CHAPTER 12

WORLD CITIZENSHIP IN A PRECARIOUS WORLD

THE AGENT AS CAMPAIGNER

What does the ethic defended in this book (biocentric consequentialism) ask of the individual, and does it ask too much? These questions have political overtones, and this chapter delves into some of their political implications. It also explores the notions of global citizenship and of civil society; for the realities corresponding to these notions turn out to be significant if global problems are to be tackled and if individuals are to be capable of playing a part in tackling them.

A recurrent objection to consequentialist theories consists in their alleged overdemandingness, seemingly requiring the individual to become worn out optimising the balance of good over evil without respite. As this objection can be directed at several other forms of cosmopolitanism too, including Kantianism and including those approaches for which rights are fundamental, it could even be employed in the cause of alleging the superiority of egoism or of communitarianism. But this objection presupposes that consequentialism (and generally cosmopolitanism) cannot recognise any upper limit to obligation, a presupposition which I have challenged elsewhere.[1] Further, a reply was offered in Chapters 6 and 10 to the version of this objection that concerns the possible overburdening of a particular generation: it would be counterproductive, it was replied, to expect any one generation to bear a disproportionate burden of obligation. A version of this reply holds good at the level of individual agents too. However, a different reply again is also relevant here.

For, as Paul Gomberg has argued, the above objection assumes one particular model of agency, that of the individual as philanthropist, surrounded by a sea of misery, and shouldering in isolation the unending humanitarian burden of relieving or alleviating this misery. But this

objection ignores other, often more accessible, models of agency, including the political model. In this model, the agent co-operates with others to change the world, or rather some of its structures, and to provide for the alleviation of misery or environmental threats or degradation through a collaborative approach, rather than through lonely and unlimited self-sacrifice. (Comparatively few agents, we can reasonably assume, will have the money or power to adopt a philanthropic role on a regular basis.) Thus to assume the philanthropic model is to invent a problem through a misleading kind of abstraction, for actual agents are free to adopt the model of campaigner instead, a model that is much more rewarding and psychologically self-sustaining.[2] Campaigning can be challenging too, but can also be enjoyable, and can foster mutual respect and self-respect among campaigners. Besides, as Gary Varner has recently remarked, on a consequentialist basis, about animal activists: 'Through demonstrations, popular and philosophical literature, films, advertisements, political campaigns and so on, they sometimes succeed in shifting the goal posts of their culture's common morality.'[3] In any case campaigning is not intrinsically characterised by overdemandingness, as the objection predicts for ways of life in which consequentialism is consistently embodied and put into practice, for the obligation to optimise foreseeable outcomes is shared, rather than shouldered alone. (In some circumstances campaigning can be combined with witnessing against particular objectionable products through symbolic abstentions or boycotts; but witnessing should probably not be regarded as a satisfactory independent model of agency, as it would often be ineffective in the absence of campaigning.)

However, the viability of the political model of agency is sometimes held to involve preconditions far removed from those of the real world, particularly with regard to environmental campaigning. This claim, which, if upheld, would once again plunge attempts to apply biocentric consequentialism into futility, will be considered in the coming section.

DECISION-MAKING IN NON-IDEAL SITUATIONS

It is sometimes held that only societies with special decision-making procedures offer any genuine prospect of environmental sensitivity. More specifically, John S. Dryzek maintains that in an 'open society' (roughly, a community resembling Karl Popper's society of problem-solvers, 'governed by free and open conjecture and criticism'),[4] 'nature *can only* be manipulated and engineered'.[5] While Dryzek does not

believe that the open society actually exists,[6] his criticism is reiterable for all forms of non-primitive society except those embodying 'communicative rationality', in which alone 'there is no obstacle to' a 'symbiotic orientation toward the natural world'.[7] In all other kinds of society, the prospects for such a positive orientation are seemingly hopeless.

