SQUARING ENVIRONMENT AND DEVELOPMENT –

GLOBAL MARSHALL PLAN AND DEVELOPING COUNTRY PERSPECTIVES

DIPLOMARBEIT

zur Erlangung des Magistergrades

an der Kultur- und Gesellschaftswissenschaftlichen Fakultät

der Universität Salzburg

Fachbereich Politikwissenschaft und Soziologie

Gutachter: Univ.-Prof. Dr. Martin Weichbold

Eingereicht von

DANIEL SAUDEK

Salzburg 2008

Preface

My motive for writing this paper was concern about contemporary global problems, the wish to find out which solutions have been proposed and which of them are viable, and therefore also to discover what is going on on the scene of global governance, or indeed behind that scene. I have for a long time had the impression that there are lots of well thought out proposals around to tackle the current challenges, but also that neither problems nor solutions received much attention in the media, something which piqued my curiosity to explore these issues further. The subject matter of global sustainable development enters into a wide variety of disciplines such as sociology, environmental science, economics, international relations etc. and it seemed best to me to try to find out a bit of everything, rather than devote too much attention to any one field at the expense of others, in order to attain at least a sketchy overview, since quite simply, things are connected, especially with such a very general topic. In the context of this endeavour, I began to become interested in the Global Marshall Plan Initiative about four years ago, when Franz-Josef Radermacher held a speech in Salzburg, the town where I live, and I have been involved in the initiative ever since. I particularly liked Radermacher's clear-cut critical analysis of contemporary goings-on in combination with an integrative approach, in which, for example, economics and business are assigned a positive role for global sustainable development, rather than being portrayed merely as its natural enemies. However, I also felt that more consultation with experts from developing countries was indispensable for so global a topic and that this was the "missing link", a gap which I wanted to contribute to fill through the research project of which this paper is the result. In retrospect, the presence of such a gap hardly surprises me any more, having experienced the practical difficulties connected with such type of research.

It is a pleasure and a duty to thank the people who have contributed to this research project: my parents for their support; my interview partners in different countries all over the globe for devoting their time to fill out the quite lengthy and detailed questionnaire; my supervising professor Martin Weichbold for his patience and advice; Chibueze Udeani and Mathieu Lobingo for acting as interview partners for the pretest, and Maike Sippel for corrections of the questionnaire; Frithjof Finkbeiner for providing lots of free books;

Apart from those mentioned a lot of people, whom I cannot all name here, have helped me with advice to find potential interview partners or have expressed their interest in and support for this project.

Table of contents

1. Introduction 5
2. Some notes on the methodology employed 7
3. Sustainable Development 12
3.1 Concept and definition 12
3.2 Different theoretical perspectives 15
3.3 The concept of global governance 19
3.4 Global rules concerning the environmental dimension – status quo and suggestions 22
3.4.1 Global warming 23
3.4.2 Loss of biodiversity 32
3.5 Global rules concerning the economic dimension – status quo and suggestions 35
3.6 Global rules concerning the social dimension – status quo and suggestions 43
4. Institutions and Organizations for global sustainable development 51
4.1 The Bretton Woods Institutions 53
4.2 The WTO 55
4.3 Suggestions for reform of the Bretton Woods Institutions and the WTO 57
4.4 The United Nations and its Specialized Agencies: 63
4.5 Suggestions for reform of the United Nations and its Specialized Agencies: 67
4.6 Creation of new institutions 71
4.7 The process – how to get to global sustainable development 72
4.8 Further remarks by experts 75
5. The Global Marshall Plan 77
5.1 Eco-social market economy 80
5.2 Standards and co-financing 81
5.3 Financing concept 83
5.4 Closer connection between the Bretton Woods Institutions and the WTO with the United Nations system 83
5.6 Growth vs. restriction 85
6. Conclusion 87
7. Bibliography 89
8. Appendix: the questionnaire 95

1. Introduction

The perennial challenge of achieving a viable economic organization and good relations between people while protecting and avoiding excessive strain on the extra-human environment for the first time presents itself on a global scale in our age. Attempts to solve environmental problems such as global warming at the expense of socio-economic balance by denying the world's poor access to decent livelihoods is undesirable and can be expected to lead to unrest and conflict, while the reverse risks the collapse of the global ecosystem – hence the need to square environment and development. The Global Marshall Plan Initiative, founded in Germany in 2003, seeks to meet this challenge and has developed a set of proposals and measures in order to bring about global sustainable development in the environmental, economic and social spheres and thereby achieving a state in which the world is in balance, to employ the initiative's own wording. The initiative is most widespread in Europe and partly in the United States, but hardly known in other countries so far, so that it seemed necessary to me to discover what experts in the field of sustainable development who come from developing countries think.
The Global Marshall Plan, a concept which we shall explore in more detail in chapter five, is basically about rendering the existing global governance institutions and their respective legal frameworks more coherent, so that already existing agreements on social and environmental standards are integrated into the rules and institutions that govern the world trade system. Generally speaking, the initiative's philosophy is to use in an effective way those structures and agreements which are already there and building up upon them, as opposed to reinventing the wheel. In the context of such a more coherent governance framework, small global taxes would be introduced to raise the money necessary to attain common global development objectives, exemplified in the medium term by the United Nations' Millennium Development Goals. In the long term, the goal is no less than global sustainable development: the preservation, to the extent that this is still possible, of the global environment, while simultaneously tackling the trend of growing inequality, reversing it and achieving greater global equity, thus contributing to world peace.

After a few remarks on the methodology employed for this research project, we will set out our exploration of the whole wide-ranging topic of sustainable development starting with some general theoretical reflections on this concept, going particularly into sociological

theoretical approaches. Since we are talking specifically about *global* sustainable development, a few reflections on the concept of 'global governance' and on its relevance to global sustainable development follow.

Subsequently, we shall examine more closely each of the fields of sustainable development: environmental, economic and social. We shall find out which rules are already in place in each of these areas, which rules are missing, and which suggestions there are for improvement, both in relevant literature and according to the feedback of the experts polled[1].

In the next part, there follows an overview of the currently existing global governance institutions and organizations, what their relevance is for bringing about a sustainable state of affairs, and which institutional reforms would be necessary to that end, or whether these institutions are in fact insufficient on their own, so that new institutions would need to be created.

After having explored both the status quo and suggestions for a state of affairs worth aiming for, we then turn to sustainable development seen as a process, i.e. how we might get to this state of affairs, which institutions and organizations could play a part in that respect, what can be expected to help such a process come about and what could impede it.

In chapter five, after an introduction to the concept of the Global Marshall Plan, the measures which the Global Marshall Plan Initiative proposes are evaluated with the help of experts' opinions. A few personal reflections on selected aspects of the Global Marshall Plan and on improvements I would advocate follow.

[1] Translations from sources in German, Spanish or French are by the author.

2. Some notes on the methodology employed

A double approach was followed in order to find out what a framework for global sustainable development could look like, and to evaluate the concept of the Global Marshall Plan: on the one hand, contemporary literature was consulted, while on the other, experts from developing countries were interviewed so as to explore what a first-hand developing country perspective on these issues might be. As one might expect, comparatively few publications from developing countries themselves are available which would permit to assess such a perspective. However, the publications consulted by the United Nations and its specialized agencies feature authors from all over the world or, as in the case of the International Labour Organization's report "A Fair Globalization"[2], draw upon an extensive consultation process in order to thereby adequately reflect the very varied perspectives of the different world regions. While the majority of the sources which this paper builds upon are in English (and a few in French), a glimpse at the bibliography of this paper will reveal that a substantial part is in German. German speaking countries have traditionally featured a relatively strong strand of research especially on the environmental dimension of sustainable development which seems, however, to have hitherto had comparatively little impact on the global discourse, which is probably due to the language barrier. This also holds true for the publications of the Global Marshall Plan Initiative, though some of its key publications have been translated into English. In the field of development economics, sources could be broadly categorized according to the respective roles they assign to free markets, states and international market regulations, from pronounced free market optimism (as found e.g. in the work of Jeffrey Sachs) to a school of thought that self-identifies as a heterodox "other canon"[3] in opposition to neoliberal orthodoxy, and of course intermediate positions, though I will argue (chap. 4.2) that such categorizations can also obscure, rather than clarify, the issue.

Although questions related to sustainable development in its different dimensions affect everybody on the globe, due to the complex nature of the questions, and especially the theoretical or practical expertise required to competently evaluate the concept of the Global

[2] World Commission on the Social Dimension of Globalization (2004): A Fair Globalization. Creating Opportunities for All. http://www.ilo.org/public/english/wcsdg/docs/report.pdf (12. March 2008).

[3] Chang, Ha-Joon (ed.) (2003): Rethinking Development Economics. New York: Anthem Press, p. 1-18.

Marshall Plan, the expert interview was the method of choice for the survey project. The research instrument was a questionnaire sent by e-mail (this method was chosen due to cost and time savings and the number of potential participants which could thereby be reached) to institutions or private e-mail addresses. Together with the questionnaire, a brief description of the Global Marshall Plan was added as an attachment to enable participants to attain an overview of the key points of this concept.

The contact information of suitable institutions or private persons in developing countries was acquired through research on the internet and also via the byway of consultation with institutions and individual experts in Europe and the United States. The institutions contacted were a. those who can in the narrower sense be seen as development agents[4], i.e. non-governmental organizations, including faith based organizations, that have to do with one or more dimensions of sustainable development, regional development banks, global organizations such as UN specialized agencies and international financial institutions, the relevant ministries within states' governments, and b. relevant university faculties and departments (e.g. social, economic and legal sciences, humanities, natural sciences) and other institutions involved in research on sustainable development.

All these were situated in "developing countries", defined as countries which, according to the United Nations' Development Programme's 2006 Human Development Report, attained a Human Development Index under 0,8 (i.e. "medium", or "low" human development). The term "developing countries" is of course a problematic one a. because it presupposes a notion of development and on which countries are more or less developed, something which is hard to define[5] and b. because the simple distinction of "developed" vs. "developing", categories inherited from the development discourse of the first few decades after World War II, has become increasingly blurred with the emergence of some transition economies which are of greater weight in international relations now than they used to be, and of course with the end of the cold war and the associated three part division of the planet into first, second and third

[4] Comp.: De Abreu Fialho Gomes/ Hanak/ Schicho (2003): Die Praxis der Entwicklungszusammenarbeit, p. 47-65.

[5] Comp. also: Novacek/ Mederly (2002): Global Partnership for Development.
The authors propose the concept of the "Sustainable Development Index", in which countries' sustainability is assessed separately in seven different fields (politics, demography, health, education, economy, resource and environment), thereby enabling a very differentiated approach to the subject, because a country's scoring is rarely uniform, e.g. a country might attain a high level in the political sphere, but a low one in the environmental sphere or vice-versa. Taken together, the seven dimensions make up the aggregated sustainable development index.

world[6]. In addition, the term "developing country" can give rise to the impression that we are talking about a uniform block of states, and can thereby understate the great variety of countries thus qualified. In spite of this and for lack of a better term, the term "developing country" is nevertheless employed in this paper to refer to countries whose inhabitants are on average not as wealthy, long-lived or well educated (these three criteria define a country's scoring on the Human Development Index) than those of the "developed" countries – those which score over 0,8 on the index. The reason for asking experts from developing countries is that the Global Marshall Plan is a concept addressing development topics, that it is most well known in the rich countries, and that therefore consultation with experts from developing countries may be expected to yield a valuable new perspective on the concept of the Global Marshall Plan.

The questionnaire was sent to some 450 e-mail addresses of institutions or individuals (the latter being mostly addresses of university researchers), including a reminder after approximately five to six weeks. A third call was launched after the same time span, this time with a Spanish translation of the questionnaire for Latin American countries and a French version for African countries of the *francophonie* (in the first two rounds the questionnaire had only been sent in English). The rate of return was low, even for an E-mail survey: eight experts mailed a questionnaire back, and seven of these questionnaires were complete. However, the questionnaires returned contained a sufficient richness of information and an interesting variety of perspectives reflecting the different geographical and professional backgrounds of the participants. Reasons for the low response rate can only be guessed, but may include the amount of time required to fill in the quite lengthy questionnaire, the necessary expertise, or technical difficulties.

The experts who answered were: a sociologist (Ph. D.) living in the Congo (Brazzaville) working for a UN specialized agency and specializing, among others, in conflict management, ethnic relations, international governance and human rights; experts from the Guatemalan ministry for environment and natural resources, specializing also in financing for development; a Russian specialist in environmental economics; a Peruvian professor of economics specializing in issues pertaining to climate and energy, and also in theory of economic growth; an Indian NGO-worker in the field of rural development, whose fields of expertise are amongst others, poverty, health, and nutrition, population growth and human

[6] Payne (2006): The Global Politics of Unequal Development, p. 7.

rights; a Georgian researcher in an environmental research centre, specializing in environmental issues, climate and energy, international governance, and poverty related issues; an expert working for a UN specialized agency in Nicaragua (though of Swiss origin), whose main focus lies on human rights and poverty related issues; and the head of a church based charity organization in Malawi, a trained geneticist specializing in poverty/ health/ nutrition, women's rights and financing of development.

Communication by E-mail, of course, opens up new possibilities for research projects which include many different countries and can therefore be expected to be especially beneficial for research related to development and connected questions of international relations and global governance, since it enables the assessment of the respective perspectives of experts in different world regions with relative ease compared to the five or so decades of development discourse after World War II during which this method of communication was not available. The marked digital divide between those who have access to this technology and those who cannot afford it springs to mind as an impediment to this kind of research and therefore as a potential source of distortion of its results. This applies to a lesser extent to institutions or organizations which can be expected to have access to the internet more often than individuals, although, for example, a great many African NGOs can only be reached by telephone[7] and there is often little information on faculties and staff on the websites of many African universities. Nevertheless, Africa, though most affected by the digital divide, is quite well represented in this survey with two out of eight participants.

Similar difficulties, though for different reasons, were encountered attempting to contact experts in the People's Republic of China, since NGOs are scarce and universities do not disclose much information online, especially contact information of university staff, so that personal acquaintance or networking may well be the best option to engage in scientific exchange in order to get in touch with Chinese experts. The relative difficulties posed when engaging into scientific exchange with experts in China puts what we have said above about the benefits of e-mail research for the field of sustainable development into perspective, given the importance and sheer size (in every respect) of China. Unfortunately too, no responses came from countries with a majority Muslim population.

[7] See e.g. United Nations Public Administration Network (2007): Directory of African NGOs. www.unpan.org/NGO-Africa-Directory/ (3. April 2007).

Conversely, the presence of participants from Russia and Georgia may come as a surprise, since these countries used to constitute parts of what was called the “second world”, and are therefore rarely associated with the usual concept of “developing countries”. However, these countries were included due to their rating on the Human Development Index as of 2006.

The aim of the survey was to find out what such experts from developing countries think about the following questions: What could a global governance framework that best enables sustainable development look like? And in that context: how well suited is the concept of the Global Marshall Plan to attain global sustainable development?

The first question was broken down into its dimensions: 1. global rules, and 2. institutions or organizations in which these rules would be laid down, as constituents of a global governance framework; then, 3. what a process leading to the establishment of such a framework could look like, which intermediate steps would need to be taken, and which institutions or organizations could play a part in this, 4. how probable or realistic it is that such a process will indeed take place, which factors would be advantageous to that end, and which obstacles would need to be expected, and 5. whether there is anything else that needs to be added regarding global sustainable development which does not fit into categories 1-4.

This dimensional analysis formed the basis of the first part of the questionnaire. The second part dealt with the evaluation of measures proposed by the Global Marshall Plan Initiative with the help of experts’ opinions. At the end of the questionnaire, participants were asked to provide personal information: their country of origin and of current residence, the organization they work for, and their fields of expertise in matters pertaining to sustainable development.

A double approach was therefore applied: in order to evaluate whether a Global Marshall Plan would be good for sustainable development in the opinion of experts from developing countries, it was also necessary to first find out what kind of a framework for global sustainable development these experts would conceive of independently of that which the Global Marshall Plan suggests. This, as mentioned, formed the first part of the questionnaire. The second served as an instrument for evaluating whether the Global Marshall Plan itself would be conducive to global sustainable development.

3. Sustainable Development

3.1 Concept and definition

Scientific thought on sustainable development is essentially an integrative business, bringing together the sciences and necessitating cooperation between them[8]. Also, it typically combines descriptive and normative approaches, asking what the status quo is, what state of affairs would be worth aiming for, and how to get there. In this paper we shall employ a by now classical notion of sustainable development, for the reason of its wide acceptance and therefore utility when engaging in scientific dialogue, and because of its descriptive value. This understanding of sustainable development is made up of two ingredients:

a. The well known definition of sustainable development as put forward in the Brundtland Report of 1987, according to which development is sustainable when it "meets the needs of the present generation without compromising the ability of future generations to meet their own needs[9]".

b. The three-component model of sustainable development which is employed in many publications today, for example in the final document of the UN General Assembly's World Summit of 2005: „economic development, social development and environmental protection – as interdependent and mutually reinforcing pillars.“ [10]

This understanding of sustainable development has served as the basis for the construction of the first part of the survey questionnaire and of this paper. We need, however, to bear in mind a few caveats when employing it:

First, the three dimensions of sustainability – environmental, economic and social – are essentially “fuzzy”. They overlap and cannot be separated neatly, neither analytically or in

[8] For the relevance of this basic thought to computer models for sustainable development comp. Mesarovic, Mihajlo D. (1996): Cybernetics of Global Change, p. 17. Mesarovic’s approach seeks to avoid too simplistically mechanistic predictions of the co-evolution of man and his environment by “putting the human inside the model”. In this “Human/Computer Integrated Modeling Process” a computer represents the natural (extra-human) environment and its changes, with which a human player interacts – “the former contributes efficient logical procedures, the latter provides value preferences and subjective judgments” (p.20). Mesarovic’s paper is available online at http://unesdoc.unesco.org/images/0010/001055/105583E.pdf (Jan. 10th 2008).

[9] United Nations General Assembly (1987): Report of the World Commission on Environment and Development. http://www.un.org/documents/ga/res/42/ares42-187.htm (26. September 2007).

[10] United Nations General Assembly (2005): Final Document of the UN General Assembly's World Summit of 2005. http://daccessdds.un.org/doc/UNDOC/GEN/N05/487/60/PDF/N0548760.pdf?OpenElement (26. September 2007).
Comp. Also Minsch, Jürg (1997): Institutionelle Reformen für eine Politik der Nachhaltigkeit, p. 16.

practice. For example, human economic activities cannot be treated separately from the ecological basis they rely upon, or from the socio-cultural context in which they take place, while overexploitation of any kind of finite resource has implications for all three fields of sustainability. The same holds true for the subject of the distribution of wealth and resources – whether this should be assigned as belonging conceptually to the social or the economic sphere of sustainability cannot be conclusively decided or depends on the context. This "fuzziness" is not, as sometimes criticized, a conceptual weakness, being due rather to the very general nature of the subject matter, comprising a plurality of levels, from that of inanimate matter (e.g. the atmosphere or oil reserves) through the biological sphere right up to that of human beings – hence the difficulty or even impossibility to discuss sustainable development using the terms of any one science in isolation from other sciences[11]. While the delimitation or the number of the different dimensions could be debated (for example the social and economic dimensions could be merged and conceived of as a single socio-economic one, or, conversely, a political or cultural dimension could be added as fourth and fifth components), it seems that the overlapping of spheres and therefore the "fuzziness" of sustainable development is inherent and, for the reasons stated above, cannot be eliminated.

Second, a sustainable state of affairs is not merely one which can be physically perpetuated for a long period of time. This holds true especially for the social dimension. While in the environmental sphere, sustainability means the avoidance of degradation or, in the long term, collapse of the ecosystem[12], and while in economics the term "sustainable" may be employed, for example, for finance markets or for a system of international currency management which are capable of guaranteeing a certain stability over time, in the social sphere the scientific as well as the general discourse on sustainable development is usually about more than stability and the avoidance of collapse: it also focuses on matters such as decent life, human rights and dignity, basic needs, political participation and so forth. In short, it is typically about morally desirable states of affairs instead of merely stable ones, given that it is possible to conceive of societal structures and conditions which remain stable over many centuries and at the same time do not do much harm to the environment, but which are morally undesirable. In the definition of the Brundtland report, the key word for this normative element is "needs",

[11] For this type of philosophy of science comp. Schumacher, Ernst Friedrich (1977): A Guide for the Perplexed.

[12] The notion of ecological sustainability is of course based on a roughly ceteris paribus assumption, usually meaning the avoidance of the disruption of natural ecosystems *as we know them*, rather than the sort of dramatic changes ecosystems undergo, with or without human influence, when viewed in the long term perspective beyond the duration of the lifespans of a few generations of humans.

although it is of course impossible to define in a universal manner what these needs actually consist of, a point which was therefore left open to the free interpretation of the participants in the survey which forms the empirical part of this inquiry.
The cited definition highlights inter-generational fairness ("future generations") – something which could be termed the "vertical" dimension – but a "horizontal" one is also present, i.e. whether the needs of the living generation at any one point in time ("present generation") are satisfied, and to what extent and how equitably they are satisfied. A satisfactory model for sustainable development, then, will need to take both dimensions into account.

Finally, the three component model sees the ecological, economic and social pillars as "mutually reinforcing", but leaves open whether they fall into any order of priorities, and if so, which one. On a *descriptive* level, the observation that the dimensions of sustainability reinforce each other can arguably be said to hold true (which is why this model is employed here), since no society, no matter how well organized, can subsist without a functioning environment and, conversely, the better mutual understanding within a society, the easier it will be for it to manage a limited resource responsibly, while a lack of understanding or even warfare goes to the expense also of the society's natural environment. In a *normative* discourse and in decision making on the other hand, some criterion for the order of priorities will have to be found to solve practical dilemmas. For example, "poor countries face the dilemma of poverty before that of environmental sustainability", as the survey participant from Peru noted, while on the other hand, the contemporary environmental discourse and the movements associated with it have originated in the rich countries – this, in turn does not necessarily imply that their inhabitants are more environmentally aware than those of poorer countries[13].

Although one might say that the concept of sustainability was originally "borrowed" from the sphere of the environment[14] and subsequently carried over to the other two dimensions, which could be interpreted as suggesting that the environmental sphere is of conceptual priority and

[13] Dunlap and Mertig argue that just the reverse is the case. Dunlap, Riley E. / Mertig, Angela G. (1996): Weltweites Umweltbewußtsein. Eine Herausforderung für die soziologische Theorie. In: Diekmann, Andreas / Jaeger, Carlo C. (ed.) (1996): Umweltsoziologie, p. 193-218.
[14] This, in any case, appears to be the case for the German equivalent term „Nachhaltigkeit" (sustainability), which was first used in forestry in the early 18th century according to: Grober Ulrich (1999): Der Erfinder der Nachhaltigkeit. www.zeit.de/1999/48/Der_Erfinder_der_Nachhaltigkeit (13. March 2008). In the French and German terms *développement durable* and *nachhaltige Entwicklung*, the word "development" itself is the subject, so that they mean a development which can last or endure, while the English and Spanish terms "sustainable"/ "sostenible", imply a different subject, something that is able to sustain such a state e.g. the ecosystem or the earth.

that the other two dimensions are but later derivations of this original sense of the term 'sustainability', the following brief exploration of sociological theories dealing with sustainability look at this issue from the starting point of human social organization itself and of its ability or inability to deal with such challenges[15].

3.2 Different theoretical perspectives

The American historian Jared Diamond's bestselling book "Collapse"[16] gives accounts of societies in the past which have grappled with the management of the limited resources which their environment offered them, and how these societies "choose to fail or succeed". Sociological theory offers different approaches to explain a society's reaction to threats posed by environmental degradation.

