

After the World Summit for Sustainable Development The Double Nexus between Sustainable Development, Globalization and Security

Sascha Müller-Kraenner

Uwe Brendle

 **HEINRICH BÖLL STIFTUNG**



Sascha Müller-Kraenner is Director for Europe and North America at the Heinrich Böll Foundation in Berlin. His email is Sascha@Boell.org

Uwe Brendle is deputy head of Section II "Nature Conservation and Development" of the German Federal Agency for Nature Conservation in Bonn. His email is Uwe.Brendle@BfN.de

November 2003

**Ecologic – Institute for International and European Environmental Policy
Pfalzburger Str. 43-44, 10717 Berlin, Germany, <http://www.ecologic.de/>
Tel. +49 30 86880-0; Fax: +49 30 86880-100; Office@Ecologic.de**

Content

1	Introduction	2
2	Europe's Role in the World	3
3	Multi-polarity and Crisis Prevention	3
4	Access to the Contentious Relationship between Nature Protection and Conflict	4
5	The Environmental Consequences of Conflict	6
6	Global Environmental Governance	6
7	Partnerships for Sustainable Development	8
8	Annex: Extracts from the WSSD Plan of Implementation	11

Preface

Environmental degradation, leading ultimately to the destruction of natural ecosystems and the communities and their lifestyles that depend on them, is generally perceived as a form of aggression, certainly by the victims if not always by the aggressors. The same is true for the denial of fair access to natural resources – such as water or land, plants or wildlife – and the exclusive appropriation of indigenous knowledge, forcing people to abandon their traditional medicine, customs, food or other aspects of their culture and way of life. Sometimes, the response, which many consider to be legitimate on moral grounds, includes violence leading to armed conflict. Causes and effects and the chain of events are well understood in most cases; conflicts are predictable and, at least in theory, preventable and manageable. Robert Redford's 1988 film "Milagro Beanfield War" is an excellent illustration of this point.

In consequence, environmental degradation and resource scarcities are now understood to be important factors in the relations between communities, as well as in foreign affairs and security policy, and in the technical, financial and capacity-building co-operation with developing countries. The emergence of official networks for environmental diplomacy and the growing body of literature on environment and security are evidence of this fact. Ecologic has for some time contributed to a better understanding of the issues involved and has furthered the debate, in Germany, in Europe and globally. Our focus has always been on the role that conserving the integrity and diversity of nature can play in preventing conflict, and on showing how fair and sustainable access to natural resources and the sharing of benefits can build trust and understanding, thus defusing tension and avoiding violent confrontations.

This paper by Sascha Müller-Kraenner, of the Heinrich Böll Foundation, and Uwe Brendle, of the German Federal Agency for Nature Conservation, writing in personal capacities and expressing their own views, places the security dimension of environmental policy in its wider context of sustainable development and globalisation. That is the appropriate context given the economic interdependencies of nations around the world, the importance of long-distance effects of environmental degradation, and the global reach of perpetrators of violence. Their paper expresses the hope that innovative approaches and new forms of partnerships can help strengthen crisis prevention and non-military means of conflict resolution.

R. Andreas Kraemer, Director

Ecologic Institute, Berlin & Brussels

1 Introduction

"I was standing in the sun on the hot steel deck of a fishing ship capable of processing a fifty ton catch on a good day. But it wasn't a good day. We were anchored in what used to be the most productive fishing site in all of central Asia, but as I looked out over the bow, the prospects of a good catch looked bleak. Where there should have been gentle blue-green waves lapping against the side of the ship, there was nothing but hot dry sand – as far as I could see in all directions."

Al Gore, *Earth in the Balance: Ecology and the Human Spirit*, 1992

With these observations, Al Gore, then Senator and later Vice President of the United States, begins his book "Earth in the Balance." The increasing deterioration of the environmental situation was one of the reasons for the creeping and later rampant deterioration of the Soviet Union. Environmental catastrophes such as the drying up of the Aral Sea, the ecological burden on the Caspian Sea and the decline of fishing triggered regional tensions. With these and other observations and prognoses of ecological degradation, Gore concludes that the environmental threat today has taken the place of military threat in the post cold war era. In order to establish environmental security, Al Gore recommends, among other measures, the elaboration of global environmental law.

