

Tentative summary of the socio-economic proposals of the Alliance

Context and general challenges

The socio-economic agenda we will try to build should be an answer to the general **challenges** of our societies, and also of socio-economy of solidarity. This is just a short reminder of some of the basic challenges of our societies.

- **The current economic model excludes numerous people and human activities.** The concentration of wealth and social inequality are stronger today than ever. The opportunities for formal employment, particularly in countries from the South, are scarce. Consequently, a large portion of the world population is living at the margins of formal economy. Part of it is engaged in activities of solidarity economy, often not acknowledged for, another part (more important) is engaged in self- subsistence activities.
- **Companies have become major players of our societies.** But legally they are not submitted to social or environmental responsibility. And the concentration of their activities within a few companies, and their encroachment on new fields (information and communication, life sciences, etc.) can be observed. The states are usually slow in relation to the dynamics of the economy, which is led by companies. Citizen regulations try to complement the states' actions, which have become less powerful, but are not yet strong enough for that.
- **There have been fundamental changes in the relationships between men and work,** with more and more individualism and diversification in work relationships, and the crisis of wage work in all the countries. Solidarity economy, as well as labour unions, must bring answers to this situation. The proposals made by the WSSE in this field are: breaking the link between work and income, sharing work time, the right to an universal allowance, and the recognition of "community activities" (i.e. solidarity economy).
- **The development of new technologies of information and communication** offers new important opportunities for the development of networks (virtual learning communities), but are also submitted to the social fracture, excluding large parts of humanity from its benefits. An economy of knowledge seems to emerge, but neither will it escape from the conjunction of forces of mainstream economy.
- **Finance takes more and more place in the economy,** which shows the drifting of a « security utopia». We should recall that finance is not an autonomous field: it reflects the social values and mentalities. This phenomenon has led to the permanence and growth of the **financial debt** on states of the North and the South. The debt and structural adjustment plans affect everyday lives of millions of citizens from the South, because the resources that could be useful for an authentic development are transferred to the North.
- **The system of international regulations** has become the instrument of a market religion. In the last ten years, the World Trade Organization seems to have conducted this movement through a dispute settlement system which installed sanctions mechanisms, and which puts itself above other aspects of international life. The current debates within this organization could change its course. Despite the creation of some other instruments of international regulations, there still is no balanced system of global governance. All the states, including in the South, are still pushed to open themselves up as soon and as widely as possible.
- **An emerging consciousness of the physical limitations of our planet and of the mainstream model of economic growth** appears, without still being reflected in changes sufficient to inflect significantly the direction of our societies. Some individual actors (the consumers) have changed their behaviour faster than the companies or than the states, even though some of those have changed their practices.
- **The ecological crisis** announces itself as particularly severe. It has and will have consequences in the following areas: energy, water, soils, biodiversity, agriculture, fishing, and urbanism. In all those areas, big operators are preferred to local or family solutions, even though the latter have more sustainable practices.

Platform for a Responsible and United World

PN: Solidarity Economy, Work, Debt, Towards Finance for the common good, International trade

Time and sustainable development, Industrial Ecology, NTIC

Vision, concepts and practices of solidarity economy

Solidarity economy is not a sector of the economy, but includes initiatives in most sectors of the economy. It defines itself mainly by stressing out specific values, and a **new economic paradigm**, which puts in its centre the needs of human beings and development, while respecting the environment, and through the intimate linkage between economic, social, cultural and even ecological aspects of its activities.

According to mainstream economics, the ultimate goal of human being is the individual accumulation of material and immaterial goods, and the economy is the science of management of scarce resources. Among the definitions given by solidarity economy, let's risk the following:

The economy is the art of caring for the planet and human beings, and to manage the resources produced by them, seeking a balance between individual and collective aspirations.

