

THE ROAD TO JOHANNESBURG AFTER SEPTEMBER 11, 2001

Kurt Klotzle, Editor

Published by the Heinrich Böll Foundation

Stakeholder Forum for Our Common Future

The Stakeholder Forum for Our Common Future, formerly UNED Forum, is a unique multi-stakeholder network and forum on sustainable development which has promoted outcomes from the first Earth Summit in 1992. In the run-up to World Summit 2002, the Stakeholder Forum aims at facilitating the involvement of Major Groups and stakeholders in the policy work of the United Nations and other inter-governmental institutions in the area of sustainable development.

Contact: Stakeholder Forum for Our Common Future, c/o United Nations Association UK, 3 Whitehall Court, London SW1A 2EL, United Kingdom, Tel. +44 20 78391784, Fax +44 20 79305893, info@earthsummit2002.org, www.earthsummit2002.org, www.stakeholderforum.org

World Summit Papers of the Heinrich Böll Foundation, No. 9:
The Road to Johannesburg after September 11, 2001. Kurt Klotzle (Ed.)
Published by the Heinrich Böll Foundation
Printed in Germany, March 2002
© by the authors and the Heinrich Böll Foundation
All rights reserved
Editing: Kurt Klotzle
Production: trigger, Berlin

The following documentation 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.de; www.worldsummit2002.org

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Introduction	5
<i>Jasmin Enayati and Kurt Klotzle</i>	
Part I	9
Expanding the Globalization Debate beyond Trade, Expanding the Joannesburg Agenda beyond “Narrow” Environmentalism: How September 11 Highlights the Necessity of Sustainable Development, Poverty Reduction, Equity, Democratization, and a Broader Concept of Security	
The Road to Johannesburg after September 11	11
<i>Margaret Brusasco-Mackenzie</i>	
Terrorism and Development: What is Sustainable Response?	14
<i>Maria Ivanova</i>	
The Double Nexus of Security, Globalization, and Sustainable Development	17
<i>Sascha Müller-Kraenner</i>	
September 11 and the Road to Johannesburg	23
<i>Hermann E. Ott</i>	
September 11: The Beginning or the End of History?	28
<i>Saliem Fakir</i>	
What New World?	33
<i>Tom Athanasiou and Paul Baer</i>	
Part II	37
A New Multilateralism? Will September 11 Effect Long-term Changes in U. S. Foreign Policy and International Cooperation?	
America, You Can Do Better	39
<i>Reinhard Loske</i>	
The “With Us or Against Us” Syndrome	43
<i>Anja Sharma</i>	
After September 11: Towards a World Summit on Unsustainable Development?	47
<i>Jörg Haas</i>	
Afterword	50
<i>Kurt Klotzle</i>	

INTRODUCTION

“One is tempted to say that we must now focus all our energies on the struggle against terrorism, and on directly related issues. Yet if we should do so, we will be giving the terrorists a victory of a kind. Let us remember that none of the issues that faced us on 10 September has become less urgent. The number of people living on less than one dollar a day has not decreased. The numbers dying of HIV/AIDS, malaria, tuberculosis, and other preventable diseases have not decreased. The factors that cause the desert to advance, biodiversity to be lost, and the Earth’s atmosphere to warm have not decreased.”

UN Secretary-General Kofi Annan to the UN General Assembly, November 10, 2001

The terrorist attacks of September 11 seem to have changed world politics dramatically. New and unexpected alliances are being forged, the priorities of governments are being reassessed, and public attention is focused on the threat of terrorism. A global “war against terrorism” appears to have been unleashed that is likely to stay with us during the coming years.

What do these developments mean for the road to the World Summit on Sustainable Development? This UN Summit will be held in Johannesburg, South Africa, in September 2002, 10 years after the historical Rio Conference on Environment and Development, and one year after the attacks in New York and Washington. Still, preparations for the Summit go on apparently unaffected by the recent events. But if everything changes, can the Johannesburg Summit and its preparatory process remain untouched?

Between November 16-24, 2001, the Heinrich Böll Foundation and UNED Forum* together initiated a global online debate on these questions—i.e., the impact of the September 11 attacks and consequences for the Johannesburg Summit process. The forum addressed the following issues:

- Will the shock create a new climate of international cooperation between North and South, East and West, thus creating fertile ground for a new “global deal”?
- Will the terrorist attacks shift media attention and the priorities of governments away from the issues of poverty, environmental degradation, and globalization that are at the center of the Johannesburg agenda?
- Will the climate of an unfolding “global civil war” ultimately lead to the failure of Johannesburg 2002, symbol of global cooperation?
- Does the Johannesburg agenda need to be reframed, for example in terms of (environmental) security or the provision of global common goods, peace being one of them?

* As of January 1, 2002, UNED Forum changed its name to *Stakeholder Forum for Our Common Future*. Since the online discussion took place before this name change, the organization will be referred to throughout this publication as UNED Forum.

- Johannesburg was partly conceived as a global response to the challenges of globalization. How will the globalization debate and the anti-globalization movement be affected by recent developments?
- How can civil society engaged in preparations for Johannesburg 2002 react to the new developments? What strategies can be implemented to make the World Summit a success under these new circumstances?

To fight intolerance and fundamentalism of any kind, the sources of inequality, hatred, and environmental degradation need to be better understood and confronted. This attempt motivated more than 400 subscribers from all over the globe and from many stakeholder groups to participate in a very timely and lively debate. The online discussion on “The Road to Johannesburg after September 11” was an attempt to better understand how to strike a balance between the three pillars of sustainable development: environmental protection, healthy economic growth, and social equity.

We invited eminent intellectuals from all over the globe to contribute short opinion articles as “think pieces” to start the debate. One or two of these think pieces were posted on the Internet during each day of the discussion, and discussion participants then posted commentaries that either responded to the think pieces or elaborated their own opinions on the linkages between September 11 and issues of sustainable development.

Invitations to participate in the online debate were sent via e-mail to relevant list servers and discussion groups and to both the Heinrich Böll Foundation’s and UNED Forum’s databases. The debate was also advertised on UNED Forum’s websites in preparation for the World Summit on Sustainable Development (at www.earthsummit2002.org).

To focus the discussion on the questions at hand, we set a few ground rules; the function of the moderator was to observe these rules and try to keep the discussion focused. For one week, participants discussed crucial questions concerning the climate of international cooperation among nations; a possible growing commitment to multilateralism; a “global deal” between North and South; collaboration among all stakeholders; the role of the UN and other stakeholders; an intensified religious divide; economic liberalization; the global free market; and much more.

Many of these issues provoked a heated debate among participants in the discussion. Respondents addressed a wide spectrum of issues, and their comments were spread across a broad continuum of optimism vs. pessimism concerning the ultimate ramifications of September 11 for the sustainable development movement. However, there was agreement on certain basic issues, including a sense of urgency to turn the Johannesburg Summit into a success by profoundly shifting its emphasis to focus on poverty eradication and social equity and to create and promote a common vision. Participants were largely unanimous in their assessment that the Johannesburg Summit agenda will have to confront the new realities after September 11 and must provide a platform for intensifying our focus on governance structures, social development, and global economic disparities.

Furthermore, there was clear acknowledgement that the United States’ role in processes of international cooperation and sustainable development is crucial. While many discussants expressed the hope that one positive consequence of the September 11 tragedies would be a fundamental, long-term shift in U.S. foreign policy toward international consultation and cooperation, a significant number of participants remained convinced

that the United States will engage in multilateral efforts only to the extent that such efforts promote, and remain subservient to, U.S. national interests.

With a total of 425 participants from 58 countries, the online discussion was certainly global in reach. The largest number of participants came from Europe (44%), followed by North America (27%), Asia (10%), and Africa (8%). The circle of participants was equally diverse in terms of profession and area of specialization: 41% of the discussants were from the field of civil society/NGOs, followed by academia (28%), government and international institutions (19%), and business and media (12%).

This publication reproduces nearly all of the think pieces featured in the online discussion as well as numerous responses and independent commentaries provided by discussion participants. The think pieces have been divided into two broad categories:

- Expanding the Globalization Debate beyond Trade, Expanding the Johannesburg Agenda beyond “Narrow” Environmentalism: How September 11 Highlights the Necessity of Sustainable Development, Poverty Reduction, Equity, Democratization, and a Broader Concept of Security
- A New Multilateralism? Will September 11 Effect Long-term Changes in U.S. Foreign Policy and International Cooperation?

It should be noted that the think pieces do not fall neatly into the above categories. Rather, each author provides an exploratory essay that examines a broad range of concepts and ideas—including globalization, multilateralism, environment-security linkages, poverty reduction, equity, democratization, and the need for a clearer, more encompassing agenda at Johannesburg—and the ways in which all of these topics are intertwined with both (1) the issue of sustainable development and (2) the events of September 11.

Furthermore, the authors provide more questions than answers. Ultimately, the jury is still out on the questions of (1) whether September 11 has provided a long-term impetus toward truly multilateral responses to international problems or rather toward unilateralism and national interest-based approaches; and (2) whether September 11 will stimulate a broader understanding of “globalization” that goes beyond mere economics to include interrelationships between the world economy, the environment, sustainable development, equity, and security.

Nevertheless, it is precisely the questions raised by the various authors and discussants in this volume that must be addressed in order to turn the Johannesburg Summit into a forum that takes effective steps toward solving problems of global proportion. Despite the tremendous uncertainty in this potentially new era of international relations, the World Summit on Sustainable Development provides a crucial opportunity for demonstrating the necessity of increased global cooperation. But this opportunity must be prepared for. It is the Heinrich Böll Foundation’s and UNED Forum’s hope that the online discussion, and this publication, will contribute to this preparatory process for the Johannesburg Summit.

Jasmin Enayati is a project coordinator at UNED Forum and served as the moderator of the online discussion. Kurt Klotzle is events manager for the Heinrich Böll Foundation’s Europe Department and a freelance editor.

PART I

**Expanding the Globalization Debate beyond Trade,
Expanding the Johannesburg Agenda beyond “Narrow”
Environmentalism:**

**How September 11 Highlights the Necessity of
Sustainable Development, Poverty Reduction, Equity,
Democratization, and a Broader Concept of Security**

Margaret Brusasco-Mackenzie

THE ROAD TO JOHANNESBURG AFTER SEPTEMBER 11

UNED Forum and the Heinrich Böll Foundation have been organizing an online debate on the dramatic events of September 11 and their aftermath. While a band of terrorists comprised the immediate cause of the tragic loss of lives on September 11, we must of course look much deeper into the actual causes that allow such fanaticism to flourish.

It is quite clear that economic conditions in many Third World countries have deteriorated considerably since the Rio Conference in 1992. Many Least Developed Countries (LDCs) have been sinking even deeper into abject poverty, with a large percentage of young people unemployed. Far from having been a decade of sustainable development, the past decade has in many cases been one of no development at all. Hopefully there is some recognition of this fact among politicians so that they will focus on models other than rampant globalization and will instead turn toward sustainable development.

Afghanistan is clearly a case in point where there has not been any development since Rio, and it must surely be one of the most underdeveloped and poverty-stricken countries in the world. Clearly, a 20-year war provides no possibility for development of any kind. Furthermore, the outrageous exclusion of women from any role outside the home has clearly contributed to this ruinous situation, since women have a significant role to play in sustainable development practices – whether as good or wasteful users of energy, as water gatherers or water polluters, etc. Moreover, women often play an essential role in educating future generations to be respectful of the environment.

It is obvious to all that war has negative environmental impacts and that environmental and security issues should be given higher priority. Clearly, remnants of war have a disastrous effect on the environment – ammunition dumps, depleted uranium shells, and land mines are just a few of many possible examples. Perhaps the latter are the most pernicious since they are the most numerous. In the case of a country like Mozambique, land mines have seriously hindered sustainable development because they have been sown in large tracts of good agricultural land. As a result, farmers have been forced to move onto the flood plain and to produce too intensively elsewhere. Yet environmental and security concerns have to do with more than just the results of war. Rather, they have a much larger “upstream” dimension. By this I mean that the scarcity of environmental resources, particularly water and arable land, can lead to conflict. For example, the right to withdraw water from the Jordan River has always been one of the most difficult aspects within Israeli-Palestinian negotiations, and there are many other countries in the world where tensions of this kind arise. Only if more attention is paid to these upstream issues can we make progress toward sustainable development.

Hopefully, the events of September 11 will cause OECD countries to focus more seriously on the challenges of poverty in the Third World. Will they have the courage to insist that the reasons for September 11 be tackled at source, i.e., will they begin to promote sustainable development so that citizens in Third World countries will be able to find work, lead a life of dignity, and thereby have a stake in security of all kinds and

for all people? It is worrying that we are already not sure how much additional investment will be directed toward Afghanistan, especially with regard to humanitarian assistance and subsequent redevelopment and reconstruction. We need a public outcry to make sure that the international coalition's HUMANITARIAN efforts match their WAR efforts.

