or informal, is the process through which the knowledge and values needed to strengthen democratic action for sustainability are nurtured.

The earlier we can plant the seeds, the longer we can reap the benefits. Children and young people are the next generation of activists for a greener and fairer world and should have access to education to build the skills and knowledge to shape democracy so that it can deliver a healthy environment and fairness for all.

Education must empower all people, whatever their age, to be active as citizens and followers, and wise as leaders. It must help to unlock the potential of being, not having. It must ensure that people everywhere, including their representatives, have a deep understanding of their roles, responsibilities and rights in taking decisions for a healthy environment and fairness for all, now and in the future.

The knowledge and skills needed to engage, to deliberate, to respect difference, and to be inclusive in deed as well as mind, to enjoy the natural environment whilst pursuing what is fair for people now and in the future should be nurtured in all the places where the ideal of democracy is an inspiration – from producer cooperatives to building societies, from trades unions to community groups and residents' associations.

Commitments

We will speak out in favour of revitalised programmes of civic education that can enable people to be active, participative and engaged, and to build understanding of the case for democracy and its meanings and applications in different contexts.

We will advocate strong programmes of sustainability education, starting from an early age, to build understanding of the interlocking nature of environmental and social challenges around the world and of our relationship with the natural environment and future generations.

Recognising that it is not the job of government alone to lead education for active citizenship, democracy and sustainability, we will bring these issues together through our involvement in community groups and civil society organisations. We will use this Manifesto as a resource in that process.

Principle 3: Re-balance knowledge, participation and representation

Sustainable development needs informed and participatory decision-making in which expertise and science offer insights and inform policy.

The detailed knowledge and wisdom of ordinary people on practices and impacts of which they have first-hand experience (for example in rural farming communities) needs to be respected as expert evidence by elected representatives, public officials and other citizens.

Elected representatives and public officials should take seriously the advice and evidence of independent experts when a clear assessment of facts, impacts or possible future scenarios is needed.

Expert evidence is not a substitute for decision-making by the people. To the greatest extent possible, independent expert advice and evidence to elected representatives should be submitted to public scrutiny and feedback before decision-making.

Public investment should support objective research and the objective dissemination of findings and protect them from distortion by media funded by private corporate interests.

Where science is uncertain, or potential risks to the environment grave, leaders at all levels need to prepare people to play an active part in decision-making based on an assessment of available evidence and the identification of shared community values. These values should include respect for human rights and the overall common interest of nations and humanity as a whole, rather than pure self-interest.

Institutions and processes such as the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change which help to ensure that expert evidence is provided to elected representatives, policy-makers and citizens in decision-making related to sustainable development should incorporate opportunities for public scrutiny of and comment on the evidence. They should to the greatest extent feasible allow for the involvement of individual members of the public in their governance structures, whether based on election or on selection by lot.

Commitments

We will create and support initiatives designed to bring public scrutiny and engagement into international and national scientific processes that inform public decision-making on key sustainability challenges, including the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change.

Through our engagement and actions as citizens, we will make the case for evidence-based decision-making that values the expertise of first-hand experience as well as formal education and scientific inquiry.

We will speak out when we see that elected representatives and public officials rely too heavily on economic evidence and expertise, at the expense of expert evidence or first-hand knowledge of social or environmental impacts and options.

We will speak out in favour of a greater role for evidence-based decisions that are grounded in deliberation and strong community values and responsibilities, not just the rights and interests of individuals.

Principle 4: Separate democracy from unsustainable economic growth

Getting to a healthy environment and fairness for all, now and in the future, demands transformation of economic growth models that lead to environmental destruction, keep people in poverty, and open up huge gaps in income and resources between the richest and the poorest. Elected representatives and businesses need to commit to this process of transformation, not to put economic growth first.

Democracy needs to drive the economy, not the other way round. Economies must support us, as people, to find ways to innovate, grow, and do things in ways that are both green and fair. We need systems of democracy that are free from vested economic interests driven by pursuit of short-term profit.

Commitments

We will support development of measures of progress that value fairness, happiness and the environment, and their adoption by governments and public bodies. We will speak out against the inappropriate use of economic growth or employment indicators that fail to take these measures into account.

We will encourage governments to make sustainable development among the central organising principles of public policy and public bodies and to develop institutions and accountability mechanisms to support this.

We will support regulation to ensure full transparency in the funding of political parties and candidates and place limits on private finance for political campaigns.

We will support reforms at national and international level to ensure that the purpose of enterprises is to contribute to delivering a healthy environment and fairness for all now and in the future, rather than short-term profit.

We will support and experiment with forms of collaborative enterprise that strengthen democracy and a green and fair economy.

We will commit to lifestyles that demonstrate that it is the will of the people that our elected representatives prioritise action to deliver a healthy environment and fairness for all, now and in the future.

Principle 5: Ensure that people everywhere count, from the local to the global

Ensuring fairness for all, now and in the future, means that democracy from the local to the global level should value everyone in society, including people who are not currently given rights to vote.

The interests of all people affected by public decisions, as well as the needs of future generations and our common interest as people in maintaining a healthy environment, need to be taken into account by decision-makers at all levels. Children and young people are particularly important: if we fail to create systems that include children and young people, our political futures will be bleak indeed. An inclusive people-centred democracy should also reflect the inherent value of maintaining healthy ecosystems. Democracy is not the sum of the individual wishes of powerful elites, or even people who are given a vote or who choose actively to participate in decision-making.

Ensuring that people everywhere count means that a practice that seems ‘sustainable’ at local level shouldn’t be implemented by passing burdens onto neighbouring communities who have had no direct say or representation. Equally, sustainability at national level should not be pursued by passing environmental burdens to communities in other countries or by impacting on the ability of people in other countries to meet their needs.

Sustainable development is a global challenge and a global responsibility. It cannot be achieved by democracy based in national and local elections alone. We do not want to be governed at world level by people who have only been elected to do so at national level. We do not want to be governed by international organisations that do not represent us adequately. At regional and global levels, it is the ideal of democracy that needs to become the basis for decision-making, not the self-interest of individual nation states. Sustainability demands that democracy burst out of its national borders.

Commitments

We will support and experiment with approaches to bringing the interests and needs of people who have not been given a vote, including for example children, refugees, and people in other countries, into democracy at national and local levels.

We will support and experiment with initiatives designed to build public awareness of the interconnectedness of people everywhere and nature.

We will support and experiment with legal and institutional ways to enhance the importance of natural systems and nature in democratic decision-making.

We will support leaders and elected representatives who seek to forge new ways of balancing participatory decision-making and responsibility and accountability to their

electorate with regard for the common interest in delivering a healthy environment and fairness for all, now and in the future.

We will support initiatives designed to secure formal equality of voting power at the international level, so that the votes of states are proportional to the sizes of their populations.

We will support reforms designed to ensure that international institutions are accountable to parliaments rather than to the governments of nation states, and to ensure that their processes are transparent and open to public scrutiny.

We will support the campaign for a UN Parliamentary Assembly as the first step towards creating a system of global democracy beyond the narrow interests of states.

Principle 6: Take the long view

From the local to the global, the practice of democracy urgently needs to find ways to get beyond the short-termism of electoral cycles and company balance-sheets and to take account of the uncertainties which surround our efforts to take care of the future.

Democracy must plan for, human needs and the earth's natural boundaries in both the long and the short-term.

Commitments

We will advocate and support the development of institutions and policy approaches that are designed to bring future generations and longer-term thinking and evidence into political processes from the local to the global.

We will support political leaders who are accountable and committed to strong leadership for long-term sustainability by acknowledging and supporting their space to lead.

Through our active citizenship, participation and engagement, we will act as advocates for future generations and for the long-term collective interest in sustainability, be it at local, national or international levels.

Principle 7: Deepen democracy in strategic decisions on the infrastructure and technologies for sustainability; strengthen local capacities

A) Deepening democracy in strategic decisions on the infrastructure and technologies for sustainability

Strategic decision-making about the infrastructure and technology to meet the needs of the present without compromising the ability of future generations to meet their own needs must be long-term, inclusive, participatory, transparent and fair.

In such decision-making at national level, opportunities for public input must go further than passive consultation to provide opportunities for citizens to deliberate expert evidence and

offer ongoing scrutiny of decision-making. People need to know in advance whether representation, expert evidence, participation or informed deliberation – or which combinations of these - will determine what counts and what happens next.

At local level, when decisions over priorities for sustainability mean new projects, technologies or practices, legal, institutional and policy frameworks must provide directly affected people with meaningful opportunities to influence what is implemented. Concerns of principle should be accommodated to the greatest extent consistent with respect for legitimate and inclusive long-term strategic decision-making.

Independent evidence of the overall pros and cons of new projects and practices from national and global sustainability perspectives should be made available in accessible forms to communities involved in local decision-making and implementation.

Structures for representation of diverse citizen interests through civil society groups are important to strategic decision-making over key sustainability choices. They must be transparent and accountable: they often participate in decision-making before people likely to be affected by implementation at local level can be directly identified.

B) Strengthen local capacities for sustainability decision-making

Sustainability needs to be built from the bottom up. This means that communities must have access to the decision-making spaces and assets they need to innovate for sustainability and shape their own futures, with due regard for the wellbeing of others, future generations, and the health of the environment.

Strong civic leadership and institutions at local level are essential to supporting cultures of inclusive and deliberative community participation and encouraging local solutions to environmental and social challenges.

Commitments

We will advocate for the development of new consultation and participation approaches designed to enhance the quality and breadth of public input into strategic choices over sustainability, for example on issues including renewable energy, energy and transport infrastructure, and food production systems. Such approaches must be tailored to national and local contexts.

When new strategies, projects and technologies for sustainability generate costs and benefits beyond the immediate local level, we will encourage the development and application of tools including online approaches to advance practices of deliberative consultation, and participatory decision-making methods that involve direct representation of and open deliberation by transparently selected groups of citizens, so long as this is appropriate to our geographical, technological and cultural settings.

We will support and call for public sector and civil society investment in the institutions, skills and networks needed to enable informed, inclusive and deliberative participation and decision-making for sustainability at local level.

We will support transparency and accountability of civil society groups that participate in strategic decision-making over sustainability; particularly when they do so before directly affected individuals can be identified.

Part B: Analysis of consultation responses and rationale for Mark 1 Manifesto text

Why a Manifesto?

One of the main obstacles to any sort of major change is often a belief that ‘it can’t be done, in the time and on the scale required’. At FDSD, we often hear that kind of sentiment in our work.

The alternative to doing nothing is an outcome that’s worth actively avoiding: accelerating environmental pressures that trigger huge social challenges around the world and which may lead to the erosion of democracy and democratic institutions. It needn’t be that way though. The process of drawing up Iceland’s new constitution in the aftermath of the country’s financial crisis (see *Box 1* below), shows that crisis can actually lead to a deepening in democratic engagement, rather than erosion of civil rights or democratic institutions.

In Spain too, currently in the grip of a sovereign debt crisis with all its impacts, consultees we engaged with at a workshop in Madrid, led by IIDMA, were readily able to find ‘pluses’ as well as ‘minuses’ in the impacts of the crisis on the potential for democracy to work better for sustainable development. The potential that emerges from the rapid fortification of social movements was one positive feature, for example, among others.

Democracy matters and it needs to be cherished if it is to thrive and adapt to the pressures that climate change, resource scarcity and population growth will create. These are major reasons to invest time and effort in creating a Manifesto for change: a positive Manifesto for action on democracy and sustainable development. A Manifesto which focuses on those democracy challenges that are particularly tricky when it comes to the ability of democracy to deliver sustainable development.

There are plenty of different definitions of sustainable development; but one way of understanding it is to think of it as reflecting a combination of social justice and economic development linked to environmental protection and respect for the earth’s natural boundaries. Fairness between people alive today and fairness to future generations are also crucially important parts of the mix.

If one thinks of democracy as a way to achieve these outcomes, it becomes possible to offer some basic starting points, or principles, for a Manifesto for democracy and sustainable development. And it’s these sustainable development specific points of tension within the practice of democracy that we wanted the Manifesto for democracy and sustainable development to zero in on.

This is *not* about ‘democratisation’ or the process of spreading democracy to ‘non-democracies’. Rather, the Manifesto is concerned to improve the *practice* of democracy from the perspective of sustainable development. It’s about working to build a Manifesto for change so that in democracies, this most promising of political systems is properly equipped to adapt and evolve so that it can deliver sustainable development on the ground.

Starting points for the Manifesto

The consultation Process

We ‘soft-launched’ the Manifesto consultation process on the FDSO website in early June 2012, and then took the consultation process to Rio de Janeiro over the period June 2012, during the UN Conference on Sustainable Development.

We had no funds to offer potential partners around the world, and this meant that the consultation process evolved gradually, relying on generating voluntary, unpaid contributions to the process by interested organisations around the world. This had some significant limitations (most notably that we were not in a position to guarantee an even geographical spread in the consultations), but certainly seemed to be in line with the idea of generating a ‘ripple effect’ through the voluntary and self-motivated actions of interested people and civil society groups.



Aside from launch events in Rio de Janeiro and a series of stands and workshops in the UK, as well as an online consultation form, consultation workshops took place in Buenos Aires (led by Fundación Cambio Democrático – see *Annex G*), Madrid (led by IIDMA) and Manila (hosted by the Ateneo School of Government). There were also consultation events in

Pakistan through the Green Pakistan initiative, though it was not been possible at the time of writing to incorporate findings from these events and discussions in this report or in compiling the Mark 1 Manifesto. A summary note from the consultation process in Pakistan was later added as [Annex I](#).

The consultation process ended on November 30, 2012. Our final consultation workshop, led by partner NGO IIDMA, took place in Madrid on 29th November during Spain's national environmental congress, CONAMA.

The consultation process was based on a series of questions. In face to face conversations, we told consultees that our idea was that the Manifesto should be short (2-3 pages) and that it should contain a vision, principles and actions. We asked three sets of questions, designed to help us to develop the 'vision', 'principles' and 'actions' for inclusion in the Manifesto.

As to the first of these areas, the Vision, we asked consultees to offer suggestions on inspiring quotes, words and phrases that could either inspire the drafters of the Manifesto, or that they would like to see reflected directly in the Manifesto text (see [Annex B](#)). We then asked participants for feedback or new ideas on an initial set of six principles for inclusion in the Manifesto (see [Annex A](#)). Finally, we invited suggestion on the substantive areas for action that needed to be reflected in the Manifesto – or alternatively examples of existing 'good practice' in formal democracy or understanding democracy as a social system of organization – that could inspire the Manifesto's concrete 'actions'. We asked people to think about what 'could be' as well as positive examples of what 'is'. And we were also particularly concerned to encourage people not to focus on listing what is "bad" but coming up with ideas to further develop democracy.

Consultees offered ideas online (through forms on our website in English and in Spanish) and in person, as well as through events in the UK, Europe, Latin America and Asia. We also took account of a small number of *ad hoc* individual conversations with experts when compiling this report.

It proved to be hard work to get responses to the consultation – and immediately after the launch events in Rio de Janeiro we set ourselves a target of 300 individual responses by the time of the close of the consultation. We were able to meet and slightly exceed this target.

Table 1 below is a summary table of consultation events.

Table 1: Consultation workshops and events

Event	Participants	Where	When	Additional info
Cupula dos Povos	Members of the Brazilian public and people attending the 'People's Summit' in Flamengo Park during the 2012 UN Conference for Sustainable Development	Rio de Janeiro, Brazil		We set up a consultation table on two separate days. Lack of clear sign-posting meant that who we engaged with among Cupula dos Povos attendees was largely random.
Fair Ideas conference	Delegates (some 1500 registered in total) visiting our consultation stall	Rio de Janeiro, Brazil	June 16 th – 17 th	IIED gave us a stand at the event.
Choosing Our Future: Open and Participatory Sustainable Development Governance	Delegates (some 200 registered in total) visiting our consultation stall	Rio de Janeiro, Brazil	June 19 th	The Access Initiative, coordinated by the World Resources Institute, kindly gave us a stand at the event
Electoral Reform Society Annual Conference: Navigating the New Democracy	Delegates (some 120 registered in total for the event) visiting our consultation stall	London, UK	June 26 th	The Electoral Reform Society kindly offered us a consultation stand at the event
Social Liberal Forum Conference: Social Justice Across Generations	Delegates (some 200 registered in total??) visiting our consultation stall	London, UK	14 th July	We ran a consultation stall at this annual conference for Social Liberals within the Liberal Democratic Party

Student workshop	20-25	Manila, Philippines	August 16th	Ateneo School of Government organized a consultation session for students (mostly political science majors) studying on an environmental policy course. FDSD's Halina Ward facilitated the discussion via Skype
Green Party England and Wales Autumn Conference	Delegates (some 600 registered in total) visiting our consultation stall	Bristol, UK	September 7 th –10 th	We ran a consultation stall at this event
Friends of the Earth Local Groups conference	Delegates completed consultation questionnaires at our consultation stall	London, UK	September 14 th –16 th	We ran a consultation stall at the event
Labour Party Annual Conference	Delegates (some 5000 registered in total) visiting our consultation stall	Manchester, UK	September 30 th – October 4 th	We ran a consultation stall at the event
Democracy and sustainable development lecture/consultation discussion	30'ish (with eight students pre-completing consultation forms)	Guildford, UK	November 1 st	University of Surrey, Foundations of Sustainable Development Module
Christian Ecology Links workshop	30	London, UK	November 17 th	We wanted to work with at least one faith-based group during the consultation process. Christian Ecology Links members provided input on vision, principles, actions – as well as <i>“what values would help democracy to deliver your vision of sustainable development?”</i>
Manifesto for Change	15	Buenos Aires,	November	Discussants and workshop participants considered the

workshop hosted by FLACSO and organised by Fundación Cambio Democrático (participation by Halina Ward and Gabriela Flores of FDSD via Skype).		Argentina	21 st	relationship between democracy and sustainable development in Latin America and workshop participants also offered feedback on the draft Principles proposed for the Manifesto discussion
CONAMA (consultation stand and events in partnership with Madrid-based IIDMA)	Delegates (some 7000 registered in total) visiting our consultation stall, together with 13 participants in a consultation workshop	Madrid, Spain	26 th -30 th November (workshop: 29 th November)	Workshop participants provided ideas on Principles and Actions for the Manifesto, and also considered “ <i>what’s happening to democracy in Spain at the moment, when it comes to sustainable development?</i> ” and also “ <i>what does democracy mean for you?</i> ”

We also actively pursued other opportunities to raise awareness of the issues under discussion in the Manifesto consultation process in other ways. These included sending Manifesto ‘ripple’ flyers to events in Peru and the UK; guest blog posts and web-based articles (including on the website of UK youth and sustainable development charity Otesha; Huffington Post UK; Open Democracy; Campaign for a UN Parliamentary Assembly); listings in newsletters (including the UK’s Sustainable Development Research Network and the UK Department for Environment, Food and Rural Affairs ‘SD Scene’ website); and a Press Release announcing the launch of the Manifesto consultation during the UN Conference on Sustainable Development (re-posted to the website of the International Institute for Environment and Development); and email newsletters and updates.

We also made a number of presentations on the core ideas in the Manifesto consultation process at panel discussions and events including a panel discussion on ‘future generations and the public interest’ organized by Brazil’s Ministério Público in June 2012, two presentations at Law and Democracy Day and Democracy and Environment Day, respectively, during Occupy London’s New Putney Debates (November 2012), a presentation at Dartford Labour Party Forum (UK – November 2012), a panel discussion on during the Fair Ideas conference in Rio de Janeiro (June 2012), and a workshop on

democracy and sustainable development for young people aged from 15-18 at an Envision event for London schoolchildren (November 2012).

