9 Taking "Good Governance" Seriously

You know what good government is? It's the same old government in a helluva fright. Heard in Canada

The seventh transition must take place in institutions and governance. The World Business Council for Sustainable Development, a leading international group of major corporations, has sketched several illustrative scenarios depicting different approaches to environmental governance. One they playfully call "FROG": First Raise Our Growth. The FROG philosophy is to meet economic challenges first and worry about the environment later. FROG is thus a business-as-usual scenario leading to huge environmental costs. FROG leads not just to a wrecked global ecosystem but to a wrecked global society as well. It is a path to failure even in the eyes of the business-oriented WBCSD.[1]

In the WBCSD's other two scenarios, sustainability is successfully pursued, but the approaches are very different. Under "GEOpolity," people turn to governments to focus the market on environmental and social ends, and they rely heavily on intergovernmental institutions and treaties. GEOpolity is the world of international environmental law and global environmental agreements. Under "JAZZ," the third scenario, people and businesses create a world full of unscripted, voluntary initiatives that are decentralized and improvisational, like jazz. In the JAZZ world, information about business behavior is abundant, and good conduct is enforced by public opinion and consumer decisions. Governments facilitate more than regulate, environmental and consumer groups are very active, and businesses see strategic advantage in doing the right thing.

Employing this useful framework, we can say that the initial international response to global challenges has tried to move the world from FROG to GEOpolity. For reasons I reviewed in chapter 5, this move has not worked well. Nations have not yet genuinely embraced GEOpolity, and where GEOpolity approaches have been used, they have been too weak to be successful.

Getting serious about global environmental governance requires new action on two mutually supportive fronts: pursuing a very different approach to GEOpolity, and taking JAZZ to scale, enlarging it until it is a major part of the solution.

What does it mean to pursue GEOpolity differently? As we saw in chapter 5, the current world of GEOpolity is a world that is designed to fail. How can it be redesigned for success? Basically, two things must happen. First, we must alter the broad "external" context—the setting—from which we expect impressive legal regimes to emerge and in which we expect them to be effectively implemented. And second, "internal" to the GEOpolity process, we need very different international institutions, procedures, and core understandings. International environmental law is failing today on the big issues, but it need not.

Regarding the "external" context of GEOpolity, most basic is the transition in governance to capable, accountable, and democratic governments. The United Nations Development Programme estimates that today about 65 percent of the world's people live in countries with multiparty electoral systems and that 121 of 147 countries surveyed had some or all of the elements of formal democracy.[2] Progress on this

front is sine qua non. It can be aided by development assistance focused on building capacities in government, on fighting corruption, on political and civil rights, and on elections and democratic reforms. When I was at UNDP, I saw over and over again the need for initiatives in these areas. By the time I left in 1999, we had over a third of our resources programmed to support "good governance" in developing countries, but we were able to meet only a small portion of the need.

Development progress in the poorer regions is essential for many reasons, but its relevance here is that GEOpolity will never succeed unless development is succeeding. The only world that works is one in which the aspirations of poor people and poor nations for fairness and opportunity are being realized. Developing country views in international negotiations on environment are powerfully influenced by their fear of the costs of environmental measures, their focus on their own compelling economic and social challenges, and their distrust of the intentions and policies of the industrial countries.[3] Sustained and sustainable human development, strongly supported by the international community, provides the only context in which the developing world has enough confidence, trust, and hope to ground the difficult measures needed to realize environmental objectives.

Beyond sharply improving overall development prospects, we need to bring both creativity and resources to the forging of "compacts" or "bargains" between the rich countries of the North and poorer countries of the South.[4] Under these arrangements, poorer countries would take impressive steps to halt deforestation and biodiversity loss, for example, while rich countries provide financial, political, and other support for these efforts (which will often be politically difficult and risky) as well as for the poorer countries' development priorities. With a portfolio of over sixteen billion dollars, the Global Environmental Facility assists developing countries in meeting international objectives, principally in climate and biodiversity protection, and can be thought of as a type of broad global compact. It should be supplemented by a flowering of country-specific compacts, incorporating and linking priority goals

of industrial and developing countries. I discussed one type of such compacts, involving the protection of forests, in chapter 2. To succeed, these compacts must put providing sustainable livelihoods for the poor at the heart of conservation planning.

