

OFFICIAL STATEMENTS



Below are excerpts from recent official statements in which environment and population issues are prominently cited in the context of security and national interests. The Wilson Center encourages readers to inform the ECSP Report of other related public statements.

STATEMENTS BY WILLIAM J. CLINTON President of the United States

Excerpts from President Clinton's remarks to the People of New Zealand, Antarctic Centre, Christchurch, New Zealand

15 September 1999

...The overwhelming consensus of world scientific opinion is that greenhouse gases from human activity are raising the Earth's temperature in a rapid and unsustainable way. The five warmest years since the fifteenth century have all been in the 1990s; 1998 was the warmest year ever recorded, eclipsing the record set just the year before, in 1997.

Unless we change course, most scientists believe the seas will rise so high they will swallow whole islands and coastal areas. Storms, like hurricanes and droughts both, will intensify. Diseases like malaria will be borne by mosquitoes to higher and higher altitudes, and across borders, threatening more lives—a phenomenon we already see today in Africa.

...In 1992, the nations of the world began to address this challenge at the Earth Summit in Rio. Five years later, 150 nations made more progress toward that goal in Kyoto, Japan. But we still have so much more to do.

...[We] have a big responsibility because America produces more greenhouse gases than any other country in the world. I have offered an aggressive program to reduce that production in every area. We are also mindful that emissions are growing in the developing world even more rapidly than in the developed world, and we have a responsibility there.

...[T]he largest obstacle to meeting the challenge of climate change...is the continued...idea that the only way a country can become wealthy and remain wealthy is to have the patterns of energy use that brought us the Industrial Age. In other words, if you [are] not burning more oil and coal this year than you were last year, you [are] not getting richer; you [are] not creating more jobs; you [are] not lifting more children out of poverty. That is no longer true.

We now know that technologies that permit breathtaking advances in energy conservation, and the use of alternative forms of energy, make it possible to grow the economy faster while healing the environment, and that...it is no longer necessary to burn up the atmosphere to create economic opportunity.

...We are committed to doing more at home and to do more to help developing nations bring on these technologies, so they can improve living standards and improve the environment. [In] 1987, the international community came together in Montreal and agreed to stop the use of chemicals that deplete the ozone layer. Experts tell us that if we keep going, the ozone hole will shrink, and by the middle of the next century the ozone hole could actually close, so that, miracle of miracles, we would have a problem created by people solved by people, and their develop-

ment. This is the sort of thing we have to do with climate change-and the stakes are even higher....

**Excerpts from President Clinton's State of the Union Address, Washington, D.C.
27 January 2000**

...America must help more nations to break the bonds of disease. Last year in Africa, ten times as many people died from AIDS as were killed in wars-ten times. The budget I give you invests \$150 million more in the fight against this and other infectious killers. And today, I propose a tax credit to speed the development of vaccines for diseases like malaria, TB [tuberculosis], and AIDS. I ask the private sector and our partners around the world to join us in embracing this cause. We can save millions of lives together, and we ought to do it....

...The greatest environmental challenge of the new century is global warming. The scientists tell us the 1990s were the hottest decade of the entire millennium. If we fail to reduce the emission of greenhouse gases, deadly heat waves and droughts will become more frequent, coastal areas will flood, and economies will be disrupted. That is going to happen, unless we act.

Many people in the United States...and lots of folks around the world still believe you cannot cut greenhouse gas emissions without slowing economic growth. In the Industrial Age that may well have been true. But in this digital economy, it is not true anymore. New technologies make it possible to cut harmful emissions and provide even more growth.

...In the new century, innovations in science and technology will be the key not only to the health of the environment, but to miraculous improvements in the quality of our lives and advances in the economy.

...These steps will allow us to lead toward the far frontiers of science and technology. They will enhance our health, the environment, the economy in ways we [can not] even imagine today. But we all know that at a time when science, technology, and the forces of globalization are bringing so many changes into all our lives, [it is] more important than ever that we strengthen the bonds that root us in our local communities and in our national community.

.....

**STATEMENTS BY ALBERT GORE, JR.
Vice President of the United States**

**Excerpts from Vice President Gore's remarks to United Nations Security Council Opening Session, New York, N.Y.
10 January 2000**

Let me thank the distinguished members of the Council for the...willingness to greet the dawn of this new millennium by exploring a brand new definition of world security.

Today marks the first time...that the Security Council will discuss a health issue as a security threat. We tend to think of a threat to security in terms of war and peace. Yet no one can doubt that the havoc wreaked and

the toll exacted by HIV/AIDS do threaten our security. The heart of the security agenda is protecting lives-and we now know that the number of people who will die of AIDS in the first decade of the twenty-first century will rival the number that died in all the wars in all the decades of the twentieth century. When ten people in sub-Saharan Africa are infected every minute; when eleven million children have already become or-

phans, and many must be raised by other children; when a single disease threatens everything from economic strength to peacekeeping-we clearly face a security threat of the greatest magnitude.

This historic session not only recognizes the real and present danger to world security posed by the AIDS pandemic...this meeting also begins a month-long focus by this Council on the special challenges confronting the continent of Africa. The powerful fact that we begin by concentrating on AIDS has a still larger significance: it sets a precedent for Security Council concern and action on a broader security agenda. By the power of example, this meeting demands of us that we see security through a new and wider prism, and forever after, think about it according to a new, more expansive definition. For the past half century, the Security Council has dealt with the classic security agenda-built upon common efforts to resist aggression, and to stop armed

“We must understand that the old conception of global security-with its focus almost solely on armies, ideologies, and geopolitics-has to be enlarged.”

