

Javier Marzal

The Way to Change the World (Part 2 of 2)

**Emerging system
(first chapters)**



Driving the Change of Governance System

International Association to Change the World

This PDF includes the first chapters of the second part of my book "The Way to Change the World," where I described emerging new structures that have the capacity to build a new system of government that replaces the current ones, including dictatorships, democracies and communism.

INDEX

PART 2

- 11.- Radical change in the collective thinking.
- 12.- Reactions against the system.
- 13.- Human activity. The social sector.
- 14.- The social sector in the intergovernmental institutions.
- 15.- Comparative table between the public and the social sectors.

ANNEX – Ideas to seek information and reflect.

The first part of this work included an analysis of the situation; a diagnosis of the current system's decadence problem and of the industrial order's decline that has led to "abusecracy". An abusecracy, where public authorities, their friends and family who hold hand-picked and well paid public positions, big enterprises, trade associations, labor unions, public administration's surveyors and public subsidies' beneficiaries, form a "friends capitalism" that makes the public sector inefficient and drags the production economy, jeopardizing progress and making an untenable system. Western countries are in decadence and they are also menaced by the competition of the big emerging countries. To arrive to a better understanding of this second part, it's advisable to have read the first one before, which is available in the internet, at www.javiermarzal.com, free of charge, in Spanish and English.

It has been said that "abusecracy" has replaced democracy and dictatorships all over the world, because the laws that break human rights are increasing. It is also because each day is more common that the government leaders, public and private institutions, and big enterprises do not enforce the laws and violate human rights. The Rule of Law and democracy are dysfunctional because they are bad systems.

The system is broken because, for the first time in history, in the richest countries, the current generations will be more impoverished than their parents. This situation is mainly due to the fact that public authorities not only don't defend the people's interests, but also to the fact that their priority is to defend a corrupt and unjust system which gives increasing privileges to the leading and wealthy minorities. The subject of the second part of this document is the current emergent system that will replace the abusecracy.

To read the second part it is essential to have an open-minded attitude, breaking free from the instilled dogmas. It is therefore desirable to remember that there was a time in which nobody dared to imagine that the power of the Catholic Church would ever end or the power of the nobility, which ended in absolutist monarchies or absolutism. The system changed due to the revolutions in all fields, which originated the transition to the Industrial Age. Nowadays everyone knows that, for decades, we are in a new age transition, specifically, from the Industrial Age to the Information Age. Thus, it can make sense considering that the current power could disappear, as the power of nobility did, or at least that it could turn into a mere influence, as in the case of the power of the Catholic Church.

The current crisis and the assertion that the next generations will have a worse life than the one their parents had, as well as the intellectual, politic, terrorist and popular opposition against western democracies, are taking western citizens out of their comfort zone. The comfort zone made most of the western citizens defend their lifestyle and their cultures, including their dogmas; however, the increase of uncertainty and insecurity are making that more and more people prefer to take the risk of making a radical change than to remain in this current system that nobody likes. In the Spanish general elections of 2015, the two hegemonic political parties (two-party system) obtained only 50.73% of votes, with a citizens' participation of 73.2% and therefore, a little more than the third part of the people entitled to vote. The two new political parties with the highest number of votes obtained 34.59% of the votes.

Leaving the comfort zone make us more given for the assumption of new opportunities and risks to accept sudden changes. This attitude of wanting changes makes objectivity and creativity increase.

For the first time in history, the current generations will be more impoverished than their parents; nevertheless, most of them are ready to accept the risks of changing the system to avoid it

The increment of inequality is originating a great worldwide reply which is pressing to obtain radical changes. The institutional reaction lies on increasing repression, with laws that violate human rights, unjust judicial sentences and police officers who attack demonstrators and even kill them with total impunity. Most of the people keep supporting the system, mainly the feeble-minded people who, at the age of thirty five, become old like a lousy wine that turns sour over the years. However, in some countries, things are beginning to change. It is worth mentioning the case of Belgium (European country), which established a worldwide record for remaining without a government for 541 days, the 6th December 2011, after an agreement of the six main political parties.

The current crisis, the loss of trust in the system and the massive desertion from the comfort zone make possible to achieve the structural changes suitable for this new Information Age. At the same time, it can also help revolutionary people to turn up and destroy achievements and progress. But what it definitely doesn't allow is the system to survive.