There have been some promising signs, including British Prime Minister Tony Blair's speech at the IMF in which he insisted on substantially increasing aid to developing countries. There does seem to be some possibility that the U.K. and Germany will increase their foreign aid expenditures, but there are many other countries that urgently need to increase their overseas development assistance (ODA), notably the U.S. Very few countries – only Denmark, Finland, the Netherlands, and Sweden – have reached the OECD Development Assistance Committee target of 0.7% of GNP. ODA has actually fallen since Rio, although recently it has gradually increased. We now need a major effort by all OECD countries. Civil society must maintain pressure on politicians to ensure that the provision of appropriate financial resources for sustainable development policies is a central topic at both the March 2002 Financing for Development Conference and the Johannesburg World Summit on Sustainable Development. *Our motto should be that governments should invest as much in peace as they do in war.*

Another sign that may be promising is the recent agreement to launch a new round of World Trade Organization (WTO) talks. We desperately need to ensure both (1) fairer and freer trade and (2) far greater access for products from developing countries within OECD markets, while simultaneously respecting the environment. If we can “green” this kind of globalization, we would take important strides toward reducing Third World poverty. Here again we must bring pressure upon our governments to make sure that this next round of trade talks is not only a Development Round but also a Sustainable Development Round. On the positive side, the next round will include issues of the environment as well as greater market access for LDCs. However, intellectual property rights and access for new technologies will also figure in the next round, which could pose difficulties for LDCs. If the next WTO talks are both greener and more development-oriented, it may be possible to create the right kind of globalization in which all countries benefit. We, the members of the NGO community, should work together with anti-globalization movements to formulate positive approaches toward the next round of WTO talks, since many of our concerns are similar and the WTO needs to be opened further to civil society. This will not be an easy task. However, because we have seen progress at the UN since Rio, particularly within the Commission on Sustainable Development (CSD), we know it can be done, and engaging in cooperative efforts will increase our chances for success.

If September 11 has indeed helped people understand that terror arises from poverty and injustice in the Third World, and that terror can strike any of us anywhere, then perhaps it is possible to turn the tragic events to good purpose on our road to Johannesburg. Hopefully we will receive some positive signs from some of our governments. Many NGOs have also taken the opportunity offered by September 11 to expose the inequities of the current global system and to plead for sustainable development as the most promising way forward. We must continue to build on these efforts, and online debates such as this one enable many voices to be heard. In the build-up to Johannesburg, all stakeholders worldwide must play their proper role – and the essential role of civil society is to expand awareness, increase pressure on governments, and create alliances.

There is little time before Johannesburg: let us hope that September 11 has lent urgency to our cooperative efforts!

Margaret Brusasco-Mackenzie is Vice Chair of UNED Forum.

EXCERPT FROM THE ONLINE DISCUSSION

I would be very surprised if poverty, sustainability, and globalization were de-prioritized in the wake of September 11. Already we see signs of a widespread recognition that issues of inequality and social exclusion are intimately linked to global stability I see a retrenchment of positions in relation to defense and security issues but also openings for unprecedented alliances to create opportunities for new political and social spaces. In the U.K., Tony Blair linked his response to the crisis in Afghanistan with the issues of worldwide inequality, poverty, and sustainability.

Most crucially, it seems to me that September 11 has given a platform for an issue that has generally been subsumed within purely economic or political discourses. I refer to the issue of identity and values. What commentators as diverse as Francis Fukuyama, Mikhail Gorbachev, Alain Touraine, and Manuel Castells seem to agree on is that the September 11 attacks had at their most basic root not issues of economics but rather issues of identity It seems to me that Johannesburg would be a more useful mechanism than the Afghan war to address the challenges and opportunities involved in the unprecedented encounter/clash of values that is one of the least-addressed aspects of globalization and that, as the September 11 attacks show, has grown in importance to the point of impacting severely on global politics, economics, and security.

Ismael Velasco, Envision Projects

Maria Ivanova

TERRORISM AND DEVELOPMENT: WHAT IS THE SUSTAINABLE RESPONSE?

The Implications of September 11 for the World Summit on Sustainable Development and the UN Conference on Financing for Development

The recognition that increasingly global challenges require a global response has grown over the past decade, as globalization has accelerated and underscored the interdependence of world economies and citizens of all nations. The tragic events of September 11 brought a sense of urgency to that realization and showed that a multilateral response to new security threats is essential. While a global coalition against terrorism is critical, global collective action to address the root causes of distress, hatred, poverty, and alienation is also imperative.

In his recent address to the General Assembly of the United Nations – postponed by nearly seven weeks due to the attacks – Kofi Annan referred to four “burning issues.” The Secretary-General cited poverty, HIV/AIDS, conflict prevention, and environmental protection as issues that demand international resolve and action. Countries need to find ways to work together to tackle multiple shared challenges that require new mechanisms of international cooperation. Two major international events in the coming year are critical forums for forging new alliances as well as a global agreement on concrete agendas for action – the March 2002 Conference on Financing for Development and the September 2002 World Summit on Sustainable Development.

In the aftermath of September 11, the outcome of these international meetings will be crucial for the future of global governance efforts. The international community needs to show an unprecedented determination and commitment to begin bridging the gaps that divide the world and to begin building new governance structures. What challenges do these two international conferences face and how can they be overcome?

Difficulties for both initiatives will arise at three levels. First, at the *systemic level*, the failed collective action of past efforts taints any optimism for new solutions. Current governance structures do not provide adequate incentives for collective solutions. Lack of information on problems and policy options, the behavior of peers, and excessive institutional complexity encourage evasion rather than meaningful participation in global accords. Credibility and accountability gaps in previous commitments further compromise the willingness to take on new obligations.

Second, the *international environment*, while seemingly more conducive to multilateral action, might favor cooperation on anti-terrorist military efforts rather than the financing and implementation of sustainable development strategies. The paradox is clear but will be difficult to overcome without the active engagement of the United States. Before September 11, the annual U.S. defense budget exceeded \$300 billion; the new annual budget is projected at \$400 billion. \$100 billion a year is what the World Bank estimates would be necessary to cut poverty in half by 2015.

Third, the *national context* in both developed and developing countries presents the challenges of responding to both economic downturn and immediate political concerns. Moreover, when incentives for free-riding on the efforts of others are pervasive internationally, it is difficult to provide domestic justification for additional expenditures and new commitments.

It is thus evident that a set of structural problems hinders the effectiveness of international cooperation. The institutional mechanisms through which the international community governs itself do not provide the requisite incentive structure for the relevant stakeholders to engage in collectively optimal behavior.

What both meetings need in order to overcome these problems is (1) a clear agenda and (2) a clean slate. A constructive dialogue can be ensured only if a set of well-defined questions is formulated and addressed. While the agenda for the Conference on Financing for Development focuses on six core issues (enabling domestic environments, mobilizing international flows, enhancing trade, confronting external debt, enhancing official development assistance, and improving the financial architecture), the agenda for the World Summit on Sustainable Development remains undefined. In view of the critical importance of the Summit, its agenda should be forward-looking, should focus on substantive problems that require international collective action, and should center on options for strengthening the global environmental and development architecture.

The new reality of global affairs demands new attitudes. To avoid stalemate, the international community needs to approach these two events with an openness toward innovation, a readiness to listen, and a focus on interests rather than rigid official positions. The challenge of initiating and maintaining an inclusive, constructive, and sustained dialogue on a multilateral vision for sustainable development will be unparalleled in its enormity. Yet such a dialogue is the only viable option. A possibility now exists to align the interests of the various constituencies to build coalitions promoting the common good.

However, certain analysts have argued that a focus on concerns other than “hard” security issues may jeopardize the international coalition against terror. Patrick Michaels of the Cato Institute has argued that the environmental debate damages international security cooperation. Opposing the climate talks in Marrakesh on the grounds that they would detract from U.S. attention to the war, he urged: “Let’s kill this meeting now, before it harms our wartime alliance. All it will do is re-open old wounds.” The meeting did proceed as planned and achieved a breakthrough in negotiations that was hoped for but hardly expected. However, the U.S. remained a mere spectator in that multilateral forum.

Support for more thoughtful and constructive international policymaking in the wake of September 11 has been overwhelming. Leaders from around the world have appealed to their peers not to lose sight of the causes of violence and the remedies for grievance and resentment. Gus Speth, Dean of the Yale School of Forestry and Environmental Studies and former head of the UN Development Program, points out that human security is affected by “poverty, inequity, joblessness and social disintegration And development – sustainable, people-centered development – will almost always be a part of any cure.” Moreover, “in a world where half the jobs worldwide depend on forests, fisheries, and agriculture (the percentage is higher in developing countries) and access to water and other resources are both constraints to development and sources of inter-

national tension, human security and economic prospects depend very much on successful environmental management.”

What this critical moment in history calls for is coordinated diplomacy and new approaches to global governance. Global environmental and development concerns might provide the common ground for negotiations on new mechanisms of governance sensitive to income disparities, socioeconomic capacities, and political realities. The World Summit on Sustainable Development and the Conference on Financing for Development present unique opportunities for the creation of a new climate of international cooperation and a fertile ground for a new “global deal.”

Maria Ivanova is the Director of the Global Environmental Governance Project at the Yale Center for Environmental Law and Policy and a doctoral student at the Yale University School of Forestry and Environmental Studies.

EXCERPT FROM THE ONLINE DISCUSSION

This is the real problem: sustainable development advocates do not know what sustainable development is or how to achieve it Before you can administer or implement a program you must have the content developed. The process looks hollow and has no positive outcome because there are no meaningful moves on our side of the game board. There is a lot of analysis, understanding of the problems, projections of trends, and forecasts of approaching disaster, but we are lacking in power plays

Is there a vacuum at the center of sustainable development?

Richard Nelson, Founder, Solarroofgarden

Uncertainty shall rule future developments to a much larger degree than ever before, and this is in contradiction to the kinds of certainties needed to keep the world economy going. In short, there will be no “global deal” of any significance because there is still no agreement on basic needs and on how this globe should be treated by present generations seeking some kind of continuity in life.

The loss of political accountability justified by the war against terrorism will render government actions increasingly intransparent. Further, additional expenditures on security, intelligence, and the military have already increased disproportionately to what world economies can take. This development is not at all in favor of sustainable development as some might hope.

Hatto Fischer, Athens, Greece

Sascha Müller-Kraenner

THE DOUBLE NEXUS OF SECURITY, GLOBALIZATION, AND SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT

Beyond this conflict (...) the further destiny of the United States is being shaped by mass poverty, mass illiteracy, mass disease and massive environmental disruption. The people of the United States realize this. They know that we cannot protect our future by turning our backs on it. In that knowledge they are well ahead of at least part of the political system.

Prof. Leon Furth, former National Security Advisor to Al Gore

September 11 has made it clear that there will no longer be two different zones of security in the world. The democratic, rich, and safe countries of the North cannot insulate themselves from lawlessness, poverty, and unsafe countries in other world regions. The current effort of the United States and its allies to fight terrorism, its supporters, and its support structures in a multilateral coalition and with a mix of military, economic, diplomatic, and humanitarian instruments should lead to a new global security architecture and replace, step by step, regional arrangements that have separated the world into safe and unsafe places. The complexity of this strategy and the character of the multilateral approach as such imply that any new security framework will not rely on military and geopolitical components alone but must include a broad range of reforms in governance and international cooperation.

This raises the question whether the new global security architecture will replace current globalization tendencies or be integrated with them. The economic globalization of the last decade has been criticized for doing damage to the environment and the poor. Institutions that play a prominent role in globalization, like the World Bank, the International Monetary Fund, and the World Trade Organization were accused of lacking democratic accountability. It is an open question whether the new emphasis on regional stability and security will enforce current globalization trends or lead to a stronger focus on human development, social cohesion, and good governance in developing countries.

The World Summit on Sustainable Development (WSSD) in Johannesburg will take place exactly one year after the terrorist attacks of September 11. The summit provides a unique opportunity to discuss globalization from a sustainable development perspective. Whether this perspective is still in demand depends on whether we can make a convincing argument that sustainable development contributes to a positive economic perspective in all regions and to the political stability of the international system.

Drawing the double nexus between a new international security architecture, globalization, and sustainable development is partly an intellectual exercise. A vague awareness exists that unsustainable patterns of development are intensified by patterns of globalization and thereby increasingly contribute to regional instabilities. The task of the environmental movement and actors in the field of development will be, however, to develop concrete proposals and instruments for redefining this double connection.

Will “the Environment” Drop off the Agenda?

For quite a while, environmental policy has not been a top concern for global policy makers. The Kyoto Protocol on Climate Change proved to be an exception. The final success of the Kyoto negotiations at the Bonn Climate Summit also showed that complex environmental negotiations can be resolved only if heads of government pay adequate attention to those processes and if they are perceived in a broader political context.

