

COMMENTS ON THE JO'BURG MEMO

Published by the Heinrich Böll Foundation

World Summit Papers of the Heinrich Böll Foundation, No. 18:
Comments on the Jo'burg Memo.

Published by the Heinrich Böll Foundation

Printed in Germany, December 2002

© by the authors and the Heinrich Böll Foundation

All rights reserved

Editing: Isabelle Reinery

Production: trigger, Berlin

The following publication does not necessarily represent the views of the Heinrich Böll Foundation.

To order this publication: Heinrich Böll Foundation, Rosenthaler Str. 40/41, 10178 Berlin, Germany. Tel.: ++49 30 285 340; Fax: ++49 30 285 34 109, info@boell.de, www.boell.de, www.worldsummit2002.org

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Foreword	5
<i>Dr. José Ramos-Horta</i>	
Editor's Foreword	7
<i>Isabelle Reinery</i>	
Assessing South Africa's Environmental Challenges	8
<i>Dr. David Fig</i>	
Johannesburg as the Beginning of the Memo	11
<i>Angel Ibarra</i>	
Much More than a Memo	14
<i>Martin Khor</i>	
The Jo'burg Memo: Beyond Development-As-Global-Growth	20
<i>Dr. Fred Luks</i>	
Development without Destruction	25
<i>Wangari Maathai</i>	
Exposing Power, Questioning Development	29
<i>Daniel Mittler</i>	
From Rio to Johannesburg: A Difficult Road	33
<i>Ricardo Navarro</i>	
A Different Perspective	36
<i>Silvia Ribeiro</i>	

FOREWORD

by **José Ramos-Horta**

Humans walked on the moon. Craig Venter is deciphering the book of life, to fight disease, he says. Heart transplantations have become a routine, in many areas medicine has made great advances to improve the quality of life. At trade fairs they sell refrigerators that can talk and do the shopping on their own. Yet the same human intelligence that has produced such miracles seems so far unable to eliminate extreme poverty or tropical diseases such as malaria and cannot provide clean water to hundreds of millions in Africa, Asia and Latin America.

Today, still 800 million people go hungry. Each year six million children under five die due to malnutrition. They starve, even though the world's economy is many times larger than it was only 50 years ago. Asia's economy expanded significantly – at the same time hunger in Asia remains widespread. No wonder: Many parts of Asia rank prominently among the world's most ecologically endangered regions. During the last 30 years, Asia lost 50% of its forest cover and biodiversity is eroding at an ever faster pace.

In the 21st century, in the globalized world where news can travel within seconds from pole to pole, hunger is man-made and the blame for such catastrophe can't be put on nature anymore. Europe's Age of Reason came along with the triumphal march of natural sciences that chased the spirits out of the woods and shaped the modern concept of materialism. But with nature demystified and paradise lost, the full weight of responsibility for hunger now falls on humans alone.

Hunger and poverty should not only touch our conscience and environmental overexploitation should not only concern conservationists: They are also matters of peace and security because they destabilize entire countries and regions. In turn they threaten the integration of the global economy that is vital if the rich are to stay rich or if the poor are to move up, if only an inch. Globalization has tied the G8 to the ROW, the less fortunate "Rest of the World". To sink or to swim is the choice.

Only to increase aid budgets will not do: Rich countries spend seven times more money on the protection of their agro-markets than on development cooperation. For every \$1 provided through aid and debt relief, developing countries lose another \$14 as a consequence of protectionist barriers in the rich world. That's why the Northern countries are still harboring the greatest concentration of personal wealth.

But the rich will not be able to continue to reap the profits of their investment in globalization, if they do not seriously address the issues of poverty on a world scale. As the Jo'burg Memo puts it provocatively: We might have to consider the "alleviation of "proliferating" wealth", if the eradication of poverty is to be more than mere Orwellian newspeak.

The gap between the rich and poor is growing, not diminishing. Those who can afford to hold savings in a bank account make up for only 8%. Meanwhile 1.2 billion of people survive on less than \$1 a day; children walk miles to go to school, if at all, or to fetch

firewood and water for the household. Child labor, prostitution and sex slavery are rampant in the impoverished societies.

Peace will always be fragile, yet it will be but an illusion as long as the resource-craving rich excessively claim environmental space for themselves, ignoring the clamor of the poor for a better life who cannot afford a meal a day and a roof.

Imbalance on issues of life and death can only be maintained by force. In their pursuit of ever greater wealth, weapons producing countries aggressively push arms exports to developing countries that cannot even afford to provide clean water to most of their people, fueling conflicts, often on the local level and linked, here, too, to the distribution of wealth. These conflicts open the market for even more arms imports – a vicious circle.

Do we have constructive and applicable answers to such complex challenges? To provide them would be a presumptuous task for a small memorandum. But even to raise the corresponding questions requires courage, wisdom and expertise. In the Jo'burg Memo a think-tank of 16 renowned experts, from the North and the South, jointly evaluated chances and limits of regulating markets with regard to their social and environmental dimensions, considering local, regional and global levels. This memorandum addresses the intricate interdependencies of environment and development, of human rights and economics, of markets and society in an original as well as responsible manner.

The Jo'burg Memo provides vision. It gives food for thought, calling for "fairness in a fragile world". This motto has a realistic flavor. It sounds like an achievable demand. But at the same time it is also painfully pragmatic: A fair approach falls short of a just one. So is fair really fair? Or at least fair enough?

The Jo'burg Memo provokes comments, some of which you can find in this outstanding publication.

Heinrich Böll Foundation pretended to give us a brief memorandum shortening lengthy journeys to Johannesburg. But in fact it decoyed us into a vivid discussion as we walk along. We will not turn silent in Johannesburg, I presume.

Dr. José Ramos-Horta, Nobel Peace Prize Laureate (1996), serves currently as Senior Minister and Minister for Foreign Affairs and Cooperation in East Timor's first independent government after the Indonesian occupation and UN administration. He is Visiting Professor to the Faculty of Law (University of New South Wales, Sydney) where he founded the Diplomacy and Human Rights Program. He is Acting President of Uma Fukun, East Timor Cultural Centre, Dili. Dr. Ramos-Horta is ILO Ambassador for Peace, Member of the Nobel Peace Commission on Arms Control, and Co-President of State of the World Forum, San Francisco.

Website: <http://www.gov.east-timor.org>

EDITOR'S FOREWORD

In December 2000 the United Nations General Assembly decided to host a new World Summit on Sustainable Development (WSSD) in Johannesburg, South Africa, in 2002 – ten years after the Earth Summit in Rio. Even before this UN decision, the Heinrich Böll Foundation was convinced to put this Summit at the center of its national and international work.

Among the host of documents published by the Heinrich Böll Foundation in the “run-up” to the WSSD, the **Jo'burg Memo – Fairness in a Fragile World** stands out for various reasons: for the quality of its writing, and by the positive reception it received wherever it was presented. It was translated in more languages than any other of our publications, and probably than any other document that will be presented in Johannesburg. Our intention was to spur public debate and increase an awareness of certain issues in the discussions around the Summit.

The Jo'burg Memo was presented and commented all over the world: In spring this year it was launched at the Prep Comm III in New York, and further Memo events took place in Washington, D.C., Brussels (Belgium), Berlin (Germany), Addis Abeba (Ethiopia), Bali (Indonesia), Managua (Nicaragua), San Salvador (El Salvador), Johannesburg (South Africa), Havana (Cuba), Barcelona and Alicante (both Spain).

A glance at the Memo's list of authors and commentators reflects the diversity of our international network, from North to South, from East to West, from NGOs, science, politics and business. Whereas the Memo is one joint piece of work, the comments on the Memo compiled in this World Summit Paper are single pieces, each reflecting different points of view and highlighting different aspects.

We would like to thank the authors David Fig, Angel Ibarra, Martin Khor, Fred Luks, Wangari Maathai, Daniel Mittler, Ricardo Navarro, José Ramos-Horta, and Silvia Ribeiro.

Isabelle Reinery

Heinrich Böll Foundation

Berlin, November 2002

David Fig

ASSESSING SOUTH AFRICA'S ENVIRONMENTAL CHALLENGES

The Johannesburg launch of the Memo took place at the end of June 2002 at an environmental complex called Delta Park.

On the horizon it is possible to see the Sandton Convention Centre, the focal point of the World Summit. We are therefore already located in the shadow of this event. And this is where the Jo'burg Memo really helped us. It both provides an outstanding analysis and it identifies some of the challenges that we need to take forward. These challenges are listed as part of an action agenda.

In South Africa it is unusual to hear praises being sung. We are often too critical of good new initiatives. I would like to make a few statements praising the Jo'burg Memo. First, the document embodies many of the values that we share. These include the values of equity and ecology and keeping those in some kind of human balance. I found it a very cogent document, because it makes excellent arguments and it makes them convincingly. It is concise, it is brief, and it uses language economically. It can be popularized. It is clear. It is not overly technical, not overly academic, and it is fairly accessible to most readers. I think it provides a comprehensive review and covers most of the key issues of the day, particularly the key global issues. It is also honest, in that it does not shy away from being critical of past compromises that have been made by the environmental movement. It analyses them very carefully. Nor does it admit that all the answers are available. It is also honest about what happened at Rio, looking at both the positive and negative sides of UNCED. Similarly, with the Rio conventions on biodiversity and climate change, as well as the Kyoto Protocol, which came in the wake of the climate change convention, it gives us some direction. It sketches out a blueprint, and it gives us ammunition against the summit being hijacked away from the key issues. So, for all these reasons, it has been a worthwhile document.

It has also helped us to try and take stock in South Africa and to bring the Memo back home. How can we best employ this document back in South Africa? I will try to make a few points to elaborate on this.

Firstly, our participation in Rio was almost non-existent, because at the time of Rio, ten years ago, we had no international status or UN credentials. We had an observer mission at UNCED, which had no input into the proceedings. We had, however, a number of NGO activists who attended the Global Forum in Rio. And I would like to trace the trajectories of four of them. One has become the minister of economic affairs of the Western Cape province, one co-founded an NGO opposed to plant genetic modification, one has been an advisor to the minister of agriculture, and one is a consultant responsible for WSSD issues within the department of foreign affairs. So our original NGO observers have gone on to bigger and brighter things. But, in general, the impact of Rio within South Africa was minimal.

What we have experienced since then is what I call a new environmental leadership. A new wave of politicians have had to take the environment seriously. New ministries have been created at provincial level, and at national level the issues have been addressed more comprehensively, although I think we still await an environmental policy from the ruling party. So we hope that this document will feed into post-summit deliberations in that respect.

Our NGOs have both grown and fragmented and become weaker since Rio. This has become evident in some of the processes in the run up to the summit. Within the civil society secretariat we have seen the focus on sustainable development being misunderstood and used to marginalize the participation of some environmental NGOs. We have also seen confusion about whether the NGOs should be participating in the underfunded and overpriced Global Forum or whether they should join a breakaway group called the People's Earth Summit which will meet at a different venue.

So the verdict is that the new environmental leadership still needs to be consolidated. It needs to take up the issues raised in the document and argue more about content than about process.

We have new environmental legislation which came out of a very consultative process. However this legislation is not being implemented in full and its public participation elements are simply being ignored. In essence the law is very progressive and lays out a number of the key environmental principles that the Jo'burg Memo includes and promotes. But in South Africa those principles are not yet being applied. They are not taken seriously enough. In fact, there is a fear that they may be revised to fit in with a more narrow corporate agenda.

