

- Simon, Rita
1976 "American Women and Crime." Lee H. Bowker (ed.), *Women and Crime in America*. New York: Macmillan: 6-18.
- Smart, Carol and Barry Smart
1978 *Women, Sexuality, and Social Control*. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul Ltd.
- Steffensmeier, Darrell J.
1981 "Patterns of Female Property Crime, 1960-1977: A Postscript." Lee H. Bowker (ed.), *Women and Crime in America*. New York: Macmillan: 59-65.
- Steffensmeier, Darrell and Emilie Allan
1989 "Youth, Underemployment, and Property Crime: Differential Effects of Job Availability and Job Quality on Juvenile and Young Adult Arrest Rates." *American Sociological Review* 54,1 (February): 107-123.
- 1988 "Sex Disparities in Arrests by Residence, Race, and Age: An Assessment of the Gender Convergence/Crime Hypothesis." *Justice Quarterly* 5,1: (March).
- U.S. Bureau of the Census
1980 *Census of the Population*. Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office: 1960, 1970, and 1980 editions.

- Voley, Harold L., Jr.
1991 "Employment, Age, Race, and Crime: A Labor Theoretic Investigation." *Journal of Quantitative Criminology* 7,2: 123-153.
- 1988 *Dependency Economic and Social Data for New York City*. New York: Office of Policy and Economic Research, Human Resources Administration (January-June).
- Weisberg, Sanford
1985 *Applied Linear Regression*. New York: John Wiley & Son.

new german critique

Number 68

Spring-Summer 1996

- Eva Geulen: On Thomas Mann's Mario and the Magician*
Stefan Jonsson: Subjectivity and Modernity in Robert Musil
Lisa Gates: Rilke and Orientalism
Beatrice Hanssen: Jelinek's Language Of Violence
Gerd Gemünden: Introduction to Enzensberger
Hans Magnus Enzensberger: A Theory of Tourism
Christopher Pausek: Negt and Kluge's Redemption of Labor
Nora M. Alter: The Political Imperceptible in the Essay Film

Personal one-year subscriptions cost \$30 in the US and \$34.50 elsewhere. One-year institutional subscriptions cost \$70.00 in the US and \$80.50 elsewhere. Make checks payable in US funds, drawn on US Banks. Back issues are \$13.00 each. Institutions pay \$30.00. All back issues are still available. Send all correspondence to:

Telos Press, 431 E. 12th Street, New York, NY 10009
tel: 212-228-6479

International Initiatives

The Copenhagen Summit: A Victory for the World Bank?

William Felice

FIDEL CASTRO CAN STEAL A SHOW BY JUST SHOWING UP. AT THE WORLD SUMMIT for Social Development in Copenhagen in early March 1995, the talk of the town was about Fidel. What would he wear? How would he act? And most of all, how would he react to the Queen of Denmark? As the senior head of state, Fidel would be seated next to the Queen at the Summit's final banquet. Fidel quit smoking a while back, but the Queen apparently is a chain smoker. There was much speculation in Denmark as to how Fidel would act around the nicotine-addicted Queen. In the end, according to press reports, they got along quite nicely. Fidel wore a suit, and was on good behavior.

Despite the media's superficial obsession with Fidel's wardrobe, critical and substantive debates on the contrasting approaches to overcoming global obstacles to alleviating poverty were on display at the World Summit. Three of these perspectives, analyzed below, are those from the official Summit of Nation States, the Non-Governmental Forum of thousands of independent organizations from civil society, and the World Bank contribution.

To a degree, these differences in outlook on issues of social development stem from radically different definitions of the problem of global poverty. The World Bank sees one billion people worldwide struggle to survive on less than one dollar a day and therefore live in poverty (World Bank, 1995: v and ix). To many Nongovernmental Organizations (NGOs), this statement represents "the Big Lie." The reality, according to them, is that over three billion people live in poverty and suffer a life of misery.

