WSF's Unrealistic And Harmful Agenda Will Further Worsen World Problems Wayout Of The Existing World Troubles Lies In Nature-Human Centric Agenda

I. World Social Forum (WSF)

(A) A Brief History

The first edition of WSF was organised at Porto Alegre in Brazil from January 25 to January 30, 2001. The second WSF, held in January 2002, was marked by the participation of 15,000 registered delegates and a total of some 55,000 people from 131 countries. The session was also characterised by the formation of an international council (IC) to guide the WSF's thought and action. The third WSF session took place in Porto Algere in Brazil in January 2003. Here, the meeting of IC decided that the next forum in 2004 would be held in India (first time outside Brazil).

In 2004 (Mumbai), there was participation of about 1,00,000 delegates in the WSF.

In January 2005 in Porto Alegre, Brazil, over 1,20,000 delegates attended WSF annual meet.

Here, the international council decided to promote the decentralisation of WSF process by proposing polycentric WSF in 2006 instead of one global event. Polycentric events were organised in Caracas, Venezuela and Bamako (Mali) in January 2006 and in March 2006 in Karachi (Pakistan) and in Delhi in November 2006.

Next addition of global WSF event will be held in Nairobi, Kenya, between January 20-25, 2007.

(B) Some Undesirable Practices Of WSF

The above-stated WSF meets were notable for some undesirable practices which need particular attention:

One is that the WSF does not disclose names of movements and groups participating in its annual meets.

The other is that the billions of dollars spent on any WSF annual meet always remain hidden.

The third is that the source of millions upon millions of dollars spent on air travel by 50-60 thousands of WSF participants from various parts of the world, particularly the US and Europe, is always kept secret.

The fourth is that no audit is done of the expenditure spent on any annual WSF process and thus kept concealed.

The fifth is that the WSF constitutes social movements, networks and NGO's who are financially paid by different corporate governments or assisted by corporate-aided charitable trusts.

It is not difficult to imagine that a process marked by secrecy is always characterised by something dubious.

II. Relevance And Justification Of WSF's Agenda

To know the real nature of WSF, it is necessary to understand the relevance and justification of its agenda to the actual existing conditions in our world. This agenda is contained in WSF's Charter Of Principles (COP) which is to be upheld by all its constituents.

Charter Of Principles (COP)

Introduction Or Preamble

The committee of Brazilian organisations that conceived of and organised the first World Social Forum, held in Porto Alegre from January 25 to January 30, 2001, after evaluating the results of that Forum and the expectations it raised, consider it necessary and legitimate to draw up a Charter Of

Principles to guide the continued pursuit of that initiative. While the principles contained in this Charter—to be respected by all those, who wish to take part in the process and to organise new editions of the World Social Forum—are a consolidation of the decisions that presided over the holding of the Porto Alegre Forum and ensured its success, they extend the reach of those decisions and define orientations that flow from their logic.

Taking up the above-stated introductory para which, in other words, can also be called the preamble of the COP, the following points need serious consideration. The preamble of any document defines its orientation or fundamental principle that is binding for all concerned at all times.

Our Comment On Introduction Or Preamble

Our first general comment on WSF's COP is that it had been drawn up only by one committee comprising of only Brazilian organisations that conceived of and organised the first world social forum, held in Porto Alegre from January 25th to 30th, 2001. Next, the preamble says that these principles are to be respected by all those who wish to take part in the WSF process and to organise new editions of the World Social Forum and further these principles define orientation for all concerned with WSF. Since 2001, six WSF annual meets have taken place and the one committee prepared COP has never been placed before any meet for approval nor any WSF annual meet has demanded that this one committee prepared document be placed before WSF international meet for final approval. Does the above-stated style expresses a democratic approach? Surely, it indicates only fascist thinking and dictatorial style.

First Principle Of COP

The World Social Forum is an open meeting place for reflective thinking, democratic debate of ideas, formulation of proposals, free exchange of experiences & interlinking for effective action by groups & movements of civil society that are opposed to neo-liberalism and to domination of the world by capital and any form of imperialism, and are committed to building a planetary society directed towards fruitful relationships among mankind and between it and the earth.