The values and conceptions of solidarity economy are supported by a group of **practices**, new and old, in a large number of contexts. We can observe new practices emerging, but also the rediscovery of old practices (cooperatives, local savings and credit societies, non monetary exchanges...) ». It is important to stress out that some of those practices refer to particular "moments" of the consumption-production-exchange chain (social finance, local exchange systems, fair trade, for instance), others to movements of specific social actors (associations of farmers, women, young people, the unemployed, district dwellers). Some are grassroots initiatives, whereas others support or are linked to the grassroots initiatives on a second or third level. Some are completely independent and self-managed while others are carried out in collaboration with the public sector (employment programs and companies, appropriate work centres, participatory urban management, etc.).¹

These practices are all elements of a global approach, which aims to the **transformation of the economy**, and not only to the adaptation to the mainstream economy². The horizon pointed out by this transformation is still not very precise and united; this is one of the reasons for which the dialogue between practices and networks is still necessary. Everybody however agrees to stress out that **re-conceptualising the basic economic concepts** underpins solidarity economy: economy, work, exchange, development, wealth, finance. It proposes among other things a **new conception of development**, political, socio-economic and cultural. According to the networks that participated to WSF 2003, this conception relies on a « bottom up » approach³, with a predominant local dimension. The *Solidarity Economy* PN expresses these different dimensions by mentioning a new development model « centred on human beings, social justice and sustainability, rooted in a shared ethical code which must materialize in a renewed socio-economic regulation. »

Because of their specific position in society (their participation to the survival of large sections of humanity is fundamental), **the position of and the vision that women have in the economy** seem to be essential for solidarity economy. Some promoters of solidarity economy mention the need to « **feminize the economy** ». The need for recognition of women solidarity initiatives is very concrete.

The debates and exchanges during the social fora allowed us to check that those practices of solidarity economy have **common characteristics**: they are build from local to global, they express the implementation of a democratisation of the economy, and their relationships with the State are difficult (no recognition). They concur on proposals, on the necessity to make linkages (networks and alliances) between themselves and with social movements, and to propose innovative models at different scales.

Here is a presentation of the practices that are analysed in the proposal notebooks (PN), with some of the questions they raise, knowing that many of them are missing:

Social money experiences have been developing for the past 20 years. Complementary currencies (a type of social money) are an answer to the lack of money, result of the present crisis. For the PN on this theme, social money is one of the three major innovations in finance, with micro-credit (solidarity finance) and the participative budgeting. Resistances to accept and adopt this initiative can be observed, even in the networks of solidarity economy. Is it the lever of a new paradigm, or just one of

1 *Solidarity Economy* proposal notebook (PN)

2 Point made explicitly by the solidarity economy networks at the social fora since WSF 2002.

3 This bottom-up focus is what the Governance and Citizenship Pole calls « active subsidiarity ».

the socio-economic innovations? Social money can certainly reinforce solidarity economy. It seems to propose the building up of a new paradigm – defined as feminine – of social organisation, based on abundance and reinforcing social links.

Solidarity **finance** is a specific form of micro-finance. It is necessary to differentiate it from other forms, according to the type of practices of Microfinance Institutions. The microfinance institutions that see their role as providers of financial services, or just of loans are often linked to the liberal system, and their social impact can be restricted or negative. Only those that are at the service of human and social development can be called solidarity finance. **Social capital** is a key concept of solidarity finance, which can be used beyond it. It is defined by the PN as « people's ability to cooperate and act together, using or creating the necessary social ties towards solid and sustainable shared goals».

Fair Trade is a practice of solidarity in consumption that is known above all in its North-South dimension. It proposes alternative forms of regulations to conventional international trade, on the basis of the principles of equity and transparency. Drawback of its success, the concept of fair trade could be made trivial and be taken over by major distributors. The fair trade movement is currently facing a variety of challenges: a more universal definition, more horizontal relationships between players of the South and the North, and taking better into account the need for sustainability.

