



Note of discussions at FDSD and SGS Synthesis Workshop: towards a Manifesto for Democracy and Sustainable Development

Note by Jyoti Panday with additional inputs from Katharina Schwarz and Halina Ward

12th-14th December, 2012

Schloss Leopoldskron, Salzburg (SGS Session 519)

Workshop Participants

Busani Bafana, *Zimbabwe*; Ana Barreira, *Spain*; Andreas Bummel, *Germany*; Jane Davidson, *United Kingdom*; Alexandre De Faria, *Portugal*; María De Los Angeles Ortiz, *Argentina*; Lalanath De Silva, *Sri Lanka*; Cecilia Therese Guiao ('Niner'), *Philippines*; Ramzi Jaber, *Palestine*; John Lotherington, *United Kingdom*; Erin Mazursky, *USA*; Jyoti Panday, *India* (13-14 only); Biraj Patnaik, *India*; Sagari Ramdas, *India*; Catarina Tully, *United Kingdom*; Tom Wakeford, *United Kingdom* (13-14 only); Halina Ward, *United Kingdom*; Nicolò Wojewoda, *Italy*; David Woodward, *United Kingdom*; Shahid Mahmood Zia, *Pakistan*; János Zlinszky, *Hungary*

Salzburg Global Seminar Staff (each for part of the workshop only)

Clare Shine; Sofia Azar; Louise Hallman; Katharina Schwarz; Julia Stepan; Rob Fish

12th December

Session 1: Welcome and Introductions

Halina, Nicolò and Clare welcomed participants to Schloss Leopoldskron, and introduced the workshop and the manifesto consultation process. Participants introduced one another.

Halina summarized the manifesto consultation process. Whilst the consultation process had reached people in a number of countries, it was not fully balanced geographically, with almost 50% of some 300 respondents from the UK. Whilst this was undoubtedly a flaw, FDSD's proposal was for a manifesto with international reach beyond any particular group of countries or any particular region. It would be important to be transparent about the nature of the consultation process on which it had been based. A Mark I Manifesto, based on consultation responses received, had been circulated as part of a Background Paper which also raised questions for discussion during the Salzburg workshop and explained how, based on the consultation responses, the Mark I Manifesto text had been arrived at.

Halina noted that the Manifesto was not intended as a tool for 'spreading' democracy (or democratization) but rather to focus on the points of intersection between sustainable development and democracy for applications in settings where it was possible, or meaningful, to discuss how best to shape the practices of democracy to deliver sustainable development. Participants at the workshop were invited to offer guidance to FDSD on how to strengthen and improve the Manifesto text and deal with a number of outstanding issues, and how most effectively to plan for its launch. However, the

workshop was not designed as a consensus event and there was no assumption that participants would endorse the eventual draft of the Manifesto.

Ground rules were discussed and agreed for the workshop. In particular, the following were relevant beyond the period of the workshop itself:

1. The Chatham House Rule would apply to live tweeting and social networking during the workshop. However, the Chatham House Rule would not apply to exchanges during the workshop, though FDSO would share a draft of the note from the workshop before making it public.
2. Videos and photos would be made/taken during the workshop as a resource for the launch of the Manifesto. Footage would be shared with participants before being made public.
3. Participants take part in the discussion as individuals. The workshop was not designed to arrive at consensus but to offer advice to FDSO on how best to finalise the manifesto and prepare for its launch. Consequently, no assumption of support for any particular draft of the Manifesto should be imputed to any participant by virtue of their participation in the event.

Session 2: Round Table: Overall questions and concerns

Halina invited each participant in round table format to share any overall concerns they had about the Mark I Manifesto as shared in the background paper for the workshop. The following issues emerged for further discussion later during the workshop:

Audience/tone

“What are we trying to accomplish?”

The manifesto as a document versus consensus-building versus a setting vision: how radical should it be?

How radical are we? Are we lobbying government? Creating a people’s movement? These require completely different languages.

The Manifesto must be “more accessible”; some words with particular cultural associations could be problematic.

The term “evidence-based” is not used in Indian discussions.