Our Comment

Taking up the 1st principle which says that the WSF is an open meeting place for reflective thinking, democratic debate of ideas, formulation of proposals, free exchange of experience etc., we find that this type of democratic style is clearly negated by its above preamble which does not allow any WSF session to amend even one principle of the COP. Further, the 1st principle states that WSF will interlink groups and movements of civil society that are opposed to neo-liberalism and to domination of the world by capital and any form of imperialism. WSF already comprises of social movements, networks and NGO's who are financially paid by the world corporate governments and corporate supported charitable trusts. Will these groups oppose neo-liberalism and to domination of world by capital and any form of imperialism? Can these groups rally the people? Do they know that the forms of neo-liberal and imperial types of capital have become things of the past? Today, the world capital both in the developed and the underdeveloped countries operates in the corporate form.

Lastly, its (i.e., the first principle's) slogan of building a planetary society directed towards fruitful relationships among mankind and between it and the earth is only a propagandist and pompous slogan to lure the people on its own side. Perhaps, WSF itself does not know what type of fruitful relationships among mankind and between it and the earth it wants to establish. An organisation (like the WSF) which is quite unaware of the most fatal danger coming to mankind from environmental degradation, on the one hand, and 70 percent of mankind leading a sub-human, wretched and miserable life on our planet earth, cannot build fruitful relations among mankind and between the latter and the earth.

Second Principle Of COP

The World Social Forum at Porto Alegre was an event localised in time & place. From now on, in the certainty proclaimed at Porto Alegre that 'Another World Is Possible', it becomes a permanent process of seeking & building alternatives, which cannot be reduced to the events supporting it.

Our Comment

The 2nd principle says: from now on, the slogan of another world is possible becomes a permanent process of seeking and building alternatives which cannot be reduced to the events supporting it. But it is interesting to note that, during the past six year, it has not been able to specify even one alternative.

Third Principle Of COP

The World Social Forum is a world process. All meetings that are held as part of this process have an international dimension.

Our Comment

The third principle makes the international dimension as WSF's one dimension and not the primary one. This means that it can adopt any perspective in any situation apart from the actual conditions.

Fourth Principle Of COP

The alternatives proposed at the World Social Forum stand in opposition to a process of globalisation commanded by the large multinational corporations & by the governments & international institutions at the service of those corporations' interests, with the complicity of national governments. They are designed to ensure that globalisation in solidarity will prevail as a new stage in world history. This will respect universal human rights, and those of all citizens—men and women—of all nations and the environment & will rest on democratic international systems and institutions at the service of social justice, equality and the sovereignty of peoples.

Our Comment

The fourth principle introduces a new confusion. Without mentioning liberalism and imperialism, it says that the WSF stands for opposing globalisation without clarifying whether neo-liberalism and imperialism are synonymous to globalisation and vice versa. Literally, the world globalisation only denotes the worldwide character of a phenomenon. It does not indicate any thing concrete, except the size or extent of a thing. Hence, globalisation cannot be a substitute for neo-liberalism or imperialism.

Fifth Principle Of COP

The World Social Forum brings together & interlinks only organisations & movements of civil society from all the countries in the world, but intends neither to be a body representing world civil society.

Our Comment

The fifth principle is a misleading idea. A forum which makes it obligatory to accept its one committee prepared Charter Of Principles in toto at all times and places, in practice, forces all organisations and movements interlinked to it to practically act as a fully disciplined and integrated body.

Sixth Principle Of COP

The meetings of the World Social Forum do not deliberate on behalf of the World Social Forum as a body. No one, therefore, will be authorised, on behalf of any of the editions of the Forum, to express positions claiming to be those of all its participants. The participants in the Forum shall not be called on to take decisions as a body, whether by vote or acclamation, on declarations or proposals for action that would commit all, or the majority, of them and that propose to be taken as establishing positions of the Forum as a body. It thus does not constitute a locus of power to be disputed by the participants in its meetings, nor does it intend to constitute the only option for inter-relation and action by the organisations and movements that participate in it.

Our Comment

`The 6th principle too is a confused proposition. Whenever persons having identical views assemble to discuss a certain agenda, they either agree or disagree on some thing. They may not define the majority agreement as a decision, but, in actual fact, it is taken in that spirit. And practically this has been happening in the WSF process. The Brazilian organising committee has already been functioning as a super-centre of WSF, while two other new centers—i.e., international council and the secretariat of the WSF—have emerged on the scene.

