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This thesis explores a micro-perspective on the construction of world orders through rhetorical acts. A neo-Gramscian approach to international relations provides an understanding of world orders as historical structures that are constantly reconstructed. The United Nations takes on a decisive role in shaping and maintaining world orders. The United Nations Global Compact marks a changed approach to business by the United Nations, from code of conduct to collaboration. This thesis sees the change in approach in relation to a broader world order of neo-liberal globalization, zooming in on rhetorical acts on behalf of former Secretary-General Kofi Annan. In five speeches, Kofi Annan addresses business at the World Economic Forum, encouraging participation in the Global Compact. The thesis performs an analysis of those speeches, bringing out the constructed role offered to business. Drawing on the framework of Second Persona, the offered role lends insights into underlying ideology, and the ideology is discussed in terms of how it supports and/or reconstructs neo-liberal world order. The analysis shows how Kofi Annan constructs a hierarchical argument structure that argues how social responsibility should form integral social pillars of a neo-liberal global market and why business should participate in building such pillars (by signing on to the Global Compact). While the ideology of neo-liberal globalization is subject to reconstruction through the idea of social responsibility in the speeches, the thesis finds that, most of all, the offered role and underlying ideology should be understood as a political and discursive support of existing world order of neo-liberal globalization.

In this way, the thesis is an example of speech analysis contributing to international relations by showing how world orders can come to life through a rhetorical micro-perspective.
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"I propose that you, the business leaders gathered in Davos, and we, the United Nations, initiate a global compact of shared values and principles, which will give a human face to the global market”

- Kofi Annan at World Economic Forum, February 1st 1999
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INTRODUCTION

The approach of the United Nations (UN), an institution that is truly global in nature, towards the private sector has throughout most of its history, broadly speaking, been characterized by an unwillingness to engage and cooperate. This approach largely changed with the inauguration of Kofi Annan as Secretary-General. Especially his multi-stakeholder initiative the Global Compact marks a redefinition of the relationship between the UN and business, from confrontational code-of-conduct to collaborative approach (Rasche, 2012; Hummel, 2005; Bull, 2010). The Global Compact is a voluntary framework for corporations, encouraging them to support ten socially responsible principles in a cooperative venture with the UN. Please see Appendix 1 for a presentation of the United Nations Global Compact.

The fundamental shift in approach is set in a historical context marked by increased interconnectedness in a world that is truly global in nature. The global reality is especially characterized by increasing influence of corporations on the international scene (Bull, 2010). With the Global Compact, Annan creates a stronger tie between the UN and international corporations. Hartwig Hummel (2005) connects the two developments of a changed UN approach and an increasingly influential role of business in global governance, arguing that the introduction of the Global Compact should be directly understood and explained through a framework of an overall neo-liberal world order.

This thesis takes on a similar position; more specifically, it assumes a current neo-liberal world order and approaches the research from that starting point. What I mean by neo-liberal world order will be explained through a theoretical framework of a neo-Gramscian approach to international relations.

International organizations such as the UN take on a crucial role in shaping and maintaining world orders (Hummel, 2005: 6). Following this, the project of Annan – acting as a spearhead for the organization - to strengthen UN-business relations by introducing the Global Compact can be viewed through the lenses of the support and
reconstruction of a neo-liberal world order. And these are the exact lenses deployed in this thesis.

The thesis takes Hummel’s arguments as a starting point and goes a step further, analyzing how the changed UN approach relates to the construction of world order through rhetorical acts. Neo-liberal world order exists on a macro-scale. Hummel operationalizes neo-liberal world order by applying it to the Global Compact. I take the macro-scale world order further to a micro-level by operationalizing it in rhetorical acts concerning the Global Compact. The influence of the UN lies especially in intellectual contributions; in ideas communicated about the world. “...ideas and concepts are a main driving force in human progress, and they arguably have been one of the most important contributions of the world organization [the UN]” (Sagafi-Nejad, 2008: ix). Annan officially introduced the Global Compact in a famed speech at the World Economic Forum (WEF) in 1999, marking the culmination of the new course of the UN (Hummel, 2005: 14). He followed up the speech with four more held at the same forum in 2001, 2002, 2004 and 2006, respectively. The launch of the Global Compact and a redefined approach towards business are arguably rooted in ideas about world order, and speeches are a relevant place to look for reflections of those ideas; a relevant place to look for construction of world order in action.

The thesis will direct the lenses of the reconstruction and maintenance of a neo-liberal world order towards Annan’s speeches, as well as the other way around. Across the speeches, Annan constructs a story, and I will examine the story as expression of world order, by uncovering the underlying ideology. I will search for the underlying ideology by making a speech analysis departing from a rhetorical theoretical framework of agency and second persona. I will introduce this framework thoroughly but, in short, the idea is that the role Annan offers business in the speeches constitutes a window into the underlying ideology. The aim of the thesis is to uncover that ideology and discuss it in terms of a neo-Gramscian understanding of constant reconstruction of world order. I will discuss who creates who, so to speak. Does Annan reconstruct neo-liberal globalization or is he to a greater extent constrained to supporting the existing world order? The thesis is, thus, based upon a premise of neo-liberal globalization constituting current world order. The aim is not to challenge the neo-Gramscian argument of neo-liberal globalization; nor is it the aim to prove the theory in practice. Rather, the exploration of Annan’s speeches serves as a micro-perspective on the construction of world order. It shows how rhetoric can make world orders come to life.
Research question
The thesis is guided by the following research question and sub-questions:

**How do the speeches held by Kofi Annan at the World Economic Forum relate to a world order of neo-liberal globalization?**

1. How can Annan’s speeches be understood as supporting and/or reconstructing a world order of neo-liberal globalization?

2. What insights do Annan’s speeches lend into the construction of neo-liberal world order on a rhetorical micro-scale?

3. More specifically, how does the underlying ideology inherent in the second persona constructed in the speeches support and/or reconstruct a world order of neo-liberal globalization?

Thesis outline
To answer the research question, the thesis is structured as follows. Chapter 1 presents the neo-Gramscian theoretical framework that explains the adopted view upon the nature of world orders as well as presents the characteristics of the assumed world order of neo-liberal globalization. As the choice of theory and the assumed world order provide an overall framework for the thesis, including for the adopted philosophy of science, it is presented in the first chapter. Chapter 2 then outlines the adopted research strategy, including the philosophical standpoint and the research methodology. Chapter 3 sets the speeches in a broader context and in a specific situation, which is necessary to qualify the interpretive analysis. This is followed by the speech analysis approach in Chapter 4, presenting a 3-step theoretical and practical approach applied to the analysis. Chapter 5 presents an in-depth analysis of the five speeches, bringing forward the constructed story and second persona. Please refer to the five speeches in Appendix 2. The insights brought forward by the analysis are then discussed in Chapter 6, in terms of the underlying ideology and the construction of neo-liberal globalization. The conclusion completes the thesis and presents an answer to the research question.

The structure of the thesis is visualized in Figure 1 on the following page.
CHAPTER 1

NEO-GRAMSCIAN APPROACH TO INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS

This chapter presents the theoretical framework that this thesis locates itself within. In short, the key perception lend by this framework is the idea that world orders are constantly reconstructed in historical contexts. International organizations such as the UN take on a crucial role in shaping and maintaining world orders, as does Annan through his role as a so-called organic intellectual (Hummel, 2005: 24). The chapter begins with an explanation of neo-Gramscian understanding of the nature of world orders, followed by a presentation of the characteristics of a current world order of neo-liberal globalization that this thesis takes on as a point of reference.

Neo-Gramscian theory applies a critical theory approach to the study of international relations that explores the interface of ideas, institutions and material capabilities as shaping world order. The approach goes behind theories of prevailing world order, so to speak, and establishes a theoretical framework for understanding how world orders emerge, develop and change. In this sense, the neo-Gramscian approach challenges a deadlock between the so-called realist and liberal schools of thought by viewing the very theoretical foundations of the two streams as shaped historically in context of a particular world order (Cox, 1981: 129; Underhill, 2006: 15). Let us start from the beginning.

The neo-Gramscian perspective can be traced to Robert W. Cox’s 1981 article ‘Social Forces, States and World Orders: Beyond International Relations Theory’ and his 1983 article ‘Gramsci, Hegemony and International Relations: An Essay in Method’. It is an approach to understanding international relations heavily influenced by the writings of early 20th century Marxist thinker Antonio Gramsci (Scherrer, 2004: 112). For instance, Cox builds on a Gramscian understanding of hegemony as based not on coercion and dominance, but on broad acceptance of a certain order (Gill and Law, 1989).

The overall mission of Cox’s two articles was to forge a critical study of international relations, as opposed to the mainstream problem-solving (in the words of Cox) theories.
of the time (Cox, 1981: 128). Mainstream neo-realist and neo-liberal approaches assume that basic features of the international system are static, and the theoretical approaches are concerned with solving problems and maintaining power relationships in such a constant system (Bieler and Morton, 2004: 86). They do not particularly interrogate the origin and development of power relationships and systems.

Structural changes in the recent course of history have many times challenged the idea of constant power structures. The end of the Cold War is one example of major structural changes. During the Cold War, international relations theory rotated around managing a world system pinned down by two superpowers. According to Cox, prevailing international relations theories of the time did not provide a satisfying framework to understand the emerging uncertainty in power relations because the uncertainties contravened fixed features of a constant international system. Streams of critical theory emanated from the structural changes, sharing the common belief that systems and relationships can not be understood as causal, nor studied objectively (Bieler and Morton, 2003: 1). Cox’s development of a neo-Gramscian approach should be seen as part of this rejection of mainstream approaches on behalf of critical international relations theories (Underhill, 2006: 15; Bieler and Morton, 2004: 86).

Following the arguments of Cox, theories of international relations should not concern themselves with problem-solving objectives in a fixed frame, for theories concerning the social can never claim to have direct access to the truth. A theory always emancipates from a certain standpoint in time and space, rooted in certain ideologies. “Theory is always for someone and for some purpose” (Cox, 1981: 128). According to Cox, the purpose must be laid bare to reveal the perspectives behind theories presenting themselves as divorced from context and certain understandings. Problem-solving theory springs from a purpose of providing a direct response to problems posed within the particular perspective that the theory operates within. Critical theory, including neo-Gramscianism, springs from a purpose of becoming aware of the perspectives that give rise to theorizing and becoming aware of the choice of other perspectives to create an alternative world. So, the object of critical theory is to achieve perspective on perspectives, so to speak. More specifically, neo-Gramscian theory seeks to understand and question the forces constituting world order. In the words of Cox, neo-Gramscian critical theory “...does not take institutions and social and power relations for granted but calls them into question by concerning itself with their origins and how and whether they might be in the process of changing” (Cox, 1981: 129).

Cox (1981: 135ff) states five premises upon which his conception of a neo-Gramscian critical approach rests:
1. All action takes place within a framework which constitutes its problematic. Neo-Gramscian theory seeks to understand those frameworks.

2. Theories are also shaped by the same frameworks, of which they must be aware and thereby be conscious of their own relativity in a broad time-perspective. Cox argues that “...no period of history has the capacity both to assess the nature of the problems it faces and to predict the future in light of those problems” (Hoogvelt, A. et al, 1999: 395).

3. The framework for action changes over time. Neo-Gramscian theory seeks to understand those changes.

4. The framework has the shape of a historical structure, which is a picture of a particular configuration of forces. The historical structure does not determine actions in any direct, mechanical way but imposes expectations and constraints. As expressed in the first sub-question of the research question, one of the aims of the speech analysis is concerned with examining how the story constructed in the speeches is constrained by existing historical structure (neo-liberal globalization, as I will elaborate on later in this chapter) and how it can reconstruct it.

5. The historical structure must be grasped from the bottom (as this thesis does) or from the outside.

Thus, the primary object of neo-Gramscian analysis is a configuration of forces called historical structures which change over time and shape actions and understandings. Let us have a closer look.

**Historical structures**

As pointed out in the fourth premise mentioned above, historical structures are based on a configuration of forces. Cox identifies three categories of forces that interact reciprocally to form a structure: Material capabilities, ideas and institutions (Cox, 1981: 136ff). The forces are interdependent and can not be understood in isolation of each other (Hummel, 2005: 4). The structures created through the three forces can then be hegemonic, which I will turn to shortly.

*Material capabilities*

Material capabilities are understood as productive potentials, i.e. natural resources and stocks of equipment and the wealth and capabilities needed to command these. Power based on control of production processes.

*Ideas*

Cox identifies two overall kinds of ideas. One is so-called intersubjective meanings. They are shared ideas about the nature of social relations, and they set expectations that guide behavior. Intersubjective meanings in world politics are, for example, shared notions about certain kinds of overall authority, relationships and behavior between
people, states and other actors. Cox uses the examples that states have authority over
defined territory, people are organized in states, and certain kinds of behavior are
expected for certain kinds of situations, such as a situation where one state threatens
the borders of another. These notions transcend long periods of time, yet their origins
can still be traced historically.
The other kind of ideas that form historical structure is collective images of social
order. They are views held across groups of people and different groups can hold
different and conflicting collective images. In this characteristic they differ from
intersubjective meanings, which form broadly common ground throughout a particular
historical structure. Clashes between collective images show potential for the
emergence of a new structure on the basis of alternative material and institutional
basis.

Institutions
Cox attaches the concept of institutionalization to the process of stabilizing and
supporting a particular order, shaped through material capabilities and ideas. This
process takes place within institutions, and international institutions thus play a key
role in supporting and influencing world orders on a global scale. Institutions reflect
particular configurations of material capabilities and ideas and can also influence the
development of material capabilities and new ideas.

The three forces together shape historical structures, or world orders.
If a given historical structure dominates across all three forces, it can be said to be
hegemonic. Hegemony is a key neo-Gramscian concept.

Hegemony and world order
The concept of hegemony is most often tied to neo-realist hegemonic stability theory,
explaining a world order constituted by the dominance of one powerful state, as was for
example a widespread perception of world order dominated by the Unites States
following the dissolution of the Soviet Union. Hegemonic stability theory concerns
order among states; an order where one state sets hegemonic rules by dominating
others on the grounds of military and economic superiority. Cox’s concept of hegemony
dissociates itself from power through coercive dominance. Neo-Gramscian hegemony,
like its neo-realist counterpart, seeks to analyze the stability of world order(s). Only,
the concept of hegemony coined by Gramsci and developed by Cox is not about order
among states; rather, it is about a broad acceptance of a certain order, political and
social. So it exists as a form of dominance, but it refers to the dominance of an order
through broad collective consent, not the dominance of a certain state (Cox, 1983: 170;
Hummel, 2005: 4-5). World hegemony is explained as a stabile world order that is:
...based on a coherent conjunction or fit between a configuration of material power, the prevalent collective image of world order (including certain norms) and set of institutions which administer the order with a certain resemblance of universality (i.e. not just as the overt instruments of a particular state’s dominance). (Cox, 1981: 139)

In line with the three forces constituting historical structures, hegemony is, thus, a social structure, an economic structure and a political structure, and it must be all three simultaneously (Cox, 1981: 137). So, hegemony is a stable historic structure based on collective consent, rooted in the acceptance of ideas and supported by material resources and institutions (Bieler and Morton, 2003: 1). Historic structures can also be non-hegemonic, if dominant orders are not backed by collective consent. For example, a state might found a hegemonic order in a neo-realist sense, but the hegemony must be universal in the sense that the order must be compatible with the interests of most other states (Cox, 1983: 171) or at least perceived to be.

**Organic intellectuals and counterhegemony**

Now I have established how neo-Gramscianism explains the constant development of world orders through three categories of forces. As explained, historical structures are largely dependent on ideas and ideologies, which are by neo-Gramscians given the same energy as material forces to change the world. Some individuals hold positions that grant them opportunity to influence collective images more than other individuals. These individuals are referred to as organic intellectuals (Cox, 1983: 168). As ideas hold the potential to change the world, organic intellectuals can potentially yield great influence on world order. They are individuals who can engage masses by making people aware of their position in society and question contemporary politics. Organic intellectuals can be defined as:

...those able to theorize the conditions of existence of the system as a whole, suggest policies and their justifications, and, if need be, apply them. Such intellectuals need to synthesize a strategic vision with the technical and political ability to realize it in practice. (Gill & Law, 1989: 488)

Annan is most definitely an organic intellectual in the neo-Gramscian sense. As the leader of the largest political institution in the world, he is at the forefront of theorizing as well as influencing the world system as a whole. With the Global Compact, Annan presents a strategic vision of UN-business cooperation, and the speeches at the WEF are expressions of this vision. He has the political power to realize the Global Compact in practice, although he needs the support of business in translating the vision into a practical success. The ideas that organic intellectuals like Annan have the potential to promote can, on the one hand, be used to stabilize a hegemonic historical structure, but
they can also be used in an emancipatory fashion to make people aware of and break free from existing structures (Benton & Craib, 2011: 136-140). This refers to the first sub-question of this thesis; Annan has the potential to support as well as reconstruct the neo-liberal historical structure.

The potential to question and make a break with existing structures can ultimately take the shape of counterhegemony. Counterhegemony refers to an alternative interpretation of the functioning of social, economic, and political institutions than the existing one. If a counterhegemonic movement grows large enough, it is able to challenge and possibly replace the historical structure it is born in. Through persuasion or propaganda, a counterhegemonic movement attempts to increase the number of people who share its view on the hegemonic order, ultimately to overthrow the current hegemony (Cox, 1983: 174).

This lays the groundwork for a neo-Gramscian understanding of the nature of world orders. The following presents the characteristics of a current world order of neo-liberal globalization that this thesis takes on as an assumption. Starting off, a brief account of the rise of neo-liberal globalization as a hegemonic structure is put forward, which should by no means be perceived as comprehensive. But it is adequate for the purpose of this thesis, and any depiction will in a way be insufficient, as the processes between different historical structures are in no means linear or uncontested.

**The emergence and characteristics of neo-liberal globalization**

World orders are constantly reconstructed, taking the shape of historical structures that are in a continuous process of development and change. Hegemony can never be taken for granted and hegemonic historical structures are always marked by contradictions and challenges from social forces. A new historical structure emerges gradually from a reconstruction of the previous one and usually takes on a hegemonic status in pace with growing contestation of the previous hegemonic project (Hummel, 2005: 5).

The hegemonic historical structure of neo-liberal globalization dominating the time of Annan’s speeches has gradually evolved from a former Fordist hegemony, coined in the 1930s by Gramsci, among others. Cox refers to the Fordist regime led by the United States after World War II as Pax Americana (Bieler and Morton, 2004: 93-94; Cox, 1981: 144). Put into the framework of the three constituting forces argued by neo-Gramscian theory, Fordism was marked by mass production in terms of material capabilities, modernization in terms of ideology, and welfare nationalism and
embedded liberalism\textsuperscript{1} in terms of political institutions (Hummel, 2005: 6; Bieler and Morton, 2004: 94). During the economic crisis of the 1970s, the Fordist hegemonic project became increasingly challenged. There was a loss of trust in the ability of the welfare state to secure economic prosperity (Hoogvelt, A. et al, 1999: 394; Bull, 2010: 185), and there was an increasing belief in the ability of the free market as a driver of growth. At the same time, internationalization of production made business and capital increasingly mobile and powerful and increasingly difficult for states to control (Bieler and Morton, 2004: 94). Overall, the change was a turn away from interventionist approaches towards market-based ones; an increasingly global market, that is. The result of the developments was the rise of a new historical structure.

The new historical structure gained momentum through the three reciprocally interacting categories of forces identified by Cox: Material capabilities, ideas and institutions. As mentioned, globalized production processes put power in the hands of business (Bieler and Morton, 2004: 95), and with this power followed an ideational power to advance a strong collective image of a free global market as the only road to economic growth. In the words of Cox, “There has emerged an ideological belief that the right way to develop is to open up the world to capitalism as the primary impetus to development” (Hoogvelt, A. et al, 1999: 394). The power over material capabilities and ideas, in turn, influenced the world of politics towards policies supporting market liberalization and deregulation, institutionalized through the diffusion of the Washington Consensus\textsuperscript{2}. The result, gaining hegemony during the 1980s, was a neo-liberal world order (Hummel, 2005: 23).

The current world order of neo-liberal globalization that this thesis assumes is complex and multifaceted, but, building on the theoretical foundation from the rest of this chapter, sufficiently characterized through the three constituting and interdependent forces as follows (Hummel, 2005: 6, 23):

\textit{Material capabilities:} Globalized production. Business holds increasing control of production processes, meaning increasing power over material capabilities and increasing influence in a global world order.  

\textit{Ideas:} The prevalent collective image of social order is currently (in the developed world, at least) an ideology of privatization and liberalization.  

\textit{Institutions:} Global governance and transnational networks.

\textsuperscript{1} Embedded liberalism refers to a global economic system and political orientation marked by a combination of international free trade and freedom for states to intervene in the economy to secure domestic stability and welfare (Bieler and Morton, 2004: 94).

\textsuperscript{2} Washington Consensus was originally coined in 1989 to name ten specific policies in an economic reform package promoted by US financial institutions. It has later come to refer to a broader ideology of a free-market approach (Williamson, 1990).
To sum up this chapter, world orders take the shape of historical structures that are constant reconstructions of material capabilities, ideas and institutions. Coherence between all three forces is necessary to secure a hegemonic world order; that is, a stable historic structure based on collective consent (Cox, 1981). Institutions like the UN play a key part in the constitution of historical structures, both in terms of political and discursive support. Business might hold substantive power in terms of material capabilities, but if it is not embedded politically through institutions with a certain resemblance of universality, it will not be accepted in world society as a collective image of world order (Cox, 1981: 139).