Probably the most famous and obvious of these is the "tragedy of the commons" perspective, which approaches this question from the point of view of social agents, be they individuals or institutional or organizational bodies. Agents share a finite resource but, in the absence of binding rules and sanctions, are unable to predict the future action of any other agent ("prisoner's dilemma situation"), so that they will maximize their own benefit through exploitation of the resource in question, the aggregated consequence being the depletion of the resource to the detriment of the agents, so that "individual rationality leads to collective irrationality". One of Jared Diamond's examples is the case of Easter Island, where rivaling tribes competed in the setting up of impressive stone statues (the famous *moais*) of their respective chieftains, for which they needed wood, so that the island was stripped naked of forests within a few centuries.
Deepak Nayyar's wording illustrates what the "tragedy of the commons" implies for international relations:

> The order of preferences, in the pursuit of self-interest, would be as follows: 1. our country does not contribute but others do (free rider problem) 2.our country contributes as do all other countries and everybody is better off (cooperative solution) 3. no country contributes and everybody is worse off (Prisoner's Dilemma outcome) and 4. our country contributes but no other country does (the isolation paradox in reverse). Although every country prefers 2 to 3, the hope for 1 and the fear of 4 lead to 3.[17]

[15] Such an approach, "anthropocentric" perhaps, since it sees human beings and their social organization as the key issue, does not contradict what we have said above about the general nature of scientific thought on sustainable development which integrates the sciences pertaining to very different types or levels of being, but it does set them in a hierarchical order, both descriptively and normatively.
[16] Jared Diamond (2005): Collapse. How Societies Choose to Fail or Succeed.
[17] Nayyar, Deepak (2002): Towards Global Governance. In: Nayyar, Deepak (ed.) (2002): Governing

Arguably, this line of thought could be applied not only to countries but to any type of social agent who finds himself in a situation of uncertainty concerning the course of action of another agent.

Different ways out of the "tragedy of the commons" are conceivable of: on the one hand, the tragedy of the commons is often brought into context with the closely related thought experiment known as the prisoner's dilemma[18], in which two prisoner's are accused of a crime which they have committed together. Each of them is promised mild punishment (say, two years in prison) if he confesses, which will entail harsh punishment (ten years) for the other prisoner, while if both confess, they can expect five years each in jail. A key point of this scenario is that the two prisoner's are locked up separately from each other, so that no communication between them is possible, through which they could agree to cooperate by both confessing and consequently getting five years each. On the other hand, even if this were possible, each prisoner would have an important incentive to break the agreement. Insofar as the social agents' ignorance of their mutual intentions enters into tragedy of the commons-type constellations, the obvious remedy would be communication. In practice, e.g. in international relations, this will be the case only more or less – there are of course obstacles to communication between social agents, so that more communication can indeed be expected to be of help, but these obstacles are generally not absolute, so that agents are not completely sealed off from each other as they are in the prisoner's dilemma thought experiment (whose explanatory value is that of an ideal type, rather than that of a description of an actual situation). Moreover, communication does not necessarily entail cooperation, since a player can plainly and squarely announce that he is not ready to cooperate, as is the case with the United States' boycotting of some international treaties. In addition, as indicated, in the prisoner's dilemma situation a breach of promise by an agent cannot be ruled out. Therefore, it seems that the cooperation necessary for the management of global commons could only be achieved in the context of enforceable rules, and institutions to that end[19].

Macrosociological approaches can also contribute to our understanding of a society's response to environmental challenges. For example, in Niklas Luhmann's systems theory which explores the relationships between the sub-systems of society the main challenge to

---

Globalization. Issues and Institutions, p. 13.

[18] Comp.: Frey, Bruno S./ Bohnet, Iris (1996): Tragik der Allmende. Einsicht Perversion, Überwindung. In: Diekmann/ Jaeger (ed.) (1996), p. 293.

[19] Comp. Diekmann/ Jaeger (1996), p. 20-21.

sustainability (though Luhmann does not employ this term) comes from the economic subsystem, since environmental concerns simply do not translate into the code which this subsystem employs, i.e. money, so that the economic subsystem cannot process the information that the environmental situation is deteriorating and therefore, simply by following its own systemic logic, continues to deplete natural resources. The most obvious response to this difficulty is perhaps the classical approach of environmental economics, i.e. the integration of external costs (i.e. the detrimental side effects which affect another agent or the extra-human environment) into the "code" which the economic subsystem can deal with, for example via taxation of the usage of the commons[20]. Another, related, approach stems from the observation that the human scope of action has been greatly increased through vastly improved transport and communication, resulting in economic operations on a global level, while the bulk of traditional political institutions and mechanisms of decision making stay confined to the national level. It would follow, then, that politics would need to "catch up" with economics and (re-)gain its control over the economic sphere, thereby enabling it to impose rules and sanctions, whether financial or otherwise. For example, the World Commission on the Social Dimension of Globalization judges that

> the problems we have identified are not due to globalization as such but to deficiencies in its governance. Global markets have grown rapidly without the parallel development of economic and social institutions necessary for their smooth and equitable functioning[21].

Others see political decisions by elites, rather than the technological developments, as the main culprits for the genesis of an unbridled globalization and its associated detrimental consequences in the social and environmental sphere[22], and sometimes conspiracy theories, seeking to identify those responsible for these decisions, are invoked. Normative consequences drawn from such an analysis may involve increased transparency, democratization, and generally improvement of the, at present, macchiavellian global decision making processes or, conversely, an un-doing of globalization thus negatively understood in order to recover the desired national and local sovereignty, or some combination of the two.

---

[20] Ibid., p. 21.

[21] World Commission on the Social Dimension of Globalization (2004): A Fair Globalization. Creating Opportunities for All, p. xi. http://www.ilo.org/public/english/wcsdg/docs/report.pdf (12. March 2008).

[22] Comp. Plehwe, Dieter (2005): Neoliberale Netzwerke. Globalisierung wurde gemacht. In: Faschingseder, Gerald/ Ornig, Nikola (ed.) (2005): Globalisierung ent-wickeln. Eine Reflexion über Entwicklung, Globalisierung und Repolitisierung, p. 304-343.

For Ulrich Beck, the differentiation of society into subsystems, an analysis which he shares with Luhman, leads to an "organized irresponsibility"[23], since each subsystem operates according to its own particular logic and cannot effectively manage the situation of society as a whole, and thereby systematically defers responsibility to the other subsystems. This holds true even for the political sphere, since politics builds upon its legitimization by the people. For Beck, however, such a legitimization cannot be produced in the absence of scientific expertise universally acknowledged as conclusive and undisputed, a type of expertise unavailable today due to a kind of postmodern disenchantment of science itself which, so to speak, has fallen victim to its own methodic scepticism[24]. Beck, therefore, does not set his hopes to overcome the environmental crisis in any one subsystem, such as politics, the economy or science, but in individuals themselves, specifically, an avant-garde of global citizens[25] capable of overcoming their mental fixation within the subsystems and of acquiring an overview of the global situation as a whole. These global citizens, Beck hopes, will organize into new social movements pressurizing from below for the solution of urgent global problems.

Another set of related theoretical approaches to sustainability could perhaps be termed "macrohistoric" or "limits to growth" perspectives – those, from a variety of scientific disciplines which, so to speak, take a step back, seeking to attain an overview of the basic mechanisms of the evolution of mankind within the context of a limited environment, and thereby to understand the current global environmental crisis. The most obvious – and no doubt central – issue is that of population growth, which, however, is sometimes singled out as the main culprit behind the crisis, although sheer numbers alone do not automatically make for environmental deterioration as long as the aggregate consequences of their lifestyles remain within certain limits[26] (needless to say, the environmental impact of lifestyles in poor countries are generally far below those of rich countries).

Self enforcing mechanisms have been made out by authors such as the economic historian Peter Jay to explain the exponential course of the population curve, including economic growth (through the acquisition of resources or technological innovation) leading to the ability to raise more children, which in turn enables more division of labour and hence more wealth and so forth. Radermacher states that the population size thus increased leads, in turn,

[23] Beck, Ulrich (2003): Weltrisikogesellschaft. Auf der Suche nach der verlorenen Sicherheit, p. 61-64.
[24] Ibid., p. 94-95.
[25] Ibid., p. 119.
[26] Comp. La Revue Durable (2007): La planète peut accueillir beaucoup de monde, tout dépend des comportements. In: La Revue Durable, no. 24, p. 20-22.

to an exponential increase in the possibilities for communication, which increase fourfold as population doubles, and therefore in the exchange of scientific and technological ideas, resulting in the emergence of sophisticated technology and consequently a huge population size practically over night[27]. Technological progress also produces gains in efficiency, which could be expected to alleviate the environmental situation, but these gains in turn are mopped up by the increased usage of the technology in question. The introduction of a twice as efficient car will not mitigate the greenhouse effect if it is used three times as much. Meadows' / Randers' / Meadows' by now famous report entitled "Limits to Growth"[28], first published in 1972, is perhaps the most well known example of such a type of perspective.

3.3 The concept of global governance

If something is true of both agent and systems theory, a type of loose integration on the global level could be expected, since, on the one hand, the difficulties associated with the prisoner's dilemma situation in which nation states currently find themselves leads to pressure towards the setting up of more rules governing the usage of global commons, while on the other, no "outside enemies" beyond and outside the global level are currently in sight which would force the "system of humanity" to integrate in the same way as, for example, nation states have politically integrated against rival nation states[29], so that "global humanity" can currently be seen as an isolated system comparable to Easter Island, whose inhabitants lived in isolation for centuries. "Global governance" then, would be such a state of loose integration, resulting from pressure from the elements of the system, such as states, multinational institutions, civil society, companies etc.

The term global governance, then, needs to be distinguished from the confusion with the concept of a world government analogous to a national government on the one hand, but also from a mere increased multilateralism on the other. According to a study conducted for the German national assembly, global governance "is about institutionalizing a multilateral

[27] Radermacher, Franz Josef / Beyers, Bert (2007): Welt mit Zukunft. Überleben im 21. Jahrhundert, p. 26-27.
[28] Meadows/ Randers/ Meadows (2007): Limits to Growth. The 30-Year Update.
[29] According to the Peter Jay, a three way dialectic pervades human economic history: 1. economic growth through conquest, discovery or technological innovation, 2. jealousy from neighbouring groups leading to conflict over the new wealth, and 3. the setting up of a more organized political and military structure to counter the attacks from outside. If this logic holds true, then once human action reaches a global level, the initial conflicts would result in a type of integration to end them, and then phase out in the absence of outside enemies. Jay, Peter (2000): Road to Riches. Or the Wealth of Man.

culture of cooperation in order to solve ... global problems together with others affected"[30]. Similarly, the Centre for the Study of Global Governance at the London School of Economics sees global governance "not as government but as a minimum framework of rules necessary to tackle global problems guaranteed by a set of institutions including both international organizations and national governments"[31].

Such a conception can already be found in Kant's "On Perpetual Peace", in which Kant argues for a league of independent states to prevent future wars. Kant, of course, knew nothing of the sort of environmental concerns as we are familiar with today, but laments the exploitation of poor world regions by powerful European nations and the arms' race between these nations in a way the contemporary reader will find strikingly adequate to today's world. The constitution of the states which form this league, according to Kant, would need to be "republican", meaning that the ownership of such a state is with the people (though for Kant, this does not necessarily imply that decision making is achieved democratically, but it does, for example, rule out serfdom). The basic tension inherent in proposals for global governance is therefore implicitly present already in Kant's thought: though the member states of the global league of nations are sovereign and independent, states' governments are required at least to ensure a "republican" order – a tyranny would not fit into a world system such as Kant envisaged it and could not be tolerated by the other states[32]. Today, the same difficulty arises when we ask whether the international community is entitled to demand "good governance" from a state, for example, compliance with anti-corruption standards[33], as will be discussed later.

On the other hand, global governance can also be seen as being conducive to national sovereignty rather than undermining it, since the presence of rules makes the course of action of the agents more predictable and overcomes or mitigates the prisoner's dilemma and the types of restraints on agents associated with it. Such a view might be termed "compatibilist". It appears quite frequently in the International Labour Organization's report "A Fair Globalization" which suggests the establishment of binding global rules concerning, for

[30] Deutscher Bundestag (ed.) (2002): Schlussbericht der Enquete –Kommission Globalisierung der Weltwirtschaft, p. 419.
[31] London School of Economics (2003): The Centre for the Study of Global Governance's mission statement. www.lse.ac.uk/depts/global (12. March 2008).
[32] Kant, Immanuel (1919): Zum ewigen Frieden und ausgewählte Stücke, p. 19-36.
Comp. also Deutscher Bundestag (2002), p. 420: „effective and legitimate global governance depends on the existence of democratic and responsible states".
[33] Comp.: Transparency International (2007): Corruption Perceptions Index 2007. www.transparency.org/policy_research/surveys_indices/cpi/2007 (15. January 2008).

example, trade, migration and labour standards, and reforms of global institutions to that end, while simultaneously arguing for increased ownership of, and control over development processes at the national and local level. The ILO's report, which builds upon an extensive consultation process with representatives from many different social and institutional backgrounds on all continents, judges that

> good governance, at both the national and global level, should further values such as freedom, security, diversity, fairness and solidarity. It should also ensure respect for human rights, international rule of law, democracy and participation, promote entrepreneurship and adhere to the principles of accountability, efficacy and subsidiarity.[34]

The role of subsidiarity for global governance, according to the study commissioned by the German government, could be specified thus: "According to the concept of global governance, the different political systems and levels ideally integrate into a subsidiary multi-level arrangement"[35]. As will be dealt with in more depth later, many of the experts consulted have similarly argued for coherent multi-level arrangements integrating the different levels from local to global.

This paper rests on such a conception of global governance, and the questions posed to the experts in the course of the survey were devised on the basis of the assumption that, for the reasons sketched out above, some kinds of governance structures, i.e. rules and institutions are necessary to solve both environmental challenges and the closely related questions of distribution of wealth and resources and of socio-cultural, economic, political and legal organization. We will see that the tension, already present in Kant's thought, between the urgency for the establishment of rules on the one hand and the need for national and local autonomy and ownership of development on the other, is a recurrent theme in the discussion of rules and institutions for sustainability in contemporary literature, in the feedback from the experts who participated in the survey project, and in the evaluation of the concept of the Global Marshall Plan.

---

[34] World Commission on the Social Dimension of Globalization (2004), § 335.
For details on the national and regional preparatory dialogues, see:
Idem (2004): National and Regional Dialogues. www.ilo.org/public/english/wcsdg/consulta/index.htm (12. March 2008).

[35] Deutscher Bundestag (2002): p. 420.

3.4 Global rules concerning the environmental dimension – status quo and suggestions

There are a number of environmental issues and problems which are "global" in nature, meaning that the aggregated consequences of such types of human activity which are detrimental to the environment can be felt everywhere on the earth. This is of course especially true of those issues which have to do with the atmosphere, i.e. global warming and depletion of the ozone layer. It applies perhaps to a lesser extent to other environmental problems which are also present all around the globe, but which are consequences of human action of more limited geographical reach – the most important being loss of biodiversity (insofar as it is a consequence of destruction of natural habitats and not of global climate change), soil degradation, depletion of global commons such as marine ecosystems, waste, toxic substances and so forth. They also are relevant to global governance – one reason for this is simply that, as discussed above, agents find themselves in a prisoner's dilemma situation so that, for example, countries which comply with standards for environmental protection at the local level and refrain from depletion of their resources often need to make some form of economic sacrifice, while those which ignore them gain competitive advantages. It follows that whether global rules and standards are in force and whether there is international cooperation (e.g. technical or financial) to meet them also has consequences for those environmental problems which are the result of human activities of a more limited reach[36].

In addition, the problems listed above cannot be viewed as isolated, but rather as interrelated and interdependent. Global warming especially is pivotal, since it aggravates many of the other problems mentioned.

Global rules and regulations have been agreed upon in all of the areas mentioned. We shall, however, focus on global warming and species extinction, which are usually seen as the most crucial issues, in the following discussion, exploring existing global governance mechanisms as well as suggestions for new ones.

[36] I would therefore argue that the criticism against the adequateness of prisoner's dilemma for more regional environmental problems is beside the point. For this criticism comp. Frey/ Bohnet in: Diekmann (1996), p. 292-307.

3.4.1 Global warming

Global warming, though acknowledged as a central problem at the latest since the Rio Earth Summit in 1992, has begun to attract an unprecedented amount of attention in the media very recently. The IPCC and Stern reports have brought global warming to the forefront of the discourse in the media with their startling predictions. The Nobel prize winning former report foretells an increase in earth surface temperatures by between 1,1°C and 6,4°C and sees human activity as the major force behind these developments[37]. The latter sees the possibility of a decrease of the global economy of up to 20% if global warming remains untackled, but also estimates that a 1% investment of the world's gross domestic product would suffice to finance the necessary counter-measures, i.e. cutting emissions to avoid the worst effects of climate change[38]. Hence, global warming may from today's point of view be termed "the predictable emergency"[39], and current observations may well imply that its scope has hitherto been under- rather than overestimated[40]. But, as the difference between the higher and lower projections in the IPCC report illustrates, the scale and future development of the problem are as yet very uncertain. For example, the role of self-enforcing mechanisms or "vicious circles" is still poorly understood, such as the release of methane caused by the thawing of permafrost or deep sea ice[41]. While the seriousness of global warming is still contested, research from the UK-based Ipsos Mori institute suggests that this is the case mainly in the general public debate and in the media, as opposed to the scientific debate as such[42].

The first international agreements concerning climate change were the fruits of the United Nations Conference on Environment and Development, also known as the Rio Earth Summit,

---

[37] Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (2007): Climate Change 2007 Synthesis Report. Summary for Policymakers. http://www.ipcc.ch/pdf/assessment-report/ar4/syr/ar4_syr_spm.pdf, p. 6-7. (12. March 2008).

[38] Stern, Nicholas (2007): Stern Review. The Economics of Climate Change. http://www.hm-treasury.gov.uk/media/9/9/CLOSED_SHORT_executive_summary.pdf , p.1. (12. March 2008).

[39] UNDP (2006): Human Development Report 2006, p. 159.

[40] This may perhaps seem a somewhat daring statement to be made in a sociological piece of research. On the other hand, the social sciences, like all sciences dealing with sustainable development, need to be able to build their arguments on evidence which they cannot produce themselves, given the complexity of the problem. Likewise, physicists dealing with climate change will typically need to cooperate with researchers from other fields of knowledge when it comes to devising effective strategies. Comp. http://news.bbc.co.uk/2/hi/science/nature/7058074.stm for a fuller treatment of the argument that climate change has been underestimated.

[41] Wicke, Lutz/ Spiegel, Peter/ Wicke-Thüs, Inga (2006): Kyoto Plus. So gelingt die Klimawende, p. 24.

[42] BBC (2007): Scepticism over climate claims. http://news.bbc.co.uk/2/hi/science/nature/6263690.stm (5. March 2008). And Ipsos Mori Institute (2007): Climate Change Survey. http://www.ipsos-mori.com/polls/2007/climatechange.shtml (4. July 2007).
Comp. also Black, Richard (2007): Climate Science. Sceptical about bias. http://news.bbc.co.uk/2/hi/science/nature/7092614.stm (14. November 2007).

which produced, among other documents, the UN Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC). Among its most important points is the avoidance of dangerous anthropogenic climate change (though no quantifiable target in terms of, for example, a maximum tolerable concentration of greenhouse gases in the atmosphere, was set) and the principle of "common but differentiated responsibilities" of countries, which were classified as annex I (developed countries) or non-annex I countries according to their respective emission levels. The convention paved the way to its amendment, the Kyoto protocol, negotiated in 1997 and entering into force in 2005 after it was ratified by Russia. Its aim is to reduce greenhouse gas emissions of annex I countries by 5, 2 % by the period between 2008 and 2012 compared to 1990 levels. However, the protocol also allows for these reductions to be achieved by emissions trade with non-annex I countries' emission savings achieved through clean development projects[43], as opposed to domestic savings in the respective country alone.

A survey participant living in the Congo (Brazzaville) emphasized the necessity that every country ratify the Kyoto protocol (the US, still the world's largest emitter, have signed but not ratified, as is well known) and suggested tighter measures on a global level to assess and tax countries' contribution to global warming and to other environmental problems, together with limits to the production of certain engines and armaments. Similarly, a combination of prices for pollution and ecosystem services on the one hand, and clean technology on the other, was put forward by our correspondent in Russia. These proposals resemble Ernst Ulrich Weizsäcker's scheme of an ecological-social tax reform, whereby prices for energy consumption would be increased while other taxes, for example on labour, would be lowered, thus leading to an "efficiency revolution", so that "kilowatt hours and barrels of oil become unemployed, rather than people"[44]. Weizsäcker, together with the authors Amory and L. Hunter Lovins, lists fifty examples of more efficient and thus less polluting technologies than those which are usually employed even today, twelve years after the publication of his book "Factor 4"[45], such as cars, houses, heating and cooling systems, refrigerators etc., which on average use four times less energy input – hence the name of the book – than conventional technologies do. These technologies, as the authors argue, would become more competitive under such a tax regime. My personal impression is that this book and the general perspective of an "efficiency revolution" described in it have received very little attention in the general

[43] Payne (2006), p. 201-217.
[44] Weizsäcker, Ernst Ulrich von/ Lovins, Amory B./ Lovins, L. Hunter (1995): Faktor 4. Doppelter ‚Wohlstand – halbierter Naturverbrauch, p. 23.
[45] Comp. also Lovins, Amory (2005): More Profit with Less Carbon. In: Scientific American, Volume 293, Number. 3, p. 52-61.

discourse on sustainable development, especially in the media. The authors do not, however, succumb to the illusion that technology will fix all our problems – they also emphasize the importance of the right logistics in the use of technologies (for example, car sharing pools in cities and an end in subsidies for excessive transport of goods) and of effective governance measures[46].

Apart from goals for the reduction of greenhouse gas emissions, the Kyoto protocol also provides for adaptation efforts against the damaging effects of climate change. The issue of adaptation has become more prominent in recent years since it has become increasingly clear that retarded action has made global warming and its impacts irrevocable. The participants from Malawi have suggested that "each country should make an analysis of the impact of climate change and its effects – once these are identified, proper funding should be provided to mitigate the negative effects." This answer reflects the fact that a. countries like Malawi bear almost no responsibility for the anthropogenic greenhouse effect, b. that they are affected by its consequences (indeed in general more so than the rich countries) and c. that it follows that international financial cooperation is necessary to help such countries cope with the negative effects of global warming. Similarly, the UNDP's 2007 Human Development Report argues for a "twin track": "stringent mitigation to limit 21st century warming to less than 2°C with strengthened international cooperation on adaptation"[47] (whether a limitation to 2°C warming is still within the realm of the feasible is of course debatable). It warns of setbacks in development progress already achieved, since developing countries will bear the brunt of the effects of global warming, often lack financial resources for adaptation and also account for a relatively small proportion of the anthropogenic greenhouse effect.

Former World Bank chief economist Joseph Sitglitz[48] puts forward a scheme whereby all countries on the globe should tax emissions and thus integrate external costs of economic activities contributing to global warming on a national level – each country would be entitled to keep the revenues and lower taxes elsewhere, e.g. those on labour. Such revenues could also be used for investing in adaptation to climatic change. Stiglitz points out that the advantage of this model is that numerically defined goals for emission cuts for each country are thus avoided, given that the definition of such national goals would make for endless

[46] Weizsäcker/ Lovins/ Lovins (1995), chapters 6 and 7.
[47] United Nations Non-Governmental Liaison Service (2007): Climate Change threatens unprecedented human development reversals. http://www.un-ngls.org/site/article.php3?id_article=393 (10. February 2008).
[48] Stiglitz, Joseph (2006): Making Globalization Work, p. 230-231.

bargaining in the international arena of diplomacy on which country needs to reduce how much. However, Stiglitz leaves open how this scheme should be internationally organized, for example how it could be brought about that each country integrates these external costs in a comparable way, rather than defining their own respective standards for such a measure – such a lack of coordination could subsequently lead to a "race to the bottom" in the standards employed. Therefore, it seems that such a scheme would need to be combined with effective global governance mechanisms.

Al Gore's ecological Global Marshall Plan, set out in his book "Earth in Balance"[49] (this should not be confused with the related but different concept of the Global Marshall Plan as devised by the initiative of the same name in Germany in 2003, and which we shall discuss in chapter 4), addresses the issue of global standards, calling for a "comprehensive and ubiquitous change in the economic 'rules of the road' by which we measure the impact of our decisions on the environment", the foremost issue for Gore being that the measurement of GDP should take environmental degradation and depletion of natural resources into account. The other key points in Gore's plan are: stabilizing world population through the byway of enhanced literacy, reduced infant mortality and access to means of birth control; development and transfer of less polluting technologies from the rich to the poor countries; a new generation of international agreements on global warming, though Gore does not go into detail as to the content of these agreements; and, interestingly, raising global consciousness for global warming, for example by including schoolchildren into the monitoring of climate change in the world's different regions.