The relevance of the connection between security and resource consumption was recognized more broadly than merely from the perspective of environmental policy. In the words of the last UN General Secretary, Boutros Boutros-Ghali, "The next war in the Near East will not be over oil, but rather over water."

Already in 1987, the Brundtland report concluded that, "the ever increasing environmental crisis represents for national survival – under certain circumstances – a greater threat than a well-armed, ill-wishing neighbour or hostile military alliances. Already today, in some parts of South America, Asia, the Middle East and Africa environmental crises are the source of political unrest and international tensions."

In fact there are quite a few political and military conflicts that can, among other causes, be traced back to environmental conflicts. The cause of these conflicts can be the unjust distribution of scant resources, such as water, and environmental deterioration caused by various conflictive parties at the expense of others. Because security conflicts can normally be traced back to several causes, the point at which environmental problems become part of security problems is difficult to assess. This results in many differing opinions as to if and in which cases environmental problems are critical to the outbreak of a security conflict.

Nature protection policy and environmental measures within development and international cooperation play a central role in conflicts over resources. In the final declaration of the World Summit on Sustainable Development in Johannesburg (Johannesburg Plan of Implementation), the chapter "Protecting and Managing the Natural Base of Economic and Social Development" takes a central role. Nature Protection is mentioned in the clauses that deal with biodiversity, forests, sustainable farming and regional sustainable development, including tourism, as well as the protection and use of maritime resources and mountainous

regions. Thus, biodiversity is assigned a central role in reaching economic and social development goals ("Biodiversity ... plays a critical role in the overall sustainable development and poverty eradication on our planet, human well-being and the livelihood and cultural integrity of people.")

2 Europe's Role in the World

The foreign and security policy agendas are undergoing dramatic changes since the end of the block-confrontation and were accelerated after the attacks of September 11th, 2001. The traditional security parameters of deterrence and containment are being replaced by new concepts of global risk prevention, crisis intervention and the securing of peace. Questions related to foreign, security and development policy are becoming less relevant. The war on Iraq has shown the tensions between the US and Europe as well as those within the European Union (EU) due to different risk perceptions and views on how to react.

Just as the cooperative style of problem solving within a multilateral framework is characteristic for Europe, the EU developed a preference for solving political issues together rather than in isolation. Even when the integration of different political areas (in terms of environmental policy this was anchored into the EU treaty) raises the complexity of the issues and how to handle them, the advantage of a convergence of political problem solving efforts reflects more accurately on current social reality where problems seldom stand alone, but rather emerge as complex structures.

A succession of such complex problem structures, in which conflicts in and around natural resources are a central issue and very often play different roles, will be presented as case studies in this publication. These case studies offer regulations and procedures for the treatment of such conflicts in regimes and institutions.

This comprises:

- The inclusion of the challenges of global change in terms of our understanding of foreign, security and peace policies and the elaboration of a "holistic" strategy as opposed to the traditional dualism of "foreign" and "development" policies.
- The inclusion of "new" players, above all from the NGO community when it comes to foreign and security policies and decision making.
- The inclusion of the North-South relationship into discussions concerning future crisis potential and new models in terms of international cooperation.

3 Multi-polarity and Crisis Prevention

Foreign policy within the red-green coalition treaty is defined as a peace policy which must "with all its strength, endeavour to use effective crisis prevention strategies and instruments that seek peaceful solutions to crisis (1998)". This development allows for the fact that today

the majority of political, violent conflict occurs either within the borders of countries or are disputes over internal differences between states.

However, the regionalization of violent conflict runs parallel to the clear consequences of globalization. The so called new wars define themselves through a change in the way wars are waged and this can be traced back more and more to the negative consequences of globalization and disintegration. An example of this is the growing "violent markets" and their involvement in a global war economy (i.e., drugs, commerce in species that are on the endangered species list, the plundering of natural resources). Also, the phenomenon of global change such as environmental and climate change as well as the deterioration of resources for entire societies can result in economic and social disavowal. For fragile societies in transition this can have a destabilizing effect and create more conflict.

In the concrete case, there are many factors that lay the ground for the outbreak of collective internal violence. What many regions of conflict have in common is that they have very fragmented societies with extreme social inequality especially between men and women and there has been no consolidation of identity on a national level (i.e., the former colonies). The regions with the highest number of violent conflicts are Sub-Saharan Africa and the Near East followed by South and South-East Asia, the Caucasus and Central Asia.

