

The Beginning of History: Eight Kinds of Peace¹

Cristovam Buarque

In his famous book, Professor Fukuyama states that the failure of the socialist governments of Eastern Europe and the victory of the liberal capitalism cause what he calls “The End of History.” I prefer to speak about “The Beginning of History.” He believes that the changes brought about by the fall of the Berlin Wall and the end of the Iron Curtain would have put an end to the long-lasting discussion between authoritarianism and democracy that characterized history. In my opinion, that debate characterized pre-history.

History will continue to be built as long as changes emerge from the discussions about the kind of democracy humanity will pursue—a democracy that either promotes or fights social exclusion, that destroys or protects the environment, that imposes a particular set of cultural values and concepts or encourages respect and tolerance. Democracy confined to each country separately, or expanded at global level.

The end of the Twentieth Century witnessed three major revolutions—in globalization, in the field of liberal politics and economics and in science and technology

(information technology, biotechnology and microelectronics)—that bring new challenges for the future of democracy. It is with a strong belief that history is just beginning that I present eight challenges for the global democracy in the next decades.

1. Democracy Lagging Behind

Churchill once stated that democracy is the worst political system, except all the others. His statement was further validated with the rise of the rights of minorities against the democratic authoritarianism of the majority. It is even more applicable today considering the globalization process. Democracy no longer meets the requirements of the global world, but up to this date there is no other system capable of replacing it.

Invented in a time when States were restricted to cities, and rulers had their powers limited to their own small territories and to the short span of their own lives, democracy has grown old in a world where the power of any president goes far beyond the borders of his own country, and triggers effects, which last far longer than his term of office; thus, his actions have repercussions in the life of citizens of other countries who did not elect him and in the life of future generations.

This is obvious as regards the rulers of big countries, whose decisions may warm up the planet, change the course of rivers, cause nuclear or biological wars, destabilize other countries or the entire civilization. But it is also true for the

presidents of small countries who decide to build nuclear plants, to dam an international river, to authorize the operation of bank systems used for money laundering, or to allow terrorist bases or drug traffic in their territories.

In the globalized world, the actions of each State can have repercussions in the entire world for centuries ahead, but democracy goes on electing rulers on the basis of national elections for short terms of office. The world has become global and long-termed, but democracy is still national and short-termed.

A global world needs a democracy that is capable of incorporating the global reality.

To become democratic, globalization must cease being identified only with trade.

Save some ecological, social, or political tragedy, trade will never return to the times of closed nations. International trade will be the distinguishing mark of the future. However, if trade is to take place with a minimum civilizing efficiency, it must be accompanied by international solidarity, by means of investments to overcome poverty and local calamities, and to face the problems experienced by those excluded from the advantages of global modernity.

Global democracy will require the combination of national democracy and international solidarity among present-day societies, and among present and future generations, allowing us to complete the world mobility framework. In addition to the commercial peace that stems from free trade now being implemented, the world will seek to attain other

peaceful goals: social peace, moral peace, security peace, migration peace, technological peace, cultural peace, political peace and green peace.

2. Social Peace: the Fight against Poverty

The world cannot be global in the areas of trade, economy, and finance, and go on keeping humankind divided. The *iron curtain*, which in the past prevented globalization, dividing humankind along ideological, political, economic, and military lines, must not be replaced—as happens today—by a *golden curtain*, which prevents democratic globalization, dividing humankind along social and demographic lines.

There is no global democracy in a world, which opens its borders to the entry of products that increase the well-being of the rich and closes its borders to people escaping poverty. Globalizing wealth for a few, while still nationalizing poverty for so many, is immoral.

The present global world has created a divided humankind: in the place of an *iron curtain*, a *golden curtain*. On one side, an *archipelago of the poor of the world*, they themselves divided by cultural differences; on the other side, an *international first world of the rich*, united in the same modern standards of consumption and culture. Globalization has spread the right to wealth for social groups, regardless of the country where a person lives, but has also excluded—within each country—segments of the local population. The pre-globalization world divided into a First, a Second, and a

Third World has been replaced by a world where the Second World has disappeared, pockets of poverty have been formed in the First World, and pockets of affluence have come forth in the Third World. The global world of the 21st Century is a huge *Third world World*, with *countries with a low-income population majority* and *countries with a high-income population majority*, with rich and poor in both countries; the only difference is the proportion between these segments within each country.

Within a few decades, if this scenario is maintained, the World will face such a brutal division between the rich and the poor—regardless of which country they live in—that a biological rupture in the human species will occur, with one group living longer and enjoying greater physical health and more intelligence, and the other group—the majority—living less, with a weakened health and no education. The outcome will be the moral tragedy of the acceptance of exclusion, caused by the feeling of *dissimilarity* – which has already begun to spread around the world—between the rich and the poor. The rich will be free to indulge in the moral violence of despising the poor, enjoying wealth and technological progress without solidarity, whereas the poor will be free to indulge in physical violence against the rich.