Seventh Principle Of COP

Nonetheless, organisations or groups of organisations that participate in the Forum's meetings must be assured the right, during such meetings, to deliberate on declarations or actions they may decide on, whether singly or in coordination with other participants. The World Social Forum undertakes to circulate such decisions widely by the means at its disposal, without directing, hierarchising, censuring or restricting them, but as deliberations of the organisations or groups of organisations that made the decisions.

Our Comment

The seventh principle is not an innovation. It is generally followed by all democratic bodies. Some democratic organisations even publish the dissenting views discussed in their meetings.

Eighth Principle Of COP

The World Social Forum is a plural, diversified, non-confessional, non-governmental and non-party context that, in a decentralised fashion, inter-relates organisations and movements engaged in concrete action at levels from the local to the international to build another world.

Our Comment

The eighth principle is also a misnomer. Whenever WSF inter-relates to bring together separate groups or entities, it performs the functions of a core or basic (the most important part of a thing) group.

Ninth Principle Of COP

The World Social Forum will always be a forum open to pluralism and to the diversity of activities and ways of engaging of the organisations and movements that decide to participate in it, as well as the diversity of genders, ethnicities, cultures, generations and physical capacities, providing they abide by this Charter of Principles. Neither party representations nor military organisations shall participate in the Forum. Government leaders and members of legislatures who accept the commitments of this Charter may be invited to participate in a personal capacity.

Our Comment

The ninth principle presents a double-dealing notion. While, on the one hand, it declares that the forum is open to pluralism and diversity in thought and action of different groups and movements, it conditions this freedom of thought and action by making its Charter of Principles obligatory for all the concerned groups and movements, making a sham of the preceding part of this statement.

Tenth Principle Of COP

The World Social Forum is opposed to all totalitarian and reductionist views of economy, development and history and to the use of violence as a means of social control by the state. It upholds respect for Human Rights, the practices of real democracy, participatory democracy, peaceful relations, in equality and solidarity, among people, ethnicities, genders and peoples, and condemns all forms of domination and all subjection of one person by another.

Our Comment

The tenth principle represents a democratic idea but its Charter Of Principles nullifies this view by upholding the totalitarian approach.

Eleventh Principle Of COP

As a Forum for debate the World Social Forum is a movement of ideas that prompts reflection, and the transparent circulation of the results of that reflection, on the mechanisms and instruments of domination by capital, on means and actions to resist and overcome that domination, and on the alternatives proposed to solve the problems of exclusion and social inequality that the process of capitalist globalisation with its racist, sexist and environmentally destructive dimensions is creating internationally and within countries.

Our Comment

The eleventh principle, while ignoring WSF's own pet concepts of neo-liberalism and imperialism brings forth the notions of capitalist domination and capitalist globalisation as synonymous to neo-liberalism and imperialism. It would have been more rational and reasonable had it termed the capitalist domination and capitalist globalisation as corporate capitalist domination and corporate capitalist globalisation. Because corporate form of capital is the only form of capital pervading the world over today.

Twelfth Principle Of COP

As a framework for the exchange of experiences, the World Social Forum encourages understanding and mutual recognition amongst its participant organisations and movements, and places special value on the exchange among them, particularly on all that society is building to canter economic activity and political action on meeting the needs of people and respective nature, in the present and for future generations.

Our Comment

The twelfth principle, while laying stress on the exchange of experiences, encouraging understanding and mutual recognition amongst its participant organisations and movements and placing special value on the exchange among them particularly on all that society is building to canter economic activity and political action on meeting the needs of people and respecting nature in the present and for future generations, still feels shy to emphasise the need of united action by the identical groups.

Thirteenth Principle Of COP

As a context for inter-relations, the World Social Forum seeks to strengthen and create new national and international links among organisations and movements of society, that, in both public and private life, will increase the capacity for non-violent social resistance to the process of dehumanisation the world is undergoing and to the violence used by the state, and reinforce the humanising measures being taken by the action of these movements and organisations.

