Official Statements

Below are excerpts from recent official statements in which environment, population, and human security issues are prominently cited in the context of national and security interests. The Environmental Change and Security Project welcomes information on other related public statements. Please see the inside cover of this issue for our contact information.

From Monterrey to Johannesburg

Statement by James D. Wolfensohn
President, The World Bank Group

Excerpts of Mr. Wolfensohn's speech at the Woodrow Wilson International Center for Scholars
6 March 2002

Rarely has there been an issue [financing for development] so vital to long-term peace and security, and yet so marginalized in domestic politics in most of the rich world…

Never perhaps has the chance for concerted action been greater, or the prize more worth the winning. The horrifying events of September 11 have made this a time of reflection on how to make the world a better and safer place. The international community has already acted strongly, by confronting terrorism directly and increasing security. But those actions by themselves are not enough. We will not create that better and safer world with bombs or brigades alone. We will not win the peace until we have the foresight, the courage, and the political will to redefine the war…

We must recognize that while there is social injustice on a global scale, both between states and within them; while the fight against poverty is barely begun in too many parts of the world; while the link between progress in development and progress toward peace is not recognized—we may win a battle against terror, but we will not conclude a war that will yield enduring peace.

Poverty is our greatest long-term challenge. Grueling, mind-numbing poverty—which snatches hope and opportunity away from young hearts and dreams just when they should take flight and soar.

Poverty—which takes the promise of a whole life ahead and stunts it into a struggle for day-to-day survival.

Poverty—which together with its handmaiden, hopelessness, can lead to exclusion, anger, and even conflict.

Poverty—which does not itself necessarily lead to violence, but which can provide a breeding ground for the ideas and actions of those who promote conflict and terror.

On September 11, the crisis of Afghanistan came to Wall Street, to the Pentagon, and to a field in Pennsylvania. And the imaginary wall that divided the rich world from the poor world came crashing down.

Belief in that wall, and in those separate and separated worlds, has for too long allowed us to view as normal a world where less than 20 percent of the population—the rich countries in which we are today—dominates the world's wealth and resources and takes 80 percent of its dollar income.

Belief in that wall has too long allowed us to view as normal a world where every minute a woman dies in childbirth.

Belief in that wall has allowed us for too long to view the violence, disenfranchisement, and inequality in the world as the problem of poor, weak countries and not our own.

There is no wall. There are not two worlds. There is only one…

There is no wall. We are linked by trade, investment, finance, by travel and communications, by disease, by crime, by migration, by environmental degradation, by drugs, by financial crises, and by terror…

It is time to tear down that wall, to recognize that in this unified world poverty is our collective enemy. Poverty is the war we must fight. We must fight it because it is morally and ethically repugnant. We must fight it because it is in the self-interest of the rich to join the struggle. We must fight it because its existence is like a cancer—weakening the whole of the body, not just the parts that are directly affected.

And we need not fight blindly. For we already have a vision of what the road to victory could look

like.

Last year, at the Summit held at the United Nations, more than 140 world leaders agreed to launch a campaign to attack poverty on a number of fronts. Together, we agreed to support the Millennium Development Goals. By 2015, we said, we will:

- Halve the proportion of people living on less than one dollar a day;
- Ensure that boys and girls alike complete primary schooling;
- Eliminate gender disparity at all levels of education;
- Reduce child mortality by two-thirds;
- Reduce maternal mortality by three-quarters;
- Roll-back HIV/AIDS, malaria, and other diseases;
- Halve the proportion of people without access to safe water; and
- Develop a global partnership for development.

And these challenges will only grow over the next 30 years, as the global population increases by two billion to eight billion people, with almost the entire increase going to developing countries…

If we want to build long-term peace, if we want stability for our economies, if we want growth opportunities in the years ahead, if we want to build that better and safer world, fighting poverty must be part of national and international security. I do not underestimate the challenge of securing an extra $50 billion for development. But I know, as do many others, that this is the place to put our money. The conquest of poverty is indeed the quest for peace.

We must not let our mission be clouded by debates on which there is no debate. The debates are: Let's have effectiveness. Let's have productivity. Let's ensure that the money is well spent. Let's ensure that programs and projects are not corrupt. Let's ensure that women are given an important place in the development process. Let's ensure that issues are locally owned. Let's use all instruments at our disposal, grants, loans, and guarantees. These are not issues for debate. They are issues on which the principles are all agreed. These are not issues to hold up action. These are issues on which we can all close ranks and move forward…

Statement by George W. Bush
President of the United States of America

Excerpts of remarks made by President Bush at the International Conference on Financing for Development, Monterrey, Mexico
22 March 2002

Many here today have devoted their lives to the fight against global poverty, and you know the stakes. We fight against poverty because hope is an answer to terror. We fight against poverty because opportunity is a fundamental right to human dignity. We fight against poverty because faith requires it and conscience demands it. And we fight against poverty with a growing conviction that major progress is within our reach.

Yet this progress will require change. For decades, the success of development aid was measured only in the resources spent, not the results achieved. Yet pouring money into a failed status quo does little to help the poor, and can actually delay the progress of reform. We must accept a higher, more difficult, more promising call. Developed nations have a duty not only to share our wealth, but also to encourage sources that produce wealth: economic freedom, political liberty, the rule of law and human rights.

The lesson of our time is clear: When nations close their markets and opportunity is hoarded by a privileged few, no amount—no amount—of development aid is ever enough. When nations respect their people, open markets, invest in better health and education, every dollar of aid, every dollar of trade revenue and domestic capital is used more effectively.

We must tie greater aid to political and legal and economic reforms. And by insisting on reform, we do the work of compassion. The United States will lead by example. I have proposed a 50-percent increase in our core development assistance over the next three budget years. Eventually, this will mean a five billion dollar annual increase over current levels.

These new funds will go into a new Millennium Challenge Account, devoted to projects in nations that govern justly, invest in their people, and encourage economic freedom. We will promote development from the bottom up, helping citizens find the tools and training and technologies to seize the opportunities of the global economy.

I've asked Secretary of State Powell [and] Secretary of [the] Treasury O'Neill to reach out to the world community to develop clear and concrete objective

criteria for the Millennium Challenge Account. We'll apply these criteria fairly and rigorously.

And to jump-start this initiative, I'll work with the United States Congress to make resources available over the 12 months for qualifying countries. Many developing nations are already working hard on the road—and they're on the road of reform and bringing benefits to their people. The new Compact for Development will reward these nations and encourage others to follow their example.

The goal of our development aid will be for nations to grow and prosper beyond the need for any aid. When nations adopt reforms, each dollar of aid attracts two dollars of private investments. When aid is linked to good policy, four times as many people are lifted out of poverty compared to old aid practices.

Yet we have much more to do. Developing nations need greater access to markets of wealthy nations. And we must bring down the high trade barriers between developing nations themselves. The global trade negotiations launched in Doha confront these challenges.

The success of these negotiations will bring greater prosperity to rich and middle-income and poor nations alike. By one estimate, a new global trade pact could lift 300 million lives out of poverty. When trade advances, there's no question but the fact that poverty retreats.

The task of development is urgent and difficult, yet the way is clear. As we plan and act, we must remember the true source of economic progress is the creativity of human beings. Nations' most vital

All of us... must focus on real benefits to the poor, instead of debating arbitrary levels of inputs from the rich.
—George W. Bush

All of us here must focus on real benefits to the poor, instead of debating arbitrary levels of inputs from the rich. We should invest in better health and build on our efforts to fight AIDS, which threatens to undermine whole societies. We should give more of our aid in the form of grants, rather than loans that can never be repaid.

The work of development is much broader than development aid. The vast majority of financing for development comes not from aid, but from trade and domestic capital and foreign investment. Developing countries receive approximately $50 billion every year in aid. That is compared to foreign investment of almost $200 billion in annual earnings from exports of $2.4 trillion. So, to be serious about fighting poverty, we must be serious about expanding trade.

Trade helped nations as diverse as South Korea and Chile and China to replace despair with opportunity for millions of their citizens. Trade brings new technology, new ideas, and new habits, and trade brings expectations of freedom. And greater access to the markets of wealthy countries has a direct and immediate impact on the economies of developing nations.

As one example, in a single year, the African Growth and Opportunity Act has increased African exports to the United States by more than 1,000 percent, generated nearly one billion dollars in investment, and created thousands of jobs.

natural resources are found in the minds and skills and enterprise of their citizens. The greatness of a society is achieved by unleashing the greatness of its people. The poor of the world need resources to meet their needs, and like all people, they deserve institutions that encourage their dreams.

All people deserve governments instituted by their own consent; legal systems that spread opportunity, instead of protecting the narrow interests of a few; and the economic systems that respect their ambition and reward efforts of the people. Liberty and law and opportunity are the conditions for development, and they are the common hopes of mankind.

The spirit of enterprise is not limited by geography or religion or history. Men and women were made for freedom, and prosperity comes as freedom triumphs. And that is why the United States of America is leading the fight for freedom from terror.

We thank our friends and neighbors throughout the world for helping in this great cause. History has called us to a titanic struggle, whose stakes could not be higher because we're fighting for freedom itself. We're pursuing great and worthy goals to make the world safer, and as we do, to make it better. We will challenge the poverty and hopelessness and lack of education and failed governments that too often allow conditions that terrorists can seize and try to turn to their advantage.

Our new approach for development places

responsibility on developing nations and on all nations. We must build the institutions of freedom, not subsidize the failures of the past. We must do more than just feel good about what we are doing; we must do good.

By taking the side of liberty and good government, we will liberate millions from poverty's prison. We'll help defeat despair and resentment. We'll draw whole nations into an expanding circle of opportunity and enterprise. We'll gain true partners in development and add a hopeful new chapter to the history of our times.

Statement by Gordon Brown
UK Chancellor of the Exchequer

Excerpts of Chancellor Brown's speech to the National Press Club, Washington, DC
17 December 2001

I want to urge that together we form a new global alliance for prosperity that starts from the shared needs, common interests, and linked destinies of developed and developing worlds working together.

I want to describe how America's post-Second World War achievement in what we now call the Marshall Plan should be our inspiration in this post-Cold War world—not just for the reconstruction of Afghanistan but for the entire developing world…

Like our predecessors, we understand that national safety and global reconstruction are inextricably linked. Like them, we see the need for a new economic leadership—a comprehensive plan that goes beyond temporary relief to wholesale economic and social development. Like them, we see the need for a new global economic and social order grounded in both rights and responsibilities accepted by all. Like theirs, our proposals call on the poorest countries themselves to rise to the challenge.

But while there are parallels between our time and 50 years ago, no historical analogies can ever be exact. Far more so than in Marshall's time, our interdependence means that what happens to the poorest citizen in the poorest country can directly affect the richest citizen in the richest country. And while the Marshall Plan deserves an honored place in our history, its remedies cannot be blindly or rigidly applied to efforts to solve the challenges of today and the future…

And 50 years on, we not only see more clearly our interdependence, but [also] the gap between what technology enables us to do—abolish poverty—and the reality of 110 million children without schooling, seven million avoidable child deaths each year, and one billion of our citizens in poverty.

It is for these reasons that the whole international community—the IMF, World Bank, the UN, and each of our countries—has solemnly committed to the most ambitious development goals for 2015: to halve world poverty, cut child mortality by two-thirds, and guarantee every child primary education.

Our plan is this: developing countries must pursue corruption-free policies for stability, for opening up trade, and for creating a favorable environment for investment. In return, we should be prepared to increase by 50 billion [dollars] a year in the years to 2015 vitally needed funds to achieve these…Millennium Development Goals.

The development funding I propose is not aid in the traditional sense to compensate for poverty, but new investment in the future to address the causes of poverty…

Indeed the proposal I am making today will work only if we see development assistance in this light: more effective in-country use of funds to help countries invest and compete; the multi-national pooling of budgets and the proper monitoring of their use to achieve the greatest cost effectiveness of new investment; untying aid [and] so maximizing its efficiency in diminishing poverty; and development funding conditional on pursuing agreed goals for social and economic development.

Indeed, our proposals are designed to create the best environment for private investment to take off and flourish by increasing funds for investment in health and education—not typically areas in[to] which private capital flows, but areas in which public investment is necessary to create an environment in which private investment can flourish.

Our vision of the way forward—akin to Marshall's challenge to rich and poor countries alike—is that, by each meeting their obligations for change, all countries can benefit.

For the poorest countries: new responsibilities—to pursue transparent corruption-free policies for stability and the attraction of private investment; and new opportunities—with access to increased trade and development supported by a transfer of resources from

rich to poor for investment in health and education.

For the richest countries: new responsibilities—to open our markets, to reform our international institutions, and to transfer resources; and yet new opportunities too—increased trade and a globalization that works in the public interest.

In future, no country genuinely committed to pro-stability, pro-trade, and pro-investment policies should be denied the chance of progress through the lack of basic investment in education, health, and the basic infrastructure for economic development.

And this is our answer to globalization and to the critics of globalization.

Some critics say the issue is whether we should have globalization or not. In fact, the issue is whether we manage globalization well or badly, fairly or unfairly.

Globalization can be for the people or against the people. Poorly managed, globalization can create a vicious circle of poverty, widening inequality, and increasing resentment. Managed wisely, it can lift millions out of deprivation and become the high road to a more just and inclusive global economy.

Our answer to anti-globalization campaigners…is that we shall not retreat from globalization.

Instead, we will advance social justice on a global scale—and we will do so with greater global cooperation, not less; and with stronger, not weaker, international institutions.

We will best help the poor not by opting out or by cutting cooperation across the world, but by strengthening that cooperation, modernizing our international rules, and radically reforming the institutions of economic cooperation to meet the new challenges…

Statement by Paul H. O'Neill
U.S. Secretary of the Treasury

Excerpts of Secretary O'Neill's remarks entitled "Caring Greatly and Succeeding Greatly: Producing Results in Africa," made to the Carnegie Endowment for Peace, Washington, DC
5 June 2002

We in the developed world must support African leaders who are creating the conditions for success—ruling justly, encouraging economic freedom, and investing in their people. And we must ourselves take a leadership role in demanding results.

The impoverished people of Africa—and in poor nations everywhere—require a new kind of help, that goes beyond the well-intentioned but disappointing results of the past fifty years.