The Manifesto needs a short preamble to explain what it is (and what it isn’t).

“Be the change you want to see in the world”, “do things by yourself, don’t wait for others” should come across.

This is part of, not the end of, a movement.

Consensus could be good, in allowing people to carry forward those parts of message that resonated with them: potential larger circle of actors.

Audience: who are we talking to? As broad as we can think: “world public”?

Currently it’s a very uncontroversial, consensus-seeking document.

Must try to work towards a manifesto with contents that all agree on and which all can promote [Note: this was not agreed generally within the group. Some felt it important to get as many people to sign on as possible, while others were hesitant to sacrifice a more radical vision for the sake of greater numbers].

[NB: Participants returned to questions of ‘audience’ and ‘tone’ the following day; 13th December]

Context

Much of the problem is structural inequality and power: the text is about democracy and fairness, but some people would have to lose power to allow this to happen. A Preamble should set out the inequality context.

In an Indian context there are special protections given to certain citizens. Such protections create more fairness, not less, but are inherently not necessarily “fair”. What is fairness?

The Manifesto must speak of crisis and the chance to achieve a paradigm shift to something different.

Comments on the content of the Mark I Manifesto text and core concepts

Sequencing: the principles are not currently in a logical order.

Principle 7: perhaps better to integrate into others than to keep separate?

The draft manifesto contains little on the global requirement for democracy. What about WTO, etc. which impact the non-democratic societies?

Principles 6 and 7 are linked: the policies in 7 should be put into the strategic long-view in Principle 6
Principle 4 needs to be more positive.

Commitments are phrased as “we will _____”, which is dangerous since it puts things off to the future. Should instead be “we ____” without the “will”. “Actions not promises.”

Words like “dissidence”, “dignity”, “community”, would speak to “people who bring about democracy in those places where democracy must be made to happen.”

“Movements” is also missing: “history has always seen abuse of power and it’s the movements that pushed back on this.”

You must reclaim the narrative to have a democratic movement. That should be a principle or sub-principle, perhaps education-related, but definitely as long-term objective.

“Leadership” terminology is problematic in implying that “leaders” are not part of the Manifesto’s audience, when in fact they could be high-impact carriers of message.

Inclusiveness/diversity

The text should resonate with indigenous people and across cultures.

The text should include more ideas on diversity.

Should include minority protection.

On the meaning of democracy

Important to distinguish between democracy and majoritarianism- voice of majority does not necessarily equal democracy.

“Democracy” means different things to different people. “I’ve never voted in my life, but it means something”. It resonates, but not only positively.

Manifestos are actions to an end, so we must better understand the breadth of “democracy” to move on.

Mention that democracy is more than voting and that certain things should be “beyond decision.”

Democracy evolves as people act and behave, with changing living conditions in a society. Note diversity and that inclusive democracy is not just the rule of the majority.

Democracy is a living creature with a historical basis.

There is a danger in legislating to create a perfect democracy, when we need an open, dynamic document which will speak to those who wish to evolve democracy.

Democracy is a “zone of conflict”, where you can fight without damaging others as conflict does.

We need to reclaim language from the political purposes for which it has been used, to reopen meanings instead of abandoning terms.

Session 3: On Democracy and Sustainable Development

Following this initial round of comments, Halina invited participants to add ideas on the meanings of ‘democracy’ and ‘sustainable development’ respectively on a series of sticky notes. These ‘post-its’ were reviewed by participants in conversation. Some saw tremendous overlap between the ideas put forward, making it feasible to include definitions of each term within the manifesto. Others saw key differences. Halina invited small groups of those who saw similarities or consensus within the post-its to offer feedback on how they saw the core elements.

NB: offering feedback the following day, two small groups offered the following ideas:

Democracy

“A process in which all people have the opportunity to exercise their voice with dignity, respect and justice and to equal influence on outcomes. Democracy enables people to decide upon a common way forward for themselves for their communities and their society based on the ideal that all people are created equal. A process based on collective self governance for the greater common good.(Not on the governors and governed)”

Sustainable Development

- Balance between market/state (equilibrium between human needs and respect for nature's boundaries.
- Ecosystem approach policies.
- Community welfare (economic, political, cultural, social and environmental aspects).
- Equity between species and generations.
- A better quality of life.
- A new and equilibrated relationship with nature.
- Acting responsibly now for the sake of the future.

