
Contents

Part One: What is sustainability?

Introduction

Sustainability and the environment

Sustainability and society

Sustainability and economics

Part Two: the way forward

The role of business

The role of Government

The role of civil society

Conclusion: Dreaming of a better world

Part One: what is sustainability?

Introduction

In Choco, in the heart of the Columbian rainforest, lie the Green Gold mines from which Cred Jewellery is sourcing its gold. Choco is an amazing area, described as a 'living laboratory', full of complex and diverse ecosystems, but it is an area that has been laid waste by the legacy of large scale industrial mining.

Industrial mining involves the removal of all vegetation cover, the displacement of topsoil and the poisoning of the ecosystem through irresponsible use of chemicals such as mercury and cyanide in the extraction process. As most of the communities live by fishing in the river, the contamination by mercury has posed a long term public health threat through the region.

Socially, the communities have been caught in a trap. The artisan miners have traditionally operated at a scale that allows autonomous ecosystem restoration, but the independence of this lifestyle was eroded as the community found work labouring for the industrial mines. The industrial mines extracted the last remaining wealth from the communal properties and when they left they often did not settle the labour force in full.

It was into this situation that the Green Gold initiative started in the late 1990s by Catalina; a remarkable young Columbian woman, fresh out of university. The Green Gold programme has developed a certification system that rewards artisan miners and protects the rainforest from the negative effects of industrial mining. The criteria (which evolved from a series of discussions with miners, community groups, national institutions and NGOs) involves things like not using any toxic chemicals in the extraction process, replacing topsoil and ensuring that all mining operations are conducted with the agreement of the local community councils.

There are now over 100 certified mines, producing more than a kilo of raw gold every month. The economic impact has been significant, securing a financial future for all those miners signed up to the certification programme. Environmentally, in an area left with little potential for growing back to maturity, reforestation and biodiversity programmes are in place and all areas mined are returned back to the rainforest after three years. Green Gold is a good example of sustainability.

Sustainability is a word that is very much in vogue nowadays and is used across the board in society, so much so that it has been nicely described as a 'big sloppy subject'.¹ But what does it actually mean? The standard definition is that provided by the Brundtland Commission (the World Commission on Environment and Development) in 1987, which defines sustainability as the ability to 'meet the needs of the present without compromising the ability of future generations to meet their own needs.' There are, of course, many dimensions within that broad definition and, to look at this subject in more detail, we will break it down into three areas:

- Sustainability and the environment
- Sustainability and society
- Sustainability and economics

Sustainability and the Environment

It will come as no surprise that we begin with the environmental area because our needs – both present and future – are met primarily through the earth that we live on and the resources it contains. At the heart of sustainability is learning how to look after our earth and steward those resources. We do that because,

without them, we cannot survive, but also because we believe that the earth and its inhabitants have value in and of themselves, regardless of human beings.

In 2002, world leaders met in Johannesburg for the World Summit for Sustainable Development (WSSD), ten years after the Earth Summit in Rio which had set the environmental agenda. The aim was to look practically at how to achieve the Millennium Development Goals that had been agreed on between the two summits in a series of UN conferences.ⁱⁱ The WSSD became a controversy, with NGOs claiming that it was nothing but talk with powerful governments and businesses ruling the roost. However, besides achieving two new international targets (to halve the proportion of people without adequate sanitation by 2015 and to reverse the decline in marine fish stocks), it was successful in another way too: it brought together the environmental lobby with the more human-focussed NGOs in a way that had not happened before.

The seventh Millennium Development Goal is to ensure environmental sustainability. What came through powerfully from the WSSD was that environmental and human-centred interests cannot be separated. Human needs cannot ultimately be met without taking care of the world that we live in; conversely, the world will not be looked after unless those same needs are met. The two, therefore, must work together and the signs, at present, are not too encouraging. We will look in the next section at the more human-focussed end, but for now we are looking at the environmental end, and what we see is a world straining under the pressure that we humans are putting on it.ⁱⁱⁱ There are, of course, a huge number of issues that we could look at^{iv}, but environmentalists agree that there are four problems facing our planet that are particularly acute.^v

The first, and biggest, is climate change. This is having a devastating effect on our world with floods, droughts, storms and heatwaves trebling over the last thirty years, wreaking havoc the world over. In 1998, for example, 26 million people were made homeless through flooding in Bangladesh. As temperatures rise and glaciers melt, sea levels are rising around the world, threatening low-lying coastal areas. The Maldives, for example, are likely to disappear altogether.

Global warming is directly related to the high consumption of fossil fuels on the part of the richer industrial nations. Nearly everything that we do today will be reliant on fossil fuels. One particular problem is that of global trade and the energy used in transporting goods all around the world. For example, each kilogramme of apples from New Zealand that is imported into the UK produces its own weight in Carbon Dioxide emissions.^{vi} Nearly three-quarters of the energy that is used globally comes from fossil fuels (oil, coal and gas) and the rest is from nuclear, hydro and biomass. In the UK, nearly 90% of energy is from fossil fuels.

Central to the issue of climate change is oil because it is essential to agriculture, petro-chemicals and to the production of the petrol and electricity that we use. Its extraction causes environmental degradation and this only looks set to worsen as new reserves become harder to find and are opened in such fragile and beautiful places as Alaska, officially a National Wildlife Refuge. The well publicised case of the Ogoni people in Nigeria reveals the human rights abuses involved in oil extraction.^{vii} Oil has become a major factor in world politics and a factor in recent wars, which of course only result in more environmental destruction and human death and misery.

The second problem is that of deforestation, which in itself is the second highest contributor to climate change, behind that of burning fossil fuels, responsible for 20 – 30% of all carbon dioxide in the atmosphere.^{viii} Rainforests are incredibly precious.^{ix} They are the earth's oldest living ecosystems. Whilst they cover a

relatively small amount of land area, they house half of all the plant and animal species in the world. Still, scientists estimate that there could be as many as 30 thousand plant species yet to be discovered. They are amazingly rich in both medical and food stuffs.

Despite this, they are facing intense pressure and the figures on how they are disappearing are staggering. All the primary (ie original) rainforests in India, Bangladesh, Sri Lanka and Haiti have been destroyed. 2.4 acres is destroyed every second; 149 acres every minute; 214,000 acres each day (larger than New York City) and 78 million acres each year (larger than Poland). The rainforests of the Ivory Coast have almost been completely destroyed. The Philippines lost 55% of its forests between 1960 and 1985 and, by 1985, Thailand had lost 45%.

There are five primary causes of deforestation: the demand for goods made from wood (including paper products)^x; farming for beef for richer countries^{xi}; mineral and oil extraction^{xii}; hydro-electric dams (built to provide the energy for the extraction)^{xiii} and subsistence farming. Deforestation is clearly linked with issues of poverty as the uneven distribution of land and money are both caused by, and a cause of, the forests' destruction.