The consequences of "regional" violence very often reach far beyond the region in question. Migration and refugee problems, humanitarian emergencies and massive human rights abuses occupy the minds of neighbouring states and international organizations; they have become part of global diplomacy. At the same time the "new wars" in many cases do not adhere to the traditional centralized, state-oriented political influence of the international community.

The choice of security measures and crisis prevention instruments depends on the respective perception and definition of risk. Aside from Europe's typical preference for cooperative conflict resolution within a multilateral framework, European policy postulates a preference for preventative treatment of crisis as opposed to the development of civil and military instruments for conflict management, even in cases when conflict and crisis are difficult to tell apart.

Security policy in the 21st century requires active participation for the development of peace; security and crisis prevention, crisis reaction and post crisis care. In this area, the Heinrich Böll Foundation is active in many regions. Partners of the foundation who deal with crisis prevention are regional civil-society organizations in the above mentioned policy areas as well as scientific institutes and non-governmental organizations that deal with practice-oriented instruments for crisis prevention and conflict resolution policies.

4 Access to the Contentious Relationship between Nature Protection and Conflict

After the attacks of September 11th, 2001 the World Summit in Johannesburg was almost cancelled. For security reasons the Summit was moved up one week to avoid having the closing ceremonies fall on the first anniversary of the attacks.

Originally it was feared that the new security policy debate would overshadow the debate on sustainable development, but this did not happen. The discussion of sustainable development was already declared a contradiction in terms in the mid-nineties by those debating globalization. If it were possible, in the wake of September 11th and the resulting solidarity of the international community, to successfully bring an end to both the WTO Ministers' Conference and the UN Summit on Financing for Development, then at the World Summit in Johannesburg there was a phase during which the subject of sustainable development was overshadowed by polarization on the subject of globalization between North and South.

One central failure of the Johannesburg Summit was that it did not include the issues regarding stewardship of natural resources on the one hand nor, in the political arena, crisis prevention, conflict management or the securing of peace. This would have been most effective in view of the current problems. The presence of the political leaders of most of the UN members would have made Johannesburg a place where the double nexus between sustainable development, globalization and security issues could have been placed firmly on the political agenda in the coming years. The place for dealing with these relationships should not have been forced into the closing ceremony of the summit (which shines more for its exclusions in its description of sustainable development within this new global context than for its content) but rather have been part of the public debate between the official and civil society at the World Summit. An opportunity was lost when the "world" that came together at Johannesburg did not discuss the issues that lay closest to their hearts.

The relationship between the issues "Protection of Natural Resources" and "Crisis Prevention" can be characterized through the following three aspects:

a. Measures for the Protection of Natural Resources Themselves Can Become the Cause of or Trigger for Local Conflict

Local conflict can be triggered when the establishment of protected areas and national parks combine with massive restriction of land-use touch on the economic interests or traditional rights and customs of the people. Measures for the protection of natural resources should be taken into consideration as part of the reality of the region to harmonize the interests of protection and use. Where the competition between protection and use is in danger of increasing economic, cultural and ethnic conflicts, the protective measures should be embedded more than ever within the context of sustainable development.

b. The Destruction of Natural Resources and Unequal Distribution as Cause of Conflict

Increasingly, the destruction of and unequal access to natural resources as causes of conflict are appearing on the political radar. The shortage of natural resources as a result of over use and unequal access leads more and more to conflicts within and without national borders. The lack of regulation and insufficient institutional structures that protect natural resources are fundamental reasons for their overuse.

c. Nature Protection as an Element and Instrument of Crisis Prevention and Civil Conflict Resolution

The protection and maintenance of natural resources can make a significant contribution to diminishing conflicts due to access. Furthermore, efforts made toward nature protection can provide a platform for regional cooperation of different players all the way to cross border cooperation. In this way, nature protection can increasingly become a new strategic element for development and international cooperation. Nature protection or the instruments thereof, for example, biosphere parks, can be used as door openers for regional cooperation and hence can be viewed as a contribution to crisis prevention and civil conflict resolution. Examples of this are the planned "peace parks" initiatives in Southern Africa and the establishment of biosphere parks (i.e., Altai Region) with their combination of regional protective and socio-economic development goals. Within this security policy context, an environmental policy that is guided according to precautionary principles and commits to stronger international environmental cooperation gains in significance.