Thus, Gore's plan integrates several aspects – demographics, technology, law, economics, and also education and the building up of awareness – under the central goal of fighting global warming. Also, it is noteworthy that Gore emphasizes changes necessary in *developed* countries themselves[50] as opposed to simply demanding good practice from the rest of the world. On the other hand, the plan seems rather lopsided – consultation with developing countries is not mentioned, and the level of global governance receives relatively little attention, so that it seems that the proposed measures would be implemented on a bilateral basis – rich countries devising a plan of action for the world as a whole and then helping poor countries, rather than all parties convening at eye-level in an international platform. The international financial institutions receive little attention in this scheme (although Gore does

[49] Gore, Albert (2007): Earth in the Balance. 2nd edition, chapter 15.
[50] Ibid., p. 300.

at one point mention that they should integrate ecological concerns into their practices[51]) and Gore is sceptical that the UN-system should play any important role[52].

In the field of global warming, the constellation of the "tragedy of the commons", which blocks international progress on resource management, is joined by the so called "grandfather principle": the established industrialized countries are used to emitting more than the developing countries who have contributed relatively little to the problem, and argue that the problem are the countries with transition economies who now emit more greenhouse gases than they used to[53], so that those whose grandfathers used to emit a lot are still entitled to do so today, while it is a case of tough luck for those whose grandfathers emitted little. For Stiglitz, the Kyoto-protocol qualifies as an instance of such grandfathering, since it provides for reduction of emissions relative (measured in per cent) to the level of 1990, and hence: "the more greenhouse gases a country emitted in 1990, the more it may emit in the future"[54].

Wicke et al.[55] put forward the principle of "one person, one emission right" within the context of a global cap and trade system - put briefly, their scheme suggests that a level of greenhouse gases in the atmosphere which must not be surpassed be agreed upon (e.g. 550 ppm of CO2 equivalent), and the permissible amount of greenhouse gases emitted globally per year be calculated accordingly[56]. Every citizen of the world would then theoretically be allowed an equal share. Since, however, the industrialized countries will not be able to adapt their economies over night and many people in developing countries do not emit as much as they would be entitled to in this scheme, emission rights are traded via a global central emission bank and its branches in every country. Thus, polluters would receive an incentive for lowering their emissions and thereby avoid having to buy emission rights, while countries which are still below the aggregated per capita level they are allowed would thus receive funds which they could invest in their own development. The latter, too, would presumably attempt to develop using relatively clean technologies, since this will save emissions and thus enable them to sell rights. The authors suggest that countries would be obliged to devise national development plans ("Marshall plans") into which these resources flow and submit

[51] Ibid., p. 347.
[52] Ibid., p. 302.
[53] Payne (2006), p. 203.
[54] Stiglitz (2006), p. 223.
[55] Wicke, Lutz/ Spiegel, Peter/ Wicke-Thüs, Inga (2006): Kyoto Plus. So gelingt die Klimawende.
[56] The Kyoto-protocol also provides for a cap-and-trade system, but the target to be reached is defined as a reduction in per cent in relation to 1990 emission levels, while Wicke et al. propose to set the target in terms of a limit of greenhouse gas concentration in the atmosphere that must not be surpassed.

these plans to a global authority within the UN-system (e.g. UNDP and/ or UNEP), whose approval would be required. A crucial point is that receiving funds in this trading scheme is linked to a country's rating in the transparency international index: countries with relatively good performance would receive funds for their national Marshall Plans in advance, while those that do not meet required good governance standards will only receive funds once their national development plans are successfully implemented[57]. This would put pressure on corrupt governments in those countries which are in a position to sell emission rights to reform, while fostering good governance in those countries. It will likely be more difficult to persuade countries which are ruled by corrupt governments and whose relatively high per-capita emissions make them unable to sell emission rights to participate in such a system.

The interesting point in the model proposed by the authors is that social and economic sustainability is attained through ecological sustainability and that greater equity between people is approached via the byway of equality of emission rights. There is of course, as always in sustainable development, the issue of political feasibility and acceptance of the scheme. On the one hand, chances for a scheme following the principle of "one person, one emission right" are enhanced by the fact that countries with transition economies, more powerful on the scene of international relations now than they used to be, will not accept any attempt of "grandfathering" on the part of the high-polluting countries and are capable of blocking negotiations, while all parties, including the rich, have a high a stake in the global good of a stable climate and would simply be forced to move in order to secure that good. That being said however, the powerful countries are better equipped in economic resources and knowledge necessary to adapt to climate change, as well as military power to protect their own territories and populations in the event of any armed conflict that it may bring about – while those countries which have contributed little to global warming will likely be more vulnerable. In other words, the rich countries have better chances of remaining relatively safe places even when and if the disruption of livelihoods of large populations in "the south" will cause conflict and upheaval – this, in turn, diminishes the incentive of the rich countries to agree to such a scheme, especially as public pressure to lower emissions is rather modest in these countries.

[57] Ibid., p. 137.

A difficulty in the planning and realization of the national development plans is that of finding the right balance between the compliance with internationally agreed upon standards necessary for the sanctioning of the national development plans by the international supervising body on the one hand, and the respect for national ownership of development policies and a country's people's right to self-determination on the other – the type of "Kantian" tension generally inherent in global governance measures. Some form of agreement on minimal social and political standards will presumably have to be made, at least to ensure responsible use of the funds thus generated.

Another problem which would need to be resolved is which population size is used to calculate each country's aggregated emission rights: the size of the population at a fixed point, e.g. at the point of the inception of the cap and trade scheme, or the respective current population size in each year, in which case each country's rights would need to be recalculated every year. The issue is difficult to resolve: the former model would very probably make it easier to obtain the acceptance of the scheme by the rich countries, since otherwise population growth in the poor countries will have the effect that there are less emission rights to go round on the global level – on the other hand, only the second model guarantees the consistent application of the principle of equal emission rights which gives the scheme its appeal in the first place. The authors advocate the former model, while Radermacher, for one, favours the latter[58].

Despite these theoretical and practical problems, the scheme suggested by the authors does have the advantage that it avoids the difficulties associated with Stiglitz' and Gore's proposals: it precludes the possibility of a "race to the bottom", since the emission targets are fixed on a global level; and, although it imposes certain minimal standards on states' governments, it leaves room for nationally owned development strategies and for the creativity of businesses in each country to find the least polluting solution. Most importantly, the concept of "one person, one emission right" epitomizes the principle of human equality and translates it into economic terms, using as its starting point the simple, easy to communicate, and therefore perhaps appealing mathematical operation of setting a maximum for greenhouse gas concentration and then simply dividing it by the number of people living on earth.

[58] Ibid., p. 88-89.

The UNDP's 2007 Human Development Report argues in favour of both cap and trade systems and of carbon taxation as complementary ways to reduce emissions. It recommends their implementation on a national level, while not excluding that this could develop into a globally organized system of carbon pricing. However, the report also acknowledges that the necessary global governance structures are still lacking as of now[59]. The Russian survey participant, an environmental economist, advocated international payments for ecosystem services in general, and trading in permits, not just for the field of global warming but also for other forms of pollution, such as of air, water and waste.

One might also object to Wicke's proposal that if poor countries' economies catch up and living standards improve, their populations will now be able to afford unsustainable lifestyles. This is a crucial point which any pathway to sustainable development needs to address if it would be credible. This conflict of interest can arguably be seen as a crucial factor leading to the blockage of international environmental negotiations in the recent past. Radermacher, for one, warns that instead of reconciling those two areas, the powerful countries will try to attain global ecological sustainability at the expense of social and economic sustainability, i.e. through barring the way of the poor toward a higher level of life, through "eco-dictatorship", in his words[60].

For many authors, technology plays a role in bridging this gap. The idea of an "efficiency revolution" was mentioned above. As pointed out in chapter one, however, greater efficiency does not necessarily lead to a decreasing depletion of resources, since energy and resource savings through efficiency are undone if the new technology is used more frequently. Hence, greater efficiency alone presumably will not solve the environmental problem unless it is combined with political measures, as authors like Weizsäcker and Radermacher point out[61]. Similarly, Pacala and Socolow show that a combination of more efficient technologies, a limitation of their usage, carbon sequestering in coal power plants, renewable energy and changes in agricultural production could, taken together, solve the climate problem. Thus, they too argue for a combination of political measures with a variety of technologies, as opposed to a single panacea. In their words:

---

[59] United Nations Development Programme (2007): Human Development Report 2007. http://hdr.undp.org/en/media/hdr_20072008_en_complete.pdf (12. March 2008), p. 128.

[60] comp. e.g. Radermacher (2004): Balance or Destruction, chapter 26. The expression "kicking away the ladder", used by Chang Ha-Joon to describe the current state of global economic governance, might also be a fitting image for this state of affairs.

[61] Radermacher, Franz Josef / Beyers, Bert (2007): Welt mit Zukunft. Überleben im 21. Jahrhundert, p. 36-42.

> Humanity already possesses the fundamental scientific, technical, and industrial know-how to solve the carbon and climate problem for the next half-century. A portfolio of technologies now exists to meet the world's energy needs over the next fifty years and limit atmospheric CO2 to a trajectory that avoids a doubling of the preindustrial concentration. Every element in this portfolio has passed beyond the laboratory bench and demonstration project; many are already implemented somewhere at full industrial scale. Although no element is a credible candidate for doing the entire job (or even half the job) by itself, the portfolio as a whole is large enough that not every element has to be used.[62]

Apart from that, technological fixes have also been proposed to undo damage once it is already done, by removing greenhouse gases from the atmosphere or by making the earth cooler in other ways, since even rapid progress in cutting emissions through better energy efficiency or an increase in the share of renewable energy sources will presumably not bring fast relief to the warming planet, given that greenhouse gases accumulate in the atmosphere and are only depleted in the long term. Such fixes include, among others: fertilizing the sea with iron to enhance the growth of algae expected to absorb carbon dioxide; inducing chemical reactions with minerals such as serpentine and thus binding CO2; placing vertical pipes into the sea which spout cold water from lower levels of the ocean to the top, thus cooling the ocean surface and fostering the growth of living organisms which bind CO2 on the surface; and even the placing of "sunshades" into space or into the atmosphere to cool the earth down or the creation of "artificial clouds" which provide shade, have been proposed[63]. The problem with all such measures is of course that they can give rise to the impression that emissions do not need to be cut, since some ingenious technology will subsequently be able to do the cleaning up anyway – while we have argued neither better governance nor improved efficiency nor "technological fixes" will do on their own, but need to be combined. Also, side effects of these technologies such as ocean acidification need to be taken into account[64]. On the other hand, the scale global warming may make it necessary to put on such "emergency brakes" as well.

---

[62] Pacala, Stephen / Socolow, Robert (2004): Stabilization Wedges. Solving the Climate Problem for the Next 50 Years with Current Technologies.In: Science, Volume 305, Number 5686, p. 968.

[63] Lovelock, James (2006): The Revenge of Gaia, chapter 7. The "ocean pipes" proposal is described in: Black, Richard (2007): Lovelock urges ocean climate fix. http://news.bbc.co.uk/2/hi/science/nature/7014503.stm (26. September 2007).

[64] Lovelock does not limit his considerations to the sphere of technology. He also advocates a shift in the perception of environmental problems, arguing that the idea of man's stewardship for the earth is inadequate and that a more environment-centred (or indeed gaia-centred) perspective is necessary (loc. cit., chapter 8). Personally, I find the argument unconvincing: concern over people's livelihoods, which are known to be seriously affected by global warming, may be a more potent motivator to tackle global warming than concern over the environment. And the discussion of theoretical reflections at the beginning of this paper suggest that it is man's social organization itself when it comes to the allocation of limited resources – or indeed the lack of such organization – which determines whether an environmental problem is successfully dealt with, and hence that equity and social justice considerations and governance measures are pivotal to environmental issues as well.

3.4.2 Loss of biodiversity

Species extinction may now be proceeding at a rate of approximately one-hundred times the "natural" one[65] - though such estimates require caution, given that most microorganisms and most species in the deep sea are as yet unknown to science. These uncertainties notwithstanding, there is wide agreement that the phenomenon has reached dramatic dimensions, so much so that it can be likened to but a small handful of extinction events that have taken place in the history of the earth[66]. The UNEP's Global Biodiversity Outlook report attributes the loss of biodiversity to deforestation, particularly the loss of prime forests, and of coral reefs, kelp forests and mangrove forests. All of these, in turn, are linked to a growth in increasingly unsustainable patterns of consumption. Another danger the report highlights is the adverse effect of invasive species to biodiversity[67]. Marine life is threatened by overfishing, climate change, toxic substances and waste. A recent report concludes that the oceans may be virtually devoid of anything worth fishing by mid-century[68].

The international community has documented its awareness of this threat of species extinction through the setting up of the Convention on Biological Diversity during the Rio Summit on Environment and Development in 1992. Most of the world's countries have ratified the convention, with the important exception, as so often, of the United States[69]. The convention's aim is the protection of biodiversity for its own sake and for the sake of its value to mankind. It places the right to access genetic resources, as well as the responsibility to use these sustainably, into the realm of the state and provides for technical and financial cooperation to that end, given the difficulties that especially developing countries will experience meeting these standards. For any usage of the resource in question the convention requires informed consent on the part of the provider. It also provides for monitoring and reporting the progress achieved on the part of the signatory countries.

The 1992 convention was followed up by the Cartagena Protocol in 2000 which addresses the by now increasingly urgent questions linked to the advancement of genetic engineering.

---

[65] Pimm, Stuart L. /Jenkins, Clinton (2005): Sustaining the Variety of Life. In: Scientific American, Volume 293, Number. 3, p. 44.
[66] As illustrated by the title of the book „The Sixth Extinction" by Richard E. Leaky and Roger Lewin (1996).
[67] The Global Biodiversity Outlook, the Convention on Biological Diversity and the Cartagena Protocol can be downloaded at www.cbd.int.
[68] Worm, Boris et al. (2006): Impacts of Biodiversity Loss on Ocean Ecosystem Services. In: Science, vol. 314, no. 5800, p. 787-790. Comp. also Black, Richard (2006): Only fifty years left for sea fish. http://news.bbc.co.uk/2/hi/science/nature/6108414.stm (2. November 2006).
[69] Payne (2006), p. 221.

Specifically, it addresses possible dangers resulting from the transfer of living modified organisms (LMO) and reaffirms the "precautionary principle" already present in the Rio convention, according to which states have a right to deny the introduction of LMOs into their territories when scientific evidence that this is safe is not yet conclusive.

There is, however, a tension between the Cartagena protocol and the WTO's agreement on the application of sanitary and phytosanitary measures[70] (SPS). SPS builds upon previous agreements addressing plant and animal hygiene and prevention of diseases, as well as hygienic standards for foodstuffs. Its aim is to ensure that, one the one hand, such standards are not used as an excuse for barring imports, while on the other, sufficient room is provided for each country to choose and safeguard the standards it wishes[71]. Countries may implement such standards, provided they are based on a scientific assessment of risks (article 5.1 of SPS), and the agreement allows for moratoria of a "reasonable period of time" to produce this evidence. In other words, the burden of proof, according to SPS, lies with those countries which would deny access to genetically modified organisms. This, however, is difficult, given the lack of long-term research available in this field at present, and given that scientific results which run contrary to the interests of the biotech-industry are suppressed, as in the case of the geneticist Árpád Pusztai. Pusztai's research on genetically modified potatoes led him to the conclusion which he voiced on British television that "he would not eat genetically engineered food because of the insufficient testing procedures they have undergone", a statement which resulted in a defamation campaign against Pusztai launched by the biotech industry[72].

The feedback from Malawi suggested addressing on a global level the issue of genetically modified organisms, and especially how they impact livelihoods in developing countries. Genetic Engineering brings the danger of making the farmers dependent on the company selling seeds. Hence, the report for the German national assembly advocated the implementation of a global rule guaranteeing the farmer's right to reuse of seeds, in addition to the prohibition of patenting any kind of living organism and gene sequences[73].

---

[70] Available online at http://www.wto.org/english/docs_e/legal_e/15-sps.pdf (5. March 2008).
[71] Reichert /Gottwald in: Fischer / Gottwald (ed.), p. 111-113.
[72] Faissner, Klaus (2007): Anbauverbot in Gefahr. In: Die Furche, Nr. 46, 15. November 2007, p. 6. Comp. for a description of the controversy: Physicians and Scientists for Responsible Application of Science and Technology (2007): World renowned scientist lost job when he warned about GE foods. http://www.psrast.org/pusztai.htm (10. March 2008).
[73] Deutscher Bundestag (2004), p. 292.

The importance of the preservation of natural resources and the conservation of biodiversity was also emphasized by the survey participant from India, a specialist in rural development. In that context, "local knowledge in local context" was put forward as a suggestion for a global rule. This answer can probably be seen before the background of the struggles that have taken place in India concerning the detrimental influences from multinational biotechnology firms and the efforts, associated with the name of Alternative Nobel Prize winner Vandana Shiva, to protect the wealth of regional traditional crop varieties from these influences.
In addition, the participant advocated not only the pre-emptive aspects of conservation and preservation, but also argued for disaster-preparedness at the global level, since there are currently no large-scale global mechanisms to respond to environmental catastrophes.

The feedback from the Guatemalan ministry for environment and natural resources emphasizes the central importance of the institutions for global environmental governance themselves, highlighting especially the importance of the UN Environment Programme (UNEP), and of the Global Environment Facility, a body which is unique in current global governance architecture in that it is governed by representatives from the World Bank on the one hand, and from UNEP and the UN Development Programme (UNDP) on the other[74]. Specifically, the experts from Guatemala argue for an upgrading of the UN environmental institutions, which should receive more funds and whose authority should be strengthened. This is seen as the central issue for the attainment of coordinated global environmental governance. UNEP should be transformed into a UN Environmental Organization, rather than just a "programme", meaning that it should become a central pillar of global environmental governance. In that context, a number of measures for improvement of the work of these organizations were also brought forward by the ministry:

- a more integrated structure in order to execute environmental activities in the UN
- enhanced coordination
- improved policy and guidance
- strengthened scientific knowledge, assessment and cooperation
- better treaty compliance with respect to autonomy of the treaties
- better integration of environmental activities in the broader sustainable development framework at the operational level, including capacity building.

Similarly, upgrading of environment ministries at the national level and better coordination with other ministries was advocated – these governmental agencies in turn need to cooperate

[74] Novacek (2002), p. 34.

with civil society, research institutions and municipalities and communities.

The Georgian participant, an environment researcher, also stressed that any rules for environmental protection would need to comply with the basic principle of "local actions and global thinking".

3.5 Global rules concerning the economic dimension – status quo and suggestions

The economic dimension of sustainable development comprises a wide array of issues beyond the scope of this paper, ranging from finance markets to debt, the world currency system, international cash flows, intellectual property rights, natural resources and so on. We shall focus on the issue of poverty and economic inequality and related questions of the terms of international trade.

According to contemporary figures, somewhere between 850 million and 1,1 billion people live in extreme poverty[75], i.e. have less than one US$ per day at their disposal, while 2,7 mio. – some 40% of current world population – live on less than 2 US$[76]. As of 2006, 1,1 billion people did not have access to clean water, and 2,6 billion lacked adequate sanitation[77]. This is not due to actual physical unavailability of fresh water of sufficient quality, but to distribution: "the scarcity at the heart of the global water crisis is rooted in power, poverty and inequality, not in physical availability" – hence, water scarcity is an issue pertaining to governance and management[78], although climate change too is causing water stress in many regions[79]. Unavailability of clean water is a pivotal issue, since it entails an array of other problems such as increased vulnerability to disease, higher child mortality and lower education levels because of the time consumed for fetching water, typically considered a women's or girls' job[80].

---

[75] Comp. e.g. Stiglitz (2006), p. 30.
Sachs, Jeffrey (2005): Can extreme poverty be eliminated? In: Scientific American, Volume 293, Number. 3, p. 34-43.
Nayyar (2002), p. 5.

[76] World Bank (2007): Understanding Poverty. http://web.worldbank.org/WBSITE/EXTERNAL/TOPICS/EXTPOVERTY/0,,contentMDK:20153855~menuPK:373757~pagePK:148956~piPK:216618~theSitePK:336992,00.html (10. February 2008).

[77] UNDP (2006): Human Development Report 2006, p. 33. http://hdr.undp.org/en/media/hdr06-complete.pdf.

[78] Ibid., p. 2.

[79] Ibid., p 4.

[80] Ibid., p. 41-48.

Though most sources agree at least approximately as to such figures, the student of contemporary literature on global economic inequality is confronted with different, even contradictory diagnoses of the present situation. Whereas some emphasize that the gap between rich and poor is widening, other sources stress that economic growth has led to an increase of income, literacy and life expectancy. An analysis of the evolution of the Human Development Index shows rising figures everywhere except in subsahara Africa. However, the aggregated HDI can only give a statistical value per country[81] – the distribution of wealth within a country is another matter.

On a global level, absolute poverty, measured in purchasing power, is decreasing[82]. The first UN millennium goal – halving the proportion of people living on less than a US-Dollar per day – may well be reached[83]. This can be attributed mainly to economic growth and distribution in East Asia[84], a growth in which state intervention and the restriction of short term capital flows played a central role[85]. On the other hand, the situation in sub-Saharan Africa, stricken by disease and marginalized in the world economic system, is stagnating or even deteriorating.

Figures on absolute poverty and the fulfillment of basic needs are relatively easy to obtain and interpret, and there is a basic consensus about them. A very different picture emerges when we try to assess inequality, since, for a start, there is no agreement on the concept itself. For example, equal relative income growth of two states of differing GDP will result in greater inequality - if a country with a high and one with a low GDP each grow at a rate of, say, 5% the gap between them will become larger.

Is globalization making the rich richer and the poor poorer? “Generally, the answer is no” affirms Jeffrey Sachs[86], “economic globalization is supporting very rapid advances of many impoverished economies, notably in Asia”. Joseph Stiglitz, on the other hand, writes that

[81] although the more recent Human Development Reports do also calculate the HDI in quintiles of a country’s population.
[82] World Commission on the Social Dimension of Globalization (2004), § 201. And Ravallion in Meier-Walser / Stein 2004, p. 252.
[83] Ravallion, Martin (2004): The Debate on Globalization, Poverty and Inequality. Why Measurement Matters. In: Meier-Walser, Reinhard C. / Stein, Peter (ed.) (2004): Globalisierung und Perspektiven internationaler Verantwortung. Problemstellungen, Analysen, Lösungsstrategien: Eine systemische Bestandsaufnahme, p. 252.
[84] Ibid., p. 251.
[85] Stiglitz (2006), p. 53-58.
[86] Scientific American, Sep. 2005, p. 38.

"poverty in the developing countries, outside China, has increased in the last twenty years"[87]. Deepak Nayyar notes that "inequality in terms of wages and incomes has registered an increase almost everywhere in the world"[88].

These strikingly different accounts and ways of looking at poverty and inequality can be in part attributed to the background of the source's author, but also have to do with the complex statistical problems of measuring – it is important to clarify what is actually being measured and in what way[89]. For example, whether absolute numbers or percentages are used, given that the global population is growing; whether incomes are compared using purchasing power parity or foreign exchange rates – in the former case, income inequality will appear less pronounced than in the latter, while it is a matter of value judgment whether what matters is somebody's purchasing power within his own country or region or his economic weight on the scene of the international economy[90]; whether country averages or individual incomes are compared, given inequality inside a country which average per capita income does not express; whether figures for extreme (defined as under US$1 per person per day) or moderate poverty (under US$ 2 per day) are used, and so forth.

Summarizing this complex muddle of descriptions of the status quo is difficult, but some key points can be confidently asserted:

Poverty, measured by an *absolute* standard – such as the definition of the first millennium development goal – is on a slow decrease, both in numbers and in per cent of the world population. This is mainly due to progress in China and India[91]. Economic globalization has played a role here, but so has clever harnessing of globalization by the state. However, poverty is on the increase in Latin America and the Caribbean, Europe and Central Asia, and above all in parts of subsahara Africa, where the HDI has in fact fallen in many countries since the 1990s.