If our assistance is not making a difference, or if we cannot measure our results to know what difference we have made, then we have to change our approach. We owe that to the people of Africa.

In Africa, I saw signs of progress everywhere. Programs are working, aid is helping, and standards of living are improving.

But there is a long way to go. The progress I saw deserves praise, but it just isn't enough.

Let me highlight the areas in which we witnessed progress. In particular, I saw three kinds of investments in people that are vital to realizing Africa's potential: clean water, primary education, and fighting HIV/AIDS.

Clean water is, surely, one of the most essential elements of a dignified, civilized life. No aspect of infrastructure is more basic. Yet 45 percent of sub-Saharan Africans lack access to clean, safe water. That's about 300 million people—more than the total population of the United States. In Ethiopia, that figure is 78 percent, or 50 million people in that country alone.

One insight from my Africa tour is that local leaders, with some engineering and financial support, could develop clean water sources for their towns and villages fairly quickly. For example, in one Ugandan village I saw a concrete basin installed to protect a natural spring. The women of the village could collect the water directly from the basin instead of collecting it after it spilled across the muddy ground. The concrete basin cost a thousand dollars to install.

But the local chairman for the project told me that the greatest hindrance to installing the system had been local fears that a snake was protecting the spring, and that the snake would become enraged by any tampering and would take away the water. He had to spend considerable time persuading his fellow villagers to go ahead with the project. It took his leadership to get the project finished…

In these and other cases, only local leadership could tailor development projects to suit local cultures and customs. And it was sometimes shocking to see the disconnect between the aid bureaucracies with their 15-year plans and the availability of more immediate solutions.

You cannot airdrop solutions to local problems. You can only offer air support. Local leadership must implement the solutions on the ground and be accountable for success.

If we can figure out a way to support African leaders in bringing clean water to their nations—and I think we can do that much faster and cheaper than the endless studies say we can—we can liberate hundreds of millions of people, especially women and children, from preventable, debilitating illness and meaningless, wearisome labor. They would be free to pursue their dreams for a better life.

You cannot air drop solutions to local problems. You can only offer air support. Local leadership must implement the solutions on the ground and be accountable for success.
—Paul H. O'Neill

The second important investment I saw was in raising primary education enrollment. I believe that in Africa, in the United States, and in every part of the world, children by the age of about ten years old should and can have the tools to be life-long self-learners. But that requires that we get them into schools at an early age, and keep them there, with adequate materials…

The third, perhaps most crucial area for investment in people is health care. Nowhere is this more urgent, and more heartbreaking, than in the struggle against AIDS. In South Africa I saw mothers with AIDS caring for babies with AIDS, even when proven, inexpensive drugs are available to stop transmission between mother and child. I saw the dedication of nurses and doctors treating people with AIDS, and their patients' struggle to survive.

Certainly, prevention of further HIV contagion is the utmost priority, especially to keep the next generation of newborns free from disease. Uganda, in particular, thanks to President Museveni's leadership on this issue, is one of the few to reduce the portion of the population afflicted with AIDS. But among the challenges facing those who fight AIDS in Africa is that in many countries, there is a social stigma attached to even testing for the disease. They need more leaders to tackle this issue head-on…

Providing the framework for basic health and education is fundamental for enabling people to realize their potential. When governments are investing in their people, providing clean water, education, and health care, and when the other aspects of good governance are present—just rule and economic freedom—prosperity can blossom…

As private enterprise expands in an economy, trade and investment grow to dwarf official aid. Countries that won political independence years ago finally win their economic independence as well. Government provides the conditions for growth, but it is not the source of prosperity. Private citizens create prosperity through enterprise…

Unfortunately, in too many cases, potential entrepreneurs and investors in Africa are deterred by arbitrary laws, corrupt bureaucracies, and government favoritism. Africa is a continent of entrepreneurial enthusiasm—that's what I saw. But these individuals have no chance for success without governments that fairly enforce laws and contracts, respect human rights and property, and fight corruption. Governments also must remove barriers to trade—both internal and external—and open their economies to investment. They must allow companies and entrepreneurs to compete without excessive interference, including interference from government-owned enterprises…

Many extol debt forgiveness as the path to African development. I would agree that debt forgiveness may help, but it alone is not the solution.

Debt forgiveness solves nothing if we allow new debt to create the next generation of heavily indebted poor countries a decade from now. President Bush has proposed that up to 50 percent of World Bank and other development bank funds for the poorest countries be provided as grants rather than as loans. This proposal acknowledges the long-term development challenges facing these countries, their vulnerability to economic shocks, and the reality that essential investments in social sectors, such as education and health care—investments in people—cannot directly generate the incremental revenue to service new debt.

Replacing loans with targeted grants will eliminate the need for governments to repay long-term investments in people. It will thereby eliminate the next generation of debt service problems. It is time to end the sad cycle of indebtedness for countries committed to success.

Second, it's a simple fact that is as true about an individual as it is about a nation—even without debt, it's impossible to prosper without income. Even if we forgave all debts, many of these countries still could not fund their own budgets, and they would not be much better off…

In the long-term, domestic entrepreneurship as well as trade and foreign investment are far more important for economic growth than official aid…

I went to those troubled lands, and I believe this: with the right combination of aid and accountability—from both rich nations and poor ones—we can accelerate the spread of education, clean water, and private enterprise throughout Africa. We can help the African people create vibrant, self-sustaining economies and a rising standard of living.

Development is complicated. I know that. I don't underestimate the challenge. I just don't think we should accept complexity as an excuse for delay.

As Marshall said, "With foresight, and a willingness on the part of our people to face up to the vast responsibility which history has placed upon our country, the difficulties I have outlined can and will be overcome."

Together, we can produce results for Africa. We will tear down the walls to prosperity. Not in the next generation, but right now. In this era of global opportunity, no continent, no country, and no person should be left behind. President Bush said it best—there are no second class citizens in the human race. We must make his vision into a worldwide reality.

Statement by Jacques Chirac
President of France

Excerpts of President Chirac's address to the International Conference on Financing for Development, Monterrey, Mexico
22 March 2002

Only yesterday, the world order was frozen by the clash of blocs, which posed a threat to peace and liberty.

Now that this fault-line has been overcome, the world can at last set about accomplishing its common destiny.

Globalization has brought us a degree of economic dynamism without parallel in history, free trade with its immense promises, and swift advances in knowledge and technology.

And yet more than two billion people live in dire poverty. People are still dying of cholera, tuberculosis, and malaria for want of treatment. HIV/AIDS is ravaging entire populations—a terrible human tragedy and an obstacle to development.

And yet the world is confronted with fanatical terrorism, the tentacular power of organized crime, and drug trafficking. It is not immune to financial turbulence. And nations, fearing their identity is about to be steamrollered by rampant globalization, are sometimes inclined to seek refuge in nostalgia for times past.

The inexorable advance of economic globalization calls for the globalization of solidarity. What is at stake in Monterrey is not only the financing of development. It is also about harnessing the world's nations in search of an answer to the gnawing question of our times: namely, how to end a situation that is morally unacceptable, politically dangerous, and economically absurd?

How are we to put an end to a situation in which the accumulation of wealth will not suffice to lift the very poor out of poverty?

I want to see a new wind blowing in Monterrey, a wind of generosity and hope. The conference document represents only a first step, in my view, a first realization of the scale of the problem. We should be more ambitious. Already Europe has decided to step up its development aid effort, aiming for the objective of 0.7 percent.

President Bush has announced America's plans to revitalize its aid. The developing countries have committed themselves to promoting economic growth through good governance and greater recourse to private initiative. A global partnership for development through solidarity is being established where everyone will be pulling their weight. Africa has shown the way with the adoption of the New Partnership for Africa's Development.

But we need to go further still.

To achieve the aims of the Millennium Summit, the World Bank estimates it will be necessary to double the amount currently spent on poverty eradication. It puts those needs at 100 billion dollars annually. That is undoubtedly a lot of money. But we need to place that in the context of the huge volume of international trade. It does not amount to very much when compared with the human, political, and economic benefits our world would reap from eradicating poverty.

We must pursue every avenue in search of this objective. And those avenues exist, starting with an increase in official development aid. But that alone is not enough. We need to build on that. Via an additional allocation of special drawing rights. Via greater generosity in the application of debt cancellation decisions for the very poor countries and more ambitious treatment for the severely indebted middle-income countries. And it is natural to consider drawing on the wealth created by globalization in order to finance efforts to humanize and control it. We therefore need to ponder more deeply the possibilities of international taxation.

But the issues raised by this new partnership are broader still.

We want to bequeath a clean planet to our children. Even now we are using up nature's resources faster than it can replenish them. It would be irresponsible not to put an end to this dangerous trend. Polluting emissions have triggered a process of climate warming that threatens the conditions of life itself for ourselves and for our children. The Kyoto Protocol is the only credible means to reduce them, and I call upon all countries to ratify it. The approach it embodies prefigures the new sharing of resources and responsibilities on which nations must now agree.

For we need to build on Monterrey through a partnership for sustainable development. The ecological revolution is comparable in scale to the industrial revolution. That is the challenge we must work together to overcome in Johannesburg, by inventing new modes of production and consumption. By creating a World Environment Organization.

Six months ago New York was disfigured by a hateful crime. America, with the support of the international community, struck back at the terrorists who threatened it. And the world came together in a coalition against terrorism, determined to act firmly, within the framework of the law.

What can be done against terrorism can surely be done against poverty, in the name of a more human, manageable globalization. Let us form a coalition to build together a universal civilization where there is a place for everyone, where everyone is respected, and where everyone has a chance.

Inspired by that ideal and by the commitments of the Millennium Summit, France proposes that we work together over the coming decade to bring to fruition five projects. Five projects that testify to our resolve to make globalization serve mankind:

- Allocating 0.7 percent of the wealth of the industrialized countries to development of the poor countries;
- Agreement on new funding for their development;
- Creation of an Economic and Social Security Council, within which all can work together for the sustainable management of global public goods;
- Fulfillment of the Kyoto objectives and the establishment of a World Environment Organization;
- Conclusion of a Convention on Cultural Diversity, expressing our confidence in the capacity of humans to reconcile the unity of the world with its diversity.

We owe it to future generations.

Statement by Thoraya Ahmed Obaid
Executive Director, United Nations Population Fund

Excerpts from Dr. Obaid's address to the International Conference on Financing for Development, Monterrey, Mexico
21 March 2002

We are gathered in Monterrey to try to resolve a paradox: the paradox of a world where wealth is being created faster than ever before, but inequalities are widening faster than ever before; where the 10 richest individuals are richer than the 10 poorest countries; where education and health care are universally valued, but where illiteracy and ill-health are still the norm for half the world.

We have emerged from a century of paradox: a century of systematic destruction and soaring achievement; a century of ethnic strife and emerging democracy; a century of assaults on basic humanity and universal agreement on human rights.

Are we ready now to tip the scale towards humanity: to use human resources and ingenuity to end poverty, to promote human rights, and to work towards a satisfying and sustainable life for everyone on the planet? Or will we allow the new century to continue the way it has begun?

There are reasons to think that we cannot continue in this way and expect our civilization to survive. There are four times as many people as there were in 1900. Among us, we wield terrible power. In the last hundred years we have altered the planet more than

in the whole of human history. We have drastically reduced the available margin for error. Action to end poverty is more than a matter of mere survival. It is a matter of morality. It is simply unacceptable that one-fifth of humanity commands more than four-fifths of the world's resources, while more than a billion people subsist on a dollar a day. Most of the world's men and women live with the consequences of poverty—malnutrition, chronic ill-health, exposure to communicable disease, and maternal death during childbirth. Largely because of poverty, and our failure to address it, 40 million people are now living with HIV/AIDS—and this is only the beginning. The sad end of this story is that these consequences are all preventable.

We can end poverty, at least extreme poverty. We all know what needs to be done, and to a large extent we know how to do it. We know that economic poverty has social roots and that poverty is intergenerational. The consensus reached at international UN conferences of the 1990s and at the UN Millennium Summit converged around the same practical and affordable goals in several areas, including health, education, population, and gender equity and equality. Achieving these goals would lay a solid foundation for ending poverty in many of the poorest countries over the next generation.

It is encouraging that we can point to success in at least one of these areas. Population has been a success story, where women and men have taken their decisions to plan their families and to contribute to slowing population growth. Today women in large numbers are making their own choices regarding birth spacing and family size.

Today women in Bangladesh have chosen to have half as many children as they did 20 years ago. In India, the average woman has three children today, compared to five children two decades ago. In Indonesia, average family size has decreased from more than four children in 1980 to between two and three children today. Here in Mexico in the late 1960s, when UNFPA began its work, total fertility peaked at nearly seven children per woman. A concerted national effort was started in 1974 with UNFPA cooperation. Now, women have on average fewer than three children. Mexico's population profile is beginning to look like that of an industrial country, with a higher proportion of people of working age compared to children and the elderly.

UNFPA has worked for three decades in close partnership with developing countries in all regions. Everything we have learned shows that when women are empowered—through laws that ensure their rights, health care that ensures their well-being, and education that ensures their active participation—the benefits go far beyond the individual: they benefit the family, the community, and the nation.

Statement by Gro Harlem Brundtland

Director-General of the World Health Organization

Excerpts from Dr. Brundtland's remarks at the International Conference on Financing for Development, Monterrey, Mexico
20 March 2002

How do we make sure that financing for development brings useful benefits to the people who need them most? How can we ensure that resources lead to real improvements in the lives of the poorest two billion?

My view on these issues is clear. Development is not possible unless people are healthy.

Investing in people is crucial. It will yield enormous benefits and allow millions of people to move out of poverty. Better health will bring real improvements to their lives.

In 1999, I asked leading economists and health experts from around the world to analyze the links between health and economic development.

Last December, in London, Clare Short and Bono joined me when Jeff Sachs presented the Report of the Commission on Macroeconomics and Health. [The Report] shows how disease is a drain on economies and how investment in health spurs economic growth. Improving people's health could be the single most important determinant of economic growth in Africa.

The Commission's proposal would mean the saving of eight million lives a year with a six-fold economic return on resources invested.

This week we ask ourselves: how do we increase—and improve—investments in development, making them even more effective? How can the private sector engage more strongly in promoting development and reducing poverty?

