

Barcelona  
February 5-6 2004

# Earth Dialogues

BRIEFING BOOK FOR SPEAKERS  
Discussion Paper

THE ETHICAL DIMENSIONS OF THE EVOLVING SECURITY AND SUSTAINABILITY  
AGENDAS IN THE MEDITERRANEAN AND THE WORLD AT LARGE



Cambre de Comerç  
de Barcelona



# Earth Dialogues Barcelona

## Discussion Paper

### Table of Contents

A. The new global sustainability ethics	4
B. The new and emerging sustainability challenges	10
C. The new and emerging security challenges	14
D. The World Summit for Sustainable Development (WSSD) advances and retreats	19
E. The critical path forward	26

## INTRODUCTION

On February 5-6, 2004, Green Cross International in collaboration with the city of Barcelona will host the *Earth Dialogues Barcelona*, as an official launch event for the Universal Forum of Cultures Barcelona 2004. The Forum Barcelona 2004 is a platform for thinking differently about three interrelated challenges: sustainable development, cultural diversity, and conditions for peace. Sharing the central goals of the Forum Barcelona 2004, the *Earth Dialogues Barcelona* will address the challenge of forging a new global agenda for peace and security that is grounded in the ethical values of sustainability and diversity.

Increasing tensions on the world scene, escalating terrorism, religious intolerance, environmental degradation, and the systematic violation of human rights all demonstrate now more than ever the need to understand the diverse roots of conflicts, as well as the links between poverty, environmental deterioration and scarcity, and peace and security. The Dialogues will examine the ecological, human and economic dimensions of the expanding concept of security, and will address the key ethical challenges of forging a deeper and longer-lasting global commitment to the values of sustainability, diversity, and peace and security.

This discussion paper provides the substantive background to the main issues that will be addressed throughout the opening and closing plenaries and the three parallels working group sessions. The discussion paper addresses the following themes:

- A. The new global sustainability ethics
- B. The new and emerging sustainability challenges
- C. The new and emerging security challenges
- D. The WSSD advances and retreats and
- E. The critical path forward

## A. THE NEW GLOBAL SUSTAINABILITY ETHICS

### I. The need for global ethics

### II. The importance of the Earth Charter

### III. The new and emerging global sustainability ethics

#### I. THE NEED FOR NEW GLOBAL ETHICS

##### The new global crises

As the Universal Declaration for a Global Ethic states, the world is “experiencing a fundamental crisis: a crisis in global economy, global ecology, and global politics. The lack of a grand vision, the tangle of unresolved problems, political paralysis, mediocre political leadership with little insight or foresight, and in general too little sense for the commonweal are seen everywhere. Too many old answers to new challenges.”

##### The new tensions

Professor Hans Kung, one of the authors of the Universal Declaration of a Global Ethic and Director of the Institute of Ecumenical Studies at Tübingen University identifies the new tensions as including the dangerous new clashes between believers and non-believers, between civilisations, and between fundamentalisms. On an even deeper level, the complexity of contemporary life generates tensions between important values such as the task of harmonizing diversity with unity, not to mention the conflict between private interests and the public good, as well as the choice between short-term gains and long-term benefits.

##### The need for a shared vision

As never before in history, the emerging world community beckons for a new understanding of the global situation. A shared vision of common values can provide and sustain an ethical foundation for a dialogue among civilizations. However a new sense of global interdependence is essential to renew collaborative efforts to foster a worldwide mindset of hope. As Mikhail Gorbachev states, “I believe that one of the most important things is the shaping of a new value system, because nature can live without us, but we cannot without nature. Instead of a hedonistic approach, we should promote an approach that reasonably limits consumerism and which promotes the virtue of “enoughness.” If we insist on consumerism as the new utopia, nature will reject such a system, as surely as cultural diversity rejected the totalitarian system. Our generation has to face a difficult challenge, but as recent history has proven, walls of difficulty, like the Berlin Wall, can fall.”

##### Universal principles necessary for the common good

As Maurice Strong has asserted, while it is true that every people have their own ethical principles, their own value systems, and their

own religious backgrounds, there are certain universal principles which we must all embrace for our common good to enable us to survive. Strong makes the further point that if our political processes are not guided by fundamental values and ethical principles, we will be working in a completely anarchistic system where the strong will always prevail and will not be subject to any real constraint or discipline or societal responsibility. Nobel Peace laureate Ang San Suu Kyi of Burma makes the point that the challenge we now face is for the different nations and peoples of the world to agree on a basic set of human values to serve as a unifying force in the development of a truly global community.

#### The scope of a global ethic

According to Professor Hans Kung, a global ethic is not a new ideology or superstructure. It is not intended to make the specific ethics of the different religions and superfluous. Neither is it intended to be a substitute for the Torah, the Sermon on the Mount, the Qur'an, the Bhagavadgita, the Discourses of the Buddha or the Sayings of Confucius. Kung maintains instead that a global ethic is the core consensus of the common values, standards, and basic attitudes from all of these great traditions. A global ethic should constitute a core of belief, which is acceptable to all. It should not impose one vision or to legislate away our differences. Rather it should strive for unity, and seek neither to eradicate nor compromise diversity. In "Crossing the Divide: Dialogue Between Civilisations", HRH Prince El Hassan Bin Talal of Jordan state that by providing a starting point that we can all agree upon, a global ethic would identify the fundamental values that are common to all

religious traditions, and distil from them the essence of human belief.

#### The importance of a global ethic for forging a better world order

Kung asserts that a better world order requires: (i) common values, ideals, aims and criteria; (ii) heightened global responsibility on the part of all individuals and their political leaders; and (iii) a new global ethic that provide "values for the global neighbourhood", in the words of the 1995 Commission on Global Governance. According to the 1995 World Commission on Culture and Development, a core of shared ethical values and principles would greatly facilitate collaboration between people of different cultures and interests, not to mention diminish and limit conflict. A better world is possibly only where all actors see themselves bound and motivated by shared commitments.

## II. THE IMPORTANCE OF THE EARTH CHARTER

The Earth Charter is an authoritative synthesis of common values, principles and aspirations, which together, provide an integrated framework for addressing the world's new generation of global survival problems. The Earth Charter's combination of core principles of respect for nature, social justice and commitment to human rights, democracy, peace and respect for diversity represent the core values that are widely shared across the world and which are needed to ensure the global transition for a sustainable future.

At a time when major changes are required in both lifestyles and mindsets, the Earth Charter challenges humanity to examine its values

and to choose a more just, peaceful and sustainable way of life. The Earth Charter calls for the search for common ground in the midst of growing global diversity and for the embracing of a new ethical vision that is indeed increasingly shared by growing numbers of individuals, cultures, and nations.