Globalization will be democratic only if the fight against poverty becomes a global program—a sort of *Global Social Marshall Plan*. The end of poverty will not be reached through a permanent system of foreign help, result of a generous solidarity, nor does it stem from economic growth. A

Marshall Plan for the economy would increase wealth, but would not decrease poverty. In some cases, it could even worsen poverty, augmenting inequality.

In the pre-globalization period, democracy created a Marshall Plan for the economic reconstruction of Europe. In times of globalization, a New Marshall Plan is necessary, in a global scale and for social purposes.

Post-29-crash Keynesianism aimed at fostering economy through the increase of the aggregate demand and was carried out many times with no fiscal responsibility and excessive state interventionism. Together with Keynesianism, the post-war Marshall Plan aimed at financing industrial and infrastructure investments. Both succeeded in promoting the economic growth of the last sixty years.

The 21st Century is demanding a new Marshall Plan and a new Keynesianism in the world struggle against poverty. With fiscal responsibility and full respect to the laws of the market it is possible to transfer income to the poor population of the world, providing jobs for this population in the production of the goods and services that they need to exit poverty. It would be *a new joint social Keynesianism and social Marshall Plan*, the difference being that the program would directly finance *social subsidies*, an income to employ the poor in the production of goods the poor need to escape poverty.

The best-known examples of *social subsidy* are the programs Bolsa-Escola (Child/Family Scholarship Program) in Brazil and Progresá in Mexico, both later renamed as Bol-

sa-Família (Family Program) and Oportunidad (Opportunity)². Based on such programs, the governments of these countries pay an income to poor mothers, under the condition that these mothers keep their children in school and guarantee their daily attendance and success. Besides the income received by the families that allows them an immediate exit from poverty, the school further guarantees that these children will be able to escape poverty. The book *India: From Midnight to the Millennium*,³ by Shashi Tharoor, describes how simple instruments of support to poor groups, the “untouchable,” in the case of India, are able to promote their improvement, with their social inclusion and escape from poverty.

Studies have shown that the cost of a world program to fight poverty requires a small portion of the world income, which is today something about US\$ 40 trillions per year, especially if the financial engineering of these expenditures takes into account the reduction of the poor countries’ debt service.

In a world scale, at the cost of only 13% of the poor countries’ debt service, it is possible to put an end to child labor and place 250 million children in school, creating at the same time a trickle up instead of a trickle down effect, a kind of *social Keynesianism*, with a growth from the basis and a positive social impact on poverty.

The recent negotiation between Argentina and Spain allowed the pardon of part of the first country’s debt to creditors of the second, under the condition that the amount

forgiven be used in education, especially in programs such as *Bolsa-Escola*.

3. Migration Peace: Internal Attractiveness

One cannot imagine a democratic globalization in a world that has succeeded a free circulation of goods but is erecting growing barriers in order to hinder the circulation of people across national frontiers. The world will not be global and democratic at the same time in a planetary scale as long as a strong discrimination against migration persists. Almost the same number of people die each year trying to cross the border between the United States and Mexico as in all 43 years of the Berlin Wall.⁴ This means that crossing the *golden curtain* is much more dangerous and deadly than crossing the iron curtain.

At the same time, it is normal to imagine that rich countries with small territories try to defend themselves both culturally and socially. The equation of trying to globalize demography while protecting national rights of each people, including the rich, will only be solved with adequate policies, so that each poor nation finds the way of progress and survival within its own frontiers. The ones, with no need to migrate, the others with no need to restrain migration.

At a total cost of a border police officer in the United States it is possible, by means of a *Bolsa-Escola* program, to finance school for one thousand children in Honduras, under the condition that these children do not miss classes and that their parents do not leave them in order to migrate. The

scholarship that is paid and the need of the parents' presence are enough moral reasons to decrease the need and to justify the prohibition of migration. An international program for the improvement of teachers' salaries in the *countries with a low income population majority* would be able to stop part of the migration of the local youth in search of better salaries. The equipments of these schools not only retain parents and their children within the country borders, but would also improve the supply of jobs in the countries that manufacture these same equipments.

Instead of border violence that hinders migration, and the consequences of migration liberality, democratic globalization must follow an internationally financed program of internal attractiveness, within each country, so that migration will no longer be a need. The donor countries will find that the financial and moral benefits of an internal attractiveness program more than pay off its cost.