Alongside climate change, one of the most pressing concerns over deforestation is the third problem: loss of biodiversity, which is resulting in an alarming rate of species extinction. It is thought that 10% of the world's species could disappear within twenty-five years because of the breakdown of rainforest ecosystems.

The destruction of the rainforest is the biggest cause of species extinction, but not the only one. Intensive agriculture, commercial fishing, the car and its roads and the effects of industrial activity in general all combine to contribute to a devastating loss of the planet's ecosystems. The authoritative 2004 Red List of Threatened Species says that 15,503 species face extinction: this is a staggering 4,970 more species since the 2000 edition.^{xiv} Incredibly, a third of the world's primate species face a serious risk of extinction.^{xv}

One of the most devastating affects of climate change is that of drought, and water is the fourth problem facing our world and its people. Global water consumption rose sixfold between 1900 and 1995 (more than double the rate of population growth) and is continuing to grow rapidly as agricultural, industrial and domestic demand increases. Currently, 41% of the world's population (2.3 billion people) live in areas of water scarcity. Of these 2.3 billion, 1.7 people do not have the resources to tackle the shortage and the affects become severe, leading to problems with local food production and economic development. It is thought that by 2050 nearly half of the world's population (48%: 3.5 billion people) will face severe shortages.^{xvi} The health implications are catastrophic while armed conflict over dwindling water resources, particularly in the Middle East, will become an increasing threat.^{xvii}

As with so many environmental issues, it is the poor who suffer most, but who are least responsible for the problems.^{xviii} As competition for water increases, the rich and powerful are the ones who have the most influence. One major cause of water shortages is the migration of people to the cities, leading to a demand that far outstrips supply as people desperately try to survive in slums and shanty towns. As the economic demands placed on poorer countries by the rich nations include the privatisation of public amenities, so water prices are hiked up in the cities and the needs of those in urban areas are ignored. Water problems are growing, too, because of the increasing consumption of water due to economic development and growing standards of living. The tourism industry, for example, can worsen shortages as hotels and golf-courses take the majority of water away from the local community.^{xix} Industry and agriculture consume huge amounts of

water (agriculture uses 70% of the world's water). They lead to deforestation, soil erosion and water pollution, all of which exacerbate water problems.

Climate change, deforestation, loss of biodiversity and clean water shortages are the main environmental problems facing our world today. As consumer demands increase and the volume of world trade rises so untold pressure is being put on the planet and its resources. These issues, especially climate change, plus others such as shrinking cropland per person and collapsing fisheries (that space has not allowed us to look at in detail) are major barriers to improving the lives of people around the world and could indeed lead to what the New Economics Foundation calls, 'the great reversal of human progress'.^{xx}

So what is the way forward on these issues? In the years following the Rio Earth Summit, Friends of the Earth Europe developed a concept called 'environmental space'. To put it at its simplest, environmental space 'allows us to measure the amount of resources the world has, and then divide our use of these resources fairly according to the size of each nation's population. It enables us to understand the limits of the Earth, while ensuring that all the world's people have access to a fair share of what is available.'^{xxi} So, on a global level there needs to be a 50% cut in Carbon Dioxide emissions. For this to be done fairly, the cut in UK emissions needs to be 90% over the next fifty years. To use only a fair share of the world's productive land, the UK must reduce the amount it uses by around 25% (and protect that land from degradation in order to sustain its productivity). Use of energy-intensive metals in the UK, such as aluminium and steel, should be cut by more than 80%; timber by around 75% and water by 15%.^{xxii}

These levels are high, but they *are* achievable. We have the necessary technologies to change our practices in many of these areas (shifting to renewable energies is the obvious example^{xxiii}) and, if we are prepared to put in more thought and effort, there are many opportunities to increase our efficiency and cut out the wasteful way in which we use resources.

What this concept also means is that there will be some countries who will be enabled to *increase* their levels of consumption, where currently these levels are not enough to sustain basic human needs.

Alongside looking at how we can get 'more from less' is also learning – for us in the economically developed countries – how to be satisfied with having and using less. We will look at consumerism more in the next section, but it is helpful to state the obvious here that the problems of our world are due to humanity's incessant desire to have more and our inability to say, 'I have enough, I don't need anything else'.

Sustainability and Society

The Brundtland definition of sustainability starts with the requirement to meet the needs of the present and for many this is happening. Globalisation led to an unparalleled boom in the world economy over the last decade of the 20th Century with annual output growing from \$31 trillion in 1990 to \$42 trillion in 2001.^{xxiv} This has led to the development of the global consumer class: those who use televisions, telephones and computers and who espouse the ideals that these things bring with them. More than a quarter of the world's population – some 1.7 billion people – make up this class, spending \$18 billion on makeup, \$17 billion on pet food in Europe and the USA, and \$11 billion on ice cream in Europe.^{xxv}

However, this economic boom has far from embraced all areas and peoples of the world and it is one of globalisation's starkest characteristics that, the way it currently works, it leads to massive inequalities.^{xxvi} So GNP per person ranges from \$35,400 in the USA to \$25,510 in the UK to \$4,200 in Argentina to \$3,540

in Malaysia, to \$960 in China and right down to a GNP of \$100 in Burundi.^{xxvii} Inequality exists within countries as well as between them. In the USA the top 10% of the population has six times the income of the lowest 20% and, in Brazil, the ratio is 19 to 1.^{xxviii}

The good news is that there is progress being made on alleviating global poverty. The proportion of people living in extreme poverty (less than \$1 a day) in developing countries dropped by almost half between 1981 and 2001, from 40 to 21 percent of global population. The bad news is that, again, this alleviation is occurring unequally. So, while rapid economic growth in East and South Asia has pulled over 500 million people out of poverty in those two regions alone, the proportion of poor has grown, or fallen only slightly, in many countries in Africa, Latin America, Eastern Europe and Central Asia.^{xxix}

We thus find ourselves in the situation in which the basic needs of many are not being met and the Millennium Development Goals discussed in the previous chapter look far from being fulfilled. Thus it is estimated that there are still 840 million people who are chronically undernourished. Education, too, is lagging behind the target of universal primary education. Despite impressive growth in South Asia, for example, that region still registers malnutrition among children reaching almost 50 percent, along with chronically low school enrolment and completion rates. If current trends persist, children in more than half of developing countries will still not be attending a full course of primary education by 2015.