At the Earth Charter's formal launch in The Hague Peace Palace in 2000, then Dutch Minister for Agriculture Laurens Brinkhorst said that "without consciousness, without the sense of reflection, without the hope that we work for future generations, the work of today cannot succeed. And it is against that background that this document of consciousness is so important, because it gives a sense of mission." Shortly after, in the preface of the German translation of the Earth Charter, Klaus Toepfer, Executive-Director of UNEP stated that the "ecological aggression" that stems from the ecological footprint of the North is the starting point and lasting reason for conflict in the world. Toepfer asserted that the Earth Charter principles serve as important guidelines for redressing this form of aggression.

The principles of the Earth Charter reflect extensive worldwide, cross-cultural, interdisciplinary consultations and dialogue conducted over the last decade. These principles are also based upon contemporary science, philosophy, international law, and the insights of the world's religions and faith-based traditions.<sup>1</sup> The drafting of the Earth Charter was part of the unfinished business of the 1992 Rio Earth Summit. In 1994, Maurice Strong, Secretary-General of the Earth Summit and

Mikhail Gorbachev, President of Green Cross International launched the Earth Charter initiative with support from the Dutch Government.

The Earth Charter has succeeded in generating critical public and political support in recent years. Besides the groundswell of activity within civil society organizations around the world, many national governments have independently endorsed the Earth Charter, including the Governments of Costa Rica, Mexico, Jordan, Dominican Republic, Jamaica, Romania, Niger and the Republic of Tatarstan. The Intergovernmental Latin American & Caribbean Initiative for Sustainable Development, an agreement by all ministers of environment of the region, supported the Charter and reaffirmed this support in Johannesburg in 2002.

The most recent expression of political support is reflected in the recent decision of the 32nd General Conference of UNESCO, which took place in October 2003 "to recognize the Earth Charter as an important ethical framework for sustainable development" and to "acknowledge its ethical principles, its objectives and its contents, as an expression that coincides with the vision that UNESCO has with regard to their new Medium-Term Strategy for 2002-2007." Furthermore, all Member States except the United States affirmed their intention "to utilize the Earth Charter as an educational instrument, particularly in the framework of the United Nations Decade for Education for Sustainable Development" which begins in 2005. UNESCO will be the leading organisation in this initia-

<sup>1</sup> See [www.earthcharter.org](http://www.earthcharter.org)

tive and the Earth Charter has now been officially regarded as an important tool for the Decade.

### III. THE NEW AND EMERGING SUSTAINABILITY ETHICS <sup>2</sup>

This section provides an overview of the fundamental ethical principles that have governed the sustainable development movement in recent years. These principles are enshrined in a wide range of international instruments, ranging from the 1972 Stockholm Declaration on the Human Environment, the 1982 World Charter for Nature, the 1992 Rio Declaration on Environment and Development, the 2003 Johannesburg Declaration on Sustainable Development, as well as the Earth Charter. These sustainability ethics include, *inter alia*, the following principles, which are described below:

- Respect for Earth and all life in all its diversity
- Interdependence and intrinsic value of all life forms
- Inherent dignity of all human beings
- Care for the community of life
- Common but differentiated responsibilities
- The ethos of justice, democracy and peace

#### Respect for Earth and all life in all its diversity

The principle of “Respect for earth and all life” is the foundational principle of the Earth Charter. It provides the spiritual and ethical basis upon which humans should interact with each other and with the ecological world. The ethic of respect is founded on a belief in people as a creative force, and in the value of

<sup>2</sup> ??????????

every human and all beings.

Since human life is sustained by all other animate and inanimate beings, respect for, and a sense of co-existence with, nature is an important basis for human actions. The ethic of respect recognizes the interdependence of human and natural communities, and the duty of each person to care for all beings, as well as future generations. Respect grows out of an understanding and appreciation of the diversity, interdependence and intrinsic value of all beings. The Earth Charter’s respect principle focuses on Earth and life in all its diversity, recognizing the interrelationship of all human and non-human forms, which comprise the web of life.

#### Interdependence and intrinsic value of all life forms

This ethical principle highlights that all human and non-human life on earth are part of one great interdependent system. They influence and depend on all components of the planet – the air, waters, and soils. The Earth community, of which humankind is a part, functions in interrelated cycles, processes and systems. It is the maintenance of this delicate balance of interdependence, which is essential to the well-being of the larger community of life. Since all components of the web of life are interdependent, what harm befalls one component, ultimately affects the larger community of life. Each being is unique, and each contributes in an integral way to the integrity of ecological systems.

Affirmation of the interdependence of all beings is grounded in the ethic of the intrin-

insic value of all life forms. This entails that all species and all living beings warrant respect regardless of their utilitarian or instrumental value to humanity. The development of this ethical principle is a response to former utilitarian approaches, which limited legal protection to life forms that were perceived to be immediately useful for economic purposes.

#### Inherent dignity of all human beings

The principle of the inherent dignity of all humans is closely tied to the principles of interdependence, intrinsic value and respect. All human rights are founded on the respect for the dignity and inherent worth of all persons, regardless of their race, religion, sex, national identity, etc. The inherent dignity of human beings is not wholly measurable in material terms, but is also linked to intangible values such as spiritual and emotional well-being. Human dignity, together with human rights and fundamental freedoms, equality, equity and social justice constitute the fundamental values of all societies. Indeed, the pursuit, promotion and protection of these values provide the basic legitimacy of all institutions and the benchmark against which the credibility and social responsiveness of the institutions of any state should be measured.

#### Care for the community of life

The principle of care for the community of life follows from the principle of respect. The Earth Charter language refers to the importance of care for the community of life with “understanding, compassion, and love”. These important qualifiers emphasize the new ethic and attitudes that are required in the discharge of the responsibilities for caring for humanity and the natural world. The principle

of care implies a relationship of stewardship whereby each and every person, group or nation, has a common but differentiated responsibility for preserving and advancing the common good, the well-being of the planet and the whole human family.

#### Common but differentiated responsibilities

The new generation of global survival problems transcends conventional geo-political boundaries. As such, the resolution of these problems requires a new expression of shared responsibility in order to develop effective solutions. However, not all state and non-state actors can or should share the same degree of responsibility for the causes of global environmental problems. Therefore the equitable sharing of the burden of responsibility for responding to these problems should be apportioned according to capacity, capability and the degree to which a given actor’s actions contributed to the problem at hand. This concept of “common but differentiated responsibilities” implies that all actors must share in the global effort for preserving the well being of the Earth, but that the precise scope of these efforts will be differentiated according to special capacities and situations.

#### The ethos of justice, democracy and peace

The Earth Charter calls for the creation of democratic societies that are “just, participatory, sustainable and peaceful”. These principles are specifically referred to in the preamble of the Earth Charter as the essential underpinnings for a sustainable global society. This principle brings together the imperatives of justice, in all its various forms, sustainable development, the democratic principle of participation and the culture of peace, recogniz-



ing that all these values do form an indivisible whole, and that each are interdependent and mutually reinforcing.