We still have not seen an integrated approach to environmental governance. Some of the good principles have been trumped by neo-liberalism. And the window of participation, which was a very exciting and empowering part of the policy formulation process during the mid-1990s, has seemingly closed down, and we hope that this document and other documents to follow will reopen the question of bringing the public back into the policy debates. We have new environmental rights, which is a major asset in any country, with our new constitution grappling with new democratic processes. Yet we have not seen these environmental rights being realized. The constitution has not yet been invoked to protect any particular violations of our environmental rights. Some basic economic rights have been addressed, but for the most part services such as energy and water have become unaffordable to most poor people. Our land reform is being targeted now only at the more affluent of the small farmers who will benefit at the expense of the very poor.

We have seen the gross running down of the state's conservation obligations. We have seen a return to nuclear power as an option for our energy provision. We have seen unsustainable transport systems being promoted, and the vital question of public transport provision not being addressed in the terms of the energy solutions suggested in the Memo. We have seen the large scale construction of white elephant developments, to name but a few: the Lesotho Highlands Water Project, the Saldanha Steel Mill, and more recently the opening up of a new deep water project at Coega with all its environmental compromises. When I call them pharaohonic developments, it is not an exag-

geration: even the government's own publicity programme for the opening of the Coega project links it to Alexandria in ancient Egypt!

Trade and finance ministries dominate our policy making and decision making processes, no matter what our international environmental obligations are in those areas, particularly our obligations to nature. So the invisible hand of Marrakesh has triumphed over the spirit of Rio in this country.

Under the Rio Convention on Biological Diversity, sovereignty has been reclaimed over our plant genetic resources, only to be sold off to foreign companies. And, regulatory capacity, weak as it is, is also being ceded in deals with the corporate sector.

Now all this is disappointing and needs a lot more activism and a lot more analysis. Particularly we need to take on the question of how do we get the rich to cede power? We have a word in South Africa which has been used for the past ten years or so, and that word is redistribution. We need to mobilize around the re-opening of the question of redistribution, or what the Memo calls wealth alleviation, so that the convergence between rich and poor that the document also speaks about becomes more of a reality in our society. These are the things that we can learn from the Jo'burg Memo. These are the things which our new environmental leadership needs to adopt and popularize, so that the vision of Rio and of Porto Alegre and the renewed reflections in Johannesburg begin to trump the world being made over our heads in Marrakesh, Davos and Doha.

Dr. David Fig is a research associate of the Sociology of Work Unit at the University of Witwatersrand, Johannesburg, where he is leading a united nations study on corporate accountability in South Africa. He was formally director of the Group for Environmental Monitoring (GEM), a Johannesburg-based NGO. He helped establish Biowatch South Africa, an NGO concerned with biodiversity and genetic modification. He has written extensively on nuclear, conservation, and corporate accountability issues and has helped develop the study of environmental sociology in South Africa.

Angel Ibarra

JOHANNESBURG AS THE BEGINNING OF THE MEMO

The Memo is a good text about political ecology, useful for the environmentalists of that region; because very often, we have to deal with documents that touch upon the global environmental problem and the global problem happens to be very far away from us. But in this document, we speak about the issues we are dealing with on our agenda.

The document repeats and helps us to point out, more urgently than 10 years ago, that the hegemonic policy of the world is not sustainable. There are new kinds of argumentation. The issue of ecological footprints appears in a more distinct manner, the issue of the global warming, that there is also a limit in the sky and that it is not only a question of resources coming to their end (more than Meadow supposed it to be in the year of 1972).

In my opinion, it's important that we combine defending the planet and defending the people, because they do form part of the emphasis it has. And in the context of Rio + 10, it is also a question of combining equity and ecology, instead of maintaining the hegemonic aspects of the governments' agenda: we need to speak more about development and to make Johannesburg a summit on development. It has to be more than a summit in which environmental problems are brought up regardless of the fact that sustainability and equity are closely linked.

As we clearly identify the global North and the localized South, this also helps us to become more clear about relocating power. Because speaking about power helps us to find out where we should go, to identify the ways we should avoid and who might be our partner of alliance and whom we might choose as a strategic partner and against whom we should fight, etc. This is our use of the concept of the global North and the global South; I agree that North and South aren't geographical concepts. The global North, that means this 20% of the population that is consuming, which represents the peer group of marketing strategies, which owns a car, uses mobile phones, is connected to the Internet, can travel by airplane and so on. On the base of this concentration of power, incomes and uses of resources, the differences between first and second-class citizens on the planet become stronger and this is the main issue.

That's why we should pay more attention to the issue of population. We refer to it in the Memo in terms of resources per head. I believe that we should speak about population as a whole and about the different types of mankind on earth: the consuming, globalized mankind and the covetous, excluded mankind. As the concept of mankind is not universal, I would feel more likely to dare to assume that there are different types of mankind. The issue of population should be considered as an issue combined to the appearance of a population that might be considered as rejectable or vacillating.

In case of the outbreak of a crisis demanding us to live consuming the resources that would exist on 5 or 6 planets similar to ours, it would not be astonishing if it would not be the research of the four or five planets missing the way out, but to have to reduce in a notable way the population of human beings. In this conflict we have to take into ac-

count those who produce and those who don't, those who consume and those who do not consume; the more vulnerable populations, the so-called minorities and those who suffer from plagues such as AIDS, the rejectable populations. This represents a threat that we should take in serious and see it in the context of the uprising of neo-fascistic, racist points of view and more xenophobia that is spreading already (i.e. in Europe), on the basis of phenomena linked to unemployment, lack of social security, migration and so on.

Another issue to that we should pay more attention might be the accelerated urbanization of the earth, a phenomenon whose importance continuously grows. And of course, as a problem directly linked to it, the precariousness of the standards of living in rural areas, another phenomenon existing all over the world and which is due to the sustainability of poverty in the current status quo. The document does also omit to criticize clearly and in detail the current model of techno-scientific development. We never reached before the scientific and technical progress we do have nowadays, but the science has never been before totally devoted to the rationalism that destroys the earth.

In view of the above, I think that the diagnoses and the questions brought up by the document make it a good plea, conscious of the need of urgent actions, as we are at the least 10 years more delayed than in Rio 92 and as we reached a very critical level of deterioration of the problems. In Central America, compared to the situation 10 years ago, the impacts of the (badly) so-called natural disasters are getting worse and the frequency of such disasters is rising. This is a consequence of the worsening of the global socio-environmental, regional and local crisis.

We find some provocative questions in the Memo: The concept of "fair wealth" did never come to my mind before, maybe because the experience of our countries with the accumulation of wealth is a very dramatic one, unfair in every respect, we are going to re-read and re-think about it. But there is also another assumption, that is even more provocative, and that's the fact that it is not seen as an advantage, but as an opportunity for 80% of the world's population that they do not belong to the class of consumers, but to be "impoverished or weak", as it has been said. As they can't be consumers with the levels of the global North, this limitation provides us with the opportunity to build a sustainable model, it helps us to avoid the imitation of or dependency on the way the North did follow.

Finally, I do agree that this document is going beyond Johannesburg, for me, the meeting for the summit represents the moment to start to spread its message, maybe even its conception, although there are a couple of things that need to be worked out more in detail. Although we generally agree that the document is neither a platform nor a finished scientific study, I think it is the basis of a platform, I believe it might be a little bit ambitious to call Memo what could be a platform that mobilizes the global South. In our case, we have to make efforts in order to get from the global to the local and the regional (and vice versa), putting into the same context other concepts that are generally not mentioned here (in 92, there wasn't a "Plan Puebla Panamá", there weren't FTAs, there wasn't the project of FTAA, which will change our continent in an important way). At least, concerning the ecosystem, the regions should fight together against the new threats mentioned in this document.

I would say that Johannesburg is the beginning and not the end of the Memo, because I believe that framing proposals on new environmental institutions such as the Global Environmental Organization or the International Agency for Renewable Energy is impossible; I don't believe that they will be geared to the Agenda. Also I believe that the proposal concerning a business agreement that goes beyond benefice and financial gain will not be fulfilled.

Angel Maria Ibarra Turcios, Ph.D. in Medicine and MA in Ecology, is currently the rector of the Lutheran University of San Salvador "ULS" and president of the Ecological Union of San Salvador "UNES". He is supporter of the environmental point of view in the struggle for sustainability of El Salvador and Central America. He has published several books on the problems related to disasters and proposes an ecological risk management. He has also written about the water crisis and about political ecology in Central America.

Martin Khor

MUCH MORE THAN A MEMO

I have some criticisms of the Jo'burg Memo, of course, and all of us will have, one reason is because it is such a thick report. The name is wrong, it is not a memo, it is really a very substantive report, it is much more than a memo. This by the way is a compliment. I suppose it is called a memo so it gives the impression we can read it very fast. "Excuse me, I have a memo, I hope you don't mind reading it, there is also an executive summary." But it's really a rather big report. It reads well. It also has many good points.

The first section that deals with Rio and the legacy of Rio has views that I can identify with. I have made an analysis of Rio that is very similar. Rio was very good in making the conceptual breakthrough linking development and environment, linking the commitments of the North to the commitments of the South, the obligations of both. It gave birth to the principle of common but differentiated responsibility, which was a major breakthrough: "We all need to do something, but some of us have to do more." And the precautionary principle is equally important, to take care of the environmental and technological side of things. Since Rio, of course, we have seen the deterioration of the situation. The commitments have not been met on both sides and the forces of globalization have got the upper hand and downgraded the importance of environment and development. Governments are so worried about whether their countries and companies will lose competitiveness and they have really given up on the environmental agenda all over the world as compared to ten years ago when they signed those agreements. We have this situation where the governments have in a way voluntarily given up their powers to the market, and it is the markets that now discipline and regulate the governments by the threat that if you don't do as we tell you, we will move to another country. There was a report that President Clinton was reading a very good book called "Global Dreams" about how transnationals control the world. He was on board US Airforce One together with some journalists and he told them he was reading this great book and that all of them should also read it, to understand how transnationals are now controlling all of us. And one of the journalists asked, "What are you going to do about this, Mr. President?" "What am I going to do about it? Nothing, I am only the President of the United States. I can't do anything about these companies." This report has stuck in my mind, as it showed how political leaders allow themselves to feel helpless in the face of globalization and the power of corporations.

I think the Jo'burg Memo has many unique features. For example it has quite a comprehensive critique of the environment crisis. Usually, when we read something on sustainable development the author or the group focuses more on the environment side and injects a bit of development or they focus on the development side and they inject a bit of environment. But here, I think, the expertise on both environment and development issues comes through. You will find many chapters and many paragraphs with interesting analysis on climate, bio-diversity and on the linkage between livelihoods and these environmental issues. I think this is quite a unique feature because it is done in an in-depth-manner. This memo does look at the environmental, technological, human rights,

economics aspects of sustainable development. We need to congratulate the authors for being able to put it all together.