Health concerns are serious too. For example, in 20 developing countries child mortality rates fell only half as fast for the poorest 20 percent of the population as for the whole population. Although, worldwide, the under-five mortality rate is decreasing, much faster progress is needed to reach the MDG of reducing it to 32 per thousand births by 2015.^{xxx} The biggest health concern is, of course, HIV/AIDS, which has infected more than 60 million people worldwide, with more than 95 percent of them in developing countries. 70 percent of the infections are in Sub-Saharan Africa, where it has resulted in a drop in life expectancy from 48 years in 1980 to 46 years in 2002 and is expected to have a massive effect on the economic development of that area.^{xxxi}

One of the reasons why there are so many problems – and this links back with the previous section on the environment – is the massive growth in population that our world has experienced. The number of people living in the world grew fourfold over the last century. By 2000 there were 6 billion people and that figure is expected to reach nearly 9 billion by 2050. Moreover, population growth is concentrated in less developed regions.^{xxxii} It is estimated that there would need to be the equivalent of eight worlds if everyone were to have the lifestyle that we have in the UK. However, it is too simplistic to blame these pressures on population growth alone. This can be seen if we look at the difference in carbon dioxide emissions between Bangladesh and the UK. Bangladesh's annual increase in population is about 2.4 million, while that of Britain is about 100,000. However, per capita carbon dioxide emissions in Britain are fifty times higher than in Bangladesh, with the result that the 100,000 extra UK residents cause more than twice the amount of emissions than do the 2.4 million Bangladeshis.^{xxxiii}

Sustainable development is about meeting people's physical needs today in such a way as to ensure that tomorrow's needs are not compromised. However, sustainability goes beyond purely physical needs and is also concerned with that opaque, but important, concept of quality of life and with the idea, not only of economic progress, but also of social progress.

The difficulty is that social progress and life quality are hard to measure precisely. There are some things that can begin to give us indicators as to how these areas are developing. So, for example, recent figures on employment in the UK are encouraging. The proportion of working-age people who live in households where no one works has fallen gradually since the mid-1990s and there has been steady progress in reducing the proportion of working-age people without a qualification.^{xxxiv} Similarly, the proportion of single elderly households experiencing fuel poverty fell from 77% in 1991 to 27% in 2001. In the area of health, too, there are signs of progress. Death rates from circulatory disease (for people under 75) and accidents have halved since the 1970s and death rates from cancer and suicide have fallen during and since the 1990s.^{xxxv}

Not all the signs are encouraging though. Recent figures show a 13-fold increase in crime over the last fifty years, with a disturbing increase in violent crimes. Divorce rates appeared to be stabilising in the early 1990s (even if at a level five and a half times that of 1950), but the first years of this millennium show the trend beginning to increase again.^{xxxvi} Housing conditions, too, have a long way to go. Whilst improving, 33% of housing in the UK was considered non-decent in 2001. Perhaps most telling is the fact that the percentage of households participating in voluntary activity decreased by a quarter between 1996/7 and 2001/2.^{xxxvii} This would seem to be a manifestation of people's disenchantment with society and hence an unwillingness to see themselves as having any sense of ownership or responsibility for what goes on around them (this would seem to be confirmed by the fact that more people volunteer in areas that are affluent than in low-income areas).

The volunteering statistic is also a clear indicator of the time pressures that face so many people. As we live in a society so dominated by the drive to increase personal wealth, security and possessions, so we face longer working hours, increased time sitting behind the wheel of a car and less time to do the other things we enjoy. As Friends of the Earth's *More From Less* states, 'Quality of life is about having good health, a worthwhile job and a healthy environment. It's about having time for yourself, family and friends. A large pay cheque is no guarantee of life quality'.^{xxxviii}

It seems clear that we must learn – both as a society and as individuals – to put less emphasis on economic growth and more emphasis on the things that improve life quality and social progress. Even Tony Blair recognises this! In his Foreword to the Government's strategy paper for sustainable development he states, 'We have failed to see how our economy, environment and our society are all one. And that delivering the best possible quality of life for us all means more than concentrating solely on economic growth'.^{xxxix}

For this to happen we need to become more aware of the culture of consumerism that we are living in. We will look at the underlying economic structure of consumerism in the next section, but here we need to comment on its effects on society as a whole and on how we as individuals think and act.^{xl} Consumerism, as we are all very aware, is the culture that breeds on discontent. It teaches us always to want more: to want more stuff, to look more beautiful, to be more fulfilled, to be more happy. It makes us believe that this gnawing dissatisfaction can be expunged by a trip to the shops. It is profoundly self-centred. It favours the short-term, works against commitment and places money and financial security as the goal of our lives.

The way society is structured works to promote consumerism. It infiltrates our relationships, politics, our work, our faith... All of these, we believe, are there for our own benefit. If a particular relationship, political party or religious institution does not suit us, then we put it back on the shelf, so to speak, and try another

one on for size. Consumerism - as it is manifested currently - goes against sustainability; making cheapness in price and ease of convenience the priorities. Thus important issues, such as the conditions of the workers who made the product or the amount of resources used, are sidelined. Whilst living standards for many have risen, the price that has been paid for that is a high one and the problems in our society indicate that levels of life satisfaction are not rising at the same rate as standards of living.^{xli}

Because it is the water that we learn to swim in, it is very hard to go against it. The antidote, however, to consumerism is contentment and we learn contentment through focussing on the things that really do enhance the quality of our lives. Money is one of those things for sure. The way our society works today means that we do need to have a certain amount of money if we are to eat, clothe ourselves, have somewhere to live, keep ourselves warm etc.

However, research consistently shows that, once above a certain modest level, rises in income do not correspond with rises in happiness. A study in the USA tracks people across time and shows that at any given time most people believe that a 20% rise in income would make them happier. But measuring their life satisfaction a few years later when they have received that rise in income shows that they are no happier, but have simply adapted to that new level in income.^{xlii} Money, therefore, is not the be-all-and-end-all and there are more important things that contribute to our well-being. Stan Thekaekara, who works with tribal groups in India, tells this wonderful story of an extensive exercise that was undertaken, in which all the villages were talking about their future and where to go from where they were. As a part of that exercise, one of the questions was, 'what is your understanding of wealth?' The answers they received back were amazing: 'Our children, our forests, our culture, our language, our unity, our sharing' and so on. From every one of the 167 villages that Stan works with, not a single one mentioned money.^{xliii}

And so it is to money that we now turn...

Sustainability and Economics

Sustainability is about living our lives as human beings in such a way that the world we live in is respected and looked after, and we are enabled both to meet our basic needs and to flourish, as individuals and as communities. We have seen that currently this is not happening on a global scale. A large part of this is due to the economic structures that underpin our societies.

These economic structures are generally described under the heading of 'globalisation'.^{xliv} Globalisation is, at its simplest, 'the process by which the world is becoming more and more connected and interdependent'.^{xlv} We experience this by drinking coffee from Nicaragua; eating avocados from Israel; wearing clothes made in Morocco; using a computer assembled in the Philippines and so on. On an economic level, globalisation is, 'the ever-increasing integration of national economies into the global economy through trade and investment rules and privatisation, aided by technological advances'.^{xlvi}

Economic globalisation works on the policies of trade liberalisation, privatisation and financial market deregulation. It is believed, with good reason, that free trade between nations, with no protective barriers, is the most effective way of increasing global wealth and lifting poorer countries out of their poverty. This economic system only works where there is growth and so the whole focus is on making a profit. As Clinton said, 'I do not believe that a country with 4.5% of the world's population can maintain its standard of living if we don't have more customers'. All attention, therefore, is focussed on driving down production costs at the one end and increasing the number of consumers at the other.