Regarding arrangements "internal" to GEOpolity, there must be new procedures, institutions, and understandings if GEOpolity is to do the job. Strengthening GEOpolity first requires international acceptance of certain fundamental, underlying principles. Professionals in international environmental law have called for a binding covenant incorporating basic international environmental law principles.[5] The following are among the most important:

Fundamental human right. All human beings have a right to an environment adequate for their health and well-being.

Common concern. The global environment is a common concern of humanity.

Common but differentiated responsibilities. In view of their different contributions to global environmental degradation and their different capacities to support solutions, states have common but differentiated responsibilities.

Duty not to cause environmental harm. States have the responsibility to ensure that activities within their jurisdiction or control do not damage the environment of other states or of areas beyond the limits of national jurisdiction.

Integration. In order to achieve sustainable development, environmental protection shall constitute an integral part of the development process and cannot be considered in isolation from it.

The polluter pays principle. National authorities should promote the internalization of environmental costs and the use of economic instruments, taking into account the approach that the polluter should, in principle, bear the cost of pollution.

The precautionary principle. Where there are threats of serious or irreversible damage, lack of full scientific certainty shall not be used

as a reason for postponing cost-effective measures to prevent environmental degradation.

Public participation. Environmental issues are best handled with the participation of all concerned citizens, at the relevant level.

Right to development. The right to development must be fulfilled so as to equitably meet developmental and environmental needs of present and future generations.

It is worth noting that these are essentially the "Rio Principles" adopted informally at the Earth Summit more than a decade ago. That legal scholars and others see the need to elevate them to the level of a binding agreement is yet another reflection of how much of what was agreed at the Rio Earth Summit has never been implemented. Within this framework, the precautionary principle could not be more important, given how rapidly potentially hazardous chemicals and technologies can be introduced and spread.

Today's GEOpolity approach can also be redesigned for success by insisting on new procedures for setting international requirements and on new institutions, including a World Environment Organization.

There are many innovative ways the decision-making process in GEOpolity can be improved. As has happened with the Montreal Protocol and the Stockholm Convention on Persistent Organic Pollutants, the Conference of the Parties to a convention can be empowered to make certain types of regulatory decisions that would not need to be ratified as separate treaties, and decision-making procedures can be adopted whereby a two-thirds supermajority, a double majority (a majority of both industrial and developing countries), or even a mere majority of the COP members could make decisions binding for all. Conceivably a COP could even delegate certain rulemaking or standard-setting powers to an expert body, provided there were safeguards ensuring broad public participation. The COP would then limit itself to providing the general policy framework and providing a check against abuse of discretion, much as Congress and the federal courts supervise decision-making in U.S. regulatory agencies. Under all of these arrangements, enforcement procedures could be introduced whereby the COP, the treaty secretariat, or an aggrieved party (government or nongovernment) can take a government before a court or some adjudicatory body to compel action.

The European Community/European Union has seen a progression in which environmental policy has moved from being the separate province of each European country to being more common throughout Europe. The extent of the change is reflected in a *New York Times* article of 2001: "The European Commission plans to take eight countries to the European Court for not implementing water standards. Britain, Belgium, Spain and Luxembourg failed to meet the December 2000 deadline for drinking water; France, Greece, Germany and Ireland failed to meet standards for waste water or bathing water."[6]

There was a moment in 1989 when the world seemed ready to change. Motivated primarily by concern over global warming, twenty-four countries—among them France, Germany, Brazil, India, and Japan—signed the Hague Declaration, which called for an international body that could make non-unanimous decisions needed to protect the global environment.[7] Forty countries eventually signed the declaration, but conspicuous by their absence were most of the permanent members of the U.N. Security Council—the United States, China, Russia, and Britain. So the Hague Declaration died an early death. But this history does remind us that sometimes seemingly far-out ideas can quickly gather strength and prominence.