Halina reserved judgment on whether it was desirable to include precise definitions of democracy or sustainable development respectively based on these ideas.

Session 4: Mark I Manifesto: Vision

Turning to the content of the Mark I Manifesto, Ramzi, Jane and János presented their reactions to the initial preambular ‘Vision’ section of the Mark I Manifesto.

Ramzi. Points included:

It is not ‘democracy’ but ‘we’ who should be doing the actions throughout the Manifesto.

Without deleting the word ‘democracy’ add more terms that people can relate to directly, e.g ‘dignity’

There is little space for non-voters in the Manifesto. There are other types of democracies and people who see themselves as pro-democracy, even if they do not live in a democracy...

Ethiopian saying: -“a man who hides a disease cannot be cured.”

Jane. Points included:

Once you have audience, content and language will follow.

Wales is the first country in the world to make SD center of its legislature, (though legislation is not ‘the’ answer). The 2009 document “One Wales, One Planet” led to a vision of what a sustainable Wales 2050 could be. The Manifesto also needs a vision; one which should be tested on many groups.

János. Points included:

The current draft of the Manifesto does not contain a ‘Vision’. It should describe the target state we want to create; what we see at end of road. The text should describe a “green and fair democracy”. The vision should express:

- 1) Concern for the central roles of humans and community.
- 2) Reality/limits: we must be aware of these. The mistake of the 1992 UN Conference on Environment and Development was to conceive of sustainable development as ‘three pillars’, which failed to acknowledge nested systems, and built three silos instead.

In talking about vision for democracy, “we should aim for acceptance of responsibility for planet, and for the future, dignity of person, and common good, to accept and learn from the laws of nature.”

The formal part of the day's discussions then concluded. Over dinner, participants were invited to offer toasts from a future - in the year 2032 – in which the Manifesto has been widely implemented.

13th December

Session 1: Audience and tone

Halina proposed that participants begin Day Two with a deeper discussion on the key issues of audience and tone for the manifesto. Nicolò and Halina facilitated feedback from the subsequent discussion which initially took place in break-out groups. A summary of key points follows.

Tone

There is a close link between the target audience and the tone of the document itself (conciliatory? A call to action?) Perhaps more radical language could be used in the Preamble, pointing to global symptoms or problems and setting out the context and need for the Manifesto. One participant saw the Preamble as a call to action in the future, but the Manifesto itself as inspirational, defining the connection between democracy and sustainable development.

The 'Manifesto' itself could also communicate in a wider variety of formats than simply the written word; using for example storytelling and visual and design elements to connect with its audiences.

The language of the manifesto needs to be clearer and more forthright than currently. It should contain a vision of the world that its commitments seek to generate; and it should also describe the context out of which it's been developed (including inequality, unfairness, dwindling natural resources, etc etc).

There would be value in the Manifesto adopting a stronger, clearer and more positive tone – containing commitments 'for' something. It should be inspiring, questioning the *ennui* and nonchalance that have come to plague social movements. Keeping it short is important, but not so short as to lose strength or to make it simplistic ("simple, not simplistic").

The Manifesto could start with a 'burning platform statement', but the vocabulary and ideas should be simple and inclusive. The link between sustainable development and democracy needs to be established at the outset.

Before moving to a discussion on how to build a 'movement' with the Manifesto, it's important to clarify the theory of change that lies behind it, cautioned one participant. The Manifesto itself needs to be clear on its long-term goals, identify measurable indicators of success, and formulate actions to achieve goals. But it is important to frame the Manifesto simply as an anchor for a wider movement of people who are interested in and willing to take the cause forward.

It is important to establish who is speaking to whom through the Manifesto: both the authors of the Manifesto and its audiences should be clear. Using inclusive vocabulary could allow others to communicate the ideas, so that they could explain the Manifesto further.