- Albert Gore

conflict. We have witnessed wars among nations, and violence on the scale of war within nations, for many reasons:

- Because of claims of religious or racial superiority.
- Because of lust for power, disguised as ideology or rationalized as geo-strategic doctrine.
- Because of a sense that a small place or a larger region-or the whole world-was too small to allow for the survival and prosperity of all, unless the powerful could dominate the weak.
- Because of the tendency of too many to see themselves solely as separate groups, celebrating and defending their exclusivity, by demonizing and dehumanizing others.
- Because of poverty, which causes the collapse of hopes and expectations, the coming apart of a society, and makes people first desperate, then freshly open to evil leadership.

But while the old threats still face our global community, there are new things under the sun-new forces arising that now or soon will challenge international order, raising issues of peace and war...From this new vantage point, we must forge and follow a new agenda for world security, an agenda that includes:

- The global environmental challenge, which could render all our other progress meaningless, unless we deal with it successfully.
- The global challenge of defeating drugs and corruption, which now spill across our borders.
- The global challenge of terror-magnified by the availability of new weapons of mass destruction so small they can be concealed in a coat pocket.
- The new pandemics, laying waste to whole societies, and the emergence of new strains of old diseases that are horrifyingly resistant to the antibiotics that protected the last three generations.

Our new security agenda should be pursued with determination, adequate resources, and creative use of the new tools at the world's disposal that can be used to bring us together in successful common efforts-tools such as the Internet and the emerging global information infrastructure-which, if used imaginatively, will enable new

depths of insight and cooperation by nations, nongovernmental organizations, and citizens at all levels. Our task is not merely to recognize and confront these challenges, but to rise to our higher ideals, and work together to make our brightest dreams real in the lives of our children. In order to succeed, I believe, along with growing billions around this planet, that we must create a world where people's faith in their own capacity for self-governance unlocks their human potential, and justifies their growing

belief that all can share in an ever-widening circle of human dignity and self-sufficiency... A world in which parents are free to choose the size of their families with the confidence that the children they bring into this world will survive to become

healthy adults, with economic opportunity in prosperous and peaceful communities. A world where we educate girls as well as boys, and secure the rights of women everywhere, as full members of the human family.

All this and more constitutes the great global challenge of our time: to create and strengthen a sense of solidarity, as we seek a newer world of security for all-security not only from loss of life and the ravages of war, but security from constant fear and degradation, and from a loss of the quality of life and liberty of spirit that should belong to all. If we are to succeed in addressing this new security agenda, we must recognize that because of our rapid growth in population, and the historically unprecedented power of the new technologies at our widespread disposal, mistakes which once were tolerable can now have consequences that are multiplied many-fold.

For example, for almost all the years of recorded history, people could do whatever they wished to their environment, and do little to permanently harm it. People could wage war in the world, and do nothing to destroy it. But now, threats that were once local can have consequences that are regional or global; damage once temporary can now become chronic and catastrophic. As a world community, we must prove to our citizens that we are wise enough to control what we have been smart enough to create. We must understand that the old conception of global security-with its focus almost solely on armies, ideologies, and geopolitics-has to be enlarged. We need to show that we not only can contain

“ **[E]**nvironmental threats should be seen for what they are—namely, threats to our security.”

- **Madeleine Albright**

aggression, prevent war, and mediate conflicts, but that we can work together to anticipate and respond to a new century with its new global imperatives. The human mind-our ingenuity, our dreaming, our restless quest to do better-created this moment. Now the human will-not of one individual, not of one nation or group of nations-but the collective will of truly united nations, must master this moment. We must bend it in the direction of life, not death; justice, not oppression; opportunity, not deprivation-a new security for the new world we now inhabit....

.....
STATEMENTS BY MADELEINE K. ALBRIGHT
U.S. Secretary of State

Excerpts from Secretary of State Albright's remarks to the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People (NAACP) in New York, N.Y. 13 July 1999

...Neither numbers nor statistics, are adequate to describe the human destruction being caused by [AIDS], especially in Africa....

The imperative in Africa now, as in our own country a decade or so ago, is to face squarely the reality of this disease, for we know that with national leadership, international assistance and local interventions, the tide can be turned. Uganda was among the first nations to be devastated by AIDS, but it fought back. President Museveni has urged every cabinet minister, every school, every church, and every business to promote AIDS awareness, prevention, and treatment. Ugandans call this "the big noise," and it has cut HIV infection rates by fifty percent.

Today, the big noise is starting to be heard in more and more African nations. The United States has helped by urging others to heed Uganda's example, and by steering to Africa more than one-half of the \$1 billion we have invested in the global fight against AIDS. But so much more needs to be done. So I can pledge this morning that I will do all I can to see that we will do more-and that we stick with this fight until its won....

Excerpts from Secretary of State Albright's remarks entitled "An Alliance for Global Water Security in the Twenty-first Century" at the National Defense University, Washington, D.C. 10 April 2000

...[N]ot even [President] Theodore Roosevelt drew

then the connection that this university does now between the defense of American security and the protection of the world environment. As our armed forces can attest, that connection has been on display throughout the past decade.

In the former Soviet Union, we have been helping to dismantle nuclear and chemical weapons facilities safely. And we know that easing that region's environmental challenges must be part of any real democratic transition there.

We also know that regional conflicts pose a major threat to international stability, and that competition for natural resources can contribute to political extremism and civil strife. Somalia was an example of this, and the Congo now is another.