When heads of government make the decision whether to participate in the Johannesburg Summit and whether to invest the necessary political capital to make it a success, they will make this decision based on the following questions:

- Is there a clear agenda?
- Will there be achievable results?
- Are the results relevant to my core constituencies?

At this point in time, the answer to all three questions is “no.” Must the WSSD agenda therefore be changed? The answer is obviously yes; most of all, a new urgency should be injected into the negotiations. The preparations for Johannesburg in the Commission on Sustainable Development (CSD) experienced a slow start. Now, within the new context of current events, time has become an even more critical factor. Johannesburg must advertise itself as *the* forum where globalization – on an unprecedented scale – will be discussed by the world’s governments and civil society actors.

After September 11, the question was raised whether the WSSD should go ahead as planned. It was argued that the security situation and the shift in international priorities should lead to a postponement or even a cancellation of the summit. However, as the climate conference in Marrakesh (Morocco) and the World Trade Summit in Doha (Qatar) have shown, such security concerns can be addressed. Moreover, some have even argued that the current climate of cooperation in the aftermath of September 11 can lead to swift political agreements to overcome technical difficulties in a number of international arenas.

Even before September 11, it was obvious that the WSSD would have to address the nexus between globalization and sustainable development to achieve political relevance. Now the criterion for success must be that sustainable development makes a significant contribution to a model of globalization that increases security for both the North and South.

The Johannesburg Summit could achieve the following:¹

- *Address poverty*

It has been widely recognized that, while not the immediate cause of terrorist acts, widespread poverty in a number of world regions has provided a fertile breeding ground for radical political ideologies and movements. On the other hand, poverty has contributed to the depletion of resources and has prevented the implementation of environmental legislation in those regions. September 11 has

¹ <http://www.worldsummit2002.org.org/texts/RioToJoburg.pdf>

brought home the message that poverty matters not only for humanitarian but also for security reasons.

Example: One of the poverty-related questions that Johannesburg should address is the reduction of hunger. The 1996 World Food Summit has set a target to reduce the number of people suffering from hunger by 50% by the year 2015. Sustainable land use, access to clean energy and water, and the equitable distribution of those resources can contribute significantly to the achievement of this goal.

- *Improve governance structures*

Dysfunctional states, democratic deficits, and an underdeveloped civil society in a number of countries are part of the reason that the sustainable development objectives of Rio could not be achieved. On the other hand, fragmentary and fragile governance structures also result in a lack of security especially for those parts of the population that cannot afford private security services. Environmental governance at national and international levels is only part of a stable system of overall governance and cannot be achieved in isolation. However, environmental governance can make a valuable contribution to the democratic development of communities and the international realm.

- *Assert the value of international law*

The current U.S. administration's rejection of a number of international treaties is an expression of a political analysis that challenges the legitimacy and effectiveness of international law in principle. The rejection of the Kyoto Protocol on Climate Change was just the most spectacular and controversial illustration of this thinking that is privately shared by governments and others in a number of countries.

The experience of vulnerability after September 11 may lead to a reassessment of the effectiveness of international law as a whole. The willingness of the U.S. to coordinate the fight against terrorism with an international coalition might strengthen the position of U.S. elites who have argued continuously that the U.S. must accept the legitimacy of international law.

The Kyoto Protocol with its high symbolic value is a chance to prove this point. It is doubtful whether U.S. ratification will be achieved by the beginning of the WSSD, when the Protocol is scheduled to enter into force. However, the parties to the Protocol should keep the door open for the U.S. to join later.

- *Develop mechanisms to manage global public goods*

Emphasizing the linkages between environment and security could make a useful contribution in this area.

- *Strengthen democratic decision-making and discourse*

- *Provide additional funding for reducing poverty through sustainable development projects and for building functioning governance structures in Southern countries*

How Will the Debate on Globalization Change?

Movements critical of globalization had picked up momentum after a series of campaigns around the WTO ministerial conference in Seattle, the EU Summit in Gothenburg, and the G7 Summit in Genoa. The movement has always criticized current U.S. economic policy as contributing significantly to certain negative aspects of globalization. The U.S. has also been accused of throwing its weight around in international institutions and blocking progress in others.

However, movements critical to globalization have not only criticized current U.S. policies but also willingly and unwillingly nourished an anti-American ideology. The fashionable anti-Americanism of certain parts of the anti-globalization left is mirrored by parallel developments on the extreme right. Both accuse “Americans” of worshipping a materialistic lifestyle that stands in stark contrast to the post-materialistic values of globalization critics and to traditional cultures both in Europe and the Third World.

After September 11, this pattern of argument presents itself in a different context. Naomi Klein, author of *No Logo*, an acclaimed overview of the anti-globalization movement, writes in *The Nation* (October 22, 2001) that “tactics that rely on attacking – even peacefully – powerful symbols of capitalism find themselves in an utterly transformed semiotic landscape.” Other activists might put it less eloquently, but the cancellation of planned protests even before the annual World Bank/IMF meeting was cancelled has shown that the anti-globalization movement is deeply unnerved. At a moment when everyone publicly states their solidarity with the American people, it is almost impossible to paint America as a symbol for everything that is unjust in the world economic order.

However, it might be even more dangerous if the anti-globalization movement tries to capitalize on the expected protests against the U.S.-led war in Afghanistan. Both the international NGO movement (led and sponsored to a considerable extent by the U.S.) and the UN system will suffer if anti-globalization movements continue to propagate an anti-American ideology as part of their activities. If anti-globalization movements wish to enter into a renewed democratic debate with the U.S. government on how poverty reduction and improved structures of global governance can contribute to global economic development and security, these movements will have to reject anti-American ideologies.

Will the United States Return to Multilateralism?

It is frequently stated that, in the aftermath of September 11, the U.S. and others will rejoin efforts to promote international cooperation, and that this rebirth of multilateralism could provide fertile ground for a “global deal” between environmental interests of the “North” and development interests of the “South.” However, the Bush administration’s current cooperation with the UN Security Council and the ad hoc anti-terrorist coalition of approximately 35 countries does not automatically mean that the U.S. will become more forcefully engaged in other multilateral processes.

A debate is taking place over whether September 11 will motivate the Bush administration to rethink its recent unilateral policies and to return to the multilateral approach of the Clinton administration. In fact, after the terrorist attacks, the U.S. paid their UN dues, turned to the Security Council for a mandate, and asked its allies to invoke Article

5 of the NATO treaty. However, concerns have been expressed that current U.S. efforts to build an international coalition against terrorism merely represent multilateralism “à la carte.” Some analysts argue that the U.S. has preferred, and always will prefer, the flexibility of issue-oriented bilateral arrangements to multilateral treaties and institutions.

It is definitely true that average U.S. citizens have rediscovered the rest of the world. Whether this increased interest in other countries and the complexities of international relations will translate into (1) a greater willingness to help developing countries and become involved in international institutions or (2) an isolationist tendency against newly perceived threats (e.g., through higher defense spending) has yet to be shown. Internationalists in both the U.S. and other countries have a window of opportunity to prove to U.S. government leaders that international cooperation is indispensable and can have positive consequences for U.S. national interests.

Sascha Müller-Kraenner is the Director of the Heinrich Böll Foundation's office in Washington, D.C.

EXCERPTS FROM THE ONLINE DISCUSSION

Security requires the satisfaction of basic human needs. Satisfaction of basic needs is a precondition sine qua non for life and for peace on this planet. The psychologist Abraham Maslow established a hierarchy of human needs. From a scientific perspective, the two most basic needs in Maslow's list are material resources and bodily integrity

Nations have similar security requirements: satisfaction of material needs through a sustainable, healthy ecosystem, and protection from harm in peaceful existence without violence are fundamental for the well-being of nations.

Today, the Cold War is over, but the idea of security through military strength still exists. The fragmentation of political power has increased the complexity of conflicts. In addition to the devastating capacity of readily available weapons, the vulnerability of our civilization has increased. The high density of human settlement and the exploitation of the ecosystem's life-supporting capacity almost to its breaking point have created a fragile state of the world. In this situation, the strength of military blocs, of some individual nations, and even of terrorist organizations creates an unacceptable degree of insecurity. Nuclear weapons are still on trigger alert, and all of humanity is in great danger of perishing by the decision of a sick mind, or even by a technical or human error. In this situation, military strength is far from offering security. On the contrary, it is self-destructive, suicidal, and it is no longer a rational policy option.

Therefore, the only rational and humane security policy is one based on cooperation. The world community of nations must move to establish the global rule of law. This is a logical next step in the historical process of the evolution of humankind. An Irish proverb sums it up: “It is in the shelter of each other that the people live.” Alliances began with clans and evolved via city-states to nations and then to continental unions; the United Nations provides a good beginning for a global alliance. The UN must now be given the authority and the means needed for creating a secure, just, and sustainable world.

Helmut Burkhardt, Adjunct Professor of Physics, Ryerson University, Toronto, Canada

If we start to develop a positive program for globalization that will direct the energy of those concerned with negative impacts toward positive action rather than dramatic confrontation, we will get further ahead. It is not the time to put a violent face on our issues. I don't believe it was ever suitable—but after September 11 such tactics will be counterproductive. We should recognize that there is an extreme fringe within our midst, and at this point I believe it is wise to communicate a renewed standard for nonviolent protest to the radical and provocative groups if they wish to associate with our broad-based community.

The sort of “confrontational protesters” who have begun to dominate the public perception of this debate have no solutions to offer. They confuse the large majority of people and may make intelligent progress more difficult. We do not need protests of the meetings of the globalization proponents to take center stage. We should get to work on our own agenda. How can the process serve our purpose unless we are able to point it in a specific direction?

Richard Nelson, Founder, Solaroofgarden

As a journalist who is not a member of the sustainable development community, I offer the following observation and suggestion. Most people in the U.S. have never even heard of sustainable development, and even fewer have any idea what it means. Outside of some enclaves in the State Department and environmental groups, it is simply not a word in the political lexicon.

The September 11 events may provide an opportunity for the sustainable development community to introduce Americans to the basic concept of sustainable development at Johannesburg. If you actually got George W. Bush, some Congressional leaders, or some prominent columnists to use the words, it would be an incredible accomplishment.

The American people do not reject the message. They have not heard it.

David E. Wojcik, President, Climate Change Debate

Hermann E. Ott

SEPTEMBER 11 & THE ROAD TO JOHANNESBURG

On September 11, the entire world watched in horror as two passenger airplanes brought the World Trade Center twin towers down in a matter of a few horrible minutes. There is little doubt that these terrorist attacks have changed the world – just how much, in what ways, and in which directions will only be revealed to us over time. At the same time, as UN Secretary-General Kofi Annan has just stated in his address to the General Assembly, none of the old problems have gone away.

The effect reminds me of the impact of an earthquake and the eruption of a volcano on a physical landscape. There are new hills and canyons that were not there before. The well-established “diplomatic rivers” are scrambling desperately for a new course to forge through the changed terrain. And of course, a new element has appeared on the scene: terrorism and anti-terrorist measures – hot and fiercely aggressive like lava, with equally unpredictable consequences. True, there are still parts of the landscape that appear to be untouched, but this may change soon due to the unpredictability of the situation. Moreover, further quakes and eruptions may follow, and the aftershocks could be even more devastating. This geological analogy may have its flaws, but it serves to illustrate the massive shake-up of all sectors of international politics by the hideous terrorist attacks and the reactions of the United States and its allies.

A number of authors have been asked by the Heinrich Böll Foundation to ascertain the possible or likely effects of the terrorist attacks on the post-Rio process and the World Summit for Sustainable Development (WSSD) in Johannesburg, South Africa.

One of the most striking features is certainly that the events of September 11 have stimulated such an extraordinary debate in all corners of the globe. There is an enormous range of opinions as to the underlying causes of the attacks and the consequences that flow from them. Opinions range from die-hard militarists and right-wing op-ed writers who proclaim total war, to the other end of the spectrum where peaceniks and new age prophets call for an end to all conflict and the establishment of new forms of global government to keep the peace.

A similar breadth of opinion is reflected in the range of prospects for international diplomatic efforts to protect the environment and to foster sustainable development. There are reasonable assertions that the terrorist attacks will likely lead to enhanced cooperation and a stronger commitment by the U.S. to multilateralism. On the other hand, there are equally valid views that these new forms of terror and the military responses we have seen in the last few weeks will force the world to retreat into long-forgotten dark ages, where naïve “black and white” perceptions prevail and every good cause will be subsumed under the prerogatives of military security.

Our own contributions to this debate should thus be assessed with critical analysis and thoughtful consideration of other possible perspectives. I will attempt to make some preliminary observations and conclusions, albeit with a certain humility. This article is intended to stimulate a discussion and will provide an overview of some key issues.