The second strength is that the report has linked poverty to wealth. It's not just saying "Oh, well, if you don't take care of the environment, more people will get poor." It does make the point that is not the poor people that led to the environment crisis. This is a point which is not unique to the NGO community. Most of us share this view. But what it has also done is to coin this phrase that we need not only poverty alleviation, but also wealth alleviation. I think that's a good "gimmick" in terms of a striking phrase. Maybe this good phrase could have been explained a little bit more in one or two paragraphs because it is so important. What do you mean by alleviation in relation to wealth? It is not the concept that is new, we are all talking about how rich people have to give up more of their consumption. But the word "alleviation" in relation to wealth is a possibly extremely important term, or even slogan and if we could define more what we mean by wealth alleviation, I think it will catch on as something important, rather than just wealth reduction.

This report calls for changes in the North. Quite a lot of it. And this is what we would have expected because Wolfgang Sachs helped to coordinate parts of this wonderful project started a few years ago by Friends of the Earth, initiated by Manus van Brakel of Milieu Defense Netherlands, on "sustainable society", or what would a sustainable society look like. There were reports on "Sustainable Holland", "Sustainable Germany", "Sustainable Europe". There was also a book edited by Wolfgang on "Greening the North." I wish that this would have been very highly projected at the official conference here, with the Northern governments coming forward to say, "We want to change ourselves in terms of sustainable consumption and production. This is how it can be done. This is the model. This is the calculation of data. These are the results" The exercise carried out by our good friends in the environmental and development movement in the North to formulate the transition of Northern societies to sustainability was an inspiration to us, not only because we can borrow the concepts and do it for our own countries in the South, but because we know that for the world to change, it will also require the North, which is so powerful, deciding to change. And we in the South can help to give a big push to the people in the North to do that change in their own society.

So the report, by linking the need for poverty alleviation and wealth reduction, by calling for changes in the North, is doing a very important job. I think for a report of this kind you have to establish this as the first big step and then you can go on to say, "Well, we also need something from the South, that is, Don't adopt our development model, Take on a different development path, Don't commit the same mistakes we made, and we admit that it's been a mistake, and we are going to make a big change." Also: "We are not going to give up vehicles in Germany. But Mercedes Benz is now going to produce public transport buses and bicycles, not motor cars any more." And then, on that basis, you can go to China and say, "Eh, you know, Mercedes Benz should not be exporting to you because we're giving up the car here, and here are all the modern systems of public transport and so on."

The report also does ask for the South to be more serious on the environment. This is a critique that we ourselves in the South have made of our own governments. We say, don't make it an excuse that since the North didn't change, we ourselves don't change.

But it is true that if the North doesn't change, but keeps on lecturing to the South to change, it makes the job very difficult for Southern activists to convince our governments, even our public, that we need to change. So this kind of balanced approach is very useful.

Now, what is also important is that this calling for a change in the North is made by basically a group in the North. The team here is balanced, it also contains people from the South, but we know the Heinrich Böll Foundation and Wolfgang are both from the North. So in a way, you are in a more difficult position, because when you're asking for change in the South, then it is very dicey. But the good thing is that it is calling for a change in the North as a primary step and that coming from the citizens of the North – because this is a citizens' report – is a powerful message that we in the South can bring back to our own governments. And of course, we can bring that to your Northern governments as well and hopefully this will be a major tool for lobbying in the North to the Northern governments.

Another strong point of this report is the linkage between technology, production, human rights and environment. You find on page 22 an interesting concept that we are now in the solar age in terms of energy, except that we don't quite know it and we haven't quite used it. But the potential is there. Page 26 deals with biodiversity and links it to livelihoods; page 27 land, water, livelihoods; page 29 energy, and so on. The linkages are made in interesting ways. So overall, I think, for those who organized this report and wrote it, you deserve our congratulations and appreciation.

But of course, the report also has a few shortcomings, in my view.

This report makes a critique that where the governments are concerned, they actually just meant growth and they continue with growth and the goal of sustainable development was not genuine. I think that this may not be entirely fair. If you hear what one of the government negotiators said this morning it was pretty good. In terms of his conceptualization of sustainable development principles, he did stress the precautionary principle as well as the principle of common and differentiated responsibility, he said the arm of social development has to stress poverty eradication. He did say that on the environment you really have to change the entire way in which growth and development have been based and the change in consumption and production patterns is a number-one issue, otherwise this world will not survive. And then on the third arm of economics, of course, he was talking about fair items and trade and so on. So I think, where some of the people in government are concerned, they do realize that sustainable development is more than business-as-usual growth. On the term "sustainable development" there is already a widespread agreement that it contains social, economic and environmental aspects including the change in lifestyle, technology and so on that are accepted. The problem is that it is not translated into operational terms and daily policies due to the fact that trade and finance have a greater priority in each of our countries since trade and finance are governed by rules – and many of these rules are legally binding in one way or another. Especially for developing countries. They do not have the luxury of sitting down objectively to see whether the environment or the social development is more important than trade or finance. These governments are dependent on the IMF for renewal of loans, so they have to follow. They are worried that if they do not follow the WTO rules they will be brought to court and penalized. So they know where their pri-

orities are. And they may not like it themselves that they have this priority, but they are trapped in a system in which they are as much victims as they are culprits. To a large extent they are also victims of this globalized system where the legally binding rules force them to put a priority on the kind of globalization the IMF calls for or the liberalization that the WTO calls for. So I think in a way it is too condescending on the part of the report to say that the governments will just take the term sustainability and transform it to economic growth as usual.

Now, another problem I find is on page 19 in relation to the North-South discussion. Page 19 says that the distinction between North and South is misleading and that these terms are zombie categories, concepts which clumsily survive in every-day speech despite the fact that they do not reflect political categories. The report was quoting somebody called Mr. U. Beck, so we should read him and find out what he meant. But this is quite a dangerous statement because we can argue whether North and South is still relevant, but if you use the term "zombie category" to describe the distinction between North and South, then people will react that the report says that North and South are categories that shouldn't exist and those who use them are zombies. I do agree that North and South are not by themselves adequate concepts. And that of course there are rich people in the North and in the South and poor people in the North too and that therefore we should be concerned about the poor everywhere. But North and South are important, justifiable and still very useful concepts. Because firstly the existence of the North and the South is a reality. It's not just a categorical reality, it is a reality, because there are for example the OECD (that defines itself as a group of rich countries) and the Group of 77 and China, made up of governments that consider their countries to be developing countries. The G77 and the NAM (non-aligned movement) define themselves according mainly to economic categories and maybe political as well as cultural categories. The ex-colonized countries that are the developing countries are still suffering the after effects and hangover of colonialism, plus they have entered a new era of economic colonialism, beholden to the rich countries and to the IMF and World Bank. They find that very often they are bargaining as developing countries, whether for debt relief, or in WTO, or even in the UN. The clash of opinion and action proposals is on North-South lines, that is the former colonized countries versus the former colonial master countries. So, as a political reality North and South are still very important. As economic reality they are still very important, although of course the report makes the point that there is such a diversity among the South that you can't just call everybody the South. Singapore or Mali are very different countries and that is true. And within the North there is a diversity. There is even a difference between the United States and Europe. But the categories North and South are still extremely useful and important. Thus instead of saying that North and South are wrong categories that should be abolished, we could say North and South may be useful categories for certain purposes, certainly in political terms where groupings are made that way: G7, OECD and so on and they are still operational. But they are not sufficient and we have to go beyond North and South to understand the reality at deeper levels of reality, for example, the existence of rich and poor people in each country. That would be I think politically and also intellectually more sound. As it is, I think it is a mistake to have that paragraph in the report attacking the North, South concept.

Another point is in relation to the environment and the WTO on page 57 and 58. The trade and environment issue is very complex concept and, unfortunately, it is politicized even more in the WTO because it is now the subject of negotiation as a result of the Doha Ministerial meeting. "Negotiation" in the WTO is a code word for the formulation of legally binding rules and agreements. Whereas on one hand we are very worried as environmentalists. There are genuine environmental agreements that are formulated, for example the Biosafety Protocol that expresses concern over genetic engineering. It is a genuinely environmental concern based on sufficiently sound science. There may not at this stage be absolutely clear evidence of tremendous dangers, but there is sufficiently sound science, getting sounder and sounder as the days go by as evidence accumulates. So we need a Biosafety Protocol that is strong. Then countries like the US take the position that genetic engineering and its products are safe and countries that regulate imports containing GMOs are going against the free trade rules of the WTO. That sends a chilling effect to the diplomats that are negotiating the Biosafety Protocol who really don't know very much about the WTO because they come from the environment ministry. And so what we are concerned about is the chilling effect of attempts made to sabotage the creation of MEAs through the use of the name of WTO and free trade.

Secondly, when those agreements are already formulated, again countries are trying to implement the disciplines. Some countries want to label GM food and others want to ban imports until they are sure it is safe. The US might come along and say, "Well, that's against WTO rules and I'm gonna take you to court in WTO". And then when the countries say, "Are you sure it is really against WTO, but you yourself are a signatory to the Biosafety Protocol, aren't you?" and the US says "No, we aren't." So the whole thing is very complicated.

The solution, it would appear, would be to amend the rules of the WTO and this is suggested here in this report as well, you will find it on page 65. So it would appear that it'll be good to amend Article 20 of GATT which allows governments to take trade measures that usually contravene GATT principles, on environmental grounds. The suggestion is to amend Article 20 in order to give an automatic waiver for trade measures contained in multilateral environment agreements (MEAs). This idea has been put forward by the EU. It is being objected to by the developing countries. The reason is this: They are afraid of an automatic waiver being misused for protectionist reasons against their products. For a start there is no agreed definition as to what is an MEA. It could be an agreement that three countries establish. They could have a MEA that unfairly penalizes products coming from poor countries. The environmental grounds for the MEA could also be weak. So there are understandable fears that lead to a rejection of automatic waiver for MEAs through amending Article 20 of GATT. The report should have reflected the complexities of the issue.

Finally, page 65 contains a suggestion to upgrade UNEP into a World Environment Organization. This raises some questions which we need to think more about. I think we are all in favor of strengthening UNEP and we do realize that UNEP has at present too limited a mandate. It should be really strengthened. But the concept of a WEO has been opposed also by many developing countries and many NGOs. We now have this concept of environment and development. Could we therefore have a world environment and development organization which is based on the principles that came out of Rio and after Rio, that are not just based on the environment, but also on development? There is

a concern that if there is a World Environment Organization, then it would deal only with environmental problems which may then not be seen in the context of sustainable development but in more narrow terms. The contextual underpinnings of "environment and development" and of "sustainable development" would then be eroded or lost. Obligations could be more easily imposed on developing countries, which are asked to bear the brunt of the burden. On the other hand, if environmental problems are seen and policies are considered within the context of environment, development and Rio, the development aspects (such as the common but differentiated responsibility principle) would have to be considered. How do we ensure that the three arms of sustainability – environment, social and economic – are taken into account? Would a strong WEO erode the concept and operationalizing of sustainable development? Or could it be a building block towards global sustainable development governance? These are some issues that arise when the proposals for a World Environment Organization are made.

As I said, I have some serious criticisms, but overall the report has made a major contribution and I think you deserve our appreciation and thanks for that.