And as we have seen in Africa, Haiti, and the Balkans, environmental problems slow [the] recovery from conflict, and make the transition to stability that much harder.

With the Cold War long since over, the need to respond to natural disasters has placed new pressure on our armed forces. During the past two years, we have sent troops to aid recovery efforts in Southeast Asia, the Caribbean, Central America, and Mozambique.

Beyond this, there is an even more basic connection. Our citizens cannot be secure if the air we breathe, the food we grow, and the water we drink are at risk because the global environment is in danger.

The Clinton Administration came to office understanding these linkages. And that is why, in its first year, we established the positions of Under Secretary of State for Global Affairs, the Deputy Under Secretary of Defense for Environmental Security, and an environmental director at the National Security Council....

Since coming to office, President Clinton and Vice President Gore have made it clear that environmental threats should be seen for what they are—namely, threats to our security.

That is why four years ago, Secretary of State Warren Christopher explicitly incorporated environmental goals into the mainstream of U.S. foreign policy. And we have been acting on that basis ever since.

Our priorities for the year 2000 include President Clinton's "Greening the Globe" initiative, under which USAID, will allocate \$150 million to the conservation of tropical forests.

We are asking the Senate to ratify the Desertification Convention and to back efforts to reverse the life-stealing loss of agricultural land, especially in Africa. We are also urging the Senate to approve the Biodiversity Convention, for we cannot ensure our future without safeguarding our biological base. We are

working toward an agreement that would ban or severely restrict the production of twelve of the world's most deadly and persistent toxins. And we are asking Congress to restore full funding for international family planning, which reduces environmental stress, while saving human lives.

And we are waging a worldwide diplomatic campaign to combat global climate change. This is the Administration's highest environmental priority. By now, the scientific consensus is clear that the earth is getting warmer. If we don't address the problem, the economic and ecological consequences will be enormous—drought in some areas, floods in others, rising sea levels, and spreading disease.

The United States has the world's largest economy. Our scientists have designed the best environmental technology. And our society is by far the largest emitter of the gases that cause global climate change. So we have both the capacity and the obligation to lead.

That is why the Administration has taken bold strides to control greenhouse gas emissions while also growing our economy—and why we are striving to shape an effective world response. The Kyoto Protocol was an essential first step. We are committed to completing its rules in a manner that will pave the way for U.S. ratification. Getting those rules right will help the environment while also promoting economic gains. We cannot solve this problem alone. Soon, fifty percent of global emissions will come from developing countries. And that is why we are seeking their meaningful participation...

As a diplomat, I have seen firsthand the tensions that competition for water can generate, and the suffering that mismanagement and shortages can cause.

...I have been to village after village, especially in Africa, where the term "water shortage" translates not into brown lawns and wilted flowers, as in our suburbs, but into whole communities of people prostrated by dehydration and weakened by disease.

Today, around the world, more than one billion people lack access to safe drinking water. More than two billion live in countries experiencing some kind of water stress. At least five million people die every year from water-related illness. That [is] more than the population of Maryland.

And pollution is the great thief of freshwater, despoiling an ever-growing fraction of the world's supplies. Of every two major rivers and lakes on the planet, one is seriously sick. On every continent, freshwater ecosystems have been harmed. And half the world's wetlands have disappeared. Moreover, studies show that the squeeze on water resources will tighten as populations

grow, demand increases, pollution continues, and global climate change accelerates.

As competition for water intensifies, further disagreements over access and use are likely to erupt. And unless properly managed, water scarcity can be a major source of strife, as well as a roadblock to economic and social progress.

...[T]he World Water Forum... [declared] that "every person, everywhere, should have access to enough safe water at an affordable cost." Together, we must address the water crisis in three ways. The first is technical, because our problems result far less from how much water we have, than from how much we waste. For example, agriculture accounts for seventy percent of global water use; yet irrigation systems squander as much as three out of every five gallons pumped. Better technologies, such as drip irrigation systems, and improved measurement and forecasting can reduce water use substantially while still getting the job done. The result is more crop per drop; a better payoff for the farmer, and a smaller environmental cost...

Second, [addressing the water crisis] requires good economics....[W]ater is wasted because it is underpriced. Direct and indirect subsidies are common in both developed and developing countries. These subsidies are often built into investments that serve primarily those who are already well off. For example, the residents of many urban shantytowns can only obtain fresh water from peddlers, at a price far higher than that charged by local utilities...

[I]ncentives must be found for more water-related investments and technology. Using the right techniques, and developing sound-pricing policies can help a nation get the most out of their water resources. But it cannot guarantee water security. As is common, those resources extend across national lines. There are more than 300 shared river basins and aquifers in the world. And two out of every five people rely upon them.

These people are dependent not only on what they do themselves, but also on the practices of their neighbors who live up the river or across the lake, or who draw water from the same underground source....The ability to work together is critical, but will likely be complicated by political, social, economic, and even cultural considerations. And this is where the third element, diplomacy—comes in...

...But there are other issues that we need to deal with overseas. A good example is in the Middle East, one of the world's most environmentally-stressed areas—stressed in other ways also, but environmentally-stressed areas—where the United States chairs a working group on water resources. Its purpose is to encourage techni-

cal cooperation, and bring parties together with donors for the purpose of increasing water security for all.