Hummel (2005) uses the constantly changing nature of historical structures and the rise of neo-liberal globalization to explain the change in UN approach towards business that the Global Compact represents; from interventionist to cooperative. In Chapter 3, I will draw out the highlights from this neo-Gramscian analysis to serve as part of a broader historical context for understanding the speeches. For, in line with neo-Gramscian theory, I see the relationship between the UN and business not as structurally determined, but dependent on agency in historical frameworks of action. While the hegemony of neo-liberal globalization shapes understandings and imposes expectations and constraints for Annan to operate within, as an organic intellectual representing a major political institution Annan has the potential to support or reconstruct neo-liberal globalization through influence on ideas about social order. The speeches are analyzed as realizations of this potential through rhetorical acts. The following chapter unfolds the research strategy.
CHAPTER 2
RESEARCH STRATEGY

The following will address the adopted methodological approach to answering the research question. I will account for how the research is conducted, explain the methodological choices and reflect upon their effect on the research outcomes. Firstly, my philosophical approach to the research is openly accounted for, touching upon theory of knowledge in the nexus of the fields of rhetoric and international relations. Secondly, I account in a more specific manner for the research methodology, along two overall lines; method of data collection and method of data analysis.

**Philosophy of science**

Knowledge is not simply knowledge. It is relevant to make epistemological considerations as obtainment of knowledge is not a given and agreed upon process. What is considered to be acceptable as knowledge is linked to different philosophies of science concerned with the nature of knowledge and research, attempting to define the process of knowledge creation by pointing to basic principles and questions of validity within different disciplines of science (Fuglsang and Olsen, 2004: 8). Research philosophy sets assumptions about how to perceive and make sense of the world. The adopted research philosophy, then, guides how I make sense of the research field and how I set out to develop knowledge in the thesis. I do not as a researcher commit to a specific philosophy of science, per se, but I apply a perspective on the research and in order to make reflected methodological choices I must be conscious of that perspective and the premises it sets.

Inherent in neo-Gramscian theory is a view that world orders are not given structures; rather, they are constructed in social and historic context. I adhere to this view, and it is reflected in the research question. Just like the use of neo-Gramscian theory, the idea that the construction of world orders exists on a rhetorical micro-scale reflect an overall interpretivist research philosophy. Interpretivism focuses on understanding the meaning behind social reality rather than measuring it. For the social world is
constructed and we make sense of it through our subjective interpretations (Fuglsang and Olsen, 2004: 19). In the study of the social, interpretivists argue that objective research and the discovery of universal truths is not possible. The interpretivist philosophical stance taken in this thesis is expressed on many levels. It is expressed in the overall perception that guides how I make sense of the research field; namely, that world orders take the shape of historic structures and that social forces help construct those structures. It is expressed in the hypothesis that Annan’s speeches can be acts of constructing social reality, for social reality is not viewed as phenomena that exist objectively ‘out there’, independent of the context that Annan and the UN both shape and operate in. Also, the interpretivist stance is expressed in how I set out to develop knowledge; not by measuring, but by interpreting Annan’s speeches. I will explain the research approach in depth shortly.

**Constructivist interpretivism**

Within a framework of interpretivism, neo-Gramscian theory is an inhabitant of the constructivist school, setting out to critically question and understand world order, as opposed to the goals of problem-solving approaches. The academic goal of Robert Cox is, in his own words, to understand the structures that underlie the world (Hoogvelt et al, 1999: 390). Not measure and quantify, but understand. The thesis operates within this view that world orders are continuously shaped and reconstructed. So, within an interpretivist philosophy of science, my ontological position is marked by constructivism. Constructivism in international relations refers to aspects of international relations (here, world order) as socially and historically constructed as collective phenomena (Wendt, 1995: 75). Following neo-Gramscian thought, the way we perceive and understand world order is always influenced by that same world order, for we can not place ourselves outside it. Unlike earlier Marxist critical theory, the goal is not to distinguish ‘false’ knowledge from ‘true’ knowledge in order to liberate people from systemic ideologies that are, in reality, a construction. The nature of reality – or world order – as being socially and historically constructed means that we can not place ourselves outside and offer ‘true’ knowledge. World order might be socially constructed, but it is still real to us and shapes our understandings. Cox argues:

> It seems to me that there is a way in which people often speak of reality, as though it were something apart from us [...] My sense of reality has always been more historicised: reality is a sense of the world which is constantly created and re-created by people in different circumstances. (Hoogvelt et al, 1999: 393)

This links to the aim of analyzing how Annan supports and reconstructs a world order of neo-liberal globalization. The aim of this thesis is not concerned with breaking down constructed world order; rather, it is constructivist in the sense that I seek to
understand the construction of world orders as “...a historical phenomenon that changes constantly...” (Hoogvelt et al, 1999: 393), and in the sense that ideas about world order are not taken for granted. An example is the idea of a global market, a key term across Annan’s speeches that I will analyze in depth as a construction, rather than take for granted. In general, the aim of a constructivist approach to international relations, including neo-Gramscianism, is to gain perspective on perspectives; I seek to gain perspective on the construction of world orders by examining neo-liberal world order through the lenses of Annan’s speeches.

In line with the critical approach argued by Cox, I see the speeches as taking place within an overall framework, as it is necessary to “…sit back from all the detail and ask yourself broader questions about how the whole is changing...” (Hoogvelt, A. et al, 1999: 393). That is, in this context, to understand the speeches as part of changing world orders. I also turn this upside down, zooming in on the detail to show how the whole is changing. It can be a disadvantage of critical theory that it “…directs our attention to the whole even though we might acknowledge that when you look at the whole you are going to miss a lot of the detail” (Hoogvelt, A. et al, 1999: 394). The speech analysis offers an example of how changing world orders can take place in detail.

**Hermeneutic interpretivism**

As well as constructivism, I lean on a hermeneutic branch of interpretivism, especially in terms of the level of the research approach concerned with how I set out to develop knowledge from the speeches. Following the tradition of hermeneutics means that I interpret the speeches as set in context. I do not analyze them as independent objects but as existing in a circular relationship with the rhetor (Annan) and the historical context. The same goes for me as an interpreter, meaning that my context shapes prejudices that affect how I make sense of the speeches. “…the critic cannot assimilate the text until it is filtered through his or her own conceptual apparatus. Meaning cannot be assigned to expression except by reference to something outside the original expression...” (Leff, 1980: 344). This does not hinder my ability to make interpretations, but it entails that I do not create objective results (Gadamer, 2004). Hermeneutics is at the basis of critical theory (Fuglsang and Olsen, 2004: 19), including critical theory within international relations, herein counting neo-Gramscian theory and the quest to question world order. I seek to gain a perspective on the process of changing world orders by analyzing the speeches as concrete research objects expressing the process of changing world orders on a micro-scale. I am aware that there are other potential outcomes from such an exercise, as knowledge is always situated (Abbott, 2004: 50); however, keeping with the interpretivist tradition, I do not seek to locate absolute truths.
In the following, the research approach is addressed, explaining how I seek to shed light on the research field and reflecting on the type of outcomes that can be expected from the adopted approach. The root in interpretivist philosophy of science is hopefully evident.

**Research methodology**

The overall methodology applied in this thesis is speech analysis. There are two levels of methodology: Method of data collection and method of data analysis.

**Method of data collection**

Accounting for my method of data collection means accounting for how and why I have chosen the specific speeches as objects of analysis. The WEF is a key forum for the political world and the business world to meet. In this sense, it is a relevant scene to look for manifests of a neo-liberal world order marked by an increase in business power. The existence of the Forum is in itself a sign of an increasing role of business in global governance (Hummel, 2005: 11), and when addressing the Forum, Annan, representing the political world, expresses a position about the changing role of business; he offers business a certain role. It is this role that I will examine as relating to neo-liberal world order. The role is presented in a framework for action; namely, the Global Compact. It is a widespread perception (Hummel, 2005; Rasche, 2012) that the 1999 speech introducing the Global Compact marks the culmination of a new course of the UN, led by Annan. The new course of the UN, and the expressed role of business in the global world that this course navigates within, is elaborated on across the 1999 speech and Annan’s four following addresses at WEF during his term as Secretary-General. Annan chose the Forum as the place and time to introduce and find support for the spearhead of a more open UN approach – the Global Compact. Given such key role, these exact speeches seem relevant to examine as expressions of world order. They seem a relevant research object that can lend insights into how Annan views the overlapping worlds of business and politics; into how he relates to and possibly influences a current world order. Furthermore, all five speeches are held within the same framework, in front of roughly the same audience, and so I expect them to build upon a joint story. Compared to bringing in speeches held by Annan across different settings, I expect to find a progression, i.e. that the constructed story and role of business unfolds across these exact speeches. Therefore, I have made the five speeches held by Kofi Annan at the WEF from 1999 to 2006 my objects of analysis.
Method of data analysis

My interpretivist philosophical approach is reflected in the choice of a small number of speeches. I do not seek to locate replicable causal relationships in a quantitative, positivist manner. Rather, the method of data analysis is qualitative through interpretation. Although I do not create objective results, my interpretation rests upon a rhetorical theoretical foundation and a toolbox for rhetorical analysis with which I qualify the analysis. The approach, theoretical as well as practical, to developing knowledge from the speeches has three levels which are presented immediately prior to the speech analysis itself. Although this three-level foundation constitutes a theoretically supported method of approaching the speeches, it does not set a rigid framework that I place the content of the speeches into. That is, I do not adhere to a deductive approach where a theoretical basis forms a hypothesis that is then tested in practice. This goes both for the rhetorical and political levels of analysis in this thesis; I do not test the neo-Gramscian theory of neo-liberal world order through Annan’s speeches, nor do I pass judgment on the speeches based on rhetorical theory. Instead, the interpretation of the speeches is an end in itself (Jasinski, 2001: 251). Not because the interpretation can inform the proposal of a new theory, as is often the goal of an inductive approach; an understanding of the speeches is in itself the primary goal. The speeches are analyzed as an expression of neo-liberal world order, yes, but neither to test neo-Gramscian theory, nor to develop a new theory of world order in an inductive manner. Instead, I follow an interpretive approach that is expressed in the context of rhetorical analysis by Michael Leff, who argues that within this discipline, the process of theory “... does not take the form of a ladder leading up to or down from high order abstractions. Instead, such theory moves along the broken ground covered by the specific material of the discipline” (Leff, 1980: 347). My approach to the analysis and discussion can be explained as abduction, where theory and ‘text’ inform each other reciprocally. I make sense of the speeches by performing conceptually-oriented criticism, where key concepts from the speeches form focal points of analysis (Jasinski, 2001: 256). In the words of James Jasinski, “...theory and criticism in rhetorical studies intersect in the development of conceptually grounded, interpretive accounts of particular discursive performances” (Jasinski, 2001: 261).

The contribution of an interpretive approach to rhetorical criticism is that it provides a holistic understanding of the speeches. The speeches are not simply seen as artifacts to be judged on their ability to work according to the author’s intention in the particular situation (Gadamer, 2004). Instead, as well as providing an in-depth understanding of the speeches, interpretation allows me to gain knowledge about the role of the speeches in the particular situation and in a broader context; the context of the construction of a neo-liberal world order. For, as I will develop later (in Chapter 3), I see rhetorical acts as constituting reality, not just emerging in the wake of existing reality (Villadsen,
2009: 41-45). My interpretive account of Annan’s speeches, then, constitutes a window into the process of neo-liberal world order in practice.

The method used in this thesis, then, is rhetorical analysis. I do not perform discourse analysis, which is a related and widely used approach to the research field of world orders (Jørgensen and Phillips, 1999: 9). As such, this thesis could take its place as part of a broader discourse analysis. The above outlined philosophical standpoints of dissociation with the detection of ‘true’ knowledge outside ideological haze and of socially constructed reality, indeed, are very similar to philosophical standpoints inherent in the idea of discourse (Hansen, 2004: 410). An example of similarity in analytical approach is how key concepts from the speeches form focal points of analysis. Only, I examine them to make sense of the speeches, rather than to make sense of a neo-liberal discourse. That is, the specific research strategy employed here offers a more detail-oriented approach. The analysis on micro-level does not feed into a quest to shed light on neo-liberal world order on a macro-level, and this is the primary motivation to choose the approach of speech analysis. Discourse analysis would primarily find the speeches interesting as a gateway to understanding and revealing the exclusions of the neo-liberal discourse they are expressions of (Hansen, 2004: 402, 406). As touched upon in the above paragraph, the speeches are not analyzed in order to expose or understand neo-liberal ideology, or discourse; I find the speeches interesting in their own right. To refer to some of the five underlying premises of a neo-Gramscian approach presented in Chapter 1 (page 7), the project undertaken in this thesis assigns most focus to the third, and very little to the first premise. That is, the primary aim is not to deepen an understanding of neo-liberal globalization, but to understand and show how historical structures can change through rhetorical acts. Annan’s speeches show how world orders can be constructed on a micro-level, through rhetorical acts. Thus, the interpretation of the speeches is an end in itself (Jasinski, 2001: 251), whereas discourse analysts tend to study specific texts to get at broader regularities.

Before moving on, I will make a note about how I address the relationship between the speeches and the UN as a whole. As already mentioned, and this point will reoccur throughout the thesis, the Global Compact is a spearhead of a more open approach by the UN towards business. This does, however, not mean that this thesis argues that the initiative represents the whole UN system. More importantly, I do not set out to argue that the expressions about the Global Compact (the speeches) represent an attitude towards business across the whole UN system. By performing the analysis and discussion, I am not able to make conclusions about the role of the UN or the role of business in a neo-liberal world order, nor is it my intention. The intention is to interpret the speeches as expressions of world order and shed light on their role in a constant reconstruction of that same world order. Of course, the reason why it is
relevant to analyze the speeches as influential in terms of world order is the status of Annan as political leader of an influential institution. As explained, he acts as an organic intellectual in a neo-Gramscian sense. But Kofi Annan is not necessarily seen as representing the whole UN system; in fact, the definition of his role versus the UN is not necessary for answering the research question. This being said, a hermeneutic interpretation sees the speeches as set in a context, and so a reflection on the framework of the speeches precedes the speech analysis and the context is continually drawn into the analysis. The next chapter presents this reflection on the speeches in a setting.
Before moving on to an analysis of the content of the five speeches, I will shed some light on the elements that frame the speeches, or constitute the setting. The speeches are not just flowing in mid-air, so to speak, cut off from time and space. Rather, they exist in a specific situation and in a broader context that influence the speeches by placing possibilities and constraints on them. So the speech analysis, and the thesis as a whole for that matter, illuminates a small section of a broader process. The following provides a reflection on the framework of the speeches to set the scene for the speech analysis.

In line with a hermeneutic interpretative stance, I see the speeches as set in a context, and in line with the adopted neo-Gramscian approach, this context is constantly changing historical structures and neo-liberal globalization. While Annan as an organic intellectual has the potential to support and reconstruct neo-liberal globalization through influence on ideas about social order, the hegemony of neo-liberal globalization also shapes understandings and imposes expectations and constraints for Annan to operate within. I have already outlined the characteristics of neo-liberal globalization (page 10), and so the following, in preparing for the speech analysis, concretizes the framework of the speeches by connecting the history of UN-business relations and the introduction of the Global Compact to the context of world orders, in order to understand the historical frame that Annan operates within. The following also sheds light on the specific situation that the speeches are held in. With situation I refer to the specific setting in which the speeches are situated. Seeing as speeches are acts in a specific setting, prepared and held in that setting, an interpretation of the speeches must first reflect upon the setting. So, the scene of the WEF and the audience to which the speeches are directed will be described in order to set the scene for the speeches. Prior to that, however, I provide a reflection on the wider context of the speeches, referring to a societal setting in a broader sense. Reflection on this broader context takes up the most part of this chapter, as the aim of the thesis is to set the speeches in relation to a broader societal and ideological context of neo-liberal globalization.
In terms of the discussion on how Annan can shape or is shaped by existing world order, a line can be drawn to the role of rhetor versus the role of the situation in rhetorical theory. Lloyd Bitzer and Richard Vatz have each formulated an approach that can be said to inhabit opposite extremities of a scale of the relationship between rhetoric and situation. On one end of the scale, Bitzer (1968) advocates that the situation is critical to rhetoric. In fact, the situation is not just critical, but determining for the rhetorical act. A speech occurs as a result of a vacuum created by a rhetorical situation: "A speech will be rhetorical when it is a response to the kind of situation which is rhetorical" (Bitzer, 1968: 10). According to Vatz, whose work inhabits the opposite end of the rhetoric-situation scale, the relationship must be turned upside down; rhetoric creates the situation. We interpret situations through the way in which others explain or otherwise communicate them to us: “To the audience, events become meaningful only through their linguistic depiction” (Vatz, 1973: 157). Unlike Bitzer, Vatz argues that rhetor is not a puppet controlled by the situation, but can control how the situation is interpreted. The speaker has the power to determine content and structure and, equally important, what is omitted.

Rhetoric moves in the continuum between the two approaches, and rather than perceiving them as conflicting, I acknowledge and draw on both. I acknowledge that the situation and broader context constrains Annan’s space for action, while believing that his rhetorical acts have constitutive potential to influence the context, in turn. No matter to which side the pendulum swings, it is relevant to reflect upon the situation and context surrounding Annan’s rhetorical acts – as it influences and/or is influenced by the speeches.

Let us turn first to the history of UN-relations, in order to understand the historical frame that Annan operates within. This broader societal context is relevant to keep in mind when interpreting the speeches, as “Rhetorical works belong to the class of things which obtain their character from the circumstances of the historic context in which they occur” (Bitzer, 1968: 3).

**The historical context of UN-business relations**

I have already made the point that the introduction of the Global Compact initiative marked a fundamental change in UN approach to business (Hummel, 2005; Rasche, 2012). Here, I will connect a few words to the developments in the approach, to set a broader historical context relevant to the interpretation of Annan’s speeches and forming a first step in connecting the primary theme of the speeches – the Global Compact – to the neo-Gramscian historical framework of neo-liberal globalization. To make this outline, I draw on existing literature, primarily the analysis made by Hummel (2005) of the changing relationship seen through a neo-Gramscian perspective of changing world orders.
The Global Compact is by far the first attempt of the UN to deal with TNCs (transnational corporations) (Rasche, 2012: 34). In the decades following World War II, no global international regime existed to govern TNCs. The UN, inter-governmental in its construction, did not have the mandate to regulate that area, either. As corporations increasingly expanded across national borders, their activities began to appear on the political agenda. At this point, the approach towards TNCs was largely marked by concern, and the dominating focus was on the rights of host states, also in the UN. As explained, the international economic order of the 1960s and 70s was dominated by embedded liberalism of a Fordist historical structure, placing the regulation of TNCs on national governments (Hummel, 2005: 23). This practice was further strengthened when, after criticism in the international community on the conduct of TNCs, the UN passed a charter that granted host states the right to regulate and supervise the activities of TNCs. At the same time, in 1974, the UN established an intergovernmental Commission on Transnational Corporations with the primary task of drafting a code of conduct to regulate the behavior of TNCs (Hummel, 2005: 9). This code-of-conduct approach characterized the UN’s relationship with business in the following years.

However, although the idea of legally binding regulation dominated in the UN, it was largely opposed by business, political elites in the OECD countries and liberal economists (Hummel, 2005: 9). And without coherence between all three forces, to follow the conceptual universe of neo-Gramscianism, a historical structure will never prevail, let alone be sustained. “With the rise of neo-liberal globalization in the 1980s the negotiations on an international regime for TNCs began to stagnate” (Hummel, 2005: 10), and this was reflected in the failure of the before-mentioned Commission to ever pass the intended code of conduct (Bull, 2010: 182); in fact, the Commission was closed in 1992. Developments towards increased inclusion of TNCs into global politics took off, with the World Economic Forum as a key platform for political and business leaders to meet. The focus of international negotiations was increasingly shifting from the protection of host nations to the protection of business against state regulations (Hummel, 2005: 11).

As the new neo-liberal historical structure gained footing, the UN continued to advocate a focus on social policies well into the 1990s, with UN agencies like UNICEF and UNDP criticizing economic liberalization policies. So, “During Boutros Boutros-Ghali’s term as Secretary-General of the United Nations, the United Nations were not fully supportive of neo-liberal globalization yet” (Hummel, 2005: 13). This shifted with the inauguration of Annan and his intention to reform the institution, spearheaded by the Global Compact (Bull, 2010: 183).

---
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Neo-liberal globalization met substantive criticism in the beginning and middle of the 1990s. Trade liberalization negotiations were countered with mass demonstrations and a growing counter-movement. In this period, the concept of CSR presented a possibility to relegate the world order. Reconstructing neo-liberal globalization by inviting social responsibility into business practice could support the hegemony of the historical structure. The growing awareness in the business environment of the threats presented by pressure for corporate responsibility opened a window of opportunity for Annan to gain support for the Global Compact (Hummel, 2005: 24, 26).

The failed attempt to pass a code of conduct shows clearly how the UN, despite its political and intellectual leadership, cannot just set the agenda independent of other prevalent forces and ideas in society. Neo-liberal globalization constitutes the overall ideological and economic context that Annan’s speeches operate in. This sets a framework but it does not necessarily mean that he is in no position to influence that framework. That question is at the heart of this thesis; how the story Annan constructs in the speeches reflects existing neo-liberal world order and how it reconstructs and challenges it.

Next, let me introduce you to Annan, not as an isolated subject, but as rooted in the broader social and historical context outlined above (Villadsen, 2009: 44). By following especially the arguments of Vatz, rhetor is ascribed an important role in analysis: "We do not just have the academic exercise of determining whether the rhetor understood the "situation" correctly. Instead, he must assume responsibility for the salience he has created" (Vatz, 1973: 158). Annan is able to make some rhetorical choices that I will illuminate throughout the rhetorical analysis. Following a brief introduction to Annan, I turn to the specific setting in which Annan’s rhetorical acts and the broader context get together, so to speak – in front of the audience at the WEF.