The definition of the problem, of course, determines the solution. The World Bank, having identified "astonishing success" in the development experience of

William Felice is an Assistant Professor of Political Science at Eckerd College (4200 54th Avenue South, St. Petersburg, FL 33711). He is the author of *Taking Suffering Seriously: The Importance of Collective Human Rights* (State University of New York Press, 1996) and a number of articles on the theory and practice of human rights. In the 1980s he was the representative to the United Nations for the International League for the Rights of Peoples. Special thanks to Ed McCaughan, Nancy Mitchell, and the anonymous reviewers for extremely helpful comments on an earlier draft.

the last 40 years, advocates a series of system-maintaining proposals. Numerous NGOs, on the other hand, pointing to the "astounding failure" in the prevailing neoliberal economic paradigm of development, call for fundamental system transformation. The official summit of nation-states, primarily joined with the World Bank and was essentially interested in system maintenance, with minimal reforms to deal with extremes of social dislocations caused by neoliberal economic policies. These nations were unwilling to act on the NGO proposals seeking fundamental structural change.

Examining these contributions in more detail provides a means to evaluate the overall impact of the Summit. Was this huge effort the tremendous waste of money that critics charge? Or did it provide a needed forum for the world community to focus on issues of poverty and development and to begin to approach new solutions to desperate problems?

System Maintaining and System Reforming: The Official Summit of Nation-States

To supporters of the Summit, the Copenhagen Declaration, "The Declaration and Programme of Action of the World Summit for Social Development," agreed to by the 120 heads of state gathered in Denmark represents the first step to a fairer and more equitable world. The poor got center stage at the summit and some real commitments were made. The nations that signed agreed to incorporate social concerns into structural-adjustment programs and to consider the ratification of certain International Labor Organization (ILO) Conventions. In addition, the right to development and women's rights were affirmed.

For the first time at such a high level, the international community committed itself to doing something about poverty. Commitment 2 reads: "We commit ourselves to the goal of eradicating poverty in the world through decisive national actions and international cooperation, as an ethical, social, political, and economic imperative of humankind."² Although there is neither a global monitoring by the U.N. system, nor a timetable for this international commitment to be met, each nation is to prepare a time-bound strategy at the national level. The hope is that there will now be both the development of indicators to measure the eradication of poverty and specific timelines to hold nations accountable.

20:20:3 Arguably, one of the most innovative proposals agreed to was the 20:20 initiative (Chapter V, #87, c). This proposal calls for 20% of Overseas Development Assistance (up from some 10%) and 20% of national budgets of developing countries (up from some 13%) to be devoted to providing basic social services, including:

By the year 2000, universal access to basic education and completion of primary education by at least 80 per cent of primary school-age children; closing the gender gap in primary and secondary school education by the

year 2005; universal primary education in all countries before the year 2015 (Chapter II: #36, a).

By the year 2000, a reduction of severe and moderate malnutrition among children under five years of age by half of the 1990 level (Chapter II: #36, D).

By the year 2000, reduction of mortality rates of infants and children under five years of ages by one-third of the 1990 level... (Chapter II: #36, c).

Achieving food security by ensuring a safe and nutritionally adequate food supply... (Chapter II: #36, e).

Providing, on a sustainable basis, access to safe drinking water in sufficient quantities and proper sanitation for all (Chapter II: #36, I).

By the year 2000, attainment by all peoples of the world of a level of health that will permit them to lead a socially and economically productive life; and to this end, ensuring primary health care for all (Chapter II: #36, g).

The Summit agreed on the basic concept of 20:20 and endorsed its focus on basic social needs. It is significant that the Summit approved this new approach. It is a public acknowledgment of the magnitude of the global problem of poverty and the urgent need for action. These nations made a specific commitment to provide a floor of resources to meet basic human needs. We gain from 20:20 a yardstick, a mechanism to embarrass nations that continue to spend more on military and prestige projects than on meeting the basic needs of their people. In that sense it can be viewed as a modest victory. However, there were very few mechanisms adopted to guarantee that states would meet these obligations.