We were fortunate to be able to partner with Salzburg Global Seminar to deliver a 'synthesis workshop' at Schloss Leopoldskron in Austria from 12th 14th December 2012, at which an international group of some 25 participants reviewed consultation responses and a first draft of the Manifesto (referred to as the "Mark 1 Manifesto" in this report).

FSDSD will coordinate a launch process for the final draft of the Manifesto. Launch is planned for late February or, at latest, early March 2013. **Global reach** The Manifesto consultation process and the text of the Mark 1 Manifesto have been developed with the idea that the Manifesto should have resonance globally in existing democracies (however flawed they might be), or in other places or spaces where it is meaningful to discuss how best to equip democracy to deliver sustainable development.

Realising this global ambition will certainly be a work in progress; helped by all of the individuals and organisations who pledge to spread the Manifesto's ripples; to experiment with it; devise improvements and additions; and add to the resources available to people everywhere to transform democracy for sustainability.

Aside from an open online consultation form, the consultation process took place through consultation workshops or consultation stands which sought to reach people who were likely to be interested in democracy, sustainable development, or both. Consequently, the process did seek to gather ideas from the 'disinterested public' for whom either democracy, or sustainable development, or both, might be undesirable or alien concepts.

Statistics

A total number of 313 peoples' views were analysed to prepare the Mark 1 Manifesto, along with a small number of individual *ad hoc* discussions with experts.

We received a total of 286 individual consultation responses via online questionnaires or printed forms.

In addition, fifteen people provided ideas at a consultation workshop in Buenos Aires, and of a total of thirty participants at a Christian Ecology Links workshop, twelve contributed via group exercises but did not submit individual consultation responses.

Table 2: Summary of individual consultation responses

By country (simplified)		By continent	
N/A	10	Africa	3
Argentina	1	Asia	23
Australia	2	America	47
Bolivia	2	Europe	212
Brazil	28	Oceania	3
Canada	3	N/A	10
Chile	3		
China	1		
Germany	6		
Guatemala	1		
Honduras	1		
Hungary	1		
India	2	Other	
Ireland	1	Countries	35
Italy	2	of which, European	11
Kenya	1	of which, non-European	24
Kosovo	1		
Latvia	1		
Mexico	1		
Nepal	1		
New Zealand	1		

Pakistan	1		
Peru	1		
Philippines	15		
Portugal	2		
Russian Federation	1		
Singapore	1		
South Africa	1		
Sri Lanka	1		
Thailand	1		
The Netherlands	2		
Spain	42		
UK	153		
USA	5		
Venezuela	1		
Zimbabwe	1		

Table 3: Summary of Consultation responses by type and event

Individual responses	286
By submission	
Online, unsolicited	35
As a result of in person event	251
CEL workshop	18
Choosing our future	21
By Event	
CONAMA consultation stall	36
CONAMA workshop	14
Cupula dos Povos	13
ERS	13
FDSD board meeting	5
FoE conference	12
Green Party	37
IIED – Fair ideas	19
Labour Party	27
Other	1
Social Liberal Forum	14
Univ of Surrey (online)	8
Ateneo School of Gov't Workshop	13
By language	
English	224
Portuguese	3
Spanish	59

The scope of the consultation was limited by the following factors:

- Most respondents to our online form were from the UK, and a majority of the consultation events were held in the UK too.
- Our consultation ran in just two languages: English and Spanish (though at the time the decision to run the consultation in a second language felt like a major step for FDSD as a small non-governmental organisation). This meant that we were not able to engage directly with people who were not able to communicate in one or the other language (though some Brazilian consultees responded in Portuguese and their responses were taken into account). This may in turn have had an impact on the concepts and institutional responses reflected in the Mark 1 Manifesto.

What makes a good manifesto?

Manifestos flourish aplenty nowadays. From the Occupy movement, through big brands, to small and large online and offline communities alike, what was once exclusively the purview of political parties and intellectuals has been adopted as a popular form of communication of an organization's goals, a movement's vision, or an individual's frustrations.

As we continue our work towards a people's Manifesto for democracy and sustainable development, we ask ourselves a question. The document we're developing will be short, open to sign-ons, and will contain a vision, principles, and actions. Within those boundaries, *what would make for a good Manifesto?*

Based on some comparative research (see [Annex E](#)), here are some factors which we'd like to consider as we finalise the Manifesto:

1. Compelling visuals

Typographic designs are becoming quite popular, as of late, both as images and videos. A physical, printed version of our Manifesto (in the form of a poster) could have the advantage of being displayed in public places, perhaps in the kind of places where democracy happens (MPs' offices, city halls, community centres, offices, etc.).

2. A positive tone

Many Manifestos aim to criticize and destroy systems, and end up looking like a list of grievances. In some contexts, that tone provides common ground to unite efforts. In most cases, however, it stifles action and discourages engagement.

3. Limited jargon

The most popular Manifestos are those that can be read and understood by all. Plain language could help, as would avoiding the use of terms that might require expertise on the subject.

4. Short

If we want our Manifesto to be widely promoted and adopted, we'll need to condense our message into no more than a few pages. But how short is too short?

5. Relevance

A link with current events and trends could give the message the context it needs to resonate with people's experiences, but could also diminish its universality.

6. Structured flow

Section titles, and a clear flow from challenges, through vision, to solutions, could help. But when does structure become a burden on the content?

How to read the Mark 1 Manifesto

The Mark 1 Manifesto begins with a 'Vision' section, followed by a series of seven Principles and associated Commitments.

A short version of the Manifesto forms [Part A](#) of this paper. In a long version of the Manifesto set out in [Annex H](#), including a series of additional resources for website use, each of the Principles and associated Commitments is accompanied by a short explanatory text; a complete listing of proposed 'actions' from consultees, and finally a 'resources'

section which contains links to existing initiatives and resources. We have also included a selection of quotes provided by consultees at the beginning of each Principle and associated Commitments in the long version of the Manifesto.

Because we want the Manifesto to be globally resonant, highly geographic or culture-specific suggestions for ‘commitments’ (for example proposals for reform of the House of Lords) have been included within the ‘proposals from consultees’ or ‘resources proposed by consultees’, but have not found their way into the Manifesto’s Principles and Commitments.

We plan to translate the Manifesto into Spanish as well as its original language, English.

Question for Salzburg: *Is there a case for translating the Manifesto into languages other than English and Spanish (for example Arabic, Russian, French and Portuguese), even when FDSD does not have current or proposed partners in countries where those languages are spoken? Resources expended on translation would effectively mean a reduction in resources for other launch activities.*

The significance of ‘sign-on’

Our current thinking is that a ‘sign-on’ version of the Manifesto, which FDSD and partners would invite individuals and organisations to accede to, would incorporate simply the Vision, Principles and Actions sections. The longer text, to include the ‘explanation’ and ‘resources’ sections, would be made available online only, together with a pdf final version of the analysis of consultation inputs.

‘Signing on’ to the Manifesto would indicate:

- Endorsement of the Manifesto’s Vision and Principles in their entirety
- A pledge to experiment with at least one of the ‘Commitments’

Question for Salzburg: *is this the right approach to the significance of ‘sign-on’ and the tone of the ‘actions’?*

The idea of the ripple effect

The Manifesto process has been developed around the idea of the ‘ripple effect’; namely that if individuals and civil society organisations take steps within their respective spheres of activity and competence to shift the practice of democracy in ways that support sustainable development, a systems change becomes possible.

It follows from this that the actions in the Manifesto should be capable of being taken up by individuals and civil society organisations, rather than direct calls upon governments or elected representatives to take action. As Pablo Lumerman of Fundacion Cambio Democratico in Argentina put it *“No es para incidir en políticos, sino para movilizar a otros para la acción”*.

One consequence is that the language of the ‘actions’ (which must in any event be capable of ‘actioning’ around the world) is less direct than a series of first-party calls on government or elected representatives. This seems appropriate, particularly given the fact that changes in democracy to enable it better to deliver sustainable development need, for the long term, to be underpinned by cultural shifts which can only be secured at societal level.

John Lotherington offers a practical approach:

“The innovations should have the closest possible fit with existing forms and contexts. E.g. Where there are ombudsmen, one should act for future generations; or where a second, revising chamber is open to reform, it should take on protection of future generations. This would make innovation part of the flow of political change and more readily understood and accepted.”

In the words of Martin Luther King Jnr (1963), suggested by one consultee as inspiration for the vision behind the Manifesto:

“The saving of our world from pending doom will come, not through the complacent adjustment of the conforming majority, but through the creative maladjustment of a nonconforming minority.”

The Manifesto is designed to help to start a ripple effect, with a nonconforming minority – its signatories – the pebbles at the centre of the ripples.

Democracy, religion and values

We have chosen to draft the Manifesto in such a way that it does not explicitly take a position on the long-standing debate on the relationship between democracy, or state, and religion. We have not, for example, responded directly to the suggestion offered by one consultee that nor to the suggestion from one UK consultee that there be *“no religious representation without elections”*.

Faith, or religion, is among the most significant sources of human values. And it is clear that many of the kinds of changes that are contemplated in the Manifesto would be unstable for so long as they do not carry the broad support of societal values.

At a consultation workshop with Christian Ecology Links on 17th November, we explored the links between values and a Manifesto for democracy and sustainable development. From a Christian starting point, participants offered a number of suggestions on the values that could support a system of democracy designed to deliver their vision of sustainable development. We have incorporated suggestions for additional principles that emerged from this discussion below, under ‘suggestions for additional principles’. In addition, we reproduce in [Annex D](#) the complete list of suggestions from an initial brainstorming session

at that workshop on ‘values’. Many of them directly support the concepts embedded within the Manifesto’s principles.

This is not to say that the Manifesto should in any sense be wedded to ‘Christian’ values. It is an entirely secular document. But many of the shifts that it envisages are likely to be supported by the core values of multiple faiths and faith-based perspectives; in particular the regard for ‘the other’ and ‘the whole’ rather than simply ‘self’. As a Spanish consultee put it: *“Los cimientos de la democracia deben basarse en principios o ‘valores’ espirituales, en los que se fundamenta la condición humana: compasión; solidaridad, cooperación, etc”*

A systems perspective also lends itself to a focus on values. For example, commenting on one of the draft Principles that we had initially proposed, Rico Faria (Portugal) remarks: *“[t]his implies an evolution of mindsets - that is, of value systems and beliefs about those value systems towards a more integral/systemic worldview where we see complex systems, interaction between people with (very) different value systems. From this integral vantage point (a helicopter view), we can deal with "things" as they are without value judgements and can support adaptation, progress and achievements for (almost) all”*

General consultation feedback (and our responses)

General feedback on the Manifesto provided pointers to some significant overall choices about tone and audiences:

Make the text more accessible

Some participants questioned whether the draft principles suggested in the consultation process were sufficiently accessible to reach a wide audience and asked that the Manifesto be in plain English. Others suggested that the Principles should be simplified even further (though some suggestions would have had the effect of making them longer). One wrote *“I felt the language of the principles should be more concrete and action oriented... the way they are now just seems something that everyone would agree!”*

Another said that *“this language is too abstract (like many political documents!)”* and asked, more generically, *“[s]hould you have a further principle that Manifestos should be written in accessible language with concrete examples so that the majority of the population will have a clearer idea what’s going on? I’m not joking! Many average people have a real difficulty with abstract language”.*

In distinct responses, consultees asked both for the tone of the Principles to be less colloquial, and more accessible. *“Clear words must be used – short document instead of a long complex one”* (Brazil). *“Necesitar mayor robustez en el lenguaje del manifiesto”* (Buenos Aires workshop).

Question for Salzburg: *We have tried to do justice to these suggestions, and request help in clarifying and de-jargonising the text further. At the same time, our consultation in both English and Spanish has alerted us to the risk of being too tied to linguistic frames or catch-phrases that do not translate well to other languages, and there is some merit, given the need to translate into Spanish, to using Latin-based words where possible.*

Use positive language

Three respondents suggested that where possible the Manifesto should be framed in positive language - rather than a series of negatives.

We have tried to take this into account, though a few negative statements may remain here and there.

Refer to the obstacles to progress

One consultee from the Philippines advised that *"It would be great to lay out possible obstacles in achieving the goals, coupling them with possible and practical solutions. It might be too idealistic for the Philippines, a country that has witnessed such great injustice in spite of its long term history of democracy"*.

At this stage we have not addressed this suggestion directly, though it might be possible to do so by better developing the 'resources' sections of the accompanying web resources.

Bold statements and link to values and lived experiences

One consultee asked for 'bold statements', and another for *"words and phrases related to human values and experiences in their personal lives, and not just a document with abstract concepts"*. One consultee pointed to the need for a sense of personal agency to emerge from the Manifesto language (*"I can make a difference"*).

We have tried to take these suggestions into account.

Avoid the incrementalist

A consultee from the Philippines advised to *"avoid the incrementalist: by avoiding limited alternatives being considered that differ in small degrees from existing policies, a leap towards the main problems of sustainable development is tackled in the context of focusing on primary matters rather than just slowly fixing secondary problems using band-aid solutions to up ease the situation at hand"*.

The current text probably errs on the side of incrementalism (with a view to encouraging practical experimentation in the here and now).

Define democracy

Just one consultee, from Brazil, suggested that the Manifesto should define the word 'democracy': *"I think that you should define better democracy. Liberal democracy was implemented differently throughout the world. How about "an institutional reform that*

includes direct and indirect participation, and the maximum transparency and accountability possible that should be assured through regulation." Just a few lines giving a general idea from where you guys are coming from!"

We have referred to democracy as rule (as opposed to the longer word 'governance') of the people by the people for the people. We have also tried to make clear throughout that democracy is about more than voting – and that it is a guide to social as well as a political action. However, we have not sought to offer a more detailed definition of democracy that would likely alienate experts and non-experts in equal numbers without necessarily adding to the Manifesto's clarity.

At a final consultation workshop in Madrid on 29th November (led by Spanish NGO IIDMA) during the national environmental conference CONAMA, a brainstorming exercise on 'what does democracy mean for you?' offered ideas which we have used to check that the Mark 1 text of the Manifesto *overall* reflects a well-rounded view of democracy, without seeking a single textual definition. (The results of the brainstorming exercise form *Annex D* to this report).

Avoid the term 'sustainable development'

Whilst one consultee in the UK offered a definition of sustainable development as a proposed principle for the Manifesto (*"Meeting the needs of current generation universally whilst ensuring that future generations will not be disadvantaged by our actions"*, UK), others consultees questioned the use of the term 'sustainable development' (e.g. UK: *"'sustainable' needs to be defined"*; and *"Sustainable development has been interpreted by green capitalists as perpetual economic growth decoupled from its environmental impact"*; *"Make sure it's in plain English! E.g. ditch 'sustainable'"* (UK; *"The phrase 'sustainable development' has been devalued in the UK by its use in the NPPF [National Planning Policy Framework] and means development. Your phrase 'a healthy environment and fairness for all now and in the future' is fine. 'Development' could be more exactly defined.. 'sustainable' could be defined in terms of specific needs (physical/social/psychological?) – 'needs' on its own is vague."* (UK); *"Democracy should not merely be a vehicle for sustainable development alone, where development in the present sense mean only economic development. For economic development, democracy already is into a very dangerous liaison with capitalism, and this unhealthy liaison itself is what makes modern democracy a fake coin"* (Abraham Joseph, Conscience of Society non-governmental organisation, India, referring also to <http://influxofcapitalisticvalues.blogspot.in/>, and <http://direneedofreinventingdemocracy.blogspot.in>). A consultee from the UK suggested that the word 'sustainability' might be more appropriate; another remarked *"would appreciate an understanding of the word 'sustainable' - this implies for many a 'static' or 'corrective' idea; I prefer the notion of 'sustainable evolution' of society on this planet"*; another preferred *"ecological and social sustainability"* and a consultee from the US

suggested that sustainable development be replaced with ‘sustainable economic development’ in Principle 1 of the consultation version of the Principles. Interestingly, there was no objection to the Spanish versions of ‘sustainable development’ from consultees with Spanish or Portuguese as a first language.

Question for Salzburg: *Since the Manifesto consultations suggested that the term ‘sustainable development’ did not resonate in some contexts; or is controversial; we have called the Manifesto a Manifesto for ‘a green and fair democracy’, though we continue to use the term ‘sustainable development’ in parts of the text. We’re not convinced that this is the right title yet. Do you have suggestions for alternatives that avoid the term ‘sustainable development’? Elsewhere in the text we have used the expression ‘a healthy environment and fairness for all, now and in the future’. Might that be more appropriately incorporated in the title of the Manifesto somehow?*

On linking to existing initiatives

A number of [UK] responses suggested that the Manifesto should reflect or incorporate existing documents, including the Earth Charter (www.earthcharter.org and picturesofsuccess.org) The Natural Step, the complete set of Permaculture Principles, and the Extractive Industries Transparency Initiative (referred to at the Buenos Aires workshop). Others pointed to the relevance of existing campaigns as resources for the Manifesto, including the Campaign for a UN Parliamentary Assembly and the World Future Council’s campaign for ombudspersons for future generations, which is linked, at international level, to advocacy for a UN High Commissioner for Future Generations.

We have not incorporated existing documents directly into the text of the Mark 1 Manifesto, though the text of the Manifesto draws on a number of existing texts and quotes from consultees as inspiration. However, in two places, we have drawn directly on existing campaigns with ‘global’ reach, where the question of regional national specificities does not arise. These are the campaign for a UN Parliamentary Assembly and the campaign for a High Commissioner, or ombudsperson, for future generations.

On tactics

For any system of democracy for sustainability to come into effect, the pressure of a mass movement would be an invaluable tool. At a consultation workshop with Christian Ecology Links, one participant applied a Biblical metaphor: “To get to this heaven there has to be a crucifixion - the challenge to power”. We have not incorporated a direct response to this suggestion. This is consistent with a view that it is for organisations choosing to experiment with the Manifesto to decide on their own choice of tactics. *The Manifesto itself does not advocate non-violent direct action or any other particular advocacy or campaign tactic.*

Question for Salzburg: *Are there generically resonant tactics, including non-violent direct action, that should be referred to in the Manifesto, or is it right that the text is based on the*

idea that the choice of tactics for implementing the Manifesto's actions should lie with the individual signatories?

Revising the Manifesto: Feedback on Vision, Principles and Commitments

Vision

Our consultation process invited people to offer suggestions for inspirational words, phrases or sentiments that could guide or inspire the drafters of the preliminary 'vision' section of the Manifesto. Consultees were invited to offer quotes from inspirational leaders or role-models, or their own ideas, which could also be key words or phrases. (No-one rose to the suggestion that quotes based on grandmothers' favourite sayings might be a source of inspiration).

A selection of quotes is set out in *Annex B*.

The 'vision' text that is set out as the front part of the Mark 1 Manifesto draws partly on these suggestions, together with suggestions for 'additional principles' described in the following sub-section, and in some cases comments on the six principles that we had initially proposed.

It aims to:

- Set out the scope of the Manifesto
- Explain why the issues addressed in the Manifesto are important
- Make clear who its signatories (or those whose 'voice' is used in the text) are
- Inspire the reader to go further

The Vision does not currently make clear the significance of 'signing on' to the Manifesto; an omission that can readily be addressed in the final draft. Neither does it aim to set out a complete vision, or scenario, for the world that would result from implementation of the scenario. Rather, it incorporates language designed to give a sense for the qualities of the world that the Manifesto is intended to lead to.

Principles and Commitments

In the text that follows, we analyse consultation responses to each of the six principles which we initially proposed for discussion in turn.