We know what needs to be done.

Three diseases—HIV/AIDS, tuberculosis, and

malaria—bring a heavy burden. Maternal and child conditions and good nutrition are also global health priorities. As we concluded in Stockholm last week, the survival and destiny of children is crucial to our future.

Any serious attempt to reduce the disease burden faced by the world's poorest people must concentrate on these conditions.

Any serious attempt to stimulate global economic and social development and promote human security must address this burden.

The proposed investments are cost-effective. Their impact can be measured—in terms of reducing disease burdens and improving health. Our emphasis is on results: on investing where it makes a difference.

We seek the engagement of a range of partners at local and national levels, with civil society, private entities, researchers, and the media joining public-sector actors. We encourage them to pursue common strategies: building on best practice while harnessing innovations for the future.

We have seen the formation of national and international alliances that increase access to vital vaccines and medicines—for HIV care, leprosy, rolling back malaria, stopping TB, tackling sleeping sickness, controlling diabetes, reducing tobacco use, and combating childhood infections.

At the global level, new systems for scaling up national efforts are emerging. Funding mechanisms like the Global Fund to Fight AIDS, TB and Malaria and the Global Alliance for Vaccines and Immunization support such action.

We encourage donors to work jointly with national level partners—through sector-wide approaches and poverty-reduction strategies. We are all learning from experience.

WHO will focus on making sure that funds are well spent.

We are strengthening our capacity to provide countries with the technical assistance they need for this extra effort. It will include delivery of vaccines, maternal and child health services, care for people living with HIV, and control measures for malaria and TB.

Statement by Chris Patten
European Union External Relations Commissioner

Excerpts from Commissioner Patten's address at the Forum for the Future, Church House, Westminster, London
29 November 2001

So we have moved in the decade that saw the end of one bloody century and the inauspicious beginning of another, from "The End of History," to borrow one book title, to "The Coming Anarchy," to borrow another. In today's political world you are no longer regarded as a crank when you argue that "the environment"—demography, disease, deforestation, depletion of resources, and so on—is the most important national security and foreign policy challenge we face.

By any measure, the shift from greater awareness of an apocalyptic future to delivery of national and international action to head off the threats has been grossly insufficient. In the view of poorer countries, the Rio concept of "common but differentiated responsibility" has not been met by an adequate shouldering of the burden by the rich. Meanwhile, rich nations remain uneasy about taking measures, which they fear might in the short term chip away at the all-important economic growth that has marked most of the period since Rio. For both, preoccupation with immediate concerns has relegated longer-term problems steadily down the agenda of political priorities.

So yes, we have been there before. The world's leaders cannot be eager to be reminded that the promises of Rio have not been met. Especially as they have no one to blame but each other. Add to this the growing consensus that the gulf between rich and poor could make the global economy as unsustainable as its ecology, and you hardly have a recipe for unbridled enthusiasm. But "summit fatigue" must not become an excuse to justify lukewarm commitment to vitally important international processes, however difficult it is to see a productive way forward. We cannot bunk off school when most of us have already been playing truant for ten years. I am glad that Tony Blair was among the first to volunteer for service at Johannesburg. I would be delighted if that meeting became, as some have suggested it should, a "summit to end all summits." But it can only be so if it sets off an era of international cooperation, which is genuinely different from anything we have seen since the years

immediately following the Second World War.

So I want to consider today what has and has not changed in the ten years since Rio. Are we within a fighting chance of creating new global disciplines? And can sustainable development be placed at the center of those disciplines, taking its rightful place as an indispensable element of global security as well as a pressing moral responsibility?

this is a self-deluding notion. You can hang on to the forms of sovereignty while losing the substance, a proposition that pretty much encapsulates the main political argument about Britain and Europe. In order to protect and promote their national interest, countries have increasingly to pool their sovereignty. No country is sufficient unto itself, even this "jewel set in a silver sea."

Summit fatigue must not become an excuse to justify lukewarm commitment to vitally important processes.
—Chris Patten

How Has the World Changed Since Rio?

I shall begin at the end. September 11. It certainly looked like the end for a few appalling moments. But did the atrocities cause a seismic shift in global attitudes, or are we witnessing a short-lived spate of togetherness? The web of international alliances and divisions is undergoing radical change. There has been a surge of coming together which has produced many unlikely bedfellows. Age-old rifts will not disappear overnight, but we are seeing a multitude of new efforts to heal them. The coalition against terrorism is as near to global as we are ever going to get, and has certainly consigned the last remnants of the Cold War definitively to the dustbin. Old distinctions between "home" and "abroad," "developed" and "developing" have been spectacularly erased. As Jim Wolfensohn has said, the idea that a rich world and a poor world can co-exist without dramatic implications collapsed along with the twin towers on September 11.

Such a shift in perception should come as no surprise to those who have long been arguing that it is the very interconnection of countries and events which must be the point of departure for international policy and decision-making everywhere; that each nation's stability, prosperity, and security are dependent on the global community's collective approach to matters which are framed neither by national borders nor [by] conventional concepts of sovereignty. As I have argued before, sovereignty is a notoriously slippery concept. And today for us in Britain, a dangerous one, too. It has distorted the debate about Britain's role in the world and our relationship with Europe, a relationship demonized by some as the pilfering year by year, piece by piece, of our national birthright like the vandalizing and demolition of an ancient monument.

But even for the greatest, most powerful countries,

The century ahead will be defined by the growing domain of interests that are common to all countries. If foreign policy in the past consisted chiefly in seeking to persuade others to align themselves with one's national aims, it is now about aligning all national aims so that they are directed at the same global targets.

Idealists have taken the events of September 11 as grounds to assert that the power of community is now bound to take its place once and for all ahead of outdated concepts of national interest. If only we could be so sure. For while it is certainly right to make the link between waging war on terrorism and draining the swamp of disaffection, exclusion, envy, and anger which breeds support for lunatic agendas of revenge, simply making the link through rhetoric will not be enough.

I am afraid it would require a leap of faith to imagine that we can now expect nations to unite seamlessly and effortlessly in the quest to weed out the "root causes" of the September 11 attacks. Those root causes go far beyond the networks of transnational crime and money laundering, drug dealing, and arms smuggling, to the destabilizing division between haves and have-nots, the spread of diseases, the persistence of abject poverty and dysfunctional states, and to rising tensions over access to ever-scarcer natural resources.

They are the causes rooted in a world where 10 percent of the world receives 70 percent of its income, and the three richest men have assets equal to the output of the 48 poorest nations. A world where the average American uses 1600 liters of petrol each year, compared to 50 liters for an Asian, and still less for an African. And such stark contrasts exist locally as well as globally. Here in London, a journey of six stops on the tube from Westminster to Canning Town takes you to a place where life expectancy is six years lower.

Still, the optimist in me also feels that somewhere

in the aftermath of September 11 lurks an opportunity to galvanize what some might regard as an unholy alliance of world leaders into doing more to tackle this whole litany of evils, the "dark side" of globalization in all its forms. The fight against terrorism must consist of action which is multi-frontal as well as multilateral; it must engage the widest possible number of international actors and confront the fullest possible range of causes. The challenges of making globalization more sustainable and more inclusive will require a sea-change in attitudes to problems which are not about to knock down skyscrapers in Manhattan or London: problems which cannot be blamed on terrorists or rogue states, or any identifiable and attackable baddies. Problems, alas, caused by you and me—the man and woman in the street—and the millions of little choices we make every day. Hopping in the car to drive to the shops; buying those beautiful ivory ornaments while holidaying in Africa; popping an illegal pill before going to the night-club; quietly hoping that petrol blockades achieve their aim of keeping prices low: a revolutionary triumph for Mondeo Man.

NGOs and Protesters: Ripe for a Coming of Age?

My sense of fresh opportunity does not just depend on a great and good phoenix rising from the ashes of Manhattan and the Pentagon. There are other currents, which are carrying forward a promising reassessment of priorities in the White Houses, Number 10s, and Elysée Palaces. Let me take you back a little further to the street scenes of Seattle, Prague, Gothenburg, and Genoa. The apparent quiet since then, the completion of a real job of work at Doha without any headline-grabbing demonstrations, should not lead us to forget that there has been a growing movement of dissent which has dragged, however chaotically, a ragbag of global concerns into the public eye. Some say that this is the voice of an extreme left which no longer feels represented by mainstream politics: the triumph of a liberal political and economic world order leaving Marxists with nowhere to go but the street. But I do not think these voices should be dismissed so lightly.

The protests are a public manifestation of an unease with global development which strikes a familiar chord at the international institutions and meetings they have chosen to target. Crucially, I repeat, it is a familiar chord, not a new revelation. Many of the concerns of the protesters would have occupied the minds of political leaders in any event, indeed have occupied them for years. The G8 pledged a billion-and-a-half new dollars to the developing world's fight against AIDS and other diseases at Genoa. At Gothenburg, the EU leaders adopted an ambitious strategy for Europe's own sustainability, and took President Bush to task for his unilateral withdrawal from the Kyoto Protocol. The biggest danger of the protest movement for me—aside from the insurrection of a violent minority of thugs—has been the propagation of a false impression of intractable opposition of purpose between those outside the meetings and those on the inside.

So I am encouraged that recent constructive efforts to unravel a coherent message from within the "civil" ranks of the protesters have revealed these common concerns. The sane majority of civil society is not, I am pleased to report, anti-globalization at all. They understand enough to know this would be tantamount to being anti-weather, or anti-time—that there is no "in or out" choice…Many groups who assemble under the umbrella of anti-globalization are becoming important partners in a real debate, a debate which must continue.

At the risk of offending some, I would submit that what most protesters want is more globalization, but globalization of a different sort. They want the institutions to catch up with the markets, to do a better job of spreading their benefits more widely, and to address needs that markets do not automatically serve: the needs of the disenfranchised poor; the needs of the environment. Without global structures and effective rules, the strong are bound to dominate the weak. Indeed the prime target of protesters' wrath—the WTO—may show us the way ahead. This is our only rule-based system with a real dispute-settlement mechanism, and real penalties for non-compliance; ingredients which might usefully be extended or replicated to address other global matters such as the environment. We must not let attacks on the imperfections of the current machinery shade into attacks on their very existence…

The key message I draw from the protests, and one with which I identify without hesitation, is that we cannot continue to ignore the impacts of exclusion of certain elements of our societies—or certain societies in their entirety—from a meaningful stake in the world's only viable economic system. We cannot continue to provide for ourselves that which we deny to others. Other countries. Future generations. It is simply not sustainable.

The Positive Role of Business

A rallying cry of many activists has been that globalization's biggest beneficiary is big business, the multinationals who will always place market share and profits before social equity or environmental protection. And these firms, it is said, wield significantly more power than the governments of many countries. Big firms which have weak régimes over a barrel when seeking the most favorable conditions in which to invest. But this is not the whole story. A more dispassionate approach may reveal another tale of promising change, which has unfolded for the most part in the ten years since Rio.

First of all, the two-thirds of all foreign direct investment that takes place between the countries of the OECD is clearly not driven by an indiscriminate search for the world's cheapest labor. Companies value the security of a reliable rule of law, an educated—not a subjugated—workforce. Repressive regimes are the hardest countries in which to do business, both literally and politically. The correlation between economic stability, a predictable and comfortable business environment, and an open, plural, democratic society is clear. The remarkable boom in European investment in Latin America was directly related to political as well as economic reform on that continent.

Secondly, corporate "good citizenship" ceases to be a fad for the philanthropic few as soon as it becomes an indispensable part of sound business sense. Questions of environmental and social responsibility have nowadays become a reflex for firms who wish to maintain their position in a world where their activities are scrutinized by all manner of campaign groups…

Thirdly, I am convinced that the interests of the big guns of the US energy establishment—those who see little gain and much pain in the Kyoto process—will have to compete more and more vigorously with the interests of an innovative research sector which sees a rosy future financially as well as ecologically in clean technology, emissions trading, and renewable energy. If Europe continues to lead the rest of the world in pushing ahead with Kyoto, as it must, the United States will one day come around, however grudgingly, and participate. The image of an awkward and unconvinced partner joining after the rest have tested the equipment is very familiar to a British Commissioner working in Brussels.

So companies themselves can be responsible for upward spirals as well as downward ones. Much criticized "self-regulation" can push standards higher. And some of the biggest players advocate more stringent statutory rules as their preferred way forward, as this should force the true cowboys among their competitors out of the market…

A Positive Agenda for Johannesburg

Governments. Civil society. Business. All the stakeholders are capable, with a little help from events and circumstances and a lot of mutual pressure, of pulling in the same direction. Can the run-up to Johannesburg be used to stoke up a new coalition of determination to confront fundamental questions of global sustainability and equity? I believe it must. And for the reasons I have just set out, I for one am ready to believe that the conditions now may even be better than they were ten years ago for us finally to start meeting the challenge of the Brundtland Report.

Things move painfully slowly at the multilateral level. But since the Rio commitments were made, they have been supplemented by those of a series of further UN Summits to give us the Millennium Development Goals endorsed last year by the whole international community. These provide us with an extremely comprehensive (not to say daunting) agenda for action. The challenge, as we all know, is in the delivery.

The EU's strategy for sustainable development should, I believe, run along four principal tracks. We must strengthen global rules to address long-term needs, not only by continuing to bolster the financial and trading systems, but also better to safeguard common concerns such as the environment. We must make trade an effective tool for growth in poor countries as well as rich, and do more to give the most marginalized countries a better chance to participate in world markets. We must deploy more and better targeted development assistance, especially at a time when private capital flows to developing countries are falling sharply; official development assistance must double from current levels of about $50 billion a year. And as we get the trains running on these first three tracks, the developing countries themselves have to continue their moves toward better national policies, to build a more favorable investment climate, and ensure reliable and efficient governance…

Conclusion: Better Multilateralism Does Not Mean Easier Multilateralism

The realignment of nations in our post-Cold War, post September 11 world may be dangling the trophies of better, more complete multilateralism closer to our grasp than ever before. But as Henry Kissinger has remarked, the absence of easily identifiable ideological

opponents can serve ironically to increase the difficulty of achieving global consensus. The more we sense the feasibility of genuinely global coalitions, the more we owe it to ourselves to seize that chance, to commit ourselves to solutions which require give as well as take, to put in the hard work required to turn possibilities into realities.