**Rhetor**

Kofi Annan, a long time UN bureaucrat, took office as UN Secretary-General in 1997, replacing Boutros Boutros-Ghali and eventually succeeded by Ban Ki-moon in 2007. From the beginning of his period, Annan was on a mission to fundamentally reform management of the UN. In July 1997 he issued a complete reform agenda called ‘Renewing the United Nations: A Programme for Reform’, proposing a new management structure and key sectoral measures, together shaping, in the words of Annan, “...the most extensive and far-reaching reforms in the fifty-two year history of this Organization” (Annan, 1997: 1). A step in the renewal was reaching out to civil society and the private sector. The work of the UN on most areas increasingly depends on contributions of non-governmental actors and the report states that a growing international economy has:
...established the private sector as the major driving force of international economic change. Yet despite those growing manifestations of an ever-more robust global civil society, the United Nations is at present inadequately equipped to engage civil society and make it a true partner in its work. (Annan, 1997: paragraph 59)

Annan intended to make arrangements to open the organization up to close partnerships, increasing cooperation between the UN and private sector actors as well as civil society (Annan, 1997: paragraph 59). This mission to actively engage with business charted a new course for the UN, and soon partnership projects within UN agencies took shape and Annan took on a role as beacon for the business-friendly approach, meeting regularly with business leaders around the world. The introduction of the new course culminated with Annan’s speech at the WEF on January 31st 1999, announcing the birth of the Global Compact as a cornerstone in changed UN-business relations (Hummel, 2005; Rasche, 2012). Thus, the speeches at the WEF, targeting business and with the Global Compact as a key theme, should be seen as an element in a broader quest to change discourse, to draw on Vatz. They are tools for the rhetor – Annan – to alter the reality of UN-business relations.

Audience at the World Economic Forum
A speech is distinctive in that it is produced to be held only once and consists of instantaneous characteristics, although it lives on as text. It has a function to produce action or change in the world (Bitzer, 1968: 4), and in this case the overall function is to convince business leaders to sign on to the Global Compact. As Annan seeks to achieve an effect with his audience, let us for a moment consider that audience. According to Bitzer, changing the situation requires an audience with the power to influence the situation; an audience that can become mediators of change. This includes both the direct audience and the indirect audience (Bitzer, 1968: 7-8).

The direct audience at the WEF consists of 2,500 participants, most of whom represent the elite of business leaders from all over the world. They are influential people in the sense that they lead the world’s largest global enterprises that set visible footprints on the development of the private sector and the regions in which they operate. They are gathered at the annual meeting in Davos, which forms the flagship of the WEF and focuses on discussions around key issues of global concern. The organization is independent and “...committed to improving the state of the world by engaging business, political, academic and other leaders of society to shape global, regional and industry agendas” (WEF). So the project of the WEF goes well with the project of the Global Compact. In fact, as well as providing the opportunity to address his key audience directly, the WEF is a fitting setting for Annan to deliver the messages encompassed in the Global Compact. The WEF is a prime forum for CEOs and political leaders, as well as representatives from civil and academic society, to meet and work on
resolving international conflicts. Founded in 1971, the Forum was part of a movement away from governmental efforts to regulate TNCs towards more participation of business actors in global politics (Hummel, 2005: 11). In a sense, then, the WEF constitutes a symbolic setting for putting forth visions like those encompassed in the Global Compact.

The audience is not limited to the direct audience present at the Forum; it also includes those who are not listening directly to the speech but who can nevertheless become mediators for change (Bitzer, 1968: 8). Thus, the created discourse can expand beyond the specific setting and influence a band of susceptible people with the power to convey the change that the discourse seeks to advance (Klujeff, 2009: 64). This indirect audience – business leaders, political leaders and representatives from civil and academic society alike - can be influenced by the ideas mediated from the speeches through the immense media coverage of the WEF or through the rippling effects set out by the direct participating audience.

**Business as primary audience**

As mentioned, Annan’s primary audience is the business leaders. He speaks to them from the other side of the table; on behalf of a political institution. By forming the Global Compact, he has initiated the beginning of stronger UN-business relations from the political side and he now needs to convince business to take part in that course. This audience focus is reflected continuously throughout the speeches, both in the recurring subject of how business can contribute, and by making clear that the term ‘you’ refers to the business leaders. Examples are: “Five years ago, here in Davos, I asked you, the world's business leaders, to join the United Nations on a journey” (Annan, 2004: 4), and “Specifically, I asked you to embrace and enact, within your own firms...” (Annan, 2001: 45). The clearest example is a central quote from his 1999 speech, which also illustrates the UN-business typology: “I propose that you, the business leaders gathered in Davos, and we, the United Nations, initiate a global compact...” (Annan, 1999: 15). To a certain extent, Annan takes on the attending political leaders and representatives from civil and academic society as audience as well, urging them to support the new course of active business participation in the governance of global issues. For the Global Compact to succeed, Annan needs business participation, sympathy from strong civil society voices and support from governments ‘at home’ in the UN. “Indeed, all of you here – leaders from business and civil society organizations alike – must come to realize that you represent the vanguard of tomorrow's global society...” (Annan, 2001: 133).

Directed at business leaders, Annan’s speeches invite business to take on a role and join forces with the UN under the framework of the Global Compact. It is this offered role I seek to shed light upon, ultimately to analyze how it relates to an ideology of neo-liberal globalization. The following chapter presents how I intend to do that.
Before diving into the speeches to uncover the offered role and the ideology it reflects, I explain my approach to the analysis. Adopting an interpretive approach, the analysis does not follow a step-by-step procedure that will in the end present a ‘correct’ result. Rather, the speeches themselves set the analytical agenda, influenced to some extent by my reading of them, in a hermeneutic sense. Although a rigid procedure is not placed over the speeches, I have a choice of theory to guide and qualify my analysis; methodological tools, if you will (Villadsen, 2009: 50). I apply a three-level theoretical and practical approach to the analysis.

The overall level concerns how Annan offers his audience a room for action; an agency to explore. While the idea of offered agency forms the backbone of my analysis, I concretize my approach by drawing on the second persona constructed in the story and how that persona expresses an underlying ideology held by Annan. The second persona is then illuminated by adding yet another layer; namely, a practical analytical tool offered by the topics. The following will introduce you to the three levels; agency, second persona and the topics, while continually making clear how each contributes to drawing knowledge from the speeches that will contribute to fulfilling the mission of the thesis.

**Rhetorical agency**

The idea of the individual’s possibility to rhetorically change the situation for herself or others is at the heart of engaging in rhetorical activities. Otherwise, what would be the point? The idea of this possibility is captured in a concept of rhetorical agency (Isager, 2009: 269). To put it very simplified, agency roughly refers to a person who is acting with a certain direction, in order to achieve something (Hewson, 2010: 13). Rhetorical agency, then, is to perform agency through rhetorical acts.

The dominating focus of rhetorical agency as a concept is the agency exercised by the rhetor as a purposeful acting individual. There is a duality in the concept of agency,
referring to the agential potential, on the one hand, and the actual exercised agency on the other. The first is concerned with constitutive aspects; that is, the structural factors that constitute rhetor as a speaker and gives him access to perform rhetorical agency. The second is concerned with the rhetorical act itself; that is, how rhetor uses rhetoric to achieve a certain intention (Hoff-Clausen et al, 2005: 56-57). The thesis takes an interest in the second aspect of rhetorical agency, as the research question focuses on what Annan actually does rhetorically and how it relates to neo-liberal globalization. However, in rhetorical criticism it is problematic to ascribe a certain intention to rhetor (Wimsatt and Beardsley, 1946) since the objects of analysis are texts, not rhetors themselves. I work my way around this problematic by focusing on the agency Annan offers his audience. Through the constructed story, he offers the audience a room for action; an agency to enact. He invites them to take on a role of agents in changing the situation. It is this role, or agency, that I seek to explore. For exercised rhetorical acts serve to somehow influence the audience to reflect on and hopefully take on a certain perception, which shows in the agency the audience is invited to take on. Thus, the offered agency, by a circuitous route, indicates Annan’s intentions and what he does rhetorically. So, the aim of analyzing the role offered to business is not to learn more about the actual audience, but to gain insights into the intentions and ideology held by Annan.

Thus, the analysis does not seek to illuminate the rhetorical agency exercised by Annan, but the agency that he offers business through the constructed story. Following the analysis, this offered agency is then discussed as relating to a certain world order, discussing specifically how the speeches can be understood as supporting and/or reconstructing existing world order. This discussion of how the speeches relate to neo-liberal ideology should not be perceived as a discussion of Annan’s exercised rhetorical agency; rather, it is a discussion of his speeches’ potential to influence ideology in a broader context - a discussion that offered agency can contribute to. Let me make a quick note that I do not intend to imply that it is possible to view the offered agency as separate from the exercised agency. So I do not disallow the role of the agency that Annan exercises, but my focus is elsewhere in the analysis to come.

By excluding a study of Annan’s construction of self, I jump straight to studying his construction of audience. The audience – both the direct and indirect, following Bitzer’s understanding – are people who hold power to change the situation. The business leaders hold the capabilities and resources to positively influence global social issues. By presenting them with a forum for partnership, Annan adds to the possibility of business to connect with the problems and provides them with the tools to do so. What he needs to do next is to convince the business leaders to direct their power to act with a purpose that is in agreement with the values and goals of the Global Compact – convince them to engage
in the forum and use the tools. The business leaders do not lack agency in general, as lack of agency is to be controlled and be acted upon (Hewson, 2010: 13). But Annan invites them to take on the specific agency he offers and exert their power towards a specific purpose. As he concludes his 1999 speech: “I am sure you will make the right choice” (Annan, 1999: 122).

My ultimate aim is not to evaluate the constructed discourse in regards to how effective it is in offering an agency engaging enough to result in the business leaders performing the desired actions. My mission is to bring out the characteristics of the offered agency, as I believe that the role Annan constructs and offers business lends insights into an underlying ideology and world view. By examining the agency that Annan encourages business to take on, I can then compare that offered agency to an ideology of neo-liberal globalization.

To this purpose, I need to add a level in my analytical approach. Where the idea of offered agency functions as an overall frame, in order to dig into analyzing the speeches, I need to concretize an approach. I find the next level in the concept of personas; more specifically, second persona (2nd persona). I will use 2nd persona as an analytical framework that digs a level deeper within the framework of agency. That is, I concretize the offered agency, which it is the aim of the analysis to bring forward, as an offered 2nd persona. As well as adding further to the part of rhetorical agency that I concern myself with; namely, the constructed audience agency, second persona also contributes by tying an exploration of offered agency to my quest to explore the ideology behind. Let me explain how.

Second persona

What is second persona?

Edwin Black (1970) introduced the idea of a 2nd persona in rhetoric. As mentioned above, rhetorical criticism traditionally focuses on the rhetor – first persona – as shaping and delivering a message. This message, then, has an effect on the audience, to follow Bitzer's (1968) understanding of the concept audience as those that can be influenced by discourse. Black takes this discursive notion of audience further (Klujeff, 2009: 67ff), arguing that, rather than studying the effect of a constructed story on the actual audience, rhetorical critics should focus on the story itself and the audience that is implied therein; the 2nd persona (Black, 1970: 112). Because through the rhetorical act, the first persona implies an audience and offers that audience agency. By focusing on this implied audience, the critic avoids ascribing rhetor a certain intention. The 2nd persona reflects what the rhetor would have his real audience become. Herein lies the key contribution of 2nd persona, namely that it is reflections of an underlying ideology.
Chapter 4

Black argues that “Discourses contain tokens of their authors,” (Black, 1970: 110) and this is true for first persona as well as 2nd persona expressed in the discourse. Identifying 2nd persona in Annan’s speeches opens a door to shedding light on underlying ideology and perceptions. This reflects my adopted interpretivist philosophy of science; I do not seek to merely explain what I read, but to understand and uncover what lies underneath.

Black argues that the implied audience constitutes a channel for rhetor to influence the actual audience, as they seek clues that tell them who they should be and how they should view the world (Black, 1970: 113). So, even if a rhetorical discourse does not directly offer the audience a role or a persona, the persuasion to believe something can extend to persuasion to be something, because a discourse solicits the audience to fulfill it.

The primary motive of Black in developing a theory of 2nd persona is to pass moral judgment on constructed discourse and its alluring call for a certain audience persona (Black, 1970: 109-10). I do not seek to pass judgment on the constructed story or on the ideology that it expresses. But even if my mission of rhetorical analysis is not that proposed by Black, my analysis can still gain insights from the proposed two-step approach leading to moral judgment; that is, analysis of 2nd persona and interpretation of underlying ideology (Klujeff, 2009: 70).

**How to uncover second persona**

So, how do I identify and analyze the 2nd persona in Annan’s speeches, in order to drag out and interpret ideology underneath? According to Black, 2nd persona is implied through content and style. Although the strongest evidence for ideology is located in content, it rarely exposes itself here, and instead I must seek its representations in instruments of style. “The best evidence in the discourse for this implication will be the substantive claims that are made, but the most likely evidence available will be in the form of stylistic tokens” (Black, 1970: 112). A perception is not necessarily discussed openly, but can for example surface in the use of a claim, a term or a metaphor. So, even if an issue is seemingly expressed neutrally, an attitude will often be evident in loaded terms and parallels used to articulate the issue. And these metaphors and terms can then be deconstructed to bring out the 2nd persona and underlying ideology nested within. “...there are strong and multifarious links between a style and an outlook,” and so the critic may “...move from the manifest evidence of style to the human personality that this evidence projects as a beckoning archetype” (Black, 1970: 119).

In terms of offering specific tools for identifying tokens – in style and in content – that express 2nd persona in Annan’s speeches, Black’s contribution can benefit from adding a more practical level. He mentions that metaphors can be rooted in topoi, which are
also tokens of ideology (Black, 1970: 115). To take a step even further towards the practical work of analyzing agency in the speeches, I will dive into topoi as a key practical tool. Before applying the approach of topoi analysis to the speeches, let me briefly introduce this framework which forms the third and final level of the analytical approach.

The topics

What are topoi?

Speeches serve a certain function in time and space. Many speeches serve a function of changing the attitude of the audience towards a given issue. This also goes for Annan’s speeches, which primarily serve a function of persuading business to join forces with the UN by accepting his proposal to join the Global Compact.

Persuasion ties first and foremost to what the rhetorical tradition terms logos, that is, persuasion through arguments. Logos is two-sided. One is logic, meaning the art of valid reasoning in argumentation, focusing on the transition from established premise to claim. The other is the topics (Gabrielsen and Christiansen, 2010: 65ff). The topics cover the art of persuading the audience by changing the issue itself, meaning, to change the very thing that the audience sees and relates to. Thus, the focus of the topics is on the choice of premises, i.e. the choice of perspectives – termed topoi. The rhetor has the power to apply certain perspectives to the articulated issue, or, following the Greek origin of the word topos (the singular of topoi), to locate the issue in a certain ‘place’. An issue does not prescribe its own perspective (Gabrielsen, 2009).

A rhetorical critique drawing on the topics qualifies an analysis of the choices made by the rhetor, by driving the chosen perspectives into the light, and in the process also considering the broad catalogue of perspectives that the rhetor has left out. As well as being a method for a rhetor to consider perspectives and construct arguments, the topics then become a method for the critic to analyze arguments. By challenging the established premises in arguments made by Annan, I draw on topoi to identify and understand the preceding process behind the chosen perspectives and arguments. This exercise opens a door to uncover the motivation and perceptions behind those choices. Such an approach goes well with the thinking behind neo-gramscian theory; namely, the purpose of becoming aware of the underlying perspectives and of the existence of other perspectives. To achieve perspective on perspectives, so to speak.

How to use topoi as method of analysis

To understand the argumentative function of topoi it is necessary to differentiate between two types, as established by Aristotle, a key figure in the making of a theory of
topics. One type is termed specific topoi; the other general topoi (Aristotle, 2002; Gabrielsen, 2009: 151).

Specific topoi refer to the actual content of a speech, meaning the broad catalogue of perspectives available to articulate an issue. The specific topoi constitute different lenses through which the rhetor can illuminate different aspects of the issue to the audience and they can be found in categories of perspectives. Examples are financial or legal topoi. By choosing some over others, Annan influences what the audience sees, so to speak. The specific topoi deal with choice of perspectives, not with how those perspectives are put to use through argumentation.

General topoi, on the other hand, deal with how the specific topoi are put to use through argumentation. They are not a matter of content as such, but a matter of form and a general topos is a way to construct an argument from the chosen specific topos. General topos is not the argument in itself, but the way the argument is structured. Like it is the case with specific topoi, general topoi can be systematized. An example of a type of general topos makes use of the principle of opposites. By for instance arguing that the opposite of something is bad, that something must logically be good.

Both specific and general types of topoi are embedded in a certain cultural and temporal context, meaning that they are, unlike principles of logic, effective only if their principles are broadly accepted as legitimate at the given time and in the given cultural context (Perelman, 2005). This means that some of the general topoi listed by Aristotle almost 2,400 years ago no longer function today, while others are still seen as legitimate principles of argumentation. In the following, I will as analytical tools draw on a catalogue of general topoi developed by Aristotle, while leaning on how more contemporary rhetorical theorists have applied as well as added to them (Gabrielsen, 2008 and 2009; Black, 1979; Gabrielsen and Christiansen, 2010). When analyzing the speeches for specific topoi, I will not be drawing on a distinct catalogue because the number of available specific topoi to choose from when arguing a case is in principle infinite. So I will let the speeches ‘speak for themselves’ and pinpoint and systematize recurring themes. This reflects my abductive methodological approach, as theory and speeches in this way inform each other. I make sense of the speeches by letting key concepts from the speeches form the centre of analysis (Jasinski, 2001: 256), but the interpretive identification of those concepts is influenced by the chosen theories of the topics and neo-Gramscianism. The result is not an exhausted analysis, bringing forward a full list of all topoi – specific and general – but a qualitative representation and systematization of the strongest recurring themes, together representing the key characteristics of the created 2nd persona.
CHAPTER 5
SPEECH ANALYSIS

I will start the analysis by bringing out the dominating specific topoi from the speeches, analyzing the perspectives chosen by Annan to articulate the issues and argue in favor of the Global Compact. Through the specific topoi, Annan influences what the audience sees and what he wants them to become; the 2nd persona. Once I have pinpointed and systematized recurring topoi across the five speeches, I develop the analysis further with an exploration of how those specific topoi are put to use through argumentation; general topoi. This two-step analysis will uncover the 2nd persona in the discourse; ultimately, opening a door to the underlying ideology held by Annan. For, drawing on Black (1970), 2nd persona and, hence, ideology is located in content (specific topoi) and surfaces in style (general topoi).

Specific topoi

Global market
As I will show in the following, most of Annan’s arguments draw upon a fundamental frame of reference; namely, a global market. In fact, the global market is the prevailing perspective, or specific topos, chosen by Annan to support the proposal of joining the Global Compact. Annan refers to the phenomenon of a global market (in the analysis of general topoi I will return to how he defines the concept) and then takes its existence for granted throughout his argumentation. He calls upon the participation of business in the Global Compact by anchoring it in a quest to save a threatened global market. “...if we do not act, there may be a threat to the open global market...” (Annan, 1999: 42). I unfold the topos of the global market in the following.

Global market is fragile
In his introductory 1999 speech, Annan initiates the Global Compact and justifies it with reference to globalization. More specifically, to the fragility of globalization: “Globalization is a fact of life. But I believe we have underestimated its fragility” (Annan, 1999: 18). He argues that the economic success of the global market happens
quickly for social and political realms to adjust, creating imbalance between the developed and the developing world. Annan focuses the attention of his audience to those in the world who do not reap the benefits of the global market. Among these people it is a widespread perception that globalization is to blame for much of their hardship: “For far too many people in the world today, greater openness looms as a threat...” (Annan, 2001: 5). Many countries stand outside the doors of the global economy, so to speak, because they are too poor or too small to attract investment from the business world. If these countries are not invited into the community, they are more likely to collapse into conflict. This, as well as causing trouble for their neighboring countries in the regions, poses threats to global security and stability, Annan warns. In other words, “... the simple fact of the matter is this: if we cannot make globalization work for all, in the end it will work for none” (Annan, 2001: 27). So, together with the UN, business is invited to work to expand the perception that Annan presents as his own; namely, that globalization offers the best hopes of overcoming social issues.

Hand in hand with the threat of social imbalance, Annan also points to the global market being threatened by tendencies in the political realm. The global market expands with a speed that challenges political systems, nationally and internationally, to keep up. The result can be distrust in the benefits of an open market economy. From the outset, Annan underpins the urgency for business of such developments. “There is enormous pressure from various interest groups to load the trade regime and investment agreements with restrictions...” (Annan, 1999: 44), and restrictions will impose standards on the trade and investment regimes so important to the economic progress of the business environment. Annan proposes a way to secure standards without restrictions: “Instead, we should find a way to achieve our proclaimed standards by other means. And that is precisely what the compact I am proposing to you is meant to do” (Annan, 1999: 48).

**Solution: A human face will sustain the global market**

To his audience, Annan paints a picture of a global market that is deeply unsustainable, threatening the continuing progress of business. He urges business to help turn the social unbalance around, warning that restrictions are the alternative. The aim of the Global Compact is presented as putting a human face to the global market: “I propose that you, the business leaders gathered in Davos, and we, the United Nations, initiate a global compact of shared values and principles, which will give a human face to the global market” (Annan, 1999: 15). The task he presents as pressing is to embed the global market in a network of shared values, because without common values the global market is fragile. “And unless those [universal] values are really seen to be taking hold, I fear we may find it increasingly difficult to make a persuasive case for the open global market” (Annan, 1999: 96). Carrying out the task demands the active involvement of business: “...I proposed a Global Compact, inviting business leaders to
play their part in building the missing social infrastructure of the new global economy” (Annan, 2001: 40).

Responsibility meets necessity

When attempting to convince business to participate in building the missing social infrastructure of globalization, Annan primarily draws on economic perspectives, rooted in the overall topos of the global market. The aim of the Global Compact (to put a human face on the global market) is described as a necessity in terms of securing the economic self-interests of business, in that business cannot afford to be perceived as the problem.