We also invited consultees to propose ‘actions’ or ‘tools’ that could implement the Principles or that demonstrated democracy – understood either as a political system or as a system of social organisation – working well from a sustainable development perspective. As we have analysed these proposals, we have sought to match ‘actions’ to individual Principles. In the Mark 1 Manifesto we have drawn on these suggestions to propose ‘Commitments’ that are not country or region-specific.

Our Mark 1 Manifesto text therefore opens with a short Vision section, and then a series of subsections, each of which has the following structure:

- **Principle** (with the Principle setting the general direction of change in each area; each of which could be further reduced by taking the title alone, or the title and the first paragraph alone)
- **Commitments** – the overall (generic) steps to implement change in the direction of each individual Principle
- (Website or long published version of the Manifesto only): **Explanation:** a short narrative explanation of the reasoning behind each Principle and its importance or relevance to the Manifesto as a whole
- (Website only): **Proposals from consultees:** a listing of the ‘actions’ proposed by consultees, matching each to a single Principle
- (Website only): **Resources proposed by consultees:** links to existing initiatives that could offer further inspiration or ideas on how to experiment with implementation of the relevant Principle.

In the analysis that follows, we mention most, but not all, of the relevant consultation responses at each stage. We have not mentioned every single one of the suggestions; particularly where they are duplicated or where they are difficult to connect to the Manifesto other than as possible *outcomes* of a system of democracy that is designed to deliver a healthy environment and fairness for all now and in the future (e.g: a proposal for retrospective carbon taxation from one consultee; or the following proposals: “Tax pollution and subsidize green solutions” “Regulation to end coal gas oil”. “Legally enforceable (by members of the public and extra state organizations and EU) resource targets pollution standards”; “*Una legislación ambiental estricta y una reforma fiscal ecológica profunda son básicas para que cada cual asuma sus costos. De otro modo hay una transferencia de costos provados al conjunto de la sociedad en forma de impactos ambientales y sociales*” (Spain); “*Create the "circular economy fund" that invests individuals' savings in circular economic ideas – plastic bottles back to plastic bottles*” (UK); “*Impuestos verdes; incentivos fiscales de empresas que implementen en sus planes de gestión (y estrategias) medidas ambientales; aplicación del derecho administrativo y penal medioambiental (priorizarlo también en los*

procesos); legislación que estandarice el cálculo de la huella de carbono (fundamental para el eco-etiquetado, los fondos del carbono, la compra-venta de los derechos de emisión); impulso de la ley 42/2007 [ley de responsabilidad ambiental] para la verdadera implementación de los seguros ambientales (Spain)” In a few cases, responses were partially illegible, and we have erred on the side of certainty rather than guesswork.

It was noticeable how many of the suggestions from consultees – particularly on participation and voice; on expertise; and on consideration of future generations; were relevant to more than one of the Principles that we had initially proposed in our consultation. That is unsurprising in the context of an inquiry into what amounts to a significant and complex systemic shift. We have sought to minimise the overlaps between the issues addressed by the Principles. However, whilst each stands alone, this means that the Manifesto’s principles must be read, and accepted by signatories, as an integrated whole.

Suggestions for additional principles

We invited consultees to make suggestions on gaps in our principles, or to offer suggestions on additional principles. We record their suggestions below, with one important exception. From an early stage in the consultation process, it was clear that the omission of education from the principles reflected a serious gap. The need for education appeared again and again in comments on individual principles, as well as in suggestions for additional principles. Consequently, we have clustered these suggestions, wherever they appeared, into a separate section (and associated Principle) on education and knowledge.

Reflecting on overall comments on voice and participation, community engagement and localism also led us to reconsider the relevance of these concepts to the Manifesto. Beyond simply reflecting general conditions for a thriving democracy, the idea of sustainable development, and the actual and potential impacts of development that is not sustainable, give special importance to these dimensions of democracy. Whilst it was not our intention initially, the consultation process led us to new Principles (or sub-Principles) to make the special and particular connections between these ideas and sustainable development.

Elsewhere, we have sought to integrate the spirit of other suggestions on ‘additional principles’, where possible, within the Manifesto’s introductory ‘vision’ or revised principles and actions. We explain how, in outline, in the listing at [Annex C](#).

Detailed Principle by Principle analysis of the consultation responses, together with a summary of [our responses in the Mark 1 Manifesto \(highlighted in blue\)](#) and [questions for Salzburg \(highlighted in yellow\)](#) can be found in Part C of this report.

Part C: Principle by Principle analysis of consultation responses

Principle 1: Cultivate the basics of a flourishing democracy

During initial consultations this was proposed as Principle 1 and read as follows:

Principle 1: Strengthen the foundations of democracy: *By ensuring that a democracy designed to deliver sustainable development reflects the best of any flourishing democracy. This must include taking steps to enable thriving public participation, trusted and trustworthy politicians, wide rights of access to information and to justice, and respect for the rule of law*

- Overall, 239 consultees provided an individual response which included views on this Principle as initially proposed
- Of this total, 227 consultees (79.37% of the total number of consultees) agreed with the Principle, 39 with additional comments and 188 with no further comment
- 12 (4.20%) disagreed, of whom 7 offered comments
- 47 (16.43%) expressed no view or did not know, of whom 7 offered comments.

Reactions to the consultation draft

The principle was considered too vague by one UK consultee, and a consultee from the Philippines also found the draft as proposed too vague, suggesting that the specifics of political systems in various countries/states should be given due consideration. Another UK consultee suggested redrafting the front part of the principle to make it clearer that sustainable development requires flourishing democracy. **In the Mark 1 Manifesto, the link between this Principle and sustainable development is, we hope, now clearer, albeit by means of explanatory text which (currently at least!) uses the metaphor of a healthy body.**

Here more than any other of the six principles that we initially proposed during the consultation, a significant number of comments offered additional pointers to a revised principle. These are considered below.

Is the word ‘foundations’ appropriate?

To what extent is it helpful to refer to the ‘foundations’ of democracy, when arguably a number of the other principles are also ‘foundational’? (UK consultee). The ‘foundations’ of democracy may be understood to lie in places other than the institutions of formal democracy itself (e.g. in society at large) (Philippines). **The text of the proposed Mark 1 Manifesto no longer refers to ‘the basics’ rather than ‘the foundations’ given the confusion**

that this could clearly generate, and the accompanying explanatory text adopts a metaphor to distinguish between ‘the basics’ and the subject matter of the other principles – which concern those issues that face democracy which are particularly acute in the light of sustainable development.

Questions for Salzburg: does the eventual Manifesto need to incorporate some version of the Mark 1 Manifesto text proposed for Principle 1 and its associated actions, or could it simply focus on stating some overall metaphor in the strongest possible way? Is the current metaphor appropriate?

Clarifying meaning

It was clear from more than one response that the principle needs to tread carefully in distinguishing between ‘democracy’ (the system) and ‘democracies’ (states). Additionally, a consultee from the Philippines suggested that the principle *“presupposes that the foundations of democracy can be largely located in political spaces. However, the foundations of democracy are also not simply localized to politics and law. Economic systems and socio-cultural arrangements are also intricately related to democracy (or the lack thereof)”*. A number of consultees stressed that democracy is about more than voting: *“la democracia no debe limitarse a ejercitar el sufragio electoral”* (Spain), and one added that democracy *“is also about the right to participate on a day-to-day basis in transparent and accountable government decision-making”* (Sri Lanka)

The Mark 1 Manifesto consciously refers to ‘democracy’ rather than simply ‘democracies’ and explicitly states that democracy is about much more than voting. The actions are designed to make clear that cultures of democratic decision-making start with how people interact with ‘neighbours in both the real and virtual worlds’.

One consultee suggested that the word ‘**mechanism**’ should be used instead of ‘steps’. Another criticised the word ‘steps’ on the basis that this sounded rather incremental. Neither term is used in the Mark 1 Manifesto.

Qualifying respect for the rule of law

The idea of ‘respect for the rule of law’ as part of the foundations of a flourishing democracy should only be applied if the law is just (two UK consultees) The Mark 1 Manifesto refers to respect for the rule of ‘legitimate’ law, but we question whether it is appropriate to imply that it is acceptable to imply that there is no need to respect ‘illegitimate’ law.

Qualifying access to information

Access to information needed to be matched by a principle of transparency, said a Spanish consultee: *“Este principio debería referirse también a la transparencia en la acción política sin necesidad que los ciudadanos tengan que reclamar cierta información que deben ofrecer los políticos al resto de la ciudadanía”*. The concept of access to information was also

qualified by one UK consultee: *“as we see at the moment, there's masses of conflicting information out there from different groups, and it is very very difficult to make a decision based on the wildly different opinions from experts, lay people and other commentators. Let alone our democratically elected officials, where the sources of their information is also considered in many cases suspect.”* Another was concerned with the quality of the information: *“The information should be unbiased or the bias made clear”*. A UK consultee suggested adding *“transparency of process and access to proper means of redress”*. However, another UK consultee warned: *“All the words like impartial, independent, unbiased are totally wrong, quality, not right also. If one wants to access something impartial about GM, or a certain drug, or the pros and cons of wind farms, or trade offs on importing vegetables vs helping poor farmers there is usually nothing to help on make an informed decision”*. We have addressed the need for ‘independent’ information in a revised Principle 3, on expertise and participation. The Mark 1 Manifesto version of the Principle also refers to transparency decision-making.

Delete the reference to trust?

A number of consultees objected to the reference to ‘trusted and trustworthy politicians’. For example, one UK consultee was concerned that this should be within reasonable limits of privacy, since one way to foster trustworthiness might be to make politicians publish personal information, for example about tax or health records. A New Zealand consultee even suggested that *“trust is unhealthy in a democracy.”*, as did the UK consultee who suggested that *“[p]oliticians are never, as a group, going to be trustworthy, but they could be subject to better systems accountability”*. A Spanish consultee wrote *“Políticos Honrados? Dónde? Eso no existe”*. In contrast, another Spanish consultee wrote *“Hay que volver a recuperar valores como 'honradez' y 'confianza' en la vida política”* and a UK consultee argued that *“[p]oliticians must be trustworthy, erosion of their integrity is damaging to the process and idea of democracy”*, and another said *“I would put trustworthy before trusted. That comes first in my book. You might also put in something about institutions, as it is lack of trust in institutions which often erodes democracy and confidence in it, as we are finding at the moment”*. The Mark 1 Manifesto no longer refers to ‘trust’ or ‘trustworthiness’, and we have added a reference to accountability.

Add respect for difference

A principle of respect for difference, suggested by many as an additional principle, also found its way into responses to Principle 1. For example, one UK consultee suggested adding *“and people who are different from us”* after ‘respect for the rule of law’. We have sought to reflect this idea elsewhere in the text.

Add a reference to independent media

Two UK consultees proposed adding references to an independent media, and a consultee from Zimbabwe proposed that a separate principle refer to the media: *“The inclusion, development and nurturing of both public and private media that respects the rule of law, fair coverage of all views and that is sensitive to the expressed wishes of all people even if they do not hold the same views as the controllers of the media in question The media ought to be the most accessible challenge to nurture ... democracy”*. The Mark 1 Manifesto adds a reference to a ‘free and independent’ media.

Add a reference to human rights

A number of respondents mentioned the need to address this omission; particularly from consultation stands in Rio de Janeiro during the Rio+20 conference. TheMark 1 Manifesto refers to ‘deep commitment across all of society to upholding fundamental human rights’. There is a need to refer to the engagement of marginalised groups in decision-making, proposed a number of consultees. Principle 1 of the Mark 1 Manifesto refers to ‘inclusive’ decision-making without referring specifically to ‘marginalised’ groups.

Refer explicitly to the need to challenge vested interests

Many consultees proposed addressing issues arising out of the influence of vested economic interests on democracy. For example: *“Here in the US, economic power is in the hands of a few and they give to only two parties; makes it easier to control the foundation of democracy”*; or a reference to *“lack of disproportionate influence by interest groups”*. The Mark 1 Manifesto refers to accountability of public decision-making ‘to people affected’, and to putting people, not vested economic or interests, at the heart of democratic practice.

The problems of elites

A consultee from India suggested that *“Democracy is increasingly being used by professional political groups in many nations to occupy the old seats of political authority and power once abandoned by its old masters; the kings and his likes, and the new system is DEMOCRATIC only in the sense that the same old drama is now enacted by members from PEOPLE’S class ! It is high time that we the sense of reason of our enlightened age find a new model of democracy that really would represent the ‘sacred realm of the collective’ of people, as depicted in the blog: <http://anewtheoryondemocraticestablishment.blogspot.in/>*

The concern to tackle the loss of confidence that could arise out of any gap between ‘government’ or ‘elected representatives’ or ‘bureaucrats’ and their constituencies was addressed in more than one comment. For example, one consultee from the Philippines wrote:

“In my opinion, CONFIDENCE BUILDING should be one of the top priorities of government institutions in the Philippines. The civilian-bureaucracy divide and

perhaps, the lack of adequate training in the bureaucratic level is a grave hindrance in allowing the institutions to efficiently serve the people. Thus, the perceived inadequacy of these institutions create a huge culture of distrust and impunity. The Philippine political culture has established the government as an enemy, rather than an ally”.

Writing of the gap between “the government and its constituency”, another consultee from the Philippines suggested:

“[t]o bridge this gap, I think, the configuration of the officials of the Philippine government has to be revolutionized. The culture of Philippine politics revolves around long-standing families -- the elites -- who have held on to power over the years. As such, they have wielded control of the government apparatus to their benefit.

These elites have to be taken down from their pedestals of power. People who have the sincerity to work for social reforms should be the ones to replace them. Only then can the gap between the government and its people be bridged. Only then can effective governance ensue.

Sure, there is a strong democratic atmosphere in the Philippines especially in civil society. The thing is, though, it would seem that democracy remains a facade. Ultimately, politicians have the final say. Don't get me wrong, there are a few politicians who I think are sincere when it comes to public service. I hope they increase in numbers”.

A Spanish consultee noted: “[u]na cosa sí tengo clara: la corrupción corrompe democracia, ambiente y personas”, and another consultee from the Philippines said that:

“There is too much concentration of power among the political elites in the sense of business in agriculture, industry, and development. This, almost always, results to widespread corruption and inequality. What needs to be done in the Philippines is a more wide-scale check and balance and control of property and monetary funds. We need a wider democratic movement and agencies to alleviate the monopoly of power which leads to inequality”.

A Spanish consultee wrote: “*mano dura*” *contra la corrupción. No solo apoyar a políticos honrados sino penar de forma ejemplar a los corruptos; Penalización para los representantes que ‘aruinan’ las arcas publicas [treasury – public funds] aunque no hayan sido corruptos.*

The Mark 1 Manifesto refers to elected representatives ‘with backgrounds as diverse as the people who elected them’ and to ‘freedom from corruption’

Extend the principle to global decision-making

A UK consultee proposed redrafting the proposal to include global decision-making, refer to accountability to ‘the population affected’ and ‘genuine equality of influence of all’; with the effect of strengthening links to the separate principle of ensuring that people everywhere count: *“Strengthen the foundations of democracy, nationally and globally: by ensuring that national and international governance systems reflect the best of flourishing democracies. This must include mechanisms to enable thriving public participation, with equal access for all people; trusted and trustworthy politicians and decision-makers, motivated by the public good; wide rights of access to information and to justice; respect for the rule of legitimate law; and effective accountability of decision-making to the population affected, based on genuine equality of influence for all”*. Principle 1 of the Mark 1 Manifesto refers to ‘the practice of democracy from local to global levels’

Add a reference to transparent political financing

“This was addressed in strong terms recently by the ‘Global Commission on Elections, Democracy and Security’ chaired by Kofi Annan”, noted one consultee. A number of proposals on transparent political financing were also made in response to the proposed principle ‘get beyond the money’. For the time being, we have added these suggestions to that Principle other than in Principle 1. **Question for Salzburg:** we welcome feedback at Salzburg on whether this is the right approach (see note below).

The role of communities

There is a need to refer to enshrining the right to local community self-governance as part of the foundations of democracy, suggested one UK consultee: *“It’s about where power lies: it should be with the people”*. The Mark 1 Manifesto incorporates a new principle subsection within Principle 7 on strengthening democratic decision-making at local level.

Linking to education

Two consultees noted the links between a flourishing democracy and education (*“A very good education system would be necessary”; “all this assumes at least a moderate level of education”*). Two UK consultees suggested, respectively, that *“Access to info etc not enough; people need to be educated and ‘unbrainwashed’ of the consumer/economic before sustainable democracy can begin to work”*, and that *“rights to and necessity of education for all”* should be added to the principle. Mark 1 of the Manifesto incorporates a new principle on education and we have not addressed these suggestions in our revised Principle 1. Mark 1 of the Manifesto incorporates a new principle (Principle 2) specifically on education, but

we have also referred to citizenship education within Principle 1. Question for Salzburg: have we got the balance right between these two principles?

Proposed commitments

During initial consultations we asked consultees for suggested actions that could implement the Manifesto's Principles. We have drawn on these to propose a series of Commitments within the Mark 1 Manifesto.

The consultation process generated a wide range of suggestions on tools, or 'actions' that could help to deliver the basic conditions for a flourishing democracy. Most however came from the United Kingdom (a number of proposals from consultees outside the UK that were potentially relevant eventually found their way into other Principles in the Mark 1 Manifesto). Many proposals were inherently context-specific (such as proposals for reform of the House of Lords in the UK) and others (such as reform of voting systems) seemed too specific to provide the basis for a universally applicable recommendation in a Manifesto with global reach.

We list the full set of proposals below. From these, and the issues identified in the revised Principle, we derive four globally applicable 'action areas' for Commitments in the Mark 1 Manifesto.

- Encouraging adoption of practices that demonstrate a deep commitment to democracy (as distinct from paying lip-service to the idea through regular elections but deeply flawed implementation of other essential elements of democracy)
- Calling on leaders to show the leadership necessary for democratic renewal
- Signatories of the Manifesto playing their part as active citizens, itself divided into:
 - Active citizenship generally and holding public officials and elected representatives accountable, and
 - Leading by example in the way in which signatories relate to other people in both the real and virtual (social media, mobile phone or internet-based) worlds

Question for Salzburg: could these actions be better linked to the proposals from consultees?

The role of political parties

This was a focus of attention in some suggestions for practical 'actions'. One UK consultee proposed that *"party manifesto or candidate manifestos must be subject to independent audit (in relation to the costings of manifesto proposals: do they stack up?)"*. *"Democracy based on parties and voting is an illusion"*, they continued, adding that *"The whip system in UK must go – maybe through international legislation. That would take away party power. Ultimately, do we need parties?"*

e-democracy

A number of respondents made suggestions on how to apply electronic or internet-based tools to democracy, or to implement 'Democracy 2.0'. One from Spain suggested as an additional principle *"Implementar las herramientas para desarrollar la democracia 2.0 con determinadas políticas ó todas las políticas y decisiones"* Another consultee suggested that electronic voting could serve to increase voter turnout as well as reducing criminal abuse of the voting system, adding that the possibility of voting electronically should be made accessible to all. And a consultee from the UK noted that many developing nations rely on mobile phones as their main source of telecommunications and asked *"how about more text message polling for issues?"*

Leadership as the key to democratic renewal

In a paper commended to us for its relevance to the Manifesto process, consultee Henry B. Tam notes: *"...what holds the key to successful democratic renewal is civic leadership... At the political level, without council leaders or government ministers who understand the value of democratic renewal and are determined to press for communitarian actions to engage communities more widely and effectively, time and resources would be diverted to other issues"*. (Henry B. Tam, <http://www.educ.cam.ac.uk/research/academicgroups/equality/forumyouthparticipation/HBTamRejuvDemocracy.pdf>).