The kind of multilateralism required to re-ignite the sustainable development agenda at Johannesburg is not the same as that which is needed to shut off the chains of supply to Al Qaeda. Building a coalition against terror has not yet implied any obvious compromise of independence of national action on the part of the coalition's leaders. But there is extraordinary unity created by extraordinary horror. We shall have to extend this momentum if governments, and the people they represent, are to be convinced of the complete rationale of global interdependence, a rationale which requires power as well as resources to be willingly pooled. It cannot be a partial acceptance [that] places security issues in a separate box from others less pressing if just as morally expedient. It must be followed through to its logical conclusion. Self-interest for a nation and the interests of the broader community are no longer in conflict.

The events of the last few months should teach us that the investment we make in sustainable development is as much a part of our global security as the investment we make in our armed forces. And it should offer much better value for money. It has been said that sustainable development is about winning the peace, rather than winning a war. For that battle to get underway, actions will have to follow the words. And that is always the hard part.

Statement by M.V. Moosa

Minister of Environmental Affairs and Tourism, South Africa

Excerpts of Minister Moosa's speech at the announcement that South Africa would host the World Summit on Sustainable Development
11 October 2001

It has been noted in the planning sessions of the [World Summit on Sustainable Development] that poverty is the most critical threat to sustainable development. The gap between the poor and the rich is widening by the day.

This [gap] poses a great threat to all nations as the instability, conflict, disease, and environmental degradation associated with poverty threaten the overall socio-economic fiber of our planet. This will be the focal area of the Summit.

For developing countries, issues of energy, biodiversity, HIV/AIDS, waste, fresh water, and desertification will be at the core of their agenda for the Summit. Government sees the value of formulating common positions around these issues. The challenge specifically for Johannesburg is to create an enabling environment for these discussions to take place in a manner that will bring about change to the world. For ordinary people globally, this Summit will be meaningless if it fails to come up with programs aimed at addressing these issues and thereby creat[ing] a difference in the way they live their daily lives.

Even…a bigger challenge to us will be to address these issues within a context created at Rio in 1992. It is clear that the developed world is still faced with a challenge to meet its financial commitments made at Rio. For example, the commitments to achieve the official development assistance target of 0.7% of GNP have not been met due to sustained lack of political commitment.

We need to create a balance between reviewing progress from Rio while charting the way forward in a manner beneficial to our people. It is our collective challenge to ensure that our interventions at all plenary sessions are geared towards achieving this goal. We will need to ensure that we constantly remind the developed world that creating an enabling economic environment is fundamental if we are to adequately address issues of sustainable development. This will have to be acknowledged by all in preparatory sessions prior to the Summit.

The Summit must be able to create principles for a constructive partnership between the developed and developing world that must recognize our common but differentiated responsibilities for working towards sustainable development. These principles must be transformed into tangible deliverables that will impact on the way we use our natural resources to address our current needs while also planning for a sustainable future for all.

Statement by Thoraya Ahmed Obaid
Executive Director, United Nations Population Fund

Excerpts from Dr. Obaid's remarks during a panel discussion at the First Prepcom for the World Summit on Sustainable Development
29 January 2002

Let me get right to the point. Ten years after the adoption of Agenda 21, the primary challenge remains: to ensure that access to resources for human development is in balance with human numbers; to end extreme poverty; and to advance equality between men and women.

As a matter of human rights as well as for the future of sustainable development, it is simply unacceptable that one person in six today lives in extreme poverty and that the gap between rich and poor continues to widen. Today, 20 percent of the world's people, mostly in high-income countries, account for 86 percent of the world's consumption of resources. Meanwhile, in Africa, where poverty has increased during the last decade, the average household consumes 20 percent less than it did 25 years ago.

In the world's developing countries, there are more than one billion people who lack access to safe drinking water and over two billion who lack adequate sanitation. In too many parts of the world, health care is a mirage, and education is for the few. And too many of the deprived are women. However long the queue among the poor, women are at the end of it.

Poverty and gender inequality are incompatible with sustainable development. We need to ensure that more economic resources flow into the hands of poor people, especially women. Women, for example, make up half of the world's agricultural work force: They need legal and social support for land ownership, tenure, and inheritance. They need guaranteed access to credit, and services for agricultural and resource management.

Everything we have learned over the past decade shows that when women are empowered—through economic opportunity, health care, and education—the benefits go far beyond the individual. Families, communities and nations are better off. Population growth slows, economic growth is stronger, and countries have more capacity, as well as more room to make choices [that] favor sustainability.

At the global conferences of the 1990s, governments, helped by a multitude of civil society organizations, drew up a recipe for sustainable development. They agreed that the empowerment of women is an essential ingredient. At every regional meeting in preparation for August's Summit, participants have stressed that sustainable development must benefit the poor.

Despite these agreements, many women in developing countries still lack access to resources, services, and the opportunity to make real choices. They are trapped in poverty by illiteracy, poor health, and unwanted high fertility. All of these contribute to environmental degradation and tighten the grip of poverty. If we are serious about sustainable development, we must break this vicious cycle.

The megacities of the world should be powerhouses of development. Instead, their essential services are at risk of collapsing under the weight of unsustainable population growth.
—Thoraya Ahmed Obaid

As a matter of human rights and as a basis for their other choices, women need ready access to the full range of reproductive health information and services, including voluntary family planning.

Access to reproductive health information and services in the next decade will determine whether the HIV/AIDS pandemic can be stopped. In the absence of a cure or a vaccine, only responsible sexual behavior among both women and men can prevent the spread of infection. The damage already done by AIDS threatens development in some of the poorest countries. All countries must act with a united resolve if the damage is to be contained and the tide of infection turned back

There are an estimated 120 million couples who would use family planning services now, if they had access to them. Demand for these services is expected to increase by 40 percent in the next 15 years.

We have made good progress in some areas. Today, some 60 percent of married women in developing countries are using modern methods of family planning, compared to about 10 percent just 40 years ago. There is a broad international consensus on the

links between ending poverty, promoting reproductive health, securing gender equality, and protecting the environment. This is a tremendous achievement in a relatively short period of time. We must continue to consolidate our gains.

The last two generations of women have increasingly chosen to have smaller families. The next generation will follow their example—if they have access to education; if they can count on care in childbirth and beyond; if they can avoid unwanted pregnancy, if they have economic opportunities, and if they have the support of their families and communities in making their own choices.

Today population growth is a matter for the poorest countries, but it affects the world, and demands a global response. In the next 50 years, the combined population of the least developed countries is expected to triple, from 658 million to 1.8 billion. The implications of this rapid growth for development and the environment will be far-reaching. The poorest countries make direct demands on natural resources for survival. If they have no other choices, the damage to the environment will be profound, and permanent.

The combination of poverty, population pressures and environmental degradation in the rural areas drives migration to cities and across national borders. The megacities of the world should be powerhouses of development. Instead, their essential services are at risk of collapsing under the weight of unsustainable population growth.

In their people, developing countries possess the most powerful resource for development. Recent steep declines in fertility have produced a "demographic bonus" in the form of the largest-ever generation of young people. Without an equally large generation behind them to make demands on scarce resources, these young people are potentially a great driving force for development, if they have the opportunity…

Statement by Paula J. Dobriansky
U.S. Under Secretary of State for Global Affairs

Excerpts from Secretary Dobriansky's remarks to the European Institute, Washington, DC
25 April 2002

At Doha, the world's trade ministers reaffirmed their countries' commitment to an inclusive trading system, which promotes sustainable development. They agreed that an open and non-discriminatory multilateral trading system and protection of the environment "can and must be mutually supportive." In Monterrey, the world agreed that "each country has primary responsibility for its own economic and social development," and that "national development efforts need to be supported by an enabling international economic environment." The international community also recognized in Monterrey that trade, investment, and domestic savings offer substantial resources for development that must be unlocked and used effectively along with ODA. Sound policies and strong, accountable national institutions are critical to success.

We carry to Johannesburg, then, the messages of Doha and Monterrey: the globalized economy is a powerful engine for development, and each country must take on the responsibility to harness it by practicing good governance, adhering to the rule of law, investing in its people, and encouraging political and economic freedom.

As the United States prepares for Johannesburg, we see that the [Summit] can be a critical opportunity to deliver concrete results that make these messages a reality for sustainable development. We already have Agenda 21, which provides the policy framework for action on a balanced approach to the three pillars of sustainable development—economic development, social development, and environmental stewardship. We also have the international development goals in the UN Millennium Declaration as well as voluntary mechanisms such as the International Coral Reef Initiative and the Arctic Council. All these provide the necessary blueprint.

We need to focus on how to move toward concrete action. Implementation is not just a question of money. Funds are a component of implementation, to be sure, but they are not the primary driving force, nor is the lack of official development assistance the primary impediment to implementing agreements.

We must recognize that, despite the increasingly globalized nature of our world and its economy, sustainable development must begin at home, and poverty alleviation, improved health, and environmental stewardship all require good domestic governance, democratic societies, free markets, and accountable public and private sectors.

In developing our approach to [Johannesburg], therefore, we settled on two broad fundamentals that have to be addressed if we want to achieve concrete results from the treaties and agreements already negotiated: strengthening good domestic governance and capturing the power of partnerships.

By good domestic governance, we are talking about how to, among other things:

- Encourage effective and democratic institutions, including an independent and fair judiciary;
- Promulgate sound monetary, fiscal, and trade policies that promote economic growth while encouraging social development and environmental protection;
- Ensure a participatory role for all members of civil society who are affected by decision-makers; and
- Develop sound policies, including through science and the scientific method.

Recognizing the essential role of partnerships to effect change is the other key element—partnerships among governments and, more importantly, between governments and civil society, particularly the private sector. For this reason, we are hoping that the dialogue leading up to Johannesburg opens channels of communication and fosters the kind of creative thinking among national and local governments, NGOs, women's groups, scientists, business and industry, farmers, foresters, and fishermen who identify their common interests and create a plan to advance them together.

By addressing the fundamentals and by creating active partnerships to build upon them with concrete actions, the Summit can shape a new approach to some of the most challenging sustainable development issues facing developed and developing countries alike:

- Increasing access to clean, reliable, affordable energy and to fresh water;
- Restoring coastal zones and fisheries to healthy, abundant environments;
- Protecting forests and promoting sustainable forest management;
- Halting the dramatic trend of biodiversity loss;
- Attacking the scourge of global diseases such as malaria, TB, and HIV/AIDS;
- Significantly increasing agricultural productivity and improving the lives of rural poor; and
- Giving hope for the future to the world's youth through education.

We do not come to the realization of what is required to effect positive change in sustainable development lightly. Nationally, we have decades of experience at the federal, state, and local level about the mix of policies, programs, and cooperation with civil society that is necessary to undertake dramatic change. Five decades of experience in international development assistance programs since World War II—its successes as well as failures—have informed our conclusions as well. We've learned throwing money at the problem doesn't solve it. Writing a new agreement that talks about it doesn't solve it. But addressing the underlying fundamentals and encouraging the players who have the most to gain from success to play an active role in strengthening those fundamentals does…

Statement by James Connaughton
Chairman, White House Council on Environmental Quality

Excerpts from an address by Mr. Connaughton on "Making Sustainable Development Work: Governance, Finance, and Public-Private Cooperation" at the Meridian International Center, Washington, DC
18 October 2001

I fear that the sustainable development dialogue in the coming year may simply be a policy-wonk's exercise about every possible point of discussion and experience over the last few years. The dialogue should focus on the important tools of sustainable development: good governance and financing for development. Those are the mechanisms that are necessary for sustainable development to occur. Equally important, however, as we move forward in this next year of discussion and in the years to follow, we must pursue a vision of sustainable development that puts the benefit of those tools into context.

Now, what is the vision of sustainable

development? Let's start with what it is not. It is not the age-old debate over the "precautionary principle." Sustainable development is not the effort to define sustainable development. To use an old tried phrase: we know what sustainable development is when we see it. The exercise of sustainable development is not about academic projects seeking to define sustainable development.

to incorporate environmental, health, and safety concerns into the planning processes for those projects. But I think one of the visions we need to recognize as we move forward with the idea of sustainable development, especially as articulated in the last 10 years, is that it has been about projects, when in fact, sustainable development needs to be a way of life.

And so, for every great aid project, we should be having 10 private-sector projects in which the environmental aspects of that activity and in which the health, safety, and social aspects of that activity are incorporated into the planning, right up front, recognizing the benefits of long-term investments in environmental integrity and in the quality of life that we can provide to workers.

For every great aid project, we should be having 10 private-sector projects in which the environmental, health, safety, and social aspects of that activity are incorporated into planning.
—James Connaughton

Sustainable development is about what we have achieved here in the United States of America, especially in the last 30 years, built on a foundation of a statute that articulated for the first time, the core principles of sustainable development that we live with today.

Our task ahead is what I call the "Supermarket Task." We go into clean, healthy, protected food supermarkets. As we walk down the aisles we say, "Wow, I want some of that, I want that cereal product, and I want some of that." What we need to do, collectively, as we go forward with sustainable development is to paint the pictures—pictures that say, "I want that."

Now, we've also learned hard lessons here in the United States. The legacy of our prior lack of vision partly stems from a lack of knowledge on the part of government and industrialists. We've overcome that today. Our mission, as we reach out to the world on sustainable development, is not to let them revisit the very costly legacy that we had to deal with. We need to own up to the fact that it was a costly and devastating legacy. We would not be as advanced as we are but for the failures of our past. We should be willing to reach out and share our ability to help other countries avoid that.

In my travels around the world, I've often seen this basic point in practice: The real money is in private-sector investment. The real money is in these long-term commitments. In any political environment, you've got to follow the money. So, we have export credit practices that we're trying to promote to make sure that the environmental aspects of financing are considered. We are working aggressively on this issue—and interestingly, most of the rest of the world is not.

We also have very effective aid programs that try having 10 private-sector projects in which the environmental aspects of that activity and in which the health, safety, and social aspects of that activity are incorporated into the planning, right up front, recognizing the benefits of long-term investments in environmental integrity and in the quality of life that we can provide to workers.

So, if I want to leave you with a core point, it is that: We need to create those pictures.