Audience

One proposal was that the audience for the manifesto should in essence be people who already care about democracy or the ideas underlying sustainability (environmental and social justice; a healthy environment and fairness for all now and in the future, for example). Its audience shouldn't principally be government (though a separate version could be addressed to government), but rather people – individuals. The Manifesto's agents of change, from this starting point, could be understood as people already interested in democracy and sustainable development, but who might never have thought about the connections between the two.

However, others felt in discussion that the act of signing the Manifesto would itself be an indication of 'caring': the manifesto itself should reach beyond that limited audience, providing its signatories with a resource that they can use in diverse ways to bring others on board. (Metaphor: the Pope speaks to everyone across the world on Day of Peace, not just to Catholics!)

If the Manifesto is understood as an 'anchor document' for a wider community of actors and practice, the wider set of resources, stories, and narratives (audio, visual and other) associated with the manifesto are just as important if not more important than the manifesto text itself. The Manifesto should not be conceived of as one document for all audiences but rather the beginning of movement.

Whilst there was widespread agreement among participants that the manifesto should be aimed at individuals, an unresolved issue (discussed further on Day Three) concerned the forms of signature: should signature be open both to individuals and organizations, for example? Could it be open to signatories to agree only with part, or must signatories be prepared to agree with every word? One view was that signature should be open only to individuals.

Signatories could then carry the manifesto's message to their communities. Others felt that there should be the option of taking up the Manifesto in its entirety or just individual principles that have resonance with certain people.

Tone and Audience: Conclusions

- The Manifesto should be written for *people* not organizations.
- The document should be a resource for people 'who care', giving them direct inspiration to take the Manifesto into their communities, translating its concepts and words as needed.
- However, the Manifesto should aspire to reach as many people as possible, whether they already care/are active or not. It should show the context and the opportunities for action.
- The document and its associated communications tools must, together, advocate democracy and sustainability as well as the link between them.
- The linkage between democracy and sustainability needs to be communicated in ways that make sense more broadly than simply people who care about one or the other.

Session 2: Addressing cross cutting themes and action points through story telling

Participants were invited to develop stories to address five cross-cutting themes within the Manifesto text:

- inclusion and diversity
- context
- vision
- values
- leadership

The stories from each of the breakout groups were videoed, and participants then reflected together on 'lessons learned', including:

- It is easier to change people with stories than with bullet points!
- There can be value in leaving a story without a clear ending, allowing people to reach their own conclusions.
- One story featured a 'World Council for Democracy and Sustainable Development'; a model that some participants felt uncomfortable with given its attendant potential idea of centralization/consolidation

- Stories potentially offered a way of advocating contentious issues more strongly than a straight debate, providing a less abrasive narrative than a piece of non-fiction analysis.

Session 3: Feedback on Principles and Commitments in the Mark I Manifesto

Participants had been pre-allocated to breakout groups focusing on each of the Principles and associated Commitments in the Mark I Manifesto. Each breakout group was invited to consider how to shorten and strengthen the relevant part of the Manifesto text and how to remove any cultural or geographical biases. In addition, the workshop background paper had posed a series of questions for each of the breakout groups in areas where particular drafting choices had arisen during the Manifesto consultation process.

The complete Manifesto text as amended during these breakout group discussions is annexed at Annex A. Each breakout group summarized its proposals in plenary, and then questions were invited from pre-assigned participants and then from participants as a whole. Points made included the following: (NB: Principles refer to the order of the Principles in the Mark I Manifesto text):

Principle 1: Flourishing democracy is a necessary enabling condition for Sustainable development

- The group added a rationale for principle. Democracy allows for pluralism and voice. It goes beyond voting and is about participation especially by marginalized communities.
- The Principle should include citizenship education, freedom from corruption, free media, upholding human rights and other mechanisms to counter vested interests.
- A reference to accountability to future generations should appear higher up (one participant asked if it was important to stress accountability to future generations?).
- The Principle should incorporate a reference to traditional leadership.
- Social justice is imperative for democracy and should be integrated within the Principle.
- Genuine equality of influence for all? [The group's written feedback suggested that this should not be incorporated in the Principle].