Two features of the principle of free trade, which have arisen as a result, are the rise of the Trans National Corporations and the phenomenon of currency speculation.^{xlvii} As companies strive towards growth, we are seeing markets increasingly dominated by a handful of powerful companies who take over smaller ones. Thus we have the situation where, of the world's 100 largest economies, 51 of those are TNCs; two-thirds of international trade are accounted for by just 500 corporations and 40% of the trade they control is between different parts of the same TNC!

Some say a trillion dollars, other say 2 trillion dollars, is now turned over each day on the currency markets. As Giddens says, 'in the new global electronic economy, fund managers, banks, corporations, as well as millions of individual investors, can transfer vast amounts of capital from one side of the world to another at the click of a mouse. As they do so, they can destabilise what might have seemed rock-solid economies – as happened in East Asia'.^{xlviii}

Economic globalisation has changed the way we see and experience the world and has radically changed our lives from previous generations. For the majority of people reading this paper, for example, we have been able to order it from the Cred web site and pay for it on credit card. We will be reading it in a comfortable house, surrounded by electronic gadgets, whilst munching on food exported from all over the world. For a farmer in Uganda, for example, his life is now one in which he grows flowers for export in Europe. For a woman in Vietnam, for example, her life is now one in which she earns her money through working in a textile factory rather than through farming. All around the world lives have changed.

For many, this has been overwhelmingly positive and there is no doubt that opening up to international trade has helped many countries grow more quickly economically than they would otherwise have done, leading to people being better off financially, living longer, with higher standards of living. China is a well known example of that. Deng Xiaoping's policies of export-led growth resulted in China's economy growing eight-fold in the 1980s and 1990s and, between 1990 and 1998 the number of Chinese living on less than a dollar a day fell by 150 million: the fastest fall in poverty the world has ever seen.

For others, however, the changes brought by economic globalisation have been overwhelmingly negative and there is no doubt that, for all its positives, one of the current features of globalisation is the huge increase in inequality that we saw in the previous section, with millions of people around the world suffering as a result. The other feature is the disregard for the environment that we saw in the first section.

There are many reasons behind why our economic system is failing both people and planet and we can only mention three of them here. Firstly, neo-liberal economics is based on the idea that all countries will benefit by investing in those sectors in which they produce goods most efficiently and then trading with each other. However, it was developed at a time when capital was held securely in domestic economies. Now, as we saw above, capital can be moved around the world virtually instantaneously. The result is that it is difficult for those countries who struggle with things such as an instable economy and weak infrastructure to attract or retain investment capital. The playing field is therefore not level from the start.^{xlix}

Secondly, the trickle-down theory patently does not work in many cases. Thekaekara describes what happens amongst the tribes he is involved with:

'if we were to track 1000 rupees from its beginning as pure capital we would find that as it moves down the rungs of the economic ladder less and less of it is used as capital till finally, in the hands of an adivasi or daily wage earner, none of it is used as capital. 'Trickle down' aptly describes this phenomenon. But as the money starts moving up the ladder again, more and more of this money is used as capital, making more and more money for people all along the higher rungs of the economic ladder. If capital *trickles* down I think it then *gushes* up, especially in today's globalised economy'.ⁱ

The situation with Shell in Nigeria is a good illustration of this. Oil accounts for 80% of the country's GDP and 90% of Government revenues, yet the industry employs only 2% of all Nigerians and deep corruption means that the nation as a whole does not feel the benefit of the oil money. In a bid to attract foreign investment, countries offer tax breaks which mean that much of that investment simply flows back out of the country again.ⁱⁱ

A third reason for the failure of the current economic system is that it does not take into account the finite nature of the earth's resources. Instead, it views them as being there primarily for us to use to further our economic development. As a Friends of the Earth paper states, 'there is no invisible hand guiding the market towards sustainability. These resources need to be husbanded; and sustainable economies managed'.ⁱⁱⁱ

Underlying all of these reasons is the unrelenting pursuit of profit by corporations and the way in which free trade has become the sacred cow to the three main organisations who preside over our economic system: the World Bank, the International Monetary Fund and the World Trade Organisation. Free trade is thus given priority over everything else, at the expense of social and environmental issues. It is a sad fact that the WTO has only ever once upheld a ruling in favour of social and environmental issues and it has even gone against laws that are adopted in order to comply with international agreements.ⁱⁱⁱⁱ

We will look in Part Two at changes that need to take place within the business and financial world. For the purpose of this section, though, the point to focus on is the overriding emphasis on the financial, to the detriment of the social and environmental. Thus something is deemed 'economic' only if it makes a financial profit, regardless of any other impact it might have.

We can see this clearly in the obsession with a country's Gross Domestic Product (GDP) as the measurement for progress. GDP is the measure of how much product a country generates (ie, its turnover) in a year. As such, it simply measures financial transactions in a country and the more money is spent, the higher a country's GDP is and the more developed it is seen to be. However, GDP does not measure the value of what that money is spent on. So, for example, clearing up after an oil spill or a chemical leak; using petrol whilst sitting in a queue on the M25 while Heathrow's T4 is built; treating patients for stress-related illnesses and so on, all contribute to a country's GDP. On the other side, essential activities that are not directly related to the market – such as bringing up children, caring for elderly parents, volunteering in the community – are ignored. Nearly forty years ago, Senator Robert Kennedy gave this prognosis on GDP, saying that it is,

Indifferent to the decency of our factories and the safety of our streets alike. It does not include the beauty of our poetry or the strength of our marriages, the intelligence of our public debate or the integrity of our public officials. The GDP measures neither our wit nor our courage, neither our wisdom nor our learning, neither our compassion nor our devotion to our country. It measures everything, in short, except that which makes life worthwhile.^{liv}

Because of the shortfalls of GDP, a whole host of other measures and indicators have been proposed, from the Index of Sustainable Economic Welfare (ISEW), to NEF's Measure of Domestic Progress (MDP), to Genuine Progress Indicator (GPI), proposed by the organisation Redefining Progress.^{lv} What all of these do is recognise the importance of economic growth whilst also appreciating how crucial it is that the notion of 'development' includes the concept of an enhanced quality of life. If we are to work towards a truly sustainable society then we have to develop an economic system that places equal value on the financial, the environmental and the social.

Part Two: the way forward

'The question facing this generation is whether the human community will take charge of its own cultural evolution and implement a rational shift to sustainable economies, or will instead stand by watching nature impose change as environmental systems break down'.^{lvi}

The challenges facing us are immense. They are also complex. There is no one sector of society that alone can make the necessary difference; to see the change that we need all groups must take action and learn to work together. These groups can be divided into three:

- The role of business
- The role of government
- The role of civil society.