In Central Asia, the former Soviet Republics inherited from their Communist predecessors a legacy of “ecocidal” practices. The two river systems of the Aral Sea Basin are sorely degraded. Improvements will depend on multilateral cooperation and the proper integration of technical and political resources. And as I said, I [will] visit the region next week, and I hope to explore these issues with the local leaders.

In Southeast Asia, the Mekong River Basin is the primary source of economic survival for nearly a quarter billion people. But pollution, poorly-placed dams, and flooding may prevent the area from realizing its potential. A stronger political commitment from within the region, and better coordination from without, would improve the Mekong River Commission’s ability to address these issues.

The longest river in the world is the Nile, whose waters flow through half a dozen countries in Central and Northeast Africa. Within the past year, these countries have made significant progress in working together. And this is good, because an agreement governing the development and management of basin resources would go far to reassure potential donors and combat the poverty that burdens much of the local population.

More Africans lack access to safe water now than a decade ago. Almost half the people on the continent suffer from water-related disease. The result is economically crippling and, from a humanitarian standpoint, flat-out unacceptable.

The African Development Bank declared recently that the lack of integrated management for most of the continent’s fifty-four transboundary water bodies is a potential threat to regional stability. The Bank approved a new plan for water resources management and pledged to help riparian countries work together. And the United States will back this effort.

...I am proposing a global alliance for water security in the twenty-first century...open to all who comprehend the urgency of working together to conserve transboundary water, manage it wisely, and use it well....

Technically, we will build capacity and identify options for improving conditions on the ground. We will spur training in water management techniques, and encourage water engineers to forge relationships across national lines. We will support early warning and other means for reducing tensions and increasing confidence. We will promote the development of water sharing agreements and institutions capable of implementing them....

Second, we will be inviting representatives from key

donor countries to Washington in early summer to talk further about how we can better help others deal cooperatively with regional water issues. Our focus will be on supporting nations that show a willingness to develop and implement constructive strategies. And our goal will be to assure that donor assistance is not haphazard and at cross purposes, but rather coordinated and complementary.

Third, we will strongly support efforts by the World Bank and private foundations to see that investments in water-related projects reflect and encourage sound management practices.

Fourth, with the support from Congress, the State Department is contributing \$2 million to start a new fund within the United Nations Development Programme to improve regional water management. Our goal is to bring the parties together to discuss and resolve transboundary water problems, and we encourage other countries to contribute, as well.

And, finally, we will seek to develop a more regular and mutually productive dialogue with the scientific and academic communities on water-related issues....

Overall, the goals of our alliance must be to dramatically improve the management of transboundary water resources; eliminate water as a source of regional instability; and use cooperation on water as a basis for bringing nations together on other issues....

.....

**STATEMENTS BY DAVID B. SANDALOW
Assistant Secretary of State for
Oceans and International
Environmental and Scientific Affairs**

**Excerpts from Assistant Secretary Sandalow’s remarks
on “Protecting and Conserving the World’s Forests” at
the National Press Club, Washington, D.C.
6 January 2000**

...[W]e value forests for all these reasons: their rich biological diversity, their many ecological services, their role in disaster prevention, their many products-so ubiquitous in our lives-the habitat they offer, and the way they help our spirits soar.

...In the past decade, the world has lost an average of thirty-eight million acres of forest per year....But the clearing of forests is not the only challenge. Around the world, the health of forests is threatened by air pollution, increases in insect infestations, invasive species and disease, catastrophic fire, and other human-induced environmental hazards.

First, roughly seventy-five percent of the world's forests are found in just sixteen countries (Russia, Brazil, Canada, the United States, China, Indonesia, Democratic Republic of Congo, Peru, India, Mexico, Colombia, Bolivia, Venezuela, Sudan, Australia, and Papua New Guinea). Indeed, roughly fifty percent of the world's forests are found in just the first four countries (Russia, Brazil, Canada, and the United States).

Second, forests are found within the sovereign territories of many countries, with different cultures, political systems, and levels of development. Any strategies to protect forests must recognize and respect these vastly different circumstances.

...There is no one-size-fits-all solution to protecting the world's forests. The world's forests and their circumstances are too diverse....What can we do to protect and conserve the world's forests?

Move forward with the Tropical Forest Conservation Act. The U.S. Congress has shown great leadership by enacting the Tropical Forest Conservation Act. This statute authorizes reduction of official debt owed to the U.S. Government by countries with significant tropical forests, in return for conservation measures.

Adopt multilateral standards for forest lending. Every year, national governments support forest sector investments worth hundreds of millions of dollars with export credits and investment guarantees. In doing so, governments should promote sound forest practices.

Address subsidies. There is a need to address government subsidies that promote over-logging and distort trade. Such subsidies can skew resource decisions, cost tax revenues, and damage ecosystems. Some experts estimate that these subsidies total billions of dollars per year worldwide, but more information is needed. We should gather information about the scope and nature of subsidies affecting the forest sector that may be environmentally damaging and trade-distorting and develop appropriate responses worldwide.

...Invest in remote sensing. Satellite observation and new technologies such as the Global Positioning Systems (GPS) are critical tools for assessing, monitoring, and managing forests. Remote sensing played a central role in almost all forest fire programs in Brazil, Mexico, Russia, and Southeast Asia during the 1997-98 El Niño. Last year, the G-8 agreed to a U.S.-proposed initiative

to enhance the use of remote sensing as a tool in managing forests and responding to forest fires. We will actively pursue this initiative, with a view to creating and maintaining databases and facilitating access to such information around the globe.