What may be the next steps forward for GEOpolity? Over the past decade, the leaders of France, Germany, and other countries have called for the creation of a World Environment Organization. UNEP, as we have seen, is very far from that today. It is strange to have a WHO, WTO, WIPO, ILO, and so on and not have a WEO. If one were writing on a clean slate—approaching afresh the question of what international regulatory organizations should be created—the case for a WEO would be among the very strongest. Many of the arguments brought forth in

the 1970s for federalizing U.S. environmental law apply to the need for globalizing environmental protection in a world where pollution knows no boundaries and where trade, deployment of technology, and investment flows are increasingly international. Imagine: what if nations had put as much energy into a WEO as they have put into the WTO?

There are several models of a WEO, ranging from quite modest to quite powerful.[8] In one model, UNEP would become a larger and more independent entity by becoming a "specialized agency" of the United Nations. (WHO and FAO are prominent specialized agencies.) These steps would increase the stature of the agency, enlarging its financial resources and providing for a more efficient and effective structure for governance and leadership. The next ratchet up would bring the various environmental treaties together under a WEO, and the most ambitious idea would create a world environment agency entrusted with setting international standards and enforcing them against laggard countries.

If we are to ever see a WEO, it will probably be essential to start at the modest end of the spectrum and strengthen the new organization over time as the need arises and as trust and confidence build. I would favor beginning with a new U.N. specialized agency that would incorporate UNEP, reflect modern organizational concepts, and *initially* do the following:

- provide an international vehicle for national environmental ministers, much as WHO is the focal point for health ministries around the world;
- promote international environmental law, including new treaties, and provide a common secretariat and dispute resolution services for the various existing treaty regimes;
- serve as a global environmental watchdog, ombudsman, and catalyst;
- provide global monitoring of conditions and trends, as well as foresight and early warning;
- develop consensus around informal international goals and mobilize financing and launch campaigns related to them;

- assess and report on national and international performance and progress; and
- coordinate and sponsor relevant scientific research.

Further, WEO would provide an international center of expertise on what works and what does not in environmental law, policy, and management. Countries setting up environmental programs at national and regional levels could seek advice and assistance. Information and data banks could be accessed by all. Thanks to an outpouring of scholarship, we now know much better the criteria for success in international environmental regimes. Future efforts in global environmental governance will have to build on this knowledge, pursue science-based and data-driven approaches to "smart regulation," and use market-based mechanisms such as emissions trading, which has been successfully deployed against acid rain and is now being used to protect climate.[9] More focused agreements involving smaller numbers of parties should be one avenue of pursuit; another should be agreements that address explicitly the need for technology transformation.

Having a well-funded World Environment Organization such as this would make a major difference, and its mandate should be strengthened as experience is gained and responsible performance proven. Institutional development is also essential in another area. We urgently need to devise new, innovative arrangements associated with the United Nations where the environmental and social rules of the road for economic globalization can be debated and devised and where the often-conflicting objectives under the sustainable development umbrella can be brought together. Current arrangements for addressing these issues are woefully inadequate.

Created after the Earth Summit in Rio, the U.N.'s Commission on Sustainable Development was supposed to take up such issues, but I saw in the United Nations that it had become little more than a talk shop. Nor are the mega-meetings of the United Nations up to the task. The 2002 World Summit on Sustainable Development in Johannesburg

was a true sustainable development summit in the sense that advocates of all three dimensions of sustainable development—the "triple bottom line" of economy, environment, and society—were there under one roof arguing their cases, raising real issues, and confronting those with different interests and perspectives.[10] It was not a social summit dealing only with poverty, social exclusion, and human rights. It was not an economic and globalization summit addressing only trade and investment, finance for development, and transfer of technology. And it was not an environmental summit focusing only on large-scale biotic impoverishment and pollution. Johannesburg was instead a summit about the intersections of these issues, and it was as sprawling and unwieldy as the sustainable development concept itself. But, because of this, it accurately reflected the dynamics of these issues as they are in reality today. Johannesburg revealed a world greatly divided on key issues: corporate accountability, globalization and the WTO, trade and subsidies, climate and energy, development priorities and aid, and many others. The summit debates raised the key issues in making economic globalization supportive of sustainable development, but in the end delegates could only agree on platitudes and on-one-hand-on-the-other-hand. What my students and I saw at Johannesburg was that the main interest of many governments there was damage limitation—avoiding anything that looks like a real commitment to which they would be held accountable, especially if it would cost money.