Simultaneously, Annan draws on a perspective of social responsibility. In a world where wealth is so unequally distributed, international corporations, understood as the world’s truly global citizens, have an obligation to wield their power to include all in the economic progress of the global market, or so Annan argues: “You are the first truly global citizens, and only you can give meaning to that term through your actions and advocacy to ensure everyone, rich and poor alike, has the chance to benefit from globalization” (Annan, 2001: 135). Under general topoi, I will unfold more examples of this topos of responsibility in the speeches.

Thus, Annan’s argumentation is rooted continuously in both a topos of economic necessity and in one of social responsibility. This two-fold argumentative framework is very clearly expressed in the following quote:

In other words, the fragility of globalization that I have spoken about poses a direct challenge to the self-interest of the corporate sector, and a central part of the solution is the need for you to accept the obligations – not merely the opportunities – of global citizenship. (Annan, 2001: 128)

When returning to the argumentative framework under general topoi, I will show how Annan draws the seemingly incompatible topoi of economic necessity and social responsibility together under the thematic framework of the global market, by arguing that social prosperity is good for business.

Actors

The above analysis lists the main thematic perspectives in which Annan roots his argumentation. Rhetor is attempting to give rise to certain actions – actions that are expressed through the thematic perspectives – and actions must be performed by actors, so speeches will include actors as a part of content. The actors also represent specific topoi; Annan chooses which actors to mention. In the following, I list the actors to whom Annan assigns agency. I elaborate on the agency of each actor under general
topoi; drawing out, in the process, how they each contribute to and lend insights into the constructed 2nd persona.

**Business**

As I have already made clear, business is put on centre stage as the key audience and constructed persona. The audience focus is reflected continually throughout the speeches, both in the recurring subject of how business can contribute to the mission and by reserving the use of the term ‘you’ to business leaders. The focus of the story constructed by Annan is not the 1st persona (Annan himself), but the 2nd persona – business. Business is placed in a key position, both in terms of securing the very survival of the global order and in assigning a human face to it.

**United Nations**

The United Nations is, after business, the actor assigned most agency in the speeches. The overarching mission of the UN is to secure the common good: “It is a means for building a better world through reliance on universal principles...” (Annan, 2004: 172). Defining the UN as a ‘means’ here indicates that the UN is solely a tool. Although the UN is a tool that allows actors to work together, the agency of the UN is not limited to such a status, but given independent agency in the speeches. Annan opens the UN for closer partnerships with business, arguing that “… the goals of the United Nations and those of business can, indeed, be mutually supportive” (Annan, 1999: 12). A partnership proposition stands apart from the prior relationship, where the approach of the UN towards business was primarily marked by restrictions (Hummel, 2005; Rasche, 2012). The Global Compact is the proposed cornerstone for a partnership approach, creating a framework through which business and the UN can work together towards the goals of protecting and developing the global market. Shortly, I will elaborate thoroughly on which agency Annan assigns the UN and, more importantly, which insights this lends us into the persona offered to business.

**Governments**

Usually, social policy and the object of making globalization work for all is seen to be the responsibility of governments, also among business leaders (Annan, 2002). What is remarkable is how little agency Annan assigns governments throughout the speeches. Speaking at the WEF, the primary 2nd persona is business. It does not mean Annan takes agency away from government, because “…governments do indeed have a decisive role to play, in the months and years ahead, in determining whether globalization really is made to work for the poor…” (Annan, 2002: 129), but in the constructed discourse it is all about offering more agency to business. And to convince business to take on that agency, the mission is rooted in the survival of a prosperous global market. This helps make business believe that making globalization work for all
is, in fact, the business of business. To achieve this, Annan actually moves agency from governments to business, as I will return to under general topoi.

**Civil society organizations**

Just like governments, civil society organizations seem a more obvious candidate than business to make globalization work for all. And Annan does in some places explicitly address that part of the audience, but in most cases addressing business at the same time, too. Like governments, civil society organizations are in no way the primary recipient of agency in the speeches. Rather, they are first and foremost called upon to support the partnership-approach Annan initiates between the UN and business through the argument that engaging with the private sector is not an option, it is an imperative (Annan, 2001). This is a key argument that I will return to later.

**The population of the developing world**

Within the topos of a mission to build a human face to the global market, the poor populations of the developing countries stand to benefit. A socially sustainable global market will improve the conditions of those that are currently standing outside the doors of globalization. In the constructed discourse, the poor are primarily described in opposition to the rich and powerful; the business leaders in particular.

This rounds up the analysis at the level of specific topoi. The chapter has brought out the dominating perspectives, including actors, chosen by Annan to argue in favor of a new relationship between the UN and business. The perspectives have been presented very briefly, as the next chapter explores each of them further, showing how they are put to use in argumentation
General topoi

In the first level of analysis – specific topoi – the content across the five speeches was systematized, making clear the different perspectives used by Annan to articulate the Global Compact and the role of business. In the following, I add another level to the analysis by exploring how those perspectives are put to use through argumentation; general topoi. For, as Black (1970) argues, the 2nd persona is located in content, but most often comes to life in form and style. In the following, then, I unfold the specific topoi listed in the previous chapter, analyzing how they are each represented through general topoi and how they relate to each other in the constructed argumentative structure. The exploration follows the structure of the specific topoi analysis, unfolding under the same subheadings.

Global market

As I have made clear, Annan refers to the global market as an overarching topos, to which most of his arguments relate. The project of the Global Compact is presented to be a project of securing the prosperity of the global market. Let me first touch upon how Annan defines the phenomenon of a global market, then sketch how the global market forms the overall framework for the argumentative structure that unfolds in the speeches.

Annan does not actually engage in defining the global market or making a direct presentation of its characteristics. The existence of a global market is presented matter-of-factly and its existence is, naturally, a prerequisite for anchoring the Global Compact in a topos of a fragile global market that needs protection. Some insights into Annan’s understanding of the concept of the global market do, however, surface through the terms he uses as synonyms. He uses terms like global order and global economy, but most noticeable is the way he uses the phenomenon of globalization almost synonymously with global market and uses it in variations of the same arguments. Even at the time of the first speech, the development towards globalization in itself was no longer questioned - “Globalization is a fact of life” (Annan, 1999: 18), and by almost equating global market with globalization, the former is conveyed to the audience as a phenomenon that should not be questioned.

So, the global market is presented as a fact of life. It is also presented as willingly constructed by ourselves: “[social imbalance] threatens to undermine and ultimately to unravel the open world economy that has been so painstakingly constructed over the course of the past half-century” (Annan, 1999: 30). The global market is indirectly defined as the very foundation of the global world that we wish to support and promote and its existence is presented as something positive. It is currently challenged, but if we succeed in the mission “…to underpin the new global economy […] we would lay the
foundation for an age of global prosperity...” (Annan, 1999: 29). This quote, in fact, expresses the key argument used to activate business in the partnership. The future prosperity of the global economy, or global market, is the key to prosperity for all - business communities and poor populations alike. Following this, supporting a healthy global market is pivotal. “...globalization, so far from being the cause of poverty and other social ills, offers the best hope of overcoming them” (Annan, 2002: 45). This starting point forms the overall framework for the argumentative structure that Annan unfolds throughout the speeches. The sketch below illustrates the framework as I interpret it, revealing an argument hierarchy expanding across all five speeches.

(Figure 2: Hierarchical structure of arguments)
In the following, I show how Annan constructs and unfolds the argumentative framework; analyzing each element in the structure and how they relate to each other.

To the purpose of analyzing each argumentative element, I will draw on a model developed by Stephen Toulmin to expose arguments to rhetorical analysis. Practical arguments consist of two types of premises; termed by Toulmin as data and warrant. Data is the factual premise and warrant is the principle that authorizes movement from the data to the claim (Gabrielsen, 2009: 155). The model, slightly simplified for the purpose, looks as so:

(Figure 3: The Toulmin model of argument)

In retrospect, Toulmin realized that his model could be seen as a rediscovery of the topics; the two premises serve two different but mutually supporting functions, which connect to the two types of topoi (Gabrielsen, 2008: 60). Specific topoi come to use in the construction of data, while general topoi are operationalized in the construction of warrant (Gabrielsen, 2009: 156). Compared to the topics, which allows critical analysis of the chosen perspectives (specific topoi) and of how the perspectives are put to use in argumentation, Toulmin’s model is simple. But it offers to make Annan’s arguments explicit, and it sheds light on which arguments Annan makes explicitly and which he takes for granted.

**Global market is fragile**

The overall topos lies in the argument that the prosperity of the global market is critical to a prosperous global world for all. In this topos Annan roots another topos; namely, that the global market is threatened and needs protection. It is threatened by social imbalance, on the one hand, and political pressure on the other.

**Social imbalance**

Looking first at the argument about social imbalance, the claim is that the global market is fragile, and the claim is rooted in a specific topos of social character; more specifically, the lack of social pillars in the global market. If the argument was to
stringently follow Toulmin’s model, the use of warrant would connect the data directly to the claim, resulting in an argument constructed like this:

However, the argument constructed by Annan is not so logically straightforward. His argument to support the claim looks something like this:

The expressed data and warrant, put together, do not fully support the claim, measured by Toulmin’s validity standards of practical argumentation. I would argue that this does not mean that Annan’s argument is poorly constructed. For Toulmin’s model was originally proposed for analyzing the validity of practical reasoning of formal character, and practical rhetorical argumentation does often not stringently follow formal reasoning. That being said, this particular argument (and many of the others, as I will show) comes quite close.

Rather than introducing a debate on whether or not Annan’s arguments are valid, the application of Toulmin’s model as a tool to place over the arguments shows - by my assessment - that Annan’s line of reasoning is strong by practical standards. In fact, multiple layers and nuances are general characteristics of Annan’s arguments in the structural framework, as will become evident as I unfold it. He brings many different data and warrants into play, developing and widening them in nuanced arguments.
In the case of the above argument about social pillars, Annan nuances and widens it because business does not necessarily accept the warrant ‘a global market that lacks social pillars will be fragile’ without further argumentation and explanation. Let me examine further how he solicits the audience to believe the relationship between social pillars and prosperity of the global market by examining how the warrant ‘if the global marked does not work for all, it works for none’ is constructed through the use of general topoi.

According to Annan, imbalance between economic and social realms (data) is a threat to the persistence of globalization (claim), as “…globalization would be only as sustainable as the social pillars on which it rested” (Annan, 2004: 15). For the line of reasoning to be convincing to business, such warrant must be developed. If the global market does not work for all, it is not sustainable, because the opposition against “The unequal distribution of benefits, and the imbalances in global rule-making, which characterize globalization today, inevitably will produce backlash and protectionism. And that, in turn, threatens to undermine and ultimately to unravel the open world economy …” (Annan, 2001: 28). Until all people have confidence in the global market, “…the global economy will be fragile and vulnerable – vulnerable to backlash from all the “isms” of our post-cold-war world: protectionism; populism; nationalism; ethnic chauvinism; fanatism; and terrorism” (Annan, 1999: 102). Here, Annan compares the future of the global market in its present form to the political threats of the 1990s. Annan warns that countries standing outside the doors of the global economy are more likely to collapse into conflict and threaten global security. He draws on September 11th as a very present example to support the claim (Annan, 2002; 2004), appealing to a sense of fear in his audience.

The message is clear: If we do not act to transform the global market, the very stability of the world is at risk. If we cannot make globalization work for all, in the end it will work for none (Annan, 2001: 27). This very argument is a general topos, setting the part in relation to the whole; if it works for some, it will work for all – if it works for all, it will work for some – if it does not work for all, it will not work for anyone (Aristotle, 2002: 174). The following warning uses the same pattern of argument: “We must understand that a threat to some is a threat to all, and needs to be addressed accordingly” (Annan, 2004: 165). In a world that is increasingly connected, unbalance and instability is difficult to confine, and the developed world, herein counting the business world, must concern itself with the problems faced by those who are not benefitting from an open economy in its present form. For, if the open economy does not work for them, it will not work for anyone, including business.

The urgency of the task is strongly presented through the continuous use of the loaded term ‘threat’. Annan illustrates the threat with a powerful metaphor; a general topos (Gabrielsen, 2009: 145). He places the world’s population aboard one small boat,
steering unstable waters, all hoping to survive. “If they are sick, all of us risk infection. And if they are angry, all of us can easily get hurt” (Annan, 2002: 29). This metaphor truly underpins the warrant that globalization works for all or none. And by metaphorically creating similarities (Lakoff and Johnson, 1980: 147ff) between the spread of instability to the spread of a disease, it becomes an urgent question of survival. Business must help prevent the outburst of the disease, which will, in turn, prevent the storm that the global market is heading into.

Metaphors, like that of the disease-infested boat, are strong general topoi and, and Annan uses them continually to construct his arguments. According to Black (1970: 115), metaphors represent obvious tokens of underlying ideology, and so more constructed metaphors will be subject to analysis in the rest of the chapter.

**Political pressure**
The second presented threat to the global market is political pressure. The argument is structured like this, almost following Toulmin’s steps of practical reasoning:

The warrant is not expressively argued, making the audience assume how Annan links the data to the claim. Letting them assume this reflects an expectation on the part of Annan that the audience will make the correct assumption; that they view the warrant as a fact. Such expectation ties to Hummel’s argument that is was an advantage of the Global Compact to be introduced in a time of substantive public pressure for political regulation (Hummel, 2005: 24, 26). When putting the specific topos of political pressure to use to argue the fragility of the global market, Anna operates within an existing liberal economic framework; understood in the sense, that in the business environment restrictions and standards are already logically perceived to limit latitude (Underhill, 2006: 7; Hummel, 2005: 9). As long as it serves the purpose of his own argument, there is no reason to argue what the audience already holds as true. For, the more something is argued, the more the audience is led to critically reflect on whether they actually agree with the arguments and, thus, the claim.
Both arguments – political pressure and lack of social pillars – support the same claim; that is, the global market is fragile. But, as shown, the two arguments differ in the nature of their warrants. The warrant of the argument of political pressure only exists implicit, while the warrant of the social pillar argument is explicitly argued for throughout the speeches. This expresses how the first argument operates within an existing logical framework that business adheres to, while the latter is an attempt to construct a new logical framework. The great weight assigned to making a compelling argument for this new framework is evident through all steps of the argumentative structure. The argument that the global market will not be sustained without social pillars is the one that Annan must truly bring business to believe. For only then will they believe that a human face is the solution. And only when they believe this, they will accept the offered 2nd persona and join the Global Compact.

**Solution: Human face will sustain the global market**

At this point in the argumentative structure, Annan has argued that, first of all, the prosperity of the global market is critical to a prosperous global world for all, including business. Secondly, the global market is threatened. Taking the first argument as a starting point, it follows naturally from the second argument that something must be done. The primary threat to the global market is presented to be the lack of social pillars, and the solution to this, logically, is to build those social pillars. They will form a solution to the second threat as well, because the second threat actually has a clear connection to the first threat. That is, the pressure for political restrictions – from governments and civil society – stems from an agenda to ensure that more people enjoy the benefits of the global economy: “For far too many people in the world today, greater openness looms as a threat [and governments] feel compelled to respond” (Annan, 2001: 5).

So, the task at hand is to construct a global market that works for all. Annan uses a number of terms about this missing ingredient in the global market. One is the mentioned ‘social pillars’, serving as a metaphor that directs the thoughts of the audience to the pillars holding buildings, bridges and other constructions (Lakoff and Johnson, 1980: 46). Without pillars, constructions will crash. But with strong pillars, a construction can withstand most pressure. Following such metaphor, the global market can not be sustained without the support of social pillars. The social element lacking in the construction of the global market is not something that can be added on top; rather, it is a crucial pillar that must form the very foundation. Another used term is ‘social infrastructure’, which is a similar metaphor. Without infrastructure, a system cannot be held together - the same goes for the global market.

Another recurring term, used synonymously with social pillars and social infrastructure, is ‘human face’. By using such a term, Annan almost personifies the
global market. Personifications “...allow us to make sense of phenomena in the world in human terms – terms that we can understand on the basis of our own motivations, goals, actions, and characteristics” (Lakoff and Johnson 1980: 34). The global market is not a phenomenon ‘out there’; it is something we can influence and relate to. He links a human face to solidarity and common values, “I propose [...] a global compact of shared values and principles, which will give a human face to the global market” (Annan, 1999: 15), and only a ‘human’ global market will work for all. From this indirectly follows that the audience, because they are human, are expected to act with solidarity in accordance with social principles.

A persuasion for the audience to believe and be something is expressed through the loaded terms Annan uses (Black, 1970), and human face as well as social pillars are examples of such terms. The terms form key elements of Annan’s arguments when he puts the specific topoi to use. Let me make it clear by putting the above explained line of reasoning into Toulmin’s model:

![Diagram]

In the above illustration, I have aided Annan by combining some of his arguments, which shows how he mixes metaphors together. When put into Toulmin’s model, the line of argumentation is clearly not valid. But, even if it does not make logical sense, it makes practical sense in the speeches. Across the speeches, he nuances and strengthens his arguments by bringing many warrants into play and continually linking them together in the argumentative structure.

At this point, it is clear that the story is constructed through an argumentative structure. As a first step, Annan argues that the global market is fragile due to lack of social pillars. If it does not work for all, it cannot be sustained. As a second step, this claim of fragility is then used as data (specific topos) to claim that a human face to the global market is necessary.

The argumentative structure continues, for Annan then connects the proposed Global Compact to the – at this point - established mission to put a human face to the global
market. As evident in the above 1999 quote (15), Annan presents the Global Compact as the very tool that will put a human face to the global market; the tool that will construct the social pillars. This argument builds on the other arguments in the structure by placing the claim from before as data in following line of reasoning:

Annan makes a strong analogy that supports the warrants in both above arguments; that is, the warrant that a human face is the solution and the warrant that the Global Compact offers to build that human face. He compares the task at hand to the social safety nets that were implemented to turn around the Great Depression. By making this analogy, he argues that a human face is the missing ingredient, just like it was in the 1930s: “In order to restore social harmony and political stability, they adopted social safety nets [...] That consensus made possible successive moves towards liberalization, which brought about the long post-war period of expansion“ (Annan, 1999: 24). This contradiction in terms is absolutely central to Annan’s arguments; in order to liberalize, social safety nets are necessary. Usually, liberalization is connected to lack of safety nets and standards. Connecting the post-war period of expansion to the safety nets of the 1930s strongly supports the argument that he is making to business 70 years later. In order to sustain the global market, we need to build social pillars. Annan terms the safety nets social, just like he argues that the pillars must be social. The analogy of the Great Depression put together with the post-war period of expansion is well-chosen. Something similar to the Great Depression is where we are currently headed if we do not take action. In the analogy, he even talks of social harmony and political stability – referring directly to the two argued threats to the global market; social imbalance and political pressure. However, if we do take action, we will head into a period of expansion. This direct comparison is made in the following quote:

Our challenge today is to devise a similar compact [as the social safety nets] on the global scale, to underpin the new global economy. If we succeed in that, we would lay the foundation for an age of global
prosperity, comparable to that enjoyed by the industrialized countries in the decades after the Second World War. (Annan, 1999: 29)

As evident in this quote, the analogy of the Great Depression also serves the purpose of supporting the argument that the Global Compact is the key to building a human face. Although not explicitly naming it, by social safety nets Annan refers to the New Deal. We need a similar compact on the global scale, holding the global market together by values, just like in national markets:

National markets are held together by shared values. In the face of economic transition and insecurity, people know that if the worst comes to the worst, they can rely on the expectation that certain minimum standards will prevail. But in the global market, people do not yet have that confidence. (Annan, 1999: 99)

The solution to creating the same confidence in the global market is the Global Compact. The Global Compact is what will take us to an age of global prosperity.

As well as serving as an analogy, the Great Depression functions as a topos of evidence; more specifically, a topos of experience (Gabrielsen and Christiansen, 2010: 82). Annan substantiates his argument by drawing on history - “History teaches us that such an imbalance between the economic, social and political realms can never be sustained for very long” (Annan, 1999: 20) – and it is hard to argue with the lessons learned by history. If the imbalance had great consequences in the 1930s, the current similar imbalance will bring great consequences today.

**Responsibility meets necessity**

At this point in the argumentative structure, Annan has argued that the Global Compact offers to build a human face to the global market, securing the very survival of the global market and forming the pillars for an age of global prosperity. The proposed Global Compact is thus legitimized, its existence even presented as a pivotal one. So, as such, the arguments could be rounded off here. Except for a key point: Why should business participate?

And so the argumentative structure develops further, arguing why business should get involved in building a human face through the Global Compact. The process of the argumentation builds on the offered 2nd persona and why business should accept it. The involvement of business is argued along two lines of reasoning; necessity and responsibility.
**Necessity**

When putting the specific topos of economic necessity to use in argumentation, Annan operates within an existing logical framework; namely, the logic of profit maximization— the idea that business is primarily concerned with bottom line and economic progress. This logical framework has also been drawn upon at earlier stages of the argumentative framework. In fact, the very choice of the global market as overall topos in which to invest his argumentation signifies that Annan operates within an existing liberal economic framework, assuming that business has an interest in sustaining an open market critical to maximize opportunity and economic prosperity. “...if we do not act, there may be a threat to the open global market, and especially to the multilateral trade regime” (Annan, 1999: 42), and a weakened trade regime will affect the possibilities of business.

The very argument that the global market is fragile lays the foundation for spurring the involvement of business, as we are likely to act to protect those things important to us, and “…the fragility of globalization that I have spoken about poses a direct challenge to the self-interest of the corporate sector…” (Annan, 2001: 128). Annan unfolds the economic logical framework further when trying to convince business that they must play a part instead of relying solely on other actors to solve the problem of lacking social pillars: “Business cannot afford to be seen as the problem. It must, working with government, and with all the other actors in society, be part of the solution” (Annan, 2002: 190). The term ‘afford’ refers to typical business terminology that the audience is likely to respond to. It implies that it is necessary for business to take on an active role, out of pure economic self-interest.

The boat metaphor mentioned earlier supports this topos of necessity. If the sick are not treated, the disease will spread to the entire boat, and business is on board too. So business must act to treat the sick, not for the sake of the sick, but out of self-interest. For if they are sick, all of us risk infection.