Fostering transparency, accountability and trust

Politicians should declare their interests as a means of building trust (UK consultee)

All civil service briefings to be available on the Internet (UK consultee)

All civil servants, politicians, and journalists to have legal obligation to tell the truth and disclose relevant information (UK consultee)

As a practical innovation designed to foster more engaged voting, one UK consultee proposed asking voters to determine if they could recognize one party from another and spot which party stands for what proposals.

A UK consultee proposed that the idea of a right of citizens to 'recall' their elected representatives should be incorporated within this principle.

Tackling under-participation and low voter turnout

One UK consultee proposed mandatory voting. In contrast, another One UK consultee suggested that *"People should stop voting and seek alternative viable means of creating democracy. Build a participative democracy then rebuild a (subordinate) representative democracy"*.

"Democracy is all about people expressing themselves and some are not really comfortable with words. So maybe the role of art should be considered"

The number of people who choose not to vote in key elections could be shown visually in parliament, for example by leaving seats taped up and therefore unusable as a visible reminder to those who chose not to vote (UK consultee)

Towards interconnected democracy

Single unified Election Day globally once every five years (UK consultee)

One Argentinian consultee pointed to the Organisation of American States' Interamerican Charter for Democracy – Lima, Peru, 11 Sep 2001 as a model.

Address lobbying

Beyond the role of 'vested interests', one UK respondent suggested that lobbying and think tanks (being unelected and unrepresentative of constituents) should be outlawed entirely (**Question for Salzburg:** as a think-tank ourselves we have not added this suggestion to the list of proposals: should we replicate all proposals in the website-based support materials for the Manifesto?). Another proposed full transparency on the part of elected representatives on all lobbying, interests and concerns.

Combating the negative aspects of adversarial decision-making

A number of UK consultees (writing from a system of democracy where the London-based Westminster parliament relies on a 'first past the post' voting system and a highly adversarial culture of decision-making) proposed that proportional representation be introduced as a route to a more representative and less adversarial system of democracy. In the words of a UK participant, the principle should be *"All votes counted, all votes count. (ie no first-past-post, 5% hurdle, etc.)"* In other suggestions designed to deliver a less adversarial system of democracy, a UK consultee proposed non-adversarial debating chambers, like that of the Scottish Parliament, and the active promotion of coalitions and negotiated decision making. (UK)

A Canadian consultee proposed the *"[d]evelopment of practices of non-verbal communication in assemblies"*.

A Spanish consultee pointed to the practical examples of good democratic practice offered by the World Social Forum; the use of Referendums in Switzerland and in California and the *"Comisión de debate público en Francia."*

A Spanish consultee proposed that *Las leyes electorales deben ser claras: una persona, un voto, + una representación para cada territorio. Fuera la Ley D'Hondt!*

(NB: on D'Hondt see e.g. http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/D'Hondt_method)

Proposed resources

The InterAmerican Charter for Democracy – Lima, Peru, 11 September 2001 (see *Box 1*).

Box 1: Inter-American Democratic Charter

In September 2001, heads of state and government of OAS (Organization of American States) countries adopted the Inter-American Democratic Charter, at the end of a decades-long journey in the sub-continent that saw military dictatorships throughout the 60s and 70s in most of its countries.

The document covers areas such as: respect of human rights and fundamental freedoms; periodic free and fair elections; transparency, probity, and respect for social rights; exercise of power in accordance with the rule of law; a pluralistic system of political parties and organizations, separation of powers and independence of the branches of government; elimination of all forms of discrimination; and the right and responsibility of all citizens to participate in decisions relating to their own development.

Source: <http://www.oas.org/en/democratic-charter/>

Report of the Global Commission on Elections, Democracy and Security

World Social Forum

Referendums in Switzerland/California

Comisión de debate público en Francia

Principle 2: Commit to education and learning as foundations of change

This Principle was not proposed during the initial consultation process but, following a review of consultation responses was incorporated within the Mark 1 Manifesto as Principle 2.

Reactions to the consultation draft

In consultees' individual responses, 'education' was mentioned or alluded to 38 times. For example: "[t]here should be environmental education in every school. It's necessary to work on people's education in order to have real changes" (Brazil); "formación y educación crítica;

la educación como pilar fundamental para crear una sociedad formada, crítica, y con una conciencia participativa y de responsabilidad civil (Spain); “[A]ñadiría como fundamental una educación y formación social, y buscar la forma de que haya una implicación real ciudadana”(Spain). And a consultee from the Philippines noted that “[p]erhaps education is a great way for promoting long-term sustainable development. The earlier we plan the seeds, the longer we can reap the benefits ...”; *“Todas las personas tengan la oportunidad de recibir una educación aplicada al desarrollo sostenible y al cuidado del medio ambiente”* (Spain); *“En la educación, me gustaría más que se estudiara en colegios e institutos temas relacionados con el desarrollo sostenible, la educación ambiental (protección del medio ambiente, respeto a la flora y la fauna, etc)”*; *“No puede haber democracia sin acceso real y equitativo a la educación”* (Spain)

Multiple subjects: The subjects of educational proposals put forward by consultees were multiple, and covered all aspects of democracy, citizenship, environment and sustainable development, as these examples show: *“Education for global citizenship (UK)”*. *“Education for citizenship in SD and democracy. We all as democratic citizens need to have spaces and information to think longer term and not just about personal issues”*; *“Information training and education in democratic processes and principles (UK)”* *“There should be opportunity to environmental education in school as well as out of school. Education is the basis of every development of democracy”* (Brazil); *“Green education since early childhood”*(Brazil); *“sensibilización y educación medioambiental”* (Spain); *“Change starts with education - both at home and at school. Will you consider education systems that prepare for a future open society? Today, education is targeting “successful” careers - often determined by only personal status, personal wealth, personal influence, etc. However, the generally accepted world role models of great people do not match these criteria”*. The Mark 1 Manifesto’s new Principle 2 addresses education as the process through which the knowledge and values to strengthen ‘democratic action for sustainability’ are nurtured.

Who are the students?

A variety of students were proposed. One consultee focused on legislators: *“would-be and established legislators need training and education in democracy, SD and the dynamic processes that connect them (UK)”*, whilst more than one focused on young people: *“Poniendo especial atención y énfasis en la Educación Primaria”* (Spain). *“Wide-ranging and independent information/education of young people (especially) about key issues: of governance and development (UK)”* *“Promote/ensure education in discussion from early youth (UK)”*. The Mark 1 Manifesto’s Principle 2 refers to people as citizens and as leaders (i.e. implicitly including legislators), and to the particular importance of focusing on children and young people as the next generation of activists for a greener and fairer world.

Who are the teachers?

A consultee from Singapore saw non-governmental organisations as important educators: *"[e]ducation is the best way to form an informed electorate that will force the government to make choices that are currently unpopular choices like no more fossil fuel subsidies, installing renewables by having a carbon tax. Since governments are unlikely to want to empower their people by giving them this knowledge, perhaps NGOs could pick this very important job"* (Singapore respondent). The Mark 1 Manifesto's Principle 2 refers to the process of building skills and knowledge as taking place in all the places where the ideal of democracy is an inspiration.

The quality of education

The quality of education was addressed implicitly in a number of proposals, and explicitly in UK and Spanish consultation responses which stressed that education must not only be improved, but should also be accessible and affordable. The Mark 1 Manifesto's Principle 2 includes a reference to 'accessible' education (taking the view that affordability is implicit within 'accessibility')

Beyond formal education

Education through realisation. Education, and learning, take place in many more places than schools, colleges and universities or vocational training courses or institutions. From the natural disaster-prone Philippines, one consultee wrote *"experience more than the school as an institution is the best teacher especially during practical situations"*. The principle of access to environmental information is a well-established principle of 'environmental democracy', as expressed in Principle 10 of the 1992 Rio Declaration and, for a growing number of countries, the Aarhus Convention. The role of environmental information is also emphasised within an 'education-through-realisation' process for democracy and sustainable development, which focuses on less formal approaches to education. In the words of a consultee from the Philippines:

"I believe that the main problem why people fail to realize the gravity of the situation with regards to the environment is due to the lack of information. People know the logic behind consumerism - it is bound to consume everything if we don't do anything, hence the different declarations on environment and sustainable development. However, declaring principles that would ultimately produce policies reflecting these principles is not enough in a person surrounded by a consumeristic way of life. The key to a proper implementation of these policies is information. The percentage of the people who are not aware of what is actually happening in the environment, greatly and ridiculously outweighs the people who knows. Education and propaganda, however, are still not enough to provide the information needed for people to start changing their lives. What they need is information through realization."

In the context of the Philippines, we, arguably, exemplify democracy through emotional appeal (EDSA I&II, NoyNoy's campaigning for presidency due to the death of Cory..) We are easily moved by the trajectories of certain events through its urgency and not its technicality, legality, etc. Filipinos all over the country help out one another in times of calamities. As heartbreaking as it is to say, people will only start moving at times of great distress. And this is the kind of information that people need to start throwing their cigarette stubs in the trash and not in the canal, or start realizing the uselessness of disposable utensils or even plastic in general. This kind of realizing-information is the key for that shift in perspective that people need to understand in sustainable development.

So in conclusion, I believe this realizing-information is the first step for people to start changing their ways. In fact, this is how most environmentalist started - a realization that they needed to help the environment in any way possible. An information drive stressing the urgency of environmental inclination that sustainable development can provide”.

The Mark 1 Manifesto's Principle 2 refers to the process of building skills and knowledge as taking place in all the places where the ideal of democracy is an inspiration.

The link to values

Education emerged as an important catalyst for the shared values that could help to address the political feasibility policy measures that might seem beyond the reach of current democratic practice; as for example in this proposal: *“Educación que permita la concentración “participativa” de políticas demográficas adaptadas a los límites ecológicos”* (Spain). *“También veo importante el crecimiento personal y colectivo. Cuanto más felices somos, mas amor podemos dar. Educación para ser personas y no maquinas”.* The Mark 1 Manifesto's Principle 2 explicitly links education to values.

From education to active citizenship and empowerment

Education was linked by a number of consultees to participation and empowerment: *“the development of citizenship is vital if democracy is to improve as the long-term decline in voting indicates that people are losing faith/interest in democracy”*, and also to combating the dominance of political elites: *“Encourage comprehensive schools to avoid the continuing dominance of an officer class from private schools”* (CEL consultation workshop participant).

There is also a readily-made link to empowerment. Proposing additional principles for inclusion in the Manifesto, a UK consultee wrote: *“Education and empowerment! So many believe their voice doesn't count or isn't important, or can't make it heard”*. A consultee from the Philippines suggested deepening the idea of participation: *“For me, it has been wrongly defined that people's participation is simply the act of saying "yes" or "no" when being consulted which seems to be the case more often than not to majority of Filipinos (perhaps*

even other developing countries). What is more important to be stressed is that people's participation is the empowerment of people's decision to cooperate with what has been agreed upon and what their decision is. It is beyond the "yes" and "no" and leads to how and why they chose to answer such". These ideas could have been addressed in the Manifesto's Principle 1, but have instead been linked to Principle 2, in part as a means of reinforcing the idea that 'education' (far better expressed in the broader word *formación*, in Spanish) and 'learning' takes place in multiple settings and on a lifelong basis. Question for Salzburg: how better to express the idea of 'learning' rather than education, and of the commitment to 'lifelong' learning and learning outside the setting of formal educational institutions?

Proposed commitments

Whilst the message that the draft Principles had omitted education, formal and informal, came across loud and clear from the consultation process, we were offered far less concrete guidance on actions that could be included in the Manifesto.

The consultation process generated a wide range of suggestions on tools, or 'actions' that could be associated with a new Principle on education (or rather more usefully in the Spanish word *formación*), could help to deliver the basic conditions for a flourishing democracy.

We list the proposals below. From these, and the issues identified in the new Principle on Education, we derive three Commitments for inclusion in the Mark 1 Manifesto:

- Advocacy in favour of revitalised programmes of civic education for active citizenship and to build understanding of democracy
- Advocacy in favour of strong programmes of sustainability education from an early age
- A commitment to make engage through community groups and civil society organisations to enhance education for democracy and sustainability, and to use the Manifesto as a resource in that process.

Question for Salzburg: could these Commitments be better linked to the proposals from consultees? Should the skills for participation; a strong theme in the actions proposed by consultees; be better integrated? Are these proposed Commitments too generic to be useful?

An Italian consultee proposed the use of debates for engaging people, advancing policy, and increasing legitimacy of decisions (e.g. Intelligence Squared).

Combating the anti-participation effects of stress

It's not just apathy or the vested interests of the political class that prevent the participation and active engagement of people in democracy. A consultee from Australia suggested:

"Stress and frustration is wide-spread today especially in the Western world (often at work). This can often interrupt decision-making with respect to sustainability. I suggest the encouraging people to understand (or simply spreading awareness of) the importance of the present moment and strengthening their relationship with nature through meditation".

There is a **link between the Manifesto itself and a process of building the skills and knowledge-base for civic participation** – building on the suggestion that non-governmental organisations, too, are important educators. A UK-based consultee suggested that the Manifesto itself could be a means to encourage civic participation: *"Civic participation is at [the] lowest it's ever been, in particular [in] places that are in deprived areas. A solution – have a wide reaching 'intro' workshop to both young and old on what civic participation is with the Manifesto being a hook"* There was a similar sentiment in the proposal from a Brazilian consultee to: *"Transferir responsablemente a las nuevas generaciones estos principios instalandose en la education escolar y superior, como un compromiso que se actualiza y revisa de la mano con la evolucion del tema".*

A UK consultee suggested **visualisation exercises carried out in junior schools about the impact of policy decisions on their community in relation to themes closely related to sustainability** (e.g. burial of nuclear waste). Students might be asked to explore the impacts on their community and what they might feel and do; how it would impact neighbouring communities; and then potentially how such a decision might impact on people in other areas or countries.

A compulsory examination in sustainable development was proposed. *"All students need to pass a GCSE in sustainable development"* (UK) [NB: GCSEs are ordinarily taken by students of all abilities in the UK at the age of 15 or 16]

The value of first-hand encounters *"Hacer más a menudo excursiones a ver espacios naturales protegidos, plantas de reciclaje, empresas de turismo ecológico etc"* (Spain)

From a country with a troubled relationship with democracy, Zimbabwe, came suggestions for the **important role of social media, the internet, radios and possibly mobile phone networks** in providing spaces for the kind of debates that shape the lived experience of democracy (see Box 4 below)

Proposed resources

A consultee from Hungary pointed to the courses for Sustainability run by the Budapest-based Regional Environmental Centre as an exemplar, along with the "Folk High Schools" model in Denmark.

AmericaSpeaks and their 21st Century Town Meetings, and the organisation Intelligence Squared, offer innovative ways of building the skills to engage in debate, in a participatory setting, on important political issues of the day (see *Boxes 2 and 3* below)

Box 2 AmericaSpeaks

In 1997, AmericaSpeaks developed the 21st Century Town Meeting®, a dynamic forum that combines small group, face-to-face dialogue with technology to engage citizens in discussions on planning, resource allocation, and policy formulation. The organization operates on a core set of principles that underlie all of its activities: diverse representation, informed participation, facilitated deliberation, clear region-wide priorities, and a link to action. Its most notable success is its involvement in the Unified New Orleans Plan, developed in the aftermath of hurricane Katrina's impact on the city of New Orleans, Louisiana. Most recently, the organization partnered in a nation-wide initiative called *Our budget, our economy*. The priorities which emerged from the discussion were to be presented to Congress and President Obama, as well as the National Commission on Fiscal Responsibility and Reform and the Bi-Partisan Policy Center's Debt Reduction Task Force.

<http://americaspeaks.org/>

<http://usabudgetdiscussion.org/>

http://www.huffingtonpost.com/archon-fung/public-deliberation-the-l_b_627983.html

Box 3 Intelligence Squared

Intelligence Squared is a UK based organisation which stages debates around the world. The debates are held in the traditional Oxford style, with as many as 2,500 people attending on occasion. A motion for debate is proposed and outlined by the chair, with a panel of two or three speakers each arguing for and against the motion. The audience is asked to vote before the debate, and then again after all the speeches have been made, to see which side has persuaded the most people to change their vote. There is also an opportunity for the audience to pose questions to individual members of each panel before the final vote is taken. The format seems to be filling a gap, making use of debating to inform and engage the public on issues of the day at a time when some are lamenting the “decline of proper parliamentary debate” and the lack of “real debate” among modern politicians

<http://www.intelligencesquared.com/>

<http://www.telegraph.co.uk/news/politics/7807687/The-House-of-Commons-no-longer-provides-model-debate.html>

<http://intelligencesquaredus.org/iq2us-blog/item/760-modern-politicians-dont-partake-in->

A consultee from Zimbabwe pointed to the website Kubatana (www.kubatana.net) and initiatives like it as offering valuable forums for public debate on issues including democracy and development (see *Box 4* below).

Box 4: Kubatana

The Kubatana website (see www.kubatana.net) is an important forum for Zimbabweans to discuss democracy and other issues and a key ingredient to real democracy is space to air all views be they contradictory or not and have those views respected and shared. This is not the case in Zimbabwe generally because of fear of reprisals after sharing one's views.

Kubatana has facilitated comments on democracy and development in Zimbabwe but falls short in its reach as an online medium because many Zimbabwean have no access to the internet. Maybe if it is accessible via a mobile platform, this could help.

Windup radios that were once distributed by the Voice of America's Studio 7 beaming for the Zimbabwe audience helped in improving information access but were summarily banned by government agents and .. taken away by government agents under the guise of tuning into a pirate station that was promoting western ideals.

Source: consultation response: Busani Bafana, Zimbabwe

Principle 3: Re-balance knowledge, participation and representation

During initial consultations this was proposed as Principle 3 and read as follows:

Principle 3: Experts on tap not on top: *By finding ways to nurture an active commitment to informed and participatory democratic decision-making whilst allowing expertise, and science, transparent space to offer insights and inform policy*

- Overall, 236 consultees (78.32% of the total number of consultees) provided an individual response which included views on this Principle.
- Of this total, 224 consultees agreed with the principle, 35 with additional comments and 189 with no further comment.
- 12 (4.20%) disagreed, of whom 8 offered additional comments.
- 50 (17.48%) expressed no view or did not know, of whom 6 offered additional comments

Reactions to the consultation draft

Too long

“Too long and wordy - loses impact”, was the overall comment of one consultee. The Mark1 Manifesto draft is considerably longer. How to shorten it?

Suggestions for rewording

One consultee offered the following, simpler, wording: *“Sustainable development needs informed and participatory democratic decision-making which allows expertise and science to offer insights and inform policy”*. One suggested that the words ‘nurture an active commitment’ be replaced with ‘cultivate’. Or perhaps the principle could be greatly simplified simply without labouring the point by replacing it with words along the following lines: *“[t]o be armed with as much information as is necessary so as to make decisions based on sound, sustainable sense”*. A consultee from Zimbabwe suggested adding the word ‘public’ after ‘active’, and a UK consultee proposed adding the words *“and inclusive of a broad range of what matters to people about the potential impacts of these decisions”*

Partly because the initial drafting clearly confused a number of respondents (as described below and also in the comment *“it is unclear what you are suggesting here are you saying expert scientific advice should be bypassed ?”*), it was difficult overall to find a clear shape in proposed revisions. But there were some clear pointers too.