Martin Khor is the Director of the International Secretariat of the Third World Network. He was also a Member of the Board of the South Centre (1996-2002) and formerly a Vice Chairman of the Expert Group on the Right to Development of the UN Commission on Human Rights. He is a member of and Consultant to the Consultative Group on Globalization established under the National Economic Action Council in the Prime Minister's Department in Malaysia. He has also been a Consultant to UNCTAD, UNDP, UNEP and the UN University, and has conducted studies and written papers for these agencies. Recently he coordinated a report of the Third World Network for UNDP on The Multilateral Trading System: A Development Perspective which was published by UNDP in January 2002. He is the author of the book, Globalization and the South, which was a report he wrote for UNCTAD and distributed at the South Summit in Havana in 2000, and has written several other books and papers on trade and WTO issues, and on environment and development issues, including the book on Intellectual Property, Biodiversity and Sustainable Development. An economist trained at Cambridge University, UK, he has lectured in Economics at the Science University of Malaysia.

Fred Luks

THE JO'BURG MEMO: BEYOND DEVELOPMENT-AS-GLOBAL-GROWTH

The Jo'burg Memo takes up many issues that are frequently neglected in the main-stream debate but are central to the discourse on global justice (i.e. sustainable development). It is a timely contribution in its focus on concerns that are hardly ever discussed in the depth they deserve. In this comment, I will not dwell on the recommendations the Memo makes but focus on four of these issues: the connection between justice and ecology, the questionable concept of „development“, the problem of economic growth and delinking and, finally, some „symbolic“ aspects of the debate.

Justice and Ecology

To start with, sustainable development is about intra- and intergenerational justice, and so will be the summit in Johannesburg. Justice within and between different generations is the core of the sustainability idea. „Fairness in a fragile world“ is therefore a good subtitle for the Memo, as it combines the two foundations of sustainable development: justice and ecology. In striving for fairness, we must take into account that our world is fragile, probably more so than ever before in history. „The insight that the globally available environmental space is finite, albeit within flexible boundaries, has added a new dimension to justice.“ (page 19) This becomes especially clear when looking at the three dimensions of sustainable development (social, economic, ecological). The social dimension, and this is often forgotten, is central to this concept, for it gives the foundation and rationality to why sustainability should be a goal of society.

One possible foundation for supporting the strive for generational justice as a basis for sustainable development is John Rawls' famous work *A Theory of Justice*. Rawls' theory tries to show how a just societal order can be designed by a mutual agreement between members of society. The starting point of this hypothetical model is the „original position“ in which fictitious persons decide on principles of justice. These persons are situated behind a „veil of ignorance“, i.e. they know about basic facts about society but not about their position in it. According to Rawls, in such a situation an assembly of free, rational and self-interested persons would agree on fair principles of justice. It is easy to see how this notion can be applied to justice between generations: by including the factor „time“. A person not knowing in which generation she or he would live would not vote for principles that endanger the living conditions of future generations. The outcome is clear: it is unjust to make the future worse off than the present. Even though Rawls does not consider ecological questions, his theory of justice leads to an obligation to sustainability. Hence, it can easily be seen how the call for intra- and intergenerational justice leads straight away to the call for sustainable development in its social, economic, and ecological dimensions.

Hence, in a finite world, questions of ecology and justice can no longer be separated. This insight is reflected in the Jo'burg Memo: „Reduction of the ecological footprint of the consumer classes around the world is not just a matter of ecology, but also a matter

of equity. (...) Just as equity is a condition of sustainability, ecology is a condition of equity.“ (20; 36) Social justice and environmental issues, in other words, are two sides of the same coin. You can't have one without the other, and that's what the Jo'burg Memo is all about, and it addresses both the North and the South: „The North is most unsustainable in resource consumption, and the South is most unsustainable with regard to poverty and misery. The former must reduce its ecological footprint, while the latter must ensure livelihood rights for the marginalized majority.“ (69) This situation, „overdeveloped“ countries with an unsustainable resource use on one hand, and „underdeveloped“ poverty-stricken countries on the other, and the interdependence between the two in a world that is economically, culturally and ecologically globalized, is the background to the Johannesburg Summit. This is a historically unique situation: „With the emergence of bio-physical limits, sustainability has become a cornerstone of world citizenship, because sustainability is not simply about frogs or forests but is fundamentally about human rights.“ (70) Today, as the Memo states, „if things are not brilliant with regard to the environment, they are worse when it comes to development.“ (17) Indeed, and the strength of this Memo is that, in view of this situation, it does not resort to the usual „development-as-growth“ strategy but explicitly raises questions about the very concept of development itself and about the meaning of poverty and wealth.

Development and Growth

A very important issue for sustainable development is the intimate connection between wealth and poverty: „Poverty is the Siamese twin of wealth. Both develop jointly and neither can be fully understood without reference to the other. (...) Poverty alleviation (...) cannot be separated from wealth alleviation.“ (35) This position should not be misunderstood as a simple model in which more wealth means more poverty. The relation is much more complicated, and it is important that the Memo addresses this all too often neglected point: poverty and wealth are always defined in relation to each other – in theory as well as in the minds and hearts of the people.

This, of course, is not to say that there isn't such a thing as poverty! And even though I agree that growth in the North is probably incompatible with long-run-sustainability, I do not see how the development problems of the poor can be solved without growth. Growth of the economy seems to be a necessary condition for many goals that most people will agree with. This issue becomes even more complicated if it is acknowledged that the model of the North with its unsustainable use of sources and sinks cannot be used as a global paradigm for development. This is a huge problem, especially in a world of unequally distributed environmental space. In such a „full world“ with limited resources and historically unique patterns of scarcity, the desirability and possibility of (un-)economic growth and its relation to development becomes crucial. Everybody wants development, and everybody wants it to be sustainable. But what exactly is development, and who benefits from it? While sustainable development was launched „as a new name for progress“ (6) ten years ago in Rio, the term remains elusive. In spite – or because of – the general agreement on the goal of sustainability, it remains unclear what sustainability „really“ means. Most people can probably agree that sustainability is about generational justice. But the content of this concept is differently defined, often depending on who speaks. From an ecological-economic point of view, the situation can be described quite simply: In a world of poverty and environmental limits, global growth cannot be the solution for global problems. Among other things, this means that

the call for sustainable development implies the notion of redistributing wealth, rights and environmental resources.

Some people share this idea, but the „mainstream“ opinion, both scientifically and politically, is that we need growth to solve our problems – not just in poor regions, but also in the North. Still, very many people and institutions are inclined to believe in the dominating development paradigm, which sees growth in the South and in the North as a necessary condition for progress. This paradigm is not sustainable on a global scale. Indeed, this was one of the crucial problems with UNCED: „Rio failed to bid farewell to the conventional idea of development. (...) Many of Rio’s shortcomings derive their genesis from the slippery nature of the core concept of development.“ (14) The Jo’burg Memo, as I read it, is an attempt to raise the awareness about this fact and to show that the historically outdated „Western“ model of development cannot be sustainable on a global scale, neither in terms of poverty problems nor in terms of environmental issues.

Growth and Delinking

Since we must move to a dematerialized economy on a global scale, resource intensive paths of development must be avoided. In the words of the Memo: „Leapfrogging into the solar age is a chance to turn ‚underdevelopment‘ into a blessing.“ (23) In the terminology of the current discourse on growth and sustainability: the task is to find a „tunnel under the Environmental Kuznets Curve“. The Jo’burg Memo sees a historical chance for the South to avoid the „mistakes“ of the North (many of which are, of course, „mistakes“ only in retrospect). Taking up a familiar argument of the ecological economist Herman E. Daly, the Memo states that „the historical pattern of scarcity, which had left its imprint to economic development and continues to shape it, today is outdated.“ (22) The notion that scarcity is historically contingent is alien to mainstream economic theory. But, in the words of Daly, humanity has moved from an empty world to a „full world“, and this implies the need for new theories as well as new practice.

The Memo calls attention to the calculations that indicate the need for a throughput reduction by a factor of 10 within 50 years in the industrialized world (36). In this context, we must carefully distinguish between absolute and relative delinking between economic activities and ecological impacts. Any analysis of development, growth, and its limits must take this crucial difference seriously. When more goods and services are produced with the same amount of material and energy, we have a relative improvement, because the productivity of resources has increased. The relation between economic activity and environmental impact has changed. Nature, however, is completely „indifferent“ to such a change, for environmental systems are not effected by the relation of impacts to monetary units but by the absolute amount of pressure put on the environment. We cannot have ecological sustainability without absolute improvements. Relative improvements – which have been observed, for example, in the case of energy – are necessary, but not enough, as long-term growth processes can „eat up“ the productivity increases. Today, there is indeed the historical chance „to quickly move out of an industrial economy wasteful of both nature and population, and head for a regenerative economy mindful of resources and in need of people.“ (22) Delinking processes must be supported (19). Possible limits to de-link growth of the economy and the growth of environmental pressures, however, must be considered as well. So far, gains in „ecological productivity“ are frequently outweighed by growth effects.

Throughput and Symbolism

It is important to consider the historical dimension of the challenge of sustainability. We must look at social, political, cultural, economic and, indeed, environmental history to understand the chances and obstacles that lie before us. We cannot do without micro- and meso-related considerations, but all too often, the „greater picture“ – for example, the context of theoretical and historical modes of development – is not seen by scientists and politicians. The historical viewpoint also enables us to look beyond purely material or economic aspects of sustainability. The Jo'burg Memo does not „only“ take a look at the material aspects of sustainable development – throughput of industrial metabolisms, reduction of poverty and alike – but also takes into account the important symbolic aspects of this discourse. It considers the rhetorical aspects which are often neglected but remain to be of utmost importance. Metaphors, stories, pictures, words and language are absolutely central for any attempts towards sustainable development. This dimension should not be underrated – symbols are desperately needed if anything is to be achieved, for they can be drivers of change. The Memo itself is part of the symbolic order influencing the discourse on sustainable development.

Rio is but one example for this symbolic dimension: „Rarely had a conference made such an impact on the political landscape simply through the means of language.“ (10) This comment on the Rio conference is not trivial. The discourse on sustainable development has opened many doors for different modes of thinking about development, poverty and overconsumption. The problem, however, remains the „translation“ of thoughts and words into action inducing change. And here, indeed, we face a central problem: „While Rio was good on rhetoric, Marrakech was fast on implementation.“ (12) Marrakech, which stands for the role of „free“ trade, proved to be more powerful than Rio did. Today, issues of globalization and trade are much more „visible“ to the media than poverty and environmental problems. This dominance is even more true for the political realm. Unfortunately, globalized economic activities so far contribute to the outspread of an unsustainable model of development.

So sum up, the Jo'burg Memo addresses crucial issues, analyses many important questions and presents many good ideas. It also tries to show steps to be taken on the way to a sustainable development: for example, more community and environmental rights, institutional and financial reforms, prevention and precaution, reinforcement of the polluter-pays-principle, reforming subsidies and taxes in a sustainable manner, fair trade instead of free trade (part 5). All these suggestions should be part of any debate about governance for sustainable development. The Memo calls for a global Johannesburg „deal“ and asserts that „North-South relations, today more than ever, are marked by mutual interests and not developmental charity or self pity.“ (69) This point is correct, but as so often in debates about sustainability, the question remains why so little is achieved in this direction. Vested interests, power structures and the complexity of socio-economic processes are so far obviously stronger than all the good ideas about sustainable development, many of which are summarized in the Memo. Hence, maybe the melody of the Jo'burg Memo is a bit too optimistic. But after all, what is more utopian: thinking that the world can continue to follow the „development-as-growth“-path or believing in the power of ideas of a sustainable and just future? I think that the Jo'burg Memo is much more realistic than the dreams of a „free-trade“ and growth-oriented model of „development“. Let's hope that this voice will be heard in Johannesburg.

