



Yves Barou: The bet of this session was to try to find a link between two topics that are usually very different. One topic is people, for instance demographers or economics talking about migrations, and HR people trying to cope with day-to-day problems, diversity, and expatriation. The idea was that there's a link and that we, HR people, should probably be more aware of those trends to better manage those policies. So we try, as we usually do, to connect global issues to practical issues.

Fernando Vasquez: I work at the European Commission, in the DG Employment, in a unit that deals with lots of different things: youth unemployment, the European globalization adjustment fund, corporate restructuring and sectorial developments, and also entrepreneurship and social economy. With regards to your subject, your topics, four ideas that seem important to me. These ideas will not be the focus of your discussions but it is useful to have them in mind when you are going to discuss, in general, human globalization and the free movement of the people across the world. That is a central topic. First of all, the idea that it is always striking for me to see that, in a world that is freeing itself, in which everything circulates, everything moves (capital, goods, services), there is very little on the free movement of people. If you look, for instance, at one of our fundamental texts, the UN Convention for Human Rights, there is nothing on the free movement of people across the world. And if you look at what is happening today at our shores with hundreds of people dying every year, trying to swim across the Mediterranean to come to Europe, we are totally indifferent of everybody. Nobody cares about this in reality. We can conclude that we are very far from this generous idea of universal justice that was in the draft of the UN Convention, more than fifty years ago. I know that we are not going to discuss this, but it may be interesting to recall these facts, just to give us the idea of the difficulty of trying to build a system in which not only companies, goods, and services, move around the world for the benefit of everybody, but also people. The second issue is a topic that is already extremely difficult and irrational within the European Union. When you hear political debates today, in preparation for the European elections in May 2014, about migration and inter-mobility, inter-community migration, you will conclude that there is no link at all between the rationality behind the fact that people should move, should be allowed to move, and that would benefit, generally speaking at least, everybody, and the general perception, the public perception in Europe, that is more and more against this idea. It's not the only problem, I know that. But it is in part at the origin of what may be a disastrous political result in the European elections. You may criticize the voice of business, and trade unions also in many aspects. But at least, today and tomorrow, you will introduce some rationality in this debate. Because you will be looking at these ideas from the point of view of their usefulness, of allowing people, human resources, to circulate around the world. Third idea is also my mandate to recall the limits of mobility. You know, of course, that intra-community mobility is a litany. Every year, only 0.3% of people move from one country to another. The European Commission's policies are trying to increase this to 1%. That gives you the idea of the difficulty of the task to promote the movement of people across Europe. And there are in fact no obstacles. There shouldn't be any obstacles, legal obstacles at least, for that movement. In fact, you'll find two reasons for people to move. First of all, there are those who, because of their attitude, because of their qualification, because they want to, will move anyway or most probably. And there are the ones who are moving or move only if they are forced to do it. That is the reality when we speak about mobility, migration. That is the history of Europe, of the European Union. We see it again and again, today, with some movement from foreign countries to where the money is - that means the North of Europe. And you know that we are implementing a



program in Vukovar, with €8 million, to try to promote youth employment and an enormous part of it is about promoting mobility. And proudly speaking, the results are extremely mannered. A bit more to see but it is becoming a failure. That reminds us of the fact that there is always an economic reason behind movement. It reminds us of the EU perspective we should take into account to take care and not try to replace solidarity and cohesion, which are fundamental values and the principles of the European Union about mobility. That means trying to leave the economic diversion that is currently going on as it stands, and telling people to just go where the companies want to invest and to recruit people. There is a political element in this debate and I know that you are not going to discuss it. But let's keep this in mind, as well as the other points I mentioned.

Józef Niemiec: I am the European Trade Union Confederation secretary in charge of employment policy, the Europe 2020 strategy, industrial policy, climate change and so on. Growth and employment are the biggest problems we face now in Europe. From this point of view I wanted to address the issue of globalization in a few points. First, you are aware that trade unions are always to some extent divided about the issue. Some are very positive but others see this as a big challenge because of the impact on the labour standards of the European model. At ETUC, we reach always to keep together this diversity of opinion and to stay positive – though under some conditions. For us, globalization could help build a better world in the sense of creating jobs, especially quality jobs, sharing democracy and the possibility for workers to have independent representation, in every part of the world. This is something we think is still possible and we continue with this approach. And here we see a clear role for companies, especially multinationals. They should participate in this role, being on a side approach but coming from the social aspect and leading to sustainable development. And we also see the European Union as their leader in this move, in fact, to export the principles of our model. From this point of view, the problem now arises: does it work? Is it effective or not? Having regard to the crisis, but also to the approach the European Union took, trying to find the way out of the crisis. When we look at the results, we hear from political leaders that everything now is starting to be positive in terms of growth. But we are still telling that, until we have no real change in terms of job creation, in terms of combatting poverty, we don't consider this as effective – on the contrary. On this, the perspectives are gloomy rather for years to come because this policy is not effectively adopted by European politicians. So we are under a lot of pressure from our people, from trade unions but also from normal workers that are approaching us. You are too naïve, trying to participate into this because of the effectiveness. In fact the financial markets were one of the major drivers of globalization. They are still doing what they want despite all these efforts made, to put an order and also to influence this, to avoid a crisis, this kind of crisis, in the future. So this is the context, especially if it comes to the way the European Union are trying to rebuild, recapture its competitiveness. It's very contentious for us. You have an opportunity to discuss the issue later on, this evening. So you can continue but what we see in short are two messages. First, there is a positive change in some parts of Europe, in Germany, in Poland, where there are improvements on the labour market. We see that good jobs are replaced by precarious jobs. That's a major trend for us. This means that, in terms of the fight against poverty, we failed. And we will continue because of this competition built on wage competition organized in the Euro zone, which has a very negative aspect. And the second one is that this is also by measure of reforms implemented – because the problem existed – to the further weakening of collective bargaining and trade unions' ability to participate in this play. And some were also contradictory and contrary to international standards, joint labour