With more leadership, better preparation, and a more focused agenda, future efforts could resolve real-world issues of inevitable difficulty and complexity. But today the United Nations lacks a forum for these negotiations. It is certainly not the Commission on Sustainable Development or another mega-conference like Johannesburg. Using modern organizational design concepts, it should be possible to create new and innovative arrangements associated with the United Nations to address these issues. That is a good challenge for the new generation.

Most broadly, the international push for liberalized trade and investment flows should be complemented by equally concerted efforts on

the environmental and social fronts. Norms and rules of the road are needed to guide globalization—to protect and benefit poor countries and poor people, the environment, workers, consumers, and investors. The WTO should be reformed to make it more open and broadly accountable, with different principles and procedures to guide its decisions. An international polity should evolve and become as robust as the international economy. While efforts to promote economic globalization proceed apace through the WTO and elsewhere, policy-makers should pursue, with equal determination, reforms and institutions needed in the social and environmental areas.

Building a new GEOpolity also involves giving the public access to the governance process, including information needed for responsible participation.[11] International environmental law is still far too dominated by the outmoded idea that only governments get to play. Principle 10 of the Rio Declaration began to break with this orthodoxy: "Environmental issues are best handled with the participation of all concerned citizens. . . . At the national level each individual shall have appropriate access to information concerning the environment . . . and the opportunity to participate in the decision making processes. . . . Effective access to judicial and administrative proceedings . . . shall be provided."[12]

Rio's Principle 10 focuses mostly on access at the national level, but access at the international level is just as important. Until citizens can have their say in international fora, get the information they need, submit petitions for action and complaints for noncompliance, participate in hearings and initiate judicial proceedings to enforce international law—all the things that are available in many countries at the national level—international environmental law and policy will never have the dynamism it so badly needs. Law professors David Hunter and Durwood Zaelke have called for an international administrative procedures treaty to set minimum norms on how intergovernmental organizations relate to citizens.[13]

Environmental organizations and other NGOs have been indispensable to the development of the major international environmental

agreements. They have brought issues to the fore, built public support for action, suggested treaty provisions, and even offered draft language. I enjoyed an analysis of ozone protection by Reiner Grundmann. He argues that, if you want an agreement as tough as the Montreal Protocol you will need both NGOs and scientists on your side, you've got to fight doggedly for it, and you must outmaneuver the opposition.[14] Grundmann observes, I believe correctly, that the Montreal Protocol battle was won because the proponents of action:

- defined the problem on their terms as a very serious cancer and other public health threats;
- made the "precautionary principle" the decision rule, rather than the "wait-till-certainty" approach;
- were given a big boost by a major "focusing event"—the discovery of the ozone hole over Antarctica; and
- had a better network and more hustle than the opposition.

Grundmann explains: "The U.S. position for the international negotiations . . . was confirmed in the spring of 1987. Shortly before that, the anti-regulation network, rallying within the Domestic Policy Council, had sparked off a new controversy within the federal government. The Secretary of the Interior, Hodel, apparently favored a 'personal protection plan' [that is, sun screen and broad-brimmed hats!] instead of international regulation. The NRDC exploited this rumor by making it public, which backfired on Hodel and his allies. In an article with the catchy headline 'Advice on Ozone May Be: Wear Hats and Stand in the Shade' *The Wall Street Journal* quoted Hodel as saying: 'People who don't stand out in the sun—it doesn't affect them.' The attempt to redefine the situation as one of personal risk ended in ridicule once it was made public. EPA administrator Lee Thomas confirmed the U.S. option of a 95 percent reduction in CFC production, which was supported by the Secretary of State, Shultz. Shultz appointed Richard Benedick as the State Department's Deputy Assistant Secretary for Environmental, Health, and Natural Resource Issues, and as chief negotiator for the international talks. As this episode shows, the U.S. adopted its leadership role willy-nilly. Beneath the governmental level, an active policy network influenced the course of action of the U.S., and also of other countries. Apart from visible scientists such as Molina and Rowland, the network consisted of quieter scientists acting as policy advisers (such as Bob Watson), people at NRDC (David Doniger), WRI (Alan Miller and Irving Mintzer), the EPA (Steven Anderson, James Hofmann, Steve Seidel), and of course, at UNEP. They also had contacts across the Atlantic to their European colleagues. This network spread vital pieces of information around the globe at a critical juncture of the international negotiation process."[15]

I was president of WRI at the time, and from my perspective Grundmann accurately describes how it happened. It is interesting to contrast these circumstances with those that have plagued agreement on climate change. Certainly, one notable contrast is the failure to get the precautionary principle as the decision rule for climate change.