The essential (radical) change is unavoidable because most of the citizens do not want to maintain the system

"With the arrival of democracy, everything was institutionalized. As legality arrived with such eagerness, society got used to claim for services. Citizens got nationalized. They began to look upwards instead of looking sideways when they had to solve their existence, their problems. In the new way of social organization, people went to official centers to arrange things. It wasn't necessary to get organized with neighbours, friends, university mates or militancy comrades anymore. It was enough to make a queue and ask for the service needed. The request would be attended if it complied with the law; but, of course, one by one. Citizens began to live one by one. Every sort of social organization disappeared, and the few that remained as, for example, neighbourhood associations were dismantled by the political parties. "From a life of action to a life of delegation. From the union to self-sufficiency. From solidarity to indifference". (From the book "No estamos solos" – We're not alone – Written by Gran Wyoming, a Spanish media leader, in 2014)

11.- Radical change in the collective thinking

The first part of this document began as it follows:

Along the Middle Ages, conspiracy hypothesis (conspiracy theory) that assigned a global power to some more or less secret organizations emerged. Many authors of the 19th and 20th centuries stated that the organization of Western societies was unjust and therefore unsustainable. In this regard, it often stands out Oswald Spengler's work "The Decline of the West", which was published in 1918 and 1923. For many people the title symbolizes the Western civilization's situation.

Previously, during the 19th century, the three masters of suspicion: Marx, Freud and Nietzsche, criticized "a way of understanding the world that arrives to nowadays" (Wikipedia, 23rd of May, 2013), i.e., the conceptual basis of social organization and of our lives.

The suspicion was confirmed during the 20th century: two world wars, the Crash of 1929, the 1930s Great Depression and the creation of tax havens.

And more...

The biggest reaction against established order was the counterculture of the 1950s and its popular expansion along the 1960s that led to the emergence of alternative lives, rejection of war, environmentalism, sexual liberation, gender equality, etc. Actually, it led to the consolidation of some basis for a new consciousness that nowadays is a general subject of conversation, though with a diverse comprehension.

The counterculture also meant the discredit of socioeconomic and political ideologies for the avant-garde intellectuals who believed in its deace, as before the philosophical-religious ones had been discarded. During the Industrial Age, the mythical philosophical-religious view was replaced by the scientific view, while socioeconomic and political dogmas that the present Information Age is eliminating were being created. These dogmas were expanding among the people as a reaction to the Great International Crisis of 2008.

Thus, at first, intellectuals opposed western democracies for not being a good system, then there was a public opposition to certain aspects of the system, then against the whole system and finally, the social sector was used to establish alternatives to be self-defended from the State's violence.

To create new ways of life, a revolutionary change inside our way of thinking – living must be operated. (Krishnamurti, 1944)

The perception of this system's decline has been transforming the collective thinking, because of the reaction of repulse against the big catastrophes that were originated by the system: The Crash of 1929 and that of 2008, the two World Wars, the lack of development of most countries in the world and the growth of corruption and inequality in the advanced economies.

This new consciousness can be analyzed through some of the phrases that have become universal and that reflect people's thinking, which is the base of culture.

“The Times They Are a-Changing” (Bob Dylan, 1964)

Bob Dylan's phrase turned into a symbol of the social will of change for a generation that opposed the system during 1960s, which originated sexual freedom, ecologic and pacifist movements, things that are now spread worldwide among the people of the countries that are qualified as the most advanced.

In 1960s, most people didn't like the system, at least, most young people.

In the last decades of 1990, it was known that the intervention of the International Monetary Fund (IMF) and the development aids were used mostly or only to enrich the rulers of the countries to which these aids were given, with the moneylenders' collusion. Besides, the IMF's loans obliged the countries that were being helped to take economic steps that would impoverish them even more.

The general dissatisfaction led to a worldwide action against this system, of which the main symbol is this phrase:

¡Another world is possible! (WSF, 2001)

This phrase was coined at the first World Social Forum (WSF) in 2001. This institution defines itself in its own website as follows:

The WSF is an area to discuss ideas in a democratic way, to go deep into reflexion, draw up suggestions, exchange experiences and assemble social actions, the net, NGOs and other civil society's organizations which oppose to neo-liberalism and, the capital and whichever kind of imperialism that wants to rule the world. After the first international meeting of 2001, it was configured as a permanent worldwide process of research and construction of alternatives to neo-liberal politics.

The change between these two first outstanding phrases is substantial. The first one contains a comment about what was happening in an unclear way, while the second phrase specifies that the change sets out towards changing the system with a clear proposition: “*put up resistance*”, from the social sector, against the “*dehumanization process that the world is suffering and the violence used by the State*”.