PN Solidarity Economy, Women and the Economy

Participation of the solidarity economy networks to the World and European Social Fora

Specific challenges of solidarity economy

Solidarity economy practices offer an important potential for social innovation, and can have a demonstration and learning effect. Another economy is possible, and is acting in thousands of grassroots practices. Its pedagogical role relies also in the emergence of new values, that new forms of education could root in the new generations. But those practices are too often fragile, isolated, with no linkage between them, not acknowledged for by the State and other social actors. The main challenges of solidarity economy can be summarized as follows:

- The consolidation of successful experiences (or practices)
- The implementation of production – distribution – consumption chains at different scales (what we call « articulation » or « integration » of solidarity economy practices)
- The need to « change scale », underlined in the social fora: to move from local practices to credible alternatives at global level. Is social finance the most appropriate ground for this, as has been suggested?
- The development of specific political practices
- Relating to public authorities (contracting and financing)
- The legal recognition of solidarity economy practices
- The recognition of practices of solidarity economy as actors of development, a sustainable multi-dimensional development (or « solidarity development »)
- Fully integrating the environmental dimension, often lacking in writings on solidarity economy, if not in practices
- Building up an integrated vision and a new economical paradigm, while solving some contradictions or limitations (proximity services, micro-credit, fair trade)
- More preciseness on solidarity economy's « development mode », or what replaces it⁴.

PN Solidarity Economy, Women and the Economy, Social Money, Solidarity Finance

Participation of the solidarity economy networks to the World and European Social Fora

⁴ The *Sustainable development* NP doesn't offer a strong enough vision on this issue. It is not well focused.

Implementing new regulations

Solidarity economy practices are not the only ones to look towards a “new economy”, and they don't pretend to be sufficient to move forward alone towards a solidarity economy. The implementation of citizen and corporate responsibility, and the re-evaluation of the States' and international institutions' role also contribute to this aim. This reflection has been initiated by WSSE in its citizen (citizens and companies) and public dimensions (public policies, international institutions), but is little taken into account by the networks of solidarity economy. It is worth summarizing it, taking also into account the findings of other networks and players.

Citizen regulations

In the countries from the North and some metropolis of the South, social responsibility of consumers is the aspect of citizen regulation most often mentioned. Because it attacks consumer society, it touches one of the core values of our present society. In the «consumer society», the model for happiness becomes *to have* and not *to be*, and the difference between necessity and desire is blurred. An authentic social and cultural revolution is necessary to step out of the current production and consumption model. The **ethical consumption** movement proposes to give back all their importance and meaning to consumers' individual choices, and asks for:

- a better information on products and on the social and environmental impacts of their production, and increasing support to responsible companies;
- the reinforcement of the role of the state to enforce social and ecological principles on companies;
- and proposes to sensitise social movements to those issues, to inform them and to support the development of local and international networks of consumers and producers.

Tourism is one of the most important activities of the world economy. It is also the only one to put face-to-face in a massive way the wealthy population of the North of the planet with the poorer population of the South. Its impact is often negative on local populations, economy and the environment. The policies of multilateral institutions have not succeeded in having companies involved in tourism adopt practices that implement the principles of sustainable development. But, as in the area of consumption in general, individual choices can make the traveller a responsible tourist. The related notebook thus proposes 10 principles and challenges for responsible tourism, that tackle the social, environmental and cultural fields.

The world of **companies** is characterized by major economic, social and cultural differences. It is, by the way, important to distinguish the big transnational corporations, which tend to be more and more directed by shareholders and investors, from small and medium enterprises. These differences, and the legal status of companies, already mentioned, explain that it is difficult to implement the principle of corporate social responsibility.

As a reflection of their power, common companies are looking today for some legitimacy from civil society. They apply conduct codes, which can circumvent the role of the state and of labour unions, but represent for the social movement a hope to remedy the lack of judicial power. Social auditors check the respect of conduct codes and certify, while societal analysts answer to the demand for ethical investments.