MIT's environmental treaty authority, Lawrence Susskind, argues for formal recognition of the role of nongovernmental interests. He sees full-fledged advisory and monitoring roles as indispensable. "Although important questions remain about how specific organizations and their representatives should be selected (in response to questions about accountability), these should not be used as an excuse to keep unofficials on the sidelines any longer."[16]

Susskind also advocates an interesting and important institutional innovation: an Amnesty International for the global environment.[17] To be successful in preparing periodic reports on each nation's environmental performance, the effort would have to be well funded, independent of other organizations, and totally committed to fearless but objective reporting. Such an effort could prove enormously valuable in galvanizing national and world opinion, especially on large-scale projects of high environmental risk, and would be a strong complement to the Environmental Sustainability Index and other efforts to measure country-by-country progress toward sustainability.[18]

If these are the types of things that need to happen to take GEOpolity seriously, what about the other path, JAZZ, and taking JAZZ to scale?

For my money, green JAZZ is the most exciting arena of ongoing action today. Environmental groups, consumer groups, and other NGOs, private businesses, state and local governments, foundations, religious organizations, investors, and others are behind a remarkable outpouring of initiatives that are the most hopeful things happening today.

At the state and local levels, initiatives are flourishing: the smart growth movement, sustainable cities, state and local greenplans, state climate protection initiatives, innovative state regulatory approaches and green purchasing programs, and environmental standards in building codes, to mention some of the developments.[19] Through the International Council for Local Environmental Initiatives, about 140 local governments are now part of a Climate Protection Campaign to reduce greenhouse gas emissions.[20] The Pew Climate Center has identified twenty-six separate state initiatives that address the challenge of climate change.[21] Thirteen states now require electric power utilities to include renewable energy as a portion of their business.

Chicago under Mayor Richard Daley has declared that it wants to be America's greenest city—and this time not by dumping green dye in the Chicago River on Saint Patrick's Day.[22] In February 2003, seven states announced plans for a lawsuit to force the federal government to regulate carbon dioxide emissions from power plants, the latest in a series of state and city legal actions challenging the Bush administration's go-slow approach to global climate change.[23]

The product certification movement is an example of still another pathbreaking phenomenon: the rise of information-rich, nonregulatory governance, even nongovernmental governance. Forest certification is occurring with governments watching from the sidelines. Political scientist Benjamin Cashore has called attention to this "startling new phenomenon . . . the emergence of domestic and transnational private governance systems that derive their policymaking authority not from

the state, but from the manipulation of global markets and attention to customer preferences. From forests to fisheries to coffee to food production and even tourism, nongovernmental organizations have developed governance structures and social and environmentally focused rules concerning the production and sale of products and services."[24] In late 2002, the Mitsubishi Corporation, one of the largest forestry companies in the world, announced its commitment to third-party certification of its forestry operations using strict Forest Stewardship Council standards.

A long list of techniques—the U.S. Toxics Release Inventory and other "right to know" disclosures, third-party auditing, market creation by government entities and consumers, product boycotts and bad publicity—coupled with the Internet and an increasingly sophisticated international NGO community, can form powerful combinations, as Mitsubishi learned when it tried to establish a salt-mining operation in whale-calving waters in Mexico. An unprecedented outpouring of opposition from Mexican civil society, the Natural Resources Defense Council, and other environmental and consumer groups forced the industrial giant to withdraw in 2000.[25]

Environmental groups, philanthropic foundations, and others—they are the real maestros of JAZZ, and their number, size, and reach have grown dramatically in the past two decades. The World Wildlife Fund, for example, now has a 3,800-person staff and annual expenditures exceeding $340 million. With other such international groups as the Nature Conservancy and Conservation International, they are seeking to protect ecoregions of unprecedented size.[26]