**Responsibility**

Annan also advocates the participation of business in building a human face by pointing to responsibility; it is simply the duty of international corporations to participate, he argues.

Let me bring out an example of argumentation that dramatically pinpoints a specific topos of social responsibility:

We have to choose between a global market driven only by calculations of short-term profit, and one which has a human face. Between a world which condemns a quarter of the human race to starvation and squalor, and one which offers everyone at least a chance of prosperity, in a healthy
environment. Between a selfish free-for-all in which we ignore the fate of the losers, and a future in which the strong and successful accept their responsibilities, showing global vision and leadership. (Annan, 1999: 116)

Annan uses an oppositional topos (Gabrielsen and Christiansen, 2010: 75; Aristotle, 2002: 177) to describe a choice between two worlds. One is selfish, driven by profit and marked by squalor; the other is a prosperous world with a human face, led with responsible visions. These two worlds are presented as the only two options; there are no alternative worlds for the audience to choose. If the audience accepts this general topos of choice between two options (Aristotle, 2002), they must consequently accept that option number two must be pursued: “I am sure you will make the right choice” (Annan, 1999: 122).

To influence business to make the right choice, Annan even gives them a direct role in option number two; as the successful, it is their responsibility to take on an active role in creating a global market with a human face. The use of loaded terms here accentuates the choice between a good and a bad world; a good and a bad role. Business can either choose to take on strong leadership that offers prosperity, or be selfish calculators that ignore and condemn the losers to squalor. The first choice offers prosperity for business as well, for following the second option will only be good for them in short-term calculations. The constructed 2nd persona is clearly identifiable and it is easy for the audience to understand what Annan would have them become (Black, 1970: 113); which agency he wants them to take on. Here, he directly offers business a role of strong actors who show global vision and leadership and argues that it is their responsibility to take on such a role.

Annan argues the responsibility of business by defining them as global leaders. TNCs are said to be truly global in their DNA and Annan identifies them as the standard-bearers of globalization; addressing the business leaders as “…leaders of profit-making enterprises, to be sure, but also as global citizens with enormous interests at stake” (Annan, 2004: 59). Enormous interests at stake in the global market mean that business must contribute. He argues that a role of global citizens comes with responsibilities, not just opportunities: “Many of you are big investors, employers and producers in dozens of different countries across the world. That power brings with it great opportunities – and great responsibilities” (Annan, 2001: 60). Making the link between power and responsibility, Annan alludes to a well-known argument, associated in our time especially with the Spiderman adaptation from 1962 (filmed in 2002), but originating from Luke 12:48: “…from the one who has been entrusted with much, much more will be asked.” The argument is so well-established in society that it is difficult to dismiss. If it is true, as Annan states matter-of-factly, that the business leaders attending the WEF are powerful – and this is also difficult to dismiss, for at least they are powerful in comparison with the less fortunate that Annan compares
them to – then they hold great responsibility. Annan then takes patent on what that responsibility involves and presents business with a way to take it on (signing on to the Global Compact), leaving no room for a discussion about the nature of the responsibility that comes with power.

It is decisive for the survival of the global market that business takes on responsibility as global citizens, but it is also the right thing to do. Annan flatters business by calling them the world’s first truly global citizens. They are the only ones capable of making a difference, and they hold the fate of everyone – rich and poor – in their hands. Such an influential position entails obligations. Within the specific topos of social responsibility, Annan addresses the business leaders’ sense of ethics, through argumentation that for example draws on topoi of opposites - a general topos that we have already seen examples of – and of comparison (Aristotle, 2002). He describes the lives of the rich compared to the lives of the poor, indicating that the huge divide between rich and poor is not ethical. The following rhetorical question (Gabrielsen and Christiansen, 2010: 157) is an example of a topos of comparison: “Try to imagine what globalization can possibly mean to […] the people of sub-Saharan Africa, who have less internet access than the inhabitants of the borough of Manhattan” and how can we possibly justify that the world today “… is tougher in protecting intellectual property rights than in protecting fundamental human rights?” (Annan, 2001: 21). The life that business leaders might take for granted is compared to that of the poor:

You all know that you are sharing this small planet with well over a billion people who are denied the very minimum requirements of human dignity and with four or five billion whose choices in life are narrow indeed compared to yours. (Annan, 2002: 22)

So, the earlier steps in the argumentative structure have deemed a human face necessary to secure the very survival of the global market and, thus, economic progress of business. From the above subsequent steps in the structure it follows that, in order to build that human face, business must take on a responsible role of global leaders, which means following the only feasible option that Annan presents; participation in the Global Compact. The argument that they must take on this role is rooted in both a topos of economic necessity and in one of social responsibility. “…I urged you, as a matter of enlightened self-interest as well as the common interest, to work with us to build and fortify those social pillars” (Annan, 2004: 21). Business might not have been aware of it before, but now that Annan has ‘enlightened’ them, they surely must realize that the construction of social pillars serves their own interests. Actually, the argumentative structure does not end here. For, in the story constructed by Annan, business’ self-interest and the common interest are not simply parallel to each other, they are intertwined. Let me show you how he constructs such a connection.
Responsibility and necessity combined: Social prosperity is good for business

As elaborated above, Annan brings together a topos of economic necessity and one of social responsibility in a two-fold argumentative framework. Traditionally, the common good and the economic prosperity of business are not perceived to be compatible topoi. Now, around the time of Annan’s speeches, the idea of CSR was really gaining a footing, as a reaction to the political pressure against liberal economic markets. Critics argued that business behavior directed by business interests is not sustainable behavior. CSR offered an opportunity to legitimize the global market by complementing it with social responsibility (Hummel, 2005: 24). Annan’s approach, in the speeches especially communicated through the responsibility topos, develops this idea further. Rather than drawing on the two topoi of responsibility and necessity as parallel frameworks, Annan combines the two by arguing that social prosperity is good for business:

Companies are learning that, as markets have gone global, so, too, must the concept and practice of corporate social responsibility. And they are discovering that doing the right thing, at the end of the day, is actually good for business. (Annan, 2001: 124)

Here, business is referred to in third person rather than in first person, as is otherwise the pattern in the speeches. By doing so, Annan indicates that many companies have already embarked on taking on global social responsibility. Drawing on a general topos of experience (Gabrielsen and Christiansen, 2010: 82), Annan supports his request by arguing that other companies are already doing the right thing. And since these other companies have discovered that it is good for business, the audience should get on board as well.

Social prosperity is not just good for business, it is economically necessary, he argues continually within the topos of the global market:

These broader social roles, of partner and advocate, may be relatively novel for the corporate world, but they can no longer be separated cleanly from the standard business model, nor can they be reduced to a question of philanthropy. (Annan, 2001: 122)

By mentioning philanthropy, Annan is targeting a widespread perception head on; that social responsibility is solely connected to philanthropy. Social responsibility is actually an integral part of the business model, or so Annan argues. Concerns for philanthropy might be novel for the corporate world, but business models are not. This argument, drawing on established business terminology, resembles an earlier mentioned quote;
that business cannot afford to be seen as the problem (Annan, 2002: 190). I return to the roles of advocate and partner shortly, under analysis of actors.

At this point, Annan has argued that business must participate in putting a human face to the global market, because it is, in fact, good for business. At an earlier step in the argumentative structure it was argued that the Global Compact is the tool that will build the human face and sustain the global market. When these two arguments are put together, it follows that business must participate in the Global Compact. For the Global Compact offers a framework where necessity and responsibility come together: “I was looking for something that would strengthen the economic openness that business needs to succeed, while also creating the opportunities that people need to build better lives” (Annan, 2004: 29). The concluding part of the argumentative structure, put into Toulmin’s model, looks something like this:
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This argument embraces both the topos of economic necessity and the topos of social responsibility, as they have been combined through the argument that social prosperity is good for business. Annan does not engage in arguing the truth of this final warrant, as he perceives it as a fact within an existing logical framework of profit-maximization.

So, this rounds the argumentative structure off. The key argument of the speeches has at this point been thoroughly argued and legitimized; business should participate in the Global Compact. The argument has been consistently developed within a global market framework, constituting an overall topos that the chosen topoi all relate to.

Annan has brought forward a long list of arguments, all tied together in the argumentative framework. Emanating from the arguments – through content (specific topoi) and style (general topoi) - is a 2nd persona (Black, 1970). What should the 2nd persona who agrees with these arguments do next? Which agency should they take on? I will approach the answer to this by investigating further the actors mentioned in the speeches. This exercise lends deeper insight into the constructed 2nd persona.
Actors

Under specific topoi, I listed the different actors that Annan mentions in the speeches. Let me now go further in depth with the actors, characterizing what agency Annan assigns them and how. All the actors included in the speeches are assigned varying degrees of agency, but this does not mean that they are all part of the 2nd persona. The constructed 2nd persona is offered to business, and the agency assigned to business is the agency I seek to explore. However, I believe that the 2nd persona is visible not only in the agency assigned directly to business, but also through the agency (or lack thereof) assigned to the other actors. Black does not explore the characteristics of 2nd persona as reflected through relations with other actors. So, as a tool to bring in this perspective, I will draw on a model called the actantial model.

Before introducing the actantial model, let me first make a practical note about my approach to the actor analysis. Where the first part of the general topoi analysis focused on analysis of arguments in a logical manner and rested on a structural approach, the coming part of the analysis focuses more on style and narrative grips. Like I drew on Toulmin's model in the above, I also apply a tool to systematize and concretize the actor analysis; the actantial model.

The actantial model was developed by Algirdas J. Greimas as a tool used to analyze the action that takes place in a story by identifying six roles, or actants. The model was originally developed for analysis of fairy tales and the like, but it is useful in systematizing who Annan assigns which roles. The six actants proposed by the model are (with examples): (1) The subject (the prince) who wants to be joined to (2) an object (the princess). (3) The sender (the father of the princess) is who or what instigates the action, while the (4) receiver (the princess/the prince) is who benefits from it. Lastly, (5) a helper (the magic sword) helps to accomplish the action, while (6) an opponent (the witch) hinders it (Hébert, 2006).

(Figure 4: The actantial model)
By viewing the actors mentioned in the speeches in light of the model, I have an analytical tool for specifying the constructed 2nd persona through the agency ascribed to this persona and other actors appearing in the speeches. It is not necessarily possible to fill all the roles in the model, nor is it necessary for the present purpose. In fact, as the motivation for using the model is not to fill the actant roles, but to use it as a tool to analyze the constructed persona, I will not apply it as a structural framework for analysis. Instead, I turn to the actors put forward under specific topoi one after the other, drawing on, but not limiting my analysis to, the model. Such a structure also makes sense because one actor can occupy more than one actant position in the discursively constructed story (Hébert, 2006). Let me, however, begin by illuminating the object.

**Object**

In a fairytale, the main character is usually on a mission. In the speeches, Annan invites business to join the UN on a mission to put a human face to the global market by joining the Global Compact. Thus, the object of the mission is to build the human face. But there are more levels to the object of the mission. As I have shown, Annan roots that mission in topoi of necessity to protect the fragile global market, on the one hand, and social responsibility for the common good, on the other. It follows from the first topos that the object of the mission is to sustain the global market. It follows from the second that the object is to make globalization work for all. Annan then combines these two, as previously shown, by arguing that socially responsible action is good for business. In sum, the overall object is to put a human face to the global market and secure the future prosperity of business.

**Business**

Throughout the analysis, I have focused on the agency offered to business. The purpose of also including the role of business at this point in the analysis is to shed further light on the offered role by analyzing it in terms of its actant role vis-à-vis the other mentioned actors.

Business is the subject, or the hero, of the story, presented as primary agent and 2nd persona. In the speeches, business is offered agency along two overall lines. One is to take on a role of advocating for standards; the other is to take action in the corporate sphere. Annan (2001) refers to them as roles of advocate and partner. The role of advocate includes wielding the power of business to influence the policy arena to advance standards: “In many countries, the voice of business leaders plays a very important role in molding the climate of opinion in which governments take their decisions” (Annan, 2002: 127). The role of partner entails that business must take initiative in improving their own corporate practices, by signing on to the principles of the Global Compact: “Specifically, I asked you to embrace and enact, within your own
firms, nine core principles derived from universally accepted agreements on human rights, labour standards and the environment” (Annan, 2001: 45).

Thus, business is primarily placed in a role of subject in the story constructed by Annan. As is often the case in stories (Hébert, 2006), the subject doubles as the receiver once the mission has been fulfilled. By setting the future prosperity of business forth as the object of the mission, as a consequence, business is also offered an actant role of receiver, since advancing a human face to the global market is argued to be good for business. If Annan has exclusively rooted his arguments in a topos of social responsibility, business would not be offered an actant role of receiver. By linking social prosperity to business prosperity, business is motivated by a wish to be receivers. The two roles are connected; in order to continue to be the receiver of the benefits of an open and prosperous global market, business must take on the role of subject.

United Nations

The UN is the secondary actor in the constructed story. The presented role of the UN vis-à-vis business tells much about the 2nd persona.

The mission of the UN is to secure the common good (Annan, 2004). Annan invites business to join the UN on that mission: “... I asked you, the world’s business leaders, to join the United Nations on a journey” (Annan, 2004: 4). Travel metaphors like the one used here imply a certain path to travel, leading in a certain direction to a set goal (Lakoff and Johnson, 1980: 90). The Global Compact marks a path for business to travel, together with the UN.

As mentioned, the course of Annan, and the introduction of the Global Compact especially, breaks with an earlier code-of-conduct approach. Annan’s project, into which his speeches at the WEF feed, has been to open up the UN to closer partnerships, including with business (Hummel, 2005: 13): “To carry out such tasks, we must engage, not only with Governments, but with all the new actors on the international scene [...] it is why I launched the Global Compact...” (Annan, 2006: 122). Drawing on the actantial model, Annan moves the business-UN relationship from a subject-opponent relationship, where the UN restricts action, to a subject-helper relationship. Offering to engage with business as an ally rather than a restrictive opponent, Annan redefines the perspective of the UN towards business.

The UN and business continuously shift between roles of subject and helper, and the lines between the two roles are not clearly marked. Annan paints a picture of a mutually-dependent relationship:

I made the point that the everyday work of the United Nations [...] helps to expand opportunities for business around the world. And I stated quite
frankly that, without your know-how and your resources, many of the objectives of the United Nations would remain elusive. (Annan, 1999: 4)

The object of the UN is to secure the common good, and on this mission the UN is put in a role of subject who needs the help of business, as advocate and partner. In order to obtain that help, then, Annan roots the story in a dominating topos of the global market, making the second object a strong global market, and, subsequently, making business the subject of that mission by arguing that responsibility meets necessity as the common good is also in the self-interest of business. And to reach this second object, business needs the help of the UN, or so Annan constructs the story.

This shifting subject-helper role distribution is reflected in the direct use of the word 'help'. In some places the UN helps business; in other places business helps the UN. An example of each: “... I offered you the help of the appropriate United Nations agencies” (Annan, 2001: 48), and “We also need your help in efforts to manage threats to peace and security...” (Annan, 2004: 130).

Annan argues in favor of the mutually-dependent relationship by applying a general topos of reciprocity: “That, ladies and gentlemen, is what I am asking of you. But what, you may be asking yourselves, am I offering in exchange? Indeed, I believe the United Nations system does have something to offer” (Annan, 1999: 78). But generally, arguments of reciprocity are rendered unnecessary because the constructed argumentative framework and nuanced topoi portray the interests of business to go hand in hand with the interests of the UN and the common good.

As part of the new partnership approach, Annan calls on business to play an active part in building a better world of universal principles; a responsibility that has otherwise been UN territory:

Without your active commitment and support, there is a danger that universal values will remain little more than fine words – documents whose anniversaries we can celebrate and make speeches about, but with limited impact on the lives of ordinary people.” (Annan, 1999: 93)

This is an interesting quote because it can actually be read as a referral to the limits of the UN system. The UN is the dominating author of documents stating universal values, such as the 1948 Universal Declaration of Human Rights, and by saying that without the support of business these documents have limited effect, Annan invites business into an area of significant global importance and responsibility that the UN cannot, it seems, manage alone. In fact, the quote can be perceived as a slight criticism of the UN system, indicating that within the auspices of the UN, documents are celebrated for their mere existence, not for their actual contribution to those in need.
Taking this perception further, Annan in some places describes the UN as being under serious strain: “...the role of the United Nations itself, the efficacy of its Charter, and the system of collective security are now under serious strain” (Annan, 2004: 72). Following such description, the constructed role of the UN to a certain extent reflects characteristics of an object. By engaging in partnerships, business can help secure the survival of the whole UN system.

**Global Compact**

The Global Compact is, naturally, not mentioned as an actor under specific topoi, but, viewed in light of the actantial model, it plays an actant role in the constructed story. I have shown how Annan roots the aim and purpose of the Global Compact in a topos of the global market, further rooting the call for involvement of business in topoi of necessity and responsibility. The Global Compact is not an actor in itself, but is presented as the framework in which the object-helper relationship between business and the UN can play out. So, it is a facilitator for the mission to succeed, filling a helper or sender position in the actantial model.

The articulation about the Global Compact stands in sharp contrast to the earlier code-of-conduct approach by the UN. In fact, there are examples where Annan explicitly dissociates the Compact from earlier practice: “The Compact is not a regulatory regime or a code of conduct, but a platform for learning and sharing lessons about what works and what doesn’t” (Annan, 2001: 56) and “And I called for a compact – not a contract; not a code of conduct; not a set of regulations, or new system of monitoring, but a concrete expression of global citizenship” (Annan, 2004: 27). Using this oppositional topos (Gabrielsen and Christiansen, 2010: 75) helps define the Global Compact through what it is not. In the eyes of business, code of conduct restricts actions (Underhill, 2006: 7; Hummel, 2005: 9) and so, following the oppositional topos, the Global Compact must be good news.

The Global Compact is not a policy initiative to restrict business; it is a forum for partnership from which both parties benefit. “The object of the exercise is to find a credible and convincing collective answer to the challenges of our time” (Annan, 2004: 151). Where code of conduct was a framework related to the prior restrictive role of the UN as opponent, the Global Compact is a framework for the new partnership approach. The name itself – Global Compact – exudes partnership over domination, as a compact is a pact made between two parties who both gain from the agreement. Annan himself does not explicitly express what he reads into the term compact, but the following explanation hints at it: “I believe what I am proposing to you is a genuine compact, because neither side can succeed without the other” (Annan, 1999: 92). The partnership approach – or ideology, to draw a line to Black - is recurrently expressed through terms such as ‘partnership’, ‘cooperation’ and ‘allies’.
Governments

It is interesting to see how little agency Annan assigns governments throughout the speeches. By assigning governments limited agency in securing the survival of a prosperous global market, he tries to convince business that they need to take on more agency:

But more and more business leaders are realizing that they do not have to wait for governments to do the right thing, and indeed they cannot afford to. In many cases, governments only find the courage and resources to do the right thing when business takes the lead. (Annan, 2002: 60)

As already showed, the 2nd persona must take on a role of advocate. The need to influence governments reflects how governments, to a certain extent, are given an actant role of opponent. This goes both for the object of putting a human face to the global market and securing the future prosperity of business.

In terms of the mission to put a human face to the global market, “...Governments should not be allowed to hide behind the shield of sovereignty to brutalize their own people. Being rightly called crimes against humanity, they demand a collective response from humanity, which should be organized and legitimized by the United Nations” (Annan, 2006: 132). Instead of forming obstacles for the mission to overcome, governments should take on a global, not just national, responsibility:

To succeed in that mission, however, political leaders need to develop a deeper awareness of their dual role. Each government has responsibilities towards its own society. At the same time, governments are, collectively, the custodians of our common life on this planet. (Annan, 2004: 178)

In terms of the mission to secure the future prosperity of business, governments are to a certain extent placed as opponents through the growing political pressure for restrictions on the business sector; pressure stemming from the populations for whom the global market is a threat.

Business is invited to play an active part influencing governments in the mission to secure both objects. For the mission of social prosperity, business is given a helper position to the UN, urged to influence governments to become active senders, to stay within the terminology of the actantial model: “You can encourage States to give us, the multilateral institutions of which they are all members, the resources and the authority to do our job” (Annan, 1999: 51). Likewise, for the mission to secure the future prosperity of business, the 2nd persona Annan offers can influence governments to move from a role of restrictive opponent to a role of sender, setting in place standards and regimes that favor business.
Governments are asked to support the offer of increased agency to business. Annan encourages governments to leave behind a role of opponent to business and instead take on a role of helper. The request is very clear in the following quote:

In 1999, when I came here and called for a “global compact” between the United Nations and the private sector, many of my colleagues in the Secretariat – and many representatives of Member States – would hardly have been more shocked if I had proposed a contract with the Devil. It is that mindset that I have been seeking to change throughout my time in office – the mindset that sees international relations as nothing more than relations between States, and the United Nations as little more than a trade union for Governments. (Annan, 2006: 13)

Here, it is clear that the Global Compact is the cornerstone in a broader transformative mission, opening the UN to partnerships with business. The narrative that Annan constructs in this quote draws on a good-against-evil typology that most would probably agree is too extreme and one-sided to describe business. Exactly because it is so obviously too extreme to define business as the Devil, governments are led to reflect on whether that is really how they view business and whether their view on international relations is similarly one-sided.

**Civil society organizations**

Like governments, civil society organizations are given limited agency in the speeches. They are first and foremost called upon to support the partnership-approach Annan initiates between the UN and business:

And I hope equally that those of you from civil society organizations who have criticized the Compact will come to understand that for us at the United Nations, engaging with the private sector is not an option. It is an imperative. (Annan, 2001: 85)

The choice of the word ‘imperative’ is interesting. Nowhere else in the speeches does Annan imply that the UN only engages in partnership with business because it is forced to, as he does in this quote. It can be interpreted as a wish to stay on good terms with civil society organizations, which are typically not overly business-friendly. At the same time, Annan does not open up for arguments on the matter. Like where he offers business a choice between two worlds (Annan, 1999: 116), Annan eliminates the option of any other alternative. If civil society organizations accept this argument, they must consequently accept to move away from a role of opponent to the Global Compact and its mission, and instead take on a role of helper or, at least, supporter.
In the places where Annan explicitly includes civil society organizations in his address, he primarily argues the overall need of the mission to put a human face to the global market. Civil society organizations are not directly addressed in the places where Annan offers concrete actions to carry out the mission; rather, their role is to accept the imperative status of the Global Compact. So, the constructed agency of civil society organizations remains minimally explored and, thus, remains much less active than that of the 2nd persona; business.