The realization of all these values is essential for the flourishing of the human potential. For example, respect for the rule of law is an important element of a just society. This implies the existence of an independent judicial system that is capable of creating and applying laws and regulations that have been promulgated through democratically legitimate and accountable legislative processes. A participatory society is one that guarantees that all persons have a role in their governance. A sustainable society is one that respects nature, ensures that its essential processes are not impaired and supports economic and social justice. And a peaceful society is one that is free of conflict and aggression and protects its inhabitants from all forms of threats to their security.

#### Intergenerational equity

This principle imposes a moral duty on present generations to manage natural, social and human capital resources in such a way that

they can be transmitted to future generations in no worse condition in which they were received. The language in the Earth Charter calls for the securing of “Earth’s bounty and beauty for present and future generations”. The Earth’s “bounty” can be interpreted as including a healthy environment; uncompromised genetic viability; the preservation of biodiversity, including the maintenance of populations of all life forms at least at levels sufficient for their survival; and the assurance of the regenerative capacities of the Earth’s ecological systems. The reference to “beauty” implies the need for protection of not just the essential ecological functions of natural systems, but also preservation of the natural aesthetic beauty of the natural world. In the Earth Charter reference is made to the importance of not just transmitting a healthy physical environment, but as well the “values, traditions, and institutions that support the long-term flourishing of Earth’s human and ecological communities”.

## B. NEW AND EMERGING SUSTAINABILITY CHALLENGES

### I. Global sustainability challenges

#### II. Mediterranean sustainability challenges

### I. GLOBAL SUSTAINABILITY CHALLENGES <sup>3</sup>

The following provides a very brief overview of the new and emerging global sustainability challenges.

#### The Development Challenges

One of the central development challenges in the post-WSSD era should be the framing of a new development paradigm, which would not only take into account economic growth imperatives, and environmental protection, but which would also assure broad-based participation and an equitable distribution of economic benefits between and within states. While the WSSD renewed political momentum for the elevation of the poverty eradication challenge, that political impetus has yet to be matched by the necessary resources. At the same time, renewed efforts are needed to empower the poor to ensure that the actual “beneficiaries” of poverty eradication strategies are given the tools and resources to participate and to exert their influence in the development of poverty eradication strategies, but also in developing their own definitions of poverty and poverty levels that are appropriate to their cultural, social and economic conditions. Moreover, it will be important to examine the poverty-related impacts of the

conditionalities, which are often imposed by the Bretton Woods institutions and which tend to perpetuate poverty and under-development.

#### The Sustainable Consumption and Production Challenges

Despite lack of formal agreement at Johannesburg, the international community has now seized the opportunity to deal seriously with the energy efficiency challenge. Political good-will will not be enough and serious efforts are needed to address the role that perverse subsidies play in perpetuating unsustainable energy production and in preventing the opening up larger shares of the global energy market to renewables. One of the most significant contributions that the North could make to demonstrate its commitment to changing consumption and production patterns would be to agree to a target for the reduction of overall consumption of natural resources within the EU and North America in order to create opportunities for the developing world to have fair and equitable access to natural resources. At the European preparatory negotiations in Geneva in September 2001, former UK Environment Minister Michael Meacher made a very hard-hitting point that the ecological consequences

<sup>3</sup> ??????????

of failed decoupling efforts will be enormous and irreversible. He argued that new strategies would be needed that harness the market to ensure more efficient resource use, through novel market based instruments, incentives for cleaner production and low cost environmentally sound technology, as well as expanded corporate responsibility. The corporate responsibility and accountability agenda will also need renewed support at all levels in light of the increasing consolidation of corporate power and influence.

#### The Financing for Development Agenda

In many cases, Northern development cooperation has often focused on the so-called “financial fix”. In actual cases, in some cases, ODA has actually increased poverty of the “recipient” countries and has in other cases, engendered a relationship of dependency. Of course, one of the fundamental problems asserted by many NGOs is that the international financial architecture does not work, and is ill-equipped to support the cause of poverty eradication. Many developing countries argue that the Heavily Indebted Poor Countries initiative (HIPC) has not solved the debt issue and that concrete measures are needed to ensure that the process is improved and that its scope is broadened to include more developing countries. As well, it was felt that the debt issue should be addressed in terms of both the implications of the financial debt incurred by the South and the ecological debt incurred by the North.

#### The Global Governance Reform Challenges

There are a number of important issues that remain to be fully addressed on the global governance reform agenda. First, the issue of

strengthening UNEP will require continued attention and focus, not to mention the ongoing debate regarding the need for an environmental institutional counterweight to the WTO. Of course, the continuing democratic deficit in the international institutional machinery will have to be addressed more meaningfully, alongside the challenge of ensuring the fair and equitable distribution of bargaining power to enable the influence and voice of the world’s poor is heard and reflected in the decisions of international environmental governance processes. In addition to ongoing efforts to address the coordination and coherence challenge, renewed efforts will be needed to address the enforcement and compliance gap.

#### The Globalisation Challenges

Some of the key globalisation challenges that must be addressed include reconciling the trade and environment dilemma, improving market access for poor countries and reducing domestic tariffs and subsidies, e.g. agriculture must be addressed more effectively, as well as ensuring that sustainable development is more firmly embedded on the agenda of the WTO Doha trade negotiations.

#### The Environment Challenges

The new generation of international environmental policymaking must be framed in the context of the larger goal of poverty eradication, and to this extent, environmental policies must be developed that support the achievement of sustainable livelihoods and which recognize the poor as important agents of change. Another key issue on the environment agenda is the need to ensure greater fairness and equity in terms of access for the

poor to productive resources such as land. Hardly enough reference to the linkage between poverty, environmental degradation and security in the WSSD final outcomes and this omission must be addressed.

## II. MEDITERRANEAN SUSTAINABILITY CHALLENGES <sup>4</sup>

The following provides a very brief overview of the key sustainability challenges faced by the Mediterranean.

### The Environmental Challenges in the Mediterranean Region

The Mediterranean is home to some of the most important biological resources in the world however, many endemic species in the region are threatened with extinction. A related problem is climate change, which has led to increased sea-level rise throughout the region. This continuing trend could mean the loss of kilometres of shoreline along the Mediterranean coast, which is particularly serious for small islands and unique cities such as Venice. As regards marine challenges, the land-locked waters of the Mediterranean have very low rates of renewal (i.e. 80 to 90 years) and are therefore extremely vulnerable to pollution. The Mediterranean represents less than 1 percent of the earth's total marine surface. However, oil tanker traffic through this sea accounts for more than 20 percent of the global traffic. Every year, 635,000 tonnes of crude oil are spilled by vessels in the sea and 80 percent of the urban sewage is dis-

charged untreated. Moreover, over 85 percent of Mediterranean forests have already disappeared due to threats such as fragmentation, road construction, tourism, forest fires, land clearing for agriculture and overgrazing. Human-induced fires account for 95 percent of all Mediterranean forest fires.