The various company stakeholders each have their role to play: company leaders, shareholders, workers, unions. Renovating unionism is necessary to bring companies to more solidarity. It is suggested that unions come closer to movements of unemployed people, women, ecologists, migrants, for the rights of children, gays and lesbians, and to the NGOs (which in return should get to know better companies). This bringing closer would allow widening negotiations and actions between stakeholders.

For solidarity economy to take advantage on private companies, it would be necessary to invert the «burden of proof», and push the companies to demonstrate and improve their social performance. Mentioning citizen regulations doesn't mean that the State is null and void, as the most fundamentalist liberals pretend. It still has a regulating role to play. The initiatives mentioned above must be framed by public regulation, and the state can also act on public markets.

NP Ethical Consumption, Companies and Solidarity, Tourism, Shareholders, Trade union movement

Public regulations: governance and the role of the State

It is easy to observe that the contemporary evolution of State policies in the fiscal, social and economical fields in general, occurs, with a few exceptions, at the reverse of a solidarity economy. For some PN dedicated to those issues, the motto « State reform », expressed on the official political stage is a wrong question, and decentralisation is, also, trapped. For others, the difficulty that public authorities encounter in reacting to the current challenges in many areas is the expression of a crisis of governance and of the function of the State, underlined by numerous players. Initially, the WSSE's model of a State was close to a Welfare State, but it evolved to become more complex, integrating the synergies between players. It became obvious that the integration of the political dimension by socio-economy of solidarity must rely on a reflection on the role and the function of the State, and on the mobilisation of society for its democratisation. It must bring pragmatic answers to present issues, as well as integrate the findings of the reflection on governance that seem relevant.

The concept of **governance** is intimately linked to the notions de « regulations », « scale articulation» and « subsidiarity », more and more often used in WSSE and in the networks of solidarity economy.

The proposals of the PN *Governance: Common Principles* converge and are complementary with those of the PNs of WSSE. They give the socio-economic field:

- A general framework to imagine regulations, the role of the state and scale articulation
- A confirmation of the relevancy of the territorial approach
- A confirmation of the importance of information systems and of indicators to control the flow of exchanges within society's and with the biosphere
- A classification of goods according to their socio-material characteristics⁵
- Taking into account the time dimension, and the distinction between planning and strategy

According to two definitions of this notebook:

- Governance is the societies' ability to equip themselves with systems that are capable of managing interdependencies in a peaceful manner.
- Governance is the regulatory system for that complex life form we call human society.

As they apply to different levels, from the local level (territories) to the global level (international regulations), those principles don't give a complete definition of the role of State. The NP *Global Governance* denounces the fiction of sovereign States, and makes the State a level of governance among others. The concept of **active subsidiarity** underlies the relevancy of the level closest to local.

The *State and development* PN develops the principles and functions that legitimise the important role that the State continues to have in development (what development, this should be defined). For that, the State must be legitimate and accountable. Its sovereignty is relative, and though it is regulatory in the short and long term, its function is rather that of a facilitator or relationships between players. It must push to the control of natural resources by local populations, recognise and develop local know-how, while being inspired by successful development experiences based on tradition and innovation. However, it is also a partner of the private sector, which sometimes makes it necessary to reform administrative procedures, often too complex. It can encourage the partnerships between companies and banks of the formal system with practices of solidarity economy, like solidarity finance.

Challenged by the liberal tendencies of current policies, the socio-economy of solidarity networks all suggest a **double strategy**: defensive to deal with consumerist and individualistic values (defending for instance not only public social security based on shared systems, but also different forms of direct and indirect taxes); but also constructive and capable of drawing on solid core groups geared at reproducing the material goods required by individuals and societies. The relationship between the State and civil society can be defined as dynamic. The solutions contemplated require the democratisation of the States and the mobilisation of society.