Third and Fourth World Debt: Some identified Africa and the least-developed "Fourth world" countries as potential "winners" at the summit. Commitment 7 of the Copenhagen Declaration states: "We commit ourselves to accelerating the economic, social, and human resource development of Africa and the least-developed countries."

The international community promised in paragraph (c) to:

find effective, development-oriented, and durable solutions to the external debt problem, through immediate implementation of the terms of debt forgiveness agreed upon in the Paris Club in December 1994, which encompasses debt reduction including cancellation or other debt relief measures.

Structural Adjustment Programs (SAP): In the preparatory meetings in New York, the terms of addressing the structural adjustment programs of the Bretton Woods institutions had been agreed to. Commitment 8 reads: "We commit ourselves

to ensuring that when structural adjustment programmes are agreed to, they should include social development goals, in particular, of eradicating poverty, promoting full and productive employment, and enhancing social integration."

This was the first time that the U.N. recognized the need for SAPs to protect people living in poverty from budget reductions on social programs and expenditures. The socially disruptive nature of SAPs was recognized and a consensus seemed to emerge around the following: the elimination of subsidies for the rich before cutting those of the poor; the reduction of military spending before social spending; and the balancing of budgets without sacrificing the lives of future generations. Unfortunately, the *Programme of Action* on how to reach the goals of this commitment is not very concrete.

ILO Conventions: Observers noted that the language on employment agreed to by the delegates was very strong. Commitment 3 states:

We commit ourselves to promoting the goal of full employment as a basic priority of our economic and social policies, and to enabling all men and women to attain secure and sustainable livelihoods through freely chosen productive employment and work.

This political commitment to promote the goal of full employment as a basic priority of economic policy comes after a decade of debate. It is thus seen by many as an indisputable step forward. Further, commitment 3(d) states:

Pursue the goal of ensuring quality jobs, and safeguard the basic rights and interests of workers, and to this end freely promote respect for relevant ILO Conventions, including those pertaining to prohibition of forced and child labor, the freedom of association, the right to organize and bargain collectively, and the principle of nondiscrimination.

The actions are formulated in strong, almost "binding," language. Yet again there is a lack of concrete steps to move toward implementation.

The Right to Development: Commitment 4 states:

We commit ourselves to promoting social integration by fostering societies that are stable, safe and just, and based on the promotion and protection of all human rights, and on the non-discrimination, tolerance, respect for diversity, equality of opportunity, solidarity, security and participation of all people, including disadvantaged and vulnerable groups and persons.

In the *Programme of Action*, 15(d) promotes the realization of the right to development — also agreed upon in Vienna: "through effective development policies at the national level, as well as equitable economic relations and a favorable economic environment at the international level."

Women's Rights: The NGOs in the Women's Caucus were exceptional in their effectiveness in lobbying for their rights both in the preparatory process and in Copenhagen. Women constitute the majority of the world's poor, and gender issues are integrated throughout most of the document. Commitment 5 states:

We commit ourselves to promoting full respect for human dignity and to achieving equality between women and men, and to recognizing and enhancing the participation and leadership roles of women in political, civil, economic, social, and cultural life in development.

Section 5(c) says that delegates commit themselves to remove all obstacles to women's access to credit, and 28(b) notes a need to integrate "gender concerns in the planning and implementation of policies and programmes for the empowerment of women."

Notably, at least on the discursive level, the official agreements out of the Copenhagen Summit break with radical "free market" ideology, so dominant since the end of the Cold War. The official Summit rhetoric represents a retreat from the extreme neoliberalism of the Reagan-Bush/Thatcher years and is clearly the result of the worsening economic and social conditions in the less-developed countries. Since the mid-1980s, it has been nearly impossible to challenge the neoliberal agenda without being attacked as an anachronism. Perhaps the Summit will now allow for a more open dialogue to occur on issues of equity and justice.