5 The Environmental Consequences of Conflict

Since the images of the burning oil fields during the first Iraq war came into our living rooms it became clear to the global community the far reaching negative ecological consequences military disputes carry: large areas of ground contaminated with war material over long periods of time, unclean water supplies, air pollution, ruined country sides that are the habitats of animals, plants and humans, etc. The destruction of natural resources is not tolerated, in the sense of collateral damage, within the context of military dispute, but it is used as part of war strategy: the destruction of natural habitats for humans is the goal. The "removal" of such ecological disasters requires an enormous investment.

6 Global Environmental Governance

Against the background of this development a special meaning is given to global environmental governance as well as the development of the concept of sustainability. Johannesburg suffered not only because of differing interests between the North and the South, and the substantial complexity and deficits of international governance structures in the areas of environment and development, but also because of the programmatic weakening of the sustainability debate. Since the mid-nineties the topic of globalization was making all the headlines. Since September 2001, global security has dominated the international agenda. Prior to the World Summit at Johannesburg, the players primarily concerned with the sustainability debate did not synthesize the Rio Agenda, the globalization debate, the newly raised issues resulting from September 11th, and regional and international security in the 21st century into a single coherent program.

At first glance, this political deficiency is surprising. Global, regional and local environmental changes as a result of violent conflict developed into a significant subject of research for social and political scientists at the end of the nineties. In trying to understand the

relationship between environmental destruction, scarcity of resources and violent conflict, the issues regarding governance of regional and global economic flow received a prominent place in discussions regarding globalization, and were described using concrete examples. Admittedly though, the debate in the nineties over the link between sustainability, economic globalization and security never left the academic ivory tower. Considering the changed circumstances of the 21st century in the wake of September 11, 2001, and with the lack of direction in which it finds itself after Johannesburg, sustainability as a social development concept should be shaped in the this new context and given a secure place on the political agenda.

The system of governance that developed after the first UN Earth Summit in 1992 and resulted in the founding of the United Nations Environment Program (UNEP) has both legitimacy and efficiency problems.

Despite, or perhaps because of, the proliferation of political environmental institutions and advisories on an international level, neither the problem solving competence of the Global Environmental Governance Systems has been able to keep up with the times, nor has the recognition of the problems, at least those in terms of the environmental crisis caused by climate change and loss of biodiversity or desertification.

The integration of the political fields of environment and development into "sustainable development", under discussion since the Brundtland report and politically postulated since Rio 1992, carries with it a new level of complexity in the political process, in the balance of interests and hence in the decision making process.

Another model, that of the World Trade Organization (WTO), has met with more success. Despite the blatant democratic deficiencies of international trade policies and the difficult negotiation processes, the governance model of the WTO proved to be so successful that today, the intention is to use these regulations and instruments for a wide array of political spheres such as investments, intellectual copyright, public service and also the implementation and enforcement of international environmental law.

The obvious weakness of this approach lies in the fact that the integration of other political fields into the WTO follows a goal and theme hierarchy in which environmental interests and other common beneficial interests are paid less political attention or, if controversy arises, are ignored.

In the run up to the World Summit in Johannesburg, there were a series of suggestions for the improvement of the System of Global Governance. From these we have chosen two as especially important. To differentiate these from mere "suggestions for improvement", we outline criteria for the following selection of governance mechanisms for the assignment, layout and financing of already existing organizations and consultancies.

- a. The conversion of the Environmental Program of the United Nations into a global mechanism capable of further integrating environmental governance structures that would remedy, step by step, the deficiencies experienced until now in the gathering

and analysis of environmental information, the systematic and further development of environmental international law and the implementation of already existing laws.¹

- b. Public-private partnerships for sustainable development.²

7 Partnerships for Sustainable Development

At the World Summit for Sustainable Development in Johannesburg, in addition to the principal closing document and, under international law, the noncommittal implementation plan, a catalogue of projects in progress was presented regarding marginal, planned or possible initiatives for partnerships. The so-called "Type II initiatives" should include the participation of the sustainable development players, even though it is primarily the economy that will implement the political goals.³

There are good reasons to argue that environmental international law should be privatized. This is exactly what the United Nations proposed in the summer of 2002 when they suggested that the implementation of the resolutions of the World Summit in Johannesburg be put into the hands of private players.

