Ecology, Religion, and Global Governance

Steven C. Rockefeller

Prepared for A Symposium on Religion and World Order

Sponsored by Global Education Associates,

Maryknoll Center for Mission Research and Study, and

Fordham University Institute on Religion and Culture

May 3-7, 1997

The science and philosophy of ecology is having a profound impact on the way human beings understand themselves and their world. It is causing a transformation in the way in which we think about ethics, world security, and global governance. Systems of governance that fail to understand and integrate ecological science and ethics into their planning, policy formation, and decision making at all levels, will become increasingly incompetent to manage the problems that face the world. Moreover, unless our governance, economic, and social systems undergo a thoroughgoing ecological revolution, the very survival of the human species is in doubt. If the religions are to play a constructive role as members of the emerging new world community, they too must reconstruct their worldviews and ethics in the light of ecological thinking.

This essay will consider the implications of ecology for ethics and global governance, and conclude with a few observations about the role of religion. The larger frame of reference for this discussion is the current world situation and the urgent need to build a planetary civilization with a moral foundation. At the outset, a few brief words about that are in order.

I. Building World Community

The world is in a time of transition. We are at a critical moment in the evolution of the human species and life on Earth. The future is unclear and uncertain. The colonial empires that ordered and ruled the world in the first half of the century have been dismantled. With the collapse of the Soviet Union, the Cold War has ended and communism has lost its ideological power. Under the influence of technology, industrialization, and a rapidly expanding world market economy, a new multi-cultural global society is taking form. With modernization and globalization has come increasing ecological and economic interdependence. As the human population has steadily grown, the world has become ever smaller and more closely interconnected.

However, as Vaclav Havel has pointed out, "The planetary civilization to which we belong ... has essentially globalized only the surface of our lives."1 It is a civilization that tends to be dominated by largely unregulated economic forces that often have a destructive impact on many local communities as well as the environment. These same economic forces have a tendency to widen the gulf between rich and

poor. In addition, beneath the communications and trade systems that link diverse peoples lie immense cultural differences. The impersonal economic forces of globalization themselves tend to generate counterforces that emphasize cultural identities that are distinct and different. As a result in certain parts of the world, globalization in its current form contributes to the clash of cultural groups.

One of the great social and political challenges facing the peoples and nations of the world involves building a planetary civilization that ensures world peace and security and that makes possible the establishment of social justice and the achievement of economic equity and ecological well-being. In order to achieve this objective, the peoples and nations of the world need a new shared global ethics. Respect for cultural diversity must be part of this ethic. The task is to create a world community with systems of governance that are guided by shared ethical principles and spiritual values.

In a book that finds the world dividing into civilizational blocs and that emphasizes cultural divisions, Samuel Huntington concludes with some important reflections on "The Commonalities of Civilization." He argues that even though respect for civilizational differences and spheres of influence is a requirement of world security, it is also necessary to promote cross cultural dialogues that identify common moral values and the shared principles and practices of civilized living. Reflecting on the breakdown in effective systems of governance throughout much of the world and the possibility that humanity could be heading into a global Dark Ages, Huntington contends that the most serious threat to world security is "the clash ... between civilization and barbarism." He concludes that "the world's great civilizations, with their rich accomplishments in religion, art, literature, philosophy, science, technology, morality, and compassion, will ... hang together or hang separately." He calls, therefore, for an international order based on "the exploration and expansion" of the values, institutions, and practices shared by all the world's civilizations.[2]

Identifying shared values, nurturing the development of global ethics, and building a world community that is founded upon commitment to these values and ethics is essential to the long-term well-being of humanity in an interdependent multicultural world.

II. Ecology and World Order

An ecological approach to the world's current problems supports the argument for developing a new global ethic and a cooperative world community. Moreover, if a universal civilization is to emerge, it will be a world community based on ecological security and the concept of sustainable living as well as the closely related values of solidarity, peace, freedom, respect for human rights, economic equity, and respect for the arts and spirituality. The ecological viewpoint has a critical contribution to make.