The Role of Business

It has become increasingly recognised how important the role of business is in shaping our world, whether for better or for worse. Business, of course, contributes positively in a number of ways, giving people an opportunity to earn a livelihood, encouraging creativity, providing necessary goods and services and luxury items and so on. However, companies also often act in ways that go against sustainability.

Linked in as they are to the economic system discussed in Part One, the main focus for corporations is on increasing profit and keeping shareholders happy. This leads to an inevitable emphasis on the short term and a reluctance to take any steps that might lead to a dip in share value. So, for example, whilst writing this paper in January 2005, the UK pub chain, Wetherspoons, announced a decision to ban all smoking by May 2005. Whilst welcomed by unions and health campaigners, who urged other pub chains to follow suit, the announcement saw the company's share price tumble by 3.9 per cent to 250 pence. Companies are reluctant in the extreme to accept environmental limits or adopt more environmentally-friendly measures where it is perceived these might place restrictions on growth.

Business is all too often seen to act only in its own financial interests, putting pressure on governments and other bodies to adopt regulations that benefit it and blocking attempts to bring in reform. The role of the Global Climate Coalition in persuading the Bush regime to back out of the Kyoto Protocol is one of the best known examples of this.

To achieve sustainability, the business sector can play a significant role by not only existing to increase financial wealth, but also to achieve positive social and environmental objectives. Environmentally, the potential is huge. Looking back at Friends of the Earth's concept of environmental space (seen in Part One) we saw

the cuts in resource use that the UK needs to make in order to achieve sustainability. There are all sorts of opportunities for businesses to become the leaders in this field, whether it is in designing innovative ways to use renewable energy; bringing in new technologies to make cars 'greener'; working on water-reducing systems; adopting eco-designs for house building; developing alternatives to plastic and wood-based paper... and so on. The benefits are not only environmental and many businesses who are taking this route are also finding that their costs are being cut as a result.^{lvii}

Socially, businesses have a responsibility to ensure that their work is carried out under good conditions and that workers' rights (such as trade unions) are respected. In a sustainable society, businesses will be responsible to all stakeholders in society – consumers, employees, communities and investors – not just to those interested in its financial growth.^{lviii} Politically, businesses must move beyond simply lobbying to protect their own financial interests, to working with others to see legislation that benefits all stakeholders. This would mean advocating policies that promote just trading patterns between nations, rather than bowing to the free trade sacred cow, as we saw in Part One. It would also mean supporting international environmental agreements and proposals such as the Tobin Tax, which seeks to discourage short-term currency trading (that is about 90 percent speculative) but leaves long-term productive investments intact and provides money that can be spent on urgent global priorities.^{lix}

For all this to happen, the business sector must develop accountability and transparency. Currently there is a voluntary approach to sustainable development, which has led to some companies taking their social and environmental responsibilities seriously. However, on a broader level, the voluntary approach is not working and, once you begin to delve into the murky world of what companies get up to, the results are truly horrifying. In December 2004, the Corporate Accountability website announced its 'Top 100 Corporate Criminals of the Decade'.^{lx} In the face of lists such as the Fortune 500, this list was designed to reveal the wave of corporate criminality that has swamped prosecutors' offices across the USA. It showed that corporate criminality caused far more damage to US society than all street crimes combined and covered crimes such as environmental, fraud, antitrust, obstruction of justice and public corruption.

Voluntary accountability is not binding legally and is too open to the charge of being a purely PR exercise. Hundreds of codes of conduct have been produced by companies, but there is little opportunity for individuals or communities actually to hold these companies accountable for what they have written. Thus, in the run up to the Johannesburg WSSD, an international campaign of NGOs and civil society groups called upon governments to go beyond these voluntary approaches and establish a legally binding framework on corporate accountability.^{lxi}

This is where the role of government comes in.

The Role of Government

The role of Government – whether local, national or global – is crucial in the development of sustainability because it is they who can provide the framework for business (and individuals, as we shall see in the next section) to work towards that goal. As with companies needing to please their shareholders, the problem for Government is the need to win votes at the next general election. This gives them a short-term focus and makes them unwilling to adopt policies that concentrate on developing longer-term sustainability. In addition, Government has to vie with the conservative interest of business that we saw in the previous section. Linking in with what we have discussed already, all the time GDP is the

main measure for a country's development, Government will find it almost impossible to shift the nation's emphasis on to sustainability.

Having said that, the Blair Government has taken some significant shifts in the right direction. In 1999 it published, *A Better Quality of Life*, which was its strategy for sustainable development for the UK. In it it stated four aims for the Government: to engender social progress that recognised the needs of everyone; to protect the environment effectively; to use natural resources prudently and to maintain high and stable levels of economic growth and employment. Certain priorities for the future were laid out, for example improving energy efficiency and reducing waste; promoting a transport system that provided choice and reduced congestion and environmental harm; and reducing the level of social exclusion. An important part of the document was ten principles that would guide Government policy. These were things such as taking a long-term perspective; transparency, information, participation and access to justice; the 'polluter pays' principle and holding to the precautionary principle (whereby we recognise that we do not know all the risks involved in scientific or technological innovations, as was the case with using CFCs, and so we should be cautious in implementing them too quickly).

In 2003 the Government then published, *Changing Patterns*, which sought to provide a further framework for sustainable development, following on from the commitments made at the 2002 WSSD, by focusing on how to promote sustainable consumption and production. It accompanied a host of papers such as *Our Energy Future: creating a low carbon economy*, *Directing the Flow: priorities for future water policy*, and various papers coming from the DTI, Defra and the Sustainable Development Commission.

With national Government taking a lead on these issues, local Government has been encouraged to do likewise. So, for example, Haringey Council have been working on ensuring that building developments are more environmentally friendly by stating that every application comes with a 'sustainability statement' that looks at issues such as recycling facilities, the potential for the use of renewable energies and using recycled materials. Chichester District Council (CDC) won a silver Green Apple Award for its *Climate Change Strategy 2004 – 2009*. This five year action plan aims to reduce greenhouse gas emissions from the District as a whole and to plan for adapting to the impacts of climate change across the District. Government incentives have also led CDC to revise completely its waste strategy, whereby all residents in the district are being given two bins – one for waste and one for mixed recycling. CDC's aim is to increase recycling to match or better the Government target of 30% by 2005/6. In 2000, Chichester district recycled 10% of its waste. By 2004 it has reached 20% and, with two more phases to go, looks set to reach the Government target.

However, as very welcome as this shift in emphasis is, Governments local and national still have a long way to go. Whilst recycling figures have been improving, the UK as a whole still lags far behind other European countries. Overall, the UK comes in 13th position with a rate of 13%: a sorry figure when compared with the Netherlands that has a 59% recycling rate and Germany that has a rate of 53%.