Hope, according to Richard Norgaard, is a prerequisite for constructive thought and action.

Dr. Fred Luks is manager of an interdisciplinary research project on Sustainable Development between Throughput and Symbolism at the Hamburg University for Economics and Politics. He is also affiliated to the Sustainable Europe Research Institute (SERI) in Vienna, Austria. Major research interests: sustainable development and growth, ecological economics, history of economic theory.

Wangari Maathai

DEVELOPMENT WITHOUT DESTRUCTION

I look at the Jo'burg Memo through the eyes of a grassroots activist who has been working for the betterment of the environment since the 1970s. I actively participated in the Earth Summit in Rio, and we intend to come here to Johannesburg in a few months to participate in the World Summit on Sustainable Development. As you can see, the name has changed in the course of the time since Stockholm in 1972. There we talked about Human Environment, and then in Rio we talked about the Earth Summit, and now we will be talking about Sustainable Development. So I guess that shows – as the Memo says – we have also evolved in the way that we look at these issues.

Now since I am from Africa, based in Kenya, I bring with me a handed-down legacy, as many of us do when we come here. We have a legacy that we bring with us, and this legacy affects the way we think and the way our perspective comes out. I have been looking through the Memo for indicators which are of concern to me and which I represent, especially the grassroots people, who must also be counted as people, and who also matter in this question of development. I hope that I can be forgiven for being pessimistic.

I worry about the promises that have been made many times but which are never fulfilled. And not only are these promises forgotten by the international community, but also by many of our governments. How do they leave the fora? They forget what they have signed. Many heads of states from this region who will be coming to South Africa act this way. They signed the document in Rio and I wonder what they will be signing again, because many of them forgot what they signed as soon as they left Rio.

This is especially disappointing to us because we put so much trust and hope in our leaders, especially on the issue of governance, and on the issues of human rights and livelihood rights. So often, people of this region need to be protected from those who have the tools and the knowledge to access the region's resources, exploit those resources and leave the people of the region languishing in debilitating poverty.

Various issues addressed by the environmental movement were rarely seen as a result of industrial development, which generated a great deal of wealth for the European continent. Most of us still believe that unless we follow that path of development, we shall not accumulate similar wealth. And it is good at this point to read the Memo carefully, and understand what the Memo asks us to do.

Dr. Wolfgang Sachs and also Dr. Taylor emphasized that in fact this could be a new opportunity. But I really don't know how many of us reflect on that possibility as being an opportunity. The fact that we are not developed, that we have not followed the industrial revolution path as much as we wanted, that we have not even managed yet to follow that path – this may be a blessing. That is actually a revolutionary statement. And we ought to reflect on it very, very carefully and see whether it makes sense. We should not just make a statement; we should not just let it pass. Because it is quite a revolutionary statement and I wonder how many of the governments that lead us think:

“Eh-eh? Are we really at a point in our history where we can say: Thank God we have not yet followed that industrial path?”

We all know about the environmental problems that resulted from the industrial revolution of Europe and which essentially were the reasons for meeting in Stockholm in 1972. Those of you who have followed the debate know that many leaders in this region were not really persuaded in Stockholm to not follow that path, because they actually feel that they are being persuaded to “not develop.” And so many of them haven’t reached that point – not because they opted against it, but because their resources and their situations have not yet allowed them to follow that path.

Major changes have taken place in the landscape, and they are narrated in the Memo, and I find some of these issues very interesting. One of them is the issue of equity and fairness. Again, I think we should read and reread the Memo on that issue to see what is meant. Fortunately, the document is very well written. Especially for those of us for whom English is not the native language, it is very easy to read – and so we really need to read it. If you are like me, I don’t understand the first time. That’s the way my brain works. I have to read and reread it, until I can almost see what went on in the discussion between these experts. As you can imagine, they met many times to come up with a document of about 67 pages. You can imagine the amount of talking and discussion that went on and eventually was crystallized by Wolfgang Sachs into a few concepts. So we really need to think about those concepts. They ought to generate a lot of discussion in our groups and organisations.

Regarding this issue of equity and fairness, we are mostly dealing with the distribution of the Earth’s resources and the extent to which these can be distributed fairly. And the question that always arises with me – please allow me to be blunt; that’s why I was invited to speak, because I would say what I think – is that when you think about fairness and equity, the question which always arises is, who wants to be fair?

Why would anybody be fair? If they aren’t in a disadvantaged position? If they are the ones who are benefiting from these resources? If they have the tools and the resources to access these resources? Why do you think they would want to say: “Excuse me, I think it is time for you to go forward.”? What resources are being accessed? Who has the tools to access them? Who will win and who will lose? And what will those who lose do?

Because – as Dr. Sachs says – the matter is: Wealth has to be alleviated. It is a very interesting new term which I had never heard before. When I read it, I had to go back and ask myself: what did he say, what did he mean? Wealth should be alleviated. Who wants his wealth alleviated, ladies and gentlemen? You will also come across the question of development which, as he puts it, is a concept that is also very loose and very amorphous. Anybody can have development, and therefore some of you campaign for us when we are in trouble, and I want to pause for a minute and say thank you very much for campaigning.

Why it is that we are in trouble so often? Because we are trying to say to the government: “Stop accessing forests! Especially in watershed areas, because that will affect the water system.” And the response we get is: “We need development. We have to access this forest, so that we promote sustainable development. We need to sustain the poor.”

And in fact, as I speak here there is a big debate going on in Kenya. We are going to court on Tuesday because we are trying to tell the government: “You can not allow the poor people to go into the forest, because we need the forest, because we need the water.” And the government answers: “We have too many poor people. They should go into the forest, because if we don’t promote that, we are not supporting the poor.” So development is a very misleading concept. I do not have an alternative to that word, but I think we need to think carefully when we are presented with the concept of development. In the 1980s, we used to say we should develop without destruction. That was actually a civil society slogan: Develop without destruction. And that still sticks in my mind, because so much of what I see is development with destruction. And we, especially those of us in civil society, have to be very, very keen and very careful about what kind of development we want to support. And I must honestly say that I am still waiting for the formula that will convince the rich and the powerful that they should be concerned with the poor and the weak and indeed, with their environment.

I have not seen that formula. It is not presented in the Memo and I guess it is left to us to find the formula. I have not yet found what the powerful will gain, except that the Memo explains in one place that our survival is in the interest of everybody, or isn’t it?

It is in everybody’s interest that the entire community of life survives – not just the human species, but all other forms of life. In our education systems, I sometimes like to explain it this way, since we are all mostly based on the bible, Jewish or Christian or also Muslim – I am sure it is in the Koran as well. God is said to have created the world in five days. And we are told that on the sixth day he created humanity. And I am always amazed at the wisdom of God for having created man on the sixth day, because if he had made the mistake and had created him on a Monday, he would have been dead by Tuesday. Because when you think about it, man needs everything that God created between Monday and Friday. But what was created up until Friday does not need man. And that should be very humbling to our species, because we are extremely arrogant with the other species.

So I think that we have to find a formula to convince the powerful and the rich of what the Memo calls the global middle ground which, as it explains, is both in the North in the South in the East and in the West; and to find a common ground and reasons why we should all come together, both in Johannesburg and when we go back home, to find reasons why we all should be concerned about the survival of this planet. For those of us who live on this continent, about up to 80 % of our people belong to those so-called marginalized people. So when you talk about 80% of your people, you wonder about the 20% – the middle class in my country is sometimes as low as 10% – and ask, is that who should survive? And we can forget about the rest? That is completely unacceptable: and we should be able to say that loud and clear to our leaders, to the corporate world, to the religious leaders, to anybody who cares to listen and to those who don’t as well. Just go ahead and say it anywhere loud and clear – they may not want to hear, but sometimes they are forced to listen because we speak so loudly.

Finally, I would like to say, especially to those of us in civil society who have given ourselves the mandate to speak on behalf of the poor, that it is very, very important for us to develop activities. Even as we speak about the possibilities and the warnings and the concerns and the threats, we must not give our people a sense of hopelessness. We

must continue to be – I am sure that most of you are in that category, that is why you are here – a source of hope for our people, and must develop initiatives in our communities, no matter how small, that give our people hope and a desire to continue struggling. Because this struggle is not only for us, but for future generations. And I have found that the best way is to involve yourself in local initiatives that give our people hope.

Wangari Maathai is a prominent figure in the global environmental movement and a leader of the women's movement in Kenya. As the first woman professor at the University of Nairobi, she founded a broad-based grassroots organization in 1976: the Greenbelt Movement. Through planting trees, the organization aims to improve the environment and quality of life for women. It has become a strong environmental movement throughout the region. In recent years Wangari Maathai's own work has focused on the human rights situation in Kenya, where she is standing up for a democratic and multi-ethnic Kenya.

Daniel Mittler

EXPOSING POWER, QUESTIONING DEVELOPMENT

It is a campaigners purpose and delight to have textual suggestions taken up by other people. This is not working as well as it should in the official process for the World Summit on Sustainable Development. There, governments continue to ignore key civil society demands on trade justice, corporate accountability and ecological debt. It is thus a pleasure to read something like the Jo'burg Memo in the midst of the hectic negotiations. Here, at least, I can find – positive – references to the work that Friends of the Earth International has been doing in the lengthy run-up to Johannesburg. Here, at least, I can find myself agreeing with the general thrust of the analysis as to why the promises of Rio have been broken. For governments do not deny that they have failed in the last ten years. But they refuse to acknowledge that their own policies, especially their trade policies, are to blame.

Since Rio, Friends of the Earth International as a network has made progress in developing intellectual tools to understand the current process of social impoverishment and environmental destruction. We have created some methodological tools to establish targets and timetables that need to be implemented in order to deliver true sustainable development. However, we have not always been very good at selling these ideas. It is thus reassuring to see both ecological debt, which captures the way in which the “global north” has been robbing the “global south” of its resources¹, and environmental space, which establishes resource reduction targets, that would guarantee a fair share of the globe's resources to all², are both mentioned in the Jo'burg Memo.

In my reading, both concepts underpin much of what the Memo has to say on the crucial, but often simplified, relationship between poverty and the environment. Since Rio, many have, intentionally or unintentionally, blamed the poor for environmental degradations. The Memo is right to remind us that this causality is upside down. Even where poor people do contribute to environmental destruction, they usually do so because of a global system of resource extraction that, for example, forces the poor onto marginal lands – or even off their lands – all in order to satisfy the consumption demands of the “global middle class”. The affluence of this overconsumption lifestyle is, of course, being dumped on the poor, who – in industrialized countries as elsewhere – are usually those living next to busy roads or dangerous industrial plants. This issue of environmental justice is rightfully identified as a key concern for the future global debate on sustainability in the Memo. It is also an idea that Friends of the Earth International is increasingly integrating into its own campaigning work³. We will use the Memo as a further spur to action on this point.

¹ For more information on ecological debt, see <http://www.foei.org/ecodebt/index.html>

² For more information on environmental space, compare Wolfgang Sachs *et al* (1998), *Greening the North – A post-industrial blueprint for Ecology and Equity*, Zed Books, London

³ See in particular the environmental justice campaigns by the Friends of the Earth members in the United Kingdom: www.foe.co.uk and www.foe-scotland.org.uk.