Our Comment

The thirteenth principle confuses the processes of dehuman-isation and humanisation in the ongoing world. Concerning dehumanisation, it depicts it (i.e. dehumanisation) as a product of violence used by the state but fails to specify whether the state belongs to the poor and middle category capitalist state or is a highly developed corporate state. Instead, it mixes them all. On the issue of humanisation, it says that this process is the result of action taken by the WSF-related movements and organisations. However, despite the WSF admission that humanisation is the outcome of its related movements, the former still orders them to remain divided on these life and death issues.

Fourteenth Principle Of COP

The World Social Forum is a process that encourages its participant organisations and movements to situate their actions, from the local level to the national level and seeking active participation in international contexts, as issues of planetary citizenship, and to introduce onto the global agenda the change-inducing practices that they are experimenting in building a new world in solidarity.

Our Comment

The fourteenth principle states that the WSF, while encouraging its participant organisations and movements to situate their actions from the local level to national level and seeking active participation in international context, it is very funny that it asks them to take isolated action and make no effort for united and coordinated action.

Our General Comment On The Charter Of Principles

The WSF's Charter Of Principles totally ignores to mention the basics of its ideal society, i.e., its ideology, culture, economics, politics, etc.

III. WSF's Total Neglect Of World Realities

The real character of the WSF can be seen from the fact of its ignoring the actual realities of the existing world. These are:

(1) WSF's total neglect of world's two-sided chief reality. That is, the pollution of our planet's natural environment, on the one hand, and the degradation of man's social (i.e., economic, cultural, political, ideological, etc.) environment, on the other. Both these challenges are highly threatening, posing a survival threat to mankind. But this two-sided reality does not find any place in WSF's COP and its series of other documents.

(2) Its total shunning of world peace from its agenda, although peace is the first essential for combating the environmental and socio-human challenges.

(3) Its mistaken view of the existing reality of capital by defining the latter as money or wealth. In fact, capital constitutes two factors i.e., human and environmental.

(4) Its silence on the unjust rules prevalent in the main institutions of the existing corporate capitalist world order—UN, WB, IMF, WTO and other UN bodies, and the principal state institutions—like the legislature, judiciary, administration, etc. This means that it accepts all these institutions as constitutional and legally fair and justified.

(5) Its total neglect of the question of social security to all types of deprived (constituting about 50 percent of the world population) as a fundamental right, fixation of income differences not more than 1:5, reduction in defence expenditure, empowerment of people, especially the women.

(6) While having no alternative of its own, its (i.e., WSF's) silence on the existing corporate development model which is at present crushing the world people.

(7) The total absence of existing world flashpoints, like J&K, Palestine, Somalia-Ethopia, Sudan-Dyfore, Srilanka-Tamil, etc., in its agenda.

(8) Its total avoidance of campaigning against corruption, crime, violence, etc.

(9) Its total disinterestedness in changing the ongoing world order by ending the principle of veto power in the security council and special weightage enjoyed by the most powerful corporate capitalist countries in the world financial institutions, WB, IMF, WTO, etc.

(10) Its total avoidance in demanding total prohibition of all types of war, nuclear weapons and armaments trade throughout the world.

IV. Wayout Of The Existing World Troubles Thrown Up By The Prevailing World Corporate System Lies In A Nature-Human Centric Agenda

Given the prevailing world corporate (neither neo-colonialist nor imperialistic) capitalist system as the cause of the existing world troubles, a realistic response to the latter (i.e., the world troubles) is and can be to restructure (or update) the existing world corporate capitalist system on the basis of a Nature-Human Centric agenda, comprising the following points:

Sociology (i.e. study of human society): Nature-Human Centric sociology holds that man, just like the other innumerable phenomena with each having its own quality & quantity, is another specific variety in the vast domain of nature. It exist in inter-relation and inter-action with other natural phenomena. The change & development in human society takes place due to a two-sided inter-action—that between nature and society, on the one hand, and within human society itself, on the other. These two inter-actions show that nature and humankind are two principal forces in the development of society.