For all its talk about sustainability the reality is that the change is not happening fast enough. The Government still wastes billions of pounds a year subsidising harmful activities, such as factory farming, fossil fuel exploration and nuclear power.^{lxii} And tax incentives only encourage businesses and individuals to drive more, build on greenfield sites and throw things away rather than recycle them.^{lxiii}

If the framework for sustainability is to be provided, the Government must be prepared to bite the bullet on a number of issues. In particular, tax reforms need to take place so that environmentally damaging activities, such as pollution and waste, are taxed highly and beneficial things, such as employment and investment in green technologies, are taxed lightly. So, for example, pesticides should be taxed and then the revenue used to help farmers cut their use of chemicals. The Treasury and DTI should offer tax breaks, grants and support to businesses that are developing goods or services using low amounts of energy.^{lxiv}

National Governments are, however, one player among many and the journey to sustainability depends on whether the global institutions that govern our world decide to help or hinder it. As we have touched on above, the IMF, World Bank and WTO face a major challenge because they are run with commercial and financial interests in mind. This is not surprising when you consider that it is to the finance ministers, central bank governors and trade ministers that they are accountable to, not to those whose lives are effected by the policies and decisions that are taken.

If sustainability and the Millenium Development Goals are to be reached on a global level it is vital that these institutions fundamentally reform so that the flow of money that goes continually from the poorer to the richer nations is stopped and reversed. Transparency should be built into the heart of these organisations and they should be held accountable to all stakeholders, as we saw with corporations, not just those primarily concerned with finance. This reform would include things like eliminating unequal voting rights, allowing flexibility in policies and preventing the development of trade rules that stop national governments pursuing the right policies for development.^{lxv}

Overall, to end poverty and protect the environment, three key things need to happen globally. Firstly, trade rules need to be changed so that they are fair and just, rather than simply free. Secondly, the debt crisis needs to be ended and all unpayable debts cancelled. Within that, countries should be allowed to choose their own solutions to ending their own poverty and environmental degradation. Thirdly, aid given by rich countries should increase and be better focussed to go to the areas where it is most needed.^{lxvi} For this to happen, poor and rich countries will need to come together to combine their respective strengths and capabilities. As Christopher Flavin states, 'this will require a new form of globalization – one that goes beyond trade links and capital flows to strengthened political and social ties between governments and civil society'.^{lxvii}

And so to civil society we now turn.

The Role of Civil Society

Those individuals not directly involved in the Corporate or Government spheres of society might well feel, having read the previous two sections, that they have little power or ability to be a positive influence. However, this is not necessarily the case and civil society – individuals, churches and other non-government organisations (NGOs) – has a vital role to play, both in taking a more sustainable route itself and in pushing businesses and Governments to do likewise.

The evidence suggests that this is something individuals would like to see happening. A Mori poll in October 2001 showed that people were suspicious of globalisation and sympathetic towards the so-called 'anti-globalisation' protestors. Only 13% agreed with the official view that globalisation enhances everyone's quality of life, whilst between 87-92% thought that the government should protect the environment, employment and health – even when it conflicted with the interests of multinationals. Bob Worcester, Mori Chairman, said that the

survey was, 'a timely indicator of people's underlying distrust of big companies when it comes to acting in people's interest'.

In addition, people's interest in making a difference in these areas on a personal level seem to be growing too. A MORI poll for the Cooperative Bank in 2000 showed that half the British public believe they can make a difference to how responsibly companies behave and would describe themselves as 'ethical consumers'. However, that same research also shows that people's desires to live more sustainably (and their perception of themselves) often do not translate into practical action. For only 23% of the people surveyed did ethical considerations actually make a difference to their purchasing habits and only 5% were 'hardcore activists' on environmental and social issues.

Why is this? Some of the reasons are internal to an individual. So, for example, the problems might seem too big and my contribution too small to make a difference. I know that if I drive I am directly contributing to climate change, but, when compared to the aeroplanes flying overhead, will it really matter if I drive the short distance to work/playgroup/shops rather than walk or cycle? The majority of us reading this Paper will live in the economically developed world, far removed from where most of the environmental and poverty problems really are and it consequently becomes hard to appreciate the impact that lifestyle choices we make have globally and hence difficult to motivate ourselves to make the necessary changes.

At the start of 2005, BBC1 broadcast a series of programmes called 'Tribe', which followed a young explorer as he spent time living and working with remote tribal groups. In the final programme he lived with a formerly nomadic tribe in the Venezuelan Amazon that had decided to settle in one area so as to be close to western medicine and facilities. Over the years of hunting in one area (rather than moving around, as would have happened previously, thus giving land and animals time to recover) the animal population declined and hunting became harder. The explorer mused on how different the tribe's life was from his: they lived such a localised existence that they could appreciate almost immediately any negative effects they were having on the environment around them, whereas he lived so globally that the impact he made happened far away and so could be easily ignored.

Underlying these reasons is a basic self-centredness, and the desire to put our own interest first manifests itself in civil society as much as in Business or Government. The harsh reality is that, whilst we may say we want to live more sustainably, too often it is simply easier for us not to think about it and not to bother.

This leads us to another set of reasons as to why people's actions do not always match their intentions and these are external to an individual. Take climate change as an example again. The UK national energy use figures for 2001 show that 30% of the major sources of greenhouse gas emissions is domestic. Thus, whatever Business decides to do, individuals in the UK can still make a big difference. There are many things that I can do to make a difference: reduce my car usage; get my energy supplied from a renewable supplier; use my heating and hot water less; use energy-saving light bulbs etc etc.^{lxviii} However, there are other things too that I would love to be able to do, such as having a non-petrol fuelled car and sourcing my heating, hot water and electricity from solar panels on my roof. As things stand at the moment, they are all simply too expensive to be realistic. This, again, is where the role of Government comes in as they have a crucial role to play in providing the framework, not only for Business to operate sustainably, but also to help individuals live more sustainable lives.^{lxix}

Conversely, individuals as voters are important in holding the Government to account for its words and pushing it to provide that framework and individuals are, of course, most effective when they work together. Thus we have seen the proliferation of NGOs and never before have there been so many organisations working outside politics (ie not belonging to a political party). Today, there are around 26,000 international NGOs: four times as many as a decade ago and there is no doubt that, when acting strategically, they can have a powerful effect.

In the 1990s, for example NGOs and individuals around the world were involved in fighting, and ultimately defeating, the MAI (Multilateral Agreement on Investment) that would have established rules for foreign investment that were largely favourable to the investors (coming, of course, from the economically developed countries). The campaign, which started when a draft agreement was leaked from the secret negotiations taking place within the OECD in 1997 and ran for two years, drew together more than 600 organisations in 70 countries.^{lxx}

In the UK now, NGOs recognise that people struggle to find the time to write campaigning letters and so now provide their supporters with postcards to send. The Secretary of Trade and Industry (Patricia Hewitt) was deluged with 35,000 cards before she went to a WTO summit in November 2001 and was unable to ignore the strength of feeling behind that number. In 1999, 30,000 postcards were sent to the Government by Friends of the Earth supporters demanding a better waste strategy. This forced the Government to change its statutory targets. Similar successes were seen when Homebase announced it would go peat-free, partly in response to a large number of emails, and also when the Countryside Act was passed, again partly as a result of 250,000 pledges being delivered to No. 10.