**The population of the developing world**

Within the topos of a mission to protect the global market, business is presented to be a receiver of the benefits that will follow, as I argue above. Naturally, the poor population of the developing countries is presented as another key receiver. They are primarily described in opposition to the rich and powerful; the business leaders in particular. As shown earlier, the perspective of the poor is used in general topoi of opposites and comparison (Annan, 2001: 25; 2002: 19; 1999: 116). In the constructed discourse, the poor are set mostly in a position of victims and are assigned a role of inactive receiver with no active agency. Thus, they are mentioned in order to motivate business leaders to take on responsibility.

In a way, this actor is also presented as an opponent to business, in that the poor are – indirectly – presented as a threat to the global market through the topos that the global market is fragile due to social imbalance. Until all people have confidence in the global market, it will be vulnerable (Annan, 1999: 103; Annan, 2004: 19), for, if some are sick, all will be infected, and if some are angry, all will be hurt (Annan, 2002). But instead of an opponent to fight, the poor populations are portrayed as an opponent to help (hence, the primary actant role of receiver), arguing that if they, too, can reap the benefits of the global market, we all can enter into an age of global prosperity. An age of prosperity like that of the post-war period, brought about by a similar consideration for the less fortunate, through social safety nets (Annan, 1999).

**The constructed 2nd persona**

To conclude the speech analysis, recall how Black argues that the implied persona contains clues as to what rhetor would have his audience become and how they should view the world. Annan offers more than clues and it figures very clearly what he would have business become; what role he wants them to take on. Sometimes, rhetorical discourse only offers a role indirectly, through the persuasion to believe something (Black, 1970: 119). Annan, however, offers a specific role for business to take on - it is not just a persuasion to believe something; it is a persuasion to be and do something. He urges business to accept the invitation through a nuanced and extensive structure of arguments.
The 2\textsuperscript{nd} persona constructed in a speech does not necessarily have to be assigned much agency, and one could easily image a 2\textsuperscript{nd} persona that does not have to take on an active role. In Annan’s speeches, however, business is encouraged to take on a very active role in building social pillars to the global market. Thus, in this case, the 2\textsuperscript{nd} persona has a lot of agency, described as being very powerful global citizens. And with great power comes great responsibility.

The following chapter discusses the offered agency and the constructed story brought out in the speech analysis as reflections of an underlying ideology and how it relates to neo-liberal globalization.
CHAPTER 6
DISCUSSION

In the following, I discuss the speech analysis in light of a neo-Gramscian approach to changes in world order presented in Chapter 1; more specifically, in light of a historical structure of neo-liberal globalization. According to neo-Gramscian thought, a historical structure is reconstructed and never simply given, on the one hand, and affects actions and understandings, on the other. I discuss the speeches in terms of their discursive and political influence on a current neo-liberal world order, but also in terms of how they themselves are influenced by that same order. The rhetorical analysis contributes with a new perspective in detail, showcasing a concrete example of how Annan, representing the UN as Secretary-General and front figure in its intellectual course, contributes to supporting and reconstructing neo-liberal globalization. In the following, I will gather the elements from the analysis and the theoretical and philosophical foundation to discuss this contribution. I will also touch upon what happens with the expressed role of the UN in the process of the speeches.

Let us briefly refresh the characteristics of the current hegemonic world order of neo-liberal globalization, as seen through the lenses of neo-Gramscianism. Neo-liberal globalization is characterized, in short, through the three constituting and interdependent forces as follows (Hummel, 2005: 6, 23):

*Material capabilities*: Globalized production. Business holds increasing control of production processes, meaning increasing power over material capabilities and increasing influence in a global world order.

*Ideas*: The prevalent collective image of social order is currently (in the developed world, at least) an ideology of privatization and liberalization.


Business might hold substantive power in terms of material capabilities, but if it is not embedded politically through institutions with a certain resemblance of universality, it will not be accepted in world society as a collective image of world order (Cox, 1981:...
Institutions play a key part in the constitution of historical structures. They support a historical structure as well as influence material capabilities and ideas, which then again reconstruct the very same structure. Within a historical structure characterized by global governance, the UN is, despite its nation-state DNA, a primary global governance institution. From its inception, it has been a forum for finding solutions to global problems exceeding the realm of nation-states. As mentioned in the presentation of neo-Gramscian theory, coherence between all three forces is necessary to secure a hegemonic world order; that is, a stable historic structure based on collective consent (Cox, 1981). So, the more a neo-liberal historical structure is reflected politically and through prevalent ideas, the more hegemonic it is. Following this, the support of the UN has substantial influence on the stability of the current world order of neo-liberal globalization, both in terms of political and discursive support (Hummel, 2005: 25). As well as supporting neo-liberal globalization politically, the UN can support and reconstruct the historical structure through influence on ideas about social order. I will unfold this in the following.

**Political support of neo-liberal globalization**

As mentioned, organic intellectuals are people who play a key part in organizing and supporting historical structures, performing intellectual and political leadership. This ties historical structures to agency. “...the relationship between the United Nations and Transnational Corporations is not structurally pre-determined, but dependent on agency within historical frameworks of action, including agency in order to change these structural frameworks” (Hummel, 2005: 27). Annan uses own agency as organic intellectual to change the relationship between the UN and TNCs, and the leadership role of Annan “... cannot be overestimated” (Hummel, 2005: 24). As stated several times, the inauguration of Annan marked a changed approach in the UN towards business. As we have seen in the analysis, Annan challenges the inter-national character of the UN. Instead of viewing business as the Devil (Annan, 2006: 16), the UN should begin to view them as allies. By opening the institution up to business, Annan supports the political forces that characterize neo-liberal globalization, moving from embedded liberalism of a Fordist historical structure to global governance. In the speeches, this shift in approach is clearly marked by how the Global Compact is defined in opposition to a code of conduct.

**Ideological contributions**

As mentioned in Chapter 3, the hegemony of neo-liberal globalization was challenged in the beginning and middle of the 1990s. The growing awareness in the business environment of the threats presented by pressure for corporate responsibility opened a window of opportunity for Annan to gain support for the Global Compact (Hummel, 2005: 24, 26). Opening the UN to business supports neo-liberal globalization politically, but Annan’s contribution to the hegemony of the existing historical
structure lies especially in the discursive influence; in ideas about social order. If neo-liberal globalization, and the global market with it, was not discursively re-legitimized in the 1990s, it would not be sustained. As Hummel states, “In order to be meaningful for reconstructing hegemony in a neo-Gramscian sense, the Global Compact should not only be judged for his political but also for his discursive effects in terms of restoring legitimacy to neo-liberal globalization” (Hummel, 2005: 25). By inviting social responsibility into business practice, the historical structure could be re-legitimized (Hummel, 2005).

This is the story Annan incorporates and builds upon in the speeches, and this is where the speech analysis brings valuable insights to the table. It shows in detail how Annan expresses and supports neo-liberal ideas, and also how he builds upon and reconstructs the ideas of the current world order. For the speeches reflect ideas about world order; or, as Black would frame it, express ideology. Let me elaborate on how Annan’s story expresses neo-liberal ideas and, at the same time, reconstructs them.

The very framework Annan creates around his constructed story – the protection of the global market – operates within and supports a neo-liberal ideology. In fact, the global market serves as a concept that materializes neo-liberal ideology, encompassing ideas of privatization, liberalization and globalized production. The mission that business must embark on alongside the UN is one necessary to secure the future of the global market; the future of a hegemonic neo-liberal world order. By rooting the speeches in the global market topos, Annan enrolls the constructed story under the ruling historical structure, offering business help in supporting the hegemony of the world order of liberalization.

Through the story Annan constructs in the speeches he does not only support neo-liberal globalization; he also reconstructs the idea upon which it rests. This is where the speech analysis goes a step further than the analysis by Hummel, showing how Annan not only supports but reconstruct the very discursive foundation of neo-liberal globalization. Let me explain.

**Reconstruction to encompass social responsibility**

The threats against the hegemony of neo-liberal globalization in the 1990s are directly leveraged in the speeches’ argumentative framework. The forces threatening a fragile global market are pointed out through topoi of political pressure for restrictions, on the one hand, and social pressure from developing countries, on the other. These topoi reflect directly the forces in society that were critically challenging the world order at the time of Annan’s first speech. In the story constructed across the speeches, a human face to the global market will support the hegemony of neo-liberal world order by legitimizing liberalization to those that are currently not reaping the benefits of globalization. In this way, it is argued that social responsibility can re-legitimize neo-
liberal ideology. The key to Annan’s discursive reconstruction of neo-liberalism, however, lies in how social responsibility is invited into the heart of neo-liberal ideology; in how social responsibility meets economic necessity. Annan does not simply present the threat of global social imbalance as an outer force that the historical structure – and business – must deal with in order to survive. Rather, social responsibility is presented as something that is actually good for business. Annan reconstructs the idea of liberalization at the heart of neo-liberal ideology by arguing that it is only possible hand in hand with social pillars. Not only because social pillars will guard against threats to hegemony by relegitimizing the ideology, but because social prosperity is actually good for business. The analogy of the Great Depression appears a key tool in this argument. Rather than following the traditional understanding of liberalization as a lack of standards and social safety nets, liberalization is portrayed as being dependent on safety nets. In this way, the speeches make social responsibility an integral part of neo-liberal ideology, reconstructing – seen through the lenses of neo-Gramscianism – neo-liberal globalization in the process. In this process of reconstructing the ideas of neo-liberal globalization, the Global Compact is not simply presented as a CSR tool that can relegitimize the global market, but as something that will make it stronger. Annan calls upon business to help relegitimize and sustain the existing world order by offering an active 2nd persona characterized by social responsibility.

Reconstruction supports neo-liberal globalization

So, the speeches to a certain extent reconstruct neo-liberal globalization by inviting social responsibility into the ideology. It is done by building on existing ideology as a starting point, not by rejecting it. However, Annan could also have made a break with the neo-liberal collective image of privatization and liberalization, especially seeing as it was under threat at the time of the first speeches. He could, as an organic intellectual, shape new ideas that break with existing ones and attempt to gain support for a counterhegemonic project. Instead, Annan promotes ideas that relegitimize and stabilize the existing hegemonic historical structure. Realizing that the UN now operates in a historical structure of neo-liberal globalization, he draws on existing neo-liberal collective ideas to argue the necessity of building a better world for all. One could say that a threatened neo-liberal ideology, in the speeches concretized as a fragile global market, functions as a tool for Annan to get business to direct their agency to change the relationship with the UN. For, operating within existing neo-liberal world order, Annan needs the support of those that hold power over material capabilities in order for his ideas to gain collective consent, because all three social forces are intertwined. If Annan is to succeed in his discursive reconstruction of a neo-liberal world order with social pillars, he needs to convince business to accept his ideas. “...Annan would probably not have succeeded without the strong support of the “organic intellectuals” of global business, most notably the leaders of the ICC and the
World Economic Forum” (Hummel, 2005: 24). By making the global market a foundation, Annan is building his offer of a 2nd persona upon common ground, so to speak. The offered 2nd persona does not threaten the self-perception of business, but builds on an existing profit-maximizing role, in the process seeking to reconstruct the collective idea of the role of business to incorporate social responsibility. This is evident in how the warrant ‘political restrictions threaten the global market’ is implicitly argued because it follows common ground, while weight throughout the argumentative structure is placed on arguing the truth of the warrant ‘a global market that lacks social pillars will be fragile’.

What is reconstructed?

So, Annan builds on neo-liberal globalization, leveraging it as a tool to reconstruct its collective ideas; bringing social pillars into neo-liberal ideology and conduct of business. Now, an interesting question is this: What or who is really reconstructed through Annan’s story? Can the current historical structure be reconstructed to embrace the social mission of the UN, or is the idea of the role of the UN actually what is reconstructed in the process?

Annan moves the UN from a role of opposing business to engaging in a subject-helper relationship. In terms of securing social prosperity, business is primarily called upon as a helper to the UN. In this relationship, the UN Annan portrays is true to its core mission. However, as portrayed in the analysis, in order to motivate business to take on a 2nd persona that incorporates social responsibility, Annan offers the UN as helper to business in securing the prosperity of the global market; in securing the sustained hegemony of neo-liberal globalization. By taking neo-liberal ideology as a starting point, Annan accepts the relative superiority of a business environment that dominates world order through their power over material capabilities. And while the speeches might succeed in getting business to accept a collective image of socially responsible liberalization – and sign on to the Global Compact – the social mission of the UN might be watered down in the process of the constructed story. Throughout the speeches, Annan is quite clear about the fact that he seeks to change - or reconstruct, if you will – the UN (Annan, 2006). In a current world order marked by global governance, Annan declares an intention to expand the UN beyond relations between states; to take on the dominating political force of global governance, in neo-Gramscian terms. In his concluding speech, Annan states that the UN “...must engage, not only with Governments, but with all the new actors on the international scene” (Annan, 2006: 103), because only then can the UN “...fulfill its vocation and be of use to humanity in the twenty-first century” (Annan, 2006: 22). He speaks openly of a crisis of the UN; that the institution in its present construction and its documents about universal values are no longer adequately fit to make a real difference in the lives of ordinary people (Annan, 1999; 2004). Without the commitment of business, the future of the
developing countries, but also the future of the UN, is deemed uncertain. By putting the
UN in a role of object in such a way, Annan offers agency to business by taking agency
away from the UN, both directly and indirectly. By indirectly I refer to the limited
agency given to governments in the speeches. The offered 2nd persona is encouraged to
take on responsibility because government action is not probable. From this
assessment indirectly follows that the power of the UN, qua its member-state
construction, is somewhat undermined. The power to influence government action is
even placed in the hands of business (Annan, 1999), and, in the process, so is the fate of
the UN to some extent.

While this story and distribution of roles might be necessary to gain the support of
business, one can wonder if the ideology reflected through the 2nd persona takes on
neo-liberal ideology to such an extent that it holds the project of social responsibility
and the Global Compact prisoner to the ruling historical structure of neo-liberal
globalization.

It could be argued that the success of globally incorporating the expressed idea of social
responsibility into the ruling ideology is more important than concerns about the role
of the UN in the project. As long as Annan’s attempts at reconstructing neo-liberal
globalization are successful, the responsibility for establishing the social pillars of the
world order can just as well be taken up by business. Except, business is by virtue of
profit-driving DNA primarily concerned with business opportunities. An acceptance of
this DNA is reflected in the 2nd persona as taking on social responsibility for the reason
that it is good for business. So even though business might sign on to the idea of a
Global Compact, they might not sign on to the more fundamental reconstruction of
neo-liberal ideas. Therefore, the attempt to gain support for the idea of social
responsibility by rooting it in neo-liberal ideology might compromise the idea itself in
the process. While Annan can use neo-liberal globalization as a tool to gain support for
ideas about social responsibility, the very same historical structure sets frameworks
that constrain the extent to which Annan is able to change the dominating neo-liberal
collective image of social order. In the speeches, Annan directly refers to the
constraints imposed by neo-liberal globalization by stating that the UN has to engage
with business - it is an imperative, not an option (Annan, 2001: 85). By enrolling his
offered 2nd persona in existing neo-liberal ideology, he is accepting the characteristics
of this ideology. In fact, Annan is not just accepting the neo-liberal historical structure.
He is, qua his role as organic intellectual representing a major global institution,
supporting and relegitimizing it politically.

To sum up, Annan’s speeches exemplify how reconstruction of the collective image of
neo-liberal globalization to encompass social responsibility may be carried out by an
organic intellectual. The constructed idea of social responsibility is not presented in
opposition to neo-liberal ideas of liberalization and free markets, but builds on them. In order to get business to support the reconstructed neo-liberal idea, Annan constructs a 2nd persona that is rooted in existing neo-liberal ideology, concerned with the prosperity of the global market.

In the process of reconstructing the prevalent ideology, Annan deems the future of the UN dependent on partnerships with business. By doing this – to some extent reconstructing the idea of the UN from inter-governmental to global governance – Annan supports the political force of neo-liberal world order, strengthening existing hegemony. So, by placing the constructed story under a neo-liberal framework of a global market, the 2nd persona supports the hegemony of the existing historical structure, both discursively and politically. For “A hegemonic world order has to be based on the control of political institutions as well as the control of material production and the achievement of a prevailing world view” (Hummel, 2005: 5).

As I have discussed, the speeches are a concrete example lending insights into the nature of historical structures as both subject to constant change and as setting a framework for actions and understandings. While the historical structure of neo-liberal globalization is subject to reconstruction through Annan’s speeches, the structure sets constraints for the story and 2nd persona that is constructed. I would argue that most of all, the offered 2nd persona expresses political and discursive support of the existing role of business in neo-liberal globalization.
CHAPTER 7
CONCLUSION

The project of the thesis has been to explore a micro-perspective on the construction of world orders. The applied neo-Gramscian theoretical perspective on international relations has provided an understanding of world orders as historical structures that are constantly reconstructed and at the same time set frameworks for understandings and actions taking place within the given historical structure. The thesis has assumed a current world order of neo-liberal globalization and has brought forward a speech analysis that operationalizes the nature of a neo-liberal world order, showing in practice how it can be reconstructed and how it can set constraints for actions and understanding.

Within this theoretical framework, the thesis has, inspired by existing literature (Hummel, 2005; Rasche, 2012), found its area of research in relation to the UN Global Compact. Kofi Annan’s Global Compact initiative marks a change in approach on behalf of the UN towards business, from code of conduct to collaboration. Drawing on neo-Gramscianism, the UN is a primary contributor in terms of maintaining and constructing world orders, especially through intellectual contributions. The thesis explores such contribution in a micro-perspective; through analysis of how Annan, as an organic intellectual representing a major global institution, articulates the new relationship between the UN and business in speeches addressed to business at the WEF. The exploration of Annan’s speeches serves as concrete insight into the construction of world order in practice, by asking the research question:

How do the speeches held by Kofi Annan at the World Economic Forum relate to a world order of neo-liberal globalization?

This research question has been approached by illuminating how the story Annan constructs across the five speeches can be understood as supporting and/or reconstructing neo-liberal world order; by illuminating who creates who. This, in turn, has been approached by analyzing the ideology that emerges through the speeches, and discussing this ideology in relation to neo-liberal ideology. The ideology expressed in
the speeches has been brought forward by applying Black’s analytical framework of 2nd persona, aided by the topics.

The speech analysis has shown how Annan roots the proposal of the Global Compact in a quest to save a fragile global market. The global market is presented as pivotal in securing a future of global prosperity. In making the protection of a global market the focal point of the constructed 2nd persona, Annan accepts existing neo-liberal ideology and positions his story within it. He then argues, through a well-constructed argument hierarchy, that social responsibility should form integral pillars of the neo-liberal global market, and that the business world should take on active agency in building those pillars because it is good for business. So, the constructed idea of social responsibility is not presented in opposition to neo-liberal ideas of liberalization and free markets, but builds on them. The constructed story can be seen as a reconstruction of existing ideology by bringing in social responsibility, but the arguments for reconstruction still follow and support existing ideology. In search of support from those that hold the material capabilities in neo-liberal world order (business), Annan accepts that the UN and the Global Compact follow existing social forces of neo-liberal globalization; increased power of business, ideology of privatization and liberalization as well as global governance.

The speech analysis has formed a concrete insight into the nature of historical structures as both subject to constant change and as setting a framework for actions and understandings. While the historical structure of neo-liberal globalization is subject to reconstruction through Annan’s speeches, the constructed story and 2nd persona first and foremost seem to support the historical structure. I argue that most of all, the speeches’ underlying ideology – surfacing through offered 2nd persona – should be understood as a political and discursive support of hegemony of existing world order of neo-liberal globalization.

Contributions to the field and ideas for future research
The contribution of the thesis lies in showing an example of world order in practice; it shows how rhetoric can make world orders come to life. In this way, rhetorical analysis can contribute with a micro-perspective on international relations, constituting a window into the process of neo-liberal world order in practice. In line with adopted hermeneutic interpretivism as a philosophical and methodological stance, the findings of the analysis are situated. I have approached the speeches as set in a context, and at the same time I am as an interpreter also set in a context that influences outcomes. I work with a hypothesis that the speeches relate in some way to neo-liberal globalization, so neo-liberal globalization is what I am going to find. Different perspectives on the analysis could have yielded different outcomes. But the intention has not been to test neo-Gramscian theory or the existence of neo-liberal world order
through Annan’s speeches, nor to pass judgment on the speeches or on Annan’s approach to business. Instead, the interpretation of the speeches has been an end in itself, driven by an interest to understand how they relate to the world order that they operate within, in the process showing how the nature of world orders can come to life through rhetorical acts.

The project of the thesis is, naturally, taken from a broad and complex context. Like with all research, we are left with many questions that can not be addressed in this thesis. Some obvious ones in this case are: So, what happened with business – has the offered 2nd persona been accepted? And what happened with the UN – is it held hostage to neo-liberal agenda of business? Or has the Global Compact succeeded in building a human face to the global market? Although very relevant, these are all questions that are outside the scope of this thesis. They are, however, questions upon which the exercise of rhetorical analysis could shed some light, in a manner resembling the research strategy applied in this thesis. For example, to touch upon the second question, one could expand the use of speech analysis to paint a broader picture of how the UN expresses its role in the current world order. As mentioned in Chapter 2 (page 18) an analysis performed on the relatively narrow sample of five speeches does not allow broader conclusions about the role of the UN in world order. One reason is that speech analysis examines expressions of reality rather than reality itself, another reason is that Annan can not necessarily be seen as representing the whole UN system. But seeing as the Global Compact was introduced as part of a broader project to reform the UN, one could imagine that the initiative – and the story constructed around it – has set a benchmark and a value framework within the UN in terms of dealing with business. It would be very interesting to see how and if the change in approach towards business initiated by Annan is rhetorically manifested across a broader UN. Such exercise could for example form a gateway into revealing the legacy of Annan’s far-reaching reform of the UN in order to make the institution better equipped to engage with business in a global reality (Annan, 1997; paragraph 59). It would be a very large-scale project of rhetorical analysis, but it would certainly be a welcome one.
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Appendix 1. What is the Global Compact?