Ecology is the study of natural communities and how they function and become disrupted. Building on evolutionary biology and the new physics, it seeks to understand the way organisms interact with each other and their larger environment. It is concerned with interdependent communities, systems, wholes. Much attention in ecological research focuses on the way human activities disrupt biotic communities or ecosystems by causing the pollution of water, soils, and air, the destruction of biodiversity, and the depletion of resources.

When the United Nations was formed following World War 11 in the mid 1940s, there was no recognition of the significance of ecology in government circles or in society at large, including the university with the exception of a very few research scientists. The original UN agenda for world security involved programs for peace, equitable social and economic development, and human rights. In the United Nations Charter no mention is made of the environment and ecological health as a common concern of humanity. However, that began to change beginning in 1972 with the Stockholm Conference on the Human Environment. As a result of the Stockholm meeting, ecological security emerged as a major concern of the United Nations.

The result has been a number of world commissions and conferences and a series of international reports, declarations, and treaties calling on the peoples and nations of the world to recognize the findings of ecology and to embrace the values and practices of environmental conservation and sustainable development. Especially noteworthy are World Charter for Nature adopted by the UN General Assembly in 1982, the report of the World Commission on Environment and Development (WCED), Our Common Future (1987), and the agreements generated by the Rio Earth Summit in 1992, including treaties on climate change and biodiversity, the Rio Declaration, and Agenda 21.

However, in spite of the conferences, reports, declarations, and treaties, the world has not yet made the radical changes required if it is to implement the sustainable development practices detailed, for example, in Agenda 21. This was the finding of the Rio+5 review that culminated in June, 1997 with a special session of the UN General Assembly. A Rio+5 report issued by the Earth Council summarizing seventy national consultations on progress toward sustainable development concludes that: "in both industrialized and developing countries, sustainable development is still low on the political agenda, in part because it is not yet seen as a component of the economic solution.3 Five years after the Rio Earth Summit, the Earth Council found that there is a widespread lack of understanding of the concrete practical meaning of sustainable development and that the practice of sustainable development is "still in its infancy" in many industrialized and developing countries.

In short, ecology and the related concept of sustainable living have not yet been effectively integrated into systems of governance and administration. It is useful, therefore, to review the basic ideas generated by ecology that support the call for new systems of global governance designed to build a global partnership for sustainable and equitable development. Among these ideas are the following:

First, human beings are part of nature. We are part of the evolving universe. Life emerged from planet Earth, and our species has co-evolved with other life forms on Earth. We are members of the community of life on Earth. We are in the universe and the universe is in us. We are part of the biosphere and the biosphere is part of our being.

Second, the biosphere is a unified system that is self-organizing and self-regulating. The health of the biosphere is closely linked to its capacities for regeneration, but these capacities have limits. In addition, the members of the community of life, including human beings, are interdependent and share a common destiny. In short, humanity depends for its survival and well-being on maintaining the diversity and health of planetary ecosystems.

Third, environmental degradation, especially irreversible damage and the depletion of resources are a threat to human health, the foundations of the economy, and the flourishing of culture. Ecological

security, involving the protection and restoration of ecosystem health, is the most fundamental condition of local and world security, even though it is not by itself a sufficient condition.

Fourth, the nations of the world live within and are dependent upon shared ecosystems and the global commons. Consequently, environmental degradation by one nation -- air or water pollution, for example -- can negatively affect others. Moreover, since the biosphere is an interdependent system, actions within one nation can cause severe or irreversible harm to the whole planetary system, leading, for example, to climate change. The local and the regional, and the local and the global are linked.

Fifth, a sustainable humane civilization must promote and maintain the well-being of both people and ecosystems. Sustainable development involves improving the quality of human life while protecting the regenerative capacities of ecosystems and restoring them when damage is done. It requires finding the right balance between using and nurturing and between short-term gratification and long-term well-being. It means integrating conservation and development in all sectors at all levels.