At the same time, the gap between rich and poor is widening – the rich are becoming relatively richer, the poor relatively – and many also absolutely – poorer. A new rentier class has emerged due to the liberalization of capital flows, while people trying to sell their labour

[87] Stiglitz (2006), p. 30.
[88] Nayyar (2002), p. 357.
[89] Comp. Ravallion (2004). In: Meier-Walser / Stein (ed.) (2004), p. 247-262.
[90] Stiglitz (2006), p. 29.
[91] World Commission on the Social Dimension of Globalization (2004), § 201.

remain comparatively immobile, facing formidable obstacles to migration[92]. According to the UN Insitute for Development Economics Research, approximately 2% of adults are now in possession of 50% of household wealth[93]. Income inequality has also increased in industrialized countries[94].

In addition, globalization, resembling medieval depictions of Fortuna, is creating winners and losers – a point which can be easily overlooked when looking at a statistic that shows that a given country's overall economic performance, GDP per capita, or Human Development Index has on the whole increased. Presumably, this is also a reason for the important differences in the perception of globalization[95]. However, there is consensus that the gap between top incomes of the economic elite and other incomes is widening.

The distinction between "developed" and "developing" countries has thus become increasingly blurred, due to economic growth for example in East Asia and South and Central America[96]. Indeed, the majority of the world's population now lives in countries with a medium Human Development Index – China, India, Brazil and South Africa are important examples. Some former "developing countries" in South and Central America and Asia have caught up and attained a high HDI. Again, this does not mean that everybody in these countries is better off – often they feature stark inequalities.

Apart from brute statistics, diagnoses diverge when it comes to making out the causes of poverty, social inequality and hunger.

On the one hand, of course, differences have historically grown – geography, access to resources, technology and even epidemiology all play a part here[97] - so that hitherto relatively isolated players, now finding themselves in a field which has recently shrunk through transport and communications technology, have unequal starting points. China's relative

---

[92] UNDP (2006), p. 273.
[93]World Institute for Development Economics Research (2007): World Distribution of Household Wealth Press Release. www.wider.unu.edu/research/2006-2007/2006-2007-1/wider-wdhw-launch-5-12-2006/wider-wdhw-press-release-5-12-2006.pdf (10. November 2007).
[94] World Commission on the Social Dimension of Globalization (2004), § 198.
[95] A good illustration of these very different perceptions of globalization is found in the ILO's reports on the national and regional dialogues that were held to prepare for the publication of the paper "A fair globalization", available online: www.ilo.org/public/english/wcsdg/consulta/index.htm (12. March 2008).
[96] Comp. Anthony Payne's criticism of a simplistic "developed vs. developing" dichotomy, in: Payne (2006), p. 6-11.
[97] An original account of the historical reasons why "the West" dominates "the rest" (to use Roger Scruton's words) is given in Diamond, Jared (2005): Guns Germs and Steel.

success on this playing field would presumably not have come about if the huge population of what today constitutes its eastern provinces had not been ethnically, politically and linguistically integrated through a process covering some two and a half millennia, while Africa's ethnic and linguistic diversity and the communication problems and conflicts associated remain a serious obstacle to political integration, and hence also to socio-economic development, until today[98].

Not surprisingly, the rules of the game – and especially some important exceptions from these rules – clearly bear the handwriting of the powerful. Hence, a participant from Malawi wrote: "One of the basic rules that have to be applied is that of fair trade. The world should ensure that trade benefits both players and there is need to plough back resources to improve social wellbeing of the producers." Similarly, the response from an Indian expert on rural development focuses especially on the needs of the poor, suggesting as global rules "cross subsidies the benefitting the poorer or weaker, equitable distribution of resources", and the principle of *Antyoyada*, according to which "the last person on the socio-economic ladder should get the benefit first". Both these answers advocate some form of redistribution of resources.

The issue of fair global terms of trade is a complex one, but clearly a central issue here are the trade barriers set up by the established industrialized countries against developing countries in those areas where the latter hold a comparative advantage – agricultural produce, textiles and other labour-intensive goods being the most important examples – so that eventual factor price equalization could be expected if trade barriers were removed in these areas.

A particularly difficult topic is that of the rich countries' subsidies for the agricultural sector. It is widely agreed that the agricultural protectionism in the rich countries should come to an end[99] – developing countries hold a comparative advantage in agriculture on the scene of international trade which they are kept from using to their own benefit, while excess produce

[98] Comp. Reinert, Erik S. (2003): Increasing Poverty in a Globalized World. Marshall Plans and Morgenthau Plans as Mechanisms of Polarization of World Incomes. In: Chang, Ha-Joon (ed.) (2003): Rethinking Development Economics, p. 453.
The Cameroonian journalist Axelle Kabou provides a virulent and provocative criticism directed to Africans themselves, especially African politicians, who, for Kabou, only stabilize underdevelopment by deferring responsibility to exploitation by the rich countries and to (neo-)colonialism. In that context, white "helpers" and Africa-sympathizers fare no better, since they reinforce the cultivation of the simple dichotomy of European perpetrators versus African victims by portraying Africans as innocent "noble savages". See:
Kabou, Axelle (2000): Et si l'Afrique refusait le développement?
[99] E.g. German Bundestag (2004), p. 145 and 342.

from the rich countries is dumped onto the markets of developing countries. This, in turn threatens the national and regional economies of the latter, especially since transport by boat, for example from a European to an African seaport, is often less costly than transport within a country with a relatively poorly developed infrastructure, so that local farmers cannot compete. The result of these trade barriers is that world prices for a number of agricultural products, such as cotton, have fallen importantly[100]. Similarly, quotas and other trade barriers are in force against textiles and other labour intensive goods. In addition, the developed countries protect themselves against the import of highly manufactured goods through tariff escalation while raw materials are granted relatively easy access, a practice reminiscent of mercantilism in the early modern era[101]. As Joseph Stiglitz notes, "trade barriers are costing developing countries three times the sum that they are receiving as development aid"[102].
The Doha-Round was intended to bring about the changes which the developing countries desired, but the resistance from the European Union and the United States blocked any progress, so that the developing countries' delegates left the ministerial conference in Cancun in 2003[103].

One participant, an economist from Peru, focused especially on the importance which global terms of trade concerning agriculture have for sustainable development, arguing that it is not consistent on the part of the rich countries to demand sustainable growth from the poor countries while at the same time barring access to their markets. "The sustainability of economic growth must be associated with the fairness in the treatment of the international primary product trade. The opposite locks up the developing countries within their national borders and makes them seek development through industrialization processes which destroy the environment and increase the greenhouse effect."
On the other hand, agriculture too contributes quite importantly to the greenhouse effect – depending of course very much on the product in question[104] – so that economic growth through agriculture is not automatically environmentally friendly.

[100] World Commission on the Social Dimension of Globalization (2004), § 375.
[101] Stiglitz (2006), p. 120.
[102] Stiglitz/ Charlton (2006), p. 70.
[103] Stiglitz/ Charlton (2006), p. 73.
[104] Reichert, Tobias / Gottwald, Franz Theo: Hunger, Armut und Klimawandel. Neue globale Herausforderungen für die Landwirtschaft. In Fischler, Franz / Gottwald, Franz Theo (ed.) (2007): Ernährung sichern weltweit. Ökosoziale Gestaltungsperspektiven, p. 93.

A quite different approach to global agriculture is that set out by Franz Fischler, former EU commissioner for agriculture. For Fischler[105], not all subsidies are necessarily detrimental to developing country markets, although he acknowledges that this is the case with the current system, in which subsidies are still granted according to the amount of production. This creates surpluses which the European market cannot absorb and which are exported. These exports, in turn, are also subsidized, though export subsidies are due to phase out by 2013[106]. According to Fischler, a simple global liberalization of the agricultural sector will not do. He argues that such a measure would merely benefit large transnational agricultural companies capable of realizing important economies of scale, but not the small farmers who account for the largest amount of the world's poor, and who rely on regional markets[107]. The agricultural sector cannot be compared to other sectors of production, since it not only yields products, but also comes with a service the farmer provides, that of landscape cultivation and conservation. Hence, Fischler advocates subsidizing farmers for that service rather than for sheer production output – the production of surpluses and the associated detrimental effects would cease.
Fischler focuses on European policies – this opens the question whether such a model, employed in the rich countries, would still distort the global agricultural market, whether the model is also applicable in other regions of the world, and if so, whether some kind of international cooperation would be necessary in order to help countries with poorly developed infrastructures to build up more integrated regional agricultural markets.

Apart from national governments' economic policies and the way in which states interact to set the global terms of trade, companies too are relevant to global governance rules concerning the economic dimension of sustainable development. The participant from the Congo suggested the following rules should apply in this area:

- There should be a mechanism of identifying how much a company earns through global trade and be taxed or forced to invest its returns in particular areas of the world.
- Capital repatriation as well as company relocations in search of cheap labour should be monitored and when these are inimical to the economy of the affected country, they should be sanctioned.

Joseph Stiglitz, too, is in favour of global rules for companies[108], rather than just for countries and their governments, given that the budget and power of the former sometimes outsize that

[105] Fischler / Gottwald (2007), p. 24-75.
[106] Reichert / Gottwald (2007), in: Fischler / Gottwald (2007), p. 148.
[107] Comp. Pretty, Jules / Hine, Rachel (2003): L'agriculture paysanne durable peut relever le défi alimentaire. In: La Revue Durable, no. 6, p. 20.
[108] Stiglitz (2006), p. 237-264.

of some of the latter. For Stiglitz, global monopolists, often backed by their home governments, constitute a threat to a fair global economy, and he thus recommends the setting up of global competition and cartel laws and a corresponding global authority invested with the power to execute these laws. Stiglitz writes that in the long term, establishment of international courts will be necessary, enabling the prosecution of companies violating social or environmental standards. To facilitate the work of these authorities, banking secrecy should be restrained, class-action lawsuits encouraged, and a global legal aid facility provided for poor people who wish to prosecute.

Comparing these two proposals, the feedback from the Congo goes further in that it not only calls for sanctions for detrimental company conduct, but also for direct taxation of companies. Another approach that centers on the role of companies is the "Global Compact", devised in 2000, by Kofi Annan, then UN general secretary[109]. The Global Compact is a platform which has set up and promotes a kind of code of conduct for companies, comprising principles concerning human rights, environment, labour (based on the ILO's core labour standards), and corruption, in order to foster a positive role for companies in global sustainable development. Though the Global Compact is a pioneer concept for legally binding global rules for companies, its principles are purely voluntary, and do not have any legal implications at present.

For the Guatemalan participants, free trade agreements between countries should include environmental issues, so as to coordinate standards for sustainability and to foster cooperation for the implementation of such environmental standards, something which is already the case with a trade agreement between Central American states, the Dominican Republic, and the United States. This agreement provides for the implementation of legal regulations and environmental monitoring.

[109] www.unglobalcompact.org .

3.6 Global rules concerning the social dimension – status quo and suggestions

The social dimension of sustainable development is perhaps still more elusive and difficult to conceptualize than the environmental and economic dimensions. On the one hand, it can be defined simply as the dimension of sustainable development which has to do with the relations between people, and therefore with issues such as peace and conflict, human rights, health, population growth, gender issues, children's issues etc. On the other, as mentioned in chapter 3.1, it is impossible to draw any clear-cut delimitations between the social dimension and other dimensions. This is especially true of the issue of the distribution of wealth and resources, which we have dealt with in the last chapter as belonging to the economic sphere, but which is of course of central relevance to relations between people. Then again, one could for example add a political-institutional dimension or a cultural one as separate spheres or treat them all under the heading of the social sphere, as we will be doing here in keeping with the classical three component model of sustainable development.

If one employs a purely eco-centric (or physiocentric or biocentric) normative approach to sustainability, according to which the top priority would be the avoidance of environmental degradation, then even very unjust types of social organization might qualify as sustainable, in fact perhaps more so than relatively equitable ones, since the exclusion of the bulk of the population from wealth means less strain on the extra-human environment. On the other hand, relative equity, associated with good relationships and cooperation between people may help social agents overcome tragedy of the commons-type constellations and thereby enable them to overcome environmental challenges.

However that may be, the Brundtland report's definition of sustainable development, as one which "meets the needs of the present generation without compromising the ability of future generations to meet their own needs" (the definition which we are employing here), puts the needs of people at the centre.

The answer from Guatemala reflects a similar understanding:

> … sustainable development, understood as: a progressive process of change that improves quality of [the life of] human beings that puts them in the centre of and [makes them the] main subject of development, by means of economic growth, social equity, transformation in patterns of production and consumption and based upon ecological balance, that brings support to the region. This process implies respect towards ethnic and cultural diversity, as well a strong civil, peaceful and harmonic participation. (Guatemala)

A sound environment is here seen as a base, economic organization as a means, and man as the centre and end (in the moral sense) of development. From this follows the necessity of

respect for people as the principal subjects of development, for the cultural diversity between peoples, and for ensuring people's effective political participation.

As already indicated, the discourse especially on the social dimension of sustainability is essentially a normative one, seeking to make out the type of societal organization which we would like to achieve. Since we are dealing here with practical ways to achieve sustainability in our age, it seems best to focus on existing global agreements on the social dimension of sustainability, above all within the UN system.

One of the most prominent of such agreements are the UN Millennium Development Goals which were agreed upon in the year 2000 and which deal essentially, though not exclusively, with issues pertaining to the social dimension of sustainability. The Millennium Declaration, signed by all UN member states, expresses a commitment to fundamental values such as freedom, equality between men and women, democracy, solidarity, tolerance and also respect for nature, thus continuing the tradition of the Charter of the United Nations, whose principles are seen as "timeless and universal"[110]. These are the goals which the international community has committed itself to reach by 2015:

1. Eradicate extreme poverty and hunger
2. Achieve universal primary education
3. Promote gender equality and empower women
4. Reduce child mortality
5. Improve maternal health
6. Combat HIV/AIDS, malaria and other diseases
7. Ensure environmental sustainability
8. Develop a global partnership for development

The individual goals have been operationalized and measurable targets set. Currently, only the first goal is likely to be reached. While there has been progress in the other areas, this will not suffice to attain the goals by 2015 unless additional action will be taken "immediately", as UN General Secretary Ban Ki Moon estimated last year[111].

The fact that all UN member states' governments have subscribed to principles such as gender equality and democracy and have expressed the view that the UN Charter's principles are "timeless and universal", is remarkable, given, for example, the current de facto state of gender equality on a global level. More generally, the lively "clash of civilizations" debate at the beginning of this millennium is in contrast with the impression of universal ethical

[110] www.un.org/millenniumgoals and www.un.org/millennium/declaration/ares552e.pdf (30. March 2008).
[111] United Nations (2007): The Millennium Development Goals Report, p. 3. http://www.un.org/millenniumgoals/pdf/mdg2007.pdf (30. March 2008).

agreement which the Millennium Declaration gives. Radermacher calls many governments' expressed commitment to realize the goals into question, stating that many have only signed the goals "so that nothing happens", but he also estimates that the promises contained in the Millennium Development Goals provide a strategic opportunity for civil society to demand their implementation nevertheless[112].

On a more general level, there are tentatives to work out some kind of a "global ethic" as a common denominator on which to build up efforts for peaceful and sustainable human development, while at the same time valuing cultural diversity. Examples are the 1948 Universal Declaration of Human Rights, which focuses on the rights of individuals, and the UNESCO's Universal Declaration on Cultural Diversity of 2001[113]. The latter was conceived of as complementary to the former, seeing "cultural diversity as necessary for humankind as biodiversity is for nature". Remarkable also is the emphasis of the development of man's "intellectual, emotional, moral and spiritual existence" as an end in itself rather than just a resource for economic growth. The declaration also affirms that democracy is a precondition for cultural diversity.
Another such effort, though outside the UN system, is the 1993 Declaration Toward a Global Ethic by the Parliament of the World's Religions[114]. Starting with the strong words "the world is in agony", it intends to offer a response to the current environmental and development crisis with the help of the earth's religious traditions. Among others, the "golden rule" is affirmed as a common denominator between them and fair economic relationships and respect for nature are urged, while any religious justification of violence is condemned.

The same kind of tension between necessary consensus on the one hand and the autonomy of people and peoples on the other which we have already discussed in the context of rules and institutions for global governance appears again in the cultural sphere. The documents discussed can be seen in the context of this tension and of the current trend of the loss of cultural diversity of which the decline of the numbers of languages spoken on the globe is indicative.

---

[112] Radermacher (2006): Die Klimafrage im Kontext von global governance. Speech held at the Acqua-Alta Congress in Hamburg, Germany, on 13. December 2006. Available at http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=VnExIewXC6s (30. March 2008).
[113] http://unesdoc.unesco.org/images/0012/001271/127160m.pdf (30. March 2008).
[114] http://www.parliamentofreligions.org/_includes/FCKcontent/File/TowardsAGlobalEthic.pdf (30. March 2008).

A recurrent theme in most of the questionnaires returned by the experts polled was the importance of the local level and the necessity of bridging and coordinating the local, national, regional and global levels. This seems to suggest that governance for sustainable development is not merely about setting the right rules on the global level, but about integrating the different levels with respect to geographical and cultural differences and to peoples' self-determination. To quote some examples:

> Development should take care of social and cultural issues of a community. So sustainable development should take the form of participatory development by all concerned. (Malawi)

> Any plan or policy aiming at sustainable development should be humain and sensitive to the social and cultural realities of the peoples concerned. This is why the famous structural adjustment programmes which were proposed or rather imposed by the World Bank and IMF were condemned later because they focused on the economic factor, leaving aside the social and cultural aspects. (Congo)

Especially the feedback from Guatemala reflects the plurality of agents at all levels, from international to local, which would need to be involved in any attempt to bring about sustainable development:

> Under the principle of common but differentiated responsibilities, we agree that in order to achieve global sustainable development there is a strong need for an agreed process on environment and municipal capacities, coordination and cooperation on a local level is basic to work on an environmental agenda, where the states, private sector, organized civil society sector, and minorities are included in a participative process that will improve and bring quality of life.

The ILO's report "A Fair Globalization", which is itself based on an international consultation process with representatives from different levels of society and countries all over the world, echoes the same basic idea: it mentions changes necessary on the global governance level, but does not neglect the role that governments and local communities have to play, their participation and responsibility.

> In line with the general principle of subsidiarity, we believe that governance should take place at the lowest level at which it is effective. This calls for the creation of strong, democratic and accountable local institutions.[115]

Other issues mentioned were gender equity, population control and enhanced literacy on environmental issues (India), and inter-generational equity (Georgia). For the ILO, adequate schooling especially for girls is pivotal, because it empowers the individual to lead a decent life, while simultaneously increasing economic growth rates, lowering fertility rates and

[115] World Commission on the Social Dimension of Globalization (2004), § 302.

leading to a reduction in child mortality[116]. Lower infant mortality rates result in decreased population growth, since high mortality rates lead families to over-compensate for the expected losses. This is perhaps the reason why the Millennium Development declaration did not set any target concerning population growth, but instead contains goals concerning education, maternal health and infant mortality.

Gender equity is a pivotal issue to human development as whole, on the one hand because women are predominantly affected by poverty and illiteracy, while on the other, experience gathered in the course of microcredit programmes such as those inaugurated by Nobel Prize winner Muhammad Yunus, suggests that women, if given the chance, are generally better at overcoming hardship and starting a livelihood or a small business from scratch than men, so that those granted a microcredit by the Grameen Bank in Bangladesh are almost exclusively women[117].

The Peruvian participant focused on the issue of migration:

> A few decades ago, some third world countries (Argentina, Brazil, Peru, Chile, Urugay, etc.) became the destination of many of the poor who lived in countries which today are rich. At the time, in Western Europe immigration was seen as a good thing, in both directions.
> For reasons that have to do with our mistakes, in Latin America, we have had recurrent economic crises which have brought about a reversion of migration towards the United States and Western Europe. It seems to me that for historical reciprocity, the developed countries should abandon their repressive migration policies and move towards a perspective of cooperation which yields productive growth in the poor countries, in such a way that the immigration wave towards their countries diminishes, and that poverty, principal source of immigration, decreases importantly.

The scale of migration movements from poor to rich countries, e.g. from South and Central America to North America and from Africa to Europe, has grown importantly in recent years, as have the fences designed to keep those same movements in check. Again, we will not analyze the problem in detail[118], focusing instead on some suggestions on global governance in this field. Insofar as migration is a consequence of economic deprivation, the above discussion of global governance in the economic sphere is relevant to migration also. And, a similar picture as with global trade emerges: a genuine liberalization of the international market for labour through the dropping or alleviation of immigration barriers can be expected to result in factor price equalization, from which the rich countries protect themselves. Therefore, rich countries' immigration policies are much more restrictive today than they were in the period sometimes called the "first globalization", i.e. the decades preceding World

[116] Ibid., § 270.
[117] Spiegel, Peter (2005): Faktor Mensch. Ein humanes Weltwirtschaftswunder ist möglich, p. 234.
[118] A startling account of the situation of African migrants attempting to enter Europe is provided in Milborn, Corinna (2006): Festung Europa.

War I, while capital flows today are liberalized and extremely mobile. At the same time, global governance mechanisms regulating and coordinating national immigration policies are lacking.

The sources consulted[119] echo the feedback from Peru, calling for more transparency of migration processes, better coordination between countries and in general fair rules and less restrictive policies, though not complete liberalization. The ILO advocates a global forum in which information relevant to migration, such as information on surpluses and shortages of labour, can be exchanged, countries' policies coordinated and tighter control of intermediaries and trafficking set up. For Deepak Nayyar, the issue of fighting poverty as the root of migration is important and measures to that end to be welcomed, while at the same time, this is not a panacea since, "even if the need to migrate decreases, the ability to migrate increases. What is more, this cannot reduce the emerging needs for labour imports in the rich industrialized countries or even in the middle-income industrializing countries". For Joseph Stiglitz, "even a modest liberalization of the mobility of labour forces would increase world GDP by an amount which lies way above optimist estimates for the income effects of a liberalization of capital markets"[120]. Joseph Stiglitz also highlights the problems for developing countries associated with brain drain, whereby poor countries lose a large proportion of their highly qualified citizens to rich countries which offer more opportunity so that the former can be said to indirectly subsidize the latter, since the rich countries can reap the benefits of poor countries' investment in education. To mitigate this state of affairs, the ILO argues for "skill circulation" through incentives for skilled workers to at least temporarily return to their home countries which would thus benefit from their skills, e.g. through facilitating dual citizenship, and for lowering the often considerable transaction costs from industrialized to developing countries, so that the latter can benefit more fully from the remittances paid by migrants[121].

For the participants from the Guatemalan environment ministry, the Millennium Development Goals integrate the rules which should be valid on the global level to ensure the social dimension of sustainable development. Therefore, they advocate evaluation of whether the targets are implemented and strong financial and technological cooperation to meet the goals,

[119] World Commission on the Social Dimension of Globalization (2004), §§ 428-446.
Nayyar, Deepak (2002): Cross-border Movements of People. In: Nayyar (2002), p. 144-171.
[120] Stiglitz (2006), p. 122.
[121] World Commission on the Social Dimension of Globalization (2004), §§ 437 and 439.

including capacity building. In that context, the participants highlight the importance of environmental degradation at the local level, presumably because this entails setbacks in development[122], but also emphasize the key role of environmental governance.

Thus, the MDGs are seen as the goal which should be attained, something which can only be achieved through action at the local level, but the answer reflects the concern that environmental degradation will threaten progress in this area. Hence, evaluation of development progress and subsequent financial and technical cooperation is necessary. This answer resembles the feedback from Malawi which we have discussed in the chapter on the environmental dimension of sustainable development, according to which countries should evaluate the damage they suffer from global warming and there should be global mechanisms for compensation payments.

Some aspects of the Guatemalan answer are reinforced by answers from other experts. For example, the Malawian participant also highlights the necessity of development funds flowing into capacity building, thus enabling countries to use the resources available locally. While the answer from Georgia seems to suggest the necessity of coherent evaluation and assessment:

> Integrating the social dimension of sustainable development and inter-generational equity with economic and environmental considerations within the context of sustainable development requires an understanding of the social impacts, risks and opportunities of a development.