In addition, tourism is an increasingly important challenge for the region, since the Mediterranean is now the most important tourist destination in the world. Of the 220 million tourists who frequent the region every year, over 100 million tourists go to the Mediterranean beaches. This level of mass tourism has led to degraded landscapes, soil erosion, increased waste discharges, habitat destruction and water scarcity. It is estimated that more than half of the coastline and dune systems have been lost due to tourist development. A related problem is desertification, with approximately 300,000 sq km of land in the European coastal zone of the Mediterranean now faced with desertification, which affects the livelihood of 16.5 million people. In Tunisia and Spain alone the costs of desertification have been evaluated at \$100 million and \$200 million per year respectively.

Of course, one of the most serious environmental challenges is water scarcity. Water resources in the region are being wasted through inefficient irrigation and drainage schemes. River engineering and dam construction continue to alter river and floodplains systems and these schemes result in the

<sup>4</sup> The following summary of Mediterranean sustainability challenges has been drawn from a range of sources obtained from the web sites of WWF Mediterranean Office (see [www.panda.org/about\\_wwf/where\\_we\\_work/europea/where/mediterranean](http://www.panda.org/about_wwf/where_we_work/europea/where/mediterranean)) and Friends of the Earth Mediterranean Network MEDNET (see [www.foemednet.org](http://www.foemednet.org))

loss of species and habitats. International disputes over water continue in Turkey, Syria, Iraq and other parts of the Middle East.

Mediterranean agriculture is among the most ancient in the world. However in the past 50 years, the development of intensive agriculture with excessive use of chemical pesticides and fertilisers risk have had considerable impacts on agriculture resources.

#### The Human and Economic Development Challenges in the Mediterranean Region

The Mediterranean region is characterized by a rapidly growing population, relatively high illiteracy levels, and rising unemployment due to low productivity growth, which in turn has led to a situation whereby the labour force is actually increasing faster than output growth. Most Mediterranean countries are middle- to low- income countries, with an average GDP per capita of approximately USD 2,100, compared to USD 20,800 for the EU.

When considering measurements on scores of human freedom, gender empowerment and access to knowledge, the Arab Development Report 2002 has highlighted startling deficits in three key areas: first, the region is by far worldwide the worst performer for human freedom; second, the region has a considerable women's empowerment deficit and finally, a knowledge and information deficit.<sup>5</sup>

Low levels of economic growth and productivity can be partly explained by the fact that

the region lags behind other developing regions in terms of their promotion of human development. Access to quality education and the level of mean years of schooling is far below the level achieved in other regions such as East Asia. Another key human development challenge is the inadequate quality of health care in the region, which often tends to have greatest impacts on women.

<sup>5</sup> Konrad-Adenauer Stiftung, "Challenges and Options for Human Development in the Arab World". [http://www.kas.de/international/entwicklung/frauen/1310\\_webseite.html](http://www.kas.de/international/entwicklung/frauen/1310_webseite.html).

## C. THE NEW AND EMERGING SECURITY CHALLENGES

### I. The sources of conflict

### II. Limitations of the conventional security approach

### III. The new comprehensive security approach

### IV. The Mediterranean security challenges

## I. THE SOURCES OF CONFLICT

### The new security tensions

As noted in the Declaration Toward a Global Ethic, “after two world wars, the collapse of fascism, Nazism, communism and colonialism and the end of the cold war, humanity has entered a new phase of its history.” As Her Majesty Queen Noor of Jordan points out, for most of the world, security tensions center “less on boundaries and external might, and more on internal conflict stemming from poverty, displaced peoples, economic instability and competition over shared resources, such as water and arable land”.

### The growing inequities

It is a sad irony that while technological progress has developed at a staggering pace, we are faced with a world that is overwhelmed with increasing levels of poverty, hunger, unemployment, misery, social exclusion and marginalisation and environmental degradation. Indeed, while humanity today possesses more economic, cultural and spiritual

resources than ever before in order to create a better global order, new ethnic, national tensions have become increasingly dangerous threats to that possibility.

### The poverty and conflict nexus

Former Swedish Prime Minister Carl Bildt asserts that it is a myth that poverty takes people to terrorism. However, it is clear that a world, in which hundreds of millions of people face only desperation and deprivation, will become a world in which there will be fertile grounds for those seeking destruction. Bildt argues that a real or perceived failure to address these needs could play into the hands of those seeking to destroy a more open and integrated world.

### Breaking the cycle of conflict

Gareth Evans, former Australian Foreign Minister asserts that breaking the cycle of conflict requires:

- Effective prevention – assessing the roots of the situation

- Effective reaction – when prevention fails, using military force as a last resort
- Follow-through – peace building efforts in the wake of violent conflict to preclude the risk of reoccurrence. <sup>6</sup>
- The global order has to be consciously constructed and mechanisms found to tackle the negative consequences of social dislocation. <sup>7</sup>
- A key component of this involves establishing in developing nations the type of resilient institutional mechanisms that have evolved in Western nations. <sup>8</sup>

### III. LIMITATIONS OF THE CONVENTIONAL SECURITY APPROACH

#### The conventional security approach

Historically, conventional security policy was based on the assumption that security problems are derived from the actions of other states, usually in a military capacity. Security concerns were typically understood as synonymous with the security of the state against external dangers. As such, it was typically believed that security threats could best be solved by increasing military capabilities.

#### Limitations of the militarist approach

The conventional security approach has been about preserving state sovereignty, and maintaining the balance of power, not to mention territorial integrity. This narrow approach to security has led to a paradoxical failure, namely the pursuit of national security, which has not been able to provide security from many of the new threats that have emerged in recent years, such as resource shortages, civil

wars and conflict, threats to human rights, global warming, destabilisation caused by poverty and famine. The conventional approach to security has a number of other critical shortcomings. Namely, it ignores the underlying reasons for conflict neglects the various forms of non-violent conflict resolution, which are better suited to redressing the root causes of conflict. As well, this statist and militarist approach to security may also induce insecurity in other states, and may engender other hostilities. <sup>9</sup> And in many cases, it has become clear that states themselves can represent great threats to human security, as in the case of Rwanda and Yugoslavia.

### III. THE COMPREHENSIVE SECURITY APPROACH

#### Contribution of the Social Summit

The 1995 UN Summit for Social Development affirmed that real security can only exist in a world where resources are available to all and that real defence is about making people stronger by meeting their basic human needs, and that security is not just about the absence of threats but about the presence of basic human needs such as food, water, shelter, access to education, and sanitation.