A society embodying communicative rationality is defined as one approximating to Jürgen Habermas' 'ideal speech situation', where decisions are made on the basis of what would be agreed at the end of full debate in the absence of irrelevant obstacles to rationality such as differences of power.[8] Even if there never was or will be an ideal speech situation, we can employ the thought of such a situation to assess the fairness and validity of decision-making. By contrast situations where decisions are affected by arbitrary factors are certain to be exploitative. While Habermas himself regards the natural world as comprising objects rather than subjects, and as unfit to enter into situations of speech, Dryzek hopes that ecosystems, as self-regulating systems, can send feedback signals to speaking subjects and 'tell' of the interests which need to be heeded.[9] If value belongs only to entities capable of entering into communication, Gaia may even so be held to satisfy this requirement.[10]

Decisions should certainly be made in as fair and rational a manner as possible. But ecosystems are not speakers; it is humans that discover how far the biosphere (or 'Gaia') is self-regulating, and how ecosystems are best preserved, to the extent that they can be identified at all (see Chapter 6 above), and it is humans that are capable of reflection on the well-being of their individual living members. This has important implications for decision-making. For some interests can and should be considered which are not represented by their holders in the forums where decisions are made; the project of broadening ideal speech situations to include non-humans is unnecessary, as well as futile. Thus decision-makers should not suppose that the interests to be considered are confined to the interests of themselves (the speakers or participants) and their electorates, or that intrinsic value is confined to beings with a voice. For if decisions are based on the interests of those represented directly or indirectly in such forums, then the well-being of entire sectors of affected beings is liable to be neglected. In these circumstances, decision-making is liable to be anthropocentric, as Robyn Eckersley argues,[11] and even within humanity, future generations are likely to be ignored. Since all this happens all too often, the implications should be pursued further.

Before procedures are suggested for avoiding this neglect, Dryzek's

appraisal of open societies should be addressed, namely that nature is certain to be manipulated in such societies, and therefore also in those actual societies (such as representative democracies) which share some of the virtues of an open society (such as freedom of speech and inquiry) but are in some regards compromised by lack of openness. Unsurprisingly, the well-being of non-human nature and of future generations is frequently neglected in such societies, at least as much as it would be in an ideal speech situation; so the prediction that nature will sometimes be manipulated is frequently upheld. However, the implicit prediction that nature will invariably be manipulated in liberal-democratic societies is not borne out by the facts; for example, wild species are sometimes protected, cruelty (and neglect) towards individual creatures is widely forbidden, and these policies and the related legislation are sometimes enforced. So blanket pessimism on the part of biocentric (or of ecocentric) people is out of place with regard to representative democracies, despite the distorting influence of commercial interests there (and is thus out of place with regard to less compromised open societies too). Whether blanket pessimism is in place about any society is an issue to which I will return.

There are, however, stronger grounds for optimism regarding ecological sensitivity where all sections of society are involved in decision-making. Only in this way are people likely to take full responsibility for their dealings with nature and their use of natural resources. Some writers even include the democratic participation of all sections of society in definitions of sustainability;[12] but it is unwise to stipulate the presence of everything desirable, including participatory democracy, before a society can be called 'sustainable', as a less demanding approach makes sustainability less out of reach and the concept more useful in practice.[13] Yet there can be little doubt that participatory democracy and sustainability are normally well adapted to each other – a partial vindication, this, of Dryzek's views on decision-making procedures.

However, the question arises of how to take into account interests not represented even in ideal speech situations, or societies modelled on them, and, more importantly, how to do so in representative democracies which do not represent these interests either, particularly where these interests are not represented in any other national legislature either. The interests of non-human nature and of future generations are unlikely to be adequately represented unless human proxies are appointed to legislatures, charged with representing these interests,[14] and supported by research staff and facilities. Since ideally all legislators would heed these interests, these additional legislators should

not be introduced in such numerical strength as to allow the others to claim that the constituencies of nature and of future generations no longer need their own attention; otherwise there would be a case for the newcomers to match or even outnumber existing legislators so as to reflect the large numbers of (for example) future people likely to exist in due course. The role of these proxy legislators would rather be to represent otherwise absent interests, and to persuade their colleagues to take them seriously.