Sixth, over the past twenty-five years since Stockholm, it has become increasingly clear that humanity's social, economic and environmental goals and problems are interdependent. In other words, peace, freedom, social justice, sustainable development, and ecological well-being are indivisible. Poverty, for example, is both a cause and consequence of environmental degradation. Caring for Earth requires caring for people and caring for people requires caring for Earth.

Seventh, the ecological analysis of global interdependence and the world's environmental problems has also made clear that international cooperation and the building of a world community are essential to human survival and well-being. Ecology and our mounting environmental problems reinforce the thinking and values regarding worldwide collaboration and global security that led to creation of the United Nations after the experience of two world wars. Natural systems function according to the principle of interdependence, and ecology has disclosed that the capacity for cooperation is as important as competitiveness in the evolutionary struggle for survival. These considerations and the state of the world lead to the conclusion that the principle of national sovereignty is not an idea upon which to found a system of world order for the twenty first century, which is not to deny the important role nation states must play in the decades ahead. The most serious problems affecting societies today are transnational in nature. No nation state can exist any longer as a separate island capable of providing in isolation opportunity and security for its people.4 Local and global security can only be founded on the principles of global partnership and the sharing of sovereignty, leading to the creation of new systems of global governance.5

Even though there is growing acceptance of many of these ideas today, there is much debate about their practical implications and about the urgency with which governments, businesses and society at large should act on them. The subject of the sovereign rights of states in an interdependent world remains a contentious issue.

III. The Ethical Implications of Ecology

With regard to the practical significance of these ideas, it is useful to consider their moral implications. Strictly speaking, scientific knowledge does not include a knowledge of moral truth--of what it is right or wrong for humans to do. By itself the factual information generated by the science of ecology does not

inform us about what moral values we should adopt. The moral conscience arises from the intuitions of the heart, including especially feelings of sympathy and compassion, and these sentiments are nurtured and shaped by social education and religion. However, if a person has a well-developed sense of social responsibility-and especially if a person respects the dignity of all persons and universal human rights-- the science of ecology with its understanding of interconnections and consequences will have a profound influence on the judgments he or she makes in many situations about what concrete human actions are good or bad. In this qualified sense, ecology has very significant moral implications for human conduct. Some of these implications have been articulated clearly over the past twenty-five years in a variety of international charters, treaties and reports.

First of all, in the light of an ecological worldview, sustainable living and sustainable development as earlier defined are a fundamental moral imperative for anyone who considers world security, human well-being, or the health of the biosphere a worthy moral goal.

Second, the spread of environmental problems and ecological understanding has led to identification of a new basic human right. To a large extent, human rights are an attempt to guarantee to people the conditions essential to their development and well-being. With the growing recognition that air and water pollution, the contamination of soil, and toxic waste dumps are a threat to human health and economic security, the idea has developed that human beings have a right to an environment adequate for their health, well-being, and dignity. This idea was clearly articulated by Rachel Carson in the early 1960's and is found in Principle One of the Stockholm Declaration. It has since been included in dozens of national constitutions and has become the foundation for the international environmental justice movement.

Second, closely linked to this idea is the idea of intergenerational equity and responsibility. Future generations, it is argued, have a right to inherit a world with healthy ecosystems and resources adequate to their needs. This idea, too, found expression in the Stockholm Declaration. In 1976 Jacques Cousteau created a whole Charter on this theme, which he proposed for adoption by the UN General Assembly. The ethics of intergenerational responsibility were a major theme in Our Common Future (1987), the report of the Brundtland Commission (WCED). From this perspective, governments and all other institutions have a fundamental moral responsibility to think and act holistically and to take into consideration the long term as well as the short term consequences of human actions. The concept of intergenerational responsibility is fundamental to the moral ideal of sustainable living.