Why cannot the implementation of environmental international law come about through international treaties, powerful institutions at the UN level and the national implementation of such obligations? The United Nations has a legitimacy and efficiency problem, but that does not hold true for the area of sustainable development and environmental protection.

The problem of legitimacy arises from the fact that the governance structure of international environmental policy and the complex field of sustainability, where environment and development interests must be interlocked and calibrated against each other, does not work. The creation of a World Environment Organization, or a comparable global mechanism, in which environmental interests would carry the same weight as world trade does in regional integration alliances and the WTO, does not enjoy any political support.

The environmental program of the UN that could have built a focal point for such a world organization is chronically underfinanced and marginalized in the larger industrialized countries. Already existing agreements that should form the core of global environmental policy, such as the Kyoto Protocol for Climate Change, are being undermined by fundamental players, particularly the United States. However, not only the broader political climate, but also considerations of principle, such as the complexity and lack of subsidiarity of international regulations, limit the further expansion of environmental international law and the global sustainability bureaucracy. We arrive again at the efficiency problem. Conclusions

¹ A complete suggestion for this is made by D. Esty & M. Ivanova (Eds.) in "Global Environmental Governance, Options & Opportunities", Yale School of Forestry & Environmental Studies, 2002.

² Recommended reading beyond the present paper: J. Witte, C. Streck & T. Brenner "Progress or Peril? Partnerships and Networks in Global Environmental Governance – The Post-Johannesburg Agenda", GPPI, 2003.

³ The text containing the basics in the implementation plan is given in the annex to this paper.

resulting from very long UN negotiations are simply not responsive to the urgency and the objective worsening of the situation.

The suggestion of General Secretary Kofi Annan was therefore not to leave the implementation of the agreements reached at the World Summit up to the activities of governments and international organizations but rather to implement them through the so-called "Type II" partnerships: to increase cooperation between public and private players. The typical characteristic of such alliances would be public-private partnerships, in which national, regional and local governments come together with private investors to, for example, work on the improvement of infrastructure and the establishment of ecological tourism. The participation of non-governmental organizations (NGOs) working as consultants, overseers or implementers is conceivable. Also the "Players of Sustainable Development" mentioned in Agenda 21 at Rio could participate in such partnerships, for example, the representatives of indigenous people or the unions.

In New York in April/May 2003 the environment and development ministers met again at the 11th meeting of the UN Commission for Sustainable Development (CSD11) for the first time since the Johannesburg Summit. On the agenda was the work program for the next twelve years and how to link the monitoring and implementation process of the resolutions arrived at in Johannesburg to the UN system.

In the coming two years the CSD will deal with the subject of water. At the World Summit the goals were for improved access to drinking water, especially in the rural areas of the South, and for better water quality and hygiene. Also, regional development interests with respect to access to water should be consistent with nature protection using cross-border management in river areas. Aside from the development component, in many regions the fight over access to water is becoming increasingly significant in terms of security policy.

It is no wonder then that many partnership initiatives suggested up to this time refer to the water policy goals of the World Summit in Johannesburg. In the spring of 2003, the first implementation conference took place in Kyoto where there were not only numerous internationally active water supply companies and representatives of different countries but also NGOs.

For example, the European Union suggested orienting all current EU-Programs dealing with access to water, improvement of water quality, resource management and capacity building in the area of water economy toward the development goals of the Johannesburg resolution and the millennium declaration of the UN. A similar initiative was suggested by the US and was already agreed to by the EU at the G8 meeting of the Environment Ministers in Canada in the spring of 2002.

The following alternatives for the future are plausible in terms of the Type II partnership idea:⁴

We may experience the spontaneous development of partnerships between governments and the private sector, between municipalities and investors, between international organiza-

⁴ Part of the following categorization were first suggested by Liliana B. Andonova and Marc A. Levy in their contribution "Franchising Global Governance: Making Sense of the Johannesburg Type Two Partnerships" to the Yearbook of International Co-operation on Environment and Development 2003/2004.

tions and NGOs. Some of these alliances will orient themselves toward the development goals of the UN, others will follow a national development plan or will orient themselves toward the rules and mores of different organizations and individual enterprises. Many such partnerships will have a mix of goals oriented toward international and national law but will largely define and elaborate them on their own. The formation of such partnerships will follow the law of supply and demand. With time, even without the help of institutional coordination, international standards will be established, either as "law of practice" or in codified form. This is what the political scientist Oran Young describes as "spontaneous regimes".