4. Technological Peace: the Fight against Epidemics

Global world faces two tragedies: a tragedy that ravages the world population through natural calamities and the moral tragedy of the indifference of the rest of the world that watches the tragedy. The fight against epidemics, hunger, and illiteracy is a fight for the globalization of access to technological advances. Globalization will not be democratic nor ethical, while the benefits derived from science and technology in the essential social sectors are still restricted to only a small segment of the population. Democratic glo-

balization will require science and technology to benefit the whole world population, in the fields of health, education and agriculture.

Though in theory related to poverty, globalized democracy will require a worldwide program to fight epidemics, which, though affecting mainly the poor population, also threatens citizens in rich countries. The fight against poliomyelitis was an example of defense of the interest of the rich, which also protected the poor. Although HIV is not transmitted by air like the virus of poliomyelitis, and thus allowing the well-informed rich to adopt prophylactic measures, it still is a threat to all. In a global democracy, a problem that affects 37.8 million people, 66%⁵ of which located in Africa, cannot be regarded as a national issue, especially in the case of those countries lacking resources to face it. Aids needs to be regarded as a world issue, within the globalization spirit that supports and fosters international trade but condemns health by restricting it to national responsibility.

The fight against epidemics, especially Aids, is within reach. Medicines and anti-retrovirals already exist, the vaccine is about to be developed, cost being the main issue. Epidemics cannot be turned into a profit vector. On the other hand, the profit of pharmaceutical companies that sell vaccines at high prices works as an incentive to technological advances and should not, therefore, be reduced on behalf of social values. The end of patent rights may hinder scientific advance, with still deeper and serious results on the future of mankind, as the delay in the invention of new drugs; howe-

ver, patent protection can obstruct the dissemination of drugs, with shameful, inhuman, and immoral consequences. This equation can be solved by the use of public funds in *countries with a high-income population majority* to cover research expenses by private companies in the health area, as it happens in the military area.

A worldwide program for the purchase and distribution of drugs would maintain the incentive to technological advance and guarantee immediate access to drugs. The cost of such program would be well within the bounds of the world wealth and would be translated into a positive globalization, not just in terms of trade, but in terms of cure of diseases.

The world will certainly face other epidemics, either from biological causes or as a result of natural disasters, as was the case of the *tsunami* on December 26, 2004. The 9/11 disaster, result of a criminal terrorist attack causing little less than 3 thousand casualties, has remained in history as a date from which the rich world started to mobilize billions of dollars in order to avoid similar political tragedies. But the 12/26, which has killed about 300 thousand people, should remain in history as a date from which rich countries started spending more in order to avoid the consequences of similar natural disasters. September 9th marks the date of a terrorist social epidemics; December 26th should deserve the same attention in order to avoid the consequences of natural disasters.

Death by hunger, life without education, and life in penury should also be regarded as catastrophes, as serious as *tsunamis*, terrorism, or Aids.

5. Cultural Peace: Tolerant Globalization

Access to universal culture has always been one of the main objectives of humankind, as much as access to science and technology. However, considering the manner in which globalization is spreading around the cultural world, what we see now is not access to universal culture, but the global unification of the stronger culture, the culture of *countries with a high-income population majority*, to the disadvantage of other countries, including ethnocides, which destroy cultures and traditions. From the cultural standpoint, globalization is doing in a global scale and in a few decades, in the beginning of the 21st Century, what was done much more slowly, in the beginning of the 16th Century, in the newly discovered countries of the Americas: the destruction of native cultures. The result is the impoverishment of the entire humankind, due to a globalization process, which does not respect diversity, destroys our heritage, and therefore is not democratic, but rather the result of a pre-globalization *archaic democracy*.

This is what the United States and Europe have been doing, naturally sometimes, by virtue of the seduction exerted by their inventions, but sometimes by means of military intervention or the mere threat of it.

The world will not be global and democratic if it is not tolerant. The intolerance that the United States has exerted upon the world, especially upon the Islamic world—as Europe was intolerant towards the native peoples of the Americas—is a form of global social dictatorship. Today, some

countries have been turned into concentration camps for the imposition of Western cultures.

Likewise, intolerance cannot be considered an internal affair of individual countries. Certain religious groups impose their world views and their rites upon others. If the West is now the main destroyer of cultures, one must not forget that it was the Islamic groups in Afghanistan who destroyed all cultures that were different from the rules of more orthodox Islamism.

6. Security Peace: the Fight against all Forms of Violence

Tolerance among cultures and respect for diversity will be fundamental tools for the world global democracy, especially for the reduction of terrorism. But world peace will not be achieved automatically. Along the coming years, globalization must include a strong international collaboration against all forms of violence.