The feedback received also included considerations focusing more on political aspects:

> It seems to me that an additional rule is related with the promotion of democracy and the right to property, because both rules assure correct decisions in the social and the private sphere. (Peru)

> All the rules envisageable are centered around the social, the economic/ecological/environmental and the cultural aspects.
> However, there is also need for rules on the political aspect. In fact, we have seen that global economy and politics condone or even promote undemocratic and corrupt regimes. There should be a global mechanism looking into global economic deals and ventures and sanction behaviours and practices that promote corruption and/or protect undemocratic regimes. (Congo)

Both answers highlight the importance of democracy. The former emphasizes the link between a democratic social order and the right to private property, while the latter focuses on the detrimental effects to democracy brought about through the mechanisms of current global economics.

---

[122] United Nations Non-Governmental Liaison Service (2007): Climate Change threatens unprecedented human development reversals. http://www.un-ngls.org/site/article.php3?id_article=393 (10. February 2008).

A global rule suggested by the participant from Russia is “elimination of war and terrorism”. This statement addresses so vast and important an issue that it is, of course, clearly beyond the scope of this paper to go into this subject matter in any detail. However, if the theoretical reflections in chapter 2, which see human social organization as the very heart of the problem of unsustainability, especially the “tragedy of the commons” perspective, hold true, then it could be argued that mutual international understanding and peace is a, or perhaps even *the* key to solving it. For example, under such a perspective, disarmament could be seen not just as an – albeit extremely important – further issue on the agenda besides environmental sustainability, but perhaps even as a condition of any international agreement that would attempt to bring about sustainable development, e.g. to an international agreement on the distribution of emission rights.

4. Institutions and Organizations for global sustainable development

In the beginning of this paper we have argued that some kind of global governance structure will be necessary if sustainable development is to be brought about. We have subsequently discussed existing rules and suggestions for new ones in all three spheres of sustainable development. We now need to explore where these rules could be laid down, which of the already existing institutions could play a part here, whether new ones would need to be created, and what the experts polled think about these questions.

On the global governance scene we find institutional players as varied as states, politically or economically more or less integrated clusters of states (such as OECD, EU, AU, Mercosur, Asean etc.), coalitions of states with similar interests (G7/8, G 20, G77, ACP-group), companies, NGOs, and so on[123]. The systems which are of special interest here though, on account of their influence and because they can count the overwhelming majority of countries in the world as their members, are the two Bretton Woods Institutions, the WTO, and the UN and its specialized agencies. Although the Bretton Woods institutions – but not the WTO – are formally part of the UN-system, they are treated separately here, since in practice they function in a manner largely autonomous from the rest of the UN-system[124].

The nation state is still the basic unit of international governance, even though it has ceded power to large enterprises and to NGOs. The principle of “one country, one vote” remains very influential in international processes and institutions, the voting modality in the UN General Assembly being a prominent example. However, states differ vastly in population size, surface area, economic weight, human development, and so on[125]. Also, the idea of the sovereign nation state as a synthesis of politics, nation, and economy, such as it emerged e.g. in Europe, and upon which global governance is set up, poses difficulties for many countries. For example, many African countries face grave difficulties with political integration within their boundaries, given that many of them are home to many dozens of ethnicities and languages which do not correspond to national boundaries, so that “the term 'state' is hardly applicable to several African countries”[126]. At the same time, these countries are faced with the necessity of having to speak with one voice in the context of international relations.

[123] Comp. Reder, Michael (2006): Global Governance. Philosophische Modelle der Weltpolitik, p. 43-56.
[124] Comp. Falk, Richard (2002): The United Nations System: Prospects for Renewal. In: Nayyar, Deepak (2002). Governing Globalization, pp. 177-208.
[125] Comp. Payne (2006), p. 49-72.
[126] Reinert, Erik S. (2003), in: Chang, Ha-Joon (ed.) (2003): Rethinking Development Economics, p. 453.

States form groups and coalitions in the context of international relations. An important example is the Group of 7/8 comprising the economic heavyweights USA, Canada, France, Italy, Germany, Japan and the UK – Russia, the "odd one out" in this family, because of its slighter economic weight and, to put it politely, "different" government system, has attended meetings since 1997. Issues on G7/8 summits were – among others – the management of the world economy, international trade, financial matters, aid, global warming and terrorism[127]. The influence of this group of countries "which really matter in the world" is a great one, so much so that it has been described as "prospectively the effective centre ... of global governance"[128].

Notwithstanding the influence of G7 over the world economy, the experience of contagious financial crises in the late 1990s has led to the recognition of the fact that other countries too are of crucial importance to its functioning as a system. Thus, the dominant world economic players began to include some developing countries and transition economies into newly formed groups whose number of members fluctuated over time – the G22, G33 and G20, respectively[129].

On the other hand, developing countries too have formed coalitions. The most important of these is the Group of 77. First established in 1964 in the course of the first session of UNCTAD by 77 states, it now comprises most developing countries in the world, 130 in total, including giants such as China and India. G77 entertains chapters with some of the UN specialized agencies and with the Bretton Woods twins. It assembles once in every five years during the South Summit, while its member states' foreign ministers meet annually. A rather loosely integrated group, the G77 serves as a common voice of developing nations mainly through the passing of resolutions – so far, these have addressed topics such as economic cooperation between developing countries, science and technology, food, industrial development, energy and finance[130]. Its member states, needless to say, are very heterogeneous.

[127] Payne (2006), p. 105.
[128] Quotes from Helmut Schmidt and John Kirton, both cited in Payne (2006), p. 105-106.
[129] Payne (2006), p. 139-142.
[130] www.g77.org (8. September 2007).

The G77 gave rise to the group of 24, a selection of its member countries – though cooperating with all of the G77 states – which coordinates the position of developing countries on monetary and development finance issues[131].

4.1 The Bretton Woods Institutions

The institutions of Bretton Woods, named after the conference which took place in 1944 in the town of Bretton Woods in New Hampshire during which they were devised, comprise the International Monetary Funds (IMF) and the World Bank (WB). The two institutions came into being just after the World War II.

The former was originally devised for managing the system of exchange rates between national currencies, which were fixed, but adaptable through adjustment of currency value by governments in coordination with the IMF, for the first two and a half decades, and for thereby fostering international trade. To that end, it was also charged with the task of helping member countries out of difficulties associated with balance of payment and foreign indebtedness by granting Special Drawing Rights to such countries in the form of hard currency, a measure for which agreement from the other member states is required.

However, once the system of fixed exchange rates was abandoned in favour of "floating" ones in 1971, the IMF, now rid of its original raison d'être of coordinating exchange rates, changed its policies and started concentrating on the surveillance of the economies of its member states, devising structural adjustment programmes for countries seeking loans from the IMF[132].

Since the IMF often has the function of a lender of last resort for countries already indebted elsewhere, member countries are often in no position to negotiate conditions for aid, but need to take what is offered[133]. These structural adjustment programs have been subject to strong criticism from NGOs and, for example, from Nobel-prize winner Joseph Stiglitz, since they generally oblige developing countries to liberalize their markets and privatize public services and infrastructures, even those which are usually conceived of as "natural monopolies"[134]. The sociologist from the Congo criticized that the IMF's structural adjustment programmes "focused on the economic factor, leaving aside the social and cultural aspects".

---

[131] www.g24.org (8. September 2007).
[132] Payne (2006), p. 107.
[133] Bretton Woods Project: IMF. http://www.brettonwoodsproject.org/institution/imf/index.shtml (31. March 2008).
[134] Stiglitz (2006), p. 13.

The IMF is headed by a Board of Governors, comprising representatives from each member country, usually finance ministers or heads of central banks. The routine tasks, however, are taken in charge of by the Executive Board, composed of 24 executive directors.
The system of voting rights within the IMF too is often criticized in relevant literature, and reform urged. The number of votes a member country disposes of is determined, on the one hand, by the idea of "one country, one vote", by virtue of which each country receives 250 basic votes. However, in addition to these basic votes, member countries receive voting rights according to their respective "quota". Quotas are expresses in Special Drawing Rights, the IMFs calculation unit which determines a country's weight in the IMF. The early members' quotas were first set up in 1943 by the US government and reflect a mix of political considerations and the taking into account of countries' respective economic power. Each new member country's quota is negotiated before it becomes a member of the IMF. The voting rights determined by quotas by far outweigh the basic votes and account for the bulk of power distribution within the IMF. For example, the United States currently hold 17,14%, while 164 countries – out of a total of 184 member countries – account for just 29,68% of voting rights[135]. This ensures an effective veto for the US, since many decisions require "special majorites" of 85% of votes. In addition, it is customary that the chair of Managing Director of the IMF is held by a European, while that of the World Bank goes to a North American, so that developing country candidates "need not apply"[136].
All that taken into consideration, it is safe to say that the IMF and its policies are largely under control of the rich parts of the world.

A similar picture emerges when we take a look at the World Bank Group. It is made up of five organizations, of which two – the International Bank for Development and Reconstruction and the International Development Association – are the most influential parts, working closely together. Often, the term World Bank is employed referring only to these two core organizations. The IBRD was founded in 1944 and provides credit for middle income countries, while the IDA, founded in 1960, focuses on the world's poorest countries, and offers financial aid free of interest, though a management fee needs to be paid[137]. As of 2005, the lending of the IBRD has amounted to 13,6 billion US$, and that of the IDA to 8,7 billion US$. Like the IMF, the World Bank Group is governed by a Board of Governors and

[135] Payne (2006), p. 108-109.
[136] Ibid., p. 111.
[137] http://www.brettonwoodsproject.org/item.shtml?x=320866 (15. Feb. 2008).

an Executive Board, composed in the same way. Voting rights in each institution in the World Bank Group vary slightly from those in the IMF, but amount to approximately the same distribution of power, those in the IDA being comparatively the most favourable to the developing countries[138].

The main function of both IBRD and IDA is to finance development through loans, their motto being "our vision is a world without poverty". The prerequisites for receiving such loans are roughly the same as those demanded by the IMF, often subsumed under the title "Washington Consensus" - they include a reduction of state intervention, privatization, reduction of barriers for trade and finance, and economic deregulation[139].

The other organizations in the World Bank Group are the International Finance Corporation (IFC) whose aim is to facilitate private sector investment and assist both governments and private companies in this; the Multilateral Investment Guarantee Agency (MIGA) which offers insurance for companies against non-economic threats, such as war and political turmoil in member countries, to which end it also offers advice services for countries seeking to attract investors; and the International Centre for the Settlement of Investment Disputes (ICSID), whose job, as the name implies, is to settle disputes between governments and investors[140].

4.2 The WTO

The WTO came into being in 1995. The post-war negotiations on the international economic architecture from which the Bretton Woods Institutions arose originally also intended the forming of an International Trade Organization (ITO), which could not be founded since this plan met with too strong resistance in the US congress[141]. Instead, the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade (GATT) dominated negotiations on trade liberalization until the WTO came into existence.

Unlike the IMF and the World Bank, the WTO does not grant loans, but rather helps create the "rules of the game" of international trade. Specifically, it promotes trade liberalization and disposes of influential means of dispute-settlement among trading partners. Its most important decision-making organ is the biennial Ministerial Conference, during which representatives of

[138] Payne (2006), p. 114.
[139] Stiglitz (2006), p. 49.
[140] http://www.brettonwoodsproject.org/item.shtml?x=537848 (31. March 2008).
[141] Ibid., p. 105.

each member country attend and decisions are made in consensus. Thus, the principle "one country, one vote" applies, without – in theory – the economic weight or the population size of a country mattering.

However, such consensus are often prepared in advance: decisions of the Ministerial Conference are first discussed in informal, formerly known as "Green Room" meetings, called together by the Director-General (the practice of "Green Room" negotiations in advance has been formally abolished, but according to Siglitz and Charlton negotiations behind closed doors are still common practice[142]). Almost invariably, these meetings include representatives of the US, the EU, Canada and Japan, plus usually some important developing countries who are intended to speak for their peers and neighbours and to coordinate standpoints with them. However, the bulk of developing countries is habitually excluded and is often ignorant of the fact that a meeting is even taking place[143].

As with its predecessor GATT, the WTO's main function is to liberalize world trade and thereby foster the world economy. This liberalization, however, is one-sided, so that the post-World War II era has been marked by dispute between rich and developing countries about those areas where the latter hold a competitive advantage, such as agriculture and textiles. The conflict has become more pronounced during the current Doha round, which began in Doha, Qatar in 2001 and was originally intended to be a development round, bringing about the changes which developing countries desired. However, during the ministerial conference in Cancun, Mexico in 2003, resistance from the rich countries in the areas mentioned has resulted in developing country representatives simply leaving the negotiations in protest.

In addition, as indicated, the international labour market is heavily restricted by the rich countries' immigration policies, while the mobility of capital has reached an unprecedented degree[144]. Personally, this makes me wonder whether the predicate "neoliberal" can indeed be correctly applied to the current state of affairs, since this kind of lopsidedness is reminiscent of what the founders of liberalism, such as Adam Smith, have opposed themselves against in their day, marked by mercantilism[145]. In other words, is the consensus that the rules of world trade are "liberal" ones (a description embraced also by its critics) itself a semantic victory by the alleged neo-liberals, i.e. the defenders of the current state of affairs?

The WTO, unlike GATT, holds dispute settlement courts whose decisions are binding. In a sense, this can be seen as an advance compared to GATT, since every country may now

[142] Stiglitz, Joseph / Charlton, Andrew (2006): Fair Trade for All. How Trade Can Promote Development, p. 181.
[143] Payne (2006), p. 118. And Stiglitz (2006), p. 134.
[144] Nayyar (2002), p. 157.
[145] Dermange, François (2003): Le Dieu du Marché. Éthique, économie et théologie dans l'oeuvre de Adam Smith.

impose trade sanctions if it wins its case before the dispute settlement court. However, the imposition of trade sanctions by a poor country against an economic heavyweight is unlikely to impress the latter, so that the playing field is uneven. It seems today that power divisions are slowly shifting with the rise of some large transition economies, and, as indicated, export subsidies are due to phase out by 2013. As already discussed, the dispute over trade with Genetically Modified Organisms (GMOs) also makes for tension, for example between the United States and the European Union.

4.3 Suggestions for reform of the Bretton Woods Institutions and the WTO

Not surprisingly, reform proposals for the Bretton Woods institutions in all sources consulted include as a priority a redistribution of voting rights, though most do not specify exactly in what way this should be brought about. Nayyar suggests that a double majority – of quotas *and* basic votes – be required for the passing of decisions[146], while the study conducted for the German Bundestag recommends that voting rights be distributed taking not only economic weight but other parameters such as population size and Human Development Index into account[147].

A system of quota calculation based on purchasing power parity has also been devised, but has met with resistance on the part of the dominating countries[148]. But even if voting rights were calculated only according to GDP in US Dollars, not taking purchasing power parity into account, this would still be more favourable to the developing countries than the present system[149], since quotas are calculated for each country when it becomes a member and are not brought up to date. As a first step to fairer representation and in the absence, for the moment, of any important change in the system of voting rights, the ILO opts for one more representative from sub-Saharan Africa in the executive board[150].

Similarly, all sources agree that transparency and accountability in both the Bretton Woods twins and the WTO need to be strengthened. This would mean a more comprehensive publication of policies and decisions. Partial progress has already been achieved in these areas

[146] You, Jong-Il (2002): The Bretton Woods Institutions. Evolution, Reform and Change. In: Nayyar (2002), p. 222.
[147] Deutscher Bundestag (2002), p. 116.
[148] Payne, (2005), p. 109.
[149] World Commission on the Social Dimension of Globalization (2004), § 523.
[150] Ibid., § 525.

but, for example, the minutes of sessions leading to these decisions are not published[151]. Consultative status of NGOs, such as is already in practice in the UN system, including a right of being heard, has also been recommended[152].

More transparency could also be achieved by strengthening evaluation units and encouraging independent evaluation[153]. At the same time, national parliaments could contribute to greater transparency by devoting more attention to decisions taken on the level of global institutions by holding their representatives accountable for their respective contribution to those decisions. Parliamentary associations such as the Inter-Parliamentary Union could also be involved in checking decisions in the IFIs[154]. Stiglitz proposes that since decisions in the IFIs have effects not only on trade and finance, but also pertain to environmental and social issues, the relevant ministers or state secretaries of member states should also be present in the process, something which has hitherto been lacking[155].

In general, the formerly clear division of labour between the IMF and the World Bank has become much more blurred after the change in the international financial regime in 1971, to the extent that the two organizations appear to be doing approximately the same thing.

> The division of labour should be improved in such a way that the IMF is responsible for the stabilization of currency relations and for overcoming crises of payment balance, while the World Bank is responsible for long-term development expenditures.[156]

Similarly, Korean political scientist Jong-Il-You advocates a clearer division of labour between the Bretton Woods twins, in which context the IMF should focus on:

> contributing to strengthening national financial systems – encouraging measures to curb excessive inflows of short-term capital – coordinating macroeconomic policy and stabilizing exchange rates. - discontinuing long term lending and focusing on the lender of last resort function - developing a mechanism for orderly debt workout[157].

The World Bank's job, in order to effectively work "for a world free of poverty", would be:

> advocating global economic governance conducive to the development of poor countries – giving up attempts to micromanage recipient economies – focusing on provision of public goods in poor countries – shifting away from loans towards grants.

---

[151] Ibid., § 528.
[152] Deutscher Bundestag (2002), p. 442 and 116.
[153] World Commission on the Social Dimension of Globalization (2004), § 529.
[154] Ibid., § 537 and 544.
[155] Stiglitz/ Charlton (2006), p. 181.
[156] Deutscher Bundestag, p. 116.
[157] Comp. also You, Jong-Il in Nayyar (2002), p. 233.

In order to counter financial crisis, former World Bank chief economist Joseph Stiglitz advocates a fundamental change in world financial system, along lines first drawn by John M. Keynes[158]: the introduction of a world reserve currency called "world dollar" or "bancor". In this scheme, countries receive world dollars from an international fund in return for paying into the fund the same value in their own currency. Countries would use these world dollars to accumulate reserves with which they can buy any hard currency to support their economy in the event of economic crisis[159]. The distribution of world dollars could also be linked to the fulfillment of certain standards by countries, such as not holding nuclear weapons or not surpassing a defined level of greenhouse gas emissions. In addition, the funds thus acquired could be used for reaching the Millennium Development Goals or for the protection of global commons[160].

For the WTO, reform proposals include ensuring the effective participation of member states, and an end of any hiding in green rooms. This would necessitate transparently announcing all meetings, which should be open to all, plus more electronic publication of documents[161]. The Enquete Commission's study for the German parliament also recommends the exclusion of public basic services, especially education, from negotiations in the WTO. At least ILO and UNEP should have access to WTO meetings and a no from their side to any measure decided should entail an obligatory justification of the ruling of the WTO[162]. Stiglitz and Charlton recommend the setting up of a new body within the WTO in which consequences of policies are objectively assessed[163].

All sources consulted advocate reform of both the Bretton Woods Institutions and the WTO and agree in the general outlook which we have sketched out above: a fairer distribution of voting rights, greater transparency and accountability, changing or eliminating conditionality, and more independent evaluation. None of them advocate the abolition of these institutions, but rather call for more coherence of their policies with those of the United Nations system

[158] According to the online-dictionary Wikipedia, Keynes' proposal of an International Clearing Union was originally conceived of by Ernst Friedrich Schumacher, one of the founding fathers of thought on sustainable development. This, however, could not be conclusively verified. http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/E._F._Schumacher (12. February 2008).
[159] Stiglitz (2006), p. 326-327.
[160] Ibid., p. 331-334.
[161] Deutscher Bundestag (2002), p. 158-159.
[162] Ibid., p. 155.
[163] Stiglitz / Charlton (2006), p. 181/182.

through institutional or policy integration. At the same time, they also agree on the necessity to strengthen, reform and democratize the UN system itself.

We have also seen in the ill fate of the ILO that the general idea of incorporating governance mechanisms for what we might today call "social sustainability" is by no means a new one, but was originally conceived of as an integral part of the new world order at the time of its inception after World War II. Ecological sustainability, of course, was simply not perceived at the time as nearly as important an issue, if at all, as it was in the last decades of the 20th century.

When talking of reform of the Bretton Woods Institutions and the WTO, it is worth noting that these institutions sometimes meet with a basic scepticism, both in developing countries and also in some civil society organizations in rich countries, due to the adverse effects which their policies, especially the imposition of conditionality by the Bretton Woods Insitutions, have brought to developing countries economies. The result is that in the mentioned contexts, any system of global governance in which these institutions – albeit reformed ones – play a part may be seen as, at best, a mitigation alleviating the worst effects of a basically flawed system, and at worst, mere cosmetics. Talk of reform, then, would appear to be to be a camouflaged attempt to maintain the status quo[164]. In other words the identification of these institutions with their failures so far, completely discredits them in the eyes of some. For example, according to the economist David Korten[165],

> more than half a century the World Bank and IMF have advanced a development model that wantonly destroys the lives of people, society, and the planet to make money for the super rich. Together they are arguably responsible for more human death and suffering than any other nonmilitary organizations in human history -- a true plague upon the earth.

The situation is rendered more difficult by the fact that there is little information about these institutions in the media, besides the specialized scientific discourse, and knowledge about their workings hardly features in normal school curricula in the same way as, for example, the workings of one's own respective national government do. Civil Society Organizations such as ATTAC have diffused information to a wider public, and succeeded in creating more public pressure, something which was instrumental in bringing about improvements, albeit slight ones, in the transparency of the WTO.

---

[164] Deutscher Bundestag (2002), p. 438.

[165] www.ratical.org/co-globalize/ifg041400DK.html (Feb. 28th, 2008). I owe the quote to the participant from Georgia.

On the whole, it is difficult, even in the context of university research and even on the internet, to get access to reliable information about the Bretton Woods Institutions and the WTO, which seem strangely shrouded in secrecy. As in the field of economic inequality, the student seeking to find out what these institutions do and what their effect is on people, will typically be confused by very different accounts and judgments depending on the source consulted, in any case I was.

Five of eight of the experts who participated in the survey judged that all three institutions, World Bank, IMF and WTO, should play an important role in global sustainable development, with one further participant (Guatemala) also assigning an "important part" to the Bretton Woods Institutions, while the WTO should play "some part".
The participant from Nicaragua was more sceptical about the role of the IFIs, assigning "some role" to the WTO, but none to the BWIs. The feedback from India reflected an intermediate position.

Experts were also asked in what way these institutions should play a part in global sustainable development and whether they would propose any reforms in them. Two participants felt unable to answer the question, while all others had reform proposals to make which, once again, were rather diverse:
The Peruvian economist judged that the Bretton Woods Institutions were equipped with competent staff, but devoted too much attention to financial and monetary aspects of the economies of their member countries. The financial aspects should instead be more closely linked to real aspects of trade, the abolition of agricultural subsidies in the rich countries being a key issue here. Both aspects should be integrated into a free trade, which permits greater well-being for all. The reason for the present one-sided approach, according to the participant, is the dependence of the BWIs from the rich countries:

> … it is not very consistent on the part of the IMF and the World Bank to recommend to poor countries that they implement commercial and financial reforms oriented toward the market and globalization of its markets, but they do not say anything against protectionism in the industrialized countries: its financial sources.

To me it seems to follow from the fact that the dependence of the BWIs from financing by the rich countries apparently renders their decisions and policies too partial in favour of the rich countries, that independent financing (e.g. through Tobin tax) could set the course for their working in a more independent way from these countries than is currently case or that it could

pave the way for a redistribution of voting rights – this proposal, however, may be impractical since it was found neither in the sources consulted, nor in feedback from the survey participants.

The feedback from the Congo also estimated that the BWIs and the WTO all have an important role to play in their respective areas and are well equipped for them: WTO for fair trade and sufficient protection of week economies, the IMF for monitoring the world financial situation and the World Bank to "supervise the world economy and to correct imbalances through soft loans to less developed countries". However, "all of them need to be reformed so that they speak the voice of the world and not the voice of the superpowers".

Similarly, the Georgian participant advocated a "fundamental review" of the policies and practices of the Bretton Woods Institutions, "including a full financial, social and ecological risk assessment. This review should be broadly based, including other industrialized countries, the nations of the developing world, and non-governmental organizations (NGOs)." As so often in the context of the entire survey, an inclusive and consultative procedure is recommended, this time with the end of reforming the Bretton Woods Institutions.

Both the Malawian and the Russian participants restated that all three institutions play an important part in global sustainable development, and added recommendations to the IMF specifically:
"The IMF should do more in assisting and building capacity of member countries to follow their strict procedures other than rushing to withholding aid" (Malawi). The Russian expert advocated more consideration of environmental issues on the part of the IMF.