The United Nations Global Compact is a voluntary framework for companies, encouraging them to embrace, support and enact, within their sphere of influence, ten sustainable and socially responsible principles. The principles are in the areas of human rights, labor, environment and anti-corruption. The principles derive from various UN conventions and thus reflect a global consensus (Hummel, 2005: 14). With over 12,000 corporate participants and other stakeholders from over 145 countries, it is the largest voluntary corporate responsibility initiative in the world (UNGC). The Global Compact is not a monitoring system; therefore, it has established an accountability framework to protect its integrity. The initiative does not set extensive standards for reporting, but companies are required to annually report on their progress in implementing the ten principles.

The initiative is locally anchored, understood in the sense that participants are clustered in local networks where they share best practices in terms of how best to advance the principles in practice. Apart from acting in accordance with the Global Compact’s principles and objectives, local networks are self-governing (UNGC). The principles are defined in general terms as they, according to Rasche, “…provide a yardstick for the exchange of ideas and are not meant to be a benchmark against which to assess compliance” (Rasche, 2012: 44). The initiative does not set a fixed framework for action and standards, and so the individual companies can interpret the principles and also push local solutions upwards in the Global Compact system. In general, “Participants are not just on the receiving end of governance, but are empowered to actively shape the design and future functioning of the Compact” (Rasche, 2012: 38). The governance of the initiative itself is decentralized and based on multistakeholder collaboration, with business carrying the primary responsibility for implementation. Rather than setting codes of conduct for business to adhere to, the Global Compact is cooperative in nature, lacking sanctioning mechanisms (Hummel, 2005: 16) and relying on proactive behavior on the part of business (Rasche, 2012: 41).
### HUMAN RIGHTS
- **Principle 1**: Businesses should support and respect the protection of internationally proclaimed human rights; and
- **Principle 2**: make sure that they are not complicit in human rights abuses.

### LABOUR
- **Principle 3**: Businesses should uphold the freedom of association and the effective recognition of the right to collective bargaining;
- **Principle 4**: the elimination of all forms of forced and compulsory labour;
- **Principle 5**: the effective abolition of child labour; and
- **Principle 6**: the elimination of discrimination in respect of employment and occupation.

### ENVIRONMENT
- **Principle 7**: Businesses should support a precautionary approach to environmental challenges;
- **Principle 8**: undertake initiatives to promote greater environmental responsibility; and
- **Principle 9**: encourage the development and diffusion of environmentally friendly technologies.

### ANTI-CORRUPTION
- **Principle 10**: Businesses should work against corruption in all its forms, including extortion and bribery.

(Figure 5: The ten principles of the UN Global Compact)
Appendix 2. The five speeches
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1999

I am delighted to join you again at the World Economic Forum. This is my third visit in just over two years as Secretary-General of the United Nations.

On my previous visits, I told you of my hopes for a creative partnership between the United Nations and the private sector. I made the point that the everyday work of the United Nations -- whether in peacekeeping, setting technical standards, protecting intellectual property or providing much-needed assistance to developing countries -- helps to expand opportunities for business around the world. And I stated quite frankly that, without your know-how and your resources, many of the objectives of the United Nations would remain elusive.

Today, I am pleased to acknowledge that, in the past two years, our relationship has taken great strides. We have shown through cooperative ventures -- both at the policy level and on the ground -- that the goals of the United Nations and those of business can, indeed, be mutually supportive.

This year, I want to challenge you to join me in taking our relationship to a still higher level. I propose that you, the business leaders gathered in Davos, and we, the United Nations, initiate a global compact of shared values and principles, which will give a human face to the global market.

Globalization is a fact of life. But I believe we have underestimated its fragility. The problem is this. The spread of markets outpaces the ability of societies and their political systems to adjust to them, let alone to guide the course they take. History teaches us that such an imbalance between the economic, social and political realms can never be sustained for very long.

The industrialized countries learned that lesson in their bitter and costly encounter with the Great Depression. In order to restore social harmony and political stability, they adopted social safety nets and other measures, designed to limit economic volatility and compensate the victims of market failures. That consensus made possible successive moves towards liberalization, which brought about the long post-war period of expansion.
Our challenge today is to devise a similar compact on the global scale, to underpin the new global economy. If we succeed in that, we would lay the foundation for an age of global prosperity, comparable to that enjoyed by the industrialized countries in the decades after the Second World War. Specifically, I call on you -- individually through your firms, and collectively through your business associations -- to embrace, support and enact a set of core values in the areas of human rights, labour standards, and environmental practices.

Why those three? In the first place, because they are all areas where you, as businessmen and women, can make a real difference. Secondly, they are areas in which universal values have already been defined by international agreements, including the Universal Declaration, the International Labour Organization's Declaration on fundamental principles and rights at work, and the Rio Declaration of the United Nations Conference on Environment and Development in 1992. Finally, I choose these three areas because they are ones where I fear that, if we do not act, there may be a threat to the open global market, and especially to the multilateral trade regime.

There is enormous pressure from various interest groups to load the trade regime and investment agreements with restrictions aimed at preserving standards in the three areas I have just mentioned. These are legitimate concerns. But restrictions on trade and investment are not the right means to use when tackling them. Instead, we should find a way to achieve our proclaimed standards by other means. And that is precisely what the compact I am proposing to you is meant to do.

Essentially there are two ways we can do it. One is through the international policy arena. You can encourage States to give us, the multilateral institutions of which they are all members, the resources and the authority we need to do our job.

The United Nations as a whole promotes peace and development, which are prerequisites for successfully meeting social and environmental goals alike. And the International Labour Organization, the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights and the United Nations Environmental Programme strive to improve labour conditions, human rights and environmental quality. We hope, in the future, to count you as our allies in these endeavours.

The second way you can promote these values is by taking them directly, by taking action in your own corporate sphere. Many of you are big investors, employers and producers in dozens of different countries across the world. That power brings with it great opportunities -- and great responsibilities.

You can uphold human rights and decent labour and environmental standards directly, by your own conduct of your own business.
Indeed, you can use these universal values as the cement binding together your global corporations, since they are values people all over the world will recognize as their own. You can make sure that in your own corporate practices you uphold and respect human rights; and that you are not yourselves complicit in human rights abuses.

Don’t wait for every country to introduce laws protecting freedom of association and the right to collective bargaining. You can at least make sure your own employees, and those of your subcontractors, enjoy those rights. You can at least make sure that you yourselves are not employing under-age children or forced labour, either directly or indirectly. And you can make sure that, in your own hiring and firing policies, you do not discriminate on grounds of race, creed, gender or ethnic origin.

You can also support a precautionary approach to environmental challenges. You can undertake initiatives to promote greater environmental responsibility. And you can encourage the development and diffusion of environmentally friendly technologies.

That, ladies and gentlemen, is what I am asking of you. But what, you may be asking yourselves, am I offering in exchange? Indeed, I believe the United Nations system does have something to offer.

The United Nations agencies -- the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights, the International Labour Organization (ILO), the United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP) -- all stand ready to assist you, if you need help, in incorporating these agreed values and principles into your mission statements and corporate practices. And we are ready to facilitate a dialogue between you and other social groups, to help find viable solutions to the genuine concerns that they have raised. You may find it useful to interact with us through our newly created website, www.un.org/partners, which offers a "one-stop shop" for corporations interested in the United Nations. More important, perhaps, is what we can do in the political arena, to help make the case for and maintain an environment which favours trade and open markets.

I believe what I am proposing to you is a genuine compact, because neither side of it can succeed without the other. Without your active commitment and support, there is a danger that universal values will remain little more than fine words -- documents whose anniversaries we can celebrate and make speeches about, but with limited impact on the lives of ordinary people. And unless those values are really seen to be taking hold, I fear we may find it increasingly difficult to make a persuasive case for the open global market.

National markets are held together by shared values. In the face of economic transition and insecurity, people know that if the worst comes to the worst, they can rely on the
expectation that certain minimum standards will prevail. But in the global market, people do not yet have that confidence. Until they do have it, the global economy will be fragile and vulnerable -- vulnerable to backlash from all the "isms" of our post-cold-war world: protectionism; populism; nationalism; ethnic chauvinism; fanaticism; and terrorism.

What all those "isms" have in common is that they exploit the insecurity and misery of people who feel threatened or victimized by the global market. The more wretched and insecure people there are, the more those "isms" will continue to gain ground. What we have to do is find a way of embedding the global market in a network of shared values. I hope I have suggested some practical ways for us to set about doing just that.

Let us remember that the global markets and multilateral trading system we have today did not come about by accident. They are the result of enlightened policy choices made by governments since 1945. If we want to maintain them in the new century, all of us -- governments, corporations, non-governmental organizations, international organizations -- have to make the right choices now.

We have to choose between a global market driven only by calculations of short-term profit, and one which has a human face. Between a world which condemns a quarter of the human race to starvation and squalor, and one which offers everyone at least a chance of prosperity, in a healthy environment. Between a selfish free-for-all in which we ignore the fate of the losers, and a future in which the strong and successful accept their responsibilities, showing global vision and leadership.

I am sure you will make the right choice.
Let me begin by thanking our friend Klaus Schwab for his very kind introduction, and for inviting me to Davos again.

Two years ago I spoke here about the fragility of globalization. Some of you probably thought I was being too alarmist. For far too many people in the world today, greater openness looms as a threat -- a threat to their livelihoods, to their ways of life, and to the ability of their governments to serve and protect them. Even when it may be exaggerated or misplaced, “fear has big eyes,” in the words of the Russian proverb. And, we might add, it has the ear of governments, who feel compelled to respond.

But it is not the case that most people would wish to reverse globalization. It is that they aspire to a different and better kind than we have today.

That was the overriding message to come out of the United Nations Millennium Summit last September -- the largest gathering ever of Heads of State and Government. Its purpose was to take a fresh look at the core priorities for the United Nations in the new century. None was ranked higher than the need to make globalization work for all the world’s people.

You in this hall may take for granted that it can and will. But it is a much tougher sell out there, in a world where half of our fellow human beings struggle to survive on less than $2 a day; where less than 10 per cent of the global health research budget is aimed at the health problems afflicting 90 per cent of the world’s population.

Try to imagine what globalization can possibly mean to the half of humanity that has never made or received a telephone call; to the people of sub-Saharan Africa, who have less Internet access than the inhabitants of the borough of Manhattan.

And how do you explain, especially to our young people, why the global system of rules, at the dawn of the twenty-first century, is tougher in protecting intellectual property rights than in protecting fundamental human rights?

My friends, the simple fact of the matter is this: if we cannot make globalization work for all, in the end it will work for none. The unequal distribution of benefits, and the imbalances in global rule-making, which characterize globalization today, inevitably will produce backlash and protectionism. And that, in turn, threatens to undermine and ultimately to unravel the open world economy that has been so painstakingly constructed over the course of the past half-century.
At the Millennium Summit, our Heads of State and Government resolved to close these gaps -- in the case of income inequalities, to halve world poverty by 2015.

But the Summit also acknowledged that governments alone cannot achieve these aims. Accordingly, in their Millennium Declaration, the leaders endorsed the idea of strong partnerships with the private sector and with civil society organizations, working towards the shared goals of all humanity.

Indeed, we have been making good progress in promoting such partnerships. You may recall that two years ago, here at the World Economic Forum, I proposed a Global Compact, inviting business leaders to play their part in building the missing social infrastructure of the new global economy. Today I want to return to that theme, and take it further.

I asked business leaders not to wait for governments to impose new laws, but to take the initiative in improving their own corporate practices. Specifically, I asked you to embrace and enact, within your own firms, nine core principles derived from universally accepted agreements on human rights, labour standards and the environment. And I offered you the help of the appropriate United Nations agencies.

I am glad to say that many business leaders have responded positively. Equally important, they have recognized the value of working with civil society to achieve these goals.

So the Global Compact now includes not only leading companies from around the world, but also the International Confederation of Free Trade Unions, and a dozen or so leading voluntary agencies which are active in upholding human rights, protecting the environment and promoting development. They are working together to identify and promote good practices, and helping, thereby, to drive out bad ones. The Compact is not a regulatory regime or a code of conduct, but a platform for learning and sharing lessons about what works and what doesn’t.

Last July, representatives from all three sectors came to United Nations Headquarters. We agreed how to take the Compact forward and set a target of 1,000 major companies by 2002.

I am very pleased to announce today that Göran Lindahl, who recently stepped down as the chief executive of ABB, has agreed to lead this corporate recruitment effort and to provide strategic guidance as my special adviser on the Global Compact. He brings to this challenge not only a very successful business career, but also a strong commitment to corporate social responsibility and citizenship.
The Compact has also inspired many tangible projects, ranging from investment promotion in the least developed countries to human rights promotion in and around the workplace. But there is much more that we can do to ensure that the opportunities of globalization are more widely enjoyed and appreciated.

In many parts of the world the biggest obstacle to social and economic progress is violent, disruptive conflict.

This, of course, is primarily the responsibility of governments. But private companies operating in these unhappy regions should be very careful to act responsibly, in ways that improve the chances of peace, or at least do not fuel the continuation of conflict. De Beers has set an example, with its response to criticism of the diamond trade in Africa and its efforts to ensure that traders and consumers of diamonds will no longer unwittingly help to finance warlords. Within the Global Compact, we are about to launch our first thematic dialogue, seeking to establish a common understanding among the various stakeholders as to the appropriate roles companies can and should play in zones of conflict.

I believe that the Global Compact is an exciting venture that can help change the world, even if only in small steps. So I hope all of you business leaders here today, if you are not already involved in it, will soon join us.

And I hope equally that those of you from civil society organizations who have criticized the Compact will come to understand that for us at the United Nations, engaging with the private sector is not an option. It is an imperative - in this and other endeavours. We must engage all relevant social actors who can make a difference.

Only through effective partnerships can we beat back endemic or epidemic disease, which is such an unmerciful enemy of normal life in developing countries. I am not sure that any of us has yet grasped the full horror of the HIV/AIDS pandemic in Africa, either in its human or its economic dimensions. In some countries it has devastated entire generations. That puts an overwhelming obligation on all of us to do whatever we can to help those already infected, and above all to halt the spread of the virus.

Similarly, investment, not just in medicine but also across the board, is of decisive importance for the developing world. The only developing countries that really are developing are those that have succeeded in attracting significant amounts of direct foreign investment, as well as mobilizing the savings and resources of their own citizens.

Unfortunately, that is only a relative handful of countries. The rest of the developing world, and especially the least developed countries, is almost entirely missing out -- in
spite of the fact that many of them have put in place highly welcoming regulatory frameworks for foreign investment, and are making extra efforts to attract it.

If they have not succeeded, it is often because they lack the necessary infrastructure, or because their market is too small and too isolated to be of interest. Local markets have to compete in the global market, and it is unforgiving.

Here, too, international companies could help change this, by working together, and working with governments, to reduce the risks and costs of doing business in the least developed countries, and to disseminate information about the investment opportunities there.

Another critical area where partnerships could make an enormous difference to developing countries is information technology. I have set up a small group of advisers to help find ways of bridging the "digital divide" -- many of whom are present here today. My special thanks to them, and to all the others who have agreed to work with me on this issue, which I believe is crucial for the future of many poor countries.

The advocacy role of business leaders is equally important. To participate more effectively in the global economy, developing countries need, above all:

- faster and more generous debt relief;

- increased official development assistance, carefully targeted to make poor countries more attractive as investment destinations;

- and the full opening of rich countries' markets to poor countries' products.

These broader social roles, of partner and advocate, may be relatively novel for the corporate world, but they can no longer be separated cleanly from the standard business model, nor can they be reduced to a question of philanthropy. Companies are learning that, as markets have gone global, so, too, must the concept and practice of corporate social responsibility. And they are discovering that doing the right thing, at the end of the day, is actually good for business.

In other words, the fragility of globalization that I have spoken about poses a direct challenge to the self-interest of the corporate sector, and a central part of the solution is the need for you to accept the obligations -- not merely the opportunities -- of global citizenship.

Indeed, all of you here -- leaders from business and civil society organizations alike -- must come to realize that you represent the vanguard of tomorrow’s global society, in
which markets must be open, but open markets must be fully underpinned by shared values and global solidarity. You are the first truly global citizens, and only you can give meaning to that term through your actions and advocacy to ensure everyone, rich and poor alike, has the chance to benefit from globalization.

In doing so, my friends, you have my full support, and that of the United Nations.
Ladies and Gentlemen,
It’s good to be back in New York, and to find all of you here.

Even in the dark days of last September, I was confident that this great city would soon recover its traditional verve and vibrancy. I am so glad that Klaus Schwab shared my confidence – and your presence here this weekend shows that we were both right.

My message to you is still the same as it was in Davos last year, and even three years ago. But I believe it has gained greater urgency.

Two months ago, I had the honour to deliver the Nobel Lecture in Oslo. I began by asking my audience to imagine what life is like, and what it holds in store, for a girl born in today’s Afghanistan – though I might equally well have mentioned a baby boy or girl in Sierra Leone, or in the poorest parts of almost any developing country.

I reminded them that the life of that girl, and of hundreds of millions of her contemporaries, would be lived under conditions that many of them in that audience would consider inhuman. It that was true for that audience, it is surely even more so for you here today.

Perhaps no one in this hall feels as rich, or as powerful and influential, as he or she is perceived to be by others. And yet I believe all of you – whether you are business leaders, political leaders or opinion leaders – know well that you are enormously privileged, compared to the great majority of your fellow human beings, both in your standard of living and in the power and influence that you wield.

You all know that you are sharing this small planet with well over a billion people who are denied the very minimum requirements of human dignity, and with four or five billion whose choices in life are narrow indeed compared to yours. In fact the planet seems to many of us more and more like a small boat driven by a fierce gale through dark and uncharted waters, with more and more people crowded on board, hoping desperately to survive.

None of us, I suggest, can afford to ignore the condition of our fellow passengers on this little boat. If they are sick, all of us risk infection. And if they are angry, all of us can easily get hurt.

Our problem is one of reality multiplied by perception.
The reality is that power and wealth in this world are very, very unequally shared, and that far too many people are condemned to lives of extreme poverty and degradation.

The perception, among many, is that this is the fault of globalization, and that globalization is driven by a global elite, composed of – or at least, represented by – the people who attend this gathering.

That perception is not universal, but it is widely shared – especially in places like Argentina and East Asia, which have recent experience of severe financial crises, but also by an increasingly vocal section of public opinion in the developed world.

Do not underestimate the attraction of the rival gathering, timed to coincide with yours, that has just finished in Porto Alegre, Brazil. Its title, "World Social Forum" is intended as a criticism of yours, implying that you are interested "only" in economics, or in profit, and that you do not care about the social effects of your economic activities. And that criticism resonates around the world.

I believe that perception is wrong – and that globalization, so far from being the cause of poverty and other social ills, offers the best hope of overcoming them. But it is up to you to prove it wrong, with actions that translate into concrete results for the downtrodden, exploited and excluded.

It is not enough to say – though it is true – that without business the poor would have no hope of escaping their poverty. Too many of them have no hope as it is.

You must show that economics, properly applied, and profits, wisely invested, can bring social benefits within reach not only for the few but for the many, and eventually for all.

Some of the business leaders among you may respond that that is not the business of business – that your job is only to look after the bottom line, and the interests of shareholders. They would argue that social policy is a matter for governments, and also that it is up to governments to ensure that more people enjoy the benefits of capitalism, by creating a business-friendly climate in each country.

Certainly there is much that governments can and must do. I will come to that in a moment. But more and more business leaders are realizing that they do not have to wait for governments to do the right thing, and indeed they cannot afford to. In many cases, governments only find the courage and resources to do the right thing when business takes the lead.
I am glad to say that many business leaders have responded to the call I first made in Davos three years ago, when I proposed the Global Compact. They have publicly espoused the nine principles that I set out then – principles drawn from international agreements on human rights, labour standards and the environment. And we are working, together with the International Confederation of Free Trade Unions, and leading non-profit groups that have relevant expertise, to help those business leaders ensure that the nine principles are really applied in their day-to-day corporate practice.

That is good, but the Global Compact asks for more.

There are many positive ways for business to make a difference in the lives of the poor – not through philanthropy, though that is also very important, but through initiatives that, over time, will help to build new markets, as well as improving the self-respect of the corporations concerned and the respect they enjoy in the wider community.

Increasingly, business leaders are recognizing that there are many small and poor countries in which they do not invest enough – not because these countries are badly governed or have unfriendly policies, but simply because they are too small and poor to be interesting markets or to become major producers, and because they lack the skills, infrastructure and institutions that a successful market economy needs. The unpleasant truth is that markets put a premium on success, and tend to punish the poor for the very fact that they are poor.

Left alone in their poverty, these countries are all too likely to collapse, or relapse, into conflict and anarchy, a menace to their neighbours and potentially – as the events of 11 September so brutally reminded us – a threat to global security. Yet, taken together, their peoples represent a very large potential market – and many of their disadvantages could be offset if international business and donor governments adopted a common strategy aimed at making them more attractive to investment and ensuring that it reaches them.

Sometimes companies can make a massive difference with really small investments. Take the case of the world’s salt manufacturers. Working with the United Nations, they have made sure that all salt manufactured for human consumption contains iodine.

The result is that every year, more than 90 million newborn children are protected against iodine deficiency, and thus against a major cause of mental retardation.