There is an important issue at stake

As a consultee from Sri Lanka put it: *"Experts have come to be termed the "Fifth Estate" and today form a powerful group that influences decisions-making in democracies. But they are for the most part hidden, non-transparent and unaccountable"*. A Spanish consultee warned *"Ciudadano! Actuaciones concretas bien estudiadas por técnicos, no tienen porque ser buenas a nivel general"*

Experts on tap not on top is confusing

The title, 'Experts on tap not on top' was clearly confusing for some: *"expertise rarely "on top"... Issue is more about ensuring evidence is used and used effectively. While not settling the terms of the governance debate esp. on emergent technologies"; "Seems to imply experts are 'on top' currently. One of biggest issues is that scientists are not listened to, respected enough currently"*. Another person also objected to the words 'on top', for different reasons: *"Why on top? Often the most important person is the low level scientist/administrator who decides whether an ecological issue is important enough to be given to the politician. If the low level scientist does not pass the information on the politician will not know"*. There was a view, from one consultee in the UK, that scientists should have more power: *"Scientists skilled in climate change on the climate change committee should have more power"* Another eschewed the 'on tap', 'on top' language, suggesting *"Ensure that experts are listened to (but that systems are in place to peer review etc) and that they are the appropriate experts"*. **The Mark 1 Manifesto bears the new title "balance knowledge, participation and representation"**.

There is a need to rethink the notion of 'expertise'

"'Expertise' needs to be defined more broadly", said one, whilst another saw expertise as *"wisdom – howsoever defined"*. In particular, the first-hand knowledge of people living close to the impacts of environmental or social change needs to be valued; suggesting a shift from 'expertise' to 'knowledge'. A Spanish consultee said *"Expertos en un territorio son todos - los científicos solo una parte"*. A UK consultee noted that: *"Indigenous peoples and working class communities are often experts on vital elements of SD, but their knowledge is marginalised"*. Another consultee focused on indigenous knowledge: *"Recognise power and insight of indigenous knowledge. We need "experts" to be humble in recognition – what "others" know."* This aside, the disciplinary 'expertise' sought needs to shift: *"whilst allowing the fact that scientists are always having their hypothesis developed, ecologists should be taken more account of than current-style economists"*. *"Experts in one small section of economy, e.g. financial economy, need to be viewed in light of future big picture"*. Another consultee addressed the inter-disciplinary nature of the expertise to be considered, suggesting adding the words *"...whilst also allowing expertise, in e.g. science, law and social science"*... A consultee from the Philippines also reflected this theme, suggesting the addition of the following words *"....expertise, science, transparent space responds and*

adjusts to the actual and local experiences of constituencies at the grass-roots level." A UK consultee reinforced a related message: *"I think you are missing a big important thing though which is the importance of giving due consideration to diversity of opinion and expertise. I think a Manifesto would propose and celebrate the need for society to consider diversity of opinion"*. Equally, the integration of traditional knowledge within decision-making is important, noted participants in the Buenos Aires consultation workshop, who added a link to participation and citizenship with the key question *"Como crear e 'saber' aliado al reclamo ciudadano para tener incidencia sobre el proceso politico"*. *"Y que trabaje con un interes public"*. Finally, a consultee from Portugal noted the need for a *"mindset evolution to an integral worldview. 'Experts' would become (replaced) complexity or change facilitators / coaches with an integral worldview acting to nurture and support interaction between system stakeholders in their process of evolution"*. The Mark 1 Manifesto emphasises that the detailed knowledge of ordinary people on practices and impacts of which they have first-hand experience needs to be respected as 'expert' evidence.

Independence needs to be stressed

The independence of expertise emerged as an important theme. In the words of one consultee: *"to do this we need experts who aren't bought. Need to confront the problem of the corporate power directly"*. Another added *"Definitely need an independence to experts"*, one suggested adding the words 'independent and objective' as qualifiers to the word 'expert', and another consultee directly addressed the link between science and commerce: *"Science, in the present world has itself been influenced by the huge investments in the business world. Therefore complete reliance on science may lead to biased results and decisions. A check mechanism for new age science also needs to be developed before we may fully trust scientific data and findings"*. Another consultee also suggested that experts *"should be subject to wide peer review"*, and two added an accountability dimension: *"experts should be accountable"*; and *"I would add 'accountable' after the word transparent so it reads: "... transparent and accountable space to offer insights and inform policy"*, respectively. The Mark 1 Manifesto refers to 'independent' experts and 'independent' advice, and also incorporates a proposal from a consultee for a new Principle (as to which see Annex C) to address the need for research findings to be protected from distortion by privately funded media.

On the quality of participation

The detailed quality of participation that might be demanded by steps to implement the principle did not receive a great deal of attention in responses, though one person added *"[t]hese processes also need to be transparent"* and a consultee in Spain noted that *"No puede haber participación ciudadana sin la implicación de los técnicos para informar al ciudadano. Reuniones conjuntas entre técnicos y ciudadanos. Ambos pueden aprender de los otros"*. One respondent indicated that 'participatory' should mean an obligation to

participate, another agreed with the principle, adding “*but with people*”, and another, also agreeing, added the rider, “[w]ithin appropriate participatory democracy”. Finally, one comment from the Christian Ecology Links workshop also pointed to the importance of linking implementation of the principle to change in other areas: “*education and media must alter otherwise no one participates*”. Our Mark 1 Manifesto addresses these issues in two ways: a) it says that ‘to the greatest extent possible’ independent expert advice and evidence to elected representatives should be submitted to public scrutiny and feedback before decision-making, and b) where science is uncertain or potential risks to the environment grave, leaders at all levels need to prepare people to play an active part in decision-making based not only on an assessment of evidence but also shared community values.

Should the qualities of elected representatives be addressed?

There was an ambiguity in the draft principle which some consultees picked up on. ‘Experts on tap not on top’ could imply that political leaders or elected representatives (those ‘on top’) should not themselves be experts. Some consultees disagreed. One consultee, for example, mused do we really want experts on tap not on top? i.e. we do want people at the top to be experts. It was not our intention to address this issue when drafting the principle, and these comments clearly show that there is a need for clarification. They are also helpful in offering additional pointers into the desired qualities, and ways of working, of political leaders. For example a consultee from Spain said: “*Creo que las personas que toman decisiones deben ser especialistas o al menos estar capacitadas para entender las decisiones que adoptan y, por tanto, lo que implican*”. One consultee from Singapore proposed: “*Pay those who are on top highly to curb corruption. E.g. Singapore – highest ministerial pay, lowest corruption!*”. A consultee from the US, agreeing with the Principle, saw it as a means to combat corruption, and added recommendations for: “*funding caps in elections; TRANSPARENCY and ACCOUNTABILITY in all economic and democratic endeavours – even hiring Citizen Auditors to make sure there is NO CORRUPTION. Citizens must have faith in our democracy, obviously this is needed in all financial transactions*”. A consultee from the UK reflected: “*I think I might be tempted to trust an expert over a politician. I think one of the advantages the UK has over the US is that our senior politicians seem to be amongst our brightest and most capable people, this doesn't always seem to be the case in the US. I think experts are going to play a big role in the coming century, we just need to make sure that they are accountable and that there is transparency around the decision making process*”. These comments point to a further area for consideration: namely what are the substantive qualities, if any, demanded of political leaders or elected representatives in the face of unsustainable development? “*Muy importante - mayor especialización de aquellos que nos representan*”(Spain). The Mark 1 Manifesto has been redrafted with a view to ensuring that it is clear that it is not intended to address the expertise of elected representatives.

Question for Salzburg: Should it say something about the qualities of elected representatives?

Some consultees thought that **experts should have more space**

“Experts need greater space”. “Non-expert politicians should have regard to expertise much more”, said one consultee. Our Mark 1 Manifesto seeks to draw a balance. On one hand it suggests that the advice and evidence of independent experts should be taken seriously *“when a clear assessment of facts, impacts or possible future scenarios is needed”,* and second that *“expert evidence is not a substitute for decision-making by the people”.*

One consultee from the Netherlands reflected that the principle *“seems to be a description of the status quo in many developed countries. Maybe one can ask, how to improve the role of experts, also in developed countries”.* The Mark 1 Manifesto has been redrafted to address in more detail the substantive relationship between expertise (‘knowledge’), participation and representation. However, a question remains for Salzburg: do we *need* a principle on the relationship between science, expertise, knowledge and participation?

Communication by technical ‘experts’ is also a challenge. Participants at the Buenos Aires consultation workshop noted that *“Experts speak in a different language and can’t be understood. Need to improve communication about expert knowledge.”* We have addressed this suggestion in two ways in the Mark 1 Manifesto: in the first place by providing a greater role for public comment on scientific findings, and in the second place by taking up the suggestion (in the context of a proposal for a new Principle) that there be public investment in objective dissemination of findings.

There were significant gaps in the consultation responses

In particular, it proved very hard here to match suggested ‘actions’ to this principle. Furthermore, no clear view on the relationship between science, or technical expertise, participation, deliberation and representation emerged. The Mark 1 Manifesto incorporates a number of new paragraphs to ensure that the revised ‘expertise and knowledge’ Principle is linked to the emphasis on public participation and deliberation elsewhere in the Manifesto, together with regard for shared community values. **Question for Salzburg:** in the Mark 1 Manifesto, this Principle is considerably too long. What could be dropped or edited?

Finally, based on a conversation with one expert, Mark 1 of the Manifesto incorporates a reference to allowing for *“the involvement of individual members of the public”* in the governance of Institutions and processes that help to ensure that expert evidence is provided to elected representatives, policy-makers and citizens, *“whether based on election or on selection by lot”.*

Proposed commitments

In our Mark 1 Manifesto we have drawn on consultees' comments on the Principle as initially proposed and more generally, together with our own research on the relationship between democracy and climate change, to make proposals on 'Commitments'. We propose that Commitments address the following four themes:

- Bringing public scrutiny and engagement into international and national scientific processes that inform public decision-making on key sustainability challenges, including for example climate change
- Making the case for decision-making to value first-hand experience as 'expertise',
- Making the case for decision-making to value the 'expert' input of a wider range of evidence and expertise (i.e. to counter the heavy reliance on economic evidence and expertise, at the expense of expert evidence or first-hand knowledge of social or environmental impacts and options).
- Making the case for evidence-based decisions to be grounded in community values and responsibilities, not simply the rights and interests of individuals.

One consultee suggested that sharing health insights was relevant to empowerment, since power is limited by ill-health. We have not currently incorporated this proposed 'action' since it is difficult to site with any clarity among the current Principles. **Should we?**

E-polling could be linked to information provided in the form of unbiased parliamentary research papers and notes. In the UK's Westminster government context, these are developed by the library of the House of Commons and House of Lords respectively to provide unbiased information to parliamentarians, and are made publicly available (UK)

Experts could be attached to polling booths at election time to help voters decide how to vote: *"selection (random?) of experts provided at polling time/station"* (UK)

Experts should engage with communities through schools on any policy change decisions (UK)

A consultee from the Philippines suggested that local government units should allow *"universities to share their expertise in the formation of policy by conducting social scientific research"*.

Question for Salzburg: Given that the Commitments have little direct basis in 'actions' proposed by consultees (as distinct from proposed amendments to the Principle), the Commitments associated with this Principle remain particularly open to change based on the expert input of participants at the Salzburg workshop. The relationship between

expertise, particularly scientific expertise, and participation, is a field where there is considerable academic and policy-oriented research.

Proposed resources

Box 5: Experts engaging the public

The Committee on Radioactive Waste Management is a group of independent experts appointed by the UK government. They scrutinise plans for managing UK higher activity radioactive waste now and into the future, and regularly seek stakeholder and public views. Comments are recorded, and taken into account in the Committee's deliberations.

In 2010, the Natural Environment Research Council ran a public dialogue on geo-engineering, in collaboration with Sciencewise-ERC, the UK's national centre for public dialogue in policy making involving science and technology issues. At the workshops, participants came together for up to three days to discuss the ethical, moral and social issues associated with the possible use of geoengineering methods to alter our environment.

In the former case, input is sought from an informed section of the public, effectively limiting accessibility of the process to those stakeholders with previous expertise. In the latter case, awareness and knowledge of geoengineering were low prior to the dialogue sessions, but developed as the dialogue proceeded, with implications for science communication in the future.

Sources: <http://corwm.decc.gov.uk/en/crwm/cms/consultations/consultations.aspx>
<http://www.nerc.ac.uk/about/consult/geoengineering.asp>

Principle 4: Separate Democracy from Unsustainable Growth

During the consultation process this was initially proposed as Principle 2 and read as follows:

Principle 2: Get beyond money: *By finding ways to break the apparent bond between liberal democracy and mainstream economic growth models that support unsustainable production and consumption.*

- Overall, 234 consultees (77.27% of the total number of consultees) provided an individual response which included views on this principle.
- Of this total, 221 consultees agreed with the principle, 33 with additional comments and 188 with no further comment.

- 13 (4.55%) disagreed, of whom 9 offered additional comments.
- 52 (18.18%) expressed no view or did not know, of whom 8 offered additional comments.

Reactions to the consultation draft

Whilst a large majority of those who responded to the Principle agreed with it, it is clear that at the same time the simplicity of a ‘beyond money’ principle (or in the Spanish translation a principle headed ‘trascender el simplismo del modelo económico predominante’) raises many questions and it is clear from responses that Principle 2, in the form in which we had initially proposed it, may not have hit its mark.

The overall problem

A Brazilian consultee expressed his overall concerns about the current economic model: *“O modelo economico actual nao promove a involucao social, so perpetua a escravidao (China) e o colonialismo (EU, USA, Canada...)”* (Brazil). One Spanish consultee suggested simply *“el desarrollo sostenible no puede alcanzarse con un crecimiento económico permanente”*, and another added *“parar la carrera de crecimiento económico a nivel mundial.”*

Refer positively to other values rather than just criticising consumerism

A participant in a UK workshop said that the principle should not just criticise consumerism but commend other values. Another UK consultee reinforced this message: *“I...think you could phrase it in a more progressive and motivational, inspirational way. A going forward sort of phrase - where models of prosperity support sustainable production and consumption. Switch it round. People find it much easier to support a positive model than a negative one. Also it allows people to get behind something. A Manifesto is, after all, proposing a mandate for positive change, not just complaining about how things are”*. The Mark 1 Manifesto refers to supporting people to innovate, grow and do things in ways that are green and fair. The proposed ‘actions’ refers to a healthy environment and fairness for all, now and in the future.

Get away from ‘liberal’ and ‘mainstream’

In direct responses to the text, two consultees expressed reservations about the words ‘liberal’ and one about ‘mainstream economic growth models’. Neither term is used in the Mark 1 Manifesto.

Get more radical

A consultee from the UK suggested that it might be necessary to question capitalism itself in the principle, rather than simply ‘liberal democracy’, and another proposed that *“[t]he ideology of capitalistic freedom needs to be replaced by the pursuit of the good”*. In contrast,

another asked simply whether it would be better *“if the mainstream economic growth models will be improved so that they provide sustainable production and consumption”*, one person said that there was *“nothing wrong with democracy and economics being tied in a responsible manner”*, and a Spanish consultee wrote that *“El problema ..[no es].. el modelo económico sino administrativo y burocrático”*. The Mark 1 Manifesto critiques ‘economig growth models’ that lead to negative environmental and social effects, but does not refer to *capitalism per se*. The language is more positive in tone – setting out what elected representatives and businesses need to commit to.

Democracy or its policy objectives: the link to values

Perhaps democracy itself is not the target either, hinted another response which focused, instead, on ‘policy objectives’ and suggested *“refocusing policy objectives from economic growth and the macroeconomy to the satisfaction of basic economic and social rights, equity, health and well-being, and sustainability”*. The connection to underlying societal values was also made by the consultee who suggested that the principle refer to *“Reasons for living and for thinking well of ourselves that do not involve the accumulation of material things”*. One UK consultee suggested that there was a need to *“[b]reak the link between poverty and thrift – thrift, reuse, recycling, pre-cycling are good for everyone. Make having a recycled handbag chic rather than latest £500 designer bag”*. The role of people as a whole (as distinct from elected representatives and businesses) in delivering the changes called for in the Principle is not directly addressed in the text of the Principle. However, Principles addressing the need for a longer-term perspective (Taking the Long View), and the cultivation of less individualistic values support this, and we have incorporated the idea of ‘leading by example’ through lifestyle choices in the proposed commitments, with a link to elected representatives (*“We will commit to lifestyles that demonstrate that it is the will of the people that our elected representatives prioritise action to deliver a healthy environment and fairness for all, now and in the future. This is consistent with the idea that taking the idea of a genuinely people-centred democracy as a starting point, ‘responsible consumption’, at the individual level, is not the primary pathway to change.*

Question for Salzburg: Does this stack up? Should the Principle refer somehow to ‘responsible consumption’, or is the current balance right? If so, how can it do so clearly without losing the clear connection to ‘democracy’ in which all people are equals (as opposed to the idea that people with greater spending power have more influence)?

(Spanish version): Drop the reference to ‘el simplismo’ of the dominant economic model It isn’t simple, noted participants in a workshop in Buenos Aires organised by Fundación Cambio Democrático, and a consultee at CONAMA2012 in Spain. The Mark 1 Manifesto does not lend itself to this translation.

Define your alternatives

The core challenge to the principle lies in the suggestion that it define 'alternative growth models'. The Mark 1 Manifesto effectively assumes that if the current bond between democracy and unsustainable economic models could be broken; the substance of 'alternative growth models' would emerge more clearly. At the same time it sets out the general pathway: transforming economic growth models that lead to environmental destruction, keep people in poverty and open up huge gaps in income and resources. It also adopts a suggestion, from one consultee, that economies must support us, as people, to find ways to innovate, grow, and do things in ways that are both green and fair.

Civil society, public and private

At a workshop in Buenos Aires, participants asked "como lograr la sinergia entre sociedad civil, privado, y public?" One noted that the actor with the greatest capacity to generate a change is the state; but at the same time "*muchos sectores (como energia) se manejan por mecanismos de govenanza privados y el estado no tiene mayor influencia*". Regulation, they noted, needs to be regionally integrated, otherwise businesses relocate from one country to another.

State/common ownership/nationalisation

Related to the previous points: a UK consultee proposed "*a strong public sector of the economy, by placing large basic and corporatised industries, major banks and the land in nationalised, state or common ownership and governed by democracy*" Commenting on Principle 1, another UK consultee referred to "identification and protection of commons from private appropriation" We have not addressed these suggestions directly in our Principle or commitments, principally on the basis that they do not resonate clearly with other responses, though we have tried to refer to the idea of 'the commons' in the Mark 1 Manifesto.

An 'apparent' bond?

There was also a suggestion that the word 'apparent' in the English version of the principle begged the question of whether there was or was not real evidence to support the idea of a bond between democracy and unsustainable economic growth ('widespread link' would be a better term, said one) The Mark 1 Manifesto has moved away from this formulation.

Money or growth?

The reference to 'money' in the English version of the principle proved controversial. Several consultees questioned whether 'money' was the right target: perhaps 'conventional growth' would be better, said one, or "*richer understanding of value and economic growth*", said another or 'beyond short term profit', as in another suggestion (echoed in the remark from a consultee in the Philippines that "[s]ustainable production is often compromised in

lieu of profit”) or ‘beyond growth’ (both from the UK). A UK consultee proposed dropping “*economic growth as a policy goal*”. Another said “*We will always have money it will always be important. Perhaps get beyond growth might be better or even realign consumption or displace materialism*”. More gloomily there was the suggestion that “*we’re lumbered with money, it’s how it’s used*”. But there were also pointers to alternative models, as with the Spanish consultee who proposed “*Fomento de la ‘economía verde’*” The Mark 1 Manifesto drops the reference to ‘money’, choosing instead to describe the undesirable effects of economic growth models and clarifying that economies need to support people to ‘innovate, grow, and do things in ways that are both green and fair’.