It believes that man is a bio-social being and bears a two-sided character, biological, on the one hand, and social, on the other. The biological aspect reflects the individual existence of man, marked by self-interest, while the social side denotes his social living, characterised by social interests. The corporate capitalist theory of man as being only a self-centred creature is a one-sided concept. Similarly, the communist theory of man as being only a social person covers up his biological aspect. Self-interest is the basic instinct of the animal sphere, while man has, since his evolution as a homo-sapian, become bio-social by nature. The character of being half-social is the only quality that distinguishes human species from the animal one. When man becomes devoid of social aspect, he turns out just like an animal in his approach and style.

It considers social development as a process, comprising three equally important dimensions of human nature, such as existential (i.e., urge for security of life), psychological (i.e., yearning for freedom of thought and action) and social (i.e., strong impulse for equality and justice in all material and psychological processes).

It thinks that the theory of might being right has today become unproductive, because the existing social reality demands an all-sided cooperation between different nations and socio-ethnic communities in order to facilitate their integration into a global human unit.

It maintains that both ends and means have an equal importance and the sanctity of both should be upheld at all times and places.

Vision: The nature of our planet and the 21st century's social reality of inter-dependence of nation-states provide us a nature-human centric vision of one planet-one world, while the 1945-UN charter gives one the corporate vision of sovereign and independent nation-states, a vision contrary to the existing reality.

Fundamental Principle: the fundamental principle of the above-mentioned vision should, firstly, be put the people and the environment at the centre of global activity (i.e., to serve the peoples interests, on the one hand, and to take care of the environmental promotion and conservation, on the other.

The aspect of environmental promotion and conservation of this fundamental principle will be observed and practised in all types of processes at all times and places. That is, it will have universal relevance in human society.

Global Order: the fundamental principle of Nature-Human Centric vision and its enviro-human priority demands that the UN be restructured on a democratic basis, style and organisation. But the UN, as it stands today, lacks this quality. The UN general assembly's structure and functioning is quite democratic, but its top decision-making body, i.e., the security council, is characterised by highly unfair and totally undemocratic norms—i.e., the permanent membership for the militarily most strong five nations and their special veto rights.

Obviously, any attempt to fully democratise this body would, at this moment, encounter stiff resistance from the five member privileged club. So, taking into account the existing global power structure, it seems that the full democratisation of the security council will take some more time. For the time being, the rule of special veto power should be done away with, while retaining the norm of permanent membership till the change in the on-going balance of power. All other seats in the security council should be filled through election by the general assembly.

The rich countries control over IMF and WB be reduced and the poorest countries be provided more voice in the WTO.

Concept of Capital: Nature-Human Centric theory maintains that the capital comprises a two-sided phenomenon, i.e., the environmental factor, on the one hand, and the human factor on the other. This is, because the environmental and human factor constitute the very life of human community and, without them, nothing has any value for humankind. Thus, it firmly rejects the concept of capital as being money (or finance). Further, money or finance (called by corporate and communist theories as capital) is also generated by these two factors, united in the form of human mental and physical labour plus natural raw material and technological tools. Obviously, all the ingredients of finance—labour, technology and raw material—are provided by environmental and human factor. Money represents only a medium of exchange or a tool of market. However, this highly important function does not entitle it for the status of the supreme thing (i.e., capital) in society.

Developmental model: The fundamental principle of people-environment priority (which is imperative for human development) demands a new type of development model that stands for a five-

fold fundamental principle, i.e., environmental sustainability, equity (with 1:5 difference in incomes and social security as a fundamental right to all), productivity, people-led democracy and all-sided transparency. This five-fold fundamental principle corresponds with the bio-social nature of humankind, i.e., it co-ordinates the man's self-interest with his social interest.

The people-environment based development model represents the updated concept of development in contrast to the two traditional national developmental models, i.e., the corporate-led and the government-directed. While the corporate-led development model singles out profitability or productivity (which ensures the interests of money-owners alone) as its sole aim, the government-directed one opts for socialisation (or nationalisation) of the means of production as its only goal (which serves the interests of the ruling politicians and bureaucrats). Both these traditional models serve only the self-interests of humankind contrary to his bio-social character, i.e, comprising both the self-interest and social-interest. Again, they do not accord any priority to environment and any place to the upholding of democratic and transparent norms in the economic or growth process. Further, while the corporate model totally rejects the principle of equity (or social justice), the government-directed one fully ignores that of political equality and productivity.

This model differs with both the corporate-led and the state-based development models on the issues of their purpose, management and style.