The first observation: the forging of the anti-terrorist alliance has demonstrated that the world after the collapse of the Soviet Empire has developed into a rather diffuse “uni-multipolar” world, a term coined by Samuel Huntington. This is not a unipolar world where the U.S. as the global hegemonic power can solve all problems on its own. The threat created by fundamentalist terrorist global networks and the subsequent attacks on Afghanistan and its Taliban warlords clearly required the diligent forging of an international alliance, even broader than the one established in the Gulf War 10 years ago. This is important new evidence of the dependency and restricted hegemony of the U.S.

But of course, the events of September 11 have also demonstrated with unequivocal clarity the superior position of the U.S. in world affairs. In fact, the prospects for environmental politics and sustainable development have completely changed twice this year – and both times because of developments in the U.S. It was early this year that analysts in governments, industry, NGOs, and think tanks tried to come to terms with the effects of George W. Bush’s rise to the White House. Actually, those analyses had not even been satisfactorily completed when the airplanes crashed into the World Trade Center and the Pentagon. One more time, the future presents itself as a “clean slate” where everything appears to be possible because the position of the U.S. government on environmental and developmental issues is unknown. Both the tremendous political weight of the U.S. and the fact that it so desperately needs reliable allies should thus not be forgotten in the analysis of the prospects for Johannesburg.

Second, the attacks on New York and Washington have shown that even the last remaining superpower cannot live in isolation from the rest of the world. Without a doubt they have shaken the self-assurance of many in the U.S. that – aside from a Russian nuclear attack – “God’s own country” is invulnerable. The National Missile Defense system was meant to close this last gap (it would of course be futile against such insidious acts from inside). This newly acquired feeling of insecurity may spread to other areas and lead to precautionary measures in the environmental field. We should not forget that it was a series of unusual weather patterns in the late 1980s that provoked Senate hearings in the U.S., which led to the establishment of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change and ultimately to the Framework Convention on Climate Change and the Kyoto Protocol. The global climate and the oceans do not respect boundaries, nor do they reflect geopolitical preferences. Protecting these commons may, in light of September 11, appear to be a safety measure comparable to a vigilant foreign and defense policy.

Third, the power balance between the nation states and civil society has changed. Comparable to the beginning of the era of nation states after 1648, there are forces that do not conform to Westphalian categories as subjects of international activities. As a result, the monopoly on the use of transboundary military force no longer lies exclusively with nation states, as it did during the past 300 years. Globalization has hit the military sector, so to speak. Following the globalization of transnational corporations and trade, financial flows, the media, and the middle class (symbolized by the rise of NGOs), terrorism and physical destruction have gone global – and become part of global “civil(!) society.” At the same time, private security companies and mercenary firms like “Executive Outcomes” are preparing for the post-nation state era.

This may, on the one hand, have an impact on the sometimes unrealistic expectations of what governments and states can achieve in Johannesburg and beyond. The “Global

Compact” initiated by Kofi Annan in July 2000 seeks to establish an alliance between the UN and transnational corporations and thus acknowledges their increasing role in the implementation of rules for human rights, labor, and the environment. Similarly, new rules on public participation recognize the role of NGOs as watchdogs and agents of the people – or at least the interests and values of the global middle class.

The terrorist threat may also, on the other hand, lead to new insights into the need for constructive institution building at the global level. The rise of non-governmental actors in the military sector represents a great challenge for the traditional function of foreign policy – to provide security for the citizens of a nation from outside threats. There are a range of possible traditional reactions to this threat, including the build-up of very complex and effective global surveillance and security systems by the U.S. and its allies. The rise of “big brother” at the global level represents a serious and realistic option, certainly favored by traditional foreign policy and defense experts. By contrast, a more proactive and forward-looking strategy might be one of building institutions that will transcend the state system in order to provide for peace and security in an era of transnational non-state violence. The threat of terrorism may thus provide a push for “globalization” on the governmental and administrative level. The current efforts to improve the international institutions dealing with environment and sustainable development in Johannesburg thus take on a new meaning and urgency. They might even have to be expanded. And by the way: the establishment of a global surveillance and security system may be unavoidable. In this case, advocates of human rights and civil liberties would be well-advised to demand new global institutions to prevent abuses of power and knowledge.

Fourth, the common notion of “security” may have been too narrowly focused on protection from military attacks by states. It may have to be broadened in order to encompass environmental as well as social aspects. Many experts in the environmental field and a few in the military community have for some time argued that ecological or environmental security must be part of the package. The threat of ecological disasters and water shortages that force millions to flee their homes is highly alarming – and not only because such scenarios might provoke military activities. Dislocation – apart from the wide range of cultural, social, and environmental impacts that accompany it – is also one of the root causes of despair and hate, as much of Europe experienced after World War II.

It appears, however, that the notion of security has to be expanded even more. The 1995 Social Summit in Copenhagen concluded that security is not just the absence of violence, but the presence of basic human needs. “Security” thus may have to encompass what Jonathan Lash, President of the World Resources Institute recently called a “partnership for human security.” This would have to include the “dialogue of civilizations” announced by Kofi Annan as well as the elimination of poverty and environmental degradation as the underlying causes of much fanaticism and hatred.

Fifth, some conclusions. The WSSD agenda may have to reflect these new realities that have arisen in the aftermath of September 11. This agenda should probably put much more emphasis on poverty eradication and the social dimension of sustainable development. “Equity” is the central challenge for peaceful South/North relations, as well as for the protection of the world’s natural resources as the ecological basis for human life.

The world simply will not be sustainable in the presence of widespread poverty, starvation, and misery.

The sustainable development agenda after Rio has focused far too much on the environmental dimension – and I say this as an environmental scientist and advocate. The overwhelming presence of environment ministers from industrialized countries at meetings of the Commission on Sustainable Development (CSD) represents a telling truth. The difficulty of convincing non-attending finance ministers of the need for enhanced cooperation on social and educational matters represents another. Not to mention the lack of transparency and socio-ecological blindness of many export credit agencies, first and foremost among them Hermes in Germany. These issues must be part of the WSSD agenda.

The hidden problem looming behind these justice and equity issues, however, is that of democracy. At the moment, vital decisions for each of the world's citizens are being taken without any participation by those affected. Decisions taken by the U.S. President on global warming, for example, have profound impacts on millions of people living in low-lying coastal and estuary areas, especially in small island countries and countries like Bangladesh, Vietnam, Indonesia, and Egypt. Tackling this subject may be too large a task for Johannesburg, but the Summit could initiate or call for a process dealing with these issues that will determine the fate of mankind in the 21st century.

Much more could be said on the effects of September 11 – on the willingness to engage in multilateral diplomacy by the U.S. and other major players, on the consequences for energy supply and security (Middle East!), and on the need to provide micro power for the two billion people on this planet who do not have access to the electricity grid. These and other aspects of the debate will be examined by other contributions in more detail. I may be allowed one last word, however, on the implications of September 11 for diplomatic activities before, at, and after Johannesburg. The need to keep the anti-terror alliance together will considerably enhance the willingness of the Bush administration to play a constructive role in most diplomatic forums. This might provide windows of opportunity for the sustainable development agenda, like the one that was just used in Marrakesh to bring negotiations on the details of the Kyoto Protocol to a successful conclusion. If the future is wide open after the collapse of the twin towers, it provides opportunities for those who are willing to use them.

Diplomacy in the 21st century will increasingly demand policy responses beyond those of traditional foreign policy. As Peter Hain has eloquently stated, problems like climate change, drugs, AIDS, and – we might add – terrorism require new convergent policy-making since they do not have a localized source but arise instead from interlinked and highly distributed global patterns of human behavior. Standing firm on principles of equity, democracy, and environmental protection in Johannesburg and beyond is thus a non-negotiable! In the end, the tragic events on and after September 11 may yield a renewed sense of realism in world affairs on all sides. They may ultimately even lead to a more sustainable and just world, certainly unintended by the perpetrators. Or, as Mephistopheles replied in Goethe's *Faust* when asked "Well now, who are you then?": "Part of that Power which would The Evil ever do, and ever does the Good."

Hermann E. Ott is the Director of the Climate Policy Division at the Wuppertal Institute for Climate, Environment and Energy, Germany.

EXCERPTS FROM THE ONLINE DISCUSSION

For the Global Summit to push on with its current agenda will mean that the delegates will be debating pre-September 11 issues while the rest of the world is thinking about post-September 11 issues.

In our opinion the Global Summit should change its emphasis profoundly to deal primarily with the issue of how to raise living standards in all Third World and Islamic countries

If the Global Summit were to prioritize raising living standards in all Third World and Islamic countries as a long-term solution to terrorism, it could in effect kill two birds with one stone. First, it would stand a better chance of actually mobilizing public opinion toward improving the lot of the 1.2 billion people currently languishing in abject poverty. Second, if effective policies could emerge from the Summit that actually do raise living standards amongst the poor and dispossessed, then it really would restore public confidence that the terrorism problem can be solved.

Unless the developed countries now make a concerted effort to raise living standards in all Third World and Islamic countries, this new brand of terrorism that has now emerged will be an ever recurring problem.

Scientists for Population Reduction, www.scientists4pr.org

This is a short comment on the message from Scientists for Population Reduction:

They conclude with the statement: "Unless the developed countries now make a concerted effort to raise living standards in all Third World and Islamic countries, this new brand of terrorism that has now emerged will be an ever recurring problem." True, but is an irrelevant aspect the way those countries are run?

[W]hat kind of fair and distributive economic development can exist where there are dictatorships, where decisions are taken by few persons far from public scrutiny, or where half the population (women) has little or no rights? This, unfortunately, is the situation in many developing and Islamic countries, and this is the stumbling block.

I think that the problem today is not that there is globalization, but that there is too little globalization. Only trade is globalized, up to a point, but human, social, and environmental rights are not; democracy is not. And this is the problem mankind has to solve.

Laura Radiconcini, Amici della Terra (Friends of the Earth Italy), Rome

Saliem Fakir

SEPTEMBER 11: THE BEGINNING OR THE END OF HISTORY?

In 1992, Francis Fukuyama wrote the much-celebrated neoliberal diatribe, *The End of History and the Last Man*. The book, disguised as a scholarly excursion, served as a justification for Fukuyama's sweeping pronouncement that the fall of the Berlin Wall and the collapse of the Soviet Union marked the inevitable triumph of market liberalism. It contained the very trait of which Marx was accused when he posited his theory of historical materialism, i.e., historical determinism. While Marx argued that history favored the inevitable victory of the working class, Fukuyama posited that the "invincible hand(s)" of markets and capital would come to dominate. Both make the mistake of claiming history as favoring their particular moral orders, as if history were guided by some hidden supra-rational force of historical consequence. The problem with such doctrines is that the mass atrocities we see today, or have seen in the past, are conveniently swept under the carpet of historical inevitability, which must run its course so that "nirvana" may ultimately prevail even at the cost of innocent lives. As the journalist John Gray wrote recently in *The New Statesman* (September 24, 2001): "The west greeted the collapse of communism – though it was a western utopian ideology – as the triumph of western values. The end of the most catastrophic utopian experiment in history was welcomed as a historic opportunity to launch yet another vast utopian project – a global free market."

Since the fall of the Berlin Wall, we have known only the grand narrative that market liberalism conforms to the innate disposition of all human beings toward self-interest and the survival of the fittest. It has taken on the form of a new religion, which roughly states that big capital and its rapacious characteristics hold greater moral sway than any other tendencies. Neoliberalism has become the official and predominant doctrine of the post-Cold War era to such an extent that the liberal left – or what the Germans call *die neue Mitte*, symbolized by the Blair-Schröder Manifesto – has become living proof of the fact that even left-wing parties have had to toe the neoliberal line and dogma. With no credible alternative emerging on the horizon, the neoliberal doctrine has acquired an aura of unimpeachability and infallibility. September 11 may have forced many to re-think their strategy as to whether an absolutist approach to economic liberalism is good for world peace. Or perhaps not, as the military-industrial congressional complex in the United States may find renewed impetus in this climate of fear to resurrect the ominous Cold War era. On offer is the *security apparatus* as the only protection for citizens and the continued role of the "invisible" market.

Fear unhinges reason and the collective suspicion we must have of power. It reduces us to the lowest common denominator and sinks us into the abyss of ignorance rather than analysis. September 11 has let loose the lowest common denominator on both fronts of neoliberal and religious fundamentalism. If both hold sway over our imagination, our sense of calm and control, we will enter a neo-Cold War era characterized by a reversal in the progress we have made toward building the foundations of democratic society, despite the many imperfections that still beset this system of governance. To permit a

bipolar world of both neoliberal and religious fundamentalism would be to revert back to the era of the Crusades and what Salman Rushdie recently called the emergence of “shadow warriors” – that unseen, unaccountable, detached group of people who wage secret wars of revenge and hate. It may just be the right bipolar recipe for Samuel Huntington’s rather dangerous thesis of the “clash of civilizations.” This bipolarity is not the result of religion or ideology per se, but rather economic disparity that increasingly divides the world’s rich and poor as their numbers increase daily. Ideology and religion merely use the suffering of others to advance their own agendas.