It should be pointed out that the WSF promoted the creation of social regional forums, as the American Social Forum, the Asiatic Social Forum and the European social Forum, which are actively represented in most of the countries of these three continents.

Another world is possible”, creating the Different World Order based on non-profit organizations

But the system went on increasing social injustice and the abusocrats’ privileges, until it collapsed with the Crash of 1929 or the International Crisis of 2008 and with the governmental answers that sacrificed the general interest to increase the social inequality, confiscating and indebting a lot of people in order to help the most dangerous and scamming organizations of the financial system. From every government and economic transnational bodies the same social engineering was done: Something has to be done to prevent the collapse of the financial system, because otherwise, the economy would sink and all of us would become poorer. Facing this fallacy, the American presidency candidate itself endorsed a phrase that was shouted at the demonstration against this universal, big scam that politicians (The Breed) are carrying out to foster the financial system:

Yes, we can (Obama, 2008)

This phrase implies the definitive step towards the system’s change: Not only things are changing (Dylan 1964) and they are, because “another world is possible” (WSF), but moreover, we can do it despite the resistance to change (the U.S. President, 2008). The U.S. President, unlike the WSF, states that the system can be changed from the government; without doubt, he was trying trying to defend the questionable legitimacy of the public sector and the governments.

In short:

“The Times They Are a-Changing” (1964) and “Another world is possible!” (2001) because “Yes, we can” (2008) change the system.

The Spanish 15M organisation’s activities became well-known thanks to the media and rejoined worldwide, making part of the rich countries’ present thinking. Its most famous phrase is the following:

They (The governments) don’t represent us (15M-2011)

With this phrase the organization asserted that The Breed (governments and intergovernmental bodies) don’t represent the majority of the people. Connecting this phrase with the previous two, it could be said that they don’t match with Obama, because the governments don’t represent us, whereas they do with the WSF’s, as for both of them propose

the creation of an alternative system, without governments, that would come from the social sector. Nevertheless, time has called into question its first position. What is left from 15M is “anti-systemic”, “anti-capitalistic”, anti-globalization, with a communist pattern, in which private organizations of the social sector are not permitted. 15M brought to light that Spain is systematically corrupt, that its institutions, controlled by the political parties, employers associations and big trade unions, are “criminal gangs’ nests”, an expression that I coined and brought to light on 14th February 2016.

The conservative people who are for the system (from communists to liberals) assert that this phrase is an atrocity because it implies the end of the democratic legitimacy. However, they themselves often admit that “The Breed” do not represent the general interests that make them legal and which they should represent as their highest priority. The 2008 Global Crisis revealed, in a global way, that “The Breeds” just represent the “abusocrats” and maintain “abusecracy”, both of them adverse to the general interests and incompatible with them and with a democracy that we no longer have. The truth is that none of the parliaments represent the citizens, as long as the parliamentary seats that belong to blank votes and abstentions are not left empty. This means that laws which are approved do not represent most of citizens entitled to vote. For this reason, this action is claimed worldwide, for the parliaments to, legitimately, represent their people. The number of those who assert that the only democracy is a direct one and that the representative democracy is a fraud, is increasing.

Logically, for those who assert that the governments don’t represent us, the intergovernmental organizations, as United Nations or European Union, represent even less the general interests of the people. Besides, their leaders are chosen by the member governments, for which they are accused of not having been elected democratically.

The international crisis of 2008 has shown that **the system doesn’t work and it isn’t reliable or sustainable**. As a reaction there is a massive and increasing popular mobilization which makes evident that people can make the system change. The system is no longer as strong as to fight against the social activism, which encompasses millions of people who are working to change it significantly. The support of this unprecedented social activism is the above mentioned phrase “Yes, We Can”, popularized by the U.S. presidential candidate in 2008. In Spanish it would be “Si se puede” and is used even to promote the civil disobedience. The western system is dying, as the corrupt Roman Empire or the corrupt USSR did.

In Spain, several TV programmes that inform and talk against corruption and the system have been created. They have a wide audience, so now “corruption and change” are a big business that benefits not only the change of system, but also parts of the current system (media power). It’s one of the ways in which the system holds up its self-destruction.

“At this moment, the associations that are not dangerous for the system are the ones that ask only for their own business. They have a partial vision; they only care about the everyday problems of the group which they represent. And, at this moment, the associations whose worries are more of a global nature are increasing, [...]. This “global” conception is of great importance and it is expanding. That is what is really dangerous for the system”. (Celes – Yayoflauta, book “No estamos solos”, Gran Wyoming 2014).