Use the power of the market. The marketplace can be a powerful tool for protecting and conserving forests. But too often, markets fail to value essential forest services. Certification and labeling programs, along with industry codes of conduct, can help correct this problem. Another important tool for valuing forests is carbon trading. Forests play a central role in the global carbon cycle; we must find new and innovative ways to value the carbon-absorbing services that forests provide.

Focus UN discussion on practical results. Since 1995, governments from around the world have come together under the auspices of the UN Commission on Sustainable Development (CSD) to discuss approaches for conserving the world's forests. Governments have identified more than 135 proposals for action. In the years ahead, we should build on this work. When the Intergovernmental Forum on Forests meets next month, it should take the next step, which is to focus on implementation of what has already been agreed. We should move forward to shape a transparent, practical, results-oriented forum-one focused not on talk but action....

“ [W]hat is taking place in Ethiopia today is a man-made disaster. Without the war, there would be no famine.”

- Benjamin Gilman

.....

**STATEMENTS BY BENJAMIN A. GILMAN
U.S. Congressman from New York, Chair,
House Committee on International Relations**

Excerpts from Congressman Gilman's remarks at a House International Relations Committee hearing on the "Looming Famine in Ethiopia," Washington, D.C. 18 May 2000

...The war is inextricably linked to the famine, which is the focus of our hearing today. In southeastern Ethiopia and in parts of the central highlands, food shortages have reached a critical stage. Eight million of Ethiopia's sixty million citizens are at risk of starvation. Nearly a billion metric tons of food are required, and the United States is prepared to supply half of it.

The cycle of famine in Ethiopia will not be broken, however, for as long as the government continues to spend a third of its budget on the military. The International Institute for Strategic Studies estimates that Ethiopia spent \$467 million on its military last year, a dramatic increase over previous years. Economic development efforts have been put on hold while scarce resources are committed to the war effort.

...[W]hat is taking place in Ethiopia today is a man-made disaster. Without the war, there would be no famine. The decisions of the governments of Ethiopia and Eritrea have directly contributed to the dire condition of their populations.

This is the same pattern we saw in the early 1980s when the horrific Dergue regime under Mengistu used famine to make war on its own people. How regrettable that the current governments of Eritrea and Ethiopia, which had valiantly fought against the Dergue, now share this aspect with it....

STATEMENTS BY **GEORGE W. BUSH**
Governor of Texas

**Excerpts from Governor Bush's remarks on "A Distinctly American Internationalism" at the Ronald Reagan Presidential Library, Simi Valley, California
19 November 1999**

...Our first order of business is the national security of our nation—and here both Russia and the United States face a changed world. Instead of confronting each other, we confront the legacy of a dead ideological rivalry—thousands of nuclear weapons, which, in the case of Russia, may not be secure. And together we also face an emerging threat—from rogue nations, nuclear theft, and accidental launch. All this requires nothing short of a new strategic relationship to protect the peace of the world.

In an act of foresight and statesmanship, [Senator Richard Lugar and Senator Sam Nunn] realized that existing Russian nuclear facilities were in danger of being compromised. Under the [1991] Nunn-Lugar program, security at many Russian nuclear facilities has been improved and warheads have been destroyed.

Even so, the Energy Department warns us that our estimates of Russian nuclear stockpiles could be off by as much as thirty percent. In other words, a great deal of Russian nuclear material cannot be accounted for. The next president must press for an accurate inventory of all this material. And we must do more. I [will] ask the

[U.S.] Congress to increase substantially our assistance to dismantle as many of Russia's weapons as possible, as quickly as possible...

STATEMENTS BY **KOFI ANNAN**
Secretary-General, United Nations

Excerpts from Secretary-General Annan's remarks on the Occasion of World Environment Day, New York, N.Y.

5 June 2000

We may be at the dawn of a new millennium, but the environmental problems we face are painfully familiar. They may even be getting worse. Despite the Earth Summit, and despite success stories like the Montreal Protocol to protect the ozone layer, human beings continue to plunder the global environment.

Unsustainable practices remain deeply embedded in the fabric of our daily lives. We are failing to protect resources and ecosystems. We are failing to invest enough in alternative technologies, especially for energy. We are failing even to keep the debate alive. These are deeply troubling trends. I recommend four priorities for reversing them.

First, we need a major public education effort. Understanding of the challenges we face is alarmingly low. Corporations and consumers alike need to recognize that their choices can have significant consequences. Schools and civil society groups have a crucial role to play.

Second, environmental issues must be fundamentally repositioned in the policymaking arena. The environment must become better integrated into mainstream economic policy, and the surest way is through green accounting.

Third, governments must not only create environmental agreements, they must enforce them. They can, for example, cut the subsidies that sustain environmentally harmful activities each and every year. They can also devise more environment-friendly incentives for markets to respond to.

And fourth, we need sound scientific information. This is the only basis for effective policy, yet large gaps in our knowledge remain.

Technological breakthroughs that are unimaginable today may well solve some of the environmental challenges we face. But it would be foolish to count on them and to continue with business as usual. The theme for this year's World Environment Day says it best: the year 2000 begins the environment millennium; the time to

act is now. There will be no easy solutions. Unpleasant ecological surprises lie ahead. But the start of the new century could not be a more opportune time to commit ourselves-peoples as well as governments-to a new ethic of conservation and stewardship.

**Excerpts from Secretary-General Annan’s remarks as the Commencement Speaker for Class of 2000, Stanford University, Stanford, California
11 June 2000**

...[O]ne of our main responsibilities is to leave to successor generations a sustainable future.