While the corporate model stands for developing the capital and capital owners and the state model advances the interests of its ruling politicians and bureaucrats plus labour aristocracy, the Nature-Human Centric one serves the interests of people and environment, in general, and poor and deprived sections in particular.

In management, while the corporate sector upholds the monopoly corporate management and control and the state sector supports the monopoly bureaucratic management and control, the Nature-Human Centric development model stands for democratic management and control of public limited companies by elected joint committees, each comprising two-third elected members from ordinary shareholders, and one-third elected workers representatives in place of permanent corporators.

In style, contrary to authoritarian and secretive corporate and state style, the Nature-Human Centric development model stands for democratic, transparent and accountable style.

Global Peace And Security: a Nature-Human Centric development model, first of all needs a stable and durable peace and security. To establish such a peace, it is necessary that the politics of domination, privilege and special powers be discarded, mode of confrontation and military solution be ended by total disarmament and vesting the full control of nuclear weapons in the UN, political, economic and cultural inequalities be ended and the development gap between the developed and the developing countries and that between rich and poor be removed.

Politics: Nature-Human Centric politics stands for a democratic order that is based on fully democratic principles, functioning and structure. Such a model necessitates the ending of the rule of special veto power in the UN system and introducing of the principle of the maximum possible empowerment of the people in decision-making corresponding to the necessary dilution of the party centralised power in all countries, regions and areas.

Economics: Nature-Human Centric economics demands a rational and realistic economics whose concepts, laws and rules are required to be framed in the light of former's two top priorities (i.e., humankind and environment) and five principles (i.e., environmental sustainability, equity, productivity, democracy and transparency). In view of human's bio-social nature both Adam Smith's basic economic principle of "self -interest" and Marxian basic economic rule of state nationalisation of everything are one-sided in view of human's bio-social nature. But, ironically, both measure development, prosperity and progress in terms of monetary growth and not in the context of human and environmental development.

Value System: Nature-Human Centric value system calls for a way of life (or lifestyle that is embedded in basic human and environmental values and promotes rational humanist and environmentalist thinking, behaviour and organisation among the people.

Identity: Internationalism becomes the principal form, with nationality and ethnicity as secondary modes.

Public Motivational factor: Environmental humanism comes to be chief public motivational factor, followed by some other humanist trends.

Approach: Nature-Human Centric approach stands for scientific realism which studies and interprets natural phenomena in the light of scientific facts and social objects on the basis of authentic information and data. It holds that both unity and struggle act as a catalyst to bring changes in nature and society, with each in given conditions occupying the first position and the other in the secondary place and vice-versa.

The fundamental right to social security should be ensured through a UN covenant, mandatory for all countries. The UN covenant should lay down that the expenditure on social security will be met 50 percent by the concerned state and the rest by the UN; that the UN general assembly will immediately set up a high-powered UN sustainable development council to act as a global authority for the conservation and promotion of the environmental resources, on the one hand, and the development of human resources, on the other; that this council will enact fundamental international reforms in regard to environmental and human advancement; that the finances for the council will come from: (a) each country contributing 30 percent mandatory saving from its respective military budget, and (b) global taxation, such as on global trade, use of natural resources like oil, coal, communication, satellites, air travels, Antarctica mining, sea bed mining, oceanic transportation, etc; that the UN general assembly will devise the scheme for the distribution of the said global revenues between the UN and the members states in which the least developed countries will be given special consideration.

The Nature-Human Centric theory will enable us not only to face the challenges created by the corporate and the communist theories and their respective systems to the environmental and human resources, but also provide us the way to make their (i.e. natural and human resources) judicious use in future.

V. A Justice-Based World Is Possible
(Nature-Human Centric Short-Term Agenda)

The Nature-human Centric Peoples Movement holds that the human community at the present juncture is confronted with a highly dangerous environmental-human crisis. The challenge is so serious that, it is not answered by a realistic agenda, the consequences can be very very harmful for the humanitarian cause. Such a grave situation, first of all, needs a complete unity among the different segments of humankind. And the factor of unity demands the ending of all types of conflicts within the human community. The only way to achieve human unity and the ending of all types of conflicts within the human community lies in eliminating all sorts of existing injustices in the world.