Principle 2: Education links democracy to sustainable development

- The group's amendments deleted the last paragraph.
- Education is not just the prerogative of government; civil society can play an important role too.
- Diverse ways of education such as 'socialization' and media should be included in the principle.
- Link between democracy and sustainable development within education.
- Empowerment and information: the link needs to be highlighted.
- Education for citizens is a lifelong process involving multiple actors.
- Power and education not reflected, educational processes can be affected by various exercises of power.
- Environmental literacy needs to be incorporated.
- Maybe Global citizenship and global patriotism are values that citizens need to be educated on?
- Not only citizens but also leaders need to be educated: the manifesto should reflect this.

Principle 3: Re-balance knowledge, participation and representation

- Group discussed research funding and who should have control over future research.
- The question of whether the public/public deliberation should control the aim of the research was heavily contested.
- Funding for research and its sources should be transparent. Climate change issue of fake studies was discussed.

- There was agreement that the public should have access to and be made aware of all findings funded by public money whilst recognizing that freedom of inquiry to carry out independent research was also important.
- In areas such as agricultural practices, locals/farmers actually know how to work best and at lowest cost. Their knowledge should be respected and might serve as a model for future decisions.

Principle 4: Establish Wellbeing and Sustainability as the Goal of Policy

- The group proposed a number of detailed textual changes, including to the title (which could be seen as negative in tone), and suggested that the second paragraph of the Principle appear first.

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

- The group read out their proposed amendment.
- In discussion, one participant proposed greater representation at international levels, with the idea of the World Parliament as an example of what could lie in the future.
- There was a suggestion that a greater commitment to decision-making at local level be integrated within the Principle.

Principle 6: Take the long view

- Global to local: taking the long term approach is needed at all levels.
- The Principle should contain a reference to the 'five capitals'
- Establishment of independent institutions should form part of the Commitments.
- Some reservations were expressed about the Commitment on strong leadership (vague).
- Manifesto bears a tension: it suggests that ultimately decisions will be democratic provided they are informed. This actually allows for deep problems to remain: institutional basis/policy approaches have to be segregated for this purpose.
- Does the long view factor in the agency of people?
- Consideration of equity, innovation, resilience need to be incorporated.

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

- The group working on this Principle found it deeply contentious, since its language undermined efforts in some parts of the world to secure final decision-making rights at local (rather than national or regional) level. The text was skewed towards a Western democratic view. Instead, the emphasis should be on local self-governance.
- Halina proposed simply deleting the Principle, which had caused difficulties as initially framed during the consultation process, too.
- There was discussion on whether the Principle could be replaced with a Principle of 'subsidiarity' (without using that word itself). Halina agreed to try to draft this.

The formal part of the day then concluded. After dinner, over drinks, Erin led an informal discussion on 'movement-building 1.01'.

14th December

Halina opened with a brief stock-take. Whilst there had been many good suggestions for amendment of the Mark I Manifesto text, they were not yet close to delivering a draft of three pages (the desired maximum length for an English language version). She would need to make a number of additional judgments in arriving at a final text, and some of the suggestions that had been made would inevitably be lost along the way. Halina would also need to balance participant's suggestions alongside other consultation responses received, in the round.

Session 1: Sign On Mechanism for the Manifesto and associated initiative

Participants began the day by revisiting the question of the appropriate sign-on mechanism for the manifesto and its associated initiatives. Points of discussion included:

- What would be the best approach to increasing the number of people who sign on? Was it important to share the number of those who have signed on? A few participants felt it would be better to show the number.
- What would be the stepped approach and forms of distribution for the sign-on? Would people have the choice to sign on to individual parts of the Manifesto that they agree with or must people sign on to everything? Would there be a formal sign-on mechanism for each principle. This could make the process very complex.
- A few participants suggested that it might be of value in seeing the names of those who have signed on, or celebrities who might sign on - though others might prefer anonymity.
- One approach could be to have people sign to indicate their desire to be part of the movement associated with the Manifesto even if they did not necessarily endorse its content entirely. For example sign-on could mean association with a pledge along the lines: "I believe that there is a connection between democracy and sustainable development and that this connection must be strengthened. I commit to doing what I can, within my means..."
- Rather than having sign-on to prescribed commitments, perhaps people could suggest new commitments, with a section on a website where they could communicate with others who have also signed on, share their commitments, advances, etc. This would also show the wider impact of the Manifesto on the real world, generating positive feedback loops.
- It was suggested that sign-on should be open to civil society organizations as well as individuals.

Session 2: Launch plans

The reminder of this final day of the workshop focused on plans for the launch of the Manifesto and its associated initiatives. Participants were invited to consider: 'how can we spread ripples with the manifesto?'

FDSO would work towards the launch with a graphic designer, a website developer, a video-maker and a communications consultant. Participants were asked to propose ideas for the launch process, suggestions for links to other initiatives, and proposals for ways to maximize the impact of the Manifesto.

Towards launch

Participants made suggestions on elements for inclusion in a launch process:

- Development of an introductory video, explaining the need, context and aims of the Manifesto.
- Framing a narrative around the Manifesto: don't start with graphic; a narrative needs to have a hook or story.
- Could an image help to spread ripples beyond cultures – with a picture to encompass the core.
- Turning the Manifesto into a graphic presentation as a modern, fun way of communicating ideas.
- A pre-launch process could see positive stories highlighting the connection between democracy and sustainable development whilst setting the pace for the eventual launch and laying the groundwork in terms of 'urgency' and 'need' for the manifesto.
- Partnership with development blogs and other media outlets.
- Halina proposed creating media impact by inviting journalists to write pre-launch stories showcasing examples of **positive practices** that could be related to the principles and commitments in the Manifesto. Stories should not be limited to examples from middle and low income countries, and stressed that they could also make the case for **urgent action** rather than simply showcasing good practice. Halina suggested that this could be met for example by stories

showing the impact of natural disasters on democracy or the connection between the European financial crisis, democracy and sustainability (e.g. stories from Spain or from the impact of the New Zealand Christchurch earthquake on democracy).

- Each Principle would benefit from images and graphics that are easy to share and that tell stories.
- More than one participant proposed a separate website for the Manifesto, rather than simply a section of the FDSD website.

The manifesto/movement's title

A few participants objected to the use of the word 'green' in the title of the Manifesto given its association with 'green economy', 'green political parties', and the idea of 'green wash'.

A few participants felt that both democracy and sustainability should be firmly embedded in the title. There was a need to establish the interdependence of democracy and sustainability and to bring out the sense of interconnection and community.

Suggestions for the title included 'Democracy for life', 'Living together' 'People at the centre of the environment', 'Sustainable development for democracy', 'The Salzburg Manifesto', or the name of a bird that could be associated with the Manifesto.

The Manifesto itself, it was agreed, should take effect as a living document: the anchor for a new movement centred on the development of a community of practice and innovation. More important than agreeing with every part of the text itself, therefore, or agreeing a process for amendment or updates subsequently, was to show a commitment to form part of the overall movement.

Finally, one participant reflected that the discussion overall had been heavily weighted towards democracy: we should not lose sight of the environment/ sustainability.

Annex A: feedback from breakout groups on individual Mark I Manifesto Principles and Commitments

Principle 1: A flourishing democracy is a necessary enabling condition for sustainable development

Democracy represents the best governance mechanism for delivering sustainable development because it allows for pluralism, voice, commitment, innovations and collective decision-making to achieve the effective and efficient management of scarce resources.

However, democracy is about much more than elections and voting. Getting to “flourishing democracy” means a commitment from all parts of society to enable vibrant meaningful public participation in decision-making, particularly of marginalised communities.