...The world needs you to take the lead in safeguarding the global environment.

We have long been aware that unsustainable practices remain deeply embedded in the fabric of our daily lives. What was shocking was not so much the state of the environment, as the state of the debate on the environment. In a nutshell, the need for sustainable development is failing to register on the political radar screen.

That is something that should concern us all, not least because half the world’s jobs depend directly on the sustainability of ecosystems. Scientists and others who study these matters may have disagreements here and there; that is the nature of inquiry. But they are unanimous in saying we face extraordinarily grave challenges. They say that if freshwater consumption trends continue, by the year 2025 two out of every three people on Earth will live in “water stressed” countries. They say that if population and land-use trends continue, the world will face a real threat to global food security by mid-century. And they say that if emissions and energy trends continue, global warming will only accelerate.

Already, we can see portents of a world that has failed to take climate change seriously. As the warming trend has accelerated, weather patterns have become more volatile and extreme. Economic losses from natural disasters in 1999 alone totaled approximately \$100 billion-more than the cost of all such disasters in the 1980s...

...[A]ll too often a collective blindfold seems to descend on those in a position to make a difference...[M]anagement of the environment is viewed as a luxury, not a necessity. All too often, the issue is framed as an intractable conflict between economy and ecology, when, in fact, sustainable development offers a roadmap for reconciling the two. All too often, it is thought that safeguarding the environment means giving up the fight against poverty or setting aside other vital concerns. But unless we find a way to sustainably

manage the environment, poverty will grow more entrenched, and even peace may remain out of reach.

...The Kyoto Protocol on climate change can begin to control carbon emissions-if it is ratified and implemented, not least by the United States, the world’s largest producer of greenhouse gases...

...All of you, as consumers, can help protect the environment through your individual choices. And as citizens and voters, you can put pressure on governments not only to reach environmental agreements, but also to enforce them.

.....

**STATEMENTS BY MARK MALLOCH BROWN
Administrator, United Nations
Development Programme**

**Excerpts from Administrator Brown’s remarks at the U.N. Security Council Special Session on HIV/AIDS, New York, N.Y.
10 January 2000**

... At a time when the industrialized world has relaxed in the face of a declining incidence of new HIV infections, Africa is under siege: many times more people are being killed from the disease in sub-Saharan Africa each year than in the world’s wars.

... HIV/AIDS has a qualitatively different impact than a traditional health killer such as malaria. It rips across social structures, targeting a young continent’s young people, particularly its girls; by cutting deep into all sectors of society it undermines vital economic growth-perhaps reducing future national GDP size in the region by a third over the next twenty years. And by putting huge additional demand on already weak, hard to access, public services it is setting up the terms of a desperate conflict over inadequate resources.

...Change must begin by confronting the region’s troubled inheritance: extensive migrant labor, social norms and gender inequality making it hard for women and girls to deny men sex-leading to HIV incidence rates among girls three or four times higher than boys.

Let me propose to this council a set of actions:

First, resources....The U.S., with 40,000 new cases annually, spends approximately \$10 billion annually from all sources for prevention, care, treatment and research, whereas approximately \$165 million is spent on HIV/AIDS related activities in Africa where there are four million new cases a year. We must mobilize more.

Second, a coordinated response. I currently chair the committee of UNAIDS co-sponsoring organizations-

UNICEF [United Nations Children’s Fund], UNDP, UNFPA [United Nations Population Fund], UNESCO [United Nations Economic, Cultural, and Social Organization], WHO [World Health Organization], the World Bank, and UNDCP [United Nations International Drug Control Programme]. Together, we and the bilaterals, the private sector, and NGOs must do more at the country and global levels. We applaud the formation of the International Partnership Against HIV/AIDS in Africa which is a foot in the door to private-sector supported affordable care.

Third, UNICEF, WHO, and the World Bank together with UNAIDS and a number of innovative foundations have begun to innovate new public-private partnerships that by guaranteeing a market for affordable vaccines will incentivize drug company research and development. The African market for international pharmaceuticals now accounts for less than 1.5 percent of the industry. This “pull” must be combined with the “push” to increase basic public health research spending.

Fourth, we cannot lapse into a global two-tier treatment regime: drugs for the rich; no hope for the poor. While the emphasis must be on prevention, we cannot ignore treatment-despite its costs. We must work with the cooperation of the pharmaceutical industry to bring down treatment costs.

Finally, we cannot break this epidemic in isolation from the broader development context. Weak government, poor services and economic failure translate directly into failed vaccine and contaminated blood supply chains. More broadly it means the failure of schools, families, workplaces and economies to be able to meet the challenge. In this region where official development finance is drying up, I find myself fighting to reverse UNDP’s own projection that our program resources for Africa next year will be only a third of what they were five years ago. Amidst the good news of more help for HIV/AIDS, progress on debt relief, and some improvement in private sector flows, the overwhelming fact is the region’s basic development needs are not being met. There is a money gap and a governance and capacity gap. Neither the finance nor the institutions and policies are adequately in place.

.....

**STATEMENTS BY KLAUS TÖPFER
Executive Director, United Nations
Environment Programme**

**Excerpts from Executive Director Töpfer’s remarks on
“Environmental Security, Stable Social Order, and Cul-
ture” at the Teri Silver Jubilee Conference Series, New
Delhi, India**

21 February 2000

...The great economic and social issues of our time are intimately linked with the quest for political stability. But a more significant long-term development of the past few years has been the intensification of the debate concerning the impact of the current ecological crises on the political stability of nations, and regions and even within societies.