There are (at least) two key contributions which the Jo'burg memo makes to the Johannesburg Summit discourse. First, it puts the Johannesburg Summit on sustainable development into the context of the crucial question of what we actually mean by “development”. So far, the official Johannesburg Summit process has failed to question the northern industrialized development model, even though its negative consequences are acknowledged in the Chairman's text on sustainable consumption and production. Governments admit that we can't all live like the North, but advocate “copycat development” all the same. On this point, sadly, developing country governments have shown as little leadership as those of developed nations. Worse, however, industrialized countries, have tried to rebrand the free trade model which they are pursuing at the World Trade Organization as “sustainable development”⁴. Johannesburg therefore might subordinate sustainable development to the free trade agenda. The Jo'burg Memo summarizes this issue succinctly as “Marrakech Trumped Rio”. Now, we have to prevent that Doha trumps Johannesburg! But to do so effectively, we also have to reopen the wider debate about achieving a form of development that is compatible with both ecology and equity. To remind us of this more important long term task, right at the moment when we fight tooth and nail to rescue the Earth Summit from the trade negotiators, is a great service that the Jo'burg Memo provides. Friends of the Earth International has made its own start to put down some principles for an alternative development model in a paper produced in the wake of the Seattle WTO Ministerial. Once you have read the Memo, I therefore suggest that you read Towards Sustainable Economies as well⁵.

The second key contribution of the Jo'burg Memo is the emphasis it puts on the issue of power. We have seen power at play in obvious and slightly more subtle ways in the run-up to Johannesburg. Who holds power, however, not only decides as to who on the planet gets access to resources and who doesn't. In the UN context, power is the key variable, it seems, that decides who gets to include which wording in the negotiation text. Friends of the Earth International has led a global call to establish a process for negotiations on a binding convention on corporate accountability at Johannesburg. The Jo'burg Memo thankfully mentioned this, and endorses our proposal⁶. If numbers of supporters decided these negotiations, such a Convention would no doubt be initiated in Johannesburg. Eight of nine officially recognized UN stakeholders supported this proposal already at the Second Preparatory Meeting in January 2002.

Many trade unions and even some governments, especially from the G77 countries, have since pledged their support for binding global rules for global business as well. But powerful forces – no prize for guessing that the United States government and the International Chamber of Commerce are among them – have fought this proposal. And, precisely because they are more powerful, the language on corporate accountability has been watered down continuously throughout the negotiations. The “List of Issues” published by the Chair in January 2002 still called for global accountability rules. At the 4th Preparatory Conference in May, even a framework for corporate accountability was blocked. Instead, references to merely voluntary initiatives have appeared in abundance

⁴ Compare Friends of the Earth International's comments on all negotiation texts so far at www.foei.org/wssd

⁵ Friends of the Earth International, Towards Sustainable Economies, Amsterdam, 2000, www.foei.org

⁶ Friends of the Earth International, Towards Binding Corporate Accountability, London/Washington/Berlin, 2002, www.foei.org/corporates/index.html

in the official text. Friends of the Earth International has documented the continuous decline of government commitment to corporate accountability in the negotiations. I suggest you read this sad paper, as it all too clearly illustrates the “power of power”, that the Jo'burg Memo rightly points to⁷.

The Jo'burg Memo calls us, the people who have access to the amenities of an industrialized life, “the global middle class”. This term may be a bit vague, and, of course, masks differences between the absurdly rich and some relatively poor people, how nevertheless are part of the lucky few in global terms. But let us accept, that the term usefully describes the 20% of the world's population that consumes 80% of the globe's resources. Is it, then, not more accurate to say, that this class is increasingly defined by access to air-travel, rather than by access to a car, as the Memo argues? I would suggest as much. After all, there is a small but growing, sub-section of the global middle class – me among them – who forgo access to a car but who hop on and off airplanes with – for the climate – frightening regularity.

Allow me to make a German comment, as that is the country where both I and the Heinrich Böll Foundation are based. First, the Jo'burg Memo will be a key text to further the debate on globalization and the environment in Germany. My organization, Friends of the Earth Germany (BUND) has recently teamed up with “attac”, to start a working group on this topic. We want to end the German globalization debate's blindness when it comes to the negative effects of economic globalization on the environment⁸. We hope that the Jo'burg Memo will be read widely by both movements. Meanwhile, I am delighted that a German (Green) MP has signed up to the Memo. I hope this is a sign, that the Green Party will continue to question the current development paradigm. In power, the party has done well, whenever its projects were compatible with growth. Germany, for example, has made great strides in the expansion of renewable energy sources – a high tech industry that can generate thousands of jobs. The Greens have also succeeded in pouring more money into the German railways, for example. But, in power, the Greens have, more often than not, failed to limit development-as-usual. They have, for example, failed to halt further road building and overseen a massive expansion of air travel. They have also failed to alter Germany's international trade position, which continues to support the EU's neoliberal agenda at the WTO⁹. I hope that the Jo'burg Memo be read by many German Greens and that it can rekindle a debate on the question of development also within the Green Party.

The Jo'burg Memo takes forward many of the issues that Friends of the Earth International has been working on since Rio and that we have been trying to get noticed in the negotiation process for Johannesburg. The Jo'burg Memo is no blueprint for the negotiations. But, frankly, I wish it was. For: if governments listened as attentively to global civil society as the Jo'burg Memo team has done, I would certainly board the plane to Johannesburg with less frustration and more hope.

⁷Friends of the Earth International, *Losing Way: How Governments Started with a Clear Plan on Corporate Accountability, but Ended with a Poor Agreement*, London, 2002, www.worldsummit2002.org or mattp@foe.co.uk

⁸ See www.bund.net and www.attac-netzwerk.de.

⁹ Daniel Mittler, *Eclipse of the German Greens*, *The Ecologist*, December 1999, www.theecologist.org

Daniel Mittler is Head of International Campaigns at Friends of the Earth Germany (BUND) and the Earth Summit Coordinator for Friends of the Earth International. He writes in a personal capacity. Daniel Mittler studied politics and urban planning in Edinburgh, Scotland; Kingston, Ontario and London, England. He is a Fellow of the Centre for Human Ecology, Edinburgh and a Member of the Sustainable Europe Research Institute, Vienna. Email: daniel.mittler@bund.net

Ricardo Navarro

FROM RIO TO JOHANNESBURG: A DIFFICULT ROAD

The document makes a fairly adequate interpretation of the socio-environmental reality, especially of the events that have happened since the meeting in Rio. In addition, many propositions are being made for the next meeting in Johannesburg.

An idea worth discussing more in detail pertains to the globalized rich and the localized poor. Although these categories doubtlessly exist, it might be favorable to substitute the terms “poor” with “weak” and “rich” with “strong”, because the underlying problem is not one of poverty and wealth, but of power shares. Although it’s true that all of the poor are weak, not all of the weak are poor. The fundamental problem is: Who has the ability to impose decisions?

Power is becoming more and more concentrated, to such an extent that even countries are no longer in charge of it, because it is being transferred to multinational companies and they are becoming the decision-makers. When talking about countries, we do not only talk about small countries such as El Salvador, but also about big countries, such as France or Germany, who confer power to supranational authorities, such as the WTO. Due to this centralization, we perceive some mechanisms that aren’t good, neither for weak, poor and vulnerable sectors, nor for nature.

Many governments seem to be acting as if they were employees of the multinational companies. In Bali, during an interview with the delegation from the United States, held to gather support for the idea of the United Nations establishing a convention on controlling the behavior of the multinational companies, the answer was that this would be impossible because it would go beyond the sovereignty of nations. The same thing happened in another meeting with the delegation from the United Kingdom which tried to make clear that the so-called freedom of trade means excluding small entrepreneurs from the Third World from competition. They defended the idea that trade should not be hindered, and rather that efforts need to be made in order to help small entrepreneurs be ready for competition. Nevertheless, everything seems to indicate that, in the context of sustainability, international trade should be discouraged. It should not be hindered, but discouraged. But actually, it’s just the other way around: Our system is likely to motivate trade.

Wealth is a rather real expression of what power is. If one thinks about utopias that should become reality, such as the one to live in a sustainable world, we should start – sooner or later– to call for the need to limit wealth. In the presentation of the Memorandum it was stated that those who use aeroplanes need more environmental space than those who just walk. If we analyze this information under the aspect of the resource use, we can see some unfair types of behavior. For instance, there is no law forbidding the sale of petroleum, neither for direct consumption, as for transport, nor if the purchase of consumer goods is implied. The amount of petroleum consumed eventually becomes carbon dioxide and generates climate change, affecting other sectors, different from the petroleum consumers. To make a long story short, the sectors where the majority of petroleum consumers live are located in the United States, Europe or Japan and others

living in other parts of the world, i.e. in Bangladesh, India or Central America are those who suffer the floods, hurricanes and cyclones. This means that an ecological debt is incurred by the North on the South. This debt has to be reduced and, if possible, eliminated, which means that limits should be set to things such as the consumption of resources.

When we talk about the reduction of resource consumption, we usually talk about concepts like eco-efficiency, but it is also necessary to talk about aspects such as the eco-sufficiency. If presented to governments or groups of entrepreneurs, this kind of theoretical concept would give rise to strong disapproval, but we should remember that if we equally distribute resource consumption in the world and if the inhabitants of the countries in the South would have the same levels of consumption as the inhabitants of the countries in the North, we would need five more planets in order to satisfy our need for resources.

Another point of the document that requires more precision is the concept of North-South. It has been mentioned that the "North" concept is no longer adequate because it doesn't refer only to Europe and the United States anymore, but also to the elite in the South. Maybe it would be more favorable to redefine this concept, taking into account that North and South are not only geographical, but also political concepts and to continue using them, while calling for this change. In fact, there are even subjective ways to underline the superiority of the North. One example is how maps and our whole planet are usually drawn. The North is always on the top and that's a completely arbitrary choice, from the astronomic point of view, because in the universe, there is no top or bottom. "The top" is always associated with the better position. An interesting fact: If you were to turn the planet upside down, all the continents would appear geometrically stable. The intent to redraw the maps with the South at the top and the North at the bottom might seem to be nonsense, but you should keep in mind that there were times in history when ideas like saying that people of color had the same rights as whites were seeds of conflict. A short time ago, Swiss women did not have the right to vote in many cantons.

Since Rio what we have seen to be truly sustainable are poverty and environmental deterioration; there is where we definitely find sustainability. If we want to realize a sustainable world, many things need to be radically changed.

We live in a world where power is increasingly being concentrated. Where does it lead us? In order to keep our status quo and to consume the same amounts of petroleum, we have to continue opening new oil wells or mines in order to extract minerals. Consumption is being more and more related to human rights violations, a tendency that will become stronger in the future. Every time an oil well is to be opened, be it in Colombia or in Nigeria, the companies and the governments have to kill people. This is the reality and if we are willing to carry on our projects, we should keep it in mind.

What people consider "civilization" or "development" is something that is increasing the number of conflicts among human beings or between nature and them. We talk about sustainable development, but why should we make sustainable something that is destroying our planet? It is society that we should make sustainable; we should talk about the sustainability of regions, countries and the planet, and not necessarily about the sustainability of development.

The ideas about equity are adequate. This is one of the most important challenges, because equity is being questioned more often. We should fight for equity on our planet. Generally speaking, it's a good document.