Perhaps the best example of the role that civil society can play in urging Governments and Business to take on sustainability is the **MAKEPOVERTYHISTORY** campaign which, as this Paper is being written, is being launched. Drawing on the success of the Jubilee Debt Campaign and the Trade Justice Movement, this campaign brings together a huge cross-section of civil society involving charities, trade unions, campaigning groups, celebrities and faith communities.

Conclusion: Dreaming of a better world

This *Cred Paper* has begun to introduce us to the concept of sustainability and to the vision of what such a world might look like. We dream of a time when all people on earth not only have their basic needs met, but are enabled to flourish, use their skills well and experience the wealth brought about by good relationships. Communities will be formed that are just and equitable and provide a stable basis for that flourishing to take place. We dream of a time when financial profit is not the overriding focus of individuals and societies and when people will be content to live with the good things that they already have. We dream of a time when the world that we live in is looked after, cherished and enjoyed. Such a time will see a world 'powered by the sun; constructed from materials that circulate repeatedly [and] made mobile by trains, buses and bicycles'.^{lxxi} Environmental care, social concerns and economic development are all three integral to sustainability.

To see this sustainable world happen businesses, governments and civil society all have a role to play. As individuals reading this paper, though, we are at the heart of making the change. It is up to us to begin to take the right steps in our own lives; through the things we buy, the energy we consume, the transport we use,

the way we dispose of unwanted things and so on.^{lxxii} We are also key to pushing for the larger changes to take place. As voters we must use our voices to ensure our Governments make the necessary policy changes to take our societies down a sustainable route. As consumers we must use our money to push businesses to adopt sustainable practices. As these things happen, so then we will be enabled to make more sustainable lifestyle choices.

What is clear is that sustainability will only be reached where all parties are working together and when the commitment to money above all else has been broken.

As I write this Paper, the BBC news headlines are flashing along the bottom of my computer, reminding me of just how far away we currently are from achieving a sustainable world and yet, as Ellen MacArthur's boat comes sailing home triumphant, after beating the solo round-the-world sailing record, we are reminded that anything is possible with the right technology, support and more than a little determination.

Bibliography

- Department for International Development, *Eliminating Poverty: Making globalisation work for the poor* (DFID, 2000)
- Department of Trade and Regions, 'A Better Quality of Life: A strategy for sustainable development for the UK' (DETR, 1999)
- The Ecologist, *Go MAD! 365 daily ways to change the planet* (Think Publishing)
- Friends of the Earth, *More from Less: living better on less in tomorrow's world* (FOE, 2001)
- Friends of the Earth, 'Principles for Profit' (FOE, 2002)
- Friends of the Earth, 'Sustainability in Business: principles for profit' (FOE, 2003)
- Friends of the Earth, 'Towards Sustainable Economics: challenging neoliberal economic globalisation' (FOE, nd)
- A. Giddens, 'Reith Lecture' (2000)
- T. Jackson, 'Chasing Progress: beyond measuring economic growth' (NEF, 2004)
- John Ray Initiative, 'Towards Sustainable Consumption – visionary or illusory?' (JRI briefing paper, nd)
- J. Martin, 'Globalisation: an Opportunity for Churches?' (Church of England Newspaper, 12.1.04)
- National Statistics/DEFRA, 'Sustainable development indicators in your pocket 2004', (NS/DEFRA, 2004)
- New Economics Foundation, 'The End of Development? Global warming, disasters and the great reversal of human progress' (NEF, 2002)
- New Economics Foundation, *The price of power: Poverty, climate change, the coming energy crisis and the renewable revolution* (NEF, 2004)
- New Economics Foundation, 'A well-being manifesto for a flourishing society' (NEF, 2004)
- T. Prugh and E. Assadourian, 'What is Sustainability Anyway?', from the Worldwatch Institute (2003)
- C. Revenga, 'Will There be Enough Water?' (www.earthtrends.wri.org, 2000)
- J. Stiglitz, *Globlization and its Discontents* (Penguin, 2002)
- Tearfund 'Water Matters' campaign material
- S. Thekaekara, 'Beating the System: Local solutions to the globalisation crisis' (NEF Alternative Mansion House Speech, 2003)
- M. Townsend, 'Who Will Save the World' (Observer newspaper, 18.8.02)
- R. Valerio, 'Globalisation and Poverty' (Cred Papers, 2002)
- R. Valerio, *L is for Lifestyle: Christian living that doesn't cost the earth* (IVP: 2004)
- R. Valerio, 'Simplicity: living life to the full' (Cred Papers, 2002)
- World Bank, 'Development Indicators 2004' (www.worldbank.org)
- Worldwatch Institute, *State of the World 2000* (WI, 2000)
- Worldwatch Institute, *State of the World 2001* (WI, 2001)
- Worldwatch Institute, *State of the World 2004* (WI, 2004)

ⁱ T. Prugh and E. Assadourian, 'What is Sustainability Anyway?'

ⁱⁱ The goals, in summary, are: eradicate extreme hunger and poverty; achieve universal primary education; promote gender equality and empower women; reduce child mortality; improve maternal health; combat HIV/AIDS, malaria and other diseases; ensure environmental sustainability; develop a global partnership for development, encompassing official development assistance, market access and debt sustainability. For the full text, see www.dfid.gov.uk.

ⁱⁱⁱ Of course, in reality, the two 'ends' are often not so distinct (water being a clear example of an issue that is of both pressing environmental and human concern).

^{iv} *The State of the World 2000* lists seven environmental trends that are shaping our future: population growth, rising temperatures, falling water tables, shrinking cropland per person, collapsing fisheries, shrinking forests and loss of plant and animal species.

^v For more details on all of these, see the relevant chapters in R. Valerio, *L is for Lifestyle: Christian living that doesn't cost the earth*'.

^{vi} *Go M.A.D!*, 60.

^{vii} For more information on the Ogoni people and Shell, see Amnesty International's website (www.amnesty.org).

^{viii} Unless otherwise indicated, all the information on the rainforests comes from Rainforest Action Network factsheets.

^{ix} There are a number of different types of forest in the world: temperate forests (in northern Russia, North America, Chile and Australia), boreal forests (in the cold north of Europe and North America) and temperate rainforests (on the west coast of North America).^{ix} All of these contain huge varieties of wildlife and all are increasingly under threat from our demand for timber and the resources these forests hold. However, it is the tropical rainforests that are particularly significant.

^x Britain is the fifth highest paper user in the world, despite being so small.