The case for this change is a serious one. On the one hand, moral standing has been argued to extend to future generations and to non-human living creatures; on the other hand, existing legislatures are structured to disregard these interests. While it would be wrong to seek to enforce morality through legislation, there should not be such a large structural gap between legislatures and what is sometimes called 'the moral constituency'; and the suggested change is probably the most streamlined and least disruptive way of remedying the deficiency. There again, if the model of human stewardship or trusteeship of the planet is accepted (see Chapter 3), then some institutionalised provision is required to carry through the associated responsibilities; and the proposed innovation is a minimal form which this provision could take. Thus the proxies would be likely to take a special interest in the avoidance of global anthropogenic catastrophes. Admittedly, the proxies appointed could not be answerable to the interests which they would be appointed to represent; but this apparent problem could be addressed by providing for them to be appointed by, and to answer for the discharge of their duties to, as representative a body as could be devised, granted the nature of the interests in question. The largest objection to what is here proposed is that it involves a dilution of democracy; but if unmodified democracy is unlikely to provide for interests which ought to be provided for, but can do this much better in the manner proposed, and if its central structures and virtues can at the same time be maintained (as they undoubtedly can), then this is not an objection strong enough to be allowed to stand in the way of the proposed change.

There is a more general implication to draw from the possibilities for ecological sensitivity (and for global solidarity) which exist in imperfect representative democracies already, and which could be enhanced along the lines of the proposal just introduced. This is that societies and situations which fall short of being ideal for the introduction of environmentally sensitive actions and policies should not be regarded as uniformly hopeless, nor regarded with blanket pessimism. The suggestion that nothing can change for the better until all society's

structures have been positively transformed, which sometimes underlies the contrary belief, is actually a counsel of premature and unnecessary despair. Admittedly some crisis situations make all considerations other than the struggle for immediate survival distractions from that struggle, and in such circumstances people's responsibilities with regard to future generations or non-human creatures lapse, except insofar as they support one of the options leading to survival. But that still leaves numerous less-than-ideal situations in which individual agents, families or groups have some limited scope for choice, or for introducing practices or precedents conducive to ecological sensitivity or social justice or global solidarity. Billions of humans are subject to authoritarian regimes, but are not completely deprived thereby of all opportunities for forming constructive decisions in their daily lives. Hence, while ideal decision-making situations that philosophers or other theorists describe frequently remain unachievable, this cannot be allowed to absolve the majority of humanity living in non-ideal conditions from all responsibility, much less from environmental responsibility in particular. Greater responsibility, however, attaches to people living in relatively open societies and with greater-than-average opportunities.

GLOBALISATION AND RELATED CONCEPTS OF GLOBAL CITIZENSHIP

The role of people aware of global problems and of their own responsibility for ameliorating them can best be understood as one of global citizenship. Several themes of this book can be related to a contemporary understanding of global citizenship, including those of the shared global environment, of our shared trusteeship of the planet, and of shared responsibilities for justice between contemporaries, between species and between generations. A global ethic, it may reasonably he held, requires us to think of ourselves as global citizens. But first the relation should be explored between one or another conception of global citizenship and the phenomenon of globalisation.

'Globalisation' refers to the process of worldwide economic and cultural integration. More particularly, it concerns the integration of financial markets, the increasing power and outreach of international corporations, an increasing worldwide uniformity of style of places like hotels and airports, increasing international communications through technological innovations such as the internet, and the increasing use of English as an international language. The liberalisation and deregulation of trade are characteristic features of this

process, which promises (or threatens) to open up to world business the most remote fastnesses on Earth.