System Transforming: The NGO Forum

A widely divergent gathering of 2,400 NGOs from around the world participated in the NGO Forum during the World Summit. The NGO Forum brought together small, local activist organizations with large, well-funded foundations and "think-tanks." These organizations represented a huge diversity in politics and approaches toward poverty alleviation. Although there was a degree of isolation of the NGOs (a separate conference center and a lack of dialogue between the official delegate and the non-official NGOs), these nongovernmental organizations created a pressure that forced the nation-states not to abandon some of the proposals outlined above (in particular the 20:20 proposal). In addition, the NGOs produced an "Alternative Declaration"⁴ that presents a stinging critique calling for radical system transformation to meet the pressing needs of the bottom half of the world's peoples. It was quite an accomplishment to achieve broad unity among these diverse organizations on the need for such fundamental change.

The Alternative Declaration calls on the Social Summit to address the structural causes of poverty, unemployment, and social disintegration, as well as environmental degradation. The NGOs reject the prevailing global economic model, but do not suggest the imposition of another universal model. Rather, they call for innovation at the local level.⁵ They believe that the economic framework

adopted by the nation-states contradicts the objectives of equitable and sustainable social development. The NGO declaration pronounces: "The overreliance that the documents place on unaccountable open free-market forces as a basis for organizing national and international economies aggravates, rather than alleviates, the current global social crisis."

This crisis, moreover, is seen as severe. The Declaration and Program of Action of the Social Summit, agreed to by governments, accepts outright the World Bank's poverty indicators. No independent assessment of global poverty is devised. How did the World Bank arrive at the figure of one billion living in poverty? The "estimate" that 18% of the Third World is "extremely poor" and 33% is "poor." The World Bank's poverty line is set at a per capita income of one dollar a day. Population groups with incomes in excess of one dollar a day are arbitrarily identified as "non-poor." Thus, the World Bank estimate for Latin America and the Caribbean is that only 19% of the population is "poor." To many NGOs this is preposterous. Statistics indicate, for example, that over half of the Latin American population live in intolerable poverty and upwards of two-thirds of the population of some countries live in "abject poverty."⁷ In addition, the U.S. Census Bureau estimates that 20% of Americans live below the poverty line. Is the World Bank claiming that there are more "poor" in the U.S. than in Latin America? Or have they created a false measure of "poor" that thereby distorts the true level of destitution confronting millions? The "poor" in the Third World, according to the NGOs, are not a minority group (as depicted by the World Bank), but the majority.

In addition, the World Bank figures do not assess the levels of poverty in developed countries like the U.S. As a result, the social database used by the nation-states in formulating their Declaration is flawed. The true figure of global poverty is probably well over three billion people. Further, the World Bank and the Declaration paint a picture where levels of life expectancy, literacy, access to basic health care, and lower infant mortality in developing countries seem to be improving. Yet a number of NGOs documented how these achievements of the postwar period have largely been reversed, and we are unequivocally witnessing an increase in the levels of infant mortality and child malnutrition and a decline in life expectancy. For example, in Mexico, one of the "success stories" of neoliberalism, a dramatic increase in cases of malnutrition and cholera was the result of the peso devaluations of the 1990s.

In numerous NGO workshops, calls were made to open up the Bretton Woods institutions to more accountability. "The Bretton Woods institutions must be made transparent and accountable to civil society in both the South and the North." The NGOs condemned the interference of the World Bank and IMF in the internal affairs of sovereign states. They further believe that the structural adjustment programs imposed by those institutions have consistently undermined economic and social progress by suppressing wages, undermining the contribution and

livelihood of small producers, and placing social services — education and health care in particular — out of the reach of the poor.

The NGOs were also critical of the "free trade theology" that is now so broadly preached. They believe that trade liberalization through the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade (GATT) and the new World Trade Organization (WTO) creates more losers than winners, and that the negative impact is disastrous for the poor countries and the poor and working people of all countries.⁸ The NGOs hoped that the Summit documents would establish a mechanism to examine the WTO. Expectations were raised on the first day of the Summit when the U.N. secretary-general, as well as the prime ministers of Denmark and Norway, acknowledged that while the free market does generate wealth, it also creates social polarities. Yet the final documents do not address the problems with the structures that underlie the current international political economy.