Today, people around the world, particularly in the developing world are struggling to survive in the face of growing deserts, dwindling forests, declining fisheries, poisoned food, water, air

and climatic extremes and weather events that continue to intensify-floods, droughts and hurricanes.

The question that must be asked is whether the scarcity of renewable resources-such as cropland, forest, freshwater and fisheries-could precipitate violent civil or international conflicts? There are clear signs that environmental scarcities could contribute to violent conflicts in many parts of the world. In the coming decades, accelerating environmental pressures could transform the very foundations of the international political system.

...Let us take the availability of water first. Supplies of fresh water are finite. The populations of water-short countries today, estimated to be 550 million, are expected to increase to one billion by the year 2010. Water shortages will be especially adverse for agriculture in general and irrigation agriculture in particular. As the demand grows and in the absence of clear consensus on how best to use shared water resources for the benefit of all, that

**“ [I]t is high time to revisit the
notion of security and fully
appreciate the role of global health
for the future of the [United
States] and the entire system of
international cooperation.”**

- Gro Harlem Brundtland

competition has the potential of erupting into acrimonious disputes.

...An even greater threat to future human welfare is through the undermining of the productivity of the land through accelerated soil erosion, increased flooding and declining soil fertility. The growing number of people affected by desertification-estimated to be one billion-are not simply waiting to be touched by the magic wand of development. They are literally "losing ground," as their lands suffer more and more from the effects of this disease.

...Conflicts could occur when political and economic institutions and processes degrade environmental settings, and place individuals and populations at risk....The half decade since the demise of the Cold War has been characterized by numerous attempts at redefining the notion of security.

The classical conception of security in world politics is rooted in Walter Lippmann's famous contention that security is about the possession by a state of a level of military capability sufficient to avert the danger of having to sacrifice core values, if it wishes to avoid war, and is able, if challenged, to maintain them by victory in such a war.

This traditional conception of security is now being challenged by the emergence of new issues. As military threats have subsided or disappeared, other threats, especially environmental ones, have emerged with greater clarity. It is thus possible to argue that environmental care is an essential component of national or international security.

Armed force is impotent in the face of ecological breakdown. It is relentless ecological degradation, rather than any external enemy, which poses the gravest threat to international and national security today. Clearly, any aspect which threatens the survival of the planet and its human and non-human inhabitants should be treated as a security threat. International security has to rest on the elimination of the real scourges of humankind-hunger, disease, illiteracy, poverty, and deterioration of the earth's life systems.

.....

**STATEMENTS BY NAFIS SADIK
Executive Director, United Nations
Population Fund**

Excerpts from Executive Director Sadik's remarks on "Population-A New View for the New Millennium" at the Carnegie Council, New York, N.Y. 28 February 2000

...It would be too much to say that the global community has learned how to balance resources and population. But the basics are in place. Poverty and rapid population growth play an important role in environmental destruction: but so does the unconsidered exploitation of resources.

...Population projections for the early part of this century assume continuing and accelerating declines in fertility, longer life spans and a gradual aging of world population....But it is also true that in many countries low fertility has not yet become the norm: Africa in particular has only recently begun its move towards smaller families. Many things, from economic collapse to AIDS, could prevent long-term fertility decline from taking hold in the poorest countries with the fastest population growth. In other, more fortunate, developing countries, fertility is falling rapidly, but past high fertility will fuel rapid population growth for some time to come. Believe me, there is no "birth dearth." Globally, there are over a billion young people between fifteen and twenty-four, the parents of the next generation. Good information and high-quality services will guarantee smaller families in this group and long-term fertility decline: meanwhile, the new generation represents a resource for development. With wise investment, they will power economic growth to support the other new generation, the growing numbers of older people.

...We have almost certainly seen the last doubling of world population: but the demand for labor in industrial countries combined with large numbers of young people in developing countries means that there will be increased migration pressures....But they do mean that policymakers at all levels in all countries have to consider their options very carefully. All our experience in population contradicts the old adage that "all politics are local." Today, all politics are international. National decisions must be made in the knowledge that they will have global effects: and events outside national borders will increasingly have an effect within them. The need for international cooperation in policymaking has never been greater

...There is broad and deep agreement today that population policies have a place in development planning; and that, whether they are dealing with fertility or migration, they succeed to the extent that they respect choice and human rights. This is a profound change from the time when population was seen in some countries as irrelevant and in others as a matter for governments, not individual decision....Improved understanding has been encouraged by the international dialogue which began in the 1960s under United Nations auspices....Through a generation of experience, discus-

sion and action, developing countries and donors alike have learned that there are no short cuts to good population outcomes. Population policies must speak directly to the people with whom they are concerned.

...Most women in developing countries have a very long way to go before they can make their own decisions about fertility and family planning. Extreme poverty, illiteracy, and ill-health, compounded by a tradition of male superiority, limit their decision-making power.

...In an environment of inequality and active discrimination, women can make few choices of any kind about their lives, and their contribution to development is much more limited than it need be. Yet we have seen more change in this area in the last generation than in any comparable period. Over the last thirty years of the millennium, the female half of humanity began to make itself heard.

...Indeed, social investment, especially in health and education, and for women as well as men, fights the root causes of poverty, and has been shown to be in some ways a precursor to economic growth.

Experience has brought a more balanced view of development-not economic and trickle-down but centered on human rights and human potential. Successful population policies are at the heart of human-centered development.

.....