Let me challenge all of you to follow this example, and think of ways that your company can help mobilize global science and technology to tackle the interlocking crises of hunger, disease, environmental degradation and conflict that are holding back the developing world.
Please join in the Global Health Initiative, which this Forum has been discussing over the last few days. Please work with the new Global Fund to fight AIDS, TB and Malaria, to provide at low cost the products developing countries need for disease control.

It is a shocking fact that, out of the 1,233 drugs licensed in the world between 1975 and 1997, only 13 were for tropical diseases, and only four were commercially developed specifically for tropical diseases suffered by human beings. We can surely improve on this, now that governments – working with foundations and international organisations – are starting to offer venture capital for the private sector to develop medicines and vaccines for these neglected diseases, on condition that the new compounds are marketed to poor countries as close to cost price as possible.

Over the last two years I have seen this differential pricing applied to medicines for treating malaria, HIV, TB and sleeping sickness. Now, the new Fund should enable many more countries to take advantage of it.

Working together for health is not just a matter of charity. It also makes economic sense. A scientific study, led by Jeffrey Sachs of Harvard, has now proved what many of us from Africa already knew. Investments in the health of poor people are a springboard for economic growth, with as much as a six-fold return on investment.

And much the same applies to education. In the developed world, companies give large amounts of money to universities, not out of charity, but to maintain the flow of skilled engineers and scientists that the economy needs. Why not do the same in developing countries, where it would make an even greater difference?

Once you start thinking creatively along these lines, you will come up with ideas much faster than I can. Please bring them to the United Nations Development Programme – or to whichever of the various UN funds, programmes and agencies is directly involved in your sector. We will be more than happy to help you find partners in the developing world.

Initiative and partnership are the two key ingredients of success.

Business needs enlightened partners in government, but it need not wait passively for them to appear. In many countries, the voice of business leaders plays a very important role in moulding the climate of opinion in which governments take their decisions.

And governments do indeed have a decisive role to play, in the months and years ahead, in determining whether globalization really is made to work for the poor, or whether, even as it bridges geographical distance, it widens the material and psychological distance between the privileged and the powerless.
A first, vital test will come as early as next month, with the International Conference on Financing for Development, in Monterrey, Mexico. I believe this Conference offers us the best chance we have had, in many years, to unlock the financial resources that are so desperately needed for development. I believe tangible results are possible.

It is essentially up to the governments of the world to prove me right, and the sceptics wrong.

On the one hand, the Conference must strengthen and sharpen the consensus that now exists on the policies, mechanisms and institutional frameworks required, in developing countries, to mobilize domestic resources, and to attract and benefit from international private investment. In particular, there should be agreement to conclude a comprehensive international convention against corruption, providing, for example, for the repatriation of illicitly transferred funds.

But at the same time there must be real movement forward on four key issues that are of vital importance to all developing countries: trade, aid, debt, and the management of the global economy.

On trade, an event of great promise occurred in Doha last November, with the agreement to open a new round of negotiations that will address the concerns of developing countries. But so far, it is only a promise. We need results. The developed countries must negotiate in good faith, to stop flooding the world market with subsidised farm exports, to the detriment of developing countries, and to open their own markets to labour-intensive products from those countries.

But even when a door is opened, you cannot walk through it without leg muscles. So, as trade barriers are removed, we must make sure that developing countries receive the assistance they need to develop their infrastructure and capacities.

We need at least an extra $50 billion of official development assistance each year if we are to reach the Millennium development goals, including the halving of extreme poverty in the world by 2015, to which all the world’s governments have committed themselves. That means doubling the present figure for ODA – which may sound ambitious, but would still leave us well short of the recognised goal of 0.7 per cent of gross national product for all donor countries. I still see no good reason why the Monterrey Conference should not adopt that extra $50 billion as an immediate, short-term target, to be achieved within two or three years.

It should also be the occasion for creditor countries to give a clear commitment to implement the Heavily Indebted Poor Countries initiative fully and promptly, and indeed to go beyond it so that from now on the debts of those countries become truly
sustainable. And something also needs to be done to ensure more equitable burden-sharing in financial crises involving middle-income countries, as in the recent tragic case of Argentina.

Finally, all these issues can no longer be settled in private conclave among the rich and powerful. The developing countries have as a big a stake as anyone in the future of the world economy. Their views should count for something when decisions affecting it are taken. The Monterrey Conference should be the occasion for those who currently wield the greatest influence to show that they are taking this subject seriously.

I am glad to say that many business leaders are showing a great interest in this Conference, and playing an active part in the preparations for it. I hope they will make a big effort between now and then to ensure that their governments take it equally seriously. No one is better placed than they are to refute the arguments of protectionists and penny-pinchers, making a persuasive case for genuinely open markets and more generous official assistance.

My friends,
I think we all have a sense today of having come to a turning-point in history. We felt that already with the end of the cold war and the beginning of a new millennium – and then, last September, we found ourselves entering that new millennium through a gate of fire, such as none of us ever wished to see.

The forces of envy, despair and terror in today's world are stronger than many of us realised. But they are not invincible. Against them, we must bring a message of solidarity, of mutual respect and, above all, of hope.

Business cannot afford to be seen as the problem. It must, working with government, and with all the other actors in society, be part of the solution.

Let that message go out today, from this stricken but indomitable city, and let us make it heard throughout the whole world.

Thank you very much.
Prime Minister Martin, Excellencies, Professor Schwab, Ladies and Gentlemen,

Five years ago, here in Davos, I asked you, the world’s business leaders, to join the United Nations on a journey.

You were already well embarked on a journey of your own on the road to globalization.

At the time, globalization appeared to many to be almost a force of nature. And it seemed to lead inexorably in one direction: ever-closer integration of markets, ever-larger economies of scale, ever-bigger opportunities for profits and prosperity.

And yet even then ten months before the Seattle protests burst onto the scene I felt obliged to warn that globalization would be only as sustainable as the social pillars on which it rested. Global unease about poverty, equity and marginalization was beginning to reach critical mass. I was concerned that unless global markets were embedded in shared values and responsible practices, the global economy would be fragile, and vulnerable to backlash.

That was why I urged you, as a matter of enlightened self-interest as well as the common interest, to work with us to build and fortify those social pillars. I emphasized, in particular, the areas of human rights, labour standards and the environment, on which your activities have such a direct and major impact.

And I called for a compact -- not a contract; not a code of conduct; not a set of regulations, or new system of monitoring, but a concrete expression of global citizenship. I was looking for something that would strengthen the economic openness that business needs to succeed, while also creating the opportunities that people need to build better lives.

I am pleased that so many of you stepped forward to embrace that leadership challenge, and to internalize the Compact’s principles into your operations. Today, more than 1,200 corporations are involved, from more than 70 countries, North and South, and from virtually every sector of the economy. Civil society organizations and the global labour movement have joined in the effort to make the Compact work. Governments are supporting the effort.

The Compact has inspired dozens of practical initiatives on some of the key issues of
our times, from AIDS awareness to anti-corruption, from e-learning to eco-efficiency. It has generated investment in some of the world’s poorest countries. And it has opened the doors of the United Nations itself to new forms of partnership, with many different stakeholders.

Yet much more can be accomplished and it must. With that in mind, I am convening a Global Compact Summit at UN Headquarters in June, to reassess and reposition our efforts, aiming at even higher levels of achievement.

Dear friends,

Even as we deepen and expand the Compact's mission, the global landscape around us is shifting profoundly, and in some respects adversely.

Today, not only the global economic environment, but also the global security climate, and the very conduct of international politics, have become far less favourable to the maintenance of a stable, equitable and rule-based global order. So I come before you again, asking you to embrace an even bigger challenge -- as leaders of profit-making enterprises, to be sure, but also as global citizens with enormous interests at stake.

Economically, we see dwindling investment in those parts of the developing world where it is most needed, coupled with trade negotiations that have failed so far to eliminate the system's egregious biases against developing countries.

On the security front, international terrorism is not only a threat to peace and stability. It also has the potential to exacerbate cultural, religious and ethnic dividing lines. And the war against terrorism can sometimes aggravate those tensions, as well as raising concerns about the protection of human rights and civil liberties.

As if all that were not enough, the role of the United Nations itself, the efficacy of its Charter, and the system of collective security are now under serious strain.

In just a few short years, the prevailing atmosphere has shifted from belief in the near-inevitability of globalization to deep uncertainty about the very survival of our global order.

This is a challenge for the United Nations. But it obliges the business community, too, to ask how it can help put things right. Allow me to suggest some ways that you might do your part.
In the economic realm, there is a direct connection between your interests and the international community's ability to meet the Millennium Development Goals. The Goals are central to our struggle for peace and human dignity. Yet in the past year or two, the war in Iraq and other events caused our attention to drift dangerously away from them. It is time to re-balance the international agenda.

The Goals offer a compelling platform for business involvement. The target for water, for example, is to cut in half, by the year 2015, the proportion of people without access to safe drinking water. That requires making 270,000 new connections per day until then something that Governments, NGOs and development agencies alone simply cannot do. I could give you similar numbers for many of the other targets, and for the broader development investments needed to achieve them, from energy to telecommunications.

The Goals are intended, first and foremost, to help people. But they can be good for business: first, because helping to build the infrastructure is an enormous business opportunity; and second, because, once it is built, business will find larger, eager markets in place.

I should stress that the Global Compact is not the only current United Nations initiative which aims to mobilize the great capacity of the private sector in our fight against poverty. Last July, I asked the United Nations Development Programme to convene a Commission on the Private Sector and Development.

Prime Minister Martin, I would like to thank you for the dynamism you have brought to the Commission's work, along with your co-chair, former President Zedillo of Mexico. I know that you and your colleagues from the business and policy-making communities have been working hard at all the key questions – in particular, how multinational business can become a supportive partner for local entrepreneurs, and help developing countries to build up their own independent private sectors.

I am sure you will give us solid recommendations that will help us tackle this key development challenge – and I look forward to the Commission's report in the months ahead.

Business also has great potential influence in the arena of trade. Business can and should use that influence to help break the current impasse in talks. More than anything else, we need a deal on agriculture that will help the poor.
No single issue more gravely imperils the multilateral trading system, from which you benefit so much. Agricultural subsidies skew market forces. They damage the environment. And they block poor-country exports from world markets, keeping them from earning revenues that would dwarf any conceivable level of aid and investment flows to those countries. For all our sakes, and for the credibility of the system itself, they must be eliminated.

We also need your help in efforts to manage threats to peace and security, particularly through your operations in countries afflicted by conflict. Businesses must find ways of reducing the contribution -- sometimes conscious, sometimes inadvertent -- that firms make to fuelling conflicts, which are often related to factional competition for control of natural resources. Business efforts to promote transparency and fight corruption can help to prevent conflict from happening in the first place.

Business also has a powerful interest in helping to re-build our system of collective security, and thus prevent the world from sliding back into brute competition based on the laws of the jungle.

You know, all too well, how much business confidence depends on political stability and security. I hope, therefore, that you will support the work of the high-level panel, which I have asked to make recommendations on ways of dealing with threats and challenges to peace and security in the 21st century.

People have described this as a panel on UN reform. It may indeed propose changes in the rules and mechanisms of the United Nations. But if so, those changes will be a means to an end, not the end itself. The object of the exercise is to find a credible and convincing collective answer to the challenges of our time.

The Charter of the United Nations is very clear. States have the right to defend themselves – and each other – if attacked. But the first purpose of the United Nations itself, laid down in Article 1, is "to take effective collective measures for the prevention and removal of threats to the peace".

We must show that the United Nations is capable of fulfilling that purpose, not just for the most privileged members of the Organization, who are currently – and understandably – preoccupied with terrorism and weapons of mass destruction. The United Nations must also protect...
millions of our fellow men and women from the more familiar threats of poverty, hunger and deadly disease. We must understand that a threat to some is a threat to all, and needs to be addressed accordingly.

I urge you all to tell your Governments just how important this is to you, as business leaders, and try to persuade them to support the Panel’s recommendations, when they are published later this year.

Indeed, the United Nations is not an end in itself. It is a means for building a better world through reliance on universal principles -- such as justice, respect for international law, and the peaceful resolution of disputes -- and the day-to-day work of translating those principles into action.

To succeed in that mission, however, political leaders need to develop a deeper awareness of their dual role. Each government has responsibilities towards its own society. At the same time, governments are, collectively, the custodians of our common life on this planet – a life that citizens of all countries share. Each of us needs to promote that understanding. All of us need to work together to that end.

I applaud the World Economic Forum for its efforts to engender a new concept of corporate leadership, concerned with creating public value as well as private profit. I also applaud the World Social Forum for drawing attention to those members of the human family who have least, need most, and yet lack a voice.

And I hope that a way will soon be found to establish links between these two communities. For all the differences between them, they are united by a shared interest in a global order that is equitable, that is governed by the rule of law, and that reflects the needs of all the world’s people. Let each of us, and all of us, make that our overriding aim.

Thank you very much.
Some of you may remember me coming to Davos nine years ago, as a freshly minted Secretary-General.

Since then, I have attended all but three of your annual meetings -- including the memorable one in 2002, when you came to show confidence in New York, after the attack on the World Trade Center.

So I did not hesitate one minute, before accepting, when Klaus kindly invited me to come here once more, at the beginning of my last year in office. And I was also very happy to accept the title he suggested for this session -- “A New Mindset for the United Nations”.

Why? Because it expresses something I have striven to achieve throughout these nine years, and something in which Davos itself has played a part.

In 1999, when I came here and called for a “global compact” between the United Nations and the private sector, many of my colleagues in the Secretariat -- and many representatives of Member States -- would hardly have been more shocked if I had proposed a compact with the Devil.

It is that mindset that I have been seeking to change throughout my time in office -- the mindset that sees international relations as nothing more than relations between States, and the United Nations as little more than a trade union for Governments.

My objective has been to persuade both the Member States and my colleagues in the Secretariat that the United Nations needs to engage, not only with Governments, but with people. Only if it does that, I believe, can it fulfil its vocation and be of use to humanity in the twenty-first century.

That was why, in the year 2000, I used the first words of the UN Charter, “We the Peoples” as the title of my report setting out the agenda for the Millennium Summit, at which political leaders from all over the world came together to assess the challenges of a new century, and adopted a collective response, known as the “Millennium Declaration”.

And that was why last year, in my report called *In Larger Freedom*, I urged Governments to accept that security and development are interdependent, and that neither can be long sustained without respect for human rights and the rule of law.
That report was intended as the blueprint, not only for a far-reaching reform of the United Nations itself, but also for a series of decisions that would enable humanity to realize the aims of the Millennium Declaration, particularly in the light of new challenges that had arisen since.

How far the blueprint will be translated into reality remains to be seen. But, in the meantime, the United Nations has not stood still. Far from it! This has been a decade of rapid change. Let me give you a few examples.

When I took office there was a widespread perception, based on the tragic events in Bosnia, Somalia and Rwanda, that UN peacekeeping was a failed experiment, and that, henceforth, this task would have to be handled by regional organizations.

Peacekeepers, especially in countries where conflict is still raging -- where there is literally no peace to keep -- continue to face immense challenges. Even so, today we have 85,000 people serving in 16 UN peacekeeping operations, spread across four continents. Most of these operations are not static observers of a truce, but active participants in the implementation of peace agreements, helping the people of war-torn countries make the transition from war to peace.

Certainly, in many parts of the world, regional organizations play an important role, and so they should. But most often they do so in partnership with the United Nations. The UN has become, in effect, the indispensable mechanism for bringing international help to countries recovering from conflict -- and Member States have now recognized this, by agreeing to set up a Peacebuilding Commission within the UN, to manage this highly complex process.

The last decade has also seen growing use of United Nations economic sanctions. These are now used to influence or restrict the activity, not only of recalcitrant States, but also of non-State actors, such as rebel movements or terrorist groups. At the same time, the Security Council has developed more sophisticated and humane types of sanctions, aimed at individuals rather than whole societies -- travel bans, for instance, and the freezing of bank accounts.

The same philosophy of punishing individuals rather than communities has driven the work of the UN Criminal Tribunals for Rwanda and the former Yugoslavia -- one of which was the first international court to convict people of genocide (including a former Prime Minister) and of rape as a war crime, while the other has become the first to indict and try a former Head of State.

This in turn has led to further innovations, including the mixed tribunal in Sierra Leone and, of course, the International Criminal Court. The latter is not an organ of the
United Nations, but the UN convened and serviced the conference which adopted its Statute in 1998.

Over 100 States have now ratified the Statute -- which means that the Court’s jurisdiction is now recognized by well over half the UN’s membership.

Another way the UN has changed is the increasing focus on human rights -- which is reflected in the recent decision by Member States to strengthen the Office of the High Commissioner for Human Rights. That Office is now a dynamic operational entity, which deploys and supports hundreds of human rights workers around the world. And I hope that within the next week or two we may see agreement on a corresponding change at the intergovernmental level, with the establishment of a more authoritative Human Rights Council, to replace the now widely discredited Commission.

One more example of change: the United Nations has responded to the growth of international terrorism. Even before “9/11”, the Security Council had imposed sanctions on Al-Qaida, and set up a special committee to monitor its activities. Immediately after the attack, the Council went much further, with its historic resolution 1373, which imposed stringent obligations on all countries, established a list of terrorist organizations and individuals, and created the Counter-Terrorism Committee to monitor Member States compliance and help them improve their capacity to enact and implement anti-terrorist legislation.

In short, I believe the United Nations is proving itself an increasingly flexible instrument, to which its Member States turn for a wider and wider array of functions.

For instance, within the last five years the UN has been asked:

-- to shepherd Afghanistan’s transition from the anarchic wasteland of the Taliban and the warlords to the nascent democracy -- still struggling, but hopeful -- that it is today;

-- to help establish the Interim Government of Iraq, and to help organize the referendum and elections there and we have supported the Constitution writing -- and we have supported democratic elections in about 120 countries over the last 12 years;

-- and we’ve been asked and we’ve done it, to verify the withdrawal of Syrian troops from Lebanon and carry out, for the first time ever, a full criminal investigation into the assassination of a former prime minister;

-- to coordinate global relief efforts after the tsunami, and again after the earthquake in Kashmir;
and to take the lead in raising global awareness, as well as funds, to protect the world’s peoples against avian flu.

What all these activities have in common is that they involve the United Nations, not simply in relations among its Member States, but also in the lives of their peoples. To carry out such tasks, we must engage, not only with Governments, but with all the new actors on the international scene.

That includes the private sector, but it also includes parliamentarians; voluntary, non-profit organizations; philanthropic foundations; the global media; celebrities from the worlds of sport and entertainment; and in some cases labour unions, mayors and local administrators. And it includes, I must alas say, less benign actors such as terrorists, warlords, and traffickers in drugs, illicit weapons or -- worst of all -- the lives and bodies of human beings.

That is why I have repeatedly urged all the organs of the United Nations to be more open to civil society, so that their decisions can fully reflect the contribution made by groups and individuals who devote themselves to studying specific problems, or working in specific areas.

It is also why I myself have cultivated contacts with scholars, with parliamentarians, with practitioners of all sorts and with young people -- seeking to learn from their views and also encouraging them, whatever sector they work in, to use their talents for the public good and to keep the global horizon in view.

It is one of the reasons why I have worked constantly to make our Organization more transparent and comprehensible to the public, and thereby more genuinely accountable.

And, of course, it is why I launched the Global Compact, to which the international business community -- including some of you in this audience -- has responded with such enthusiasm that it is now the world’s leading corporate citizenship initiative, involving more than 2,400 companies, in nearly 90 countries.

This new mindset must also extend to the domain of international peace and security -- so that we think of security, not only in conventional terms, focusing on prevention of war between States, but also as including the protection of the world’s peoples, against threats which, to many of them today, seem more immediate and more real.

One of those threats is the threat of genocide and other crimes against humanity. I called the General Assembly’s attention to this in 1999, warning that such mass atrocities can never be treated as a purely domestic affair, and Governments should not
be allowed to hide behind the shield of sovereignty to brutalize their own people. Being rightly called crimes against humanity, they demand a collective response from humanity, which should be organized and legitimized by the United Nations.

More recently, the High-Level Panel that I appointed in 2003 has identified a broad range of threats, which Member States have more or less accepted, and included:

-- poverty, infectious disease and environmental degradation;

-- conflict within States, as well as between them;

-- the spread of nuclear, radiological, chemical and biological weapons;

-- terrorism; and

-- transnational crime.

My Larger Freedom report built on this broader definition of global security, drawing it together with the detailed recommendations of the Millennium Project for achieving the Millennium Development Goals by 2015 -- which in itself would rescue many millions of people from the threats of poverty and disease.

But my report also included a third dimension: human rights and the rule of law. Without these, any society, however well-armed, will remain insecure; and its development, however dynamic, will remain precarious.

Member States took the report as their starting-point in negotiating the outcome document of last September's world summit. I won't say that that document fulfils all my hopes. But it does contain many important decisions -- from the creation of a Peacebuilding Commission and Human Rights Council, through the commitments to advance the Millennium Development Goals, to the acceptance, by all States individually and collectively, of the responsibility to protect populations from genocide, war crimes, ethnic cleansing and crimes against humanity.

The United Nations cannot stand still, because the threats to humanity do not stand still. Every day the world presents new challenges, which the founders of the UN 60 years ago could never have anticipated. Whether it is a looming crisis over Iran and its compliance with the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty, continuing atrocities in Darfur, or the threat of an avian flu pandemic, people all over the world look to the United Nations to play a role in making peace, protecting civilians, improving livelihoods, promoting human rights and upholding international law. I have worked long and hard to transform the United Nations so that when called upon, as we are every day, we will
deliver what is asked of us -- effectively, efficiently and equitably. That is the true objective of the changes I have sought to bring about, and it will be the true measure of my success or failure.

And my successor -- since I understand several members of this panel may be interested in the position -- need not worry. Changing the mindset of the United Nations, so that it can both reflect and influence the temper of the times, is a never-ending challenge. There will be plenty more work to do in the years and decades to come.