Add a reference to closing the gap between rich and poor

An English consultee suggested that the Principle incorporate a reference to closing the gap between rich and poor, and at the Buenos Aires consultation workshop, one participant referred to the “new architecture of inequality”: “*chicos se mueren de gordura y [hay] otros que se mueren de hambre*”. From Spain, a consultee proposed “*Estableciendo porcentajes reales de enriquecimiento y consecuente distribución de la riqueza y bienestar para los individuos y los grupos que los individuos manejamos*”. In the UK context, a pioneering book, *The Spirit Level*, has lent particular fuel to the idea that a focus on reducing income inequality can bring benefits that can be strongly associated with sustainable development. In the words of one UK consultee: “*Examples can be found in “The Spirit Level” where countries with greater income equality provide evidence of the population living a better, healthier and happier life*”. The Mark 1 Manifesto text refers to gaps in income and resources between the richest and poorest, saying that economic growth models that generate such effects should be ‘transformed’. There is little basis in the consultation responses for a stronger formulation.

Embedding the market in society

A consultee from the Philippines suggested that the market must be embedded in society market; rather than vice versa: “*The capitalism/ market fundamentalism, in the words of Joseph Stiglitz, must also be seriously problematized. As Polanyi also argued, nowadays, society is embedded in the (global capitalist) market. Instead, we must strive to embed the market into society. Multi-national corporations’ supranational reach and powers should be greatly neutered or at least, changed for sustainable development rather than sheer profit-making*”. We hope that the overall sense of this suggestion, if not its precise terms, have been incorporated within the Mark 1 Manifesto.

Sequencing and timing for implementation of the Principle: There were comments on the timing and nature of the changes needed to implement this Principle. For example, one consultee cautioned that the principle should not be implemented before “a consensual working model has been found to replace it”. Another UK input was more pessimistic. The

principle, this consultee suggested, was *"fundamental for future of humanity (but only total collapse will achieve this!)"*. Another noted that *"[a]ll countries and financial systems are predicated on unsustainable growth. This will need a revolution"*. The Mark 1 Manifesto does not respond specifically to these suggestions, treating them as comments on the challenges of implementation.

Additional principles? A UK consultee suggested as additional principles: *"Stop the financialization of the global economy, particularly in terms of food commodities. Practice food sovereignty over the current model of food security"*. This was in some respects echoed in the comment from a Spanish consultee that *"Dentro del sistema democrático caben tantos modelos económicos como se quieren plantear. Lo importante es que los organismos internacionales que rigen el sistema financiero estén regulados"*. We have not incorporated these detailed suggestions directly in the Mark 1 Manifesto text, consistent with a decision not to single out any individual sector.

Proposed commitments

Here, perhaps more than any other Principle, suggestions on ‘actions’ and ‘innovations’ showed that our consultees saw a close link between social and civic innovation on the one hand and the formal business of democracy, understood as a political system, on the other. In the words of a consultee from Thailand, *"social innovators are catalysts for democracy"*. A UK consultee effectively linked this insight to the UN Charter, suggesting that *"as reflected in the UN Charter democratic legitimacy resides in the pooling of individual's sovereign collectively. The exercise of it is therefore at family, community, religious, states and internationally - though of course states do have a particular prominence"* Another explicitly made a link to lifestyles, and pointed to the potential power of voluntarism. Education (now a separate principle) was also highlighted as a basis for implementation of the principle.

We highlight the complete set of suggestions below. Based on these, we propose that commitments under this Principle address five distinct areas of activity:

- Development and dissemination of alternative measures of progress beyond ‘GDP’ or ‘inflation’.
- Reform of enterprise regulation so that the purpose of enterprises is directly to contribute to delivering a healthy environment and fairness for all
- Support for experimentation with collaborative enterprise models that can help both to strengthen democracy and the ‘green and fair’ economy.
- Support for regulation to ensure full transparency in the funding of political parties and candidates and place limits on private finance for political campaigns.

- In addition, as discussed above, we have sought to link the Principle to values with a Commitment to take lifestyle choices that can demonstrate to elected representatives that they need to prioritise action to deliver a green and fair economy.

Measuring progress

Numerous respondents suggested that there is a need to develop measures of progress beyond economic growth, employment, trade deficits and/or surpluses. Suggestions included developing measures to gauge progress in terms of health, happiness (or Gross National Happiness) and wellbeing, or recognition for the idea of the 'environmental footprint'. A Spanish consultee proposed: *"Mejorar la (FIB) Felicidad Interna Bruta, e no el PIB, Producto Interno Bruto Democracia participativa y no representativa; maior preocupación por las perspectivas ambiental, social y cultural en vez de la económica"*. At the same time, using the example of carbon accounting, a consultee from Honduras cautioned that highly aggregated measures could obscure the realities of huge differences in lifestyles between wealthy and poor people, and suggested: *"Eliminar los promedios nacionales y sectorizar las estadísticas: e.g, huella de carbón de un hondureño promedio no es indicador ni deja huella del 70% de la población (en pobreza), ni tampoco del 5% de la población que posee gran parte de la riqueza del país"*.

One UK consultee suggested *"independently produced sustainability accounts for countries, showing use of natural resources and valuation of long term assets and liabilities"*. These sustainability accounts could then become *"something that the public can hold politicians to account for"*. Another UK consultee suggested *"GDP calculations must be changed to include sustainability"*, and another *"Govt accounting on "planet living" basis not just carbon accounting"*. Another UK consultee suggested: *"Ensure sufficiency and wellbeing are the criteria for a successful democracy (not GDP growth)"*.

Reform of company law

Limited liability corporations have a significant impact on the practice of democracy (negatively as 'vested interests' and positively as 'stakeholders'). There are inherent limitations in the corporate form from a sustainability perspective given the duty of board members to maximise shareholder value. Add those limitations to any system of democracy that is short-termist, vulnerable to capture by vested interests, and committed to delivering economic growth, and the corporate form, not matter how many other experiments exist, can hamper efforts to put democracy on track to deliver sustainable development. Some respondents noted this, suggesting for example that every enterprise should be a social enterprise (in one case) and that *"the legislative boundary for private collective (ie corporate) enterprise"* should be moved *"from outside the corporation to inside"*, or in another case suggesting *"[r]evise the extent of limited liability so that there is tangible liability e.g. shareholders bear 25% of liability for damage caused by their companies"*, or *"Compulsory expanded company reporting to include measures on sustainability, training*

and procurement". A UK consultee suggested *"profit maximisation on directors in company law to be changed to sustainable benefits and returns for all stakeholders"*.

Corporate accountability

A UK consultee proposed accountability of multinationals, as well as governments, to voters and stakeholders (initially in relation to the Principle addressing economic growth). We have taken the view that this properly belongs in Principle 1; with the economic growth Principle focusing instead on enterprise regulation.

Corporate social responsibility

Voluntary action in the marketplace was endorsed by some consultees, as in the response from a Pakistani consultee: *"Ethical codes need to be strengthened and promoted, especially for promoting sustainable businesses. Multinational businesses are often found to be exploiting local conditions for their own benefits rather taking into account choices of the people. This not only creates disparity within the region, but also promotes corruption, and curtails the socio-economic growth of the within local region."*

Community-based social enterprise and innovation 'beyond money'

Asked to suggested 'innovations' or 'actions' for democracy and sustainable development, numerous consultees pointed to community-based initiatives. One, from Spain, suggested that *"economía local: consumo local de productos como única opción contra la crisis económica y para caminar hacia la sostenibilidad"* More than one consultee in the UK pointed to the launch of local currencies to keep money circulating in the local economy (such as, in the UK, the Bristol or Stroud or Lewes or Totnes or Brixton pound schemes – with local currencies encouraging people to rethink their relationship with money and the economy, at the same time as supporting local businesses and keeping money circulating locally). Other ideas included initiatives (such as local exchange trading systems or time banking) designed to open up forms of trade not based in money that could foster new friendships and community connections as well as building self and community reliance.

Community based food growing schemes and community gardens

These were proposed as examples of positive innovation, both as economic alternatives and as positive models of participation and engagement. For example, a UK consultee pointed to a local initiative; Incredible Edible Todmorden; as an example); and another said that *"[a]llotment holders in this country seem to offer a working model of mutual support around food production in an industrialised society"* (UK consultee). Other practical examples included a "Community owned greengrocers shop (Slaithwaite) - Kirklees, W Yorkshire. Community orchard. Community owned meals on wheels". One UK consultee noted that a local bakery had also issued "bread bonds" – one loaf for two years in return for a cash investment. (UK). **Consumption of local food products:** From Spain, one consultee simply

proposed *“consumo de productos locales (autarquía)”*

Focus on needs, not the market A Brazilian consultee proposed: *“fortalecer e incentivar a construção de uma nova dinâmica econômica focada nas necessidades das pessoas e não do Mercado”*

Reform of the financial services sector

With the aftermath of the 2008 financial crisis still deeply felt across many of the world’s richer nations, a number of UK consultees proposed actions related to the financial services sector. These included re-regulation of the global banking system; destruction of major financial speculative markets; banking and finance to be controlled by laws of their nation states, including a cap on size; and the splitting of commercial banking from speculative finance. **We have not addressed sector-specific proposals in the ‘commitments’, seeking to identify a set of more general principles and actions.**

Stronger sustainable development institutions (but do they belong under this Principle?)

Strong public sustainable development institutions offer one way to counteract the problems associated with the links between democracy and economic growth. There is also a strong link to enterprises, as in the proposal to: *“Instalar y adecuar departamentos, instituciones en todas las empresas, corporaciones, entidades e incluso gobiernos de fomento del desarrollo sostenible. Mas coherencia y mas implicación por parte de los trabajadores y masa social”* (Spain).

Questions of institutional capacity are, of course, far more general. At the Buenos Aires consultation workshop, a participant noted that the lack of ‘institutionalisation’ of sustainable development in Latin America means that ‘we’ are often chasing after the latest crisis.

We have allocated proposals for new sustainable development institutions to this Principle; for example a suggestion from one UK consultee that *“I would like to see the concept of SD embedded within the decision making process in local government and national government. So every government department must consider SD whenever they launch a policy or make a significant purchase.”*

Another UK consultee called for reinstatement of the UK’s Commission for Sustainable Development to hold the UK government to account.

One consultee from the UK proposed an Office for Sustainability, together with a requirement that all parliamentary bills and policy changes should be reviewed by the Office for Sustainability before debate. Another, from Hungary, pointed to the role played by

National Round Tables or Councils for Sustainable Development (citing the example of Finland).

At the same time, making sustainable development the central organising principle of government, or strengthening sustainable development institutions, would have repercussions far beyond the separation of democracy from economic growth.

Question for Salzburg: is this the right place to incorporate the idea that sustainable development should be the central organising principle of government? If not, where should it go?

Reform of political funding

A number of consultees pointed to reform of political funding, and the role of private funding in democracy. For example one consultee suggested that there should be more public funding for candidates during elections – with less from private politically motivated sources. Another argued that there is a need for a level playing field for campaign expenditure by political parties. Another called for an end to *“the ability of politicians to be funded by vested interests”*. In a suggestion on for a separate principle, a UK consultee proposed that *“Democracy can't be bought – limits needed on private finance for political campaigns & lobbying”*. **Question for Salzburg:** where does language on political financing belong? Is it here or in the ‘economy’ Principle? Does it deserve a separate principle or sub-principle, (bearing in mind space constraints!)? We have not sought to enter directly the difficult territory of regulation of lobbying. Should we? And if so how, given the Manifesto’s global reach?

Proposed resources

New business models for stronger and greener communities

In the energy sector, one consultee from the UK pointed to the idea of ‘energy democracy’ (see Box 6 below) as a business model that could strengthen communities and enhance community engagement whilst reducing dependency on centralised distribution, and another consultee added: *“issues like wind farms are mostly objected to because of their size. It should be possible (I think it is but we don't hear much about it) for people to generate fuel for their own homes or businesses, thus requiring small scale structures. I'm guessing that the success of this would bypass the major fuel companies so this is why it's not happening.”*

Box 6: Energy democracy

A report from a consultation by the UK Department on Energy and Climate Change (DECC) states, in unambiguous terms, that the “*potential for micro generation in the UK is huge*”. Micro generation, considered as a generation of 45kW for heat and 50kW for electricity, usually acquires the form of small-scale renewable technologies such as solar panels and small wind turbines.

This approach, dubbed ‘energy democracy’, engages community residents as producers of their own heat and power, and no longer simply as energy consumers. By placing decision-making, innovation, and planning in the hands of householders, communities become more responsible in tracking and improving the efficiency of their energy use (and, potentially, to benefit economically from it as well). Such democratization of energy generation empowers communities and contributes to reducing energy costs, as well as counter climate change.

Sources: <http://www.resurgence.org/magazine/article3420-energy-democracy.html>
<http://www.centerforsocialinclusion.org/ideas/energy-democracy/>
http://www.eeph.org.uk/FileUploads/Microgen_pre-consultation_final_report_1332239869_12.pdf
<http://greeningkirklees.blogspot.co.uk/2010/03/monbiot-rejects-energy-generating.html>

A consultee in the UK pointed to Casse’s ‘Enough is Enough: ten policy steps’ (see *Box 7* below).

Box 7: CASSE’s Enough is Enough

In 2010, the Center for the Advancement of the Steady State Economy (CASSE) produced ‘Enough is Enough’ – a collection of policy initiatives, tools, and reforms for an economy that makes *enough* its goal instead of *more*. Of the ten proposals, Number four is called ‘Reform the Monetary System’ and refers to centralized control of the money supply, local currencies, and “*a neutral international currency to replace the reserve currencies in use today*”; a proposal which relates in subject matter at least to the suggestion of one UK consultee that there be a single global currency. Number five considers alternatives to GDP (a suggestion which finds resonance in a number of other consultation responses), and number ten, ‘Engaging Politicians and the Media’, includes the suggestion of producing an independent film; a tactic that the launch of the manifesto is itself likely to make use of. (See <http://steadystate.org/enough-is-enough/>)

Principle 5: Ensure that people everywhere count, from the global to the local

During the consultation process this was initially proposed as Principle 5 and read as follows:

Principle 5: Ensure that people everywhere are important: *By finding ways to ensure that national and local democracy and international decision-making serve the long-term collective public interest in sustainable development, not just the interests of people with a right to vote or the narrowly defined interests of individual states.*

- Overall, 231 consultees (79.02% of the total number of consultees) provided an individual response which included views on this principle.
- Of this total, 226 consultees agreed with the principle, 32 with additional comments and 194 with no further comment.
- 5 (1.75%) disagreed, of whom 3 offered additional comments.
- 55 (19.23%) expressed no view or did not know, of whom 7 offered additional comments.

Reactions to the consultation draft

Overall clarity

Two consultees suggested that the Principle needed to be more clearly worded or that its language was too complex. One said that the principle was too vague: *"there must be a time limit for the 'talking to' step and decisions made - in the public interest"* The version of the Principle in the Mark 1 Manifesto has become considerably longer in response to comments: it is now significantly too long and needs to be reduced by around 50-70%. Salzburg workshop participants were asked to help!

Can it be done?

"Long-term collective public interest" and *"a right to vote"* are too hard to separate, said one consultee, raising the possibility that it might be impossible to bring non-voting or non-participating people (or others) into the frame. Another UK consultee added *"I think there will always be trade offs and that this should be acknowledged, but where there is the ability to understand what trade offs we are making then this makes it more democratic"*.

In Mark 1 of the Manifesto, we have responded through this Principle to a number of suggestions that **marginalised voices need more effectively to be included in the practice of democracy**. For example, from a consultee from Chile: *"Incluir de manera amplia a todos los sectores de la sociedad, incluidos a aquellos desencantados de la politica, como los*

jovenes”, “Need to empower the poor and weak; not just support the rich”, or at a more fundamental level, from a Brazilian consultee: “Promover acesso das populacoes mais vulneráveis a liberdade (alimentacao, saúde, educação, e segurança); garantir os direitos civis a toda sociedade”.

Affirming the core problem

Some consultees offered suggestions which essentially affirmed some of the core concerns to which the principle is directed: “[g]ood governance may be a huge issue in this provision as decision-making lies in the hands of the politicians. Most often, personal interests are prioritized over those pushing for sustainable development”. One consultee from Germany said: “I think it is very important that politicians [are] kind of forced to work for a nation's wellbeing and benefits as a whole. Sadly, most of the time politicians favour a special group, (mainly powerful groups that dispose of lots of resources for lobbying). This is an important issue of democracy”.

Which levels of decision-making?

A UK consultee proposed a new principle of “democracy all the way from micro (local) to macro (global)”. The Mark 1 Manifesto includes separate paragraphs on democracy generally and on democracy and decision-making between states, respectively.

Relationship with Principle 6 (long-termism and future generations)

One consultee raised the question of the relationship between this Principle (number 5 in the Mark 1 Manifesto) and what is now Principle 6 on future generations/long-termism; proposing that this Principle too include future generations; this sentiment was also implied in another suggestion that the principle related to “People everywhere and for all time” The Mark 1 Manifesto refers to fairness for all ‘now and in the future’, and makes a link to the ‘needs of future generations’. However, the specific problem of short-termism is addressed as a separate Principle and future generations are not associated, in this Principle, with specific Commitments. **Question for Salzburg:** do you agree that the issue of ensuring that all people everywhere count, and the issue of short-termism, call for distinct responses in terms of the drafting of the Manifesto?

Public interest or the common interest?

A consultee in Spain stressed that the Manifesto should draw a clear distinction between ‘the public’, ‘the private’ and ‘the commons’ (with the future, for example, a commons rather than simply a temporal concept that is ‘in the public interest’ to consider. A consultee from the Philippines referred to “Aggregation that is subordinated to a collective interest that pushes for collective gains while remaining respectful of minority interests” (Philippines). The Mark 1 Manifesto refers to our ‘common interest’ as people in a healthy environment.

Who currently decides?

One UK consultee suggested that the Principle does not need to spell out who decision-making is currently limited to (rather, it could simply refer to who decision-making *should* include). In contrast, another UK consultee said “‘I particularly like’ *“not just the interests of people with a right to vote.”* Another consultee made a link to economic and vested interests: *“not just the interests of people with a right to vote, the moneyed corporate entities, the affluent, the power-holders....”*, as did the consultee who proposed the rewording: *“taking equal account of the interests of all, and not favouring the interests of a minority based on greater voting rights, access or influence”*, and another who suggested adding *“or the interests of lobby groups or the interests of political and economic elites”* The Mark 1 Manifesto says: *“Democracy is not the sum of the individual wishes of powerful elites, or even people who are given a vote or who choose actively to participate in decision-making”*. Question for Salzburg: is this needed, particularly given that some people commented that the Manifesto should set out what it is *for* rather than what it is *against*?

The objectives to which ‘making people everywhere important’ should be directed

Some consultees made suggestions for changes to the objectives to which the Principle should be directed. The words *“sustainable, fair and just”* were suggested in place of ‘sustainable development’ by one, and another consultee suggested adding *“and.. diverse ways people want to live their lives”* after ‘collective public interest in sustainable development’. One person proposed a reference to *“Taking into account the common good”*, and another raised the bigger question: who would, and how to, identify the *“long-term collective public interest in sustainable development”*? These remarks are in some cases manifestations of discomfort by some English language consultees with the words ‘sustainable development’. The Mark 1 Manifesto avoids the use of the words ‘public interest’ and refers to ‘fairness for all, now and in the future’ and to the ‘common interest in maintaining a healthy environment.

Which people should be included in ‘people everywhere’?