Fundamentalists call on all their adherents to forego their liberties for the sake of the fundamentalist cause. Such demands exploit the psychology of fear. America’s war on terror or “new war” invokes the authority of *security apparatchiks* to infringe on the right to individual privacy and freedom. Referring to the necessity of security, the state justifies the institution of surveillance devices to monitor the internet, e-mail, and telephone conversations, as well as the expanded use of closed-circuit cameras and facial recognition machines. September 11 could just as well be the launch of the “police state” or George Orwell’s Big Brother. All of this is now justifiable in an era of “war against terror.” Civil liberties will be the sacrificial lamb of “crusaders” and shadow warriors fighting in the name of utopian ideologies, while the victims will continue to be ordinary people who are forced to take sides under the weight of doctrine.

On September 11, 2002, we will silently observe the anniversary of the most nihilistic episode in human history and the thousands of lives lost one year previously. However, this will also be the penultimate day for the conclusion of deliberations at the World Summit on Sustainable Development (WSSD). So how will September 11, 2001 (New York) influence the events of September 11, 2002 (Johannesburg)? Will the world vote for democracy, enhanced governance, and a better world for the poor, or will it vote in favor of the bipolar world of the neo-Cold War era that we find ourselves in today? Will the anti-globalization movement, which enthralled the public prior to September 11, become the voice of reason or choose the path of fundamentalist “shadow warriors”? Will this movement represent the voice of mediation and consensus in a bipolar world? This movement is already reeling from the September 11 attacks, leading one analyst to surmise that this “represents an interruption and perhaps the end of the momentum that started in Seattle” (inthesetimes.com, October 2001). These are some of the leadership challenges we must all face before we allow others to throw us into the abyss of the lowest common denominator.

The issues we faced prior to September 11 are unlikely to disappear, and they should not be made to do so. However, the voices that surfaced through mass demonstrations, teach-ins, and anti-globalization carnivals are certainly to be silenced or monitored. Furthermore, if the facial recognition devices have their way, the movement of people will be restricted. Anti-terrorist laws, such as those soon to be promulgated in South Africa, may become a convenient means by which authorities will use harsh measures to disband groups of protestors, even those practicing peaceful protest. In the “war against terrorism,” any gathering, protest or not, may be deemed a terrorist threat. The emerging discourse is no different from what we saw during the Cold War era, except that in the Cold War the enemy could be identified. The present “enemy” has no central nerve center and no visible targets to strike at, and its amorphous, almost fluid-like features make it difficult to capture and incarcerate. As a result, countermeasures become more desperate, draconian, and indiscriminate – they will affect all of us and all

our freedoms. This is a lead-up to what the French foreign minister called a “diabolical trap.”

The Bush administration conducted a stridently unilateral foreign policy during its first 100 days in office; its rejection of the Kyoto Protocol was its most notable move in this respect and was certainly not missed by the environmental movement. Not long ago, and just weeks before the September 11 attacks, Henry Kissinger commented on the questionable wisdom of this unilateralism, stating: “We will be the dominant power in the 21st century. No groups of states will be able to prevent this. But our challenge is to see if we can translate our power into an acceptance of some kind so that every foreign policy issue does not become a test of our strength, which will drain us domestically and breed resentment abroad. We must move from imposition to consensus” (*Newsweek*, August 6, 2001). Even coming from a hawk and the architect of the Vietnam War, this is an insight that cannot and should not be ignored by the conservative camp in the U.S.

September 11 cannot be an excuse for another military build-up since the U.S., even after the Cold War era, continued and continues to spend 36% of the world’s overall military budget to ensure its readiness for combat. Yet even a fortress of technology could not protect it against “asymmetric” opponents. This is a war that cannot be won through weapons and that clearly requires a new internationalism to take a completely different approach toward the establishment of global security and peace. This new internationalism must emphasize equality and the strengthening of democracy at the international level—not just within states but within the very life blood of markets, i.e., free-roaming and aggressive capital that ravages the economies of many poor nations. War has the tendency to distract our attention from root causes, and war justifies the unjustifiable.

Indeed, the U.S. in its hour of need has rightfully sought a new kind of internationalism; however, this internationalism is a narrow one still founded on military superiority and the voice of might. Consequently, it conveys the wrong message for building a global consensus that will take us safely through the 21st century. This message only reinforces the interests of missile defense proponents who wish to conquer space not for purposes of peace and human welfare but for purposes of expanding the boundaries of exploitation and control. The irony of the September 11 attacks is that they only demonstrated the futility of a missile defense shield. Instead of investing in futility, we should invest in solutions to the root causes of today’s strife, which are rampant poverty, despair, and an existential crisis.

The WSSD must provide a platform for intensifying our focus on development issues and addressing global economic disparity. It represents a leg of sustainable development that has been conveniently amputated by a narrow approach to environmentalism that has preoccupied us since 1992. It raises the specter of whether movements for social reform—whether they wear the mask of anti-globalization or not—will go underground or become the voice of a progressive internationalism that promotes consensus and the creation of a transnational governance system in which democracy is not confined to the parochial manipulation of national politicians or parties. It must be a truly international order of democracy that not only speaks the language of universal rights but rather puts these rights into action. It must be a borderless democracy that goes beyond national aspirations and interests. Every mass movement can sing the praise of its own utopia,

and anti-globalization movements are not immune to this tendency. The fascist tendencies that are a hallmark of a bipolar world may also rub off onto movements that are selective and immersed in their own ideology.

A movement survives only when it is self-critical and thereby nourishes the very quality that ensures robust democracy. It is this tradition that Socrates passed on to us, i.e., the art of dialectic, which is accompanied by a healthy suspicion of all truths, especially self-contained and self-righteous truths of all stripes. September 11 need not be doomsday; in fact, it may inject a sense of urgency into the search for solutions to the greatest challenges humanity faces at the dawn of the new millennium. By September 11, 2002, we will know which type of internationalism will win the day: a progressive one or one that thrives on fear while hypocritically waving the banner of democracy. Whose world will we let it be?

The WSSD does perhaps represent an opportunity to carve out a new “global deal.” But to get there the voice of reason and calm will have to gain the upper hand over the proponents of fundamentalism. If anything, the dark clouds that hang over us should provide sufficient impetus for finding ways to combat poverty and injustice. If not, the army of poor people and followers of right-wing dogma may become willing recruits for intolerance. Whether the future we wish to create takes the form of a “global deal” or not, one thing is certain: we cannot live in peace when millions go hungry. Because of its size, the WSSD cannot be permitted to limit itself to a narrow approach toward environmentalism. Since Rio, globalization has gained ascendancy. We must therefore re-contextualize the commitments made in Rio in light of globalization. There are both opportunities and threats. There are players who should not only pay lip service to particular principles but act out of concern and a sense of justice. We need capitalism that shows empathy, not apathy.

I will conclude with a sobering note from Edward Said:

“[I]n the various contests over justice and human rights that so many of us feel we have joined, there needs to be a component to our engagement that stresses the need for the redistribution of resources and that advocates the theoretical imperative against the huge accumulations of power and capital that distort human life. Peace cannot exist without equality: this is an intellectual value desperately in need of reiteration, demonstration and reinforcement. The seduction of the word itself – peace – is that it is surrounded by, indeed drenched in, the blandishment of approval, uncontroversial eulogizing, sentimental endorsement.” (*The Nation*, September 17, 2001)

Saliem Fakir is the Director of IUCN-South Africa (The World Conservation Union) and is writing here in his personal capacity.

EXCERPTS FROM THE ONLINE DISCUSSION

In every culture there is a fable that warns of the dangers of greed. The South African version has a farmer trapping a baboon by cutting a small hole in a pumpkin. The animal can stick its paw through the hole, but once it has grasped hold of the seeds, it cannot free itself. Unwilling to relinquish its hold on

these riches, the animal then becomes trapped and so compromises its own survival. The human race is no different.

The current Northern model of development has brought us substantial comforts and benefits The greatest obstacle to sustainable development, and our eventual survival as a species, is our unwillingness to relinquish this standard of living ... or our aspirations to it Yet providing this lifestyle for the entire global population is simply not possible on a planet with finite resources and a limited ability to assimilate our wastes

Saliem Fakir makes the statement that there is as yet no credible alternative to neoliberal dogma. However, formulating such an alternative is exactly what the discourse on sustainable development is all about To quote Gandhi: "we need to live life simply so that others may simply live." And if this means changing our entire economic system and sources of wealth, then that is what we need to start discussing. There is an alternative to the neoliberal economic system, but if, like the baboon, we are not prepared to let go of that which we already have in hand, we will eventually compromise our own survival.

Chrisna du Plessis, Programme for Sustainable Human Settlements, Pretoria, South Africa

Tom Athanasiou & Paul Baer

WHAT NEW WORLD?

The “Johannesburg process” has always faced enormous obstacles. In the short term, the events of September 11 have only made these obstacles greater. The long term, however, is far less clear. Remember, please, that the Johannesburg process was never more than a means, and somewhat of a desperate one. The goal, today as before “the world changed,” is a new set of institutions capable of effectively fostering the great transition to a global development path that is both equitable and sustainable, and to a new world. September 11 certainly underscored the severity of our predicament, and it may even be a branch point in world history, but it hasn’t fundamentally altered the situation. To the extent that it does, its effect may yet be positive.

In all this, the climate negotiations are critical. If the Kyoto Protocol is not ratified before the Johannesburg Summit, there will be almost nothing but failure to show for the Rio agenda. Ironically, however, ratification may provide an illusion of progress and allow the continuation of business as usual. Therein lies the rub.

The Kyoto Protocol, after all, is pretty weak tea. It must be defended, but only for what it is – a first step and (like September 11) a branch point. It would do us good to understand that its ratification, if indeed it takes place, will only be possible because George Bush’s rejection of Kyoto rallied the EU/G77 climate protection coalition, which in turn saved the Protocol. The United States, the globe’s 800-pound gorilla, remains violently opposed to Kyoto, to the Rio agenda, and indeed to the global justice movement that has emerged in the years since Rio.

After September 11, far more clearly than before, we can see the war of position that, it seems, will be our fate. Furthermore, we can see that the climate battles of the past five years have created new opportunities, pushing Europe and the developing countries closer together and putting even the United States’ most consistent allies (Japan, Canada, Australia, and sometimes Russia) on the defensive.

Nor is this likely to change, for the issues in the climate negotiations are central to the sustainable development agenda. As weak as they are, the climate treaties – the *Marrakesh Dilution of the Bonn Compromise on the Kyoto Protocol to the UNFCCC* – establish democratically determined limits to the exploitation of the global commons. Further, the questions that the climate negotiations raise about liability and compensation for the North’s past and current overexploitation are the same questions that must be asked about ecological debt in general.

One issue highlighted by September 11 is the odd combination of connections and disconnections between the various arenas of global politics: military security, economics and trade, and environmental governance, to name the most salient. Looking around, we can see the U.S. dragging a variety of industrialized and developing countries into the “war on terrorism,” the EU and developing countries isolating the U.S. from its traditional climate allies, and the EU antagonizing both the U.S. and developing countries with demands to include environmental protection in the trade talks. Which of these processes is most likely to drive the Johannesburg process? How will these processes

evolve as Johannesburg becomes a dim memory? And who will rule the roost as the sustainability agenda is redefined as a struggle for “comprehensive security?”

In all this, of course, “root causes” are crucial, and “development” is the lodestone to which all politics must eventually turn. This raises an uncomfortable truth: with very few exceptions, developing country governments are committed to the business-as-usual model of development, one augmented by concessional funding and national “sovereignty.” Neither ecological sustainability nor international equity is really on the table in any intergovernmental agenda; and if these issues are considered at all, this is only due to the participation of NGOs – themselves representing a diversity of commitments to equity. Without the NGOs, there would be no hope at all of turning the lofty rhetoric of Agenda 21 into meaningful action and democratic institutions.

What impact will September 11 have on the Johannesburg process? Ask instead what impact it will have on the global justice movement, and if the kinds of engagement that took place in the climate negotiations – civil society’s most successful intervention to date into the structure of institutions of international governance – will become more or less likely in the post-September 11 world. The answer, no doubt, depends on access, transparency, and procedural justice. After all, the climate negotiations, in great contrast to, say, the trade talks, allowed for a great deal of NGO participation. To win the deal, NGO experts from both North and South had to be intimately involved in the negotiating process. This was the way forward, even if it meant that NGO experts suffered divided sympathies and strained to avoid denouncing “the process” as a corrupt and pointless charade.