Third, the emphasis in ecology on interdependent communities tends to serve as a counterbalance to the exaggerated individualism in America and some other modernized cultures. It underlines the need to counterbalance rights with responsibilities, recognizing the interdependence of self and community and the interconnections between the local and the global. These insights lend support to the fundamental ethical principle that all governments and all people have shared but differentiated responsibilities for the well-being of the world community as a whole.

Fourth, in a world characterized by global ecological interdependence, governments have a moral responsibility to prevent activities within areas under their jurisdiction that may cause harm to the environment of other states or to the global commons. The basic guideline is a variation on the theme of the Golden Rule: Do not do to the environment of others what you do not want done to your environment. The obligation to prevent transboundary environmental harm is a limitation on the sovereign rights of states. It is a fundamental requirement of global community in the twenty-first century.

There are a number of other ethical imperatives that are frequently considered to be fundamental to achievement of sustainable development and environmental protection. They include an obligation to obey the precautionary principle, which states that in situations where there is the risk of irreversible or serious damage to the environment, action should be taken to avoid the harm, even when scientific information may be incomplete. They entail a responsibility to work for the eradication of poverty, the stabilization of population, and moderation in consumption. The methods of implementing these principles are the subject of much international debate. However, the goals involved are essential to the building of a sustainable civilization.

In addition, the values of non-violence, democratic participation in decision making, and gender equality are especially significant. The empowerment of women and their full participation in policy and management decision making in all sectors are essential to the achievement of sustainable development. War is a major cause of environmental damage. The elimination of weapons of mass destruction and the development and adoption of non-violent methods for managing and resolving conflict are part of the meaning of sustainable living. Wide social cooperation and grass roots support are also essential. Toward this end systems of governance and administration should be established that provide people with opportunities to influence the decisions that affect them. Consistent with this approach, transparency and accountability in administration are required in all sectors.

All of these ethical principles can be justified on the grounds that they address basic human needs and interests and are consistent with respect for human rights and the values of social justice and peace. However, as was first clearly pointed out by Aldo Leopold in his Sand Country Almanac (1949), ecology has other more radical ethical implications leading to principles that go beyond what can be justified by appeals to human self-interest. Human beings generally develop a sense of ethical responsibility in relation to the members of the communities to which they belong and upon which they are dependent. This sense of moral responsibility also extends to these communities as a whole. Where there is interdependence, there are ethical obligations and duties. Ecology is expanding humanity's sense of community to include non-human species and ecosystems.

The evolutionary process has rewarded human communities that learn to cooperate and to sustain the necessary moral values. The sense of moral concern begins to develop within the family and expands outward to embrace the clan or tribe, larger local communities, the nation, all members of a religion, and eventually all humanity. A global ethical consciousness has been articulated in the higher ethical teachings of the great world religions, even though many religious groups operate on the basis of an ethnocentric ethical consciousness. Global ethics finds its most basic expression in the modem world in the concept of universal human rights.

Ecology, however, is helping to open humanity's eyes to the awareness that the human community is part of an even larger community, the community of life as a whole--the Earth community. With this new ecological sense of community and interdependence goes a realization that other species and also ecosystems and the living Earth itself deserve respect and moral consideration. Ecology is making humanity aware that it belongs to the larger Earth community, and accordingly that it has moral duties in relation to the Earth community and to all its members. This is the central theme of environmental ethics.

The fundamental point is that other species and ecosystems are not merely things. They are not just resources that exist to be used. As Brian Swimme and Thomas Berry have explained, the universe is a communion of subjects, not merely a collection of objects.6 Non-human species are agents in their own right with a certain interior depth. They are ends in themselves, not a means only. In other words, animals, trees, and ecosystems have intrinsic value as well as instrumental value. Therefore, people should respect Earth and all life quite apart from whatever utilitarian value nature may have for people.