Social security and **food sovereignty** are principals that remain valid for large sectors of the population. The summary of proposals on agriculture thus stresses out the right for people and states to national and international regulations that are not only market-driven. It mentions the necessity of national regulations in the following areas: land (agrarian reform and policies to regulate land markets), fiscal (nutrition, polluter-payer principle), patents and intellectual property rights (genetic

⁵ Our point of view is that the reflection on the different categories of goods is still incipient.

resources, rejection of patents on all forms of life), food security / sovereignty (agricultural policies), the market, through the mobilisation of players and industries on objectives of collective interest, as food sovereignty.

A territorial (local- or land-based) approach is one of the main specificities of governance. The *Territories PN* defines the territory as a system of relationships between human beings, society and their environment. Governance makes it possible to re-value a territorial approach to development. This implies a cooperation between all the stakeholders and the participation of every citizen, as well as rethinking our relationship to time and space (against linear time, and in favour of firm roots). Finally, in the relationships between territories, solidarity and cooperation should prevail over competition. Local can be transformed to global through the networking of local players.

It can be observed that innovations in public policies usually emerge at local level. The most successful recently identified innovation in fiscal policy is based on participatory budgeting. For some PN, it is the ignition of a true change (transition). The participatory budget is in phase with the concept of solidarity economy, according to which social policies should not be apart from other public policies. But it remains necessary to deepen and extend mechanisms of participation within the budgetary and fiscal policy.

The territorial approach is kin to the values and practices of socio-economy of solidarity. The territory level seems to be the privileged scale to develop integrated projects, and imagine another development.

At these different levels, public authorities need **new indicators**, replacing the GNP, whose social and usefulness is well known, in order to measure the efforts accomplished towards a sustainable and solidarity economy. The work on those new indicators (of well-being, material and immaterial flows between territories, etc.) has been initiated in different places. The solidarity economy networks should associate themselves to it.

PN Governance: Common Principles, State and development, Territories, Global Governance
PN Fiscal Policy: taxes, distribution of national income, and social security; Economic policy, ideologies and geocultural dimension
Summary of the proposals on Agriculture and sustainable development

Public regulations: international regulations

It will be difficult to arrive to a responsible, plural and united world without instituting a legitimate and efficient system of international regulations. The interconnections between countries and regions of the world, between the current problems (environmental, economical, social and cultural) are so important that it seems illusory to destroy the current regulation system, because it is inefficient to solve them, without replacing it.

The main flaw of the current system is to be incomplete and unbalanced in favour of trade. The World Trade Organization is currently the only international institution to be able to impose sanctions on countries that don't apply the decisions that are taken there. The relationships between this organization and the other existing or to be international institutions are not defined. Urgent issues, such as climate change, the management of biodiversity, of water, of soils or forests are not considered properly in the current framework.

The challenge of governance is to elaborate, in vital areas, very long-term strategies. Humanity should be able to master not only its exchanges, but also its relationships with the biosphere and the pace of its evolution. The most urgent tasks seems to be to establish a **hierarchy of norms and rules**, common to all multilateral institutions, with the objective to institute a democratic global governance.

As a first step, one can base himself on the existing framework agreements (economy, social and cultural rights, Cartagena biosecurity protocol), but new texts and frame regulations are necessary (GMOs, patents on living organisms, for instance), as well as the acknowledgment of the **precaution principle** and of the **subsidiarity** of public action. It is necessary to systematize the cooperation between multilateral agencies, which presently act separately. But the urgent need for a new world

architecture is recognized by numerous notebooks of the WSSE and of all the poles of the Alliance. The relationships between global governance and the states must be organized according to the principle of active subsidiarity. Another challenge is to create the conditions of partnerships between public and private players.

The relationship between humanity and **environment** is in everybody's mind. It seems necessary to establish common global rules for the management of natural resources, and to associate the populations to the management and the protection of ecosystems. To ensure the financing of this action, it seems necessary to link the past destruction of ecosystems to the debt (idea of ecological debt). It is necessary to implement new management mechanisms in the following areas: Water, Soils, Forests, etc. It is necessary for example to recognize the diversity in water supply management systems, and scale articulation, because all the levels of management of this resource are interconnected.