In April 2001, hundreds of thousands of letters generated by environmental organizations paid off when agreement was reached to halt clear-cut logging on 3.5 million forest acres in British Columbia until an ecologically sensitive management plan is developed. The plan includes setting aside a large swath of ancient rainforest as a sanctuary for the rare white spirit bear. Consumer pressure was important in this campaign. The environmental groups targeted U.S. companies that are

the market for most British Columbia timber, and companies like Home Depot, Andersen, Lowe's, and others pledged to stop buying products from endangered forests.[27]

NGOs are growing stronger and more organized at the international level. About thirty thousand NGOs are operating internationally today. Timed to coincide with—and thus challenge—the elite annual meeting of the World Economics Forum in Davos, Switzerland, the 2003 World Social Forum held in Porto Alegre, Brazil, attracted 120,000 social activists from around the world when it met in January. Key themes emerging from the discussions in Porto Alegre included the effects of economic globalization on the poor and the environment, the human right to clean water for all, and corporate accountability.

What may be most surprising, and certainly heartening, is the amount of green JAZZ being played today by businesses and investors. There are now many examples:

- Seven large companies—DuPont, Shell, BP Amoco, and Alcan among them—have agreed to reduce their greenhouse gas emissions to 15 percent below their 1990 levels by 2010.[28] Indeed, Alcoa is reported to be on track to reduce its emissions 25 percent below 1990 levels by 2010, and DuPont is on schedule to reduce emissions by 65 percent by 2010. At least thirty-eight major corporations have adopted energy or emission reduction targets, and a baker's dozen of North American companies—including International Paper, MeadWestvaco, and Motorola—have joined the Chicago Climate Exchange with a commitment to reduce their greenhouse gas emissions by 4 percent by 2006.[29]
- Eleven major companies—DuPont, GM, and IBM among them—have formed the Green Power Market Development Group and have committed to develop markets for a thousand megawatts of renewable energy over the next decade.[30]
- Home Depot, Lowe's, Andersen, and others have agreed to sell wood (to the degree that it is available) only from sustainably managed forests certified by an independent group against rigorous criteria. Unilever, the largest processor of fish in the world, has agreed to the same regarding fish products.[31]
- Today, more than $2 trillion reside in socially and environmentally screened funds. In October 2002, institutional investors managing over $4.5 trillion in assets wrote the five hundred largest global companies asking for full disclosure of their emissions of climate-changing gases and their policies on global climate change.[32] Shareholders, bond ranking agencies, insurance companies, and state pension-fund managers are now coming to see the risks of inaction on climate change; meanwhile a quiet campaign is building to get the Securities and Exchange Commission to require more disclosure of company exposure to potential environmental costs.[33]
- Major corporations are now routinely issuing "sustainability reports" to stakeholders, scores of them following the rigorous practices recommended by the Global Reporting Initiative for reporting their environmental and social impacts.[34]

We are thus far beyond the old days of environmentalism as pollution control compliance. The environment is becoming more central to business strategic planning. Companies are beginning to develop sustainable enterprise strategies that are leading to profitable new processes and products.[35] New partnerships between corporations and environmental NGOs are being forged. Civil society organizations have played important roles in many of the corporate initiatives just presented.[36]

How can we reinforce these positive developments and take JAZZ to scale? Many things can be done. JAZZ requires an information-rich, wired environment, so Internet access and connectivity should be increased internationally. Initiatives like the U.S. Toxics Release Inventory and other government-mandated disclosures can ensure that the public gets new and accurate information. Ecolabeling should be improved, and systems should be built to provide product biographies covering the full life cycle of consumer goods. Securing corporate reporting

through the Securities and Exchange Commission and the voluntary Global Reporting Initiative will help to encourage compliance and responsibility.[37] NGOs can build on their growing expertise in environmental and consumer campaigns, achieving new levels of effectiveness.

Beyond information, governments can change their tax and other laws to encourage citizen group activity in JAZZ. Government and private foundation spending can promote public-private partnerships, and purchasing by governments and others can build markets for green products. The media can provide highly visible recognition for taking the right steps. Foundations can link otherwise isolated "sustainability actors" at the national and regional levels, as the AVINA foundation does in Latin America.