People, of course, may with moral justification use other species as natural resources in the effort to meet basic human needs, but people also have responsibilities to them and for them. There are moral as well as ecological limits to what humans may do in relation to nature. When there are conflicts between the rights and interests of people and those of other species, as there always will be, in many situations the rights of humans do override the interests of other species. However, again there are limits, and humans do not have an absolute right to dominate and exploit other species or ecosystems. With the right to use under certain circumstances goes the responsibility to respect, nurture, and tend.7

Even though the intrinsic value of nature has been affirmed in two major international documents, the World Charter for Nature (1992) and the Convention on Biodiversity (1992), the idea remains controversial. It was not included in the Rio Declaration. Some argue that sustainable development and environmental conservation should be defended purely on the basis of anthropocentric concerns and human self-interest. Appeals to self-interest are, of course, very important and should be used at every opportunity. However, it is not likely that such appeals will effect the radical change in human behavior that is necessary to halt and reverse the degradation of the planetary environment. In spite of warnings by scientists and environmentalists, the transition to sustainable living is proceeding very slowly, and the resistance from short-sighted governments, business people, and ordinary citizens is substantial. A fundamental change in attitude is essential. A new respect for Earth, all species, and all individual living beings is required. Only when people genuinely respect Earth and all life will they care for Earth and the community of life so as to preserve and restore it.

There is a further reason why a new global ecocentric moral consciousness is in order. The world religions teach that the person who would find his or her life must lose it. Higher wisdom often comes in such paradoxes. The deeper meaning and joy of life involves the realization that we are not here in this world alone as human beings, and we are not here for ourselves alone.8 We belong to a larger community of being-something at once vast, grand, mysterious and wonderful. The survival of the human species and the full realization of our potential are linked to this realization and the will to act on the responsibilities it implies. Our ethics must make this clear, and our spiritual practice should be designed to empower us to live in this truth,

IV. Implementing an Ethical and Ecological Transformation

Ecological ethics, then, challenge governments and all institutions to recognize humanity's membership in the larger community of life and to act with a sense of shared responsibility for the well-being of the human community and the Earth community as a whole. What can be done to advance the integration of ecological awareness and responsibility into governance systems at all levels in all sectors? There follow a few suggestions that focus on the political, ethical, legal, and religious dimensions of the problem.

In March, 1997 the independent Rio+5 review organized by the Earth Council brought together at the Rio+5 Forum in Brazil over 500 representatives from civil society and national councils of sustainable development to assess progress toward sustainable development and to recommend a strategy for implementing Agenda 21. Among the recommendations of the Rio+5 Forum are the following. First, there is a need for a clear "operational definition of sustainable development" that explains the administrative, legislative, and economic instruments required to move "from agenda to action."

Second, the Agenda 21 recommendation that calls for creation of national councils of sustainable development should be implemented in all countries as it has been in over twenty. The building of regional networks of CSDs involving regional information exchanges is also needed. Third, the adoption of national and local agenda 21 plans is required, and these agendas 21 must be well-integrated with social and economic goals.9

Fourth, increased public participation in planning and decision-making processes is essential to the achievement of sustainable development. In its Rio+5 Forum report, the Earth Council emphasized "the need for participatory processes in which government, civil society organizations, the business sector and other groups can reach agreement on priorities and actions, including the need for informed participation of different stakeholders in such processes." Addressing this issue, the Rio+5 report of the national consultation of Bangladesh states:

Participation of all stakeholders creates conditions for consensus and conflict resolution, making programs and projects more acceptable, cost-effective and enhancing ownership. Stakeholders, once offered participation, undertake significant follow-up activities on their own accord and enhance social mobilization. Hence, not only civil society will be benefited, but the government itself will succeed in its task of governing and addressing the dilemma of the just means of sustainable living and protecting the environment.10

In recent decades nongovernmental organizations have grown dramatically in power and influence, and they must be viewed as part of the new systems of global governance. One especially encouraging development is the emergence of regional and worldwide networks of nongovernmental organizations that are the beginnings of a transnational civil society. Good examples are the global networks of human rights activists, environmentalists, women's organizations, peace advocates, and indigenous peoples groups. The networking process has been significantly advanced by the kind of international gatherings of nongovernmental organizations that occurred, for example, around the Earth Summit in 1992, during the UN Social Summit in 1995, and at the Rio+5 Forum in 1997. Richard Falk characterizes the formation of a global civil society as globalization-from-below in contrast to the globalization-from-above spurred on by the Bretton Woods Institutions, the governments of the industrialized states, and transnational corporations. He writes that "our most important millennial challenge ... is to encourage the process of globalization-from-the-ground-up in any way we can," leading to new creative forms of transnational democracy. 11