Ricardo Arnoldo Navarro Pineda, Ph.D. in Engineering (Energy) is currently the President and C.E.O. of CESTA (since February 87) and President of Friends of the Earth International FOEI. This federation associates environmental institutions in 68 countries (since November 1999). Among his most well-known books are Energy Model for Third world countries and Alternativas de transporte en América Latina (Transport alternatives in Latin America). He has received various national and international awards, including the "Goldman Environmental Prize" (1995), the "Global 500 Roll of Honor" (1995) and the "Global 500 Roll of Honor" (1997).

Silvia Ribeiro

A DIFFERENT PERSPECTIVE

As a whole, the Jo'burg-Memo is a valuable contribution to a much-needed debate on our environmental, social and economic crisis. I won't attempt here to make a general appraisal or critique of the document, but to present a different perspective on a few issues on which we have worked for a long time. Additionally, we briefly mention some of the concerns we have about the introduction of new technologies, such as nanotechnology, genomics and neurosciences, and their possible impacts on our societies, which is absent from the Memo.

While we agree with the emphasis placed on community rights and the underlying recognition that cultural and biological diversity, both cultivated and in other forms, are inextricably linked and nurture each other, we don't believe that the Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD) has contributed to safeguarding this relationship (it has neither protected the rights and livelihoods of those who nurture, conserve and use biodiversity, nor the genetic resources themselves).

In this regard, we fully agree with the assertion in the Memo that „...from the beginning CBD was predominantly about regulating the exploitation of a new generation of raw materials – the genetic resources. Though the Convention speaks about biodiversity at the level of ecosystems, species and genes, a great deal of diplomatic flurry was centered around access to and rewards from genetic material. Seen from this angle, the Convention is less about protecting the wealth of nature than about protecting the wealth of a variety of economic actors in the gene business.“ (Point 4.2)

Because this is true, the CBD has several fatal flaws. Although CBD is a multilateral agreement, it strongly encourages bilateralism. Unfortunately, the CBD has put the emphasis on bilateral deal making and commercial exploitation of biodiversity, rather than promoting the idea of a common fund to promote conservation, use and development of biodiversity in the countries that share their biological treasures for the benefit of humankind.

Another central axis of the Convention is the legalization of biopiracy, mainly through the legitimization of intellectual property on life forms through „benefit sharing“; and by defining the actors needed to commercialize biodiversity and related knowledge. In fact, the Convention is completely toothless in stopping the plundering of resources and knowledge from indigenous peoples, farmers and traditional communities, but it is a powerful tool to condone it.

For ETC Group, biopiracy is the privatization through intellectual property systems of biological resources and/or related knowledge, regardless if this is legalized by a national law or a bioprospecting agreement, and even if a so called „benefit sharing“ agreement is included. As Alejandro Argumedo, a Quechua activist describes it, benefit sharing in bioprospecting contracts is like waking up while your house is being robbed, and the thieves try to calm you down by offering to share the benefits derived from the commercialization of your stolen goods.

The CBD legitimates bioprospecting in several ways. One of them is the recognition of the „sovereignty of the States over its biological resources“, which is commonly seen as a victory for the South, but has several serious drawbacks.

At the moment of the adoption of the CBD, an estimated 80% of the known resources of biodiversity (plants, animals, microbes, fungus, etc) were present in the ex-situ collections of Northern countries (botanical gardens, zoos, museums, microbial collections, gene banks, among others). This is not because the Northern countries had thoroughly collected its own genetic resources, but because through centuries of conquest, scientific and botanical expeditions these resources had been collected predominantly from Africa, Asia and Latin America, where more than 80% of the world's known biodiversity originates.

As all the *ex-situ* resources collected previously to the signature of the CBD are not covered by the Convention – not to mention that the US – which holds immense collections and has not ratified it yet – the inclusion of the „sovereignty of the states“ leaves all these resources to be commercialized and patented by the countries that own and hold the collections. There are currently some initiatives led by the Kew Botanical Garden to define voluntary guidelines for cataloging the countries of origin of the resources in their collections, and to devise „benefit sharing“ provisions in case of commercial use of their resources, but this also legitimates the use of intellectual property on these resources.

Another important pitfall of the article assigning States sovereignty over genetic resources is that it defines which actors are authorized to negotiate the commercialization of resources. This significantly facilitates the privatization of public collective resources.

But these resources were not previously in the States' domain, and most importantly, they were not for sale. They were public and collective goods, developed and nurtured by farmers and indigenous peoples since thousands of years for the welfare of their own communities and for humankind. Furthermore, the same knowledge and resources may be present in more than one State, as eco-regions and traditional cultures don't necessarily coincide with modern geopolitical divisions. Additionally, States in general have bad records for respecting the rights and livelihoods of the indigenous peoples, farmers, fishing and other local communities located in the States' territories, which clearly may lead to further plundering of the resources of these peoples by „their own“ States.

It is commonly believed that the CBD would help to prevent these abuses, by recognizing the rights of traditional people to be consulted on the use of their resources and knowledge, mainly through the article 8 (j), which states that: *„Subject to its national legislation, respect, preserve, and maintain knowledge, innovations and practices of indigenous and local communities embodying traditional lifestyles relevant for the conservation and sustainable use of biological diversity and promote their wider application with the approval and involvement of the holders of such knowledge, innovations and practices, and encourage the equitable sharing of benefits arising from the utilization of such knowledge, innovations and practices.“*

In fact, this could be a good article as the Jo'burg Memo states, but again, it has serious flaws. One that is also constant for many other paragraphs of the CBD and other Multi-

lateral Environmental Agreements, is that it is „subject to national legislation“, which leaves in the hands of the States the enforcement of the article, which in many cases is an effective way of making the whole paragraph useless in practice.

Another aspect is that by recognizing „communities“ it denies at the same time the wider concept of „Peoples“ preferred by most indigenous peoples. In using the term „communities“, it defines an easy actor to negotiate with. In fact, the strategy of many bioprospectors – companies or intermediaries such as universities, international conservation NGOs, etc- has been to look for „adequate“ communities that are willing to enter into a contract to sell their resource and/or knowledge, despite the fact that the same resources and knowledge may be historically present and shared by many other communities in the same culture and/or region that may not agree to sell them. „Communities“ as opposed to „Peoples“, is a very useful tool to privatize resources, and it has been used not only in relation to genetic resources, but also to obtain „consent“ for mega-projects with negative impacts, sale of land and exploitation of other natural resources.

The Bonn Guidelines

In our view, since UNCED 92 the CBD has constantly worsened the interpretation of its articles to facilitate biopiracy, and one of the best examples is the *Bonn Guidelines on Access and Benefit Sharing*, recently adopted in the VI Conference of the Parties of the CBD in The Hague in April 2002. This is one of the main „achievements“ that the „biocrats“ of the CBD will showcase at the WSSD in Johannesburg.

The Bonn Guidelines are, as the name indicates, a set of recommended guidelines, that provide a framework for bioprospecting contracts. Although they are „voluntary“, they will very likely become a powerful framework to justify and promote bioprospecting. Many transnational companies already indicate that „they comply with the CBD“ to justify their resource privatization. These guidelines will make their work much easier. Despite the fact that they are voluntary, they will be seen by governments as the framework for national legislation, which is the final step in the process of legalizing biopiracy.

At the same time, the fact that they are voluntary makes them functional at many levels: companies and governments can make „cherry picking“ of the worst aspects and still say that they are compliant.

Although the Bonn Guidelines are not revolutionary in their content – as the main points were defined in the CBD – they reaffirm and introduce some very negative aspects.

In the view of ETC Group, The Bonn Guidelines aim to mainstream biopiracy. They explicitly are „inputs to develop and draft legislative, administrative or policy measures on access and benefit sharing...[at national level] and contracts and other arrangements...“ The Guidelines thus promote national or regional legislation to facilitate access, as well as bilateral contracts among companies and countries or communities. Specific examples are given below.

The Guidelines:

- Use the term „stakeholders“ to define the involved parties, drawing multinational companies, NGOs, universities, governments and farmers/indigenous communities over the same line, differentiated only for the terms „users“ and „providers“.
- Reaffirm the use of the term „communities“ that fragments indigenous peoples and ignore broader cultural and historical contexts, while strengthening the role of States, which are reaffirmed to be the entity entitled to approve the access to resources.
- Although they are full of words about how prior informed consent should be done to respect indigenous and local communities, the Guidelines clearly establish that the prior informed consent be given according to article 15.5 of the CBD, which states that „Access to genetic resources shall be subject to prior informed consent of the Contracting party providing such resources, unless otherwise determined by that Party“.
- Establish that restriction to access must be based on „legal grounds“, denying ethical, cultural or other values that indigenous peoples and others may have that are most often not recognized in law.
- Legitimate and incorporate intellectual property agreements on life and traditional knowledge as a tool for benefit sharing, accounted as both a „monetary benefit“ (as the „providers“ would receive an unspecified percentage of the royalties collected by the owner of the patent), as well as a „non-monetary benefit“ as the providers (e.g. indigenous communities) may be offered to have joint-ownership of patents.
- Define „salaries“ as benefit sharing, while salaries are actually the payment for the labor – not „benefits.“
- Encourage the capacity building of indigenous and local communities to develop negotiating skills to enter contracts, and also capacity building for the economic valuation of biodiversity – rather than placing the emphasis on sustainable conservation and use of biodiversity for local communities.
- Reaffirm the idea that capacity building for the use of biotechnology should be seen as „benefit sharing“ ignoring critiques of this technology and possible impacts on peoples and countries.
- Encourage WIPO „to make rapid progress in the development of model intellectual property clauses which may be considered for inclusion in contractual agreements...”

Biodiversity „Cartel“: The Like-Minded Megadiversity Countries

Another recent biodiversity initiative, the *Cancún Declaration Of Like-Minded Megadiverse Countries*, is often misinterpreted as a pro-South initiative to conserve and utilize biodiversity, and to stop biopiracy. The Cancún Declaration was issued by environment ministers and delegates of Brazil, China, Colombia, Costa Rica, Ecuador, India, Indonesia, Kenya, Mexico, Peru, South Africa and Venezuela in Cancún, Mexico, on February 18, 2002. Unfortunately, the initiative led by Mexico to form a „cartel“ of megadiversity countries – which according to them covers 70% of the world’s biodiversity – is not

to defend the interest of their own populations nor indigenous peoples or local communities. This is particularly clear in the case of Mexico that recently failed to approve a law on indigenous rights as proposed by the National Indigenous Congress. Instead of recognizing the inter-linkages of the cultural and biological diversity and seeking to protect this process, the Group of Like Minded Megadiverse Countries can be seen as a front for selling their biological resources to the highest bidder. According to the Cancún declaration, these nations seek to introduce and/or harmonize intellectual property systems and increase the use of biotechnology as means of conserving diversity. Although the Cancún Declaration mentions the need to take into account indigenous communities and the equitable sharing of benefits, the initiative has been consistently non-consultative within their own countries.