In America today, we are going beyond the struggle to meet basic health needs. We are talking about a quality of life that we want the rest of world to enjoy. It is that picture that we need to create for the world. We look forward to spreading sustainable development. I'm hopeful that a year from now, as we go forward with the discussion about good governance and finance, we have a lot of people saying, "I want that." That's what makes sustainable development truly sustainable. I encourage you all to join with me and to join with the administration as we pursue that path.

Statement by Douglas Holtz-Eakin
Chief Economist, President's Council of Economic Advisers

Excerpts from an address by Dr. Holtz-Eakin on "Making Sustainable Development Work: Governance, Finance, and Public-Private Cooperation," at the Meridian International Center, Washington, DC
18 October 2001

The key test for sustainable development in an environmental context is the notion that we have somehow, in the process of moving forward economically, committed a harm to the welfare of future generations in a way that [does not allow us to] sustain the quality of life.

I would suggest that, when we move toward broader notions of economic development and the three pillars that include economics, environment, and social [concerns], the issue is: what do we do next? What we ought to do next is look at a problem and say is this an area in which we now face the possibility of inflicting a harm or the risk of a harm [that] would make it impossible for future generations to live the quality of life that we now live.

If that is the case, then that is an area in which we ought to focus our attentions and avoid that irretrievable harm. If we do that, we will sustain this quality of life, which is at the core of the sustainable development notion and we will have done our service to future generations and we will have exported to the world the correct paradigm for growth coexisting with broader goals.

So, I would urge people…in moving forward in the next year toward the Summit, when you face particular problems, indicators, policies and issues, to apply a very simple test. Do we now face the potential for inflicting a harm on future generations [that] would prohibit them from living our quality of life?

If it is the case that greater economic growth can substitute in some way for the loss of an environmental attribute or for a social goal, then by definition, we can use one to offset the other. At the core of the difference between sustainable development and economic development is the notion that you cannot substitute using economic development for something else [that] will be lost.

It's very hard, I think, to make a convincing case that there are a pervasive number of things for which there are no substitutes in the world. There may be some. Clean water and sustainable use of clean water is a resource that we may be unable to continue to exploit and damage in the present and sustain our quality of life in the future. So, that's exactly how [sustainable development] should be used and I endorse that notion of sustainable development...

Statement by Andrew S. Natsios
Administrator, U.S. Agency for International Development

Excerpts from address by Administrator Natsios on "Making Sustainable Development Work: Governance, Finance, and Public-Private Cooperation," Meridian International Center, Washington, DC
18 October 2001

[The World Summit on Sustainable Development] can be a watershed because we are entering now, as a result of the events of September 11 a new historical period. The beginning of World War I ended the 19th century and [the] Bismarck era of Europe. The way in which World War I ended was a disaster which, according to many historians, caused World War II. As you go through history there are certain dates of significance; September 11 is such a date…

I ask myself everyday if we are making the right decisions in terms of what we're doing in our relief program in Afghanistan, because [those decisions] will have implications for the long-term reconstruction and development of Afghanistan. What we do know is that our decisions will affect the future profoundly. We're not always clear what that effect will be. This is my favorite rule of public policy, that of unintended consequences.

So, this is a very appropriate time to have a discussion about the term "sustainable development." I don't like the term "sustainable development." I've told people in USAID, you will not hear me use that term in my speeches because, other than those of us who do this work, the American people do not know what that term means.

If you go to an African village and ask an average peasant, "What is sustainable development?" they will look at you and say, "What are you talking about?" No matter how you translate it, they don't know what you are talking about because sustainable development is an obscure term that's designed to exclude the great

bulk of the population who does not understand what it means.

So, if you begin with terms that require books to define them, you've already lost. I prefer more operational terms such as good governance, economic growth, and public health. We know what these terms mean. If you say you're trying to immunize children so they don't die from measles, people know what that means. If you try and increase agricultural production, every peasant knows what that means everywhere in the world.

So, let's focus on what we do rather than on terminology. Maybe that can be a contribution next year at the World Summit on Sustainable Development—to stop using terms that are obscure and start using more operational terms. Of course, that will upset other countries. Americans are too operational, too practical, and we're not focused enough—my European friends say—on the theory and the grand principles. I say, yes, and I think that too many people are too much focused on grand principles and not on what works on the ground. No one can eat a concept. It's not edible.

There is a relationship between political stability and the maturity of the society and social services and public safety. Educated middle-class people are the ones who demanded these things in the United States. Why did that happen? Because there was a middle-class. How do you create a middle class? You have to create wealth. How do you do it in developing countries? Agricultural development is a large part of it, as well as private-sector development.

We need to look at economic development in the private sector as an essential element of what we would call sustainable development in this smaller group. The point, though, of all of this is we're not looking enough at private institutions.

I met recently with the presidents of five of the largest environmental NGOs in the country. We talked about my personal interest, which happens to be theirs too, to attempt to do environmental programming in the developing world, understanding its relationship to economic development.

If you do environmental programming and you ignore economic incentives, you'll fail wherever you are. Profit motive and economic incentives are signals that are sent by the economy and have a profound effect on the success or failure of any program, because economics is a very powerful force. We talked about the attempt to work into the market system in many countries. We talked about illegal logging. Almost 80 percent of the logging done in the developing world is illegal [under developing-world countries'] laws. The logging that is destroying the rain forest of the Congo is all illegal. In fact, other countries have troops in the Congo to make money. The same thing is happening in Indonesia. It's not legal logging. There's a way we can do something about that…we talked about a public-private partnership...

Statement by Andrew S. Natsios
Administrator, U.S. Agency for International Development

Excerpts from Administrator Natsios' article "Addressing Poverty," which appeared in the U.S. State Department's electronic journal Economic Perspectives
September 2001

The U.S. Agency for International Development (USAID) is the U.S. government's principal institution working to fight poverty through economic growth, [to] end hunger through increased agricultural production, and [to] prevent conflict in developing countries around the world. USAID extends assistance to people recovering from disaster, trying to escape poverty, and engaging in democratic reforms…

Unless the world addresses these issues of poverty and hunger, we can look forward to spreading humanitarian crises, increasing and more violent internal conflicts, and deteriorating conditions for the world's poorest peoples. At USAID, this discontent and desperation affects our work directly: nearly two-thirds of the countries with USAID field missions have been ravaged by civil conflict over the past five years, in some cases destroying years of economic and political progress, demolishing health and education systems, and driving away affluent and educated people.

Poverty and food security are great challenges. As Americans, we have both a self-interest and a moral imperative to confront them. USAID helps fulfill these obligations by working to increase incomes and food security through broad-based economic growth and economic liberalization programs, in combination with programs in health, education, and democratic governance. From decades of experience, we know that our coordinated development programs, carefully

implemented, can over the long term improve real incomes and increase food security in a sustainable manner…

In order to fight poverty more effectively, I intend to fundamentally change the way the agency does business by focusing on four "pillars": Global Development Alliance; Economic Growth, Agriculture, and Trade; Global Health; and Democracy, Conflict, and Humanitarian Assistance. By aggregating current and new programs that are mutually reinforcing into these pillars, USAID will be able to use scarce budget and human resources more effectively and to describe its programs more clearly.

Global Development Alliance. In recent years, the paradigm of foreign assistance funding has changed drastically. The globalization of the world economy has meant that governments, while still essential, are not the only institutions through which public services are provided. The role of religious institutions, nongovernmental organizations, private foundations, universities, and the private market economy in providing services and accomplishing public objectives has dramatically increased.

U.S. organizations and companies want to and already do help less fortunate people worldwide, but many organizations are not prepared to provide assistance in developing countries effectively. On the other hand, USAID has not been prepared to take full advantage of the resources private organizations can bring us. The Global Development Alliance pillar will change this by actively seeking out partners willing to commit real resources—funding, information, and personnel—to support development programs. With these partners, we will build alliances that target specific development objectives and leverage private funds from foundations and corporations to accomplish those objectives.

Economic Growth, Agriculture, and Trade. This pillar highlights the interrelationship and interdependence of economic growth and agricultural development, international trade, environmental sustainability, and the development of a country's human capital—with the ultimate goal of creating and cultivating viable market-oriented economies.

Global Health. This pillar includes maternal and child health, nutrition, women's reproductive health, HIV/AIDS, and programs that address infectious diseases such as malaria and tuberculosis. These are global issues with global consequences: the health of a population directly affects its productivity, and unchecked diseases in other countries pose threats to our own.

Democracy, Conflict, and Humanitarian Assistance. This pillar recognizes USAID's world leadership in its ability to respond to natural and man-made disasters. This pillar also recognizes that responding to disasters is not enough: we must learn to prevent conflicts that lead to humanitarian crises before they happen and help people rebuild better after such crises. We will integrate USAID's democracy programs with new approaches to crisis and conflict analysis and with the development of new methodologies to assist conflicting parties to resolve their issues peacefully.

Our new approaches and strategies will enable USAID to coordinate our programs and leverage substantial private resources to fight poverty and hunger in the world's poorest countries. Our goal is to help poor people improve their lives and build societies that can become stable and secure trading partners. In so doing, USAID serves America's foreign policy objectives and reflects the deep humanitarian instincts freer than ever before.

Statement by Klaus Toepfer
Executive Director, United Nations Environmental Programme

Excerpts from Dr. Toepfer's remarks on World Water Day, Nairobi, Kenya.
22 March 2002

The Millennium Declaration, adopted by heads of state, set the world the following goals:

- To halve by the year 2015 the proportion of the world's people whose income is less than one dollar a day, and the proportion of people who suffer from hunger;
- And, by the same date, to halve the proportion of people who are unable to reach or to afford safe drinking water.

In the light of this commitment, the theme of World Water Day in 2002, "Water for Development," is particularly appropriate.

Without adequate clean water, there can be no escape from poverty. Water is the basis for good health and food production.

This year, water pollution, poor sanitation, and water shortages will kill over 12 million people. Millions more are in bad health and trapped in poverty, much of their energy and time wasted in the quest for clean water.

Seventy-five percent of water is used for agriculture. Crop failure due to lack of water, or too much water, can mean starvation for many.

Mankind is always at the mercy of water for survival and development. Water's almost sacred status is recognized the world over. The Koran mentions that all life originated from water, and that man himself is created of water. Water's power to destroy is well known. In the Bible, floods and drought were punishments sent from God. In Judaism, water is important for ritual purification. The Incas believed that Lake Titicaca was the center of the original world; water was the essential factor in the stability and prosperity of the Mayan peoples. The "sacred waters" of the Hindus erase caste distinctions. We too should use water to restore equity.

Water is vital to economic development. We must recognize the true dimension of the challenge we face. The challenge of ensuring sustainable water demand and use and supply of water to all. Appropriate action is required to meet this challenge.

There is a need for investment in water services and water conservation. Water resources must be developed and managed efficiently. Where appropriate, high-tech solutions for water conservation and recycling, such as those developed by UNEP's Division of Technology, Industry, and Economics (IETC), should be implemented. Awareness at every level must be increased. If there is awareness, least-cost (often simple) solutions for sustainable water conservation (such as roof rainwater collection, recycling, and reuse) can also be put into practice.

Due attention should to be given to the problem of transboundary waters. The development of legal frameworks for the equitable sharing of water resources is key to peace and stability, without which there can be no development.

Water pricing needs to be revised to reflect the true cost of the resource, taking account of the economic, social, and environmental value of water. Such a policy will encourage more efficient use and discourage waste. Pricing policy should of course take account of the limited finances of the poor. At present, the poorest pay most for clean water, both in monetary terms and in terms of the burden to their health. The problem is particularly acute in urban areas. Working with Habitat, through the project "Water for African Cities," UNEP is acting to tackle the urban water crisis in African cities. Water should be made available and affordable for all.

Statement by John Manley
Deputy Prime Minister, Canada

Excerpts of an address given by Mr. Manley as Canada's Minister of Foreign Affairs to the 2001 Diplomatic Forum, Victoria, British Columbia
November 23, 2001

I would like to use our time today to speak about…Canada's two major foreign policy priorities over the coming year—in particular, our specific response to the threat of terrorism and the wider global agenda for stability and development that we will address under our G8 chairmanship in 2002.

The global campaign against terrorism has taken on the highest priority in Canada's domestic and foreign policy agendas. The work of combating terrorism and managing its aftershocks is far from over.

At the recent session of the United Nations General Assembly, it was gratifying to hear such resounding condemnation of terrorism from member states. But Canada's message there, shared by others, was that outrage alone will not defeat terrorism; sentiment must translate into commitment, and commitment into action. To achieve this, and to fulfill the promises that we have made to each other and to our citizens, we cannot go on as before, or be diverted from a common course by diplomatic gamesmanship or limited self-interest. Simply put, in the "realpolitik" of the post-September 11 world, there can be no more "business as usual" for our international community.

Security and development cannot be separated—each supports and must coexist with the other. Poverty, the denial of human rights, the spread of HIV/AIDS, unchecked environmental degradation, and the blights of drugs and crime all undermine stability, reduce human potential, and obstruct social and economic progress. When a field cannot be tilled because anti-personnel mines may lie under its soil (and I would note that, by today's statistics, one-third of all land mine victims now recorded in the world come from

Afghanistan), or when a village lacks an educated, able workforce because AIDS has killed a tenth of its population, there can be no sustainable development of societies or of economies—no stability, no progress, no hope.

We must renew our collective commitment to creating a strong, equitable global community that can neither be attacked nor exploited by terrorists or others seeking to do harm.

Statement by David Anderson
Minster of the Environment, Canada

Excerpts from Minister Anderson's address to The Canadian Institute of International Affairs in Ottawa, Canada
27 October 2001

The three issues before this conference are the three issues at the top of the government's global environmental agenda. The environment and human security. The governance of international organizations. And climate change.

Let me talk briefly about the first two and then in some depth about climate change.

In the past eight years Lloyd Axworthy and the Prime Minister have placed human security at the heart of Canadian foreign policy. Environmental security builds on this foundation by addressing the environmental threats to human security. Environmental security seeks to provide the world with a healthy, productive, and sustainable environment. We now all fully appreciate that there are great threats to humanity and human values and not just to nation-states. We must act to address our vulnerabilities.