The more visible form of physical violence is terrorism. With its indiscriminate attacks against civilian populations, terrorism – regardless of the political cause it defends–denies global democracy. With the technological advance that will inevitably be at the disposal of individuals and groups, terrorism will soon employ nuclear, chemical, and biological weapons, which will make the present catastrophes look like minor accidents.

There is no global democracy without a global fight against all kinds of terrorism.

At the same time, it will be necessary to stand up to many forms of domestic violence: racial violence, gender violence, violence of child labor and child prostitution.

7. Green Peace: Protecting the Future

Globalization and its technological development have globalized the destruction of the environment in the whole planet. Different from the historic depredation of local environment, the world today plunders the whole planet. Its most outstanding example is the current global warming, a menace to the future of life and the whole civilized system. If the consumption and production models and the indiscriminate use of technical instruments are to go on, global civilization will be doomed. Present civilization will benefit only the current generation, or maybe one or two future generations up to the end of the 21st century; the next generations will be doomed.

Globalization has triggered a war among generations; the current generation trying voraciously to enjoy the products available through technology and trade without any commitment to the sustainability of future generations. We cannot imagine a global democracy exclusively oriented to the present day mankind.

Therefore, there is no global democracy without agreements allowing the subordination of the productive process and the use of techniques to the interests of future generations. The *Kyoto Protocol* was a step, but still a minor one and poorly respected. More than an agreement, we need a

plan of peace with the future generations, which will not be achieved by a civilization process that bases its progress on consumption increase and GDP growth, without valuing Nature.

8. Moral Peace: Globalization of Values

Civilization gained the power to destroy Nature, in a planetary scale, and decision-making mechanisms are still prisoners of short deadlines and national borders.

Global democracy, with the catastrophic power of current techniques, would require the globalization of decision-making power, something utterly impossible, since the necessity of tolerance requires respect for national diversity. Although defined by national policies, democracy today has the need for a planetary ethics.

The nuclear bomb brought to all nations a responsibility that was assumed by means of several agreements for the suspension of nuclear tests and for the reduction of nuclear weapons; the ecological crisis led to the Kyoto Protocol.

The USA has no moral authority to prevent another country from building nuclear power plants or nuclear bombs while it does not submit to the global humanistic yearning to prevent North American economy from triggering global warming with much more dramatic consequences.

The solution to the equation of the right to nationality with a global responsibility is to treat the Earth as a huge condominium, where each nation owns a share; each nation

respecting the rules common to all mankind. While an apartment owner is entitled to use it, but may not set it on fire or leave the tap on, likewise no country should be free to destroy its natural resources and freely use its technological assets. Following the path of agreements on the reduction of nuclear weapons, and other agreements that resulted in the signature of the Kyoto Protocol, it is likewise important to define ethical rules to all countries, as the use of science and technology, human rights, the use of public resources, the struggle against corruption and terrorism, and the struggle for social inclusion and poverty relief.

9. Political Peace: Globalization of Politics

Global ethics will not spread out unless politics goes beyond the borders of each country. However, only under a hypothetic planetary democracy would international parties come forth. International dissemination of communism proved to be an international tool to serve the URSS's national project. All the other attempts of international dissemination were limited to debates for politicians with similar political positions.

It is the yearning for a planetary ethics within national policies that causes non-governmental organizations to spread globally.

While still waiting for a planetary democracy and international parties, global democracy will have to use NGO's growing role as a tool of political and social interference towards emerging international values. International NGO's

can be instruments of balance in a global world where political parties are purely national, global companies seek an immediate micro-economic profit, and international churches offer a spiritual life in “the next world.”

Notes

1. Prepared for a debate with Professor Francis Fukuyama, during the Seminar “The State of Democracy in the World,” held in the U.N. Headquarters, NY in March 10th, 2005. Translated from Portuguese by Claudia Pacheco de Oliveira, Gabriela Caetano Boaventura, Maria Isabel Taveira, and Vanira Tavares de Souza. Translation Service of the Brazilian Federal Senate.
2. Many evaluation studies of the Bolsa Escola program were made by the World Bank, by the Interamerican Developing Bank, UNICEF, UNESCO, ILO. Authors like Bill Clinton, in his autobiography, and George Soros, in his book *On Globalization*, have commented about it.
3. Tharror, Shashi, *India from Midnight to the Millennium*, Millennium Edition, Penguin Books, Londres, 1997, cap. 4, p. 79-111.
4. *The Economist*, Feb. 19th-25th, p. 81. “The giant fence sealing Mexico from America stands in contrast to the Statue of Liberty. In the 43 years that the Berlin Wall shut Communism’s refugees in, it accounted for 239 deaths. America does not shoot migrants, yet in 1991-2001, at least 1,700 people died crossing its border deserts.”
5. UNAIDS table.