Last, each one of us can contribute to JAZZ every day. We can drive hybrid vehicles rather than SUVs (I love my Toyota Prius), know the seafood on the menu, become active in environmental causes and organizations, vote after checking with the League of Conservation Voters, and generally try to escape the enthrallment of utopian materialism. In business, customer-driven change occurs very rapidly. The more that we consumers demand products that have less environmental impact, the faster change will occur.

Is there a link between GEOpolity and JAZZ? One reason we are hearing so much JAZZ, especially from the business community, is because of all the classical music being played over in GEOpolity Hall. And what is it when jazz and classical music are brought together? It's called FUSION, of course, and we are beginning to see it as well. JAZZ and GEOpolity are not mutually exclusive; they can reinforce each other. GEOpolity actions, proposed or actual, can stimulate JAZZ, and successful JAZZ can pave the way for further GEOpolity initiatives that create a framework where individual initiatives can flourish.

Two useful FUSION ideas have come forward, and one has already achieved some success. The World Bank's vice president for Europe, J. F. Rischard, has proposed that the best way to address many global issues is through what he calls "global issue networks."[38] These would

be ad hoc, self-starting groups with participants from civil society organizations, governments, and businesses that would together produce norms, standards, and policies needed to address particular issues. These norms would be enforced by public scrutiny and other pressures, and could lead to implementation through national legislation. Why not try out Rischard's proposal on the global nitrogen problem discussed in chapter 3? Another good project for a new generation.

The 2002 Johannesburg Summit pioneered a FUSION initiative—using a classic GEOpolity process, a U.N. mega-conference, to promote voluntary partnerships. The summit encouraged what were called "type 2 outcomes," public-private and other partnership initiatives for sustainable development. Hundreds of these individual initiatives were showcased at Johannesburg. The United States highlighted numerous U.S.-based partnership initiatives, said to be worth $2.4 billion over several years. (Because it offered so little else in the traditional "type 1" negotiations among governments, critics accused the United States of seeking to derail the main purpose of the meeting with "type 2" agreements.) UNEP presented awards for the ten best partnerships, including ones involving Alcan for school-based recycling in Asia and the Americas and Shell for a gas exploration project in the Philippines. The United States committed thirty-six million dollars over three years to help protect Congo Basin forests.[39]

I would like to close with an extraordinary example of JAZZ beginning to go to scale. In August 2000, a group of leading scientists convened by the NGO Conservation International in Pasadena, California, endorsed a multibillion dollar plan to focus conservation efforts on biodiversity hot spots.[40] The basic idea, pioneered by Norman Myers, is that twenty-five areas around the globe, representing only 1.4 percent of the earth's land, are home to 44 percent of all plants, 35 percent of nonfish vertebrates, and 60 percent of all terrestrial species.[41] Hot spot advocates claim that the best investment for saving species is to protect these areas, most of which are threatened by development and other pressures. About 40 percent of hot spot area is already in some protected

through the Securities and Exchange Commission and the voluntary Global Reporting Initiative will help to encourage compliance and responsibility.[37] NGOs can build on their growing expertise in environmental and consumer campaigns, achieving new levels of effectiveness.

Beyond information, governments can change their tax and other laws to encourage citizen group activity in JAZZ. Government and private foundation spending can promote public-private partnerships, and purchasing by governments and others can build markets for green products. The media can provide highly visible recognition for taking the right steps. Foundations can link otherwise isolated "sustainability actors" at the national and regional levels, as the AVINA foundation does in Latin America.

Last, each one of us can contribute to JAZZ every day. We can drive hybrid vehicles rather than SUVs (I love my Toyota Prius), know the seafood on the menu, become active in environmental causes and organizations, vote after checking with the League of Conservation Voters, and generally try to escape the enthrallment of utopian materialism. In business, customer-driven change occurs very rapidly. The more that we consumers demand products that have less environmental impact, the faster change will occur.

Is there a link between GEOpolity and JAZZ? One reason we are hearing so much JAZZ, especially from the business community, is because of all the classical music being played over in GEOpolity Hall. And what is it when jazz and classical music are brought together? It's called FUSION, of course, and we are beginning to see it as well. JAZZ and GEOpolity are not mutually exclusive; they can reinforce each other. GEOpolity actions, proposed or actual, can stimulate JAZZ, and successful JAZZ can pave the way for further GEOpolity initiatives that create a framework where individual initiatives can flourish.