Equally critical is appreciating that the challenges to environmental security are, indeed, global. Pollution flows across boundaries. Toxics float across oceans. Fossil fuels burned in one country cause climate change around the globe. Infectious diseases touch all humanity…

Incidentally, I believe the events of September 11 will greatly heighten the importance of Johannesburg. There seems to me to be a direct link between the anger and fanaticism of today's terrorist organizations and the despair and squalor of the physical conditions in which so much of the world lives.

Thus a commitment of the global community in Johannesburg to a plan of sustainable development appears to me to be a logical, necessary progression of the military campaign that today fills our newspapers and television screens. World leaders in Johannesburg will need the support of us all…

We need international good will, international machinery and international action to bring about global human security and global environmental security…

Population and Health

Statement by Thoraya A. Obaid
Executive Director, United Nations Population Fund

Remarks made by Dr. Obaid on World Population Day
11 July 2001

Billions of ordinary people share the same aspirations: a secure life, a place to live, economic opportunity for themselves, education and health care for their children. Modest goals—yet half the world go their whole lives without even coming close.

The great challenge of the 21st century is to enable everyone to live a life of dignity. It can be done—the world has never seen such wealth. It must be done, because overconsumption, waste, and poverty are combining to destroy the environment that supports us all. Global warming is a fact, with rising sea levels and unpredictable climate change. Rapid population growth is a fact, with the poorest countries and the poorest areas asked to bear the biggest increases. Species destruction is a fact, with more and more people depending on a shrinking base of natural resources. Stress on food and water resources are facts, with the severest stresses in the most needy areas.

We have limited time to correct these imbalances that imperil our world. Whoever we are, wherever we live, each one of us has a responsibility.

The most important steps are the most basic. Human security and well-being start with education and health care for all. These are human rights, but they also empower women and men. They are the basic equipment to exercise responsibility in the modern world.

The goals of universal education and health care are agreed. They are within reach. Meeting them would cost a fraction of today's expenditure on less important things—arms, for example. Universal education and health care would also have multiple benefits, especially for women, who lag behind in both areas.

Reproductive rights are part of the right to health. Better reproductive health is important for men, but it is vital for women: one woman every minute dies of causes related to pregnancy, and four women every minute catch the infection that leads to AIDS. Better reproductive health means fewer unwanted pregnancies and fewer HIV infections. The AIDS pandemic will end when there are no more new infections.

Reproductive health is integrally linked to sustainable development. Women who can choose have smaller families; and that means slower population growth—a little more time to meet basic needs and make vital decisions...

Statement by Kofi Annan
UN Secretary-General

Statement by Secretary-General Annan for World Population Day
11 July 2001

The theme of this year's World Population Day, "Population, Development and the Environment," highlights the fragile relationship between our species and our planet.

The world's population has doubled since 1960 to 6.1 billion, with most of that growth occurring in developing countries. Since 1970, consumption has also doubled, with 86 percent of that consumption coming in the developed world. Humanity must solve a complex equation: we must stabilize our numbers but, equally important, we must stabilize our use of resources and ensure sustainable development for all.

Human beings consume six times as much water as we did 70 years ago, dangerously depleting local aquifers. Deforestation, pollution, and emissions of carbon dioxide have reached unprecedented levels, altering the global climate. Our ecological footprints on the earth are heavier than ever before.

The 1994 International Conference on Population and Development recognized the importance of an integrated approach to reducing poverty, slowing population growth, and protecting the environment. Among the requirements for achieving these related goals are universal access to education and to reproductive health care and family planning. Women make up more than half the world's agricultural workforce and typically manage household resources. Yet they are often denied the right to learn, to own or inherit land, and to control their own fertility. Enhancing women's opportunities enables them to make informed choices about family size—and to break the vicious cycle of poverty and environmental degradation.

Statement by E. Anne Peterson
Assistant Administrator-designate, Bureau for Global Health, U.S. Agency for International Development

Excerpts from Assistant Administrator Peterson's confirmation testimony before the U.S. Senate Committee on Foreign Relations, Washington, D.C.
9 October 2001

...Under the USAID reorganization, the Global Health Bureau will provide strategic support, leadership, research, evaluation, and technical assistance in the key areas of HIV/AIDS, family planning, child survival, maternal health, and infectious diseases. These endeavors represent tremendous opportunities for helping people around the world as they strive to establish and maintain healthy families, communities, free societies, and thriving democracies. Our assistance is not only an opportunity to aid other countries and build friendships but is also part of our response to the recent tragedy. Countries whose people are healthy can maximize their economic potential, participate meaningfully in events that control their lives and, therefore, are less likely to grow or export terrorism...

Public health works by tracking health trends across populations, then trying to identify, understand, prevent, or mitigate the disability and premature death caused by many diseases. In resource-poor regions, disease devastates and destabilizes individuals, families, communities, and nations. As recently and tragically

demonstrated, free, democratic societies including our own can be in jeopardy…

Throughout my career, there have been several important tenets that have guided my public-health practice. The first is: lasting change occurs best within a cultural context…The most successful health programs in our own country and throughout the world have recognized and planned for this, and the most effective health practitioners know that they must meet and serve others on the grounds of understanding and mutual respect.

Second, lasting improvement means transforming change in people's choices and behaviors. In the United States, major attention is turning to diet, smoking, and exercise as risk factors leading to chronic disease. Internationally, knowledge, opportunity, and the desire to change health choices can similarly transform health, whether the issue is clean water, vaccinating children, or changing risk behavior to avoid HIV/AIDS. Good data and science are the basis for wise decisions, yet neither science nor data alone will transform health…

The third tenet is: good stewardship maximizes impact. There is always more need, especially in the health arena, than we have resources for. There are always competing interests within health and outside of health. Even with America's wealth, there are always more good things to do than we have resources to do. Therefore, it is critical that the health resources we have be used where they will have greatest benefit. The American taxpayer deserves to know what his or her money is being invested in and what return he or she gets on that investment…

Statement by Bill Frist, M.D.
U.S. Senator (R-TN)

Excerpts from Senator Frist's speech introducing to the U.S. Senate Committee on Foreign Relations S. 1032, "The International Infectious Diseases Control Act," a bill to expand assistance to countries seriously affected by HIV/AIDS, malaria, and tuberculosis.
13 June 2001

Sometimes we feel overwhelmed by the enormity of insolvable problems. We become inured to the tragedy, and look for problems we can more easily solve. But we must not turn away from the worldwide devastation of HIV/AIDS. Just consider this: right now, 36 million people are infected with HIV/AIDS, a fatal infectious disease, mostly in developing countries. That number is more than the total combined populations of Virginia, Massachusetts, Tennessee, Maryland, Kentucky, Connecticut, New Mexico, Vermont, and Nebraska. As of today, AIDS has orphaned 13 million children, more than the entire population of Illinois.

Compounding this burden, over eight million people acquire tuberculosis each year, and 500 million more get malaria, both diseases that disproportionately affect the poorest countries. Frequently forgotten, malaria still kills a child every 40 seconds. Remember the horrific links between HIV/AIDS, TB, and malaria. If you have AIDS you are much more likely to contract TB, and TB has become the greatest killer of those with AIDS. Similarly, if a person with HIV/AIDS contracts malaria, that person is more likely to die. And infectious diseases such as these cause 25 percent of all the deaths in the world today. But as Americans, we have many reasons to be proud of our response to the challenges…

Every American and others throughout the world should join this fight against the diseases that have too long threatened our children, destroyed families, and undermined economic development of dozens of nations. This is not just government's fight. It is all of our responsibility to conquer HIV/AIDS, malaria, and TB and [to] consign them to the waste-bin of history.

Statement by Jesse Helms
U.S. Senator (R-NC)

Excerpts from an op-ed column by Senator Helms that originally appeared in the Washington Post
24 March 2002

This year more than half a million babies in the developing world will contract from their mothers the virus that causes AIDS, despite the fact that drugs and therapies exist that could virtually eliminate mother-to-child transmission of the killer disease.

It is my intent to offer an amendment with Sen. Bill Frist (R-Tenn.) to the emergency supplemental appropriations bill to add $500 million—contingent on dollar-for-dollar contributions from the private

sector—to the U.S. Agency for International Development's programs to fight the HIV-AIDS pandemic. The goal of this new money will be to make treatment available for every HIV-positive pregnant woman. As President Bush would say, we will leave no child behind.

There is no reason why we cannot eliminate, or nearly eliminate, mother-to-child transmission of HIV-AIDS—just as polio was virtually eliminated 40 years ago. Drugs and therapies are already provided to many in Africa and other afflicted areas. Only more resources are needed to expand this most humanitarian of projects.

Already in many African nations, an entire generation has been lost to AIDS. Mother-to-child transmission of HIV could eliminate another.
—Jesse Helms

The stakes could not be higher. Already in many African nations, an entire generation has been lost to AIDS. Mother-to-child transmission of HIV could eliminate another. Although reliable numbers are hard to come by, experts believe that more than two million pregnant women in sub-Saharan Africa have HIV. Of these, nearly one-third will pass the virus on to their babies through labor, childbirth, or breast feeding, making mother-to-child transmission of AIDS the number one killer of children under 10 in the world.

There will be obstacles to achieving universal availability of drugs and therapies. Many African nations lack the infrastructure and trained personnel to deliver health care on this scale. Some governments may not be cooperative. My amendment will provide the administration with the flexibility to deliver the necessary assistance while addressing these obstacles. For instance, if the new Global Fund to Fight AIDS, Tuberculosis and Malaria is deemed the most efficient way to deliver assistance, then the president can transfer money there.

The United Nations has already set an ambitious goal of reducing the portion of infants infected with HIV by 20 percent by 2005 and by 50 percent by 2010. We can accelerate these efforts, saving hundreds of thousands of lives, with a larger investment of public and private funds now. Private contributions, either financial or in kind—such as the donations of the drug nevirapine by the German pharmaceutical company Boehringer Ingelheim—are an essential part of a successful anti-AIDS strategy.

In February, I said publicly that I was ashamed that I had not done more concerning the world's AIDS pandemic. Some may say that, despite the urgent humanitarian nature of the AIDS pandemic, this initiative is not consistent with some of my earlier positions. Indeed, I have always been an advocate of a very limited government, particularly as it concerns overseas commitments. Thomas Jefferson once wrote eloquently of a belief to which I still subscribe today: that "our wisdom will grow with our power, and teach us, that the less we use our power the greater it will be."

The United States has become, economically and militarily, the world's greatest power. I hope that we have also become the world's wisest power, and that our wisdom will show us how to use that power in the most judicious manner possible, as we have a responsibility to those on this earth to exercise great restraint.

But not all laws are of this earth. We also have a higher calling, and in the end our conscience is answerable to God. Perhaps, in my 81st year, I am too mindful of soon meeting Him, but I know that, like the Samaritan traveling from Jerusalem to Jericho, we cannot turn away when we see our fellow man in need.

Statement by Kofi Annan
Secretary-General of the United Nations

Excerpts from Secretary-General Annan's keynote address at the Conrad N. Hilton Humanitarian Prize Luncheon in New York, NY
30 November 2001

You have understood that the biggest enemy of health in the developing world is poverty, and that the struggle for health is part and parcel of the struggle for development. You know that we shall not finally defeat the infectious diseases that plague the developing world until we have also won the battle for basic health care, sanitation, and safe drinking

water—an area where your Foundation has been particularly active.

Improved access to safe drinking water is also one of the goals of the United Nations Millennium Declaration—the landmark document for the 21st century adopted by the world's leaders at the Millennium Summit last year as a blueprint for achieving freedom from want, freedom from fear, and protection of the environment…

The world after September 11 has made all of us think more deeply about the kind of world we want our children to live in. In the new and uncertain environment into which we have been propelled, we feel, more deeply than ever, the need to hold fast to a vision of peace and security, but also to one of human security. That means redoubling our efforts to turn back the AIDS epidemic.

New figures, released only two days ago, show that the AIDS epidemic has infected more than 40 million people today. Every day, more than 8,000 people die of it. Every hour, almost 600 people become infected. Every minute, a child dies of the virus.

This is not only an unparalleled tragedy in human terms. It is a major obstacle to development.

AIDS is unique in the social and demographic devastation it inflicts. It is uniquely disruptive to economies, because it kills people in the prime of their lives. It kills the better educated and the most productive members of society. The loss of each breadwinner's income reduces the access of his or her dependants to health care, education, and nutrition—leaving them in turn more vulnerable to infection. This cycle need be repeated only a few times and AIDS destroys an entire community.

Equally threatening to communities is the toll that AIDS takes on women, and thereby on families. In the world as a whole, about half of all new infections are among women. In sub-Saharan Africa, 55 per cent of HIV-positive adults are women—and the proportion among young people is even higher. There are many reasons, ranging from poverty, abuse, and violence to lack of information and higher biological risk of infection in women.

As AIDS forces girls to drop out of school—whether they fall sick themselves, or are forced to take care of an infected relative—they fall deeper into poverty. Their own children in turn are less likely to attend school—and more likely to become infected.

In this and other ways, AIDS inflicts an intolerable burden on children. AIDS has already killed more than four million children. More than 13 million have been orphaned. And the new statistics show that the number of infants infected annually has risen to more than 700,000.

Yes, ladies and gentlemen, AIDS is indeed a terrible obstacle to development. And for far too long, the world's response was nowhere near commensurate with the challenge. But now, at last, for much of the international community, the magnitude of the crisis is finally beginning to sink in.

Never before, in the two decades that we have faced this growing catastrophe, has there been such a sense of common resolve and collective responsibility. People are grasping the seriousness of the crisis, but they are also realizing that we are not powerless against this disease. There is hope—and there is reason for hope…

Statement by Peter Piot
UNAIDS Executive Director

Excerpts of Dr. Piot's speech at the United Nations University, Tokyo, Japan
2 October 2001

There is a world of difference between the root causes of terrorism and the impact of AIDS on security. But at some deep level, we should be reminded that in many parts of the world, AIDS has caused a normal way of life to be called into question.

As a global issue, therefore, we must pay attention to AIDS as a threat to human security, and redouble our efforts against the epidemic and its impact.

Since the creation of UNAIDS six years ago, we have been positioning AIDS not only as a global epidemic of an infectious disease, but as a development issue as well as an issue of human security. The latter concept was formally recognized in the UN Security Council's first debate on AIDS, in January 2000. This debate also marked a shift in the concept of "security"—from the absence of armed conflict to a wider definition of human security, encompassing the fundamental conditions that are needed for people to live safe, secure, healthy, and productive lives.