In the 21st century, most people want to change the system and more and more people and organizations are doing it

We can change the system because the agents for the change (social activists) are stronger than the inertia and the resistance to change. The changes caused by social initiatives are replacing some politicians' decisions.

Other more or less famous phrases that point to this New Consciousness, are the following:

“Spain needs a new Luther” (La Repubblica, 17-5-2013)

The European Union is becoming a corrupt Church

12.- Reactions against the system

With the general perception that the system doesn't work, a more or less organised opposition and new structures are growing. From the opposition we can outline the following groups:

1.- Anarchists. They pretend a society without public sector, governments, laws and rules. This group appears in the last 1700s and it develops along 19th century.

2.- Anti-system: Even though most of these groups are anti-system in one way or the other, those usually denominated as such, are the ones that pretend to destroy the system without proposing a new one or suggesting other systems which have been already proved to be decadent, generally pro-state systems. They are usually anti-capitalism and anti-globalization groups.

3.- Groups that look for alternative options to the business sector. Outstanding among them is the World Social Forum (WSF), born in 2001, and its regional branches in America, Europe and Asia. They look for alternative options to capitalism and suggest that goods and services production should come from social organizations. They promote what they call social economy. It is worth pointing out that the European Union settles that its economic system is a social market economy. The WSF legitimizes these organizations' benefits, because their workers are their owners.

4.- Fair trade. *“The **Fair Trade** (also called **equitable trade**) is an alternative way of trading promoted by several non-governmental organizations, the United Nations and social movements (as pacific and ecological movements) that want a voluntary and fair relationship between producers and consumers”.* (Wikipedia 2nd February 2016). The producers are usually cooperative companies (further on, this kind of companies will be commented in this document). Fair trade is related to the former group (WSF).

5.- Most people assert that governments do not represent the general interests, but just the economic interests of a minority, beginning with their own members. This belief is the main reason for the system's loss of legitimacy and credibility. This group's mobilization becomes outstanding in the media since the Great International Crisis in 2008.

“Oligarchic practices and corruption”. “We attend not only the legitimacy’s erosion, but also the erosion of leadership structure, credibility and authority”. “Parliamentary democracy crisis”. (Nadia Urbinati, 22nd April 2013 La Republica.)

6.- Social movements, virtual platforms and communities that promote the complaints towards the system and its change. The Spanish 15M has internationally stood out. A group of people used it as a platform to create a political party (PODEMOS) and other convergent political parties used it to nominate a candidate for municipal and regional governments, as those who currently govern the two cities with the largest number of inhabitants (Madrid and Barcelona) and some regional communities. Is it by chance that Madrid and Barcelona have women as mayors when the former ones were men? We have to make a difference between the 15M movement, which was apolitical, and these political parties which have socialist/communist and anti-system ideas. They are named “populists”.

7.- Intellectuals and “Think Tanks”. They are a minority that design some of the bases of a new system, different from what we know until now and which must be sustainable, fair and equitable.

8.- Intergovernmental organizations. They establish agreements, rules and recommendations among governments, in order to eliminate mutual damages and to unify and improve the legislations and practices that exist in the public and private sectors. United Nations and the European Union are the most influential. Thus, they interfere with governmental activities to increase globalization, establishing the Different World Order.

9.- Governments. The government authorities accept the intergovernmental organizations’ agreements, although they usually break them. Some of them contribute with innovative approaches for system’s change, interfering with the self and else’s governments’ activities, to increase globalization and to establish the Different World Order. Intergovernmental organizations have the advantage and the disadvantage of not being democratic: The advantage of being able to isolate from populism and from electoral tyranny so they can make unpopular decisions, and the disadvantage of not having democratic legitimacy and being under the governments’ power.

10.- Social activists. They are making important changes in the system from the non-profit organizations of the social sector. They are a few entrepreneurs who are supported by an increasing community of funders and volunteers. “It is estimated that the number of NPOs that are operating in the US is more than 1.500.000 (datum from 2011). Russia has got 277.000 NPOs (datum from 2007). India is estimated to have 2.000.000 NPOs (datum from 2009)”. (Wikipedia). The Union of International Associations has got 69.00 International Associations registrated in 300 countries and territories; approximately 1.200 organizations are added each year. In 21st century, the massive signature collecting systems to object government’s decisions or to press governments to adopt certain decisions are standing out. The same as the

intergovernmental organizations, these platforms infer in governments' activities increasing globalization and establishing the Different World Order.