#### The comprehensive security definition

The definition of security is no longer limited to military might but extends to a more comprehensive definition encompassing economic strength, internal cohesion, food security, energy security, a clean environment, equality before law and good governance. These ele-

<sup>6</sup> Evans, Gareth. "Preventing Deadly Conflict and the Problem of Political Will", Lecture. 2002.

<sup>7</sup> Mishra, Brajesh. "Global Security: An Indian Perspective", Address at National Defence Institute, Lisbon. 13 April 2002.

<sup>8</sup>

<sup>9</sup> See [www.worldsummit.org.za/policies/ceasefire.html](http://www.worldsummit.org.za/policies/ceasefire.html).

ments all form part of the emerging comprehensive security approach. The comprehensive approach to security develops the notion that society's interests are just as important as the state interest in protecting national borders. Indeed, former Swedish Prime Minister Carl Bildt makes the point that while the possible presence of weapons of mass destruction is a source of acute concern, so should the absence of human rights and institutions and processes necessary for economic and social development, as well as environmental protection.

Her Majesty Queen Noor of Jordan states that "genuine security is a multifaceted idea, and must be explored by thinking across boundaries, national, ideological, cultural and disciplinary. She asserts that any definition wide enough to embrace anything is no definition at all. But to be effective, a comprehensive definition of security must include growth, poverty alleviation, political stability and peace. "In the largest, truest sense, security is about quality of life. Ultimately, we need a more holistic and flexible definition of security, not a besieged fortress but a safety net." <sup>10</sup>

#### Human security

In its broadest expression, human security embraces such dimensions as:

- Personal and physical security including a safe and healthy environment
- Economic security including access to meaningful and productive employment

- Social security including protection from discrimination based on age and social status combined with access to social safety nets to protect the vulnerable and marginalised sectors of society
- Political security including protection of human rights, access to information, participation and justice, and protection from oppression and the consequences of conflict
- Ethnic and cultural diversity contributing to a social climate in which minority populations are free to assert their cultural identity.

#### Ecological security

In its broadest expression, ecological security embraces such dimensions as:

- The environmental impacts of war and conflict
- The security threats presented by transboundary pollution, particularly in regards to economic impacts and the consequences for food and resource supplies, as well as human well-being
- The impacts of environmental scarcity on the perpetuation of poverty, which in turn may lead to increased conflict

#### Transboundary water security challenges

The environmental security-related crisis of transboundary water in the Middle East calls for the careful examination of issues, which could contribute to potential future conflicts in the region and pose barriers to sustainable

<sup>10</sup> Her Majesty Queen Noor of Jordan, "Towards a New Definition of Security". Kennedy School of Government, Harvard University. Boston. 18 April 2002.



development, for example, in the Jordan River Basin shared by Israel, Palestine, Jordan, Syria and Lebanon.

#### The new security ethics

The “culture of tolerance, non-violence and peace”, as enshrined in Principle 16 of the Earth Charter, provides an important ethical underpinning to the comprehensive security agenda. The culture of peace expresses a concept that goes beyond ideas of disarmament or the prevention of conflict. It implies that peace means much more than the absence of violence, war and conflict. The culture of peace represents a complex of attitudes, values, beliefs and patterns of behaviour that promote the peaceful settlement of conflict, the quest for mutual understanding, and which enable individuals to live harmoniously with each other and the larger community of life. It presumes that peace is a way of being, doing and living in society that can be taught, developed, and improved upon.

The Earth Charter’s main principle 16 embraces six important supporting principles that give further expression to the culture of peace. These include:

- Mutual understanding, solidarity and cooperation;
- Conflict prevention and collaborative problem-solving;
- Demilitarization;
- Elimination of weapons of mass destruction;

- Peaceful uses of orbital and outer space;
- Peace as the wholeness created by harmonious social relationships.

#### IV. THE MEDITERRANEAN SECURITY CHALLENGES

There are a number of critical security challenges that are currently facing the Mediterranean. First, poverty and worsening economic inequalities between the Northern and Southern regions of the Mediterranean are becoming increasingly prevalent, creating growing tensions throughout.<sup>11</sup>

Second, unemployment and poverty are acquiring an increasingly rural character and are exacerbating the intensity of the migratory phenomenon and its impact on environmental stresses. Rural economies must be stimulated with governments taking an active role in improving rural infrastructure and farm-to-market linkages, as well as in reforming price structures in favour of producers.<sup>12</sup>

Third, growing violent manifestations of intolerance, racism and xenophobia, as well as the large number of human rights violations in the region have also been significant drawbacks in the efforts to achieve sustained security and peace in the area.

Fourth, the continuation of political conflicts in the Middle East, as well as the division of Cyprus, present additional challenges for peace and security in the Mediterranean. The

<sup>11</sup> Using Human Capabilities: Recapturing Economic Growth and Reducing Human Poverty, Arab Human Development Report 2002, Ch. 6, 5.

<sup>12</sup> Ibid, 4-5.

failure of the Middle East Peace Process, the emergence of the second Intifada in 2000, not to mention the 9/11 terrorist attack, as well as the war in Iraq, have all frustrated the realisation of the Barcelona Process, which seeks to build peace and stability, shared prosperity and intercultural understanding in the Mediterranean. <sup>13</sup>

Transforming the Mediterranean basin into an area of dialogue, exchange and peace will require a significant strengthening of democracy and respect for human rights, sustainable and balanced economic and social development, enhanced poverty eradication and most certainly, a greater understanding between cultures.

<sup>13</sup> Javier Solana. "Old and New Challenges of the Barcelona Process", 1-3.

## D. JOHANNESBURG ADVANCES AND RETREATS <sup>14</sup>

### I. Overview of the WSSD Outcomes

### II. WSSD Advances

### III. WSSD Retreats

## DI. OVERVIEW OF THE WSSD OUTCOMES

### Overview of the WSSD

The World Summit on Sustainable Development (WSSD) took place in Johannesburg, South Africa from 26 August to 4 September, 2002. The WSSD brought together tens of thousands of participants, including heads of State and Government, national delegates and leaders from non-governmental organizations (NGOs), businesses and other major groups to focus the world's attention and direct action toward meeting difficult global sustainable development challenges.

The primary objective of the WSSD was to examine progress in the ten years since the 1992 Earth Summit that was held in Rio, with particular focus on the implementation challenges with Agenda 21. In undertaking that review, the Summit also reaffirmed sustainable development as a central element of the international agenda and gave new impetus for global action to fight poverty and protect the

environment. Governments agreed to and reaffirmed a wide range of concrete commitments and targets to strengthen sustainable development objectives. These were reflected in the main outputs of the Summit, namely the Johannesburg Plan of Implementation, as well the Johannesburg Declaration on Sustainable Development, and the Type II Partnership Initiatives.