standards and ILO intervened in Europe, which was supposed to be a model, saying “you are violating international standards.” So something impossible to imagine for me from Poland, joining a union 10 years ago, that it could happen in Europe. It was a model for us to follow. This leads me to the next point about the consequences in terms of politics and democracy. Because of what we see, it seems that the people we are representing, workers, are without positive prospects. So they lose confidence in their leaders and in the project itself, our European Union and its role in the world as a consequence. So I see that as a major trend. Regarding the question of migration, we are still keeping a positive approach based on human rights and the principle of integration of people rather than control and this kind of security approach. And we fear that more and more of our people we are representing, they will support the political parties against the European integration, xenophobes, nationalistic. It’s something we will see the results of in the European elections in one week’s time. But unfortunately what we see from our analysis. So the last point, and I finish there. When we hear from the leaders, but also from our partners on employers’ side, especially from BusinessEurope, we always hear that there is no alternative. And we don’t accept this because of our approach towards globalization, towards the European integration – that there are alternatives. We need leaders today. We see that on the political level. There is not enough from the European level, coming from the Commission or from the Council. So we ourselves are proposing some ideas. We proposed a social compact as an answer to the fiscal compact, limited only in terms of repression and penalties for bad governance. And we are proposing also, instead of austerity and wage competition organized at European level, a proactive approach investing in our future, in sustainable development, as a means to help Europe to stay a leader in this globalized world.

Yves Barou: It was important to put what you did on the table, big issues, even if they go far beyond our day-to-day activities, because this topic has a lot of consequences, and a lot of issues. Thank you also for, in a way, clarifying the responsibilities of the European Union, of the trade unions, because everybody is in the same boat, and all actors will have to act. I should reassert that the title of this forum is “Human Globalization: will European companies win or lose?” So, with Human Globalization, you have to know that we stole this wording from Catherine de Wenden. She will explain this later because we felt that we often speak about globalization but usually it’s not a question of human globalization. And this question of human globalization is in fact a very important factor. It’s not that new. Maybe it’s an old story but it’s interesting and Catherine will tell you about that.

Cornelia Hulla: When we worked on the program we thought a lot about what is the right thing to address and before we go into all details, I want to draw a little bit of attention to the question “is globalization good or bad” because that’s an underlying theme, of course, that goes deeply into our discussions. And we all know that globalization is not a neutral or inhuman force in the face of which people are powerless. It’s a globalizing tool that combines technological, economic, socio-cultural and political forces and transforms the concepts of social and economic development. There is by now a broad consensus that unregulated economic globalization produces more negative consequences such as financial instability, increased poverty and unemployment, a high level of economic inequality, low labour and social standards, and adverse effects on democracy. Luckily, globalization is not a neutral phenomenon that cannot be controlled, or even the invisible hand of competition that will subvert, but a multi-dimensional process that can be influenced at a



transnational level. Even though the problems of unemployment, poverty and inequality are aggravated by the present patterns of globalization, an improved model of politically and economically sustainable globalization also brings potential for development and the reduction of these problems. The good thing is the strong connection between economic and political liberalization – that is, the connection is not straightforward – but there is a good sign that democracy goes with globalization. Data suggests that the two variables – globalization and democratization – in general positively influence one another. There is no strong and direct relationship between democracy and globalization but democratic transitions in the last twenty years have suggested that globalization often acts as a catalyst for democratization, and perhaps the strongest indicator of this would be the effect of our own international and regional institutions, democratic norms and the principles of human rights are constantly reshaping such institutions and policies. Anti-globalists, of course, usually emphasize the negative effects of globalization on the nation-state. Governments are rapidly closing control over their economy and borders, their markets and their trades, while transnational companies dictate the progress of globalization. The argument goes that while globalization creates opportunity for growth it also produces growing economic disparity among people and suits multinational companies who would in turn reduce the power not only of the state, but of democracy as well, resulting ultimately in its decline. Intensified social inequality is felt also on a global scale as the gap between developed and developing countries continues to grow. But there is always another side to the coin. One of the benefits of globalization is that it has helped increase the number of well-informed and educated individuals, which in the long term helps decrease economic inequality. Of course, it should also be stated that multinational companies have increased democracy levels around the globe. Such companies demand stability from potential investment countries and stability is associated with democratic regimes. Multinational companies exert pressure on authoritarian regimes to cut down on restrictions, make progress for the market and ultimately conduct political liberalization and decentralization of powers. Information cannot be hidden so easily from citizens, even if autocratic states and demands for human rights and freedoms are getting louder around the world. We see this in Turkey at the moment. Globalization does encourage democratic institutions, international organizations as well as NGOs, which promotes democratic values and transparency. Another aspect of democracy, globalization, and this relation they have, is that globalization contributes to the decline of nation-states, especially in Europe. But what is often overlooked is the opportunity provided that this creates a vacuum and the vacuum lies in civil society. So we get stronger emphasis on civil society. And the promise of globalization is in local, regional, and super-regional communities that provide different opportunities for development, individual development, and a stronger link between civil society and global organizations that supports new means of dialogue and demographic processes. But the human social dimension of globalization that signifies the impact of globalization on the life of individuals and societies would suggest the correction of the widely prevalent economic system global market economy that is directed towards human and social growth. But we do need a global framework and we do need to discuss such things in forums like ours. All these problems need to be confronted in public debates and gatherings such as this forum, which can encourage debates on globalization, on its positive as well as negative consequences, and confront important issues such as migration, mobility, corporate social responsibility, expatriation policies, etc. So that sets the frame a little.