September 11 does nothing to change this precedent; quite the contrary, the fact that Kyoto will likely be ratified before Johannesburg will give further legitimacy to the process that produced it. In contrast, the necessarily outside-the-gates protests of the anti-globalization movement have suffered both anarchist and police provocateurs and thus a linkage between protest and violence. The result, even before September 11, was a strategic impasse. For the moment, at least, this impasse looms large. Whatever happens, Genoa likely marked the end of an era, and the “total tactics” of the climate movement will figure large in the future of global institutional politics.

September 11 did not change the picture but rather the severity of its contrasts. In the U.S., the war has been harnessed by the hard right (represented by the Bush administration) to push its America First agenda, even as the political center remains hamstrung by its inability to assert a better alternative to business as usual. In Europe, with its social democratic history, matters are going somewhat better, with a progressive coalition gradually recognizing the need for a global New Deal. Which tendency will win the war of position? This is the real question, and much depends on the United States’ success in imposing its military framing of this “new kind of war.” To some extent, this depends on the United States’ “coalition partners,” particularly in Europe and NATO. Will these partners call for new approaches to security, globalization, and energy development, and if they do, will they back up their call with real initiatives? Or will Europe, too, be hamstrung by all the many entanglements of affluence and business-as-usual culture? It is not too much to hope that Europe will play various progressive roles here, particularly in contrast to the U.S., but will they be progressive enough?

In developing countries, the coincidence of national interest with international equity in the climate negotiations stands in contrast to their resistance to environmental consid-

erations in the trade negotiations. This resistance is understandable, but no less tragic, given the position of developing countries in the world economy. Of course, all this stands atop a world of continuing environmental degradation, widening inequality, and, unless things change, a self-reinforcing spiral of ecological and social decay.

So September 11 changes the position, but does it change this position decisively? That, actually, is up to us. In the days since September 11, we have woken to find ourselves living, in fact, in a world we knew already in our darker imaginings. It was a shock and a moment of illumination that left us with a world in which more people, many more, can see our real conditions of existence. In this sense, it is as much an opportunity as it is a danger.

The only way out of this situation is just and sustainable development, and the best path may well be through the fight for a fair and adequate climate treaty. The question, then, is if that fight will be taken seriously and connected to the battle for a just globalization. In this respect, we must say that we are actually a bit optimistic, for we agree with Herman Daly, the dean of ecological economics, who once said that our best chance may be an “optimal crisis, one bad enough to shake us up, but not so bad as to impair our ability to react.”

We may have just gotten one.

The authors are co-founders of EcoEquity, an organization that advocates a phased transition to a second-generation climate treaty based on per capita carbon emission rights. For additional information, see www.ecoequity.org

EXCERPTS FROM THE ONLINE DISCUSSION

Human activity and the use of fossil fuels is leading to change in the climate faster than any in the last 10,000 years, leading almost certainly to devastating impacts on both ecosystems and human life. Catastrophic climate change will affect water resources, sea level rise will threaten vulnerable populations in low-lying areas, and agricultural output will be affected by both changes in agricultural conditions and the spread of pests. There will be significant human health impacts as a result of severe weather events, changes in patterns of disease distribution, and changes in the vectors that carry disease. By any reckoning, climate is an issue with obvious and dramatic “security” implications. The only question is when such a security threat becomes an immediate crisis.

The events of September 11 have brought into stark relief the “security” nature of the climate challenge. Those events are linked to the relationship between Islam and the West. This relationship in turn is inextricably linked to the needs of North America and Europe for a regular supply of cheap oil from the Persian Gulf.

Now more than ever a rapid transition away from fossil fuels is necessary for both environmental and human security.

Charlie Kronick, Chief Policy Advisor, Greenpeace, London, U.K.

On the Role of NGOs:

The discussion so far has focused very much on global politics and little on the progress made on the ground.

In the towns and villages of the Southern Urals and the Dniester, Amudarya, and Danube deltas, we work with women who have been changing their local environment to make it more sustainable. They are claiming their newly obtained democratic rights to bring about changes in the provision of clean drinking water, the reduced use of pesticides, and restrictions on industrial pollution. In Italy, the Netherlands, and Poland, we work with rural women who promote healthy agriculture, farmers as the “keepers” of the countryside, and “transparent” direct producer-consumer links

We think these are important albeit small steps towards a fundamental change in the direction of global sustainable development

What is important for Johannesburg is to identify effective strategies that need to be enhanced in order to promote efforts to change consumption and production patterns

The lesson from September 11 is that much more support should go via NGOs to local community-based initiatives that promote democratic culture, human rights, and sustainable development (which in our experience always brings poverty alleviation) as opposed to financial support for pro-western but undemocratic elites as well as investments in large-scale unsustainable endeavors.

Sascha Gabizon, International Director, Women in Europe for a Common Future

NGOs will suffer as a result of the September 11 attacks. This is more so for Islamic NGOs or those run by Muslims, particularly in the developed world

Aid should not be used as a means of spreading religion of any sort, since usually the target is highly vulnerable

Can we agree on an “ethical” principle that so-called faith-based aid agencies should make a distinction between aid (which I believe should be given to needy people irrespective of religion, color, ethnic origin, gender, political beliefs, etc.) and religious/political beliefs? In my humble opinion, aid is being used as a weapon. This I believe has been strongly demonstrated in the Afghanistan war

Further, can we develop an ethical mandate for international development/aid NGOs to work through governments or local NGOs with respect to the culture, religion, etc., of the target population and to have a clear, neutral definition of the target population according to humanitarian and development criteria alone?

That said, is a new role emerging for NGOs? I believe so. We must concentrate on spreading religious tolerance.

Nabil M. El-Khodari, Founder, Nile Basin Society, Canada

PART II

A New Multilateralism?: Will September 11 Effect Long-term Changes in U.S. Foreign Policy and International Cooperation?

Reinhard Loske

AMERICA, YOU CAN DO BETTER

THE RECEPTIVENESS OF U.S. FOREIGN POLICY ELITES TO MULTILATERALISM WILL DEPEND ON THE SUCCESS OF THE ANTI-TERROR ALLIANCE

Three months ago, as the Bonn World Climate Conference came to an end with a tolerably acceptable result, Bagher Asadi, the Iranian Ambassador to the UN and chief negotiator on behalf of developing countries, nearly went into raptures: in his view, the Bonn Summit represented “the triumph of multilateralism and cooperation over unilateralism.” He stated further that, under the leadership of Europe, the Bonn Summit had shown the world that it is “unacceptable and harmful to approach a complex, multilateral process from the viewpoint of one-sided national interests.” EU Commissioner Wallström seconded Asadi’s comments, stating that the Bonn accord represented a victory of ecological common sense over present-oriented egoism.

It was clear to everyone: these oblique references were directed toward America, colossus among climate change villains, boycotter of the Kyoto Protocol, and the country that – according to conventional wisdom – views its way of life as sacrosanct and its worldview as incontrovertible. During the final plenary of the Bonn Summit, the leader of the U.S. delegation was greeted with boos and derisive laughter – probably a unique occurrence on the floor of a United Nations event – when she insisted that her country was aware of its global responsibility.

In the aftermath of the climate summit, the interpretation was often heard that the United States’ “No to Kyoto” fell into line with its growing general tendency toward isolationism and unilateralism. And it is certainly not difficult to find supporting evidence for this thesis: whether the issue at hand was a test ban on nuclear weapons, the outlawing of biological weapons and land mines, the control of trade in genetically altered organisms, or the establishment of an international criminal court, the United States always found itself on the side of those who voted against strict regulations and refused to participate – usually due to national interests or geopolitical considerations. In addition, the non-payment of promised funds to the United Nations, the virtual abandonment of Africa (which in the end has been treated by Washington as nothing more than the “lost continent”), and the renunciation of an active mediating role in the Middle East were seen until recently as strong indications that America had turned away from the rest of the world and its problems.

Against this background, the U.S. government’s reaction to the terrorist attacks of September 11 was surprising for a number of reasons. Despite the unbelievable magnitude of the damage, the government’s reaction was well-considered, not impulsive. It was integrationist, not isolationist. It was multilateral, not unilateral. Above all, however, it was not chauvinistic but rather sought to include Russia, China, and the developing countries of Asia and North Africa. Furthermore, the invocation of the UN Security Council and the partial payment of arrears to the United Nations can be understood as signals of the United States’ intensified will to cooperate.

From a perspective of global sustainability, one question in particular is interesting: Will the multilateral approaches signaled by the fight against terrorism be long-lasting, and can they be transferred to other fields of international policy such as conflict prevention, climate protection, and the fight against poverty?

At present, no one can give definitive answers to this question. Current developments are still too much in a state of flux. In addition, the fight within the U.S. foreign policy elite – between “America first” hardliners and those who seek to embed U.S. foreign policy within an integrative framework – is still raging too fiercely. However, initial tendencies can be discerned:

In the United States, the insight is growing that global problems must be responded to internationally. In this sense, the United States’ experience of its own vulnerability with respect to globalized and faceless terror has served as an elemental experience. However, since Americans are convinced pragmatists, their future attitudes toward multilateralism and joint responses to world problems will depend on whether the current alliance proves to be stable and successful, or whether it falls apart in the face of minimal resistance.

Thus for Europe, and in particular for Germany, it is critical to understand the following: in the fight against international terrorism, if we wish to strengthen those actors and forces in the United States who are willing to engage in cooperative efforts, we cannot simply sit in the spectator stands and give out marks for style and technical merit. Such behavior would relinquish any possibility for gaining influence in the present and future.

What we are currently experiencing within U.S. foreign policy is not (yet) real multilateralism. Rather, it is “unilateral multilateralism,” an internationalism rooted in national security interests. Those involved believe that advantages will arise from coordinated actions, but one thing has become clear in the meantime: all nations are expected to adopt the United States’ views on both problems as well as recommended solutions. It remains the case that wherever international arrangements require concessions on national interests, one will still have to be prepared to encounter American reservations in the future.

This matter-of-fact “multilateralism à la carte” may appear egoistic to us Europeans. We prefer a more idealistic approach along the lines of “Let us assume joint responsibility for humanity and the future.” However, it would be better for us to provide material evidence to supplement our arguments for international structures of order, and to translate our arguments into the language of interests – a language that is understood on the other side of the Atlantic. For example: a ban on biological weapons is more urgent than ever against the background of international terrorism. An international criminal court would be particularly helpful now, so that just punishment can be delivered against mass murderers of all stripes. Debt relief, more development assistance, and fair global economic relations can provide future perspectives for the poorest of the poor and immunize them against the promises of religious fanatics. Climate protection is the best insurance against oil dependency, ecological catastrophes, and migration fluxes resulting from environmental conditions.

In the coming years and decades, these issues will thrust themselves forcefully onto the international agenda, and they will do so under the guise of an expanded concept of

security. It is not yet clear whether the necessary fight against terror will mark the moment of birth of a new multilateralism, or whether this fight will serve rather to distort the perception of the actual problems facing humanity. In any case, one can only warn against the use of rhetoric that had no relevance before September 11, 2001. The 2002 World Summit on Sustainable Development in Johannesburg will offer industrialized and developing nations the opportunity to develop common perspectives. We should use this opportunity.

Reinhard Loske is a member of the German Bundestag representing Alliance 90/The Greens; he is also a member of the Green party council. He is chairperson of the study group on "Global Questions for the Future" at the German Council on Foreign Relations (Deutsche Gesellschaft für Auswärtige Politik).

EXCERPTS FROM THE ONLINE DISCUSSION

[W]e must, as governments and civil society stakeholders, work to promote Johannesburg as a forum where the resounding statement is that, in the aftermath of September 11, national interests and security concerns are best served by building a sustainable economic, environmental, and social future through international cooperation, and that these efforts need to focus on poverty, wealth, and equity. This means that we need to engage human rights, peace, and faith organizations to help carry this message.

All of this would strengthen international support for sustainable development, and the anniversary of September 11 would be an ideal time to promote this message through the mass media. Rather than worrying about the timing of the Summit, perhaps we should work toward tying the Summit in to the anniversary in this way, and using the Summit as a forum whereby we can honor those who died, and those who die daily as a result of non-sustainable development, by making a leap toward the implementation of sustainable development.

Beth Hiblin, International Administration and Policy, UNED Forum

I have always respected the work of Reinhold Loske (especially *Greening the North*), but I think he is way too optimistic about the United States' supposed newfound multilateralism. If he were able to be in North America and experience the U.S. mass media, I'm sure he would recognize that Bush's initiatives have accompanied and deliberately cultivated a very crass and jingoistic cultural explosion. U.S. mass culture and consciousness have moved leaps and bounds toward Disney and Super Bowl patriotism. Sascha Müller-Kraenner may be right that the U.S. has "rediscovered the world," but this world appears to be an egoistic projection of itself and its illusions. I suspect the Bush political-military multilateralism is simply a concession to reality—that the U.S. cannot win a conventional war with terrorism. It seems not to be making any efforts to eliminate the root causes of dissatisfaction with the U.S. around the world. I really do hope Reinhold is right and I'm wrong on this, and that the U.S. will be open to cooperation on other fronts. But as of now there seems, for example, to be growing momentum to grant even more concessions to the oil industry and bury climate change concerns.