The key commitments in the Johannesburg Plan of Implementation

The most important commitments that were agreed to at the World Summit for Sustainable Development are summarised below.

- **Poverty** – Halve by the year 2015, the proportion of the world's people whose income is less than \$1 a day and the proportion of people who live in hunger. By 2020, achieve a significant improvement in the lives of at least 100 million slum dwellers. And establish a world solidarity fund to eradicate poverty and promote social and human development in developing countries.

<sup>14</sup> This section is drawn from a chapter that was originally prepared by Johannah Bernstein for LEAD International for their CD Rom entitled "The Intergovernmental System". For further information see [www.lead.org](http://www.lead.org)

- **Water and Sanitation** – Halve, by the year 2015, the proportion of people without access to safe drinking water. Halve, by the year 2015, the proportion of people who do not have access to basic sanitation.
- **Energy**- Improve access to reliable, affordable and environmentally and socially sound energy services and resources.
- **Natural Resource Management** - Encourage the application by 2010 of the ecosystem approach for the sustainable development of oceans. By 2015, maintain or restore the depleted fish stocks to levels that can provide maximum sustainable yield. By 2010, reverse the processes that have destroyed half of the world's biodiversity resources
- **Health** – Enhance health education with the objective of achieving improved health literacy on a global basis by 2010. Reduce, by 2015, mortality rates for infants and children under 5 by 2/3 and maternal mortality rates by 1/2 of the prevailing rate in 2000. Reduce HIV prevalence in affected countries by 25% in affected countries

#### Overview of the Millennium Development Goals

The Millennium Development Goals (MDGs) were agreed to by world leaders at the 2000 UN Millennium Summit. As such, they represent an important international consensus for the reduction of poverty and the promotion of sustainable human development. The MDGs were not a formal outcome per se of the World Summit for Sustainable Development. However, they were reaffirmed throughout the

text of the Johannesburg Plan of Implementation, thereby signalling the unequivocal support of the international community for their full implementation. The concrete targets and timetables contained within the MDGs were an important catalyst for the articulation of many of the other targets and timetables contained within the Johannesburg Plan of Implementation.

The eight MDGs are summarised below:

**Goal 1: Eradicate extreme poverty and hunger**  
Halve, between 1990 and 2015, the proportion of people whose income is less than \$1 a day  
Halve, between 1990 and 2015, the proportion of people who suffer from hunger

**Goal 2: Achieve universal primary education**  
Ensure that, by 2015, children everywhere, boys and girls alike, will be able to complete a full course of primary schooling

**Goal 3: Promote gender equality and empower women**  
Eliminate gender disparity in primary and secondary education preferably by 2005 and in all levels of education no later than 2015

**Goal 4: Reduce child mortality**  
Reduce by two-thirds, between 1990 and 2015, the under-five mortality rate

**Goal 5: Improve maternal health**  
Reduce by three-quarters, between 1990 and 2015, the maternal mortality ratio

**Goal 6: Combat HIV/AIDS, malaria,  
and other diseases**

Have halted by 2015 and begun to reverse the spread of HIV/AIDS

Have halted by 2015 and begun to reverse the incidence of malaria and other major diseases

**Goal 7: Ensure environmental sustainability**

Integrate the principles of sustainable development into country policies and program and reverse the loss of environmental resources

Halve, by 2015, the proportion of people without sustainable access to safe drinking water

Have achieved, by 2020, a significant improvement in the lives of at least 100 million slum dwellers

**Goal 8: Develop a global partnership  
for development**

Develop further an open, rule-based, predictable, non-discriminatory trading and financial system (includes a commitment to good governance, development, and poverty reduction—both nationally and internationally)

Address the special needs of the least developed countries (includes tariff-and quota-free access for exports enhanced program of debt relief for HIPC and cancellation of official bilateral debt, and more generous ODA for countries committed to poverty reduction)

Address the special needs of landlocked countries and small island developing states (through the Barbados Programme and the 22nd General Assembly provisions)

Deal comprehensively with the debt problems of developing countries through national and international measures in order to make debt sustainable in the long term

## D. THE JOHANNESBURG ADVANCES AND RETREATS <sup>15</sup>

### I. The Johannesburg Advances

### II. The Johannesburg Retreats

#### I. The Johannesburg Advances

##### MDGs firmly embedded on the political agenda

One of the most important outcomes of the WSSD was the extent to which the MDGs have been re-affirmed and highlighted as the primary critical path towards the eradication of poverty and the promotion of human development. Indeed, hitherto ignored issues such as access to water and sanitation were given considerable prominence on the international political agenda. Although the MDGs were formally adopted at the 2000 Millennium Summit, they remained rather low on the international political agenda until the actual WSSD. In the aftermath of Johannesburg, the international community's renewed interest and support is now reflected in the considerable amount of work that is being done in multilateral and bilateral aid institutions to realign development cooperation in line with these important goals.

##### Integration agenda advanced

For the first time, the international community, at least on paper, seems to have grasped that the advancement of sustainable development requires thoughtful integration of three pillars, notably, economic, environment and social. Social and economic concerns received a similar level of support at Johannesburg as did the global environment at the Rio Earth Summit. Unlike Agenda 21, the Johannesburg Plan of Implementation recognizes poverty as an underlying theme, linked to its multiple dimensions, from access to energy, water and sanitation, to the equitable sharing of benefits of biodiversity. While the concrete poverty-related commitments (i.e. increasing access to sanitation and clean water) simply reiterated previously agreed Millennium Development Goals, they nevertheless signalled the international community's intention to move the human development agenda forward, and in so doing, advance the integrated concept of sustainable development.

<sup>15</sup> This section was also drawn from the above-noted WSSD Chapter that was prepared by Johannah Bernstein for LEAD International.

### Green successes

There were a number of green successes, and these consisted primarily of unilateral declarations of support for the Kyoto Protocol. With over 73 countries having ratified, Johannesburg served to highlight for the world at large, the extent of the US's unhelpful behaviour on this critical global survival issue.

### Recognition of the limitations of mega-summitry

A clear recognition was expressed that the world cannot afford to repeat the pattern and process of the last ten years of endless discussions about sustainable development, which have led to few real commitments. Johannesburg catalysed a growing consensus that mega-summits have outgrown their usefulness and that the challenges of implementation and operationalisation must be advanced in smaller more focused forums.

### New developments addressed

The Johannesburg Plan of Implementation is noteworthy for its treatment of issues in a way that reflects the new global developments that have emerged since 1992. For example, there is an entirely separate chapter on globalisation, an issue which received absolutely no attention in Agenda 21. To this end, the Summit took an important step in acknowledging the uneven distribution of benefits of globalisation and the serious challenges, including serious financial crises, insecurity, poverty, exclusion and inequality that are faced by developing countries and countries with economies in transition.