With the interconnectedness mentioned, the concept of **public good** emerges again in several networks, particularly those concerned by Water, Life and Security. Global public goods should be defined at global level and their protection ensured.

The *Governance: Common Principles* PN suggests to define common rules for the management of the different categories of goods, and to organize the worldwide mutualisation of goods that multiply when shared. Knowledge and experience are part of those goods, which leads us to another major challenge: the organization of information systems. Those should be participatory, and exchanges should provide common references and basis, among which indicators. This group of challenges implies the implementation of a reflection and of practical experiences, which are still in incipient.

The *Towards Finance for the common good* PN stresses out the need to recognize the financial system as a universal public tool, and to put forward the responsibility of financial players and practices, which would facilitate the struggle against the *financiarisation* of the economy. The issue of *Debt and adjustment* could progress if the primacy of economic, social and cultural rights (ESCR) were reaffirmed, and thus the legitimacy of the conditionalities of debtors. A stop to structural adjustment plans, and the setting up of an international arbitration of financial debt, the recognition of an ecological and social debt of the North to the South, and a radical reform of the WTO (or its replacement by another, more democratic institution) can only happen through a mobilisation of civil society. The necessary social mobilisation can be supported by social innovations that go in the same direction as the new regulations (fair trade, and participatory budget, for instance).

In the middle term, it seems necessary to create a world fiscal constituency, because the construction of an international community relies on stable financing and redistribution systems, taxing for example the use of scarce or poorly renewable resources, of common goods; flows of exchanges, of matter and money; and capital.

The importance of the **regional level** is mentioned by numerous PNs, but there is no specific analysis in any of those notebooks. We could suggest a strategy using this level, wherever the geopolitical context is favourable, to introduce some of the mentioned mechanisms of global governance.

PN Towards Finance for the common good, International Trade, Debt and adjustment PN Global Governance, Summary of the proposals on Agriculture and sustainable development

The time dimension of the structural changes to operate

« He who thinks that an exponential growth can continue indefinitely in a finite world, is a madman, or an economist. »

The transition to a sustainable and united society demands deep changes in our representations and our relationships to time and space. Solidarity economy initiatives often seek to articulate short term and long-term answers, but they are more efficient in answering to immediate needs. To take into account middle and long-term, we need to introduce other approaches: industrial ecology, energy efficiency in the middle term; renewing education and changing our relationship to time and space in the long-term.

The reorganization of the productive system (the middle term)

Contemporary economy developed itself in a cultural context relying on the belief in the omnipotence of technique and the non-limitedness of natural resources. This artificial separation of human activities with natural processes has become obvious today with the ecological crisis showing up on different scales on the whole planet. However, the *phasing in* of economy activity with natural cycles is still in its infancy.

Some approaches aim to reorganize the production system for more sustainability, and suggest taking into account the long-term. The concept of **industrial ecology** proposes for example a systemic and integrated approach of all the components of the industrial economy and its links with the biosphere. It puts forward the biophysical basis (or *constituency*) of all human activities, and recalls that no system can grow indefinitely. The approach of industrial ecology is to consider industrial activities as ecosystems, composed of flows of materials, energy and information.

Industrial ecology proposes to all the actors of the industrial system a change in representations allowing to operate concrete changes. It is at the same time a theoretical and a practical approach, with an empirical basis on which its concepts and methods have already been tested. It acts in defence of a re-localisation of economy activities, without making it a dogma. It could be interesting to compare the practical and concrete approach of industrial ecology with the approach, sometimes ideological or catastrophist, of the theory of de-growth.

Industrial ecology also relativises the relevancy of money in accounting for flows of matter and energy, which do not have a universal equivalent. It suggests to build in place the "nation's physical accounts" (indicators of metabolism of economy activities). Concerned mainly by the compatibility of industrial production systems with natural ecosystems and the Biosphere, industrial ecology proposes strategies to be included in development planning. Those strategies require financing and co-operation on a very large-scale.