The NHCPM is of the view that a justice-based world is quite possible on the foundation of an all-inclusive social justice and this requires the restructuring of the existing unjust corporate system.

To restructure the existing unjust corporate system on a just basis, the NHCPM puts fourth the following 15 points for public information, association and action. It requests all those who accept the rationality of these points to propagate them determinately, steadfastly and wholeheartedly before the people.

Whenever and wherever elections become due in any region or the country as a whole, it appeals to the voters to make these 15 principles as yardstick to ascertain the genuineness of their contesting candidates by requesting them to put their signatures in support of theses just points. Those who sign deserve the voters support while anyone shirking to do so is obviously devoid of a just and rational approach.

(1) Upholding the fundamental human task of environmental (i.e., air, water, land, forest, bio-diversity, etc.) sustainability at all times and places.

(2) Human right of existence ensured through social security as a fundamental right with regard to clean air, pure drinking water, nutritious food, housing, clothing and free health facilities and education.

(3) Human right of fair equality based on 1:5 income difference.

(4) Peaceful resolution of all disputes in the world, particularly Jammu-Kashmir, Palestine, Sri Lanka, etc. In case of a just solution to Jammu-Kashmir problem, a joint Indo-Pak condominium be entrusted to handle its (Jammu-Kashmir's) defence and foreign affairs. In all other matters (except defence and foreign affairs), Jammu-Kashmir should have independence, while each of its nine ethnic

regions be given maximum possible autonomy. A similar type of just arrangement be worked out in case of Israel, Palestine and Jordan also.

(5) Restructuring of the world order by ending the veto powers of the five permanent members of the UN security council and by giving absolute power of deciding any issue of the UN general assembly on the basis of a simple majority vote.

(6) Restructuring of WTO, WB and IMF on the basis of substituting their free market perspective by Nature-Human Centric perspective and their development strategy favouring money and money-owners by a Nature-Human Centric development strategy, comprising two top priorities, i.e., human and environmental, and five principles, i.e., sustainability, equity, productivity, people-led democracy and all sided transparency.

(7) Women's empowerment, ensuring their 50 percent representation in all social institutions at all levels.

(8) Cooperative farming, ensuring the livelihood security of all concerned.

(9) Labour—both physical (or blue collar) and mental (or white collar)—empowerment, ensuring workers one-third elected representation in the management of all institutions, projects and factories.

(10) Democratisation of all industrial and services sectors by ending their corporate and state monopoly control and managing them through ordinary shareholders (two-third representation) and workers, (with one-third representation).

(11) Finance management: While the corporate sector upholds the monopoly corporate management and control and the state sector supports the monopoly bureaucratic management and control, the nature-human centric development model stands for democratic management and control of public companies by elected joint committees, each comprising two-third elected members from ordinary shareholders and one-third elected workers representatives in place of permanent corporators. All promoters' share (purchased at cheaper rates than the market rates and owned by corporate management) be ended,

(12) Political process be headed by the peoples and conducted through the Nature-Human Centric dedicated social workers (or their front). The election be entirely free where every one has right to participate as a candidate and as a voter.

(13) Ending of state power monopoly of the corrupt and money and power hungry political parties by introducing the rule of the state funding of election to each individual candidate (who is required to produce 1,000 signatures of his electors in assembly and 5,000 in Lok Sabha election) without any consideration to his party affiliation. Concerned voters right to recall any assembly or lok sabha member if one-fifth of voters demand in writing a re-poll on the ground that the afore-mentioned member has lost the confidence of his electorate.

(14) All development funds to be spent through elected peoples development committees (including the gram sabhas and not above that), abrogating the current rule of allotting Rs 2 crores to each MP and lakhs of rupees to each MLA for development spending in his constituency.

(15) Jurisprudence to be based on the fundamental principle of safe guarding and protecting the interests of environmental and human resources. Any disregard of the foregoing principle to be dealt with the aim of reforming the offender, while prescribing punishment according to the severity of the offence. Punishment may include all human forms that have existed in history except the sentence to death and human.

VI. An Appeal

We appeal to all those who are interested in changing this world on a rational and just basis by adopting different viewpoints to come together and sort out a realistic common agenda and wage the struggle from a single platform.