### Corporate responsibility agenda advanced

Since the 1992 Earth Summit was unable to agree on corporate responsibility language, the adoption of the corporate responsibility language in the Johannesburg Plan of Implementation is thus an important step forward in articulating an international consensus on the need to make corporations accountable for their actions. The agreement on the key language was in large part a result of the combination of skilled NGO lobbying together with a number of critical governments, who were ready, willing and able to stand up to US attempts to dilute text. Another positive outcome of the language is the fact that the WSSD's step forward on corporate responsibility has catalysed widespread cooperation among the NGO community, most notably between mainstream groups such as the Eco-Equity coalition together with FOE International, CorpWatch, Christian Aid, Greenpeace International, the Third World Network.

### Enhanced stakeholder participation

From the non-State actor perspective, the participation of women, youth, NGOs, parliamentarians, trade unions, local authorities, scientists and other stakeholders was greater at Johannesburg than it was in Rio, where many key groups were almost exclusively restricted from the substantive negotiation sessions. Another group whose participation also increased significantly was the private sector.

### Spotlight on Africa

Notwithstanding the entire chapter devoted to African sustainable development priorities, the fact that the Summit was held in Africa was also significant in its recognition of the

priority concerns of that continent such as the impact of HIV/AIDS, desertification, food security, poverty and debt relief.

#### Specific targets agreed

Unlike Agenda 21, the Johannesburg Plan of Implementation contains a significant number of concrete time-bound targets for the advancement of a wide range of sustainable development goals including: poverty eradication; health, education, water and sanitation, biodiversity, as well as a number of issues related to the promotion of new partnerships for sustainable development.

## II. The Johannesburg Retreats

#### Discrepancy between political statements and negotiation text

Many NGOs asserted that there was a significant discrepancy between the grand rhetoric of the world's leaders and the language in the Plan of Implementation and the Political Declaration. Heads of state made visionary statements and grand pronouncements on issues from renewable energy to making globalisation work for sustainable development. However, there seemed to be a worrisome disconnect between their words and the deals that were struck by their negotiators and Ministers. In some cases, it was felt that negotiators had undermined numerous international agreements and efforts to promote sustainable development in several of the provisions of the Plan of Implementation.

#### Political will as the missing link

A common theme throughout the head of state and government speeches, was the urgent need for political will. Kofi Annan

emphasised the need for enhanced political leadership and responsibility for the poor and the most vulnerable members of society. Political leaders such as Belgian Prime Minister Guy Verhofstadt also made strong statements regarding the need for political leadership and the lack of political will to implement the policy solutions that have been advanced in numerous international forums. Johannesburg should have taken a bolder step in addressing the root causes that continue to impede the mobilisation of political will to advance the sustainability agenda.

#### Old text renegotiated and watered down

Many felt that much of what was agreed to in Johannesburg had earlier been addressed in previous intergovernmental processes. For example, "new" aid packages from rich countries proved to be "warmed-up" pledges that were first made at last spring's Financing for Development Conference in Monterrey. Furthermore, talks on market access and farm subsidies reconfirmed promises on freeing trade that were made at WTO talks in Doha last year. With regard to some of the Rio principles (i.e. precautionary principle, common but differentiated responsibilities) the original Rio Declaration was unfortunately re-opened for debate. In key areas such as biodiversity and chemicals, the text appeared to retreat with language that is weaker than commitments made in the Biodiversity other international instruments.

#### The paramountcy of trade

Some NGOs felt that at times it seemed that the international community was negotiating a trade text, with other issues relegated to the periphery. Many NGOs argued that environ-



mental and poverty reduction interests were once again being “hijacked” by the short-term demands of trade ministries and special interest lobbying forces. Subsidies, MEAs, sustainability assessments and the precautionary principle remained in complete deadlock with certain governments calling for MEAs to be consistent with WTO rights and obligations.

#### Step backward on aid

NGOs maintained that the agreed text represented a step backward from the Agenda 21 commitment by developed countries to “reach” the target of providing 0.7% of their GNP in aid. Instead, the Johannesburg Plan of Implementation merely urges developed countries to make concrete commitments towards the ODA target. And while the text commits governments to make available the increased ODA commitments announced at Monterrey, it commits no new resources. It also fails to acknowledge the massive shortfall in aid levels needed to achieve MDGs, even after the delivery of Monterrey commitments.

#### Disappointments over energy

One of the biggest disappointments from an NGO perspective was the lack of agreed targets for increasing the world share of renewable energy, not to mention the lack of targets to deliver energy to the 2 billion poor who do not have access to electricity. NGOs did however welcome Germany’s Chancellor Schroeder’s commitment to provide 500 million EUR to build a strategic alliance with developing countries for the promotion of renewable energy and a further 500 million EUR for improvements in energy efficiency in the South.

#### Governance setbacks

NGOs identified the following shortcomings in the institutional frameworks chapter: (i) deletion of the references to human rights and fundamental freedoms; (ii) deletion of specific commitments for different MEAs; (iii) deletion of references encouraging international financial institutions and trade bodies to ensure that their decision-making processes are based on the principles of good governance; (iv) deletion of the paragraphs on Rio principle 10 regarding access to information, public participation and access to justice. Nevertheless the text does reflect the G-77 call for good governance at all levels of governance and does support greater horizontal coordination within the UN system, as well as commitment to commence implementation of national strategies for sustainable development by 2005.

E. THE CRITICAL PATH FORWARD <sup>16</sup>**Ensure delivery of the key targets**

The most immediate challenge is to concentrate on constructing delivery mechanisms on the specific targets enshrined in the Johannesburg Plan of Implementation. Target-specific implementation plans must be developed with clear benchmarks against which the performance of national governments in meeting those targets can be monitored, measured and evaluated. The Millennial goals and the WEHAB (water, energy, health agriculture and biodiversity) priorities now offer the possibility of a more focused effort over the next ten years. However, the principal challenge will of course entail keeping governments on track towards meeting these important targets. Governments must now demonstrate clear commitments to change policies and actions, and match those commitments with the necessary technical, human and financial resources.

**Address the implementation impediments**

As the international community embarks on the implementation of a new blueprint for sustainable development, it will be essential to assess the problems that have impeded implementation of Agenda 21, with a particular focus on ascertaining the political, economic and institutional factors that have worked at cross purposes with the sustainability imperative, to ensure that the Johannesburg Plan of Implementation is not frustrated in the way

that Agenda 21 has been. The most pressing implementation impediments that must be addressed include: the lack of concrete tools to promote the integration of the three pillars of sustainable development; the lack of concrete tools/indicators to monitor and measure progress on sustainable development, including implementation of WSSD commitments; the difficulties in mobilizing and maintaining the resources (political, financial, technical, etc.); the difficulties securing political and public will; as well as the challenges in integrating sustainable development priorities into the budgetary process and other key hardcore economic decision-making processes.