Industrial ecology defends, as energy efficiency, the concept of **functionality economy**, which could be a breakthrough with socio-economic and ecological implications. The approach of industrial ecology should however be shaded and completed by taking into account the social determinations of human activity.

The responsibility of **sciences** and **scientists** in the present state of the world is often mentioned. It seems urgent to clarify the roles and functions of scientists, as the *Sciences / Scientist* NP tries to do it. Their task is not to educate the citizens, but to work above all for the benefit of their domain of studies. The freedom of scientific research should be reaffirmed; what should be controlled is the production system. But in order to be able to exercise their freedom in relation to the production system, and at the same time take their responsibility, scientists should be able to call upon a **conscience clause**, which would enable them to distance themselves from those who want to force them into suspicious dealings. This clause would obey to the precaution principal; to public health; to the environment; to the ethical and deontological codes for scientific research and technological production. Researchers should also know the purpose of the applied research on which they are working, in order to be able to put their responsibility into practice.

There are several innovations that contribute to associate citizens to decision making processes, reaffirming their role, beside that of experts. The **conferences of consensus** are tools for the democratisation of the production system, which could be systematized by public authorities seeking to democratise knowledge and public action. **Science shops** aim to establish a link between a community of inhabitants and scientists, with the aim of finding a solution for a problem raised by this community. Finally, science should coexist with traditional knowledge systems, which are particular expressions of perceiving and understanding the world, and could continue to bring their precious contribution to science and technology.

PN Industrial Ecology, Sciences, Energy

Taking into account the long term

We know that the changes in representations are among the most important changes to do to succeed in the transition to a more responsible and united society. Those changes are much more difficult to measure or plan than the changes in the industrial system. They can take place only on the long-term. The introduction of new practices, and the evolution of conventional practices can contribute to it. But the reform of education systems, in their content as well as in their practices and methods, will be fundamental for a long-term and large-scale change.

Education is never neutral. It must incorporate the values of solidarity economy, and the different aspects of human development and sustainability in its contents and methods. It should be more participative and integrate the items that allow maintaining the relationship with the community. In the current context, where educational systems are subjected to market discipline, it is important that education challenges the “natural” essence of the supposed market economy laws.

Environmental Education, defines its primary objective as the strengthening of the capacity of citizens for critical analysis, to allow continuous and improved democratic control of decisions, political orientations and actions regarding the environment, development and resource management. It aims at promoting the acquisition of skills and encourages citizens to commit themselves to actions related to issues that affect their daily lives (health, food, risks, etc.) and which are also part of community life. Its methods rely on the action of groups of *relay citizens* (organizations, medias, farmers, engineers, company directors, tourists...), which play the role of trainers, in a wide sense.

Art also has a fundamental role to play in the transitions to implement. According to the corresponding PN, it carries out a fundamental role in “re-linking” society and reorganizing the social fabric. Inseparable from the social, economical, political and cultural realities of the different countries, it is a fundamental language of intergenerational understanding and communication.

The **relationship to time** is a dimension often forgotten of sustainability. The deep mutation of this relationship in the labour world is necessary, if we want to weave again the links that are necessary to a sustainable and united society. The *Time and sustainable development* NP mentions some of the changes to implement at this level: to restore values and costs to non-direct productive times, particularly through the revalorisation of training, to fight against the dictatorship of the “new” and the myth of “youth”, to restore the values and the price of experience, and to create the space of language for the inter-generational.

The transition to those new values can take place in a privileged way in the local space. The *Territories* PN reminds us that the **representations of time and space** are part of the core values of a society. It suggests opting to give priority at this level to slowness over speed, to relationship over objects, to firm roots over escaping, to effort over excessive comfort. This evolution of lifestyles is sensible on certain territories, but while remain fragile, as long as major changes are not undertaken at the same time.

PN Time and sustainable development, Territories, Education, Art