Although the NGO rhetoric was adopted by the Summit, the content of their proposals was rejected. Phrases like "sustainable development" and "putting people first" were heard constantly at the nation-state affair. Yet many NGOs felt that these same governments had little interest in the hard questions that needed to be asked to come up with new and innovative solutions. Despite the fact that NGOs probably analyzed the documents more closely than the states themselves, their suggestions were often ignored. Northern governments, in particular, refused to commit the resources necessary to accomplish the objectives of the Social Summit.

NGOs raised a series of proposals, for example, to address the multilateral debt owed by the poorest countries to the IMF and World Bank. As noted above, some words on the debt can be found in the Summit's final document. However, a consensus among NGOs around the world conversant with these issues exists regarding where to find the resources to address this debt. The NGOs believe that these resources are available in the IMF's gold hoard, a historical legacy that is worth almost \$40 billion, and in the accumulated profits of the World Bank now held in reserve, totaling about \$17 billion. Their proposal is very simple: use a portion of those resources to buy back the debt owed to the IMF and World Bank by the severely indebted low-income countries, mostly in Africa (Honelez, 1995: 8).

To the chagrin of the NGOs, neither this debt proposal nor the Tobin tax proposal were seriously discussed at the Summit. Nobel Prize-winning economist James Tobin suggests a tax on the international movements of speculative capital. He proposes a tax rate of 0.5% on such transactions, but even a tax of 0.05% during 1995 to 2000 could raise \$150 billion a year. The fund could address issues such as famines, natural disasters, and resource depletion, i.e., the duties to aid the deprived (UNDP, 1994: 70).

Overall, NGOs were critical of the Declaration because of the refusal of the governments to focus on the structural causes of poverty and to provide concrete plans for meeting lofty goals. The Declaration targets certain areas for attention

without any examination of the funding requirements. A set of abstract goals pertaining to basic education and health, life expectancy, infant mortality, child malnutrition, etc., is to be achieved by the year 2000. Yet the report does not say how these objectives will be met.

Further, the NGOs are critical that while the governments embraced the "free market" as the most effective instrument of poverty alleviation, they refused to address the structural problems that prevent a truly "free" market from operating. The concentration of wealth and power in the hands of some 700 global corporations and banks will determine the fate of millions of people's lives. Yet this issue of wealth accumulation and control over powerful economic actors was not addressed.

System Maintaining: The World Bank

The World Bank was all-pervasive at the Social Summit defending the status quo. As noted, its figures on global poverty and its basic prescriptions for growth-oriented economic policies were adopted by the official Summit. NGOs accused it of "running away" and not engaging in an open dialogue with critics of Bank policies, especially their "structural adjustment programs." In fact, the air became a bit tense. The World Bank Group was supposed to have its final discussion at "Holmen," the site of the NGO Forum, but it decided to move the meeting to "Bella Center," the site of the nation-state meeting, to prevent some NGOs from participating.

The World Bank has now adopted the "people-first" rhetoric of the NGOs. It describes the core of its mandate as the need to help countries reduce poverty through sustainable growth and investments in people. World Bank publications are filled with statements that few could disagree with, such as:

Development must be people-oriented and include efforts to reduce inequality and better manage economic change.... The goal of economic and social development is to improve the lives of people everywhere — reducing widespread poverty, spreading opportunities for more productive work, and pulling societies together for the equitable and participatory advancement of common purposes (World Bank, 1995: *xiv*).

How does the World Bank see these "people-oriented" programs working? Sustained poverty reduction, according to Bank publications produced for the Social Summit, requires a combination of economic growth, investment in human capital, and safety nets for the poor. A tremendous focus is on economic growth. Without economic growth, a country cannot hope to improve and sustain high living standards. It is not easy, but policy choices by governments can make a huge difference, determining success or failure. From "time to time," countries will contend with forces beyond their control (e.g., declines in international commod-

ity prices), but sound economic management can also help them to deal with these adverse forces.