11.- Super wealthy. The wealthiest person in the world during these last decades (Bill Gates), has created an alliance ([The Giving Pledge](#)) where numerous billionaires have pledged to donate the main part of their fortunes to the social sector, so their progeny will not inherit their whole fortunes. These fortunes could contribute to the change of the system, helping the social sector, which is creating the Different World Order.

At the beginning of 2015, twelve people were killed in the publishing house building of a French magazine. In November, that same year, 130 people were killed in six terrorist attacks, the most severe of which was inside a discotheque. All the attacks were attributed to Islamic terrorists. All the media announced that it was an attack to the western or European way of life.

Would it be considered that international Islamic terrorism is an answer to the western interferences – political, military and of any other nature – in the rest of the world? Some assert that Islamic terrorism is the answer to decades or centuries of western terrorism in the rest of the world. What is true is that the western interferences have been causing the death of civil people in other countries for decades and now some of those countries are doing the same to the western zone. Therefore, we may say that western ruling authorities have endangered their own citizens' life. The difference is that the ruling authorities have private self-guards who are paid by the citizens and they are not usually the victims of this terrorism that they themselves have created and sustain.

It is widely known that western countries have funded lots of non-western countries' revolutions and wars. Just the same as what Ecuador, Iran, Venezuela and other countries are doing now. In January 2016, Spanish media covered the fact that Iran and Venezuela, anti-western regimes, have been funding the 15M movement during these past years and, not later on, also the political party PODEMOS, which is, nowadays, the third political power in Spain. The question is if Iran, Venezuela and other countries are funding the political parties that proclaim radical changes inside the system. Whether they are new or not, some of them are already ruling the country, as in Greece. These political parties, qualified as radical by the system (politicians and media) are increasing their representation inside European parliaments in a notorious way. Western countries have been funding opposition groups and even terrorists for decades to change the governments in most countries of the world.

We may think that Western's external interferences yield to four main reasons: 1) A better knowledge of western plots in the rest of the world; 2) Better economic and organizational possibilities of the rest of the world; 3) Increase of the western weakness; 4) Loss of credibility as a benchmark model.

The journalist Raphael Minder, correspondent in Spain of The New York Times, on 27th July 2016, said the following in a Spanish TV programme: "Is Spain facing a new transition?" "It's really striking that the arrival of American Treasury is been needed to reveal something that was more or less known, that is, here and in Andorra the case had been investigated for more than one year, but for unknown reasons, it began in Washington". "Spain is like a political laboratory. We are in an electoral year, as in the United Kingdom, and we will see now how the two-party system is going to work in Europe. To test it, Spain is the best case, because there

are two new political parties. In the United Kingdom we are going to have one new political party, the situation is a bit different, but that of Spain, where two new political parties have emerged in just twelve months, is really impressive. It's a laboratory".

After more than five years of western countries interfering in the rest of the world, now the rest of the world is making things change in the western countries.

And in the international arena, nowadays there are 20.000 transnational organizations consecrated to the social change, which has popularly emerged since 1950. And its number goes on increasing" (Cooperrider and Pasmore, 1990)

13.- Human activity. The Social Sector

The collective activity or human activity is usually divided in three sectors:

- The first sector or business sector.
- Second sector or public sector (governmental).
- Third sector or social sector.

Generally, the business and social sectors' organizations are private. Despite this, the constitution of public enterprises and social organizations with public funds is quite usual.

According to the Anglo-Saxon vision, the social sector is made up of **non-profit associations (NPOs)**, as associations, foundations and mutual insurance companies. However, the European continental vision includes cooperative enterprises because they are considered to be part of the social economy. It is doubtful that cooperative enterprises should be inserted in the social sector, for their worker members can make a profit, the same as in most enterprises where their founders are partners and work in the company and share the profits, just as the cooperative members. We can outline that one of the European Union's identity signals is social market economy, where the market is subordinated to the general interests.

In the continental Europe's traditional view, foundations are not part of the third sector because their functioning is not democratic.

The social sector, in its current form, was created in 19th century. During that century, political parties and most of the different types of associations, including some of the most internationally renowned, were created. As the former Middle Age guilds, the current professional bodies were also created for liberal professions, as lawyers, architects, engineers, notaries or doctors. Generally, political parties, trade unions and employers' organizations are denominated as social agents.