**STATEMENTS BY GRO HARLEM BRUNDTLAND
Director-General,
World Health Organization**

Excerpts from Director-General Brundtland's remarks at the Council on Foreign Relations on "Why Investing in Global Health is Good Politics, New York, N.Y. 6 December 1999

...[It is] an illustrative sign of change that the Council of Foreign Relations, traditionally known to be driving the debate on national and international security, has invited the Director-General of the World Health Organization to talk about the need to invest in global health.

...[W]e need to redefine the notion of security in the age of globalization...[I]t is high time to revisit the notion of security and fully appreciate the role of global health for the future of the [United States] and the entire system of international cooperation.

...[G]lobal issues really start to matter for people's daily lives. Global issues trigger popular response. Glo-

bal issues are paving their way to the limelight of decision-makers. And maybe we are seeing that national political leaders, many of whom remain confined within the logic of their nation-states, are lagging behind their electorate's perception of security.

...[The] Global Health Council conducted a nationwide public opinion survey aimed at assessing what Americans know and think about global infectious diseases....Global health matters for their own health and security and for the future of their children. Conditions of ill-health around the world directly and indirectly threaten the lives of large numbers of Americans.

Over the course of the last fifty years, at least five times as many Americans have died from communicable diseases that have come to the U.S. from developing countries, than have died in all the military conflicts of the same period. Even the most ardent isolationists will not be able to argue that the United States can handle this challenge by turning inwards. With globalization on which this nation's prosperity so much depends-all of humankind today paddles in a single microbial sea and we have to conclude: There are no health sanctuaries.

...Diseases cannot be kept out by rear guard defensive action. The separation between domestic and international health problems is losing its usefulness as people and goods travel across continents. Two million people cross international borders every single day, about a tenth of humanity each year. And of these, more than a million people travel from developing to industrialized countries each week.

Health is tradable-as is ill-health. Health may indeed be the single most important bridge to tie together-whether we like it or not-the destinies of the fortunate and the unfortunate.

What is emerging today is a notion of "human security." The levels of ill-health in countries constituting a majority of the world's population pose a direct threat to their own national economic and political viability, and therefore to the global economic and political interests of the United States and all other countries. Territorial dispute is no longer the prime source of conflict. It is increasingly rooted in general misery, aftermaths of humanitarian crises, shortage of food and water and the spreading of poverty and ill-health.

So, investing in global health is investing in national security. This very notion has diverse and profound implications for the way we perceive national investments, foreign aid and, private-public collaboration. The awareness of these shifts is gradually sinking in. The U.S. Department of State has defined public health as an area of attention in its own strategy for defending national interests. And it is indeed a small sign of changing times

when the Clinton Administration, for the first time in U.S. history, has added a global health specialist to the staff of the National Security Council....Let me dwell on three arguments for U.S. investment in global health.

First about protecting people...From food safety, through disease spread by airline passengers, to the danger of bacteriological attacks from rogue states and terrorists; protecting U.S. citizens means improving global health levels; improving international food standards; and by concerted attempts help limit the spread of deadly virus and bacteria; and international action to contain terrorist elements.

...This leads to the second argument: the economic gain. There are moral and ethical arguments why the United States and other developed countries should invest in halting the global AIDS epidemic which is accelerating at a dreadful pace in Southern Africa-or join forces to stop the spread of tuberculosis and join us in Rolling Back Malaria.

...Looking at the world, we have to be clear about it: So far the war on poverty has failed. Differences are spreading inside countries and between countries. This degrades us and threatens us. It looms as a threat to the environment-not only that of the poor-but of all of us.

...We need effective and targeted policies. General programmatic declarations aimed at poverty reduction rarely bring much success. However, there is a growing and solid body of evidence, which shows that investing in health reduces poverty. In fact, health may be far more central to poverty reduction than macro-economists have previously thought. We have cost-effective health interventions to reduce dramatically the excess burden of disease among the poor. Remember smallpox eradication. Witness the great reductions in mortality from the spread of other immunizations.

[P]rivate involvement is absolutely necessary. But there is no way in which this can replace a strong public commitment to global health-through investments, dedicated research and political attention....It is about extending democracy and the rule of law to another level-to the global level. And hand-in-hand with this lies the crucial need for promoting certain global public goods-of which health is a critical one.

Today, ninety percent of resources allocated to health are spent on ten percent of the world population-the wealthy part-whereas ten percent of the resources go to cover ninety percent of the disease burden, which lies with the poor.

This clearly has to change. And it can be changed as we begin to take seriously the interdependence and the enlightened self-interest which should lead the developed world to take global health seriously....At WHO

we are working on presenting a realistic and combined package of interventions-based on existing technology and knowledge-addressing the leading health killers of poverty. I believe that with around ten billion dollars the world could realistically make a giant leap towards halving the number of fellow human beings living in absolute poverty by 2015.

It will not be a blueprint for action-but a clear illustration of concrete interventions-or products if you like-that are likely to lead to very concrete results. This is about human security-and ultimately about national and international security.

...[I]nvesting in global health is indeed good politics, it is good economics and it is good for national and international security. It means addressing up front the many components of global health; reproductive health, immunization, environmental health, nutrition, the emerging tide of non-communicable diseases such as cancer, heart disease and diabetes and the growing burden from mental health disorders.

...Health is truly a bridge to peace, an antidote to intolerance, a source of shared security.

One of the key challenges to everyone who will help build the twenty-first century will be to find the anchor points for a better common future. Health is one of them. The question that each and everyone of us has to answer is: Can we face up to that challenge? ■