Governments and the private sector should each "do what they do best." "Governments need to provide goods and services — law and order, national security, and an environment conducive to business and the smooth functioning of civil society — that only the state can provide." Governments must also correct for "market failures," but without creating costly administrative and bureaucratic structures. In a few areas, like health, education, and agriculture, a mixture of public and private responsibilities is often desirable. Finally, "for social reasons governments need to protect the weak and vulnerable members of society and provide safety nets for the poor" (*ibid.*: 7).

The World Bank continuously emphasizes the importance of markets and what they call "economic fundamentals." Core policies they believe are needed to spur "labor-demanding economic growth" include macroeconomic stability and price incentives, and structural policies directed at "removing biases against agriculture, restructuring public expenditure, building effective financial systems, and breaking down barriers to informal sector activities." The World Bank claims that these policies are "no longer so controversial" (*ibid.*: 11).

Yet the "fiscal and monetary discipline" behind these proposals is still extremely controversial. To critics, World Bank policies accept the status quo and obstruct structural change. For example, it too quickly sets aside human rights in the name of economic growth. Rhetorically, the Bank is against child labor, forced labor, and discrimination in the workplace. Yet in practice, it condemns attempts by the international community to address these concerns. Compare the following World Bank statements concerning basic labor standards with those of Franklin Delano Roosevelt:

World Bank: "...attempts to raise workplace standards and increase job security can end up helping only a few while driving private employers to evade the regulations or move into the informal sector. Employment practices in the public sector that are out of line with the rest of the economy inevitably depress growth in the long run..." (*ibid.*: 25).

Franklin Delano Roosevelt: "Goods produced under conditions which do not meet a rudimentary standard of decency should be regarded as contraband and not allowed to pollute the channels of international commerce."⁹

The World Bank has funded more than 6,000 operations in 140 countries with more than \$300 billion in financing over the last 50 years. The Bank gives policy advice and technical assistance. In response to the external shocks of the 1970s, the Bank introduced adjustment lending to accompany its project lending. Its commitments in lending average out to approximately \$2.5 million per hour. The conditionalities and policies implemented through these programs are designed to bring about the reforms necessary to create growth-oriented economies, which, according to the Bank, are the linchpin to reducing poverty (George, 1994: 7).

These programs are designed to give greater control over society to the market. Society used to contain the market, but World Bank policies are designed to weaken the state and the capacity of citizens to control events in their own countries. A global bureaucracy, led by the World Bank, will now control the monetary decisions and social policies that affect the lives of millions. Democratic input, despite the Bank's rhetoric on people's "participation," is not sought or considered. National social policies are monitored by the global bureaucracy.

An Opportunity Lost?

One Danish newspaper summarized the results of the Summit with the following headline: "The World Will Go on As Usual." A final evaluation of the Social Summit must be fairly pessimistic about the possibility of real change coming out of this effort. The status quo was maintained; thus, in a sense, the Summit was a victory for the World Bank. Mahbub ul Haq, Special Adviser to the United Nations Development Program, noted that the 20:20 compact was for many the minimum package to emerge from the Summit:

After all, if neither poor nations nor their rich donors would agree to commit at least one-fifth of their existing budgets for basic social services, then what credibility could be given to their passionate speeches on eradicating absolute poverty? (1995: 10).

As noted, the 20:20 compact was endorsed not to initiate any real action, but to avoid a public embarrassment. There are no mechanisms to enforce it and no monitoring structures. There are no clear definitions of basic social services. The 20:20 compact will most likely become yet another voluntary, ill-defined, and unenforceable global target.

A similarly pessimistic mood prevailed at an international conference on "Rethinking Social Development" at the University of Copenhagen during the last weekend of the Social Summit. The United Nations Research Institute for Social Development sponsored this academic event. Presenters there identified the global social disintegration plaguing developed and developing nations and desperately called on the world community to address the impact of globalization, the decline in social cohesion, and the social costs of modernization.