**Strengthen new partnerships**

There is a concern that out of the 500 Type II partnerships that were announced in Johannesburg, only 50% have actually met the criteria that were established by the Secretariat to the UN Commission for Sustainable Development. Several countries are promoting concrete guidelines for monitoring and accountability to ensure that pre-existing initiatives are not "re-packaged" as new partnerships, and that they do not detract from the substantive political commitments enshrined in the Johannesburg Plan of Implementation. One of the key challenges that may arise with the continuing operationalisation of Type II partnerships is the ten-

<sup>16</sup> This section was also drawn from the above-noted WSSD chapter that was prepared by Johannah Bernstein for LEAD International

sion between donor driven priorities (especially as regards their focus on longer-term integrated perspective) and the pressures for increased ownership (which is sometimes accompanied by a rather shorter-term vision) on the part of the partner countries. Another potential challenge is the fact that many of the current partnerships are not only government-driven initiatives, with most of the partnerships taking place between governments and international organisations. There is a growing recognition that the next generations of partnerships will have to actively engage other non-State actors such as civil society and business and industry.

#### Strengthen multilateral institutions

Despite the agreements reached on the key targets, there are a number of key challenges that remain with regard to the strengthening of the institutional arrangements needed to take forward the Johannesburg Plan of Implementation. These challenges include the importance of ensuring that the existing machinery acquires the political vitality, profile and voice in crucial debates where decisions are taken, that its influence is felt in the key debates, and that the institutional machinery has enough sustained political influence to be not only relevant but credible in setting the global sustainability agenda.

#### Make a difference on the ground

A key test of the success of the Johannesburg Plan of Implementation is whether governments along with civil society and the private sector can pursue the commitments that are contained in the documents and take actions that achieve measurable results. As UK Environment Minister Michael Meacher stat-

ed, what matters most at these conferences is not the text in the end, rather it is what happens to people's lives on the ground.

#### Catalyse political will

The key political challenges lie in mobilizing new forms of collective political will. The fundamental problem is that countries continue to act in their own short-term national economic interests rather than genuinely working together to forge a sustainable development path for the entire global community. Progressive countries will now have to work collectively to match their rhetoric with action by working with civil society, both globally and domestically, and ultimately to raise the bar within the UN and apply constructive pressure on such laggard countries as the US.

#### Redress the North South divide and renew the spirit of global partnership

The single most important measure needed to renew the North/South divide is for the international community to take serious steps to eradicate poverty and to act on their stated acknowledgement in the WSSD outcomes that poverty is without a doubt the greatest global challenge facing the world today and an indispensable requirement for sustainable development. Renewing the spirit of global partnership is a fundamentally straightforward task. It calls for the international community to get serious about international cooperation, fulfilling ODA requirements and giving real effect to the principle of common but differentiated responsibilities as set out in principle 7 of the Rio Declaration on Environment and Development.

### Deal seriously with the globalisation challenge

If the process of globalisation is to be fully inclusive and equitable, industrialised governments will have to deal seriously with the challenge of helping developing countries to respond effectively to those challenges and opportunities. This will require urgent action at all levels to democratise the multilateral trading and financial systems, support the successful completion of the work programme contained in the Doha Ministerial Declaration and the implementation of the Monterrey Consensus and enhance the capacities of developing countries to benefit from liberalized trade opportunities.

### Develop a "Culture of Prevention" and Promote responsible leadership

Former Australian Foreign Minister Gareth Evans has identified specific responses needed by governments and intergovernmental organisation to deal more effectively with new peace and security challenges. These include: (i) acting comprehensively, which in the case of security problems means addressing them in a way that recognizes that social, economic and cultural factors can be at least as important as political and military ones; (ii) acting cooperatively, which means recognizing that in the real contemporary world, however big a country may be, most international problems are only solvable with the help of others; (iii) acting intelligently, which means acting more than comprehensively and cooperatively, but preventatively as well.

## LIST OF REFERENCES

- Bildt, Carl.** "Security for a New World", Foreign and Security Policy. June, 2002.  
<http://www.bildt.net>.
- Bildt, Carl.** "To Win Peace – Not Only War", Foreign and Security Policy. February, 2002.  
<http://www.buildt.net>.
- Bildt, Carl.** "Towards a Clash of Civilisations?", Foreign and Security Policy. November 2002 Symposium. <http://www.buildt.net>.
- European Investment Bank.** "The Economic Situation of the Mediterranean Countries", Staff Report. October, 2002.
- Evans, Gareth.** "Preventing and Responding to Internal Conflict: When is it Right for Others to Intervene?", Citigroup-Asia Society Global Issues Series. Hong Kong: November, 2003.
- Gorbachev, Mikhail S.** "A New Middle East Peace Initiative", International Herald Tribune, December 9, 2000.
- Gorbachev, Mikhail S.** "Ridding Russia of its Chemical Weaponry Requires U.S.", Los Angeles Times, October 19, 2000.
- Her Majesty Queen Noor of Jordan.** "Environmental Conservation – A Shared Responsibility". IUCN-World Conservation Union Second World Conservation Congress, Amman, 2000.
- Her Majesty Queen Noor of Jordan.** "Power of Dialogue". Richmond Forum, Richmond, 2003.
- Küng, Hans.** "Explanatory Remarks: Declaration of the Religions for a Global Ethic". <http://astro.temple.edu/dialogue/Center/kung.htm>
- Levy, David.** "Peace – Economic and Human Development in the Middle East: An Israeli Outlook", Middle East/ North Africa Summit. Cairo: November , 1996.
- MDF Partners and MDF Associate Partners.** "Fourth Mediterranean Development Forum", Final Press Communiqué. Amman, 2002.
- Palacio, Ana.** "Dialogue and Co-operation in the Mediterranean: A Proposal from Europe", IEMed. Tribuna Mediterranea 2, 2003.
- Rasmussen, Poul Nyrup.** "Europe and a New Global Order: Bridging the Global Divides", A Report for the Party of European Socialists. May 2003.
- Rockefeller, Steven C.** "Vision, Courage, and Sustainability – An Address", The GEA Conference for a Sustainable Future. Tokyo: October, 2003.
- Solana, Javier.** "Old and New Challenges of the Barcelona Process". 6th Euro-Mediterranean Ministerial Conference, Naples, 28 November 2003.
- Arab Human Development Report.** "Using Human Capabilities: Recapturing Economic Growth and Reducing Human Poverty", Chapter 6, 2002.