Globalisation should not be regarded as uniformly bad (for example, the internet allows people with ethical concerns in different countries to communicate and co-ordinate more readily) nor as typically good (for example, it is probably responsible for the accelerated destruction of numerous forests, and undoubtedly responsible for numerous harmful Structural Adjustment Programmes). Nor should developments of a globalising kind be regarded as inevitable, or their characteristic ideology as irresistible, or protest against them as hopeless, in view of well-documented cases of successful resistance, and generally of human creativity and ingenuity.[15] Globalisation is no more the end of history than feudalism was. But it does comprise a significant element of the scenery of contemporary life, and thus of the context of global citizenship for the opening decades of the new millennium. Further, calls to obliterate and replace it with decentralised, local structures can be misguided, in view of the need for global structures to tackle global problems.

Several conceptions of global citizenship should be distinguished, some of them closely related to globalisation. One conception assumes a strong notion of citizenship, for which a citizen necessarily bears the rights and duties of a member of a state which is politically sovereign. Hence global citizenship could only be fully present if the present plurality of states were replaced by a sovereign global state. As was observed in Chapter 9, global problems (global environmental problems not least) are sometimes perceived as requiring nothing less than such world government, possibly through a pooling of sovereignty in the United Nations Organisation. Advocates of such political restructuring could thus be regarded as adherents of an institutional conception of global citizenship, a form of global citizenship depicted by Richard Falk as essentially focused on structural change at global level.[16] Supporters of this view could regard globalisation as strengthening their case, since a global sovereign would be in a stronger position than less powerful structures of international co-operation to constrain or regulate the global market, and to tax it to compensate its victims. Indeed Hobbesian realists, as Janna Thompson has remarked, could add their support to this view as the 'only viable means for imposing environmental restrictions on a reluctant world'.[17] But as was also argued in Chapter 9, there are some apparently conclusive objections to world government; and in the context of globalisation it could be added that a world government would be unlikely to prove the best structure for securing local consent for international policies

of constraint in resource-usage or resisting the homogenising tendencies of globalisation or preserving cultural diversity. The United Nations is undoubtedly crucial to the future of humanity and the planet, but world sovereignty need not (and probably should not) be its future role.

Hence it is important that there are other conceptions of global citizenship. In a second conception mentioned by Falk, citizenship is conceived neither in terms of political affiliation nor of local loyalty, but of participation in a global culture, such as the culture of global business. Falk depicts a businessman met on an aeroplane, who claimed to be a global citizen on the counts of his global travels and global network, of staying at the same kinds of hotels whatever country he happened to be visiting, and of having discarded meaningful local loyalties. Global citizenship as membership of a 'homogenised elite global culture'[18] thus involves being an agent of globalisation; this kind of citizenship is a matter of apolitical club-membership rather than of loyalties, whether patriotic or internationalist.

The rise of globalisation is probably generating many such global citizens. But this kind of global citizenship involves neither concern about global problems and the global environment, nor a sense of trusteeship (except where trust laws obtrude), nor concern for powerless people, nor other generations nor other species. Cosmopolitans, however, as was seen in Chapter 2, need not discard local loyalties; by contrast, the second kind of global citizen seems to combine lack of local roots with lack of global concern. Nor is his a promising route to the preservation of cultural diversity. For less inadequate conceptions of global citizenship, we have to look further.

ALTERNATIVE CONCEPTIONS OF GLOBAL CITIZENSHIP

Unedifying as the second conception of global citizenship may be, it draws to attention the fact that citizenship need not involve loyalty to an existing political sovereign. Citizens can also be conceived as members of a community that is bound together by characteristics other than a political structure; indeed this is probably a commoner sense of 'community' than the political sense. The issue about global citizenship now turns out to be whether communities are essentially either sectional or local (as presumably some communitarians believe), or whether in a significant sense there can be citizenship of a global community.