Eric Hobsbawm identified the many ways in which the nation-state has been weakened internally and externally by rising global economic and technologic structures, and thus no longer commands the obedience of its citizens, as it once did. Yet until a responsible model of global governance is clarified, Hobsbawm believes that the nation-state is all we have to check power and redress inequalities. In particular, the redistribution function, necessary to address market failure, will obviously not be carried out by the transnational private sector. Amitai Etzioni struggled with methods to sustain the social foundations of liberty. Of civil

society, the market, and the government, Etzioni believes civil society to be the weakest and in need of being rebuilt. Ralf Dahrendorf spoke of the ways in which the economic forces of globalization are destructive of civil society. Dahrendorf noted how these globalizing forces disrupt social cohesion and encourage both authoritarian tendencies and restrictions on the rule of law.

Finally, Johan Galtung addressed the global social disintegration we are currently witnessing. In the U.S., for example, he believes the most serious problem to be that the very fabric upon which society depends is now disrupted. Life in the U.S. is increasingly atomized, leading to widespread anomie. Indeed, 23% of Americans report that they have no friends — no one to talk to. The U.S. is becoming a nation of nomads — individuals equipped only with egoistic cost-benefit analysis. Progress becomes solely "what's in it for me?" This has resulted in increasing suicides, widespread loneliness, a lack of human compassion, and an increase in drugs and violence. If we let economism rule and cost-benefit egoism predominate, all values will be lost. Does a neoliberal economic "development" model automatically create such an egocentric and desperate society? Do we need to modify our understanding of "development"?

Some believe that NGO expectations for the U.N. to address structural questions of international political economy were misguided and idealistic. "Realists" further believe that the U.N. will probably never undertake a thorough examination of issues of global humane governance, designed to overcome a world governed by principles of power politics or *Realpolitik*. For example, in the economic realm notions of nation-state sovereignty appear to be rapidly eroding. However, the U.N. is based upon doctrines that uphold and sanctify this often violent and antiquated principle.

Yet, at the global level, do we have something to replace the United Nations system of governments and NGOs? If this dialogue does not take place here, where else can these issues of life and death be raised? Hobsbawm believes that, despite its limitations, we still need the nation-state because nothing else exists to protect the individual from powerful transnational economic forces. In the same vein, on the global level, I would argue that despite its limitations, we still need the U.N. system to facilitate these messy and frustrating debates between various global actors. There is no other arena for these debates.

Most NGOs have no illusions about the U.N. system. It was not foolish "idealism" for the NGOs to present their radical critique and expect to be heard. Their actions are part of setting the agenda and pushing the nations to address the dark world so expressively described by the world's academics called together at the University of Copenhagen. The NGOs are to be applauded for pushing nations to be bolder in confronting our common destiny. The developmental needs of the bottom half of the world's population is a compelling moral framework on which to base the dialogue of social development. The NGOs raised these issues consistently and articulately. It is true that their program for action was ignored at

the Social Summit. Yet their voice was not squelched and the economic and political agenda articulated in their "Alternative Declaration" morally cannot be ignored.