This needs to be supported by: citizenship education; freedom from corruption; diverse and accountable politicians, elected representatives and public officials; free and independent media; transparency and access to justice; rule of legitimate law and independent judiciary; and upholding of human rights. It also requires mechanisms to counter vested interests and elite capture, and accountability to current and future generations.

Feedback

1. Longer-term, future generations needs to come earlier (to do)
2. Traditional leadership mentioned (to do)
3. Add to first paragraph rationale: how Democracy supports SD - in particular include Social justice (to do)
4. Genuine equality of influence for all (NO)
5. To people affected "wherever they might be" (unsure necessary)

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: Education links democracy, citizenship and sustainable development

Education 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.

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.

Principle 3: Improving the generation and use of knowledge through democratic processes

In order to carry out their democratic duties it is the right and responsibility of all citizens to be informed.

The knowledge and wisdom of people that is drawn from first-hand experience needs to be as respected as that which is professionally accredited.

Informed process of public deliberation of advice and evidence shall be the basis of decision-making.

The focus of research shall be guided by dialogue with citizens. If funded with public money or at publically funded institutions all research shall be available as open access indefinitely.

Any information used by policy-makers as evidence shall be subject to open public deliberation.

We shall acknowledge uncertainty and gaps in knowledge, in these deliberations and make decisions based on shared deliberation about risk, precaution and the common good.

We acknowledge that some problems are at the global level. There shall also be public deliberations at the international level holding international organisations to scrutiny.

Commitments

Rather than relying on evidence developed in private and delivered behind closed doors, we will create and support initiatives designed to bring public engagement and deliberation into international and national processes that inform public decision-making on key sustainability challenges.

We will speak out when we see that elected representatives and public officials rely too heavily on expertise from professionals, at the expense of knowledge from those whose expertise comes from their experience.

Principle 4: Establish well-being and sustainability as the goal of policy

Democracy needs to drive the economy, not the other way round. Economies must support us all, as people, equally to fulfil our basic needs and to innovate, and to grow fairly and sustainably. We need systems of democracy that are free from vested commercial and financial interests.

Getting to a healthy environment and fairness for all, now and in the future, demands transformation of growth-focused economic models that lead to environmental destruction, keep people in poverty, and

open up huge gaps between the richest and the poorest. All sectors of society need to commit to this process of transformation.

Commitments

We will support governments and public bodies to adopt measures of progress that value fairness, wellbeing and the environment. We will speak out against the inappropriate use of economic indicators that fail to take these measures into account.

We will encourage governments and international bodies to make sustainable development a central organising principle of policy 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 to prevent conflicts of interest and eliminate financial dependency on commercial and financial interests.

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 profit maximisation.

We will support social enterprises and innovation which prioritizes solving environmental and social problems over profit.

We will commit to lifestyles that demonstrate our will to prioritise action for a healthy environment and fairness for all, now and in the future.

Principle 5: Our inherent interconnectedness means every person must count in decision-making at all levels

In our evermore global society, decisions made at all levels affect people everywhere. We must ensure fairness for all, now and in the future, which requires that everyone has an active way to participate in society and in governance, beyond the right to vote.

The interests of all people affected by public decisions, wherever they might be, need to be taken into account by decision-makers at all levels. We want decisions at the world level to be made by people who have been elected for this purpose. [NB: Suggested that we merely hold leaders accountable. Can't vote for world leaders. Point of contention]. It is the process and value of democracy that this is the basis for decision-making, not the self-interest of individual nation states.

Sustainable development is a global challenge and every individual's responsibility. Sustainability demands that democracy burst out of its national borders and we hold each other and governments accountable to this.

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.

Children and young people must be included in order to ensure we account for the needs of future generations and our common interest as people in maintaining a healthy environment.

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 electorates 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. It must take account of and adopt a precautionary approach to the uncertainties which surround our efforts to take care of the future. Democracy must plan for present and future human needs whilst acknowledging the earth's natural boundaries and the long-term stewardship of communities' resources bases. [Add the notion of five 'capitals': natural, social, human, infrastructure and financial.

Commitments

We will advocate the development and strengthening of independent institutions and processes that are designed to bring future generations, 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.

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.