Nanotechnology and other Emerging Technologies

At the very time civil society and governments are mired in acrimonious debates about GMOs and the role of biotechnology in agriculture, human health and the environment, a broad set of new and closely related technologies such as nanotechnology, human genomics and neurosciences are being rushed to market in the absence of societal discussion or governmental discussion or regulation. Over the past year we have witnessed the rapid integration of nanotech and biotech. Civil society organizations now engaged in „anti-GM“ campaigns must understand that it will soon be impossible to talk about genetic engineering without talking about nanotechnology. Nanotechnology refers to the manipulation of matter at the level of the nanometer (that is, one billionth of a meter). Nanotechnology is a very broad term referring to an array of technologies encompassing everything from the manufacture of nano-scale materials (the commercial manufacture of bulk sprays, powders and coatings is already big business), to the fabrication of structures utilizing the quantum physics of nano-scale materials, to the futuristic and hotly debated goal of creating self-replicating nano-robots. It is clear that every industry and technology will be affected by nanotechnology in the future. Global corporate and government R&D funding for nanotechnology has reached US \$4 billion. More than 470 companies, spread around the world, are actively engaged in nanotechnology, a third of these companies are commercially manufacturing nanoparticles. The US National Science Foundation predicts that the market for nanotech's products and processes will reach US \$1 trillion by 2015 and that within 10 years, the entire semiconductor industry and half of the pharmaceutical industry will rely on nanotechnology.

Human genomics and neurosciences refer to an array of new pharmaceutical industry strategies involving control and manipulation of human genetics, the human mind and enhancement of human performance. While the general public is distracted and dismayed by the debate raging over reproductive cloning, the far more serious threat to human dignity and democratic dissent lies in the field of genomics and neurosciences. Combined with „New Enclosure“ strategies for corporate control of technology, these emerging technologies represent unprecedented challenges to democracy and dissent. We must pay special attention to the impacts of genomics/neurosciences on the most vulnerable members of society, especially the poor, workers, women, the disabled.

Civil society and governments must develop the capacity to respond to the social, economic and environmental impacts of these and other emerging technologies, before it is too late. The timing is critical. Pressure is building to embrace nanotechnology as the

greenest and greatest technological fix for a sustainable future. Meanwhile, governments and Heads of State convening in Johannesburg are running a decade behind reality. Emerging technologies such as nanotechnology and the new genomics/neurosciences are absent from the WSSD agenda. Civil society and governments at WSSD must urgently call for a legally binding International Convention for the Evaluation of New Technologies (ICENT). The ICENT would provide a „template“ that lays out social participation, timetables and other consultative processes that set the terms and conditions under which a new technology might be introduced into society and the environment, how it is monitored, and the terms and conditions under which the technology might be recalled if later found threatening. Rather than simply review its failures over the past 10 years, the WSSD must set in motion measures to reverse them.

More detailed analysis and background information on these technologies and ICENT is available on the ETC Group website, <http://www.etcgroup.org>

See especially the following ETC Communiques, „New Enclosures: Alternative Mechanisms to Enhance Corporate Monopoly and BioSerfdom in the 21st Century,“ and „The New Genomics Agenda: A Political Epilogue to the Book of Life: Update on Pharmaceutical Multinationals and the Human Genome.“ ETC Group is now completing a Communique that examines the largely undisclosed risks of nanomaterials already in the environment. (It was recently disclosed that nanoparticles accumulate within organisms and that nanomaterials, even inorganic ones, have been absorbed by living cells.) Prior to the WSSD we will also release a kit on nanotechnology for civil society and policy makers.

Silvia Ribeiro is a researcher and programme manager with ETC group, based in Mexico. She has a background as a publisher, journalist and environmental campaigner in Uruguay, Brazil and Sweden. She has extensive experience in social and environmental advocacy. As a civil society representative, she has attended and followed the negotiations of several of United Nations environmental treaties.

Silvia Ribeiro has produced a number of articles related to biodiversity, genetic resources, intellectual property and biopiracy, among other issues. She has been published in Latin American, European and North American magazines and papers. From 1994-1999, she was the editor of the Latin American magazine "Biodiversidad, sustento y culturas", published by Friends of the Earth Uruguay in collaboration with Genetic Resources Action International (GRAIN). She is now a member of its international advisory editorial committee.

The Action Group on Erosion, Technology and Concentration, ETC Group (pronounced Etcetera Group), is dedicated to the conservation and sustainable advancement of cultural and ecological diversity and human rights. To this end, ETC Group supports socially responsible developments in technologies useful to the poor and marginalized and it addresses governance issues affecting the international community. ETC Group also monitors the ownership and control of technologies, and the consolidation of corporate power. <http://www.etcgroup.org>

WORLD SUMMIT PAPERS

The Jo'burg Memo - Fairness in a Fragile World

Memorandum for the World Summit on Sustainable Development.,
[World Summit Papers Special Edition](#), Berlin, April 2002, 80 pages

Also available in German, Spanish, Italian. In preparation is a Russian, Arabic; Portuguese, Turkish and Hungarian version. www.joburgmemo.org

Freier Handel – nachhaltiger Handel. Ein Widerspruch?

Hintergrundpapier für die Debatte um Handel und nachhaltige Entwicklung nach Johannesburg. Eine Studie des Sustainable Europe Research Institute (SERI) von Tobias Döppe, Stefan Giljum, Mark Hammer, Friedrich Hinterberger, Fred Luks, Doris Schnepf und Joachim Spangenberg.

World Summit Paper No. 21, Berlin, 60 Seiten

Globale Öffentliche Güter – Zukunftskonzept für die internationale Zusammenarbeit?

Ein WEED-Arbeitspapier von Jens Martens und Roland Hain

World Summit Paper No. 20, Berlin, August 2002, 40 Seiten

Managing Sustainability - World Bank-Style: An Evaluation of the World Development Report 2003

With contributions from Liane Schalatek & Barbara Unmüßig, et al.

World Summit Paper No. 19, Johannesburg, August 2002, 60 Seiten

Debating the Jo'Burg Memo

With contributions from José Ramos Horta, David Fig, Angel Ibarra, Wangari Maathai, et al.

World Summit Paper No. 18, Berlin, November 2002, 44 pages

Zukunftsfähiges Deutschland: Ein Blick aus dem Süden 10 Jahre nach Rio

Eine Studie von Meena Menon, Bernardo Reyes, Jane Ngige, Batir Wardam, Ute Sprenger (Koordinatorin)

World Summit Paper No. 17, Berlin, August 2002, 52 Seiten

Sustainable Germany - A View from the South 10 Years After Rio

An assessment by Meena Menon, Bernardo Reyes, Jane Ngige, Batir Wardam, Ute Sprenger (Co-ordinator)

World Summit Paper No. 16, Johannesburg, August 2002, 92 pages

Energy Turnround 2020 - The path to a sustainable energy system in Germany

An Öko-Institut Study by Dr. Felix Chr. Matthes and Martin Cames

World Summit Paper No. 15, Johannesburg, July 2002, 96 pages

Debating Limits to Sustainable Development

A case study of Thailand from a cultural perspective on sustainable development in Southeast Asia. By Karl H. Segschneider
World Summit Papers No. 14, Chiang Mai 2002, 110 pages

Sustainability and Justice

Documentation of a Conference in Berlin, September 2000
World Summit Papers No. 13, Johannesburg, July 2002, 92 pages

Generación Jo'Burg

Una nueva visión para la Cumbre Mundial. Una recopilación de informes por Mohammed Rabah Aghbarieh, et al.
World Summit Papers No. 12, Berlin, mayo 2002, 28 páginas

Generation Jo'Burg

A new vision for the World Summit on Sustainable Development. A Compilation of reports by Mohammed Rabah Aghbarieh, et al.
World Summit Papers No. 11, Berlin, May 2002, 28 pages

Gender and Sustainable Development

A briefing Paper by Minu Hemmati and Rosalie Gardiner
World Summit Papers No. 10, Berlin 2002, 56 pages

The Road to Johannesburg after September 11, 2001

Documentation of the online-debate on www.worldsummit2002.org
World Summit Papers No. 9, Berlin 2002, 54 pages

Rio + 10 and the North-South Divide

An essay by Wolfgang Sachs
World Summit Papers No. 8, Berlin 2001, 16 pages

Globalization and Poverty – an Ecological Perspective

By Roldan Muradian and Joan Martinez-Alier
World Summit Papers No. 7, Berlin 2001, 36 pages

Globalización y Sustentabilidad

Un ensayo de Wolfgang Sachs
World Summit Papers No. 6, San Salvador 2001, 30 pages

From Rio to Johannesburg. Contributions to the Globalization of Sustainability

By Jürgen Trittin, Uschi Eid, Sascha Müller-Kraenner and Nika Greger
World Summit Papers No. 5, Berlin 2001, 36 pages

Von Rio nach Johannesburg. Beiträge zur Globalisierung der Nachhaltigkeit

Von Jürgen Trittin, Uschi Eid, Sascha Müller-Kraenner und Nika Greger
World Summit Papers No. 4, Berlin 2001, 40 Seiten

Breaking the Impasse. Forging an EU Leadership Initiative on Climate Change

A policy paper by Hermann E. Ott and Sebastian Oberthür
World Summit Papers No. 3, Berlin 2001, 36 pages

10 Years After Rio. Debating Development Perspectives

A concise outlook on sustainable development implementation
By Karl H. Segschneider
World Summit Papers No. 2, Chiang Mai 2001, 70 pages

Towards the World Summit on Sustainable Development

A discussion paper by the South African NGO Caucus on the World Summit for Sustainable Development
World Summit Papers No. 1, Berlin 2001, 32 pages

To order these publications:

Heinrich-Böll-Stiftung, Rosenthaler Str. 40/41, 10178 Berlin

Tel.: ++49 30/285 340; fax: ++49 30/285 34 109

E-mail: info@boell.de; for downloads: www.boell.de; www.worldsummit2002.org

THE HEINRICH BÖLL FOUNDATION

The Heinrich Böll Foundation, affiliated with the German Green Party and headquartered in the Hackesche Höfe in the heart of Berlin, is a legally independent political foundation working in the spirit of intellectual openness.

The Foundation's primary objective is to support political education both within Germany and abroad, thus promoting democratic involvement, sociopolitical activism, and cross-cultural understanding. The Foundation also provides support for art and culture, science and research, and development cooperation. Its activities are guided by the fundamental political values of ecology, democracy, solidarity, and non-violence.

By way of its international collaboration with a large number of project partners – currently numbering about 200 projects in 60 countries – the Foundation aims to strengthen ecological and civil activism on a global level, to intensify the exchange of ideas and experiences, and to keep our sensibilities alert for change. The Foundation's collaboration with its international project partners on sociopolitical education programs is conducted on a long-term basis. Additional important instruments of international cooperation include visitor programs, which enhance the exchange of experiences and political networking, as well as basic and advanced training programs for committed activists.

The Heinrich Böll Foundation has about 170 full-time employees as well as approximately 350 supporting members who provide both financial and non-material assistance.

Ralf Fücks and Barbara Unmüßig comprise the current Executive Board. Dr. Birgit Laubach is the CEO of the Foundation.

Two additional bodies of the Foundation's educational work include the Green Academy and the Feminist Institute.

The Foundation currently maintains foreign and project offices in the Arab Middle East, Bosnia-Herzegovina, Brazil, Cambodia, the Czech Republic, El Salvador, India, Israel, Kenya, Nigeria, Pakistan, Poland, Russia, South Africa, Thailand, Turkey, the USA and the EU office in Brussels.

For 2002, the Foundation has almost 35 million Euro in public funds at its disposal.