The Indian expert did not assign as much importance to the BWIs and the WTO as those experts whose opinions we have discussed above (the BWIs should play "some part", the WTO a "minor part"). The role of all three institutions is to ensure that

> a. the trade is exploitation free, b. the financial assistance coming from above reaches needy sections/areas and focuses on development of underdeveloped areas c. viable means for livelihoods in the local context should be supported

Concerning reform of these organizations the participant added:

> These organizations need to be more decentralized with more people understanding micro-issues of localized natures.

There is a lot of emphasis here on the local level, which would again confirm the importance of bridging local and global levels. The special priority of the needy in any assistance programs launched by global institutions is confirmed once again (comp. the principle of Antyoyada, mentioned on p. 37-38).

4.4 The United Nations and its Specialized Agencies[166]:

The UN consists of six major bodies: the Security Council, the General Assembly, the Trusteeship Council, the Economic and Social Council, the International Court of Justice and the Secretariat. These major bodies have given rise to over 30 committees and specialized agencies charged with a great variety of areas of responsibility, ranging from peacekeeping and security, environmental issues, tourism, agriculture, women's issues, refugees and so forth.

Within the General Assembly, each member state – currently there are 191 in total – wields one vote. The General Assembly's main function is to pass resolutions, thus setting the agenda of the UN as a whole. The Nicaraguan participant recommended that the General Assembly's decisions should be binding, rather than having the status of mere recommendations as it is currently the case, and that this should be embedded in a democratic and representative context, including division of powers.

The Security Council is charged with maintaining international peace and security. It has fifteen members, five out of which hold a permanent seat and wield veto power: China, France, Russia, the United Kingdom and the United States. The holders of the remaining ten seats are elected by the UN General Assembly for two year terms[167]. The distribution of the permanent members' seats reflects the power structure in the post- World War II world and is therefore often criticized as obsolete. Reform proposals were put forward – e.g. The Razali Plan of 1993 and the High Level Panel on Threats, Challenges and Change report of 2004 – but no agreement could be produced as yet, due to resistance of the established members of the Security Council.

Several of the UN specialized agencies – indeed, perhaps too many, as we shall see later – deal with matters pertaining to sustainable development:

[166] Principal sources of this overview of the UN-system: Payne (2006), p. 124-133, and http://www.un.org/aboutun/ (5. September 2007).
[167] Payne (2006), p. 125.

For the environmental dimension of sustainable development the United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP) is the most important pillar. Set up in 1972, it conducts research about the state of the global environment and plays a central part in the coordination of international efforts on environmental issues. For example, it participated in setting up the International Panel on Climate Change (IPCC) and the Rio Earth Summit. In addition, it is responsible for managing the Global Environment Facility together with the World Bank and UNDP. As mentioned, the survey participants from the Guatemalan Environment Ministry advocate a significant upgrade of UNEP as well as of the Global Environment Facility and see this as one of the key issues for attaining good global environmental governance.

The essential function of the United Nations Development Program (UNDP), founded in 1966, is to provide advice and share knowledge to foster its member countries' development strategies. In addition, it annually publishes the well known Human Development Reports which provide in-depth analyses of the main issues and difficulties that especially poor countries face in their struggle for development. The reports also feature a calculation of the respective Human Development Index of UN member countries.

Both UNDP and UNEP, together with the World Bank, administer the Global Environment Facility (GEF)[168], though the World Bank has the upper hand[169]. According to GEF's webpage,

> Since 1991, the Global Environment Facility has provided $7.4 billion in grants and generated over $28 billion in co-financing from other sources to support over 1,950 projects that produce global environmental benefits.

This amounts to approximately $ 2 billion per year, a modest amount when compared to the volume of project financing by the World Bank, for example. The GEF, though hardly a heavyweight, is unique in current international governance, since it represents a joint effort of UN specialized agencies together with one of the international financial institutions. For the German Bundestag, the parity between developed and developing countries in the decision making of the GEF could serve as a model for reform of the Bretton Woods Institutions[170].

The Guatemalan participants also assigned an important role to the UN Commission on Sustainable Development – the role of this body, for the Guatemalan experts, consists in

[168] Novacek (2002), p. 34.
[169] Payne (2006), p. 209.
[170] Deutscher Bundestag (2002), p. 428.

policy guidance for sustainable development, and to hold responsibility for reviewing progress in the implementation of Agenda 21[171].

> … in order to support the UN system on addressing challenges related to international governance for sustainable development, it should be a central place for analyzing problems, developing solutions and reinforcing action – it should also pay special attention to the operationalization of sustainable development goals at country levels.

The Peruvian economist who participated in the survey estimated that the UN Conference on Trade and Development (UNCTAD), the UNDP and the UN Educational, Social and Cultural Organization (UNESCO) are of special relevance for the setting up of a world trade system which is both fair and enables sustainable growth, because of the plurality of interests represented in them.

The United Nations Educational, Social and Cultural Organization (UNESCO) "promotes international co-operation among member states ... in the fields of education, science, culture and communication". By this it aims to enhance sustainable development, dialogue between different cultures and thus to "build peace in the minds of men"[172].

The United Nations Conference on Trade and Development (UNCTAD) was founded in 1964. It aims to "promote the development-friendly integration of developing countries into the world economy"[173] It functions as a platform for discussion on development matters, conducts research which serves as basis for the reports it issues (such as the "Trade and Development Report"), and provides technical assistance. UNCTAD is dominated by developing countries, so that its reports are somewhat different in tone compared to those of the International Financial Institutions[174].

Among the UN specialized agencies, the International Labour Organization is the odd one out, since it was set up as early as the year 1919 – it was intended to promote labour standards in order to alleviate the condition of workers and thus to reduce the threat of a possible communist revolution, such as had already taken place in Russia. After World War II, the ILO was originally conceived as a fourth major organ in the newly established international trade system, along with the IMF, the World Bank and the ITO. The latter was, as already mentioned, replaced by GATT, which in turn did not include core labour standards into its

[171] http://www.un.org/esa/sustdev/csd/aboutCsd.htm (Jan. 20th 2008) . The proposal from Guatemala which suggest strengthening UNEP and the CSD are echoed in the study commissioned by the German Bundestag. See Deutscher Bundestag (2002), p. 380 and 432.
[172] www.unesco.org (10. October 2007).
[173] www.unctad.org (10. October 2007).
[174] Payne (2006), p. 129.

general outlook. Instead, the ILO became the UN's first specialized agency in 1946, without, however, being a central part of the newly established world economic order as originally intended[175].

The Core Labour Standards set up by the ILO include freedom of association, elimination of child labour, freedom from discrimination in employment and occupation, to name but a few[176]. How these issues can be brought to the forefront today, thereby correcting the ill fate of the ILO in the post World War II institutional design is subject to debate. For Radermacher[177], a key issue is that many WTO treaties are incompatible with ILO standards and that the two need to be rendered more coherent, so that fairer working conditions would thereby be built into the world trade system, so to speak. According to Radermacher, developing countries have hitherto objected to this, since compliance with these standards, though desirable, would mean giving up a competitive advantage, something these countries cannot afford. Radermacher's conclusion is that the international community should offer co-financing for poor countries to be able to meet these standards and for development, education and the building up of infrastructure in general. Deepak Nayyar, on the other hand, estimates that

> the issue of labour standards, of course, is simply not in the domain of the WTO and should remain in the ILO where the rights of workers are of fundamental concern[178].

The ILO itself recommends that it should be upgraded and receive more resources, while all relevant international institutions should do their part in promoting core labour standards and assistance for governments that are willing but unable to implement the standards should likewise be strengthened[179].

Hence, though there is a debate as to the exact nature of the institutional design which could achieve more coherence between core labour standards and the current global economic rules of the game, the sources consulted agree that more coherence is needed and the ILO and its standards need to be strengthened.

---

[175] Payne (2006), p. 131-132.
[176] International Labour Organization (2007): International Labour Standards by Subject. http://www.ilo.org/ilolex/english/subjectE.htm#s08 (8. March 2008).
[177] Radermacher (2004): Balance or Destruction, p. 54-61.
[178] Nayyar (2002), p. 169.
[179] World Commission on the Social Dimension of Globalization (2004), § 426.

4.5 Suggestions for reform of the United Nations and its Specialized Agencies:

One of the features in the UN that attracts most criticism is of course the composition of the Security Council, especially of the five permanent members wielding veto rights which reflect the post World War II situation, and which today, after the end of colonialism and with the growing geopolitical importance of some major developing and transition countries, seems rather arbitrary. For example, neither Africa nor Latin America are represented by any country. Alternative plans with the aim of a more equitable representation of the world's regions have been proposed – the Razali plan in 1997 and the proposal by the Thai Prime Minister Anand Panyarachun – have been put forward, but could not gain the necessary acceptance[180]. Since no such changes seem to be currently in sight, one way of alleviating the disproportionate influence of the veto-wielding members would be the introduction of a clause stating that a veto would at least entail an obligatory justification[181]. Greater policy coherence in the world community's decisions could also be achieved by counterbalancing the Security Council through the setting up of economic and social security council which, however, would be unable to pass binding decisions – this proposal too could not gain acceptance[182]. Similarly, Al Gore proposes the setting up of a "Stewardship Council", a counterpart of the Security Council dealing with safeguarding the global environment[183].

A crucial obstacle for the UN's work is its restricted, or rather, tiny budget – the entire UN system only spent approximately 12 billion Dollars per year at the beginning of this century - "less than the annual budget of the New York City Board of Education"[184]. Thus, there are calls for increased member contribution[185], but also to the introduction of independent funding, for example through Tobin Tax, since otherwise the UN system is vulnerable to pressure from members who are not satisfied – such as has been historically the case with the United States and the United Kingdom[186].

---

[180] Payne (2006), p. 125-126.
[181] German Bundestag (2002), p. 432.
[182] World Commission on the Social Dimension of Globalization (2004), § 530.
[183] Gore (2007), p. 302.
[184] Ibid., § 535.
[185] Ibid., § 536.
[186] Payne (2006), p. 127.

The long term perspective of some kind of a world parliament, democratically representing the world's population, has been around for a long time. It was proposed even before World War I and discussed in the nascent League of Nations[187]. However, it seems to be clearly out of reach today, at least in the short term. Therefore, Andreas Bummel from the "Committee for a Democratic UN" proposes a step-by-step approach, starting with the setting up of a "United Nations Parliamentary Assembly" within the UN-system. To begin with, this would be elected from the ranks of national parliaments. It would be open to all countries that have constitutionally legitimized parliaments[188] and would only enjoy consultative status at first, with the goal of becoming a fully- fledged world parliament, elected directly by the world population and entitled to pass binding decisions. George Monbiot likewise sets his hopes in a world parliament and suggests that it be made up of constituencies of approximately equal size which would transcend national boundaries[189].

As for the UN specialized agencies, they are subject to far less criticism in matters pertaining to sustainable development than the Bretton Woods Institutions and the WTO are, although the ILO, for one, recommends strengthening of the evaluation units of the specialized agencies and of the other bodies of the UN system[190], as well as the setting up of a Global Council on Global Governance as a new UN specialized agency[191].
More evaluation and more presence of the UN specialized agencies at the regional level and efforts to bridge the gaps with NGOs working at grass root level were suggested by the experts consulted from Guatemala and from India. Especially external evaluation has been demanded also for the UN system.

All participants unanimously judged that the UN and its specialized agencies have an "important role" (the highest category on the four-part scale) to play for global sustainable development. Participants were asked to specify which role the UN has to play, which of its specialized agencies are especially relevant here, and whether any reform is needed.

---

[187] Bummel, Andreas (2005): Developing International Democracy. For a Parliamentary Assembly at the United Nations, p. 102.
[188] Ibid., p. 87.
[189] Monbiot, George (2005): Construire un Parlement mondial révolutionnaire. In: La Revue Durable, no. 15, p. 60-64.
[190] World Commission on the Social Dimension of Globalization (2004), § 529.
[191] Ibid., (2004), § 531.

The experts from Guatemala and Russia focused especially on the UN's role for environmental governance: as discussed above, the Guatemalans called for stronger UN environmental institutions in general, with more money and authority, improved coordination with member states, multilateral agreements agencies and with the Global Environment Facility. Such a UN environmental organization should be at equal level with the WTO. The Commission on Sustainable Development was mentioned as a key institution to "analyze problems, develop solutions and reinforce action, also pay special attention to the operationalization of sustainable development goals at country levels". The necessity of strengthening scientific research and evaluation was also highlighted.

The approach of the Russian expert is a different one – while the Guatemalan response is about importantly upgrading UN specialized agencies that deal with environmental issues, he suggests anchoring environmental issues within the Security Council itself. Three different ways of achieving this are proposed:

> 1. Environmental issues should necessarily be included in the UN Security Council agenda, or 2. an Environmental Security Council be set up, or 3. the Economic and Social Council be turned into the UN Economic, Social, and Environmental Council.

Note that the second suggestion differs, since a new body is created.

The recurrent issue of bridging global and local is also relevant to the UN system, and the participants from Georgia, Malawi and India focused especially on this issue: the Georgian participant emphasized that both levels are indispensable, focusing on the economic sphere: global economic conditions marked by dynamism and stability needs to be combined with "determined policies at the national level" if sustainable development is to be achieved.

> "Neither will development gather momentum if the developing countries are weighted down by external indebtedness, if development finance is inadequate, if barriers restrict access to markets and if commodity prices and the terms of trade of developing countries remain depressed. … policies and measures needed to create an international environment that is strongly supportive of national development efforts are thus vital. International cooperation in this area should be designed to complement and support - not to diminish or subsume - sound domestic economic policies, in both developed and developing countries, if global progress towards sustainable development is to be achieved."

Global and local levels are here seen as complementary, rather than conflicting.

The feedback from both Malawi and India focuses on NGOs at the grass root level. The former advocates that the UN agencies should include local NGOs in the implementation of programs. The specialized agencies would "ensure proper decentralization of activities and

hence improve efficiency". The Indian participant emphasized the importance of bridging the gaps between UN agencies and the grassroot level, to which end "the procedures of working with the UN need to be simplified and UN benefits should reach those who need it."

The experts from Nicaragua and the Congo both advocated a reform cutting across the specialized agencies, since the areas of work of some agencies overlap ("UNICEF, UNFP all dealing with health as WHO, FAO and WFP dealing with food", as the sociologist from the Congo specified). Merging of institutions or specializing them while improving coordination between them would remove redundancies, improve their efficiency and reduce costs.

Comparing the International Financial Institutions on the one hand and the rest of the UN system on the other, one of the most striking differences is the very unequal respective budget. The latter merely has approximately 12 billion US$ per year at its disposal[192], while loans of the IBRD and the IDA alone amount to approximately 20 billion US$ per year[193]. One could say with Jean -Philippe Thérien that the two groups tell "two tales of world poverty"[194]. On the one hand the Bretton Woods Institutions allocate large sums of money as loans in exchange for the recipient country's meeting conditions subsumed under the name "Washington Consensus", while on the other, the UN system has to make do with comparatively little to finance its missions, set up environmental and social standards and publish its reports.
In addition, the UN and its specialized agencies have been put under pressure from the United States and the United Kingdom who have repeatedly withdrawn significant parts of their funding when they disagreed with some UN policies. The small budget, the lack of reliable funding and the financial dependence from some influential countries is an obstacle to the functioning of the UN system. Funding from independent sources, such as Tobin Tax, has been suggested to alleviate this problem[195].

A common feature of the Bretton Woods Institutions, the WTO and the UN system is a certain inertia – reforms have often been attempted and their necessity is obvious to the observer, but they have met with resistance from those in power. The anti-globalization

[192] World Commission on the Social Dimension of Globalization (2004), §535 and www.un.org/News/Press/docs/2006/gaab3787.doc.htm (8. March 2008).
[193] Bretton Woods Project (2008): World Bank Group. http://www.brettonwoodsproject.org/item.shtml?x=537848 (14. February 2008).
[194] Payne (2006), p. 132.
[195] Nayyar (2002), p. 360.

movement's protests, however, have led to more transparency, and to more public awareness about the importance of decisions at the level of the WTO, for example.

All that taken into account, it is not surprising that many authors favour a closer connection between the two camps, i.e. the organizations WTO, IMF and World Bank which exercise a strong influence on the global economy on the one hand, and the UN system on the other. The ILO for example advocates more coherence of their respective policies[196].

Participants were also asked whether organizations other than the BWIs, the WTO or the UN should play a part in global sustainable development. Four participants (from Malawi, the Congo, India, and Russia) mentioned NGOs, with the sociologist from the Congo arguing that they are more vocal and less "soft" than the more established institutions. Scientists, OECD, European Union, and regional and national banks were also mentioned as possible players.

4.6 Creation of new institutions

Apart from reform proposals for existing institutions, calls for the creation of new institutions also feature in the discourse on global sustainable development and governance. Such suggestions usually aim at the establishment of a new institution within the UN system. Examples are proposals for global legal authorities. Joseph Stiglitz, for one, makes several such proposals, including international courts to address charges brought forward by victims of environmental degradation or catastrophe, an international body responsible for debt supervision, an authority capable of acting as a referee to decide on charges of price-dumping between countries, and a world agency to counter the establishment of cartels between large global enterprises[197]. Personally, I would urge for a legal institution with the purpose of dealing with charges connected with the field of bioethics and especially genetic engineering, to counter threats to the ecosystem through the setting free of Genetically Modified Organisms, and to the human genome itself when scientists experiment in "improving" people through genetic engineering. Such an institution would need to be situated at the global level, since otherwise competition between countries can be expected to lead to a race to the bottom in bioethical standards. The same is true of individuals who will face the dilemma of whether or not to follow suit once some supposedly "improved" human beings exist.

[196] World Commission on the Social Dimension of Globalization (2004), § 532.
[197] Stiglitz (2006), pp. 260-261, 352, 128 and 255, respectively. For the last proposal, comp. also Deutscher Bundestag (2002), p. 164.

In the field of environment, the study for the German Bundestag recommends the setting up of a consultation forum including relevant stakeholders in environmental protection, and mentions representatives from civil society and economy as potential participants, though it does not go into great detail as to the agenda and the competences of such a body[198]. An international body of a similar type of composition, i.e. made up of NGOs and representatives from the business sector (a "council of transnational agents"), is proposed by Büchele and Kitzmüller for supervising and stabilizing finance markets in the interest of a sustainable world economy [199].

Survey participants were also asked whether new institutions need to be created, either within or outside of the UN system. Responses were fairly uniform: none of the experts advocated the establishment of new institutions. The answers reflected a feeling that there are enough or even too many institutions already in place, though the Malawian expert did advocate the creation of new institutions within the existing systems according to needs and as specific issues or problems in sustainable development arise.

4.7 The process – how to get to global sustainable development

The preceding chapters dealt with the design of a global governance system that would enable global sustainable development, and with the rules and institutions necessary to that end. The following chapter deals with sustainable development seen as a process – how do we get to a sustainable development, and how do we get to the establishment of the necessary rules and institutions as discussed above? Which social agents, especially, which institutions and organizations could play a part here?

Experts' answers to this question could be broadly categorized into those emphasizing especially the "micro" level of pressure from the "bottom", and those concentrating on the "macro" level of international institutions and law. Needless to say, the two approaches are by no means mutually exclusive.

[198] Deutscher Bundestag (2002), p. 380.
[199] Kitmüller, Erich / Büchele, Herwig (2005): Das Geld als Zauberstab und die Macht der internationalen Finanzmärkte, p. 410-417.

The former group presents a clear picture, reinforcing the importance of "bottom up" participation which took such a prominent place in the feedback of this entire survey:

> [Such a process should start] from grass root level by involving the beneficiaries. They are the ones to speak out and tell the world what they wish their lives to be like. Then the technicians will frame the institutions according to the peoples' voice. (Congo)

The feedbacks from Malawi, India and Georgia all present a similar general outlook: the importance of a highly consultative process and the central role of the grass root level and of communities is stressed. Institutions which are relevant to such a process include NGOs and governments (Malawi, India), faith based organizations (Malawi), and researchers cooperating with local communities or enterprises (Georgia). The Indian participant emphasized the importance of the connection between the local level and the BWIs and UN agencies, in the context of a "multi-layered system".

With the second group, responses were more varied and need to be treated individually:

The experts from the Guatemalan environment ministry focused on the strengthening of global institutions for environmental governance, specifically, the transformation of UNEP into a UN Environmental Organization with more authority and more funds. Improved coordination among intergovernmental bodies could be achieved through the creation of an integrated secretariat, rather than that of new bodies. In addition, the Guatemalan participants also emphasized the central role of efficient communication and information:

> We believe information sources are not canalized through proper channels. A strong concern campaign needs to be reinforced. Topics such as climate change, ozone layer depletion are examples of a public campaign well designed.

The Nicaraguan participant considered the legal aspect: international laws typically belong to customary law, or are anchored within international treaties. The participant suggests a process whereby treaties which the majority of countries have ratified would become binding also for those states which have not yet done so. "Such a process would need to be accompanied by different international commissions including regional and national actors which have a specific interest in the issue [concerned]."

The Peruvian professor of economics identified the abolition of the system of subsidies as the key issue for a process bringing about sustainable development, since this system is not

conducive to global economic growth. This should be achieved within the WTO, and subsidies should phase out within ten years at most.

Next, participants were asked how realistic it is that such process will actually come about, to estimate the probability thereof in percent, and to identify factors which would be advantageous for such a process, as well as possible obstacles. Participants' answers to this question need of course to be viewed in the context of the answer to the preceding question, since the likelihood of such a process depends on its nature. Of those four participants who emphasized the importance of the community and grass root level, three expressed a certain optimism that such a process can be brought about (Congo, Malawi, India), as did the experts from the Guatemalan environment ministry. Advantageous factors to such a process mentioned were "commitment of the world leaders and the work of the NGOs and civil societies supported by the UN" (Congo), involvement of the main agents and documentation of the process (Guatemala), as well as openness in dialogue, sincerity, effective decentralization and a clear time-frame (Malawi). The universal awareness of global imbalance and rising concern were also mentioned as advantageous factors. The participants from Malawi pointed out that "short cuts", i.e. the setting up of global rules without a consultative process beforehand have failed in bringing about global sustainable development. By contrast, they argued that a consultative process would lead to a feeling of ownership over the rules thus established, which again would be advantageous for their legitimacy and effectiveness.

Resistance is expected from the powerful who profit from today's imbalances (Congo) and from political intolerance in some countries (Malawi). The Nicaraguan participant noted that the individual interests of states have often prevailed over the common cause in the past, and that the coming about of a process leading to sustainable development will therefore depend on the political will of each country, but especially of that of the heavyweights on the global scene. The Peruvian economist pointed out that nationalism has worsened after the events of Sept. 11th 2001, and that therefore the necessary process is unlikely to come about – the participant gave it a ten per cent chance only. As described in the last chapter, the crucial point for such a process is a fairer economic order, especially the abolition of agrarian subsidies in "the North" – though the participant did ascribe good intentions to Europe in this field, which seem to be blocked by the United States, as the following statement suggests:

> A crucial factor is that the United States acknowledge that they are not alone in the world, that they need a truly free commerce to bring about a fairer economic world order, based on real comparative advantages. This would allow the European position to be more flexible and permits us to approach a fairer trade agreement.

The Georgian environmental researcher associated the likelihood of a process leading to sustainable development with more participation, combined with decentralized research, as opposed to control by elites. He notes that there is competition in many fields of economics and occupation, but not in policy making – the remedy would be "participation by all".

4.8 Further remarks by experts

For the case that the dimensional analysis of global sustainable development on which the questionnaire was based was incomplete – as might be expected with so broad a topic – experts were asked whether there was anything else concerning global sustainable development which does not fit into the categories discussed so far. Five participants did indeed make use of this empty category. Their answers were very diverse, so that no two answers could sensibly be integrated into any one category, and each one needs to be treated separately. The response from Malawi had to do with genetically modified organisms and was discussed in the chapter on the environmental dimension of sustainable development. To do full justice to participants' contributions, a large part of their answers needs to be quoted literally.

The Indian participant, a rural development NGO worker, stressed that "we need to differentiate between the rural and urban areas. The developmental realities between urban rural and areas, for example in countries like India, are quite different. The key for global sustainable development will lie in improving the conditions of rural areas, which is not happening in a big way currently."