I think we should be acting on the assumption that national governments, even the most enlightened ones, will act positively only to the extent that they are responding to grassroots pressure [The movement needs] to go beyond narrow oppositional action toward highlighting (and directly creating!) alternatives to corporate globalization [T]he strategic scale is local-regional, since eco-agriculture, soft energy systems, green building, and even eco-industrial manufacturing demand proximity, integration, and more local

production for local consumption. These things don't have to be created out of nothing in utopian fashion. Almost everywhere there are thriving alternative movements already developing them. But they need more support and more networking.

Brian Milani, Eco-Materials Project, Toronto, Canada

I believe what will help shove sustainable development into the mainstream of American life is for sustainable development to become worthwhile (read profitable) for some of the major corporations in our country.

How can we make corporations "buy" into the sustainable development idea? Show them where they can make a profit! Lobby governments to remove the barriers for simple implementation of sustainable processes in construction, energy production, and the movement of people, goods, and information. Remove the positive interest in maintaining the status quo.

Barry Benjamin, Vice President, Peace and Plenty Management Co., Fort Lauderdale, Florida

I see little likelihood that the Bush administration will "outgrow" its current aversion to multilateral engagement that doesn't serve its immediately perceived "national self-interest."

I will be simply amazed if they recognize any reciprocal responsibilities to the world community once the Afghan adventure is over. Indeed, they're already talking about extending this war to other "terrorist states" under the cover of which I fully anticipate they will try to blow all other multilateral issues out of the water (including those of the WSSD), while continuing to pursue their unilateralist and conservative agenda (including conventional energies, ballistic missile defense, and corporate-driven globalization).

In my opinion, the best way forward is that illustrated by the climate change talks in Bonn last July when virtually every country except the U.S. signed on for Kyoto. If the rest of the world perseveres with its own best multilateral sense of what it will take to manage global warming, to preserve and restore threatened global ecosystems, to pursue social justice, and to both humanize and localize the globalization process, the U.S. will eventually understand that, unless they get on board, they will become the international pariah they currently seek to bomb into submission.

Roger Doudna, Restore the Earth Project, Trees for Life, Scotland

Anju Sharma

THE “WITH US OR AGAINST US” SYNDROME

Colonialism and the Cold War are over, and the world is changing. Global cooperation, mutual understanding, and a simultaneous respect for national sovereignty are now needed to deal with global problems at a time when powerful nations can no longer simply impose their views upon less powerful nations. This change has been marked by the considerable number of global conventions, treaties, and institutions that have come into being over the past two decades. The Stockholm Conference and UNCED arose from the understanding that environmental problems in particular require international cooperation. Though the outcomes of these and subsequent efforts to share the burden of protecting the world’s environment are not always entirely democratic, they are a step in the right direction. Yet one cannot but think that, in this changing world, one country continues to follow an archaic policy of unilateralism, even as the rest of the world recognizes the need for multilateralism in an interdependent world. The fact that this country is one of the richest and most powerful – a superpower – is a serious hindrance to the attainment of global democracy. It could continue to be a hindrance to the achievement of any democratic, globally cooperative approach to the implementation of sustainable development policies at the World Summit for Sustainable Development (WSSD) in Johannesburg.

Before September 11, the United States appeared to be expressing a forceful rejection of multilateral efforts that sought international solutions to global problems, including the Kyoto Protocol to curb greenhouse gas emissions; the Convention on Biological Diversity; an agreement to enforce a 30-year old UN convention banning biological weapons; the creation of an international criminal court; a pact limiting the sale of small arms around the world; an international convention banning antipersonnel land mines; and a nuclear test ban treaty. In most of these cases, the United States’ rejection of multilateral efforts has been based on the perception that U.S. business interests or sovereignty were threatened. For instance, the Bush administration viewed the Kyoto Protocol as inflicting “unfair” additional costs on the U.S. economy (without taking into consideration (1) the massive costs inflicted by climate change upon poorer nations that contribute little to the global warming problem and (2) the United States’ own past and present contribution to global warming). The Bush administration also rejected changes to the convention on biological warfare due to concerns that inspections would compromise the secrecy surrounding pharmaceutical companies as they develop new commercial drugs. The International Criminal Court was rejected because “it might be used to harass U.S. citizens.” In taking these actions, the U.S. does not consider the broader implications of summarily dismissing these efforts to solve global problems without even offering constructive, workable options. The U.S. has further asserted its preference for unilateral action in cases where it has had disagreements with other nations. In many such cases it has chosen to act unilaterally, sometimes simply by adopting extraterritorial legislation and exporting domestic laws.

In responding to the recent terrorist attacks, the U.S. yet again employed a language and means to retaliate that made clear it would act unilaterally, irrespective of world opin-

ion, and without any regard for a rule-based approach to win the cooperation of other nations to deal with a global problem. Instead, the U.S. presented some nations (particularly poor nations like Pakistan) first with a do-or-die choice (“you are either with us or against us”) and then later offered financial incentives to cooperate. Similar arm-twisting tactics have been used to win support for U.S. positions in global environmental negotiations in the past. For instance, African states that wanted the Convention on International Trade in Endangered Species (CITES) to allow them to trade ivory stocks were told that U.S. aid would be withdrawn if they continued to push for ivory trade. International cooperation, however, cannot be commanded. It must be built through trust – specifically trust that (1) the U.S. is not interested solely in its own welfare, but rather in global welfare, and (2) the U.S. is interested in establishing a rule-based, democratic, and just multilateral system to deal with international problems. Such a system is in the United States’ own interest in the long term, even if it means practicing restraint in the short term. The U.S. will not be able to ensure even its own security, let alone global security, by behaving as if it is above the law.

Optimists would like to think that the events of September 11 will force the U.S. to realize the folly of its unilateral approach to global problems and relent. Global negotiations on environment and sustainable development – long-term victims of U.S. unilateralism – would undoubtedly benefit from such a change. Unfortunately, there is no evidence yet to indicate that U.S. foreign policy will undergo any such drastic changes. The U.S. may implement short-term policy changes to accommodate allies in the “strike against terror.” However, long-term changes in foreign policy require introspection and understanding on the part of the U.S. with regard to its role and responsibility in promoting global democracy; the U.S. must understand that, as a superpower, it must provide leadership and direction. There has been no such introspection in the aftermath of September 11. The U.S. media seem consciously to avoid uncomfortable questions concerning the country’s past policies – for example, in this case, the sponsoring of the very same terrorists to protect its Middle East oil interests, often at the cost of destabilizing other nations. As British journalist Robert Fisk argues, every effort is being made to switch off the “why” question, and to concentrate on the “who, what, and how.” In the same way, there is little debate within the U.S. on how its consumption patterns affect the global environment. This insularity is ultimately reflected in every aspect of its foreign policy and decision-making.

The rest of the world – governments and civil society – can play an important role in reminding the U.S. that unilateralism will only work against U.S. national interests in the long term. It is unfortunate that no other nation has questioned the wisdom of the United States’ decision to employ military force without first seeking global consensus. Before September 11, Bush’s rejection of the Kyoto Protocol resulted in global censure. The U.S. came under pressure both at home and abroad. But after September 11, this pressure has dissipated, as environmental and sustainable development issues are again relegated to the back burner. At home, Bush’s approval ratings have once again increased. It is now up to the rest of the world to ensure that the cloud of September 11 does not further color international negotiations, and that the WSSD in particular is not derailed by the “with us or against us” syndrome.

Anju Sharma is Coordinator of the Global Environmental Governance Unit at the Centre for Science and the Environment, New Delhi, India

EXCERPTS FROM THE ONLINE DISCUSSION

[I]t stands to simple logic and reason that what occurred on September 11 is the result of long years of intense, deeply rooted conflict and the greed for power feeding off the frustration and despair of the underprivileged. Indeed, it is the cause of this conflict that needs to be thoroughly assessed and analyzed, and those who do may find they may have had something to do with it, directly or indirectly. This includes the West's imposition of its views on the rest of the world. And this is what is most difficult for Western leaders and populations to swallow, because it is a direct criticism of their actions and policies. I am of course not condoning violence and terrorism in any way. But cool, in-depth understanding of the full history of this situation will ultimately be much more valuable and likely to achieve peace than standing on pedestals of self-righteous wars against terrorism

I am a realist. Peace, as we all would like or imagine it to be, may not be attainable within our lifetimes. I therefore urge all of us to work toward what I call "Intelligent Peace," which accepts the possibility of military action, conflict, and violence and recognizes that very little can change overnight. It will take everything from changes in our individual attitudes, habits, and views of the world, ourselves, and others to concerted local, national, and global action, and it will take a long time. But it is crucial that we commence and sustain, above all sustain, these positive shifts and changes. It is important that peace be included as one of the key issues at environmental and social forums around the world, including Johannesburg.

Birgitte Rasine, CEO, LUCITA, Milford, Connecticut

No one can condone violence as a means of bringing about change, or as an educational tool. Killing people to teach them a lesson is counterproductive whether you are an isolated fundamentalist or a powerful government, and righteous anger is no excuse for blind violence. However, this does not mean that we cannot learn from events such as those of September 11 and their follow-up in Afghanistan. By looking at the reasons behind the actions of the terrorists (without condoning them) and why they chose particular targets, we can begin to understand what it is that drove these people to kill themselves and others, and do something about the causes. And if some of those reasons or the grudges against those particular targets coincide with the concerns of other groups, such as the anti-globalization protesters and those protesting against the unilateral behavior of certain powerful governments, this means that we have to start addressing those concerns in earnest if we are serious about world peace and sustainable development—if only to prevent the dangerous criminals, power-hungry governments, and other madmen of the world from co-opting legitimate grievances.

Unfortunately we have not yet accepted, as a species (not as a few thinking individuals), that all lives are of equal value Do we really think that if the terrorists targeted the Petronas Towers in Kuala Lumpur we would still be talking about it? The reason we are all still talking about September 11 is that for some reason we are convinced that an attack on the U.S. is more important, more meaningful, than an attack on Malaysia.

What happened on September 11 was a major shift in perspective. It is easy to sympathize with the families and friends of all those who died in the World Trade Center; they are "our people" living lives that are familiar to us. But these attacks were not prompted by hatred against the many good people working in the WTC and elsewhere. To put it very cynically, these people were merely collateral damage in an attack on a hated symbol—the economic system of the West. How often do people remember that the "collateral damage" reported in Afghanistan, Iraq, Kosovo, Korea, etc. also have friends, families, hopes, and dreams? We can no longer talk blithely of collateral damage and not consider the fact that we ourselves can also be considered collateral damage.

This realization has serious implications for our personal relationship to an entire economic and political system. How can we continue to manufacture and sell arms if the faceless collateral damage, which we know will result from their use, suddenly has names and faces and wailing families we can identify with and may in fact be us? How can we continue to support governments and industries that do not care about the collateral damage of their activities, whether these be violent deaths or environmental destruction that threaten our survival in a million ways?

The events of September 11 have opened up a small window of opportunity for the peoples of the world to talk as equals. The only thing that can provide security for individuals as well as nations is a respectful and caring relationship with one's neighbors. Perhaps the greatest meaning Black Tuesday will have for the WSSD is that for the first time in world history, the peoples of the world can get together around a table as equals with a shared understanding of our interdependence on each other and on nature—as a true global community.

Chrisna du Plessis, Programme for Sustainable Human Settlements, Pretoria, South Africa

"September 11" has clearly reconfirmed the danger of terrorism and the obstacles it presents to our efforts to make global society sustainable.

September 11 has certainly revealed how far we are from creating a sustainable world, and this problem is fed by both "terrorism" and the "U.S. administration." September 11 questions our global ability to control the most powerful nation's tendency to act however it wants. Do we have a strategy to deal with the U.S. and its worldwide unsustainable interventionist behavior? No matter how much we may shy away from it, such a strategy is certainly an essential part of creating a sustainable world.