One consultee suggested that ‘with a right to vote’ was too specific. Another proposed that the text should properly reflect a distinction between ‘having’ a right to vote and being ‘given’ a right to vote: *“everyone has a right to vote”*, so the Principle should read: *“not just the interests of people who are given a vote or the narrowly defined interests of individual states.”* There were suggestions that the principle should apply to all people *affected* (*“ensure that all people affected are important”*). A consultee from Venezuela wondered about the consequences of making people everywhere count: *“If we are stating we are not going to exclude anybody, what will happen with those communities and countries dominated by communism?”* (The language of the Manifesto does not distinguish between people, or suggest that people are, or more, relevant, on the basis of the political system that they live in). A Spanish consultee proposed that the ideas of *“solidaridad (fraternidad)”*

special y temporal” were relevant to this Principle, with another issuing a call to *“Rechazar el individualismo del ser humano y empezar a vernos como un gran ser”*. The Mark 1 Manifesto text adopts the suggestion in relation to being ‘given’ a right to vote, and now refers to the *“interests of all people affected by public decisions”*, as well as the needs of future generations.

The link to marginalised people, voice, and participation

“Especially agree with the 'right to vote' part” said another, adding that it could also include *“those who aren't active voters”* since in practice *“Non-active citizens are nothing more than subjects”*. This consultee pointed to T.M Marshall’s (1950) *Citizenship and Social Class* (see Box 8 below). Another consultee touched on the same theme with the suggestion that *“marginalized people should be included and not just represented by someone apart from the group who can speak for them. They should definitely have a voice to speak their own views. The subaltern should be able to speak”*. *“[I]nclude the development and support of public institutions to nurture public discussion and participation in the exercise of democracy through the fair election of their representatives from local to national governance structures”* (Zimbabwe); *“..and ensure that marginalized and vulnerable groups and individuals in society are proactively included in decision-making”* (Sri Lanka); *“Atención a los colectivos minoritarios que viven con más intensidad las consecuencias de la degradación medioambiental”* (Spain).

Box 8 Civil, political, and social citizenship

British sociologist T. H. Marshall’s seminal essay *Citizenship and Social Class* analyses the development of citizenship as a development of civil, then political, then social rights. In earlier times, he argues, these three strands *“were wound into a single thread”*, but as modernization of society unfolded, specialization gave way to differentiation of institutions and their purposes, rendering those strands disjointed. Social rights in many ways lagged behind, and – as Marshall points out – *“were not woven into the fabric of citizenship”*.

<http://delong.typepad.com/marshall-citizenship-and-social-class.pdf>

The Mark 1 Manifesto notes that democracy is not the sum of the individual wishes of *“...people ... who choose actively to participate in decision-making”*, but given references elsewhere to inclusive decision-making and to enhancing the quality of participation, this Principle does not otherwise emphasise the participation of marginalised people or groups.

Local decision-making

A number of consultees made a link to the value of decision-making at the local level, as for example in the suggestion *“[r]ecognising the amazing assets and capabilities of local people to tackle their own concerns & opportunities (with appropriate external support)”*, or the suggestion that the principle include identification of *“ways to enable bottom-up national*

and global learning of what is and isn't work at a local level." The Mark 1 Manifesto carries forward these suggestions into a revised Principle 6 (now Principle 7).

Impacts of national decision-making on other countries

Ensuring that people everywhere count would also mean that democratic decision-making at the national level should take account of impacts on people in other countries. A consultee from the Philippines proposed finding *"avenues of empowering less-developed democracies to flourish by compelling richer nations to have an inward observation of their actions that disadvantage the others (in terms of economic policies for example)"*. The Mark 1 Manifesto links this point to the previous point in a paragraph which indicates that a practice deemed 'sustainable' at local or at national level respectively should not be implemented by passing burdens onto neighbouring communities or other countries.

What about the environment?

A number of consultees took a strongly ecocentric view of democracy: *"[t]his is a very people centric view of SD. What about respect for the planet and its intrinsic value and rights of non-human and future generations"*. 'Ecocentric' suggestions went beyond visionary statements of humans' relationship with nature to suggestions that nature too should have rights (as with, for example, the suggestion *"that all people, all species, all life have rights"*, or the proposed reference to *"The rights and needs of earth systems"* from a UK consultee. A softer approach which still allowed the environmental dimension to be enhanced came from the consultee who suggested adding the words: *"Governance should enable people to live a 'good life'. It should promote the health and well being of this planet and enhance the quality of relationships between people and nature"*. Less radically, one UK consultee proposed *"Respect and care for all life on earth and resources (rights for all life)"* as a principle. A consultee from Italy suggested *"I'd say that every human or natural ecosystem is important, when taking decisions"*, and a consultee from the Philippines wrote:

"I find the principles at its current form are quite imposing on what we think the path of nature, in terms of sustainable development, should take -- which is all good. However, perhaps leverage should be given to being sensitive to the 'signs of the times' and to trying to understand this as the language of nature".

Consistent with the principles of intergenerational and intragenerational equity (fairness as between people already alive, and fairness as between people already alive and those yet to be born), and the 'people-centred' approach to democracy (governance of the people by the people for the people), we have not expanded this to provide for the environment or non-human living things to be treated on a par with people. However, in a response to the previous anthropocentricity of the Principle, we have added a reference to taking into account 'our common interest as people in maintaining a healthy environment,' and in addition a new sentence: *"An inclusive people-centred democracy should also reflect the*

value of maintaining healthy ecosystems. This adds a stronger environmental dimension whilst retaining the ‘people focus’ of the Principle.

Global governance and democracy

The principle as initially proposed contains a discrete challenge relating to the democratisation of transnational and global governance. As one consultee put it: *“Our biggest challenges are international, but the political domain is based within nations – how do you overcome?”* One consultee pointed to the proposal for a UN Parliamentary Assembly as relevant to this Principle: *“Support for a World (or UN) Parliamentary Assembly should be made explicit”*. Another also pointed to the particular challenges of decision-making at the global level, saying *“Yes in principle, but exaggerated influence of powerful (individual) states in international decision making bodies must be accounted for”*.

There were other ‘globalist’ sentiments, too. A UK consultee proposed that international collaboration be *“based on the welfare of humanity as a species”*; implicitly a deep challenge to existing decision-making based on the views of individual nation states. But there were also suggestions, squarely, for ‘democratisation’ of global governance, as in this suggestion from a consultee in Germany:

“It is important to address the lack of democratic participation and representation in the system of global governance at the global level.

Strengthening global democracy: by ensuring that the world's citizens are not only heard but actively participate in agenda-setting and decision-making at the level of the UN and international institutions that deal with global commons and other matters that concern the interest of humanity as a whole. One means to achieve this could be the establishment of a popularly elected global parliamentary assembly”.

A German consultee proposes globalisation should be shaped democratically, and adds that *“Citizens have a right as well responsibility to become equal participants in the governance of our common global home”*.

She makes the case for a Parliamentary Assembly at the United Nations in some detail:

“One of the most important step[s] to give people a voice at the global level could be the establishment of a Parliamentary Assembly at the United Nations. This project is supported by a broad international network by over 800 Members of Parliament, 300 non-governmental organizations and over 4,900 individuals from more than 150 countries - the Campaign for a United Nations Parliamentary Assembly (www.unpacampaign.org) (www.kdun.org). Such a new body could be considered essential for the development of global democracy. It could achieve important functions from the beginning:

- give citizens for the first time in history a direct voice at the global level

- *express the idea of mankind as one community and a common responsibility of mankind for this planet*
- *develop a new consciousness of world citizenship - complementary with the familiar national citizenship*
- *operate as a junction at the UN System between the national parliaments, citizens and NGOs*
- *reinforcing democratisation in the countries of the world and supranational organisation*
- *address important world problems publicly and help to develop efficient and democratic procedures of global decision-making -strengthen multilateral effort to overcome the paralysis of the present state-centric system and foster global welfare - become a catalyst for advanced reforms of the UN and the international system*
- *initiate a process to develop itself step by step into a real World Parliament*

Such an Assembly would not need the difficult process of a revision of the UN Charter. It could be created as a consultative body under Article 22 through a vote of the General Assembly. At first it could be composed of delegates from the national parliaments under a schedule of 'weighted voting' but later the delegates could become elected directly by the citizens of the world..

Democracy issues associated with decision-making between states are also relevant at the *regional* level. As a participant at the Buenos Aires consultation workshop said: *"deberia haber un parlamento de Mercosur"*. There is a link to global justice, too, and to the creation of adequate institutions to deliver 'sustainable development justice' at all levels; the sustainable development application of the need for access to justice and redress which is referred to in Principle 1. As a participant in the Buenos Aires workshop put it, making the link to the problem of short-termism, *"[e]nfasis en lo internacional es importante para combatir el cortoplacismo"*. Adding more examples from the global level, another participant at the Buenos Aires workshop suggested, could help to enhance the Manifesto's reach.

We have addressed calls for evolution in regional and global systems of democracy separately within the revised Principle in Mark 1 of the Manifesto, and have explicitly incorporated the call for a UN Parliamentary Assembly into the 'Commitments' associated with the Principle. In doing so, we are also mindful of the value of reinforcing messages within the Manifesto for Global Democracy, launched in 2012, though this document is worded at the level of principle rather than containing very specific actions or commitments.

Proposed commitments

Based on these suggestions, we have proposed six Commitments related to global and regionally democracy; to decision-making at national and local levels; to awareness-raising; and to legal and institutional approaches to natural systems and nature in decision-making, as follows:

- Support for bringing the interests and needs of people who have not been given a vote into democracy at national and local levels (including e.g. children and refugees);
- Support for initiatives designed to build public awareness of the interconnectedness of people everywhere and nature;
- Support for legal and institutional ways to enhance the importance of natural systems and nature in democratic decision-making;
- Support for leaders and elected representatives who seek to forge new ways of balancing responsibility to their electorate with regard for the common interest in delivering a healthy environment and fairness for all.
- Support for initiatives designed to secure formal equality of voting power at the international level, so that the votes of states are proportional to the sizes of their populations;
- Support for reforms designed to ensure that international institutions are accountable to parliaments rather than to the governments of nation states, and to ensure that their processes are transparent and open to public scrutiny
- Support for the campaign for a UN Parliamentary Assembly as the first step towards a system of global democracy beyond the narrow interests of states.

These overall conclusions and Commitments aside, there were relatively few proposals for actions that could clearly be linked to this Principle. We provide a complete listing below.

People shouldn't stand for election based on self-selection. Communities should look out for people and invite them to stand. (UK)

"We need leaders who can listen, not push their own agendas: people who are more facilitators. Leadership is a flexible thing... We need more teachers of consensus decision-making skills." (UK)

Engage with the 'squeezed middle' about interdependence of modern world and impact on our everyday lives (UK)

"Encourage links between UK communities and communities in developing countries – people enjoy working together on projects" (UK)

If it is to last, 'ensuring that people everywhere count' must also be grounded in the peoples' values and practices and daily life experiences. In that vein, a consultee from Kenya suggested *"let's embrace more of the social media and online platforms for sharing...[T] hese*

should [implement] a skills share and learning mission that brings together various stakeholders from across the continent to share experience and strengthen networks”.

Find ways to provide for the symbolic participation of nature, plants or animals in decisions: for example, earthworms and birds could be ‘present’ in discussions about agriculture (UK).

A permanent form of indigenous people to be created in the five UN regional commissions and in every national and provincial assembly, with youth parliaments in all countries tasked with collaborating with these earth custodians (India/US).

A UK/Netherlands-based consultee proposed principles for international organisations, and suggested: *“Formal equality of voting power, somewhere between one-person-one-vote and one-country-one vote (unlike IMF/WB “economic weighting”), e.g. votes proportional to square root of population; Representation through a constituency system (cf IMF/WB Executive Boards) to allow decision-making bodies small enough to be effective (contrast IMF/WB Executive Boards and Security Council with WTO, UN General Assembly and IMF/WB Boards of Governors); BUT with effective accountability to constituents (unlike IMF/WB); Accountability to Parliaments, not governments; Transparency of decision-making (documents published well before consideration; web-casts + published transcripts of discussions; recorded votes, etc); All decision-making processes should be conducted through formal institutions observing these principles (unlike WTO “Ministerial”, “Mini-Ministerial” and “Green Room” meetings, and “Confessionals”); Long-term: consider a global Parliament (with internationally supervised/conducted elections as condition for participation?)”*

“One person, one vote. Everyone entitled to vote (excluding children), including prisoners” (UK). (NB: in the UK convicted prisoners are not permitted to vote).

Proposed resources

(Including living beings in decision-making): The Council of All Beings.

Manifesto for Global Democracy

Campaign for a UN Parliamentary Assembly

Principle 6: Take the long view

During the consultation process this was proposed as Principle 4 and read as follows:

Principle 4: Tackle short-termism: *By ensuring that the practice of democracy from the global to the local takes proper account of the long-term, and of the needs of future generations*

- Overall, 241 consultees (81.47% of the total number of consultees) provided an individual response which included views on this principle.
- Of this total, 233 consultees agreed with the principle, 37 with additional comments and 196 with no further comment.
- 8 (2.80%) disagreed, of whom 2 offered additional comments.
- 45 (15.73%) expressed no view or did not know, of whom 3 offered additional comments.

Reactions to the consultation draft

Overall, the principle was warmly welcomed ('essential!' 'key', 'yes yes', for example) though some reservations were expressed in comments. At a general level, one consultee found the prose style of this principle too colloquial; though another commented "*Good - essential principle. All the others are too worthy and wordy*". **Question for Salzburg:** As proposed in the Mark 1 Manifesto, this Principle is significantly shorter than any of the others. Should they all be the same length, as a matter of course, or should we simply take as many words as are needed clearly to state the essence of the Principle?

Long-termism or 'short-termism'?

One consultee could see a future in which "*[l]ong termism becomes entrenched – a voice for all*". Long-termism could become a vehicle for the expression of a wider range of views in democracy. Another consultee reiterated the essential sentiment in the Principle as originally proposed in the consultation: "*Focusing on the needs of future generations. Not short termism.*" Perhaps, said one consultee; a fan of Stuart Brand's book *The Long View*, the principle could be renamed 'taking the long view'? **We have adopted this last suggestion in the Mark 1 Manifesto.**

Democratise the principle

There were notes of caution about the principle from a democracy perspective: "*difficult in a parliamentary democracy*" said one. Another built democratic legitimacy into the operation of the principle with the suggestion that it would be acceptable "*as long as its transparent and highly accountable*" A UK consultee noted that "*Whatever institution is tasked with protecting future generations should be clearly accountable to living citizens - so an elected official/group preferable to an appointed official (such as an ombudsman) event if s/he has been appointed by a democratic government*". **These are valuable guides for the implementation of actions flowing from the Principle, but we have not incorporated them within the text of the Mark 1 Principle itself.**

Refer to the idea of uncertainty

A UK consultee suggested amending the Principle to include the idea of uncertainty about the future: "*by ensuring that the practice of democracy from the local to the global takes proper account of the long-term, of the needs of future generations, and of the uncertainties*

which surround our efforts to take care of the future". Mark 1 of the Manifesto incorporates this idea.

Balancing present and future

There were doubts expressed about the term 'long term' in isolation, with one consultee suggesting adding the word "planning"; and another the words *"implications of present concerns and decisions"*. A UK consultee cautioned: *"[t]he trouble is that short term matters to everyone, as in, what happens in the here and now, to my family, matters most to most people. Short term-ism, is in fact a descriptor, for me, of a particular short term financial management issue. In some respects, the idea of 'long-termism' (in opposition to 'short-termism') may itself be culturally specific"*. As a consultee from Honduras cautioned: *"Las comunidades indígenas de Latino América no tienen una visión de mediano al largo plazo, sino que al tener como prioridad la satisfacción de sus necesidades de 'hoy', han logrado respetar en gran medida las capacidades productivas de los ecosistemas"*.

Others were concerned about the potential to set up a conflict between the essential needs of people alive today, and those of people yet to be born. *"People need to have basic needs taken care of before they worry about the future"*, said one. A consultee from the Philippines said *"it seems that this idea, or perhaps the phrasing, makes short term goals look as if they are to be rejected. I think efforts to address short term goals should also be acknowledged. By meeting the needs of the present can we only be 'comfortable' enough to think about the needs of tomorrow. Maybe a simplistic analogy would be: what use of thinking about eating tomorrow if I can't even eat today. The urgency of the present moment stares us in the face"*; another suggested that the principle be reframed to take into account *"both long-term and short-term needs, with particular attention to the needs of future generations."* In a similar sentiment, a consultee from Honduras noted *"No es lógico guardar para el futuro lo que alguien no puede tener en el presente"*, and a consultee from Spain disagreed with the principle on the basis that it failed to take account of the need to take care of immediate needs too. The Mark 1 Manifesto retains the idea of 'the long view' but balances this with recognition of the importance of meeting short-term needs, too.

Practicalities: How far into the future?

One consultee asked for more specificity about *which* future generations: *"How many years ahead? 50, 100, 500 years?"* We have taken the view that the appropriate timescale for 'the long view' is determined by the particular issues under consideration, and we have not sought to define timeframes.

Practicalities: *"We cannot know the needs of future generations. The future is too unpredictable"* (CEL workshop participants) The Mark 1 Manifesto deliberately refers to the 'needs' of future generations rather than their 'interests' which are less knowable.

Beyond contemplation to impacts

A UK consultee noted that in its originally proposed form, the principle should not just be about 'taking account of' but also about actually achieving longer term thinking. They

pointed to the German democratic system as model. A UK consultee suggested “*Structures to require decision-makers to take account of long-term issues*”. The Mark 1 Manifesto continues to refer to the idea of ‘taking account of’ the needs of future generations given the role of the Principle in promoting a new balance between long and short-term needs and priorities, but also adds the words ‘planning for’, as suggested by another consultee.

Future generations or the Earth Community?

Like Principle 5 (as initially proposed) this Principle raised discussion about the extent to which democracy could provide voice to nature: “[n]ature needs a voice in our democracy too - participatory democracy for all of the Earth Community not just human beings”, said one respondent. As a practical guide to decision-making, a UK consultee proposed that there should be “no conflict between issues on future generations and environmental issues”, implicitly proposing a decision-making approach that seeks out the ‘win-win’ crossover between the environment and the needs of future generations. We have not explicitly referred to ‘future generations of plants and animals’ in our Mark 1 Manifesto text. However, we have introduced the idea of planning for ‘the earth’s natural boundaries’.

Question for Salzburg: are there better ways of making the Principle more environment-centric without losing the idea that people are at the centre of democracy? Should the text be more environment-centric?

Rights for future generations?

Others saw the principle as an opportunity to support the idea of ‘equal weight for future generations’, or for ‘rights’ as well as needs of future generations. We have not gone this far in our amended Principle. Our revised wording is sufficiently flexible to allow space for the principle proposed by another consultee to be respected, namely that: “[f]uture generations can't vote in our election”. We have not gone so far as to enshrine the rights of future generations within the Mark 1 Manifesto; though the actions are framed sufficiently broadly to allow for this to be one possible outcome. **Question for Salzburg:** how to address ?

Linking to leadership

Could inspirational leadership offer a way out of the dilemma created when voters allow their short term interests to prevail, as one consultee suggested? Another mused: “[w]e need a system of democracy that holds politicians accountable but fosters strong political leadership, something that has been lacking in terms of Sustainable Development. I am not sure how we do this perhaps there is a role for institutions such as the UN but they are not elected”. **Question for Salzburg:** the Mark 1 Manifesto does not currently have very much to say about leadership. Should it, and if so where?

