June 3, 2003 – Plenary Session II

Presenter: Dr. Stephen F. Lintner
Senior Advisor, Environment Department, World Bank

Your All Holiness, Excellencies, Eminences, Ladies and Gentlemen,

It is a pleasure to be here this morning on the Baltic Sea, to have the opportunity to participate in a much-needed dialogue on the question of religion, the question of science, the question of the environment: how are these things linked, and how are they linked to development? I think we have started out quite well; we have had a very articulate critique of the overall development process by Professor Serge Latouche, who just spoke. His presentation included a critique of mainstream economists, including a former Chief Economist of the World Bank. I am proud to tell you that I am actually a scientist and engineer, and not an economist. I think this is very important because if we consider the development process, and how we can go forward in a way that allows for improved social equity, reduction of poverty, protection of the environment and sustainable management of natural resources, it is clear that we need a broader base of people involved in development questions and strategies. Development cannot and should not be dominated by economists or any other group, and I think this is the importance of this type of symposium, which provides a wonderful opportunity for a rich cross-section of people to gather together and examine some of these questions in depth.

With regard to some of the messages being put forward not only at this Symposium but also more generally, there is no question that we should be studying current development models to see how they can be improved, or changed, or even replaced. I do not think we have to accept development models as static. In fact, if you look at development models since the post-World War II period, you can see that they are continuously changing. Sustainable development itself is a model that will evolve and eventually become something different to meet the needs of its time. I think it is important to recognize the very dynamic nature of this process.

Another issue—and this is something with which the World Bank also is concerned—is that of moving from a quantitative to a qualitative assessment of development. I think those who are here are very much committed to spiritual and ethical values, and these go far beyond measuring gross national product (GNP) and other types of standard economic and social indicators. We need to discover how development can positively affect the lives of people on the ground, conserve the environment, and promote the wise use of natural resources. Among the themes that keep arising is support for good and transparent governance, because this is quite central to any kind of development, and particularly to sustainable development. We need to find ways to promote equity, to allow people to have access to food, water and shelter; to have security of land tenure; and to have the promise of a secure future. We must also involve and empower communities, which is central to achieving equitable sustainable development.

It is also important to look at the question raised earlier in the Symposium of how we can respect nature and respect man? These are basic values that go far beyond anything that has to do with economics or science. At the same time—and I think this is very important from the viewpoint of countries in economic transition and

developing countries—we need to move from debate to action. Debate can go on forever, but action is actually needed on the ground to deal with real problems that occur every day.

Since the World Bank is a major member of the development community, I think it would be useful here to make a few points about this institution, which has existed for over fifty years, and changed quite a bit since its inception. The World Bank has over 180 member countries. In other words, it is an organization which has countries as owner-members. Its staff comes from over 150 countries, meaning that there is great diversity, whether in technical training, professional outlook or religious background. The focus of the World Bank today is on poverty reduction, with an emphasis on implementing the United Nations' Millennium Development Goals (MDGs).

We are seeking ways to reduce poverty while also addressing environmental and natural resources management issues. The World Bank remains committed to growth, but that growth must be responsible and address the question of externalities. How do we use environmental accounting, so that countries can clearly see that if they proceed with poorly planned development, give excessive emphasis to extractive industries, or endorse over-exploitation of natural resources, that this will only undercut their ability to truly grow. With regard to environmental and social sustainability, the World Bank has been integrating this approach into our work on a daily basis for over a decade.

It is important to consider the types of strategies we currently employ at the World Bank, and how these embody new visions of economic development with which it has not been traditionally associated. One of these strategies concerns the environment, which has three inter-related objectives that are in fact very similar to some of the objectives that have been discussed during this Symposium.

- First, improving the quality of life. How do management of the environment and the conservation of natural resources contribute to improving the quality of life?

- Second, how do we improve the prospects for and quality of growth? How do we stimulate not economic growth for its own sake but growth that is qualitatively better?

- Third, how do we protect the quality of the regional and global environmental commons? How do we work with others to manage shared resources in a sustainable manner for current and future generations?

This last point concerns the role of the World Bank in working with national governments, other international institutions and civil society organizations, to address questions such as climate change and the protection of shared waters. It includes programs for the conservation and protection of transboundary water bodies such as the Mediterranean Sea, the Black Sea, the Danube River, the Adriatic Sea and the Baltic Sea — the seas and rivers that have been a part of this Symposium process.

We are in a *process* with regard to sustainable development. We are in a process regarding this question of sharing responsibility for the environment. If we consider what has taken place over the last thirty years since the United Nations

Conference on the Human Environment held in Stockholm in 1972, we can see that a very important shift has taken place; not a full shift, but one in process, going from the concept that we discussed yesterday of dominion, toward stewardship. In my view, there is no question that the most important thing that is taking place with regard to the sustainable development concept, as broadly defined and as diversely interpreted, is that it is compelling a global shift of vision, from dominion to stewardship.