^{xi} In 1993 and 1994, America imported over 200 million pounds of fresh and frozen beef from Central American countries. Whether the forest is cleared for cattle grazing or for crop farming, the thin rainforest soil can only grow pasture for a few years, then forcing the cattle ranchers and farmers to move on, cutting down yet more forest.

^{xii} Mining for minerals such as aluminium and tin and oil extraction threatens large areas. BP, Chevron, Shell, Exxon, Conoco Inc and Occidental are all involved in 'exploring' different rainforest areas. The extraction leads to massive degradation and pollution, as well as effecting human rights as tribal territories are invaded.

^{xiii} These dams flood big areas of forest and displace the people that lived there.

^{xiv} 2002 IUCN Red List of Threatened Species (www.redlist.org).

^{xv} Conservation International and the Primate Specialist Group of the IUCN (www.conservation.org).

^{xvi} C. Revenga, "Will There be Enough Water", www.earthtrends.wri.org.

^{xvii} M. Townsend, "Who will save the world?"

^{xviii} The material in this paragraph is taken from Tearfund's "Water Matters" campaign material.

^{xix} On a similar note, the Sheraton hotel in Addis Ababa consumes a quarter of the entire city's electricity.

^{xx} See, *The price of power: Poverty, climate change, the coming energy crisis and the renewable revolution*, and 'The End of Development? Global warming, disasters and the great reversal of human progress'.

^{xxi} Friends of the Earth, *More From Less: living better on less in tomorrow's world*, 15.

^{xxii} *More From Less*, 16-18.

^{xxiii} See, *The Price of Power*, for an excellent discussion on the possibility of getting all our global energy needs from renewable sources.

-
- xxiv Worldwatch Institute, *State of the World 2001*, 6, drawing on figures from the OECD.
- xxv Taken from the press release for the Worldwatch Institute, *State of the World 2004*.
- xxvi For more on globalisation, see R. Valerio, 'Globalisation and Poverty' and the relevant chapter in R. Valerio, *L is for Lifestyle: Christian living that doesn't cost the earth*.
- xxvii World Bank, 'World Development Indicators 2004'.
- xxviii Worldwatch Institute, *State of the World 2001*, 7, drawing on figures from the World Bank.
- xxix World Bank, 'World Development Indicators 2004'.
- xxx In 2002 the under-five mortality rate was at 81 per thousand live births, down from 95 in 1990.
- xxxi World Bank, 'World Development Indicators 2004'.
- xxxii 'Sustainable development indicators in your pocket 2004: A selection of the UK Government's indicators of sustainable development', 14.
- xxxiii John Ray Initiative briefing paper, 'Towards Sustainable consumption – visionary or illusory?', 1.
- xxxiv This has fallen from 26.4% in 1993 to 14.8% in 2003
- xxxv Government sustainable development indicators, 2004.
- xxxvi T. Jackson, 'Chasing Progress: beyond measuring economic growth', 4, drawing on numerical analyses carried out at the Centre for Environmental Strategy in the University of Surrey.
- xxxvii Government sustainable development indicators, 2004.
- xxxviii FoE, *More from less*, 12.
- xxxix 'A Better Quality of Life: A strategy for sustainable development for the UK', 3.
- xl For a fuller discussion on consumerism see, R. Valerio, 'Simplicity: living life to the full' and the relevant chapter in, *L is for Lifestyle*.
- xli Findings from the World Values Survey, as assessment of life satisfaction in more than 65 countries conducted between 1990 and 2000, indicate that income and happiness tend to track well until about \$13,000 of annual income per person (in 1995 purchasing power parity) and then, after that, additional income yields only modest additions in self-reported happiness (press release for *State of the World 2004*).
- xlii New Economics Foundation, 'A well-being manifesto for a flourishing society', 12.
- xliii S. Thekaekara, 'Beating the System: Local solutions to the globalisation crisis', 3.
- xliv The following paragraphs are adapted from R. Valerio, 'Globalisation and Poverty' and from a presentation given to a World Evangelical Alliance conference in 2003.
- xlv Department for International Development's White Paper on Globalisation.
- xlvi Colin Hines (a fellow of the International Forum on Globalisation), cited in J. Martin, 'Globalisation: an Opportunity for Churches?', 14.
- xlvii The increase in foreign direct investment is another notable feature. Flows of FDI in 1995 reached \$315 billion, almost a six-fold increase over the level for 1981-85: over the same period world trade increased by little more than a half.
- xlviii Giddens, Reith Lectures.
- xlix For more on this see Friends of the Earth, 'Towards Sustainable Economics: challenging neoliberal economic globalisation', 5.
- l Thekaekara, 'Beating the System', 5.

li The tourism industry is another good example of this and in some cases as little as 10p in every pound spent may stay in low-income countries (for more on this see 'T is for Tourism' in R. Valerio, *L is for Lifestyle*).

lii 'Towards Sustainable Economics', 5.

liii For example, when it ruled American regulations to protect turtles to be illegal, even though they were done in accordance with CITES, which was signed by 146 nations. For more on the problems in these three organisations, see Stiglitz, *Globalisation and Its Discontents*, and relevant briefings from the World Development Movement.

liv Quote in T. Jackson, 'Chasing Progress', 3.

lv For information on the ISEW see, www.foe.co.uk/campaigns/sustainable_development/progress/; for MDP see, Jackson, 'Chasing Progress' and for GPI see, www.rprogress.org.

lvi G. Gardner, 'Accelerating the Shift to Sustainability' (*State of the World 2001*), 190.

lvii For examples see, FoE, *More From Less*, chapter 4.

lviii FoE, 'Principles for Profit', 6.

lix FoE, 'Principles for Profit', 7. For more information on the Tobin Tax, see www.ceedweb.org/iirp/factsheet.htm.

lx See www.corporate-accountability.org.

lxi www.corporate-accountability.org.

lxii For example, in 2003 the Government agreed over £4 billion worth of subsidies to the nuclear industry.

lxiii FoE briefing, 'Sustainability in Business: principles for profit'.

lxiv FoE, *More From Less*, 41. Other examples of what the Government can do are provided here.

lxv R. Valerio, *L is for Lifestyle*, 168.

lxvi Points taken from the MAKE POVERTY HISTORY leaflet.

lxvii Worldwatch Institute, *State of the World 2001*, 5.

lxviii For lots more ideas, see R. Valerio, *L is for Lifestyle*.

lix Through, for example, providing better public transport and communities that are more geared towards the walker or cyclist; increasing grants to help people buy non-petrol fuelled cars and renewable energy; charging for collecting rubbish that could be recycled; increasing grants for organic food producers; educating on the availability of recycled products and so on.

lxx For more information on the MAI, see the World Development Movement website: www.wdm.org.uk.

lxxi G. Gardner, 'Accelerating the Shift to Sustainability' (*State of the World 2001*), 204.

lxxii For much more on all of this see, R. Valerio, *L is for Lifestyle*.