A survey of the Luis Vives Foundation, “European models in the Third Social Sector’s evolution” (2011,) picks up the historic competition between the services that are supplied by the social sector and the subsequent public services. Not everyone now that public healthcare and education had been provided by the social sector decades before being provided by the public sector. The same happened with several other attention services. In fact, what the welfare State did was to copy the services provided by the social sector, using its tax collecting power to finance its globalization. In England (now United Kingdom), education and health public services have been always criticized for being of lower quality than the service formerly provided by the social sector.

The public sector has created a lot of problems to the social sector because it has seen it as a competitor or an enemy, to the extent that, in France, NPOs were forbidden during 19th century and until 1848 the freedom to create associations was not recognised, being finally regulated in 1901, as mentioned in the referred survey. New restrictive regulations in the social sector are still turning up in most countries.

In UK there is the tradition of bequeathing fortunes and making donations to the social sector. There are NPOs specialised in looking for private funds to finance other NPOs. Instead, in continental Europe these organizations are usually subsidized by the government, originating corrupt liaisons.

During 20th century, a social sector was created through organizations that covered a wide range of social needs, from the traditional assistential ones, to those which study vital aspects of the societies’ functioning or those which aim to change the world, as we have already seen.

Let us recall:

And in the international arena, nowadays there are 20.000 transnational organizations consecrated to the social change, which have popularly emerged since 1950. And its number goes on increasing (Cooperrider and Pasmore, 1990).

There are NPOs to control or to improve the governmental management. The numerous “Without Borders” organizations stand out among these. They provide with their services worldwide, as those of journalism, which make visible the problems of the least developed countries.

International Transparency is an increasingly worldwide well known association. It promotes transparency in every type of organisation, including public organizations and administrations. International Transparency studies transparency in various fields, even public ones and it has developed transparency standards for city and town councils, to show Mayors how to make their administrations more transparent, being these the closest to the people. It has become one of the most important references in the world because of its surveys and its ranking about corruption. We must consider that the lack of transparency generates corruption, which then spreads out sheltered by this opacity, becoming systematic and systemic.

The NPOs that defend human rights are known worldwide. Governments don’t do a lot to defend these rights and they even violate them.

The environmental NPOs are also well known. They grew as the ecologic thinking became popular in 1960s. This group of NPOs has made possible that governments could recognise the

environmental damage caused by human activity: global climate change and diseases caused by pollution in the cities. The initial acknowledgement of this problem provoked that important economic resources were assigned to this phenomenon, after this, actions were taken, even though many of them have been restricted by the illegitimate interests of “The Breed”.

Going back to the NPOs that are engaged in the system’s change, they are being supported by tens of millions of people who collect signatures all over the world to raise objections to some of the governmental or intergovernmental decisions.

We can make a difference between reactive NPOs, which are oriented to diminish the suffering of certain people, and proactive NPOs, oriented to the social improvement for a better collective future. Some people assert that reactive NPOs, in a way, sustain “abusecracy”; on the other hand, proactive NPOs are creating a new society and, sometimes, a new social structure. Most social sector’s organizations support the system, although sometimes they improve their functioning or replace their malfunctions. In a way, the former NPOs support a mistaken culture and an unjust and untenable system.

On 4th May 2014, the following could be read on Wikipedia: “The number of NGOs in U.S. is estimated to be 1.5 millions. Russia has 277.000 NGOs. India is estimated to have had around 2 million NGOs in 2009”.

The people and the media still use the denomination: non-governmental organization (NGO) to name NPOs, because it was the first name used in the United Nations to distinguish them from public organizations and its use spread out in every area of society. But enterprises are non-governmental organizations too, so this term is being replaced by non-profit organization.

In the United Nations and European Union’s documents it is asserted that there is no democracy without a wide social sector and that the social sector can meet the needs that the public sector is not able to meet. Nevertheless, the increasing fiscal pressure limits most of the population to finance the social sector organizations which could meet these needs. necesidades.