Two useful FUSION ideas have come forward, and one has already achieved some success. The World Bank's vice president for Europe, J. F. Rischard, has proposed that the best way to address many global issues is through what he calls "global issue networks."[38] These would

be ad hoc, self-starting groups with participants from civil society organizations, governments, and businesses that would together produce norms, standards, and policies needed to address particular issues. These norms would be enforced by public scrutiny and other pressures, and could lead to implementation through national legislation. Why not try out Rischard's proposal on the global nitrogen problem discussed in chapter 3? Another good project for a new generation.

The 2002 Johannesburg Summit pioneered a FUSION initiative—using a classic GEOpolity process, a U.N. mega-conference, to promote voluntary partnerships. The summit encouraged what were called "type 2 outcomes," public-private and other partnership initiatives for sustainable development. Hundreds of these individual initiatives were showcased at Johannesburg. The United States highlighted numerous U.S.-based partnership initiatives, said to be worth $2.4 billion over several years. (Because it offered so little else in the traditional "type 1" negotiations among governments, critics accused the United States of seeking to derail the main purpose of the meeting with "type 2" agreements.) UNEP presented awards for the ten best partnerships, including ones involving Alcan for school-based recycling in Asia and the Americas and Shell for a gas exploration project in the Philippines. The United States committed thirty-six million dollars over three years to help protect Congo Basin forests.[39]

I would like to close with an extraordinary example of JAZZ beginning to go to scale. In August 2000, a group of leading scientists convened by the NGO Conservation International in Pasadena, California, endorsed a multibillion dollar plan to focus conservation efforts on biodiversity hot spots.[40] The basic idea, pioneered by Norman Myers, is that twenty-five areas around the globe, representing only 1.4 percent of the earth's land, are home to 44 percent of all plants, 35 percent of nonfish vertebrates, and 60 percent of all terrestrial species.[41] Hot spot advocates claim that the best investment for saving species is to protect these areas, most of which are threatened by development and other pressures. About 40 percent of hot spot area is already in some protected

status, though these are often little more than paper parks. Prominent among the hot spots are areas of Madagascar, the Philippines, Indonesia, Brazil's Atlantic forest, the Caribbean, India, and Southeast Asia.

This attractive concept has now developed legs beyond the imaginings of even optimistic observers. In August 2000 the World Bank and the Global Environment Facility joined with Conservation International to launch a $150 million fund to protect hot spots. And then the Moore Foundation in San Francisco announced that it was making the largest environmental grant in history—$261 million—to CI to help launch the hot spot strategy. All of which has led even cautious observers to conclude that it just might work.

We can draw at least two important lessons from the hot spots initiative. One is to think big, even if you are a small NGO. The other is that if you have a really good and promising idea, like saving half the world's species with investments that are relatively modest, the world might just respond. Apathy is a shield people use to protect themselves against despair and powerlessness. It is not so much the product of indifference as inability. When you empower people with the possibility of action on the scale of the problem, things can happen.

The hot spots will not be saved, however, unless in a larger sense we save the world, too. A world thrown into disarray ecologically and socially by global climate change will not favor hot spot conservation. The ecosystems services on which we depend will not be provided by 1.4 percent of the land. Every place, every locale, has its endemic populations of plants and animals, genetically suited to function in that place.[42] Their loss is unconscionable, too. So while we give the hot spot initiative our fullest support, we should not neglect the larger context.

10 The Most Fundamental Transition of All

We are Nature, long have we been absent, but now we return. Walt Whitman

Confirm thy soul in self-control. "America the Beautiful"

The most fundamental transition is the transition in culture and consciousness. The change that is needed can be best put as follows: in the twentieth century we were from Mars but in the twenty-first century we must be from Venus—caring, nurturing, and sustaining.

Paul Raskin and his colleagues in the Global Scenario Group have envisioned a future when these and other human values are realized. "Here is a civilization of unprecedented freedom, tolerance and decency. The pursuit of meaningful and fulfilling lives is a universal right, the bonds of human solidarity have never been stronger and ecological sensibility infuses human values. . . . Preferred lifestyles combine material sufficiency with qualitative fulfillment. Conspicuous consumption and glitter are viewed as vulgar throwbacks to an earlier era. The