

The world “as we know it”

FIRST CONCERN

1. HERE AND NOW, we need to SEE the world as one place common to everyone and everything.. ONE SINGLE PLACE. Our real “world wide” world. BECAUSE in global terms, we lack a totalizing vision of the place where we globalize.

The world is global, also, because it is a balloon. If we look at the map of the world and we can't realize that the planet where we are globalizing is one single PLACE, at the same TIME and SPACE, where all the waters get together somewhere, we won't try to save it from the looming threats that hover simultaneously and equally, attempting not only against our ephemeral beings but against the perpetuation of life.

At first, it is possible that the most widespread theories of cosmopolitanism, sustaining that all human races form a unique community, as humans, are as indisputable as those that accounts that all the states of the world were born in a simultaneously interrelated way. The global world, as we know it today, has been born at the rhythm of the necessity of these states, to interact and to understand between each other, simply pursuing development.

However, the globalize scope per se of the concept cosmopolitanism, in the development of its theoretical framework sustains the notion of a essentially shared humanity, is, from my point of view, insufficient to connect two consecutives stages of global development (a cosmopolitanism in transit to multilateralism), because what we accept as a basic principle not necessarily CONNECTS us, in spite of linking us. And there is my first concern. We really need to see the world as ONE SINGLE PLACE. Because it is sad that in global terms we lack of a totalizing vision of the village where we are globalizing.

SECOND CONCERN

OUR PLACE needs to build and to perform the REAL MULTILATERALISM: trough legitimating the concept itself and the clear strategies in order to bind in a legitimated way.

From the cosmopolitan point of view we can SEE the world as an airport where people and others forms of life and goods circulate. From there, in that platform full of cosmo-politic moves, we overall see the microcosm of a multiplied mall: people and countries twirling in that BINDING SPACE, basically around competition and consumption.

The cosmopolitan utopia of **inclusive** economies, political scaffolding, communitarianism, states, etc., is naked in front of the reality of a freely unequal globalization: people versus goods, information versus knowledge. Haiti and Brazil, Belgium and Greenland, Puerto Rico and Angola, how do they connect? Inside the international organisms currently think and functioning as paradigms of the multilateralism? Through the internet in the digital era? While their population rise the rating of CNN and BBC? In which language and under which regulations? What must be done to truly legitimate this link that exists, and must exist only because they inhabit the same real WWW?

Polish philosopher Zygmunt Baumann, in his extraordinary essay "Tourists and Vagabonds", facing the fact that in this global momentum we all live moving around all the time, coming and going from here to there, he points out that distances are no longer important, but I would add, they still exist.

Thrown out from our sites as part of the unresolved conflict between progress and welfare, "We become nomads... always connected".

Viewing the global actions as ephemeral, while agents implementing them are in constant motion, Bauman makes the observation that the global competitiveness is a deregulated one. The legitimating of multilateral actions directly confronts the obstacle of this deregulation.

Not only the lives of those who run an alleged multilateralism are finite, but the actions themselves stop from perpetuating. "Game rules" are also liquid.

In the global world exist *tourists and vagabonds*, says Bauman, and I'm in a hurry to point out: VAGABOND WOMEN, since girls, young and elder women lead the poverty and extreme poverty figures in this WWW. Bauman tourists have visa for transit and they transit indeed. The only

thing vagabonds do is wander in a place that move around them. Tourist control the rules of the game, vagabonds will always be in the periphery: doors and parking spaces of the airport or the MALL.

THIRD CONCERN

Can we talk about multilateralism in a world where, in order to transit, a visa is required? Can we talk about multilateralism in a headless world that exhibits such bipolarities? Can we talk about multilateralism in a world so slippery where we fail to see a clear direction?

Freely globalized in inequality, we are incapable to clearly SEE who is in charge. On an effective multilateralism we should think about making visible the ones directing. No international organization, including the United Nations is constituted as directors of the global orchestra.

IT IS NOT ENOUGH to see the multilateralism from the flat view of the States and Nations understanding each other in the arena and the lobby of the friendship and cooperation's relationship. Neither theorizing nor in many cases implementing actions on common issues in a single world: Gender, violence, discrimination, poverty, religion, cults, sexual orientation, armed conflicts, education, health, water, environment, global warming, the future, etc.

We have to create the conditions, instances and normative to articulate a BINDING MULTILATERALISM. An ethical understanding is mandatory: we cannot talk about legitimating anything without it.

Instances of governance, management, or whatever we call it, must exist, if we want to legitimate multilateral stage in the history of a world that is now facing one of its most critical global moments.

When we talk about Global Government, Global Parliament, Global Army, etc. I can't stop thinking about it wasn't so far conducted the imagination of George Lucas, the visionary science fiction filmmaker who conceived the Star Wars saga. In his invention, the Galactic Republic grouped all the planets in a fiction galaxy. I still have in my mind the image of the Queen and Senator of the Naboo planet, Padme Amidala, sitting down in his seat-spacecraft galactic senate, looking for help on other planets while facing the threat of an invasion of the Trade Federation, which she ultimately

managed to overcome with the help of the Jedi order and peace agreements.

We inhabit many countries on one single planet but, despite all organizations and multilateral actions we urge, it seems unlikely that we can sit soon enough in a World Senate to cry for help from one to all the other ones, not to mention the existence of an order made by “gentlemen” with the wisdom and the reputation of the Jedi knights.

From my point of view, we are very far from being able to imagine ourselves in such scenario. This means that the binding multilateralism now seems only taken out from the imagination of George Lucas or any other science fiction author.

Rio+20 Summit, considered by the President of the United Nations Ban Ki-moon, by Antonio Patriota, Brazilian Foreign Minister, etc. as a triumph of multilateralism, has found criticism from the most important environmental leaders.

“O Futuro que Queremos” (“The future we want”) title of the document that was conceived to save the consensus, after unsuccessful efforts to reach a closing statement to the disagreements between the core countries, enrollees in the G-77 plus China and the nations of the Bolivarian Alliance for the Peoples of our America (ALBA), led by Venezuela, had reactions like the one from Daniel Mittler, director of Greenpeace Public Policy, who said “Rio+20 became an epic failure. The conference failed in terms of equity, ecology and economy. We were promised “the future we want” but now we will be only a polluting machine that will cook the planet, empty the oceans and destroyed the rainforest”.

Especially the environmental issue seems one of the most approachable in terms of a binding multilateralism, but in order to be so, it should be inclusive not only of Baunman tourists, but also the vagabonds who have to play hard to exist one day at a time.

If we don't get together a consensus, if we don't agree, it will be impossible to legitimate anything.

Earlier, I said the world is global, also because it is a balloon. Defend the planet's natural resources and improve the quality of life of the people who inhabit it requires actions linked multilaterally in the world as we know it.

There's no time for waiting for an intergalactic parliament, neither the Jedi knights. We have to act HERE AND NOW, because we are the first civilization in the history of humanity that can accomplish that. The risk is to see the end of a common place called PLANET EARTH.

Minou Tavárez Mirabal

Evian Francia, Lunes 24 de septiembre del 2012

Planetworkshops