At the same time as the Security Council's debate, the CIA produced a report on "The Global Infectious Disease Threat and Its Implications for the United States." It argued that AIDS will pose a rising global

threat and will complicate U.S. and global security over the next 20 years. The report also claimed [that] "[t]he relationship between disease and political instability is indirect but real…infant mortality—a good indicator of the overall quality of life—correlates strongly with political instability."

In January [2000], the idea that AIDS is a security issue was new. Now, the idea is widely accepted.

"war-footing," we will continue to lose ground against the epidemic. Asia is the crucial new battleground—actions taken today in Asia will determine the global shape of the epidemic in a decade's time.

UNDP—one of the eight cosponsoring organizations of UNAIDS—did groundbreaking work on the notion of human security in the first half of the 1990s. They proposed eight components of human

The impact of AIDS is a major issue for national security and many armed forces worldwide, for all peacekeeping and humanitarian operations, and for wider notions of economic security, food security, policing and social stability.
—Peter Piot

The impact of AIDS is a major issue for national security and many armed forces worldwide, for all peacekeeping and humanitarian operations, and for wider notions of economic security, food security, policing, and social stability.

Of course, the Japanese government has been leading the global movement to pay more attention to the notion of human security. They draw the distinction between freedom from fear—the traditional purview of security—and freedom from want, insisting that both aspects are equally a part of the wider notion of human security.

Today, I want to look in more detail at all the components of the AIDS and security equation, both as it has impact on national security as narrowly defined and in terms of the wider "human security" concept.

The global AIDS epidemic is one of the central security issues for the 21st century.

AIDS and global insecurity coexist in a vicious cycle. Civil and international conflict help spread HIV as populations are destabilized and armies move across new territories. And AIDS contributes to national and international insecurity, from the high levels of HIV infection experienced among military and peacekeeping personnel to the instability of societies whose future has been thrown into doubt.

Because it takes place over a time frame of years and decades, the world has failed to realize that AIDS is a massive attack on global human security. But this is not a security threat we are powerless to prevent. The epidemic is not inevitable: we know how to reduce the spread of HIV and alleviate the epidemic's impact.

Unless the global response to AIDS steps onto a security: economic, food, health, environmental, personal, community, and political. With the possible exception of environmental security, all these aspects of security are deeply affected by the HIV/AIDS epidemic.

Economic Security

The impact of AIDS on rates of economic growth in developing countries is marked. There is a direct relationship between the extent of HIV prevalence and the severity of negative growth in GDP.

But measures of per capita GDP in fact underestimate the human impact of AIDS, as AIDS kills people as well as economic activity. The cumulative impact of HIV on the total size of economies is thus even greater. By the beginning of the next decade, South Africa, which represents 40 percent of the region's economic output, is facing a real gross domestic product 17 percent lower than it would have been without AIDS.

One of the long-term impacts of AIDS [is] on a nation's human resources. In many of the worst affected countries, AIDS has substantially weakened national elites: the business people, managers, politicians, and community leaders who were poised to lead their nation's future into the 21st century.

In settings where subsistence agriculture predominates, measured economic productivity only scratches the surface of the total impact of HIV on livelihoods. For example, AIDS hits the long-term capacity for agricultural production, as livestock is often sold to pay funeral expenses or orphaned children lack the skills to look after livestock in their care.

The immediate impact of AIDS is felt most acutely in households where one or more members are HIV-

infected. In South Africa, households will on average have 13 percent less to spend per person by 2010 than they would if there were no HIV epidemic. In Cote d'Ivoire, the household impact of HIV/AIDS has been shown not only to reverse the capacity to accumulate savings, but also to reduce household consumption. AIDS not only affects income, with lower earning capacity and productivity, it also generates greater medical, funeral, and legal costs and has long-term impact on the capacity of households to stay together. This is most manifest in the cumulative number of children orphaned by AIDS, which now totals nearly 14 million.

Food Security

Emergencies, including food emergencies, are a major point of vulnerability to AIDS. When populations are on the move and the basic security of life is threatened, HIV risks rise. Women in particular may often find themselves in circumstances where they are subject to sexual violence or forced to trade sex for food. The challenge therefore is to make sure that emergencies are the focus for interventions to reduce HIV risks.

The second related challenge is how to break the vicious cycle between food insecurity and HIV vulnerability. As well as dealing with the immediate impacts of AIDS, we must continue to pay attention to sustainability and overcoming long-term vulnerability. Are less labor-intensive crops available that are still good food sources? How do we keep children at school against the pressure for them to replace the labor of sick or dying parents?

Health Security

More than 20 million people have died worldwide since the beginning of the epidemic, three quarters of them in sub-Saharan Africa. Globally, HIV/AIDS is now well established in the list of the top five leading causes of death…In sub-Saharan Africa, AIDS is responsible for one out of five deaths, twice as many as for the second leading cause of death.

The demographic impact of AIDS is unique for two reasons. First, unlike most other causes of death, AIDS deaths will continue to rise in the coming years as a result of infections that have already occurred. Second, HIV infection is highest in young women and men in their most productive years, including in the best educated and skilled sectors of populations as well as women of child bearing age (together with attendant transmission to children). In the worst affected countries, in twenty years time the standard population pyramid will have turned upside down, with more adults in their 60s and 70s than those in their 40s and 50s.

Current prevalence data do not convey the full picture facing individuals in high HIV prevalence populations. Because prevalence is a measure of current infection levels amongst living individuals, it does not capture infections amongst those who have already died or who have not yet become infected but will be in the future. On the basis of current incidence and mortality patterns, it is possible to estimate the lifetime risks of contracting HIV and dying from AIDS faced by young people embarking on the sexually active phase of their lives. In a country such as South Africa, or Zambia, where prevalence in the year 2000 has reached about 20 percent, a 15-year old teenager faces a lifetime risk of HIV infection and of death from AIDS of over 50 percent unless the current rate of new infections drops dramatically.

Personal Security

The impact of the AIDS epidemic on personal security is both direct and indirect.

Directly, people who are living with HIV or affected by HIV have often been the targets of physical violence, as well as suffering the psychological violence of stigma and discrimination.

As well as its direct effects, the AIDS epidemic has an indirect impact on personal security by its contribution to social instability. In particular, because HIV is transmitted mainly sexually, it is most prevalent among young adults. Therefore when AIDS starts causing illness, it is often people with young families who find themselves dealing with the additional burden of AIDS.

The impact of a generation of young people who have not had the support they need from their parents, and many of whom are themselves HIV-infected, is having serious effects on social cohesion. These are the same age groups that have historically been most vulnerable to involvement with crime.

The results are already being felt. The issue of crime, street violence, and instability as a result of the AIDS epidemic has already emerged as a serious concern in a number of countries, particularly in sub-Saharan Africa.

One group of young people most affected by the HIV/AIDS epidemic is the children left behind when their parents die. Already, 13 million children have been orphaned by AIDS, losing either their mother

or both parents before the age of 15. AIDS has had a dramatic affect on the global number of orphans and in particular in Africa, which accounts for 90 percent of the total number of AIDS orphans. In developing countries before AIDS, around two percent of children were orphaned; but now in many countries, 10 percent or more of children are orphans.

The war in Sierra Leone left 12,000 children without families. AIDS in Sierra Leone has already orphaned five times that number.

Community Security

AIDS affects the very fabric of society. Community structures break down. Coping capacity reduces. Policing capacity reduces. Communal conflict increases. Public administration, governance, and social services become unsustainable.

In many of the worst affected countries, civil services are having to recruit two or three people to fill one job, to cover inevitable absences for sickness, death, and funerals—and where there is not the money or the people available, essential public service tasks are left undone. Police services are heavily affected in Namibia: the police [there] earlier this year stated that AIDS has become a heavy burden, and in Kenya it accounts for 75 percent of all deaths in the force over the past two years.

Political Security

National security is directly threatened by social and economic instability, lack of predictability, and weakened governance as a result of AIDS.

There are five key ways in which AIDS has a negative impact on national political security.

First, AIDS exacerbates poverty. It forces affected households to use all their economic resources on dealing with illness and death. It causes direct health costs, and detracts from productivity on a massive scale.

Second, AIDS diverts scarce resources, especially in many of the world's least-resources countries, who can ill-afford any additional burdens.

Third, AIDS kills elites, including leadership elites. These are the people who are needed to secure the future—just when they are needed most to help nations cope with the impact of AIDS, they themselves are suffering directly from the epidemic, and capacity spirals downwards.

Fourth, in urban areas in particular where there is an expectation that health services will be accessible, a great demand is generated for HIV treatment. Middle- and working-class pressures on private and public health services become considerable, and if these demands cannot be met, [they add] to political instability and tension—just witness the destabilizing political effects that claims of "miracle cures" for AIDS have had in countries as diverse as Nigeria and many other African countries, India, and Thailand.

Fifth, there is pressure on international trade regulation and intellectual property protection. One of the crucial issues facing the future of international trade rounds is whether there the twin demands of global public health and intellectual property regulation can be satisfactorily reconciled in a way that convincingly protects the sovereign right to make public-health protection paramount but at the same time ensures that there are incentives to develop innovative pharmaceuticals and make them accessible where they are needed most.

Adding to these broad effects on political instability, AIDS has a direct effect on military capacity as an issue of national security.

Military forces suffer higher than average levels of HIV infection. The US Armed Forces Medical Intelligence Center in 1999 estimated the level of HIV infections among armed forces in sub-Saharan Africa ranging from 10 percent in Eritrea, 10 to 20 percent in Nigeria, to 40 to 60 percent in Angola and the Democratic Republic of Congo.

Conflict exacerbates the spread of HIV, and in turn, in a vicious cycle, the weakened defenses of nations contribute to international instability.

It has even been suggested by some security analysts that the international capacity for peacekeeping is being weakened because some African countries that have traditionally supported peacekeeping forces have found that AIDS has put so much pressure on their capacity they may no longer be able to fulfil this role.

What To Do?

Let me nominate seven features that are essential to an effective global effort to turn tide on HIV.

First, there is a need to build multi-sectoral responses. Just as we have seen that the impact of the HIV epidemic crossed every part of economic and social affairs, so too the response must involve every part of society in a full-scale mobilization against AIDS.

Second, leadership: the leadership to make AIDS a national priority, for prime ministers and presidents to step in and say that AIDS is not just a health issue—it is an issue fundamental to development, to progress, and to human security, the leadership to tackle stigma

and the leadership to marshal the necessary financial resources for the fight against AIDS—the seven to 10 billion dollars annually that is needed for an effective response in developing countries.

Third, the need to find ways of strengthening social inclusion. HIV feeds on marginalization, and so responses that build social inclusion are necessary—from protections against discrimination to developing prevention and care initiatives that fully involve their target groups in program planning and delivery.

Fourth, building stronger coping mechanisms at [the] community level. It is at [the] community level that the battle against AIDS will ultimately be won—and communities need to feel they are both empowered and enabled to cope with and combat the epidemic. Among other things, that means ensuring that there are efficient mechanisms for decentralization, so that national responses can be truly effective through every part of a nation.

Fifth, we need to provide international assistance and solidarity. Through the lens of AIDS as a human security issue, we can see ever more clearly our global interconnectedness. AIDS is truly a global problem that calls out for global responses including resources—for example, the new Global AIDS and Health Fund that will be operational by the end of this year and already has one and a half billion dollars pledged to it.

Sixth, we need to address the long-term need to replace depleted human resources. This agenda is barely beginning, but is vital to the long-term response to AIDS. Only when we succeed in restoring and renewing the human capacities that have been battered by the epidemic can we be confident the most affected countries will be able to secure their futures.

And last, building a partnership in the response. The response to AIDS is beyond any one nation or any one agency—it needs partnership between regions, involving public and private sectors, governments, civil society, and business. UNAIDS itself is a unique partnership in the United Nations system, bringing together the joint efforts of eight cosponsoring organizations, focused on the one set of objectives.

Conclusion

AIDS has called into question the fundamental continuity of humanity—the passing from one generation to the next of basic values, of a legacy of happiness and prosperity, of memories and hopes.

Being able to make preparations for future generations is necessary to any notion of human security. Without the security that allows people to plan for the legacy they will leave to their children and to their community, the very basis of hope in the future is called into question. Security means nothing if there is no future.

Statement by Sam Nujoma
President of the Republic of Namibia

Excepts of Dr. Nujoma's speech to the Southern African Development Community (SADC) Summit, Blantyre, Malawi
11 August 2001

Our resolve to accelerate the implementation of the SADC socio-economic agenda and the consolidation of the economies of the region has been partially hampered by natural calamities [that] befell our region. We are all well aware that some member states of SADC did experience devastating floods, which have destroyed life, properties, and physical socio-economic infrastructure such as roads, schools, hospitals, housing, and shelters. There is no doubt that the efforts by those countries to address the problems of economic growth, poverty alleviation, and development in general have been negatively affected, and this in turn has impacted on the region as a whole.

As we are meeting here today, [the] HIV/AIDS pandemic continues to pose major threats to the development of our region. It is now estimated that about ten million of our citizens are living with HIV/AIDS. This accounts for about five percent of the total population of our region. The most unfortunate situation is that the majority of those affected are the young and the most economically productive age group of our population. This situation will surely impact negatively on the economic growth and development efforts we embark upon as a region.

Equally, the region has to deal with thousands of orphans and those children born with this deadly disease. The reality today is that we have in the region a traumatic situation, where either grandparents or children head households. Similarly, our governments are required to allocate huge and increasing resources to deal with this dilemma, thereby diverting those much-needed resources from the productive sectors that are essential to enhance economic growth and

development.

We are therefore called upon to urgently intensify and strengthen collective efforts as a region in minimizing the infection rates through an HIV/AIDS campaign as well as facilitating access to affordable medicine, treatment, and care for those already infected...

Gender equality is a matter of fundamental human rights, a pre-condition for democracy as well as an economic imperative.