The Rio+5 Forum also highlighted the need to halt government subsidies for unsustainable activities. Research done in preparation for the Forum found that public funds amounting to hundreds of billions of dollars are spent annually subsidizing activities that are damaging to human health and the environment.12 Reversing this trend is an essential step in the process of constructing market mechanisms that support sustainable patterns of development.

Another fundamental need is cross-cultural dialogue that clarifies and develops the emerging global ethics that provide a foundation for regional and international cooperation. The Earth Charter Project, the secretariat for which is based at the Earth Council in Costa Rica, is an example of one initiative designed to encourage cross-cultural dialogue for the purpose of identifying the core values of ecological and sustainable development ethics.13 An extensive international dialogue on Earth Charter values took place during the Rio+5 review in 1996. The Earth Charter Commission issued a Benchmark Draft of the Charter during the Rio + 5 Forum in March. Another year of international consultation on the draft is planned. Then in June, 1998, the Commission hopes to issue a final version of the Earth Charter. During the next two years it will circulate the Charter as a people's treaty, endeavoring to generate wide support for the document in civil society and the business community and among national councils of sustainable development. Then in the year 2000 the Commission will seek adoption of the Earth Charter by the United Nations General Assembly.

Building on the fundamental principles in the Earth Charter, an integrated legal framework for all existing and future environmental and sustainable development law and policy is needed in the form of a new international convention. Such a document has already been drafted by the Commission on Environmental Law of the International Union for the Conservation of Nature (IUCN). The IUCN Draft International Covenant on Environment and Development is the result of six years of international consultations. It was presented at the UN in February of 1995. Formal negotiations on the Covenant should be initiated without further delay. This Draft International Covenant on Environment and Development spells out the new norms for state and interstate behavior that are fundamental to sustainability.

New mechanisms to enforce compliance with international accords are required. The United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP) should be strengthened and given an expanded role. An Environmental World Court of Justice should be established. The Earth Council in Costa Rica has proposed creation of an international Ombudsman to mediate and help resolve international disputes in the area of the environment. Such an Ombudsman could be very helpful.

The world religions are in a position to play a critical role in the emerging transnational civil society, advancing the social, economic, and political transformations that are essential to planetary well-being in the future.14 However, if the religions are to be a constructive influence, they must come to accept and take to heart the ideas of a multicultural world community and religious pluralism, and they must embrace their responsibility to be leaders in building this pluralistic world community. This means shedding the nationalistic, ethnocentric, and imperialistic elements in their worldviews and visions of world order. It means embracing the democratic ideals of universal human rights, tolerance, and respect for diversity as some religious groups have done. Without such changes in the religions, there is no hope for an end to war and for peace on Earth.

In order to help build the new multi-cultural world community, the religions must expand and deepen the process of interfaith dialogue.15 The purpose of dialogue is to develop mutual understanding, to clarify differences, and to work together on identifying shared ethical values and constructing the new global ethics for a sustainable and equitable world community. Dialogue can also lead to mutual transformation. The challenge to the leadership of the religions is to model for the nations and peoples of the world the mutual respect and spirit of community that is the path to peace, freedom, justice, and sustainability on Earth. Embracing the ideal of a community of the religions does not mean creation of some new religion that is a synthesis of various traditions or the suppression of commitment to what is unique and distinctive in particular traditions. Further, within a healthy world community there should be full and vigorous debate where there are significant moral differences pertaining to matters of common concern.