Linking to the economy

Given the problems of short-termism within the economy, as highlighted by consultees responding to the initially proposed ‘beyond the money’ principle (e.g: “*There must be a*

greater focus on the long-term effects and outcomes of both policy and corporate issues” (UK), the Mark 1 Manifesto text refers to ‘the short-termism of electoral cycles and company balance-sheets’, seeing the two as closely related, given the (current) link between democracy and unsustainable economic growth models

Proposed commitments

Some consultees wondered about the practical implementation of the principle. *“But how? Can’t be done in the abstract”*, said one, commenting on the initially proposed Principle. But there was no shortage of proposals for ‘actions’ that could help to implement this principle. We provide a complete listing below, and from this we have derived two proposed actions or commitments for inclusion in the Mark 1 Manifesto:

- A commitment to advocate and support development of *institutions and policy approaches* to bring future generations and longer-term thinking and evidence into political processes from the local to the global.
- Commitment to act, through active citizenship, participation and engagement, as advocates for future generations and for the long-term collective interest in sustainability, be it at local, national or international levels.

In addition, we have added a third Commitment to those proposed in the Mark 1 Manifesto, namely:

- Support for political *leaders* who are committed to long-term sustainability

This last commitment reflects the importance of leadership in creating political space for the formal practice of democracy to integrate regard for future generations, as well as showing the way towards a longer-term evolution in collective values so that, over time, integration of the needs of future generations in democracy carries overall societal support.

A consultee from Sri Lanka noted that *“several terms have come to signify this idea: Anticipatory governance, adaptive governance and proactive governance. But they all encompass such things as multi-year budgeting, ombudspersons for future generations etc”*.

A UK consultee proposed *“a positive action campaign for the whole citizenry to inspire everyone to look deeply into the future”*.

A consultee from the UK suggested *“Local people forums to make longer-term decisions over climate change”*.

Others pointed to potential innovations in the basic architecture of democracy: *“[w]ill this inherently mean longer election cycles etc”*, mused one, and another, in the same vein in the

UK context, proposed using the [proposed] *“15 year terms of elected peers to scrutinise legislation for its long term impact”*.

Perhaps giving a vote to younger people would extend time horizons, hinted a consultee from Singapore; and one person from a UK consultation workshop proposed that younger people should have more than one vote in reflection of the longer ‘future’ ahead of them, with older people receiving fewer votes.

Perhaps long-termism could be pioneered through the use of mechanisms that already exist? One consultee from the UK proposed making use of existing under-utilised/unrecognised – democratic vehicles such as England's urban and rural Parish and Town Councils that are empowered to raise local taxes. The link to inspiration for long-term decision-making at the local level was made in the suggestion that *“the global practice of democracy takes into account that of the local in order to achieve long-term and non-imposing needs for future generations”*.

Another approach might be impact assessment; for example, one UK consultee suggested, simply, *“[c]onsideration in decision-making for our impacts on future generations”*. In the same ‘impact assessment’ vein, and two UK-based consultee suggest, respectively, that policy initiatives should be supplemented by analysis of their long-term effects, and that there should be a *“Committee of both Houses with a remit to “future proof” legislation and policy proposals”*.

Institutional innovations for future generations are already the subject of a campaign by the World Future Council, and this was reflected in the proposal for *“[s]upport of the establishment of ombudspersons for future generations at all levels from national, regional to global could be included here”*. One consultee expressly singled out the institutional dimension; proposing an amendment to the effect that the principle be reframed: *“Tackle short-termism: by ensuring that institutional structures and the practice of democracy...”*

A UK consultee suggested the establishment of a panel of jury/auditors to ensure that local and national initiatives protect the interest of future generations. He suggested that there should be a panel for each individual community.

The same consultee also suggested an annual, public access conference to review our objectives and priorities to protect the welfare of future generations.

“Extension of the Human Rights Act to provide for the rights of future generations”

Claire Nash from Britain proposes a ‘museum of the future’ (see Box 9 below). Her idea could help to support the kinds of changes that would be needed for democracy to take account of the needs of future generations. In her consultation response, Claire wrote *“The*

key thing is how our expectations influence us, and how aware we are of our ability to shape our future as individuals or en masse. And how we can be wildly wrong!” (UK)

Another UK consultee suggested *“A flame (candle or fire) in the middle of any decision making or discussion forum (e.g. boardroom, committee, council or meeting) to represent the presence and needs of future generations and the effects of decisions on our children. The flame can also represent greenhouse gas production and remind us to consider how to minimize it before we blow out the flame at the end of the meeting”.*

One UK consultee proposed *“an independent ombudsperson for future generations, including arbitration on rights for future generations’ access to a sustainable future”*, and this was echoed in suggestions from the UK and Germany for the creation of ‘an Ombudsman for Future Generations’

A UK consultee suggested *“Ombudsman and Panels for Future Generations”*, and also an annual ‘State of the Future’ debate and report in Parliaments.

A UK consultee with political office proposed *“an office of resource security to look at long term challenges to our resource security”.*

Proposed resources

Ministério Público

World Future Council campaign for Ombudspersons for Future Generations

“The Climate Change Act 2008 (<http://www.legislation.gov.uk/ukpga/2008/27/contents>) and accompanying Committee on Climate Change <http://www.theccc.org.uk/> In principle at least, this is a rare example of a democracy binding its long term direction through both targets and implementing structures”. (UK)

A UK consultee pointed to The Elders as an interesting concept *“where political thought leaders can think long-term without pressure of the ballot box”*

Box 9 Museum of the Future

A Museum of the Future could function as a "virtual museum" attached to a real museum. It would seek to link people to their present, past, and future by showing how our aspirations, dreams and actions shape our future. It would provide a space to think about the future and share ideas, hopes, worries, and pledges – reminding people that what they do today will be tomorrow's history. It could ask the question: what effect do they suppose that future generations will feel? The Museum's exhibits could compare ideas and expectations from the past with what has emerged at the present time, and what could happen 1, 20 or 100 years ahead. It might feature great 'futurists' of the past, linking all disciplines including science, mathematics (featuring trajectories, probabilities, and cycles), economics, history, politics, art and design, media studies, biology/ecology, religious studies, and others. The key learning from the museum would be how our expectations influence us, and how aware we are of our ability to shape our future as individuals or en masse, and how we sometimes can be wildly wrong!

Source: Claire Nash (UK), consultation response

Principle 7: Deepen democracy in strategic decisions on the infrastructure and technologies for sustainability; strengthen local capacities

During the consultation process, Principle 7 in the Mark 1 Manifesto was proposed as Principle 6 and read as follows:

Principle 6: Be explicit about the joins: *By finding ways to ensure that decision-making with implications for the distribution of 'sustainable' or 'unsustainable' development (for example the location of major infrastructure projects) is transparent and fair. Decision-making on distributional impacts of such decisions should be based on criteria that are publicly accessible, agreed following public consultation, and made widely available in advance*

- Overall, 220 consultees (72.03% of the total number of consultees) provided an individual response which included views on this principle
- Of this total, 206 consultees agreed with the principle, 28 with additional comments and 178 with no further comment
- 14 (4.90%) disagreed, of whom 8 offered additional comments

Reactions to the consultation draft

Bad wording

The clearest overall message from the consultation responses was that this principle was poorly worded and needed significant revision: *"I can't figure out what the foregoing is trying to say"; "I don't understand what this means!"; "too vague"; "Yes but wording is so complex!" "[t]his principle is so badly worded that I find it impossible either to agree or disagree"; "Not entirely sure what this question/statement is about, really"; "???"*; *"unclear"; "Don't understand"*. One participant agreed with the principle but added *"[b]ut this didn't do much for me"*. One consultee helpfully pointed to the possible implications of confusion: *"[n]ot convinced about this one. Are you suggesting that unsustainable development is OK still?"*

Good luck to you

Three responses simply noted the challenge of getting it right: *"Hmm - this is all genuinely very difficult, fascinating and I'm interested to see where it goes"; "Good luck with the wording";* or the comments that developing the 'criteria' referred to in the principle was *"far from easy"* or in another case that it would be *"very difficult to establish criteria and agreement"*. *In an attempt to achieve clarify, the Mark 1 Manifesto text of Principle 7 is considerably longer than the initial draft consultation. How can it be reduced in length again?*

Do we really need this principle?

One consultee noted that *"all decisions have implications for distribution"*, adding that *"[a]s it stands, this seems unclear and doesn't add much to the other principles"*. Another consultee echoed this suggestion: *"Not sure whether this one adds much - i.e. would we need it if the above principles were followed? - but if included, needs to be simplified"*; and also *"It's not necessarily exclusive to sustainable development. The infrastructure decision might not be aimed at improving sustainability. I would rather see this as part of the 'foundations'"*. We seriously considered dropping the principle entirely, but these comments encouraged us to reflect more deeply on 'what is special about the sustainable development challenges of distributional impacts of decision-making?' After all, as one consultee suggested, *"[a]ll decision-making should be transparent"*, and in the words of another *"Prefer transparency and accountability. Transparency in decision making"*; or in another suggestion for amendment, the principle could be amended to add the words *"transparent and fair..to all, taking due account of real sustainability"*, with the addition of the words *"with future generations' voices included weightily in the decision"* at the end.

The tendency to simply view the principle as a poor attempt to express a challenge inherent to poor democratic practice was also reflected in the suggestion that the principle be re-titled: *"[e]nsure that everyone with a stake in decisions has a voice decision-making"*. Thus

renamed, there would be little sustainable development specificity about the principle – it could indeed simply be dropped, or incorporated within Principle 1.

But there *is* something about the quality of decisions on the infrastructure for sustainable development that creates particular challenges for democracy. Such decisions are likely to be taken with a long time horizon and to involve a distribution of impacts, positive and negative, from local to global levels. At the same time, choices over issues that are critically important for the future of natural environmental systems and humanity as a whole can often be vulnerable when they reach the local level for implementation in communities that were not directly involved in the initial strategic decisions.

It seems wrong that national, regional or global strategies and decisions in relation to such issues are vulnerable to attack *in principle*. At the same time, if such national decisions fail to take account of possible local concerns and then provide no opportunity for deep engagement at local level, they can hardly be considered inclusive, participatory or even legitimate. So whilst there is a case for *not* devolving decision-making over *all* sustainability issues with local impacts to the local level, there is certainly a case for enhancing the democratic legitimacy of decision-making at all levels.

For the longer term, it is likely that distinctions between local, national and global will continue to erode as people increasingly participate and mobilise over and above these simple boundaries – taking advantage of increasingly widely interconnected communications platforms. For the time being, however, the distinctions retain some descriptive and normative relevance, alongside more highly networked decision-making processes.

Perhaps it was our own doubt about how to frame the principle which meant that reactions to it could effectively be divided into two issues; one of them not explicitly addressed in the initial draft:

- A particular concern to ensure that **decision-making over the infrastructure for sustainable development is deeply democratic**. As one UK consultee noted, there is an obvious contrast between the local need for local rail services and the structures which determine what is actually provided which “*are distant, opaque, and apparently unaccountable despite consultation*”. Other responses which offered contributions to this particular issue included:
 - the suggestion that decision-making be: “*transparent and honest....and genuinely open - not tokenism, or the whiff of chicanery..*”,
 - that “*I am not sure this title reflects what is trying to be said here. I think this more about transparent and consistent decision making*”;

- that the principle include a reference to *“including transparency in the contracts awarded to private companies”*; and
 - in some respects the comments of the two consultees who saw the issues less in spatial terms than in terms of majorities and minorities: *“Isn't this more about minorities vs. majority, than about local vs. national? Or at least, couldn't you apply similar considerations?”*; *“The majority in a local area will often be against something that is necessary for sustainability - e.g. Wind farms - the voices of future generations must be heard and taken into account”*).
- A concern to strengthen the quality of community engagement and participation (as in the comment that *“I like this since it opens up the way for community-based projects”*; or the comment that *“Communities have been systematically disempowered”*).

There were also proposals on the *spatial* allocation of decision-making, and on the *distributional* allocation of impacts.

Spatial allocation of decision-making

The Principle provided an opportunity for respondents to offer insights into the **level** at which decision-making should take place (as in the suggestion that *“[p]eople should have the right to say no to unsustainable developments like airports/ nuclear/fracking/ supermarkets/ other lawful corporate assaults and the right to say yes to changes that would improve their communities.”*). A Spanish consultee proposed focusing on *“[p]olíticas y herramientas de acción local”*, with another Spanish consultee proposing that *“Actuaciones locales/individuales es la mejor solución para un cambio global!! Medio ambiental”*; One consultee added *“But avoid NIMBYISM”* (‘not in my back yard’ decision-making). We have not gone so far as to propose a general principle of ‘subsidiarity’ in relation to democratic decision-making on sustainable development issues, seeing this rather as an issue that should be determined in all the multiple and varied contexts in which sustainable development is implemented.

Distributional allocation of impacts

One consultee suggested, in a substantive change to the principle, that it might incorporate the idea that the *impacts* of projects should be felt fairly ‘by those that get the benefits’. Another UK consultee also proposed *“A rule that if people get the benefit of a technology, they should also bear a share of the (environmental) costs”*. We have not sought to incorporate this idea because where benefits accrue globally (as with, for example, reduced carbon emissions) it is not always possible to ensure that local ‘disbenefits’ are eradicated, or that immediate benefits (e.g. in terms of enhanced access to public transport) are all experienced principally at the level where disbenefits are experienced (e.g. by communities living alongside new railways). Some benefits, and disbenefits, are spread both in time and

in space. At the same time, the *general* principle of fair distribution of benefits and disbenefits is a sound one.

Our response

Our Mark 1 Manifesto divides the Principle in two. The first part addresses our concern to address the particular issue of retaining a deep commitment to “democracy fit for sustainability” when project proposals that are framed in terms of national decisions on ‘the infrastructure for sustainability’ potentially generate conflicts at local level, where the most immediate impacts are felt.

The second part of the principle in our Mark 1 Manifesto addresses the distinct need to ensure that the knowledge, institutional capacity and motivation to engage actively in local decision-making are all in place. As a consultee from the Philippines put it: *“If the community seem to be lacking a concrete picture of needs that would target long-term solutions, then the burden is to concretely give them a picture of what results would be like otherwise.”*

The motivation for a distinct sub-principle on strengthening local decision-making capacity for sustainability came also from multiple comments spread across the entire Manifesto, including a number of quotes and suggestions for ‘inspiring words’ connected to the importance of local decision-making (see [Annex B](#))

At the same time, we also were struck by the words of one consultation respondent, Henry B Tam, in a paper commended to us by him for its relevance to the Manifesto process:

“Not all decisions, especially those involving equity of resource distribution or requiring substantial collective capacity, can be made or carried out effectively by individuals in any given neighbourhood... Attempts to pass endless social and economic burdens to individuals who cannot cope without collective political support, are nothing more than an abdication of democratic responsibility”.

(Henry B. Tam,

<http://www.educ.cam.ac.uk/research/academicgroups/equality/forumyouthparticipation/HBTamRejuvDemocracy.pdf>)

Even adoption of a ‘full’ principle of subsidiarity would require strong collective political support to provide the shared regulatory and institutional infrastructure to implement collective priorities. But capacity-building for local level decision-making can play a valuable role in and of itself in developing decision-making capacities for sustainability.

Our amended Principle stops short of a suggestion that there should be a default presumption of local level decision-making, or that this should be the principal *locus* for decision-making.

Question for Salzburg: should this principle and its associated actions seek to address both the role of national democracy in relation to infrastructure, technologies and practices for

sustainable development *and* the need for flourishing cultures and institutions of local democracy? Do you agree that the feedback points to two distinct principles?

Proposed commitments

Infrastructure for Sustainable development

There were few proposed 'actions' that could readily be allocated specifically to the first part of this Principle. However, one UK consultee pointed to the specific role of impact assessment as an aide to democratic decision-making. She proposed that mandatory environmental impact assessment should be followed by public consultation, re-planning, public consultation and only then the development of final project plans.

"Integrated impact assessment to cover environmental, social, equality, diversity, economic and health issues should be compulsory at national level (in the UK) as in international donor-funded projects (e.g. IMF, World Bank, IFC), and in "new world" nations such as Australia.

Enhanced and dialogic community involvement in decision-making over business industrial and infrastructure projects and give people a stronger role in the policies shaping their lives. Impact assessment mitigation and management plans to involve decision-making about schemes, plans and policies for people in their community localities. A greater public role would be equivalent to further engagement with the democratic process."

Transparency in contracts awarded to companies (UK)

Strengthening local engagement

A UK consultee pointed to citizens' juries and suggested drawing on *"the best knowledge and practice in public deliberation, negotiation and scenario planning in experimenting with new forms of assembly, summits, local forums etc"*.

Leaders to hold public meetings after they are elected maybe twice a year in their constituency. A bit like a party conference, but public (UK)

"reuniones periodicos de los representantes con los electors" (Spain)

"Community Forest Management" (Transylvania municipality, Romania) (Hungary).

Online communication and social media can facilitate exploration in community organizing, suggested one consultee (Canada)

"More community organizing with "occupy" style dynamics to represent up the government scale" (Canada)

The Transition Town movement (UK)

“El estado actúa como gestor y no como decisor (desarrollo a escala humana). Se hace una política local, y la política estatal la harían ciudadanos que son elegidos aleatoriamente [random] y que asesorados por expertos, ayudan a la gestión del estado. Estos puestos políticos cambiarían cada 4 años” (Spain)

Among many examples of multi stakeholder decision-making fora, one consultee from the Philippines offered the specific example of the Naga City Model of the People's Empowerment Ordinance, and explained: *“the Local Government Unit of Naga City of the Region V (Bicol Region) here in the Philippines have legislated an ordinance ordering the creation of a People's Council that will serve as the representative of different multi-sectoral groups in the city council which serves as the legislative body of the local government unit. Thus, giving the voiceless and the most marginalized to air.. their concerns and needs and have them concretely addressed by the government through ordinances which become the legal basis of action of the local government unit”.*

A consultee from Germany suggested that round tables at local level, in which any citizen could take part in dialogue about sustainable development in the city and region, offer a good route to citizen information and participation. She began *“In a town in Germany where I used to study was a round-table established that is called DialogN (N for the German word of sustainability)”*. “Something like that”, she suggested, *“should be set up for community development by the side of the local government”*.

Hong Kong's environmental impact assessment process as an exemplar.

Proposed resources

UCL Laws: Policy Briefing: Public participation and climate change infrastructure Citizen's juries

'Community Forest Management' Transylvania Municipality, Romania, Hungary

People and Participation Net- An online toolkit produced by the UK charity Involve with case studies and a wealth of resources for effective public management

<http://www.peopleandparticipation.net/>

Participedia (www.participedia.net)

Among many examples of multi stakeholder decision making fora, one consultee from the Philippines offered the specific example of the Naga City Model of the People's Empowerment Ordinance, and explained: *“The local government unit of the Naga City of the Region V (Bicol Region) here in the Philippines have legislated an ordinance ordering the creation of a People's Council that will serve as the representative of different multi-sectoral groups in the city council which serves as the legislative body of the local government unit. Thus, giving the voiceless and the most marginalized to air their concerns and needs and*

have them concretely addressed by the government through ordinances which become the legal basis of action of the local government unit.”

Transition Town Network

Planning for Real

The Community Bill of Rights – A local law to elevate communities + nature above corporate rights (proposed by Occupy London). Basis: All power is inherent in the people, government gets its authority from people. As well communities assert their rights like right to self government, local economy, sustainable food system etc. Also places restrictions on corporate legal privileges and give power to people to revoke corporate personhood where a company proposes to do something harmful in the community (e.g. fracking). People come first, not corporate

Voice and Choice: Opening the Door to Environmental Democracy (see

<http://pdf.wri.org/voiceandchoice.pdf>)

A Seat at the Table: Including the Poor in Development and Environment Decision Making

(see http://pdf.wri.org/a_seat_at_the_table.pdf)