NOTES

1. A clear definition of "neoliberalism" is provided by Ed McCaughan: "Neoliberalism remains within the tradition of liberalism in its emphasis on free enterprise, the market, and individual initiative and responsibility. It is 'neo' in its abandonment of 20th-century liberalism's 'politics of constant rational reform,' which aimed at avoiding extreme social conflict through the integration of larger sectors of the population into the system, both nationally (through the welfare state and universal suffrage) and internationally (through national self-determination and developmentalism)." Ed McCaughan, "Globalization, National Culture, and Left Discourse in Mexico" (unpublished manuscript: 4-5). See also Immanuel Wallerstein, "The Collapse of Liberalism," in R. Miliband and L. Panitch (eds.), *Socialist Register 1992* (London: Merlin Press, 1992).
2. See U.N. Document: "The Declaration and Programme of Action of the World Summit for Social Development," A/CONF.166/L.3 (Add.1; Add.1/Corr.1; Add.1/Corr.2; Add.1/Corr.3; Add.2; Add.3; Add.3/Corr.1; Add.4; Add.4/Corr.1; Add.5; Add.6; Add.7; Add.6/Corr.1). See also Johanna Bernstein, Langston James Goree VI, Lynn Wagner, and Steve Wise, "A Summary Report on the World Summit for Social Development," *Earth Negotiations Bulletin* 10,44 (March 15, 1995); and *Politiken Summit* 8 (March 12, 1995: 8-9).
3. For a description of the 20:20 proposal, see United Nations Development Programme, *Human Development Report 1994* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1994: 77).
4. "The Copenhagen Alternative Declaration," distributed at the World Summit for Social Development (March 8, 1995). Reprinted in *Politiken Summit* 6 (March 10, 1995: 10).
5. The "Copenhagen Alternative Declaration" was the product of numerous, well-attended, and lengthy meetings open to all participating NGOs. This conference process unfortunately produced a document vague in details. Further work clearly needs to be done to articulate a "globalization-from-below" strategy to counter capital's "globalization-from-above."
6. This analysis of the distortion of World Bank figures on global poverty was presented at the NGO Forum by Michel Chossudovsky. See conference papers by Michel Chossudovsky, "The Causes of the Social Crisis: Critique of the Declaration and Programme of Action of the World Summit for Social Development" (pp. 4-5), and "The Global Economic Crisis," distributed at the World Summit for Social Development, Copenhagen (March 1995).
7. See, for example, Richard Weiskopf, "Basic Human Needs and the Democratic Process in Latin America," *North-South Issues* 2,2 (University of Miami: North-South Center).
8. See, for example, Tim Lang and Colin Hines, *The New Protectionism: Protecting the Future Against Free Trade* (New York: The New Press, 1993).
9. President Franklin Roosevelt, speech delivered in 1937 to the U.S. Congress, quoted in H. French, "Reconciling Trade and the Environment," in Brown et al., *State of the World 1993* (London: Worldwatch Institute/Earthscan, 1993: 178).

REFERENCES

- George, Susan
1994
- "The Bretton Woods Institutions at 50 Years: A Critical Appraisal." Janet Brun (ed.), *The South and the Bretton Woods Institutions*. Geneva: Subcommittee on the South.
- Homtelez, John
1995
- "Summit: A Slide Backwards." Statement by the Chairman of Friends of the Earth International to Politiken Summit 5.
- Ul Haq, Mahbub
1995
- "The World Will Go on As Usual." Politiken Summit 7.
- United Nations Development Programme (UNDP)
1994
- Human Development Report 1994. New York: Oxford University Press.
- World Bank
1995
- Advancing Social Development: A World Bank Contribution to the Social Summit. Washington, D.C.: The World Bank.

Heart of Darkness

The heart of darkness awaits. It's the unknown place that exists in the wilderness, among the people, inside your mind. As a researcher, you've chosen to venture into this shadowy world to extract its truths. How deep are you willing to go?

The expedition is difficult. You need the best tools.

Sociological Abstracts (SA) and Social Planning/Policy & Development Abstracts (SOPODA) outfit you for this important journey.

Drawing from more than 2,400 journals published in 35 countries, SA and SOPODA present abstracts of articles, books and conference papers. Bibliographic entries will guide you to relevant dissertations and important book and other media reviews. All are expertly classified and indexed for easy access.

SA and SOPODA are available in a variety of media: print, online, the microfiche CD-ROM, and magnetic tape.

Explore the unknown with confidence by using the most thorough information directly related to your areas of interest and expertise.

SA's Web site, located at www.socabs.org, contains searchable subsets, hot topics, the Note Us newsletter, and links to other relevant sites and resources.

For more information about our products and services, visit our Web site, or contact us at:

sociological abstracts, inc.

P. O. Box 22206, San Diego, CA 92192-0206

619.695.8803, Fax 619.695.0416

Internet: socio@cermet.com

Web site <http://www.socabs.org>

SA and SOPODA are available in print, online from Knight-Ridder, Inc., and in microfiche from SilverPlatter, ERSSCO, Ovid and NISC, and in CD-ROM from SA. For Annual and Address Books contact SOCI@OLCV.FTnet.att.net. Phone: 619.695.8803 Fax: 310.208.2982