September 11 has (again) clearly shown us what critical social limitations we need to overcome in order to create a genuinely sustainable global society:

- We need to control and eliminate terrorism to achieve global sustainability. However, there is no single or simple yardstick to define and/or understand "terrorism." And the U.S. administration has certainly no moral right or claim to this.
- We need to develop a strategy to educate U.S. citizens about the terrorist nature of some aspects of their government's foreign policy and its global public behavior and interventions. They need to realize their government's role in promoting global unsustainability
- When individual nations fight terrorism by organizing military interventions in foreign lands, there is room for hidden (economic, political) agendas within overt (humanitarian) gestures. Thus there is a need to make such interventions practically impossible and to place the UN and other genuinely global instruments in the forefront of such efforts. There is an urgent need for active democratic global institutions
- Religious absolutism and extremism are critically damaging our common spirituality, which can contribute positively to global sustainability. The interfaith movement needs to address this and should seize the present opportunity to mobilize people and institutions to further the cause of religious co-existence and at the same time discourage violence
- [P]atriarchy and its institutional power need to be overcome. There is a major role for women and the women's/feminist movement in contributing to the global sustainability movement
- Skewed media representations by international media that serve the needs of this or that government do not contribute to wisdom with regard to global issues ... such as "terrorism" or global sustainability. We must seriously rethink the nature of the global media and their public behavior as much as we must promote alternative media institutions or sources of information.

Dr. M. Nadarajah, Malaysia

Jörg Haas

AFTER SEPTEMBER 11: TOWARDS A WORLD SUMMIT ON *UNSUSTAINABLE* DEVELOPMENT?

This “think piece” will take on a pessimistic tone in the hope of provoking a lively discussion. I would like to focus more specifically on the diplomatic landscape of sustainable development negotiations. Let’s have a look at that landscape as it was prior to September 11: We had an alliance among several progressive developing countries and the European Union (or at least its environment ministers) that was gradually coming together but still remained unstable. During negotiations on the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety, the EU was a crucial partner in assisting African leadership to achieve a successful outcome. The climate negotiations then saw a widening rift between the United States and the EU; in this struggle, a number of political actors within the EU witnessed the emergence of a specific European identity in world politics: one that pursues its interests through cooperation rather than confrontation, through the strengthening of multilateral global governance, through the rule of law at an international level, and through the framework of sustainable development. This process even reached the level of heads of state and government at the Genoa G7/G8 summit that took place parallel to the Bonn climate negotiations among environment ministers.

Certainly, this tendency had not yet fully matured. For example, it had not yet reached the ministries of trade or finance. Nevertheless, the EU had formulated a relatively progressive and ambitious agenda toward the World Summit on Sustainable Development (see http://europa.eu.int/eur-lex/en/com/cnc/2001/com2001_0264en01.pdf), asserting a leadership role in this process.

How did September 11 change this panorama? Unfortunately, we did not witness an EU that acted in a coherent, united fashion. Rather, the larger EU states rushed individually to Washington to assure the U.S. of their unconditional support and offered military forces without knowing the purposes for which these forces might be used. Essentially we have seen an EU that is falling apart politically under the stress of this crisis, falling back on the foreign policies of national states.

What bearing does this have for Johannesburg?

1. I must admit that I do not yet see the emergence of a new multilateralism in U.S. foreign policy, as much as I would wish to see it. As a result, I expect the U.S. position at Johannesburg to remain similar to the one taken by George Bush senior in Rio (“the American way of life is not negotiable...”), championing free trade and free enterprise as the only way to achieve sustainable development. As the U.S. negotiator at the UNECE Regional PrepCom for the WSSD put it, self-criticism is a concept that is largely foreign to U.S. culture.
2. I strongly doubt that the weakened EU is now in a position to repeat the Bonn scenario of forcefully confronting unilateral U.S. policies, especially at a highly visible forum like the WSSD. Even if environment ministries wished to assert themselves in such a fashion, their governments and heads of state would not provide them with the support necessary to engage successfully in such a confrontation. Thus EU leadership may be weakened by the Johannesburg process.

3. The third player in this game will be the Southern countries, possibly led by the host country South Africa. As exemplified by the New African Initiative (<http://www.dfa.gov.za/events/afrinit.htm>), South Africa may champion an initiative to increase African integration within world markets, in the name of poverty eradication. However, this integration will most likely be based on the accelerated exploitation of Africa's natural resources. This strategy of development—based on natural resource exports and advocated consistently by the IMF in its structural adjustment programs—has in the 1990s already led to a permanent oversupply of raw materials on the world market, which has in turn led to a continuous decline in terms of trade. By the end of the 1990s, we witnessed a situation in which more and more natural resources from the South were being plundered for less and less economic benefit, a process that ran counter to every strategy for reducing overconsumption of natural resources in the North, since these resources had become increasingly cheap for Northern consumers.
4. In my most pessimistic hours, I foresee an unholy alliance for unsustainable development being formed in Johannesburg: an alliance between (1) a resource-hungry United States that has never really taken the sustainability challenge seriously, and (2) a “development”-hungry Southern elite that seeks whatever kind of development at whatever cost simply to overcome its position of powerlessness and lack of recognition. The main vehicle for putting this agenda into action will be increased foreign direct investment (FDI), investment in transport infrastructure for exports, and investment in large energy and water schemes for mining and export-oriented agriculture, all associated with massive environmental and social costs. This global deal – one that does not necessarily imply substantial increases in public funding – will satisfy existing elites in both the North and South. Moreover, the real cost of the deal will be borne by those who do not profit from this strategy: (1) marginalized rural populations who are driven from their land to make space for mining, large dams, and export agriculture, (2) people living in environmentally vulnerable areas such as coastal plains or drylands that will bear the consequences of ongoing climate change, and (3) future generations, our children and grandchildren, who will inherit an impoverished and unstable planet.

If this scenario comes true, Johannesburg will become the World Summit on Unsustainable Development. While Rio recognized that the world must find a new model for development – particularly in the North but also in the South – Johannesburg may end up celebrating the TINA doctrine: There Is No Alternative. In other words, the West offers the only model for development, with the U.S. at the forefront of a linear development path that all countries are expected to follow.

It will fall upon civil society in the North and South to expose the fallacies of such a global deal, whose ultimate price is the earth. Let us not be blinded by a rhetoric of poverty eradication that simply means more of the same failed policies of the past. We must pressure at least a few progressive Northern and Southern countries into building partnerships for a new path of development, a path toward a sustainable future for all!

Jörg Haas is Coordinator of the Ecology and Sustainable Development Program at the Heinrich Böll Foundation, Berlin.

EXCERPTS FROM THE ONLINE DISCUSSION

After September 11: An Optimist's Perspective

The U.S. wants and needs the world's support so much right now; I think a lot of things are possible in the development of international treaties that wouldn't have been possible before. Just look at President Bush's about-face on some of the arms treaties with Russia The U.S. is a new nation after September 11. I truly believe that the eyes of our leaders and citizens are more open and that our awareness about the world, its problems, and the long-term and global consequences of our actions has increased tremendously Johannesburg could be perfectly timed for taking advantage of a unique moment in world history.

Lockey White, USA Youth Planning Group for Sustainable Development

In response to Jörg Haas:

While you paint a rather gloomy picture, I think your analysis is spot on. The big question is what we, as NGOs, can do to limit the damage of the scenario you paint

[The events of September 11 have] impacts on NGOs and their supporters. The anti-globalization, anti-WTO crowds on the streets of Seattle and Genoa numbered thousands, with many more times that providing silent support at home while watching TV, reading the papers, etc. This is precisely what should happen in Johannesburg if our governments do not make real commitments to change. But can you imagine it happening now? I'm not so sure.

I think the real challenge for NGOs lies in finding a vision again, reclaiming the language of "sustainable development," and promoting this in a way that is effective but does not alienate our public support, which has become more polarized by recent events.

I have another concern. Even before September 11, it seemed as if "poverty" and its eradication was going to be a strong issue on the WSSD agenda. The September 11 fallout seems to have given even more political momentum to this idea while at the same time reinforcing the rather simplistic notion that poverty is the greatest threat to sustainable development. But poverty and wealth cannot be separated. They are two sides of the same coin. The issue is inequality, not poverty, and there is no sustainable way of addressing poverty without also addressing excessive wealth and over-consumption.

Stephen Law, Environmental Monitoring Group, Cape Town, South Africa

AFTERWORD

As readers of this volume will certainly have observed, the online discussion revealed an extraordinary mixture of skepticism and hope with regard to the effects of September 11 on the World Summit for Sustainable Development. While some discussants viewed the attacks of September 11 as a catalyst for massive international military and security measures that would overwhelm and possibly destroy the Johannesburg process, others viewed the events of that fateful day as heralding a potentially new era of cooperative international relations in support of sustainable development policies. In addition, while some participants believed that September 11 would ultimately reinforce rather than reduce U.S. tendencies to engage in unilateralist efforts and to avoid self-reflection, others claimed to espy a new multilateralist, cooperative tone in U.S. foreign policy. These expressions of skepticism and hope were not mutually exclusive; on the contrary, many contributions to the discussion combined all of the above positions within their arguments.

During the time that has followed the online discussion, events in the international arena have done nothing to clarify the question of whether September 11 will ultimately have a positive or negative effect on the Johannesburg process and on international cooperation in general. Pessimists, particularly critics U.S. unilateralism, can certainly point to a number of recent developments, including (i) the U.S. decision to withdraw unilaterally from the 1972 Anti-Ballistic Missile Treaty, (ii) U.S. obstruction of the Biological Weapons Treaty, (iii) the U.S. administration's hostile remarks toward international criminal tribunals, (iv) George W. Bush's "axis of evil" speech, (v) the Bush administration's increasingly aggressive posture toward Iraq, and (vi) the increasing international presence of U.S. forces in locations such as the Philippines, Georgia, and Yemen. Optimists, however, can point out contrasting developments, such as (i) the intensification (albeit in unconvincing fits and starts) of U.S. efforts to forge a settlement in the Israeli-Palestinian conflict, (ii) U.S. support for Arab-led peace initiatives in the Middle East, (iii) the increasing independence of opinion among European policymakers who have begun to express careful criticism of recent U.S. foreign policy decisions, (iv) corresponding warnings by governments throughout the world that the U.S. must not initiate additional military conflicts without UN approval, and (v) increasing statements by policymakers and analysts within the U.S. mainstream media that call for the United States to enhance international security by reducing its dependence on oil, improving its energy policies, increasing foreign aid expenditures, and demonstrating real commitment in the battle against climate change.

The effects of September 11 on global politics and security will remain unclear and unpredictable up to and far beyond the Johannesburg Summit. Yet despite the apparent monumentality of events on and pursuant to that day, civil society actors must not lose sight of the fact that they can and must influence policymaking decisions at the local, national, regional, and global levels. One crucial component of civil society efforts is the promotion of an open and democratic international public debate that encourages both the free expression of ideas as well as increased international exchange and understanding. If sustainable development advocates want to get their message across to a wider audience, if U.S. policymakers are to be convinced that true patriotism must co-exist with self-reflection and self-criticism, if Third World citizens want to express their simultaneous abhorrence of both terrorism and a globalization process that ignores

issues of sustainability and equity, and if the concept of security is to be understood in broader terms – then this international public discourse must be maintained and expanded. It is our hope that the online discussion “The Road to Johannesburg after September 11, 2001” provided just such a contribution to this discourse.

Kurt Klotzle

Berlin, March 2002

HEINRICH BÖLL FOUNDATION

The Heinrich Böll Foundation, affiliated with the 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 developmental 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 more than 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 Heinrich Böll Foundation's collaboration on sociopolitical education programs with its project partners abroad is on a long-term basis. Additional important instruments of international cooperation include visitor programs, which enhance the exchange of experiences and of political networking, as well as basic and advanced training programs for committed activists.

The Heinrich Böll Foundation has about 160 full-time employees as well as approximately 300 supporting members who provide both financial and non-material assistance.

Ralf Fücks and Barbara Unmüßig comprise the current Executive Board.

Two additional bodies of the Foundation's educational work are: the “Green Academy” and the “Feminist Institute”.

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

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

WORLD SUMMIT PAPERS

Gender and Sustainable Development

A briefing paper by Minu Hemmati and Rosalie Gardiner
World Summit Papers No. 10, Berlin 2002, 56 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. Segsneider
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.de

Other Publications related to the World Summit

World Summit 2002-Newsletter No. 1 of the Washington Office of the Heinrich Böll Foundation

By Nika Greger. May 2001, available in German, English, Spanish at www.worldsummit2002.org

Gender Perspectives for Earth Summit 2002 – Energy, Transport, Information for Decision-Making

Report on the International Conference at Jagdschloss Glienecke, 10-12 January 2001, Berlin. Edited by the Federal Ministry for the Environment and the Heinrich Böll Foundation. Berlin, February 2001, 42 pages.

Download at www.boell.de/downloads/gd/genderpersp2002.pdf

New World Conferences: New prospects for global environment and development financing?

Prospects for breaking new ground in financing. Essay by Barbara Unmüßig.

Only available as Download at www.boell.de/downloads/rio+10/rio10unmuessig.pdf

Globalization and Sustainability

Essay by Wolfgang Sachs. Documentations, Papers & Reports of the Heinrich Böll Foundation Nr. 5, Berlin 2000, 32 pages.

Download at www.boell.de/downloads/nachhaltigkeit/sachsglobal.pdf