The Georgian environment researcher's remark concerned the shift to global sustainability itself: past decades were not used to that effect, so that a more rapid and disruptive transition will become necessary.

> A typical public reaction will be to blame the move to sustainability for this disruption and impacts on well-being. Yet this implies a need for government policies to assist with shifts in technology, changes in requirements for skills in the economy, and to gain public understanding for what is being attempted.

> As more of the 'eggs' of unsustainability start to hatch governments are even less likely to get it right. Already we have plans for long-term nuclear weapons, nuclear power, mixed waste incineration, Genetic Manipulation and nanotechnology.

The feedback from the Congo too is best quoted literally:

> The global imbalance has reached an alarming stage. The major factors contributing to widening the gap is the greed and inhumanity of the current capitalist economy. There is need to change the mentality of the people. To bring them back to moral values that making profit at the expense of the neighbour or future generations is not worth it.
> The world has enough resources to eradicate poverty, there is need for commitment, advocacy and lobbying for a faire redistribution of the world's wealth.
> There is need to invest in basic infrastructure across the world so that the majority if not every human being attain a reasonable level of education and health which will enable every citizen of the world to contribute to wealth creation.

The answer reveals a sense of urgency, of the moral necessity of countering environmental degradation and of overcoming poverty, and also of the feasibility of these undertakings.

5. The Global Marshall Plan

The objective of this paper is to find out what a framework that leads to global sustainable development could look like, and what experts from developing countries think. The Global Marshall Plan Initiative is campaigning for such a framework and has worked out its own proposals on how to solve the development crisis while protecting the global environment. The Initiative was founded in Germany in 2003 with the Stuttgart Declaration and is most well known and most active in Austria and Germany, where it is supported by several federal states, and some high ranking politicians in these countries have spoken in favour of the plan. Campaigns have been launched in the United States and there is a group of supporters in Nigeria, but nevertheless the concept of the Global Marshall Plan is still hardly known outside the German speaking world. The fact that there are no articles on the Global Marshall Plan in the online dictionary wikipedia – apart from the German version – can probably be seen as indicative of this point[200]. A debate about the Global Marshall Plan has been going on in the German speaking countries, in the course of which, among other points, the criticism was raised that the concept is a Eurocentric one[201]. Hence, an important question this paper is attempting to answer, is whether the Global Marshall Plan is seen as a project which, put into practice, would be conducive to sustainable development in all its three dimensions, and if so to what extent and how the main points of the plan are to be judged in the light of the feedback from experts from developing countries.

The Global Marshall Plan Initiative summarizes what it is campaigning for in five key points, which are cited here according to the website:

- “implementation of the globally agreed upon UN Millennium Goals by 2015”

- “raising of an additional 100 billion US$ a year required to achieve the Millennium Goals, to enhance worldwide development”

---

[200] There is an entry of the name “Global Marshall Plan” in English, but it deals with Albert Gore’s concept of the same name, rather the Global Marshall Plan as discussed here.
Wikipedia Contributors (2008): Global Marshall Plan. http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Global_Marshall_Plan (15. January 2008).

[201] Attac Austria (2006): Position von Attac Österreich zum Global Marshall Plan. http://www.attac.at/uploads/media/GMP_Position_von_Attac_04.pdf (9. March 2008).

- “fair and competitively neutral raising of these necessary resources, also by burdening global transactions”. The initiative suggests the implementation of a global Tobin Tax on international finance transactions, a tax on kerosene used for aviation and shipping (which has so far been exempt from taxation following the 1944 Convention on International Civil Aviation), and a so-called “Terra Tax”, i.e. a small burden of between 0,3% and 0,5% on international trade in goods and services, and Special Drawing Rights with the IMF as possible sources of these funds.

- “gradually establish a worldwide Eco-Social Market Economy with an improved global policy framework through the interlinking of established rules and agreed upon standards for economic, environmental and social issues (WTO, ILO and UNEP standards)”.

The governance structure for global sustainability proposed by the Global Marshall Plan is that of integrating the Bretton Woods Institutions and the WTO with the standards already agreed upon by almost all of the world's states within the UN system, that is, core labour standards and environmental standards such as those of the Cartagena protocol, the Montreal protocol and the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change. In the publications of Radermacher, the WTO receives most attention and appears as the key institution, because the framework of rules for world trade is set in the WTO. “The problem with today’s WTO regime is that it is not responsible for social, cultural and ecological matters”.[202] By contrast, the Bretton Woods Institutions and the issue of reforming them play a relatively small part compared to the focus on the WTO.
In the field of global warming, there is no definite goal internationally agreed upon in terms of a limit or cap on, say, greenhouse gas concentration in the atmosphere or a maximum amount of annually permitted world emissions. The environmental standards agreed upon then, are at present much more patchy and incomplete, compared to the ILO standards which are much clearer and more specific. Hence, what the necessary environmental standards to be integrated into global governance rules and institutions in the economic sphere will be is at present not quite definite. The proposal of a global cap and trade system as treated above is discussed in the initiative, but is not part of the five core pillars. Also, the Global Marshall Plan does not propose its own set of environmental standards – these, of course, would hardly be of political weight – but rather makes do with the minimum standards internationally agreed upon today. In general, the initiative’s philosophy is making use of the agreements and the institutions already in place, rather than reinventing the system of global governance.

[202] Radermacher (2004): Balance or Destruction, p. 147.

Planning or eventually putting into practice a Global Marshall Plan is of course work in progress, so that a general outlook on the goals to be achieved – a global eco-social market economy – can be expected to be of more practical value for campagning and negotiation than, say, a ready-made chart with the ideal institutional design constructed beforehand on the drawing board to be rigidly followed like a cooking recipe. It is therefore hardly surprising that some details concerning the exact institutional design of a global eco-social market economy remain unspecified and are left open in the publications of the initiative.

- "new forms of appropriation of funds directed to the grassroots level, while at the same time fighting corruption". Examples for application at grass-root level can be found in the publications of the initiative: microcredit programs such as those launched by Nobel Prize winning economist Muhammad Yunus, or development schools such as the Bolivian Foundation for the Application and Teaching of Sciences (FUNDAEC) in which students function as practitioners and, once they have graduated, as teachers, so that knowledge is transmitted in a kind of snowball system.

These key points will be discussed in more detail in the context of their evaluation with the help of the opinion of the experts consulted. A more thorough exposition can of course be found in the publications of the initiative[203].

The first point is the odd one out: the UN Millennium Development Goals are, as the name implies, goals, albeit intermediate ones on the way to global sustainable development, rather than a means how to achieve sustainability. The Global Marshall Plan initiative uses them, so to speak, as a foot in the door, an argument to exercise pressure toward the fulfilment of a promise already made by the international community. Therefore, this first point was not included in the questionnaire – in addition, presumably nobody would call into question that the attainment of these goals is desirable, so that an evaluation was not deemed necessary.

[203] See e.g. Franz Joseph Radermacher (2004): Global Marshall Plan. A Planetary Contract.
Idem (2004): Balance or Destruction. And the website of the initiative: www.globalmarshallplan.org

5.1 Eco-social market economy

First, experts were asked what they think of the idea of an eco-social market economy in general, defined as "a market economy within a framework of ecological and social rules in order to bring the economy into harmony with society and the environment." Three participants found this concept "very good for global sustainable development" (those from the Congo, Peru and Nicaragua), two "rather good" (Malawi, Georgia) and one "ambivalent" (Guatemala). Two participants gave no judgment. For example, the Peruvian participant judged that historical experience has shown that this type of economy, while it imposes limits on human conduct and necessitates state intervention, is successful in reducing poverty and improving living conditions. However, the Malawians cautioned that small producers need protection and could be endangered by open markets. The Guatemalan environment ministry expressed scepticism "because the term 'eco' has been used indiscriminately, it is used only as a brand, for marketing purposes".

The Global Marshall Plan Initiative argues for a global eco-social market economy also by pointing to the positive experience in Europe with such a type of economy, which again has raised the criticism that the idea is Eurocentric, because everybody else in the world would simply need to copy an allegedly superior European model.
It seems to me that the term 'global eco-social market economy' can be understood twofold: a. the implementation of ecological and social norms for an otherwise unbridled world trade which already exists anyway, or b. the imposition of market economy as we know it in Europe everywhere on the globe – supermarkets everywhere, to put it bluntly.
The difference between both understandings is an important one, and the feedback received from the experts polled seems to suggest that a. is the option to aim for, as long as the global framework of rules allows the necessary amount of national and local ownership of development in line with the general principle of subsidiarity.

5.2 Standards and co-financing

A central part of the concept of the Global Marshall Plan is the idea of „standards for co-financing“, meaning that an agreement on international environmental and social standards is made, after which the developing countries receive funds in return for meeting these standards. Examples of such standards are those developed by the ILO, existing global environmental standards or other standards yet to be defined. Again, the Global Marshall Plan Initiative points to the good experience which the European Union has had with the model “standards combined with co-financing”, and which it applies to bring new or less developed member states up to a common European standard. The question arises whether this is an ethnocentric approach and what the experts polled think of the idea.

Summing up their judgments, there is a cautious approval of this idea, but paired with scepticism: one participant judged this idea to be “very good for global sustainable development” (Guatemala), three “rather good” (Georgia, Malawi, Nicaragua) and two “ambivalent”. Because the subject is a delicate one, because the idea of “standards and co-financing” is central to the concept of the Global Marshall Plan, and in order to give the reader an opportunity to judge for himself or herself rather than relying on my interpretation, all experts’ comments are quoted literally:

> On the one hand, [the concept of “standards combined with co-financing”] assures that developing countries assume certain commitments with respect to / concerning public policies, but on the other they could end up as an alibi to promote a certain type of foreign investment: buying of goods or services only produced in the donor country. From this point of view, the agreement could be another scheme for promoting certain industries in the donor country rather than a scheme of incentives towards a sustainable development. This already happens nowadays with certain European agencies of cooperation. (Peru – “ambivalent/ there are good and bad sides”)

> But I would advocate for proper familiarization of those standards to avoid punishing willing countries but who are unable to reach the standards due to lack of knowledge and skills - Capacity Building. (Malawi – “rather good for global sustainable development”)

> A win-win situation needs to be created, meaning that the “developing” countries, like the others, have to recognize the importance and the value of such an agreement (Nicaragua - “rather good for global sustainable development”)

> Because if member states and local actors want to receive additional cooperation to meet these goals, they have to commit and it is a good argument to address these challenges at the local level. (Guatemala – “very good for global sustainable development”)

The feedback from the Congo was lengthier:

> Whenever there is no harmony there is an imbalance, and whenever there is an imbalance someone somewhere suffers from it and in the long run everyone is affected. Any effort for sustainable development must take into consideration the human, social, ecological, cultural aspects for harmony

> and balance to prevail. It is possible if all global citizens are conscientised to this effect and take part to the effort of correcting the current imbalances.
>
> My personal experience is that these conditions for granting funds are used subjectively to deny the funds to unfavourable governments and grant them to favourable ones regardless of meeting the set guidelines. It has happened in the past with the WB policies to grant soft loans and donor countries to cancel debts of les developed countries on the basis of respect for democratic principles and rule of law in their respective countries. It was not the most democratic governments which benefited from these grants. Many dictatorial regimes were granted these benefits and some democratic regimes were not. So, my humble view is that it is better to grant funds upon presentation of a good project proposal on how to use it, including social and environmental responsiveness of the project, rather than setting conditionalities. ("ambivalent – there are good and bad sides").

To sum up these statements: the commitment to development undergone by the parties in such agreement could be positive for development (Peru, Guatemala). On the other hand, undue and detrimental interference in the economic or political sphere are seen as possible dangers, with standards serving as excuses for economic domination or wanton political intrusion (Peru, Congo). Capacity building is necessary to help countries meet these standards, lest they end up being punished for not reaching them (Malawi). Suggestions for capacity building are part of the fifth point of the Global Marshall Plan – for example, the initiative argues in favour of microcredit-programs or development schools in regional networks, such as the Bolivian foundation FUNDAEC – but the initiative also states that effective application of funds at grass root level is "perhaps the most difficult aspect of a Global Marshall Plan"[204].

Taken together, the feedback suggests that "standards and co-financing" may be a viable option, since experts' judgments were either on the positive side, or "ambivalent". Of course, the idea of "standards and cofinancing" is an integral and indispensable part of the concept of the Global Marshall Plan as a whole, which would not work without it. However, the emphasis on consultation and inclusion of the grass root level (rather than just elites), which most of the experts have repeated on several occasions in this survey, suggests that if standards there be, great care would need to be taken in any negotiations leading to them to assure that people's interest at the "bottom level" be included. The ILO report "A Fair Globalization", frequently cited in this paper, is a good example for a scientific study which is based on wide-ranging consultation with people from different world regions and very different and even opposing viewpoints, which the report tries to integrate[205]. The feedback from the Congo suggests that funds should be granted on a project basis, rather than tied to the implementation of any type of conditionality.

---

[204] Cited from the flyer of the initiative, available for download at: www.globalmarshallplan.org/e5095/e5221/e5207/e7856/flyer_eng_20050817_eng.pdf .

[205] World Commission on the Social Dimension of Globalization (2004): National and Regional Dialogues.

5.3 Financing concept

Judgments of the financing concept were mixed. Four participants estimated it as "ambivalent" (Malawi, Guatemala, Nicaragua, Georgia). The Malawian NGO worker was in favour of the basic idea of raising funds these funds, though not necessarily on aeroplane fuel, since that would affect aviation business. The experts from the Central American countries cautioned that the money will need to be applied in an efficient way and with a clear destiny, but the Guatemalan environment ministry expressed approval of the basic idea of raising this money to meet the MDGs.

The sociologist from the Congo and the Peruvian economist both judged the idea as "very good". The former expressed approval of the fact that the financial aspect of poverty eradication is addressed in the concept of the Global Marshall Plan, while the latter emphasized his support for taxation of finance transfers of multinational corporations, who would benefit by fulfilling their responsibility towards society.

In sum then, the idea itself of raising these funds was approved of, but two participants cautioned that difficulties in the application of these funds might be expected. The concern that kerosene tax is an impediment to the aviation industry can probably be seen before the background that flying is very expensive in Africa, so that people's mobility and hence their ability to choose the livelihood they want, is thereby restricted. The situation in Europe, to the dismay of environmentalists like me, is very different, flying usually being the cheaper option, compared to the train, for distances over, say, 500 kilometres (a rough but cautious estimate), so that there is a disincentive to use any other mode of travel.

5.4 Closer connection between the Bretton Woods Institutions and the WTO with the United Nations system

Among the measures proposed by the Global Marshall Plan which were evaluated through this survey, this last one met with the most approval among the experts consulted: five found it "very good", and one participant "rather good". This is perhaps not very surprising given the current state of affairs such as sketched out above. Experts' comments, not as lengthy as those on the other points evaluated, expressed support for harmonization of the Bretton Woods Institutions, the WTO and the UN system towards the goal of sustainable development – the Peruvian economist specified that this would permit a framework for more equitable trade, and that such an integration would reduce the sources of tension between rich countries and developing countries.

5.5 “Global Marshall Plan” or “Global Contract”?

After the evaluation of these key ideas of the Global Marshall Plan Initiative, experts were also asked whether there was anything else they would like to add about the concept.

> … I believe that as such this is an important initiative, however, the very fact that something new needs to be created to meet the MDGs shows that there is a basic problem, which is not only the lack of money. I think that it is important to rethink the concepts of development, “developing country” and take the sovereignty of states, regions and sub-regions seriously when it comes to deciding which path in the field of ‘development’ one thinks of taking. A “Global Marshall” plan already has the connotation of “ethnocentrism”, although this may not be the case (I am not familiar with the details). I think that it is necessary to start to think more in terms of grass root level solutions, taking into account the specificities and differences of every country, their people and cultures. Let us decentralize the models of development and apply democratic principles such as active participation in the vision and realization of the aims of the countries. The United Nations System and other bodies can be of help in this process, but it cannot replace or substitute already existing structures.” (Nicaragua)

Once again, the importance of the local and grassroot level and of participation is emphasized, and a rethinking of development models towards more decentralized structures is advocated. The participant points out that the name “Global Marshall Plan” has an ethnocentric touch to it. The Global Marshall Plan Initiative also uses “Global Contract” as an alternative name which, however, is rarely used. To me, the term “contract” suggests agreement genuinely at eye-level, as opposed to a unilateral and perhaps paternalistic effort to save the world connoted in the term “Marshall Plan”. We have already pointed out a kind of lopsidedness in Al Gore’s concept of a “Global Marshall Plan” which gave the Global Marshall Plan as devised in the publications of Radermacher and others its name. Comparing the two, the strength of the latter is its emphasis on involving existing international institutions such as the UN, a reformed WTO and the Bretton Woods institutions. As mentioned, the level of global governance institutions is almost totally lacking in Al Gore’s concept. Therefore, it seems to me that copying the name “Global Marshall Plan” from Al Gore does not do the concept of the Global Marshall Plan as we are discussing it here justice and is rather misleading.

The advantage of the term “Global Marshall Plan” is of course that especially Europeans and Americans will immediately associate it with the historical Marshall Plan, or European Recovery Programme. The Marshall Plan is generally seen as a successful undertaking which brought about a win-win situation, since it guaranteed good transatlantic relationships and stood at the beginning of a period of peace of unprecedented duration in Western Europe. At the same time, the Marshall Plan was a cooperative project which involved its European beneficiaries as those which were in charge of planning the reconstruction of Europe with US

financial aid[206]. On the other hand, the familiarity of the name "Marshall Plan" can of course also make for confusion between the historical Marshall Plan and its contemporary counterpart.

Though none of the other experts gave any comments on the name "Global Marshall Plan", the overall picture is that the idea of globally agreed upon ecological and social rules and a harmonization between the two great blocks, the UN on the one hand, and WTO and Bretton Woods on the other, have met with the most approval, while the measure of "standards and cofinancing" has met with more reserve and concern over possible undue interference in the context of such a measure was expressed. To me, this suggests that "Global Contract" is indeed a better term, especially if the support and trust of developing countries is sought, something to which the name "Marshall Plan" seems to me to be an unnecessary obstacle, so that I agree with the judgment of the Nicaraguan participant. I have repeatedly spoken in favour of a change of the name "Global Marshall Plan" to "Global Contract" in the past, and in the light of survey results, I continue to hold this position.

The participants from the Guatemalan environment ministry have pointed out that they had never heard of the Global Marshall Plan before, and that therefore the plans needs more communication. Likewise, the participants from Malawi, India and Nicaragua had not heard of the Global Marshall Plan before receiving the questionnaire, while those from the Congo, Georgia and Peru had heard of it before.

5.6 Growth vs. restriction

The Global Marshall Plan seeks to square environment and development through an eco-social market economy, in the context of which economic growth is seen as instrumental, specifically, "by the year 2050, there would be ten times as many goods and services available as there are today"[207]. This growth would be divided in such a way that developing countries are allowed 34-fold growth, while today's developed countries are allowed to increase their economies fourfold, so that the lines of growth converge and greater global income equality is achieved. Radermacher estimates that economic growth of such a scale is possible through technological innovation and greater energy efficiency on the one hand, and an increased share of services as opposed to goods on the other, so that, on the whole, the world economy would by 2050 be thoroughly de-materialized, i.e. less dependent on raw material input.

[206] Novacek (2002), p. 14.
[207] Radermacher (2004), Balance or Destruction, p. 34.

As discussed, Radermacher, like Weizsäcker, Pacala and Socolow argue for a combination of both more efficient technologies and a responsible management and restriction of their usage to avoid "boomerang" effects. For example, Pacala and Socolow advocate more efficient cars in combination with a restriction of their usage[208]. The Global Marshall Plan Initiative itself, in turn, is campaigning for internalization of external costs through taxation of fuels.

It is not quite clear from the publications of the Global Marshall Plan Initiative whether all this entails any restrictions to lifestyles in the rich countries. On the one hand, "people cannot be expected to voluntarily relinquish their acquired material status quo", while on the other, "the North should accept restrictions to its own damaging lifestyle"[209]. It is however left open what these restrictions would consist of, for example, whether any limits should be imposed on the usage of cars, the aeroplane, or the excessive consumption of animal products in the rich countries. It is hard to conceive of a sustainable global economy without any such restrictions, given that the strain on the earth already exceeds its regenerative capacity and given the urgency of the problem of global warming. Perhaps the lack of any details on necessary restrictions is due to strategic reasons of communication (imagine publicly campaigning for a more modest lifestyle), but it seems that this issue should be addressed more clearly.

[208] Pacala / Socolow (2004) in: Science, Volume 305, p. 969.
[209] Radermacher (2004): Balance or Destruction, pp. 33 and 58, respectively.

6. Conclusion

The degree of current global imbalance necessitates that researchers put their heads together and think of viable concepts to counter it, in order to achieve both an end to environmental degradation and a way out of today's development crisis, and indeed there are a great many well worked-out proposals already available, of which several, though without doubt only a fraction, were discussed in this paper. At the same time, science faces difficulties in treating sustainable development, because of the integrative nature of that subject matter, the conceptual "fuzziness" which this brings with it, and the necessary inclusion of the normative faculty of thought in order to set any priorities. Sociological approaches to sustainable development are indispensable, on the one hand because of their explanatory value, and on the other because sustainable development, following the definition of the Brundtland report, is centrally about people and their needs and therefore inseparable from human development.

Very generally speaking, we have seen that a kind of double track, or double standard, pervades the existing global governance structures relevant to sustainable development: while many documents set up in the context of the UN suggest wide international agreement on issues pertaining to both environment and development, this does not effectively translate into the economic rules of the game which, as we have seen, are lopsided. This lopsidedness is associated with the policies of the strangely aloof organizations governing global terms of trade and reflected in their organizational structure. The general perspective of harmonization of the two blocks together with important reforms and more transparency in the Bretton Woods Institutions and the WTO in such a way as to render the global governance system more coherent and more effectively working towards a more sustainable, just, and peaceful development can be seen as a common denominator on which there is agreement both in literature and from the experts consulted. Global sustainable development, however, is about more than just getting the global governance rules and structures right. Local and national autonomy ownership of development is just as important, and, while there can and will be tension between global rules on the one hand, and the autonomy of the "lower" levels on the other, literature and experts' feedback also suggest that the different levels can also be seen as mutually supportive, and that their well-balanced integration in line with the principle of subsidiarity is worth aiming for. The repeated emphasis from survey participants that the

effective inclusion and participation of all levels from grass root to global (rather than of the global level alone) is indispensable for global sustainable development was the most striking result of this survey project.

In the light of experts' feedback, the integrative nature of the concept of the Global Marshall Plan, its advocacy for a more coherent global governance system and of squaring environment and development through an eco-social market economy can be seen as conducive to global sustainable development. However, eco-social market economy should be understood in such a way as to foster, rather than undermine, local and national ownership of development, and if a Global Marshall Plan will ever be implemented, care will need to be taken to avoid any lopsidedness, above all when it comes to agreeing on internationally shared standards. We have argued that the name "Global Contract", rather than "Global Marshall Plan" would facilitate communication at eye-level and that it will be more helpful in order to make friends and gain support in the so-called developing countries.

7. Bibliography

Abreu Fialho Gomes, Bea de/ Hanak, Irmi/ Schicho, Walter (2003): Die Praxis der Entwicklungszusammenarbeit. Akteure, Interessen und Handlungsmuster. Vienna: Mandelbaum Verlag.

Attac Austria (2006): Position von Attac Österreich zum Global Marshall Plan. http://www.attac.at/uploads/media/GMP_Position_von_Attac_04.pdf (9. March 2008).

BBC (2007): Unexpected growth in CO2 found. http://news.bbc.co.uk/2/hi/science/nature/7058074.stm (23. October 2007).

--- (2007): Skepticism over climate claims. http://news.bbc.co.uk/2/hi/science/nature/6263690.stm (5. March 2008).

Beck, Ulrich (2003): Weltrisikogesellschaft. Auf der Suche nach der verlorenen Sicherheit. Frankfurt am Main: Suhrkamp Verlag.

Black, Richard (2006): Only fifty years left for sea fish. http://news.bbc.co.uk/2/hi/science/nature/6108414.stm (2. November 2006).

--- (2007): Lovelock urges ocean climate fix. http://news.bbc.co.uk/2/hi/science/nature/7014503.stm (26. September 2007).