The public sector is the social sector’s major enemy (and of most of the people) and the social sector is in turn, the public sector’s major enemy because of its capacity to replace it

Let us see some of the aspects comparing the three human activity sectors:

Sectors/variables	1 – Business	2 – Public	3 - Social
Competence	High	Low/non-existent	High/medium
Professionalism	High	Medium	Medium
Productivity	High	Low	Medium
Innovation	High/medium	Low	High/medium/low
Wealth generation	High	Low	Medium
Entrepreneur’s	High	Not applicable	High

motivation			
Employees motivation	High/medium/low	Low	High/medium
Incompetence	Medium/low	High	Medium/low
Squandering	Medium/low	High	Low
Profit seeking	Yes/no	The Breed: yes	No
Volunteering	Limited	No	Yes
Progressive	Yes/no	No	yes
Corruption	High/medium	High	Medium/low
Clients/users	Free	Compelled	Free

14.- The Social Sector in Intergovernmental Organizations

Let us see what United Nations say about the social sector on its website:
<http://www.un.org/es/civilsociety>

The UN is participant and witness of a rising global civil society. The NGOs and other civil society organizations collaborate in an increasing way with the UN system and with important links between UN and the civil society. The civil society organizations have an important role in the principal United Nations Conferences and are essential in the UN's efforts at a national level. The NGOs are consulted on politic matters and UNs' programmes. The United Nations organizes and hosts meetings and conferences for the NGOs accredited representatives in its office, programmes and agencies.

Around 30.000 of the Civil Society Organizations (CSOs) have established liaisons with the Economic and Social Council (ECOSOC). Most of these CSOs are Non-Governmental organizations (NGOs); there are also agencies, foundations, bodies and more than 1.000 Indigenous Peoples Organizations enlisted as CSOs in the ECOSOC, which keeps a registered CSOs data base.

Having been registered, CSOs can also apply for consultative status by the Economic and Social Council. If the Council provides the organizations with this status, they can have access to important international conferences summoned by the UN bodies that prepare these conferences.

This situation is similar in the EU:

European Economic and Social Committee (EESC)

Welcome to the European Economic and Social Committee website. Our purpose is to provide information on its role and its activities to organizations, agencies and citizens. The EESC is a consultative body of the European Union. Founded in 1957, it offers a specialized consulting for the big institutions of the EU (European Commission, EU Committee, European Parliament). We do this job by means of "expert opinions" focused in the EUs' legislative proposals, even if we also develop other "initiative expert opinions" about topics which we consider worth approaching. One of our main commitments is to act as a link between EU institutions and what we denominate "organized civil society". We contribute to reinforce the role of the civil society

organizations establishing a “structured dialogue” with these groups that are in the member states of the EU and in other countries all over the world.

Our members represent a wide range of economic, social and cultural stakes in their countries of origin. Their works are structured among three groups: “Employers”, “Workers” and “Various activities” (that is: farmers, consumers, ecologists, families, NGOs, etc). This is the way in which the EESC members build the bridge that links the EU with the State members’ civil society organizations.

In general in the transnational organizations’ bodies, as UN and EU, the three sectors are represented: The public sector (governmental) and the two private sectors, which are the business sector, by means of the famous lobbies, and the social sector, by means of some big NPOs. However, some differences in these tree representations that make their power unequal are worth mentioning. The governments are more powerful because they grant these bodies and they choose their leaders. The second one is usually the business sector, because it is better organized when is represented and it has got more resources to carry out all kinds of surveys. While big enterprises have organizations to put politicians and intergovernmental bodies under pressure (lobbies), the social sector doesn’t have them, so only big NPOs are actually represented. Besides, these lobbies often bribe government officials, usually corrupt, obtaining benefits that damage most of the population. As we have already seen, the business lobbies and the NPOs are advisory, so they do not take part actively in the decision making processes. Just as it happens in the States’ public sector, this monopoly of politicians and leaders that the States have designated weakens the social sector’s actions and impels corruption and bribery in the public sector worldwide.

Logically, the world would change if the decisions were voted by representatives of the three sectors, with none of them having the majority or the monopoly. In fact, the politicians’ monopoly in the governments, make western democracies decadent for the general, unavoidable corruption. In the same way, the governmental monopoly of the transnational bodies makes these corrupt and decadent.

We would have a better world if the business and social sectors could take decisions in governmental and intergovernmental bodies

15.- Comparative table between Public Sector and Social Sector

In the following table, some of the features which predetermine a sector's capacity of creating a society and a sustainable and progressive world order are compared.

Public sector	Social sector
Limited capacity to represent common interests.	Unlimited capacity to represent common interests.
Bureaucracy and opposition to change.	Entrepreneurship and innovation.
Managed by politicians.	Managed by the founders and then by professional managers.
They take action just in what they are concerned. Dispersion.	Created for a specific social function. Concentration.
Managers slightly motivated about their social role.	Managers highly motivated about their social role.
Politicians who prioritize their own interests.	Managers who prioritize their social role.
Employees that only do what they are told.	Employees committed to a specific duty.
Political interests.	Real social interests.
Opacity	Transparency
Discretion due to opacity.	Submitted to the market rules.
Politically uncontrolled.	Controlled by the market.
Monopoly (lousy and expensive service).	Rivalry (better and cheaper service).
Forfeiture for funding.	Free funders to contribute to the sustainment.
Compulsory services.	Freedom to decide who supplies the service.
Squandering, incompetence, corruption.	Talent focused on a specific activity.
Common and individual decadence.	Common progress and individual wellbeing.