How do we move from being proprietors to being priests? That is the challenge, posed to us yesterday morning by Most Reverend Metropolitan John of Pergamon, which we face here; it is the challenge we face in the future. Again, I think we have to see this as a dynamic process; the concept of sustainable development has helped us to shift from dominion to stewardship, which represents an improvement, but is not necessarily where we want to be in the end.

Sustainable development clearly means many things to many people. Sometimes diversity is a virtue, but it can also be a problem from an intellectual standpoint. If we go around this room or to other audiences, sustainable development will have a very broad range of definitions. Nevertheless, what is important is that it is becoming a force for positive change. We are seeing demonstrable differences in approaches, in attitudes, and in actions. I think this is critical.

The sustainable development approach supports an integrated examination of issues, and this has been one of the largest problems faced by local communities, by municipal governments, by national governments, by regional programmes, and at the global level. How do we look at multiplicities of questions, multiplicities of visions? How do we bring in a diversity of practitioners? How do we arrive at answers that actually represent an inclusive view of what needs to be done, rather than a very specialized or exclusive one?

I would argue that the sustainable development paradigm, although it may be transitional, plays an important role as a point of departure for evolution in our thinking. Interestingly, it has also provided an entry point for what has become a global debate on a much larger range of issues: the debate about globalization, the debate about human rights, the role of civil society, the role of the private sector, and the role of transparency and accountability. This broader dialogue, which is so important, stemmed from the debate on sustainable development.

The concept of sustainable development is being internalized at the level of the United Nations, the international financial institutions, national governments and civil society organizations. Certainly it can be improved, but internalization is a prerequisite, and there is no question that this is taking place. We see the recognition of the need for innovation. I think this is very important. We have broken out of some of the static boxes in which we have been held. There is an increasing perception of the need for coordination and harmonization. There is also awareness of the clear need for capacity building, that objectives cannot be achieved without building the capacity of institutions, communities and individuals.

Interestingly enough, this has obliged us to consider how we develop new technologies. Some of the countries we are visiting during the Symposium are leaders in development of innovative technologies for water and energy technology that focus

on the efficient use of these resources. We are being obliged to consider how we can provide for equitable access to technological innovations. The responsible use of economic incentives to promote conservation of water and energy is also an area of concern. There is no question that with proper pricing of water, proper pricing of energy, you can have improved performance and greater efficiency. But it is critical to make certain that social safety nets exist, so that the poor and people on fixed incomes are protected when pricing incentives are used at the national, municipal and community levels.

There is also clearly an increased recognition of inter-generational responsibilities. As we address these issues, it becomes obvious that we are dealing with multiple time-frames—the short term, the medium term, and the long term, into future generations. Very serious questions are being asked about inter-generational equity with regard to the use and conservation of a number of resources including air, water, land, biodiversity and minerals among others. Along with inter-generational responsibility, there is a much greater focus on individual and collective responsibilities. Questions are being asked about the responsibility of an individual, the responsibility of a group, in terms of dealing with environment and development questions. This sense of responsibility is a crucial development as we move toward stewardship.

In terms of lessons learned that can help us to move forward, I think the Baltic Sea region is a significant place for us to be. I believe some of the lessons that have been learned here in the work on the Baltic Sea can be carried forward in many other contexts, particularly with regard to sustainable development. My colleague Professor Jan Thulin noted some of these yesterday, and I would like to revisit them, because these derive from the combined experience of the Baltic Sea nations, the international financial institutions that have worked with them, and the non-governmental groups that have all cooperatively worked on these questions over the last decade. In identifying how the considerable progress on environmental management in the Baltic Sea region has come about, several lessons emerged.

- First, a shared vision is needed. You have to have a collective vision of where you want to go and be prepared to adjust that shared vision on the basis of experience.

- Second, sustained political and public support is needed. Politicians must be involved and so must the public over the short, medium and long term.

- Third, broad-based partnerships are needed. The approach taken in a program should be inclusive rather than exclusive, drawing everyone in, from the largest organizations to the individual.

These concepts must be integrated into the planning process. In the case of the Baltic Sea, the amount or rate of improvement is directly linked to the incorporation of the shared vision into actual governmental planning and budgeting processes. Finally, you need public awareness and education programmes.

In summary, I would like to reiterate that there is a clear need to critically examine development models, to improve those models, and to recognize that this process is dynamic. More than economics is involved in development, and I say this coming from the scientific community. Quality of life and of the environment needs

to be emphasized when we look at developmental questions. Sustainable development may serve as a transition to very different models of development, but it is currently the dominant model and deserves scrutiny. Climate change and climate vulnerability will likely be the biggest development challenge we will see over the next two decades.

We need to link spiritual and ethical values to the process of development, and I think these symposia and their follow-up are critical to that effort. To succeed in our efforts, three factors will be key. One, we need knowledge. Two, we need awareness. And three, we need motivation. I believe that open dialogue and willingness to look at what and how we are doing, past and present and future, is critical. I appreciate greatly the opportunity to engage in this dialogue.