Another scenario for the "spontaneous", "subsidiary" implementation of international law, primarily through the private economy, is the creation of standards for corporate accountability. In a campaign, the multinational environmental network "Friends of the Earth" demands an international convention for the elaboration of such standards.

These international regulations would create a framework for investors as well as for partnerships of various kinds and could be linked to already existing standards, such as the ones that already exist in the form of numerous voluntary commitments or the ones in "Global Contact", also a voluntary business initiative of the UN.

Ultimately, the possibility exists to systematically attempt to build a base, as suggested in Johannesburg, to mobilize private players for the implementation of international law goals. In such an alliance for sustainable development, possibly coordinated by the Commission for Sustainable Development, the NGO community and the private sector will meet the challenge of creating a theoretical framework and securing the participation of civil society in politics, projects and other measures.

8 Annex: Extracts from the WSSD Plan of Implementation

The basics in the implementation plan are in the following text:

a. The qualitative goal for 2010 is to significantly reduce the loss of biodiversity (Paragraph 42)

"Biodiversity, which plays a critical role in overall sustainable development and poverty eradication, is essential to our planet, human well-being and to the livelihood and cultural integrity of people. However, biodiversity is currently being lost at unprecedented rates due to human activities; this trend can only be reversed if the local people benefit from the conservation and sustainable use of biological diversity, in particular in countries of origin of genetic resources, in accordance with article 15 of the Convention on Biological Diversity. The Convention is the key instrument for the conservation and sustainable use of biological diversity and the fair and equitable sharing of benefits arising from use of genetic resources. A more efficient and coherent implementation of the three objectives of the Convention and the achievement by 2010 of a significant reduction in the current rate of loss of biological diversity will require the provision of new and additional financial and technical resources to developing countries, (...)"

b. The reference to Type II partnerships as an implementation possibility (paragraph 42f)

"Promote concrete international support and partnership for the conservation and sustainable use of biodiversity, including in ecosystems, at World Heritage sites and for the protection of endangered species, in particular through the appropriate channelling of financial resources and technology to developing countries and countries with economies in transition;"

c. The reaction to the paragraph on the biodiversity of forests does not include either specific timetables nor does it include qualitative or quantitative commitments. (paragraph 43)

"Forests and trees cover nearly one third of the Earth's surface. Sustainable forest management of both natural and planted forests and for timber and non-timber products is essential to achieving sustainable development and is a critical means to eradicate poverty, significantly reduce deforestation and halt the loss of forest biodiversity and land and resource degradation, and improve food security and access to safe drinking water and affordable energy; highlights the multiple benefits of both natural and planted forests and trees; and contributes to the well-being of the planet and humanity. Achievement of sustainable forest management, nationally and globally, including through partnerships among interested Governments and stakeholders, including the private sector, indigenous and local communities and non-governmental organizations, is an essential goal of sustainable development. This would include activities at all levels to: "

d. The reference to Type 2 Partnerships as an implementation possibility (paragraphs 43 f & i)

"Create and strengthen partnerships and international cooperation to facilitate the provision of increased financial resources, the transfer of environmentally sound technologies, trade, capacity-building, forest law enforcement and governance at all levels, and integrated land and resource management to implement sustainable forest management, including the Intergovernmental Panel on Forests (IPF)/Intergovernmental Forum on Forests (IFF) proposals for action;"

"Implement the Convention on Biological Diversity's expanded action-oriented work programme on all types of forest biological diversity, in close cooperation with the Forum, Partnership members and other forest-related processes and conventions, with the involvement of all relevant stakeholders."

In Johannesburg there were a great number of large partnerships suggested in the area of the biodiversity of forests. Of interest is the Congo Basin, initiated by the US. This is an initiative for sustainable forestry through which, in a region of crisis, the economic development goals, nature protection and regional cooperation can be jointly pursued. Aside from the US, France and Germany among others showed their interest to participate in such an initiative. At the time of the 11th meeting of the Commission on Sustainable Development in April 2003 there was not yet a concrete delineation of the initiative in sight.