--- (2007): Climate Science. Sceptical about bias. http://news.bbc.co.uk/2/hi/science/nature/7092614.stm (14. November 2007).

Bummel, Andreas (2005): Developing International Democracy. For a Parliamentary Assembly at the United Nations. Stuttgart: Horizonte Verlag.

Bretton Woods Project (2008): World Bank Group. http://www.brettonwoodsproject.org/item.shtml?x=537848 (14. February 2008).

Chang Ha-Joon (2002): Kicking away the ladder. Development Economics in Historical Perspective. New York: Anthem Press.

--- (ed.) (2003): Rethinking Development Economics. New York: Anthem Press.

Dermange, François (2003): Le Dieu du Marché. Éthique, économie et théologie dans l'oeuvre de Adam Smith. Geneva: Labor et Fides.

Deutscher Bundestag (ed.) (2002): Schlussbericht der Enquete –Kommission Globalisierung der Weltwirtschaft. Opladen: Leske + Budrich.

Diamond, Jared (1999): Guns Germs and Steel. The Fates of Human Societies. New York: W. W. Norton.

--- (2005): Collapse. How Societies Choose to Fail or Succeed. New York: Penguin Group.

Diekmann, Andreas / Jaeger, Carlo C. (ed.) (1996): Umweltsoziologie. Opladen: Westdeutscher Verlag.

--- (1996): Aufgaben und Perspektiven der Umweltsoziologie. In: same editors (1996): Umweltsoziologie.

.Dunlap, Riley E. / Mertig, Angela G. (1996): Weltweites Umweltbewußtsein. Eine Herausforderung für die soziologische Theorie. In: Diekmann, Andreas / Jaeger, Carlo C. (ed.) (1996): Umweltsoziologie, p. 193-218.

Faissner, Klaus (2007): Anbauverbot in Gefahr. In: Die Furche Nr. 46/2007, p. 6.

Falk, Richard (2002): The United Nations System: Prospects for Renewal. In: Nayyar, Deepak (2002): Governing Globalization, pp. 177-208.

Felber, Christian (2006): 50 Vorschläge für eine gerechtere Welt. Gegen Konzernmacht und Kapitalismus. Wien: Deuticke.

Fischler, Franz / Gottwald , Theo (ed.) (2007): Ernährung sichern weltweit. Ökosoziale Gestaltungsperspektiven. Hamburg: Murtmann.

Frey, Bruno S./ Bohnet, Iris: Tragik der Allmende. Einsicht Perversion, Überwindung. In: Diekmann/ Jaeger (ed.) (1996): Umweltsoziologie, p. 292-307.

Global Marshall Plan Initiative webpage. www.globalmarshallplan.org (10. March 2008).

Global Marshall Plan Initiative (ed.) (2004): Welt in Balance. Zukunftschance Ökosoziale Marktwirtschaft. Ulm: Ebner und Spiegel.

--- (2007): Global Marshall Plan. Balance the World with an Eco-Social Market Economy (flyer of the initiative) www.globalmarshallplan.org/e5095/e5221/e5207/e7856/flyer_eng_20050817_eng.pdf (21.1.2008).

Gore, Albert (2007): Earth in the Balance. 2nd edition. London: Earthscan.

Grober Ulrich (1999): Der Erfinder der Nachhaltigkeit. In: Die Zeit no. 48/1999. www.zeit.de/1999/48/Der_Erfinder_der_Nachhaltigkeit (13. March 2008).

Group of 24 webpage. www.g24.org (8. September 2007).

Group of 77 webpage. www.g77.org (8. September 2007).

Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (2007): Climate Change 2007 Synthesis Report. Summary for Policymakers. http://www.ipcc.ch/pdf/assessment-report/ar4/syr/ar4_syr_spm.pdf (12. March 2008).

International Labour Organization (2007): International Labour Standards by Subject. http://www.ilo.org/ilolex/english/subjectE.htm#s08 (8. March 2008).

Ipsos Mori Institute (2007): Climate Change Survey. http://www.ipsos-mori.com/polls/2007/climatechange.shtml (4. July 2007).

Jay, Peter (2000): Road to Riches. Or the Wealth of Man. London: Weidenfeld and Nicolson.

Kabou, Axelle (2000): Et si l'Afrique refusait le développement? Paris: L'Harmattan.

Kant, Immanuel (1919): Zum ewigen Frieden und ausgewählte Stücke. Munich / Vienna: Dreiländerverlag.

Kitmüller, Erich / Büchele, Herwig (2005): Das Geld als Zauberstab und die Macht der internationalen Finanzmärkte. 2nd edition. Vienna: LIT Verlag.

Korten, David (2000): One World – One World Government. Bretton Woods or United Nations? www.ratical.org/co-globalize/ifg041400DK.html (Feb. 28th, 2008).

La Revue Durable (2007): La planète peut accueillir beaucoup de monde, tout depend des comportements. In: La Revue Durable, no. 24, p. 20-22.

Leaky, Richard E. / Lewin, Roger (1996): The Sixth Extinction. New York: Anchor Books.

London School of Economics (2003): The Centre for the Study of Global Governance's mission statement. www.lse.ac.uk/depts/global (12. March 2008).

Lovelock, James (2006): The Revenge of Gaia. London: Penguin Books.

Lovins, Amory (2005): More Profit with Less Carbon. In: Scientific American, Volume 293, Number. 3, p. 52-61.

Meadows, Donella H./ Randers, Jorgen/ Meadows, Dennis L. (2007): Limits to Growth. The 30-Year Update.

Vermont: Chelsea Green.

Meier-Walser, Reinhard C. / Stein, Peter (ed.) (2004): Globalisierung und Perspektiven internationaler Verantwortung. Problemstellungen, Analysen, Lösungsstrategien: Eine systemische Bestandsaufnahme. München: K.G. Sauer.

Mesarovic, Mihajlo D. (1996): Cybernetics of Global Change. [210]http://unesdoc.unesco.org/images/0010/001055/105583E.pdf (Jan. 10th 2008).

Milborn, Corinna / Riedler, Reiner (2006): Gestürmte Festung Europa. Einwanderung zwischen Stacheldraht und Ghetto. Graz: Styria Verlag.

Minsch, Jürg (1997): Institutionelle Reformen für eine Politik der Nachhaltigkeit. Berlin: Springer Verlag.

Monbiot, George (2005): Construire un Parlement mondial révolutionnaire. In: La Revue Durable, no. 15, p. 60-64.

Münch, Richard (2004): Soziologische Theorie 3. Frankfurt am Main: Campus Verlag.

Nayyar, Deepak (ed.) (2002): Governing Globalization. Issues and Institutions. New York: Oxford University Press.

--- (2002): Towards Global Governance. In: Nayyar, Deepak (ed.) (2002): Governing Globalization, p. 3-18.

--- (2002): Cross-border Movements of People. In: Nayyar, Deepak (ed.) (2002): Governing Globalization, p.144-176.

Novacek, Pavel/ Mederly, Peter (2002): Global Partnership for Development. Olomouc: Palacky University.

Nuscheler, Franz / Fürlinger, Ernst (1994): Weniger Menschen durch weniger Armut? Bevölkerungswachstum – Globale Krise und ethische Herausforderung. Salzburg / Munich: Verlag Anton Pustet.

Office of the High Commissioner for Human Rights (1966): International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights. http://www.unhchr.ch/html/menu3/b/a_cescr.htm (8. March 2008).

Pacala, Stephen / Socolow, Robert (2004): Stabilization Wedges. Solving the Climate Problem for the Next 50 Years with Current Technologies.In: Science, Volume 305, Number 5686, p. 968-972.

Payne, Anthony (2006): The Global Politics of Unequal Development. Basingstoke: Palgrave MacMillan.

Physicians and Scientists for Responsible Application of Science and Technology (2007): World renowned scientist lost job when he warned about GE foods. http://www.psrast.org/pusztai.htm (10. March 2008).

Pimm, Stuart L. /Jenkins, Clinton (2005): Sustaining the Variety of Life. In: Scientific American, Volume 293, Number. 3, p. 44-51.

Plehwe, Dieter (2005): Neoliberale Netzwerke. Globalisierung wurde gemacht. In: Faschingseder, Gerald/ Ornig, Nikola (ed.) (2005): Globalisierung ent-wickeln. Eine Reflexion über Entwicklung, Globalisierung und Repolitisierung, p. 304-343.

Pontifical Council for Justice and Peace (2005): Compendium of the Social Doctrine of the Church. Vatican City: Libreria Editrice Vaticana.

Pretty, Jules / Hine, Rachel (2003): L'agriculture paysanne durable peut relever le défi alimentaire. In: La Revue Durable, no. 6.

Radermacher, Franz Josef (2004): Balance or Destruction. Ecosocial Market Economy as the Key to Global Sustainable Development. Vienna: Ökosoziales Forum Europa.

--- (2004): Global Marshall Plan. A Planetary Contract. Vienna: Ökosoziales Forum Europa.

--- (2006): Globalisierung gestalten. Die neue zentrale Aufgabe der Politik. 2nd updated edition. Berlin: Terra Media Verlag.

--- (2006): Die Klimafrage im Kontext von global governance. Speech held at the Acqua-Alta Congress in Hamburg, Germany, on 13. December 2006. Available at http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=VnExIewXC6s (30. March 2008).

Radermacher, Franz Josef / Beyers, Bert (2007): Welt mit Zukunft. Überleben im 21. Jahrhundert. Hamburg: Murmann Verlag.

Ravallion, Martin (2004): The Debate on Globalization, Poverty and Inequality. Why Measurement Matters. In: Meier-Walser, Reinhard C. / Stein, Peter (ed.) (2004): Globalisierung und Perspektiven internationaler Verantwortung. Problemstellungen, Analysen, Lösungsstrategien: Eine systemische Bestandsaufnahme, p. 247-262.

Reder, Michael (2006): Global Governance. Philosophische Modelle der Weltpolitik. Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft.

Reichert, Tobias / Gottwald, Franz Theo: Hunger, Armut und Klimawandel. Neue globale Herausforderungen für die Landwirtschaft. In Fischler, Franz / Gottwald, Franz Theo (ed.) (2007): Ernährung sichern weltweit. Ökosoziale Gestaltungsperspektiven, p. 90-173.

Reinert, Erik S. (2003): Increasing Poverty in a Globalized World. Marshall Plans and Morgenthau Plans as Mechanisms of Polarization of World Incomes. In: Chang, Ha-Joon (ed.) (2003): Rethinking Development Economics, p. 453-478.

Sabet, Hafez (1992): Die Schuld des Nordens. Der 50-Billionen Coup. 2nd edition. Frankfurt am Main: Horizonte.

Sachs, Jeffrey (2005): The End of Poverty. How We Can Make It Happen in Our Lifetime. London: Penguin Books.

--- (2005): Can extreme poverty be eliminated? In: Scientific American, Volume 293, Number. 3, p. 34-43.

Schmidt-Bleek, Manfred (1998): Das MIPS-Konzept. Weniger Naturverbrauch – mehr Lebensqualität durch Faktor 10. Munich: Droemer.

Schumacher, Ernst Friedrich (1977): A Guide for the Perplexed. New York: Harper and Row.

--- (1979): Good Work. London: Jonathan Cape Ltd.

Secretariat of the Convention on Biological Diversity (1992): Convention on Biological Diversity. http://www.cbd.int/doc/legal/cbd-un-en.pdf (10. March 2008).

--- (2000): Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety to the Convention on Biological Diversity. http://www.cbd.int/doc/legal/cartagena-protocol-en.pdf (10. March 2008).

--- (2006): Global Biodiversity Outlook 2. http://www.cbd.int/doc/gbo2/cbd-gbo2-en.pdf (10. March 2008).

Spiegel, Peter (2005): Faktor Mensch. Ein humanes Weltwirtschaftswunder ist möglich. Stuttgart: Horizonte.

Stern, Nicholas (2007): Stern Review. The Economics of Climate Change. http://www.hm-treasury.gov.uk/media/9/9/CLOSED_SHORT_executive_summary.pdf (12. March 2008).

Stiglitz, Joseph (2006): Making Globalization Work. New York: W.W. Norton.

Stiglitz, Joseph / Charlton, Andrew (2006): Fair Trade for All. How Trade Can Promote Development. New York: Oxford University Press.

Transparency International (2007): Corruption Perceptions Index 2007. www.transparency.org/policy_research/surveys_indices/cpi/2007 (15. January 2008).

United Nations: Webpage of the United Nations. www.un.org and www.un.org/about (25. September 2007) .

--- (2007): The Millennium Development Goals Report. http://www.un.org/millenniumgoals/pdf/mdg2007.pdf (30. March 2008).

United Nations Conference on Trade and Development webpage. www.unctad.org (10. October 2007).

United Nations Development Programme (2006): Human Development Report 2006. http://hdr.undp.org/en/media/hdr06-complete.pdf (12. March 2008).

--- (2007): Human Development Report 2007. http://hdr.undp.org/en/media/hdr_20072008_en_complete.pdf (12. March 2008).

United Nations Division for Sustainable Development webpage. http://www.un.org/esa/sustdev/csd/aboutCsd.htm (15. February 2008).

United Nations Educational, Social and Cultural Organization webpage. www.unesco.org (10. October 2008).

United Nations Educational, Social and Cultural Organization (2001): Universal Declaration on Cultural Diversity. http://unesdoc.unesco.org/images/0012/001271/127160m.pdf (30. March 2008).

United Nations Environment Programme (2007): Global Environment Outlook. Summary for Decision Makers. http://www.unep.org/geo/geo4/media/GEO4%20SDM_launch.pdf (10. March 2008).

United Nations General Assembly (1987): Report of the World Commission on Environment and Development. http://www.un.org/documents/ga/res/42/ares42-187.htm (26. September 2007).

--- (2000): United Nations Millennium Declaration. www.un.org/millennium/declaration/ares552e.pdf (30. March 2008).

--- (2005): Final Document of the UN General Assembly's World Summit of 2005. http://daccessdds.un.org/doc/UNDOC/GEN/N05/487/60/PDF/N0548760.pdf?OpenElement (26. September 2007).

--- (2006): Fifth Committee approves assessment scale for regular, peacekeeping budgets, texts on common system, pension fund, as it concludes session. www.un.org/News/Press/docs/2006/gaab3787.doc.htm (8. March 2008).

United Nations Global Compact webpage: www.unglobalcompact.org .

United Nations Non-Governmental Liaison Service (2007): Climate Change threatens unprecedented human development reversals. http://www.un-ngls.org/site/article.php3?id_article=393 (10. February 2008).

United Nations Public Administration Network (2007): Directory of African NGOs. www.unpan.org/NGO-Africa-Directory/ (3. April 2007).

Weizsäcker, Ernst Ulrich von/ Lovins, Amory B./ Lovins, L. Hunter (1995): Faktor 4. Doppelter ,Wohlstand – halbierter Naturverbrauch. Munich: Droemer Knaur.

Wicke, Lutz/ Spiegel, Peter/ Wicke-Thüs, Inga (2006): Kyoto Plus. So gelingt die Klimawende. Munich: C.H. Beck.

Wikipedia Contributors (2008): Global Marshall Plan. http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Global_Marshall_Plan (15. January 2008).

--- (2008): Ernst Friedrich Schumacher. http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/E._F._Schumacher (20. January 2008).

World Bank (2008): Understanding Poverty. http://web.worldbank.org/WBSITE/EXTERNAL/TOPICS/EXTPOVERTY/0,,contentMDK:20153855~menuPK

:373757~pagePK:148956~piPK:216618~theSitePK:336992,00.html (10. February 2008).

World Commission on the Social Dimension of Globalization (2004): A Fair Globalization. Creating Opportunities for All. http://www.ilo.org/public/english/wcsdg/docs/report.pdf (12. March 2008).

--- (2004): National and Regional Dialogues. www.ilo.org/public/english/wcsdg/consulta/index.htm (12. March 2008).

World Institute for Development Economics Research (2007): World Distribution of Household Wealth Press Release. www.wider.unu.edu/research/2006-2007/2006-2007-1/wider-wdhw-launch-5-12-2006/wider-wdhw-press-release-5-12-2006.pdf (10. November 2007).

World Parliament of Religions (1993): Declaration Towards a Global Ethic www.parliamentofreligions.org/_includes/FCKcontent/File/TowardsAGlobalEthic.pdf (30. March 2008).

World Trade Organization (1995): Agreement on the Application of Sanitary and Phytosanitary Measures. www.wto.org/english/docs_e/legal_e/15-sps.pdf (5. March 2008).

Worm, Boris et al. (2006): Impacts of Biodiversity Loss on Ocean Ecosystem Services. In: Science, vol. 314, no. 5800, p. 787.

You, Jong-Il (2002): The Bretton Woods Institutions. Evolution, Reform and Change. In: Nayyar, Deepak (ed.) (2002): Governing Globalization. Issues and Institutions, p. 209-237.

8. Appendix: the questionnaire

Dear participant,

How can global sustainable development capable of satisfying at least the basic needs of all people be made possible? What could a global economic system look like that enables and promotes such a development[211]? And what kind of a legal and institutional framework would have to be established on a global level to that end?

The aim of this survey is to find out what experts in the field of sustainable development and/ or development aid who come from „developing countries“ think about these topics. In the second part (from question 7) of the questionnaire, you are invited to give your opinion on some measures in the area of global governance proposed by the Global Marshall Plan initiative. You have as much space to answer the questions as you want. If you feel unable to answer a question, please indicate this.

1. **Rules**

a. **Which rules regarding the environment should apply on a global level in order to ensure a global sustainable development?**

b. **Which economic rules - i.e. rules regarding the terms of trade of goods and services and the distribution of wealth and ressources - should apply on a global level in order to ensure a global sustainable development?**

[211] „Development“ in the context of this survey means: a process of any kind, in the course of which societal structures and conditions are transformed in such a way as to attain the satisfaction of at least the basic needs of all people in a society.
By „sustainable“ I mean a development which „meets the needs of the present without compromising the ability of future generations to meet their own needs” (definition of the Brundtland report). “Sustainable development” is here understood as having three dimensions: ecological, economic and social.
.

c. Which rules regarding the social and / or cultural dimension of sustainable development should apply on a global level in order to ensure a global sustainable development?

d. Are there any rules of another kind which should apply on a global level in order to ensure a global sustainable development?

2. Institutional framework

Where should these rules be laid down? Which institutions and organisations should play a part here?

a. Should the World Trade Organisation and the Bretton Woods Institutions (i.e. International Monetary Fund and World Bank) play a part?

The WTO should (type an x into the brackets to mark the appropriate answer)…

( ) play an important part
( ) play some part
( ) only play a minor part
( ) play no part

The IMF should…

( ) play an important part
( ) play some part
( ) only play a minor part
( ) play no part

The World Bank should…

( ) play an important part
( ) play some part
( ) only play a minor part
( ) play no part

If you think the WTO or any of the Bretton Woods Institutions should play a part, please specify: which ones and in what way?

Would you advocate any reforms in the WTO or Bretton Woods Institutions? If so, in which of them and in what way?

b. Should the United Nations and its sub-organisations play a part?

The UN and its suborganisations should …

( ) play an important part
( ) play some part
( ) only play a minor part
( ) play no part

If you think the UN and its suborganisations should play a part, please specify: in what way? Which suborganisations should play a part?

Would you advocate any reforms in the United Nations or ist suborganisations? If so, in which ones and in what way?

c. Should any other institutions or organisations other than WTO, Bretton Woods or UN play a part? If so, in what way?

d. Should new institutions or organisations be created? If so, what kind?

3. What could a process leading to the establishment of such rules and their fixation in an institutional framework look like? Which intermediate steps would need to be taken? Which institutions or organisations could play a part here?

4. How realistic is it that such a process will be brought about? Please attempt to estimate the probability in percent. Which factors could be advantageous for the bringing about of such a process? Which obstacles should be expected?

5. Is there anything you would like to add on the subject matter of global sustainable development which doesn't fit into any of the questions above? If so, here is room for it:

6. Please estimate your own degree of expertise on the subject matter of global sustainable development and mark the appropriate item with an X.

I consider myself…

( ) very well informed
( ) rather well informed
( ) somewhat informed
( ) rather uninformed
( ) uninformed

on that subject matter.

7. Evaluation of some measures proposed by the Global Marshall Plan initiative[212]:

[212] The Global Marshall Plan Initiative was founded in Germany in 2003. It seeks to „balance the world" with a „planetary contract" and with an „eco-social market economy", i.e. an economy that incorporates ecological and social rules in its legal framework. For more information, see www.globalmarshallplan.org

Listed below are some of the cornerstones of the strategy of the Global Marshall Plan[213]. Please judge whether the measures described are conducive to global sustainable development, or what you think of these measures in general. If you feel unable to indicate this for lack of familiarity with the concept of Global Marshall Plan, or for any other reason, please indicate this.

a. The general idea of a worldwide eco-social market economy is that of a market economy within a framework of ecological and social rules in order to bring the economy into harmony with society and the environment.[214] Please judge whether this type of economy would be (mark appropriate item by typing an x into the brackets):

( ) very good for global sustainable development
( ) rather good for global sustainable development
( ) ambivalent / there are good and bad sides
( ) rather bad for global sustainable development
( ) very bad for global sustainable development
( ) can't say

Please tell us why you have come to that judgment:

b. The idea of „standards for co-financing" – this means that an agreement on international environmental and social standards is made („global contract"), after which the developing countries receive funds in return for meeting these standards[215]. Please judge whether such a measure would be:

( ) very good for global sustainable development
( ) rather good for global sustainable development
( ) ambivalent / there are good and bad sides
( ) rather bad for global sustainable development
( ) very bad for global sustainable development
( ) can't say

Please tell us why you have come to that judgment:

---

[213] Please note that these key points, though important, do not represent the strategy of the Global Marshall Plan in ist entirety, which is too complex to be broken down into a few items in a questionnaire. For more comprehensive information, see the website.

[214] The term „eco-social global" market economy does not, however, imply that non-market based economic models – such as solidarity-based economies in Latin America – should be suppressed. Rather, it means that ecological and social rules should apply on the level of the existing global market economy.

[215] Social standards: e.g. the standards of the International Labour Organisation, including freedom of association, elimination of discrimination in employment and occupation, abolition of child labour etc. (see http://www.adb.org/Documents/Handbooks/Core-Labor-Standards/default.asp for more)
Environmental standards: the standards agreed upon e.g. in the Convention on Biodiversity, the Ramsar Convention, the Washington Agreement on Endangered Species, the Kyoto Protocoll and the Protocoll of Montreal.

c. What do you think of the Global Marshall Plan's financing concept: Raising 100 billion US$ per year for the purposes desribed under (b) and for meeting the UN-Millennium Development Goals through – among others – a global Tobin Tax[216] and a tax on aeroplane and boat fuel (kerosene)

( ) very good for global sustainable development
( ) rather good for global sustainable development
( ) ambivalent / there are good and bad sides
( ) rather bad for global sustainable development
( ) very bad for global sustainable development
( ) can't say

Please tell us why you have come to that judgment:

d. The idea of a closer connection between the WTO and the Bretton Woods Institutions on the one hand with those of the United Nations on the other, e.g. by integrating the above-mentioned environmental and social standards into the rules of the WTO – please judge whether such a measure would be:

( ) very good for global sustainable development
( ) rather good for global sustainable development
( ) ambivalent / there are good and bad sides
( ) rather bad for global sustainable development
( ) very bad for global sustainable development
( ) can't say

Please tell us why you have come to that judgment:

[216] i.e. all trans-national money transfers would be burdened with a small standard tax of 0,01%.

8. Is there anything else you would like to add regarding the concept of the Global Marshall Plan? If so, here is room for it:

9. When did you first hear of the Global Marshall Plan?

( ) in the course of this survey
( ) a year ago or less
( ) more than a year ago

10. Please tell us a little about yourself:

a. Which organisation do you work for? What is the nature of your work?

b. What is/ are your field(s) of expertise?

( ) poverty, health, nutrition
( ) population growth
( ) climate and energy
( ) financing of development
( ) human rights in general
( ) women's rights and empowerment
( ) children's rights
( ) international governance
( ) cultural or religious issues
( ) other – please specify:

c. Which country do you live in and which is your country of origin? If these are not the same countries: how long have you been living in your current country of residence?

Thanks a lot for participating!