Statement by Paula J. Dobriansky
Under Secretary for Global Affairs, U.S. Department of State

Excerpts of Secretary Dobriansky's remarks at the conference "Curtailing the HIV Epidemic: The Role of Prevention," hosted by The Henry J. Kaiser Foundation, Ford Foundation Auditorium, New York City
22 June 2001

Gender equality is a matter of fundamental human rights, a pre-condition for democracy as well as an economic imperative. —Sam Nujoma

We in SADC reflected this reality in the Declaration on Gender and Development and its 1998 Addendum on the Prevention and Eradication of Violence against Women and Children. It is here in Malawi, in 1997, where we signed the Declaration on Gender and Development and committed ourselves to…ensuring the equal representation of women and men in decision-making positions. It is here where we set ourselves a minimum target of at least 30 percent women…in our decision-making bodies by the year 2005.

The region is still haunted by the legacy of colonial occupation and foreign domination as manifested by existing inequalities in income distribution and access to means of production and livelihood. The unresolved land issue is one of those stark realities facing some of our member states. The prevailing situation is untenable and needs to be redressed in order to allow the majority of our people to participate in productive activities and to be self-reliant...

Recently, our region has witnessed a number of important developments. Most importantly, it has recorded positive economic performance. Its average economic growth during the year 2000 stood at 3.4 percent, which is an improvement in the 1999 growth rate of 1.8 percent. While this figure is a notable improvement on the figure of 1999, it is still significantly below the internationally projected minimum economic growth rate of six percent required to achieve sustainable economic development and substantial poverty reduction.

Secretary Powell summed up the challenge we are confronting during his recent visit to Africa: "There is no war that is more serious, there is no war that is causing more death and destruction, there is no war on the face of the earth right now that is more serious, that is more grave, than the war we see...in sub-Saharan Africa against HIV/AIDS."

The human toll has been enormous. A recent Brookings Institution study described the HIV/AIDS threat this way: "More people have died from HIV/AIDS over the last twenty years than from any other disease in human history—including the global influenza pandemic of 1918-19 and the Bubonic Plague."

Another report released this week by the International Crisis Group says that HIV/AIDS is "taking a toll as profound as any military confrontation around the globe, and it is a security threat to countries it assaults as well as their neighbors, partners, and allies."

The threat posed by the disease is all-encompassing. Last year, in its report *Global Trends 2015*, the National Intelligence Council stated: "AIDS, other diseases, and health problems will hurt prospects for transition to democratic regimes as they undermine civil society, hamper the evolution of economic institutions, and intensify the struggle for power and resources."

Clearly, HIV/AIDS is a global problem, and the United States is by no means immune from its ravages. The recent increase in infections in the [United States] after a period in which the rate had slowed is cause for concern in and of itself. Moreover, Americans—whether tourists traveling overseas, military and diplomatic personnel stationed abroad, or even those who never leave the territory of the [United States]—

must realize that the spread of HIV/AIDS knows no boundaries.

From both a security as well as a humanitarian standpoint, we cannot sit idly by. HIV/AIDS is wreaking havoc on the populations of many countries hit hard by its spread. Most people who become infected are young and entering the most productive stage of their lives. The cycle of sickness and death is already shredding the fabric of society in sub-Saharan Africa, with other regions soon to follow. It has lowered life expectancy in many countries, stunting social and economic development and overwhelming already struggling health care systems.

Similarly, the virus is taking a toll on the armed forces of many nations. Young, mobile soldiers are especially prone to being exposed to—and transmitting—HIV/AIDS. This will have a major impact not just within a nation's military but on countries' ability to meet international peacekeeping responsibilities.

HIV/AIDS is a threat to security and global stability, plain and simple. Together with malaria and tuberculosis, HIV/AIDS has caused 25 percent of deaths worldwide. Twenty-two million people have died due to AIDS since its onset two decades ago. Another 36 million people worldwide are currently living with HIV/AIDS; more than five million of those were infected last year alone. In sub-Saharan Africa, the part of the world most devastated by the disease and home to 70 percent of the 36 million HIV/AIDS cases, AIDS is now the leading cause of death. But the problem is not unique to Africa, of course. India, Russia, and the Caribbean in particular are among many countries and regions struggling with the disease...

Hunger and Food Security

Statement by Andrew S. Natsios
Administrator, U.S. Agency for International Development

Excerpts from an address by Administrator Natsios at the "Partnership to Cut Hunger in Africa" conference, U.S. Department of State, Washington, DC
27 June 2001

The bottom line is, we have been losing the war against poverty and hunger in sub-Saharan Africa.

Chronic hunger is still a worldwide problem. But in other regions, there is progress in food security. The latest estimates by the U.S. Department of Agriculture are that, outside Africa, the number of chronically hungry people will drop from 465 million to 255 million by 2010.

But in Africa, those same estimates indicate that the number of hungry in Africa will increase by about 10 million a year over the next decade. By 2010, 435 million Africans could face severe food insecurity.

There is no one reason why Africa faces a number of serious and interrelated difficulties. Natural disasters from drought to flooding have destroyed agriculture and infrastructure. Conflicts in many parts of Africa have cost thousands of lives and disrupted food production and access. Too few Africans have access to real economic opportunity.

On top of this, Africa faces the incredible threat of AIDS. The threat of AIDS to food security is severe: in the hardest-hit African countries, there are estimates that these countries will lose between 13 percent and 23 percent of their labor forces over the next 20 years. The result will be severe farm labor shortages—at a time when we need to increase food production in Africa.

Unfortunately, as Africa has struggled, international support for agricultural development has faded. Since the mid-1980s, funding from international donors for agricultural research and development has declined by 80 percent.

In the mid-1980s, USAID put more than a billion dollars a year into agriculture activities—by 1997, that figure had dropped to $214 million. We've managed to increase our support for agricultural to more than $300 million this year—but still a far cry from the levels of past decades. That cut was due partly to severe reductions in USAID's overall budget—and also to increasing U.S. focus on other priorities like promoting democracy, protecting the environment, [and] increasing health and child survival efforts.

Many African governments also decreased their spending for agriculture and rural infrastructure. In part, these cuts reflected declining donor support, but they also reflected responses to failed policies. Price support programs turned out to provide disincentives rather than incentives to farmers. Fertilizer support programs were subject to inefficiencies and corruption.

Obviously the challenges are incredible. I believe that together we can reverse the tide. There is no magic

bullet—the causes of food insecurity are complex, and we must respond on a number of fronts. But we are not starting from scratch—we have decades of experience to draw upon in the United States and in Africa. We know what works. The key is to build partnerships that help us coordinate our efforts, maximize our resources, and ultimately to give more people access to adequate supplies of food.

We in USAID intend to fight for a new U.S. government focus to reduce poverty and hunger in Africa. We will shortly create a new central bureau of Economic Growth, Trade, and Agriculture to focus largely on agriculture. We have several specific goals for our USAID approach to this challenge:

1. Improve nutrition and diet of poor families;
2. Eliminate famine;
3. Dramatically cut absolute poverty;
4. Reduce income disparities between rural and urban families.

I believe that to accomplish these goals, we must agree on some basic principles upon which to base our strategies:

The first principle is: learn from our past mistakes—and our successes. I already mentioned the fertilizer and price support programs—they did not work once; let's make sure they don't have a chance to not work again…

The second principle is: get the economic policy framework right. We know that science-based, market-based economic policies give farmers and processors incentives to produce. Case in point: Malian farmers have increased the productivity of rice over the last 15 years to levels that were unthinkable in 1980. USAID and other donors supported policy and institutional reforms in the mid-1980s that increased incentives to invest in more intensive production and processing. Farmers were able to use high-yielding rice varieties developed by the International Rice Research Institute. Land tenure reforms led to improved management of both agricultural and natural resources. The result: rice production in the inner delta region of Mali doubled between 1993 and 2000.

The third principle is: make use of the latest agricultural research. We know that agricultural technology can increase productivity—if we ensure that rural farmers have access to appropriate technology…

The fourth principle is: focus on scale. We won't succeed by trying to make specific communities, even specific countries, food secure. The fact is famine or severe hunger in one country causes displacement and economic effects that hurt surrounding nations. The Sahel model I spoke of earlier shows that regional, coordinated approaches work to cut hunger, and I intend to focus on such large-scale initiatives.

So far, I've talked mostly about agriculture. But as you all know, to solve hunger in Africa, we must work beyond the agriculture sector to address poverty and hunger in Africa.

Together, we must fight the HIV/AIDS pandemic. The United States is the world leader in responding to HIV/AIDS. As Secretary Powell said in New York this week, President Bush has put the full force of his cabinet behind the U.S. response to this crisis. Only an integrated approach makes sense, an approach that emphasizes prevention and public education. But it also must include treatment, care for orphans, measures to stop mother-to-child transmission, affordable drugs, delivery systems and infrastructure, medical training. And of course, it must include research into vaccines and a cure…

Together, we must reduce conflict. We cannot improve food security in Africa without addressing current conflicts and preventing future ones. One civil war in one year can do as much damage as an earthquake. Infrastructure is destroyed, hospitals and schools are demolished, and educated people—those who are most mobile—flee and don't return. To address the increase in conflict and tension, USAID will undertake a major new conflict prevention, management, and resolution initiative.

Together, we must accelerate economic growth. Reducing poverty and accelerating economic growth are essential to African stability and access to food…

Statement by Jacques Diouf
Director-General, Food and Agricultural Organization of the United Nations

Excerpts from Mr. Diouf's keynote address on "Perspectives on Hunger, Poverty and Agriculture in Africa" at the National Gathering on Africa, Washington, DC
23 June 2001

Unless urgent and substantial effort is made, FAO estimates that the percentage of the

undernourished population in sub-Saharan Africa will fall to 22 percent, but that the absolute number will increase from 180 million in 1995/97 to 184 million in 2015.

War, civil conflict, and disease have taken a particularly heavy toll on the region. Sixty-one percent of the African population has been affected by war and civil conflict, while the HIV/AIDS pandemic has reduced life expectancy by as much as 20 years in the countries affected the most, and is expected to reduce Africa's economic growth by one-fourth over the next 20 years.

Agriculture continues to dominate the economies and societies of most African countries and is an important vehicle for economic growth. In 1998 for the continent as a whole, the agricultural sector accounted for nearly 60 percent of the total labor force, 20 percent of total merchandise exports, and 17 percent of GDP. For sub-Saharan Africa, these figures are even higher, amounting to two-thirds of the labor force, one-third of exports, and nearly one-third of GDP. Agriculture is the main source of raw material for industry and provides a high proportion of manufacturing value-added in most African countries. Moreover, rural households derive almost 40 percent of their income from rural off-farm activities linked one way or the other to primary agriculture.

Poverty, Food Insecurity, and Agriculture

It is well known that poverty is at the root of hunger and undernourishment. However, what often escapes our attention is that hunger and malnutrition are also major causes of poverty. Hunger reduces the productivity of what is often the only asset that the extremely poor possess: their labor. Thus undernourishment, through productivity losses and nutrition-related health problems, is an economic handicap. The undernourished are often trapped in a vicious circle of undernourishment, low productivity, and hence continuous poverty. It follows that the reduction of food insecurity must be at the center of national and international poverty reduction programs.

In Africa, although concrete programs have to be adapted to national and local conditions, the prevalence of poverty and food insecurity in rural areas points to a common feature: anti-poverty and food security policies should emphasize rural livelihoods and also agricultural and other related rural activities on which the poor depend for their survival. Hunger and poverty are, and will remain for several decades to come, rural phenomena in Africa, closely linked [not only] to agricultural production and productivity but also to rural employment and income generation which would allow sustainable and sustained socio-economic development.

In Africa, therefore, the battle against poverty over the next few decades will be won or lost in rural areas.

Coping with Disasters and Diseases

Natural and man-made disasters have increasingly become a serious threat to economic and social progress in developing countries, especially in Africa. The number of people facing serious food shortages in sub-Saharan Africa as a result of these disasters is currently estimated at over 28 million in 21 countries.

As a consequence, a principal challenge for African countries is to improve their preparedness for and prevention of the frequent disasters and diseases [that] are so detrimental to their food security and agricultural development.

FAO's Global Information and Early Warning System (GIEWS) identifies potential crisis situations arising from natural and man-made disasters and monitors ongoing agricultural production using a combination of high-tech satellite monitoring systems along with traditional on-the-ground observations. This objective information on the food availability situation allows both private voluntary organizations and bilateral donors to react more quickly in crisis situations in order to minimize human suffering and save lives.

The Health Crisis, in Particular the Spread of HIV/AIDS

Many of the problems of health that afflict peoples in Africa stem from hunger and malnutrition. It is only healthy, well-nourished children who can grow and develop normally and can learn and develop their mental capacities to the fullest. Good nutrition needs to be seen as playing an important role in preventing and mitigating the impact of infections.

The estimated annual number of new HIV infections in sub-Saharan Africa has been rising rapidly and reached four million persons in 1999. The most affected countries rely heavily on agriculture, and HIV/AIDS is expected to take a sizeable toll on the agricultural labor force, with labor force losses ranging from 13 to 26 percent in the nine most affected countries—posing a severe threat to food security.

Globalization, Trade, and Regional Integration: Opportunities and Challenges

African export patterns continue to be characterized by a small number of primary (often plantation-based) commodities and dependency on preferential access to a few developed-country markets.

An important reason for this is the supply-side constraints in the countries themselves, but others [factors] have their origins elsewhere.

African countries urgently need improved market access for their agricultural products, particularly for higher-value processed products; market-based incentives to increase investment in their own agriculture; and substantial infusions of technical and financial assistance in overcoming domestic supply constraints.

Resource Mobilization for Agricultural Development

In order to achieve a more rapid reduction of poverty and food insecurity in Africa, a much greater share of resources, both domestic and international, must be devoted to agricultural and rural development than is presently the case.

A large share of resources for investment in primary agriculture and the rural sector will have to come from the private sector, first and foremost the farmers themselves. But the public sector has a large role to play in this effort: in particular, in technology generation and diffusion, basic infrastructure for water control, roads and market infrastructure, dissemination of information, and institution-building.

The spectacular increase in foreign direct investment flowing to developing countries in the last decade has largely bypassed Africa, and it has hardly touched its agricultural sector. This is distressing but not surprising. For attracting foreign private capital, the necessary investments in infrastructure (communications and information, irrigation and drainage, health and education) need to be put in place by governments with the assistance of donors. Public capital is essential for stimulating private initiative...