The religions have the additional critical responsibility to offer people spiritual disciplines and practices that will help them grow ethically and spiritually in ways consistent with the development of a planetary civilization. Methods for the transformation of consciousness are urgently needed. Humanity is creating communications systems and financial systems that are causing globalization, but in many cases the moral and religious consciousness of people reflect earlier technological, social, economic, and political stages of development. This is part of the spiritual confusion that afflicts society today. Our growing economic, ecological, and social interdependence is generating a new global consciousness, but the new consciousness has yet to acquire the spiritual depth needed to build real world community. As the Indian philosopher Radhakrishnan explained: "The supreme task of our generation is to give soul to the growing world consciousness."16

The religions have an opportunity to play a leadership role in helping people through this time of transition by creating symbols, rituals, and practices that promote values that support world peace, universal respect for human rights, sustainable development, a love for Earth, and respect for all life. To fulfill their destinies as sources of healing, reconciliation, and liberation, the religions must themselves evolve with the social, economic, and ecological world of which they are a part and become sources of inspiration for the transformation of consciousness and the reconstruction of social institutions. Acceptance of this challenge--and many religious communities have accepted it--will mean new vitality for religious institutions, and fresh hope for the world.

In conclusion, in a modernized, globalized, and multi-cultural world, the insights and ethical implications of ecology are essential elements in any sound vision of a secure future for the Earth community.

1 Vaclav Havel, "The New Measure of Man," New York Times, July 8, 1994, Op-Ed page.

2 Samuel P. Huntington, The Clash of Civilizations and the Remaking of World Order (New York: Simon & Schuster, 1996), pp. 320-21.

3 Implementing Sustainable Development: Experiences and Recommendations from National and Regional Consultations for the Rio+5 Forum, first edition (Earth Council, 1997), p. 2.

4 "The United Nations in Its Second Half-Century," A Report of the Independent Working Group on the Future of the United Nations (New Haven: Yale University Printing Service, 1995), p. 4.

5 Richard A. Falk, Samuel S. Kim, and Saul H. Mendlovitz, The United Nations and A Just World Order, in Studies On A Just World Order, No. 3 (San Francisco: Westview Press, 1991), pp. 419-26, 433-46.

6 Brian Swimme and Thomas Berry, The Universe Story: From the Primordial Flaring Forth to the Ecozoic Era--A Celebration of the Unfolding of the Cosmos (San Francisco: Harper San Francisco, 1992), pp. 71-79, 243-44.

7 For a clear discussion of humanity's moral responsibilities to nonhuman species and ecosystems, see James Nash, Loving Nature: Ecological Integrity and Christian Responsibility (Nashville, TN: Abingdon Press, 1991), chs. 6 and 7. Nash writes from a Christian theological perspective, but his balanced approach will be found instructive by anyone interested in ecological ethics. See also Roderick Frazier Nash, The Rights of Nature, A History of Environmental Ethics (Madison, WI: University of Wisconsin Press, 1989).

8 Havel, "The New Measure of Man," New York Times, July 8, 1994.

9 See Implementing Sustainable Development, pp. 2-12.

10 Ibid., pp. 3-4.

11 Richard Falk, "Our Millennial Challenge," in Humanity (July 1996), Premier, pp. 19-21.

12 Andre de Moor and Peter Calamai, Subsidizing Unsustainable Development: Undermining the Earth with Public Funds (The Earth Council, 1997), pp. 1-8, 49-58.

13 Steven Rockefeller, "The Earth Charter: A Vision for the Future," Ecodecision 24 (Spring 1997), 70-72.

14 See, for example, the discussion in Huntington, The Clash of Civilizations, pp. 20, 42, 66-68.

15 See the excellent discussion of interfaith dialogue and pluralism in Diana Eck, Encountering God: A Spiritual Journey from Bozeman to Banaras (Boston: Beacon Press, 1993).

16 As quoted in Diana Eck, Encountering God, p. 202. See S. Radhakrishnan, Eastern Religions and Western Thought (New York: Oxford University Press, 1959), p. 2.