ANNEX. - Ideas to seek information and reflect

15M

Change

Collective progress for individual welfare

Competency and collaboration, social agreement

Consumer society

Counter-culture

Credit society

Decentralized globalization (Marzal 2008)

Defenselessness

Different World Order (DWO)

Economic policy

Entrepreneurship (personal, professional, social)

European SF

Extreme inequality

Financial engineering

Financial wealth

Fiscal State

Free society

Friends capitalism

Globalization (mundializacion)

Globalized decentralization

History of abuse

History of power

Holacracy, participative managing systems

Innovation

Interdependence

Learning

Mega-State

Meritocracy (professional and social)

Multidimensionality

Multipolar international system

Natural material world, synthetic material world and virtual world (Marzal 2008)

New consciousness (not mystic, religious or spiritual)

Non-profit associations (NPOs)

Plutocracy

Politic economy

Pork-Barrel (populism and friend's capitalism)

Pork-Barrel State

Popular capitalism

Porter's 5 Forces

Proactivity

Public opacity

Public, general, collective and personal interests

Reactivity

Representation of the collective interests

Resistance to change

Rule of Law malfunction

Self responsibility (personal, professional and social)

Short-termism

Social market economy

Social parasites

Social sector

Statism

Subsidized society

Surplus society

Systemic corruption

The Breed (governmental and intergovernmental ruling class)

Welfare zone

World of organizations (Druker)

World Social Forum (WSF)

“The Times They Are a-Changing” (1964)

Other world is possible!

... and necessary (Marzal 2014)

Yes, we can (Obama 2008)

(The governments) **They don't represent us** (15M 2011)

“We are in a time in which we are going to re-invent everything 20, 30 or 40 years”. “It is a privilege to leave in these extraordinary times, in which brave leaders, brave in every aspect of their life, and of all ages, are going to re-invent the world... Are you one of them?” (Tom Peters, 2002):

We not only need leaders, but also people to support them and people who can change their own habits.

www.thewaytochangetheworld.info

ABOUT THE AUTHOR

Javier Marzal is a Neutral writer (individual - organizations – humanity), conceptual builder of The New Conscience, The New Worldwide Order and The New Management, inherent in the Actual Information Age.

INTELLECTUAL WORK 2016: "A Different World Order. Part 2 of 2. Emerging system of the Information Age. From "abusecrazy" to a Social Market Democracy. A world of organizations" (44 pages, available in Spanish, English and soon, also in German).

FORMER INTELLECTUAL WORK: Related to talent (book and subsequent three pages essay) and to the New Management that Peter Druker announced "people centric", in particular, articles based on my own vision of talent: www.nuevomanagement.com (from 2007, in spanish). More in www.javiermarzal.com.

SOCIAL WORK:

1. Promotion and foundation in September, 15th 2014, of the Association of the Rule of Law Professionals' Victims (AVIPED), of which I am the chairman, and the purpose of which, is to end with the impunity of these professionals' regular criminality. www.anviped.org.es (available in Spanish, English and German). Help and advice to judicial victims, providing relevant innovations. Manifesto about judicial corruption is outstanding. (available in Spanish, English and German). "The origin of corruption is in the judicial power". (Spanish judge Elpidio Sanchez, 2013).
2. Promotion and foundation in February, 16th 2015, together with other associations, of the Federation for the Rule of Law, of which I am the chairman, and the purpose of which, together with other ways, is to end with the judicial system's impunity. Promotes the adoption of the United Nations Convention against Corruption in Spain and the adoption of legislative changes to avoid the current legislative promotion of institutional crime www.frd.org.es.
3. The creation of the international movement "STOP judicial corruption", which enlightens people, worldwide, about the existence of judicial corruption. The creation of associations of victims, promoting them and impelling the creation of new ones. www.stopjudicialcorruption.org.
4. Promotion and foundation in September, 30th 2016, of the International Association to Change the World, of which I am the chairman, and the purpose of which is to change the establishment. www.iachangetheworld.com

More information in www.javiermarzal.com