Belief in such a kind of global citizenship was held by some ancient

Stoics, as was remarked in Chapter 2, and without forfeiture either of local identification or of wider concerns about social issues such as hunger, as has been well brought out by Martha Nussbaum.[19] In more recent times, this notion has been resuscitated, among others by Kant (see Chapter 2); for the duty of rational agents to work towards a confederation of free states neither discards local loyalties nor seeks to replace local states with a world state, as opposed to a cosmopolitan world order.[20] For his part, Falk introduces no less than three further models of global citizenship, each embodying loyalties wider than national loyalties without a focus on world government. His third conception of global citizenship is focused on global management, particularly with regard to ecological and economic dimensions; a central example is the approach of the Brundtland Report, with its advocacy of unprecedented international co-operation to tackle urgent problems of environment and development.[21] His fourth conception is exemplified in the new consciousness, among countries of the European Union, of a European identity and the merits of European integration, but he recognises that such regionalism, despite its global benefits, could form a potential obstacle to fully global co-operation.[22] His fifth and final conception comprises the global citizenship of transnational activism; examples include Greenpeace, Amnesty International and the women's movement.[23]

For many, the European ideal has superseded the nationalistic chauvinism and belligerence of the first half of the twentieth century, and the deepening and widening of the European Union promises to form a transitional stage on the path to stronger international cooperation. In the negotiations leading up to the Kyoto agreement, for example, the European Union played a valuable role in persuading the other developed nations to join a new greenhouse gas regimen on principles acceptable to the Third World.[24] But while the European experience can serve as a precedent for overcoming traditional enmities and for a partial pooling of national sovereignty, there are also dangers of a fortress Europe approach to the rest of the world, comprising the epitome of all that is worst in Eurocentrism; such dangers are just as compatible with Europeanism as its international promise. Thus Falk's fourth conception of global citizenship is not essentially global at all.

But his third (global management) and fifth (global activism) conceptions need not be contrasted with each other. Global activists characteristically seek to reform the principles, policies or performance of international bodies such as the United Nations, the World Bank and the International Court as much as those of national governments and of multinational corporations. In other words, improved

global management is one of their objectives, embodying enhanced international observance of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, or of the Cairo Programme of Action on women's education and reproductive rights (see Chapter 7), or of Agenda 21 (the programme of environment and development action agreed at Rio). Frustrating as they may find the global bureaucracy to be, global activists, for all their ethical concern for a better world, themselves depend on systems of global governance.

The converse, of course, does not hold, and global managers do not usually rely on NGOs (non-governmental organisations) to carry out their work, although in recent years they have found it beneficial to involve NGOs in international conferences (as at Cairo in 1994, and at Beijing, the International Conference on Women, in 1996), and to involve humanitarian NGOs in handling famine relief. But there is in any case no good reason for Falk's third conception to be tied to the perspectives of global managers as an interest-group, let alone to the tendentious perspective which he proceeds to present. Falk muddies the waters when he declares that 'What it means to think of global citizenship from this functional perspective is increasingly caught up in the process of making the planet sustainable at current middle-class life-styles, which means making the carrying capacity of the planet fit what happens in different parts of the world.' Such remarks enable him to generate contrasts with his fourth and fifth conceptions, but they also generate contradictions. The supporters of *Our Common Future*, of Agenda 21 (which he mentions in the same breath) and of planetary sustainability certainly advocate unprecedented international co-operation and managerial effort at international level, but they would be inconsistent, and committed to undermining their own projects, if they aimed to globalise and perpetuate current middle-class lifestyles including current levels of consumption of energy, water and other resources, or if they sought somehow to adapt the carrying capacity of the planet (by interplanetary trading, perhaps?) to this level of resource-use. Even if the perspective presented here by Falk is held by some global managers, it is actually incompatible with the principles for global management presented by Brundtland, in Agenda 21 and in the Rio Declaration and Conventions. While these documents are not flawless, they are not significantly flawed by managerialism or elitism.

Thus supporters of these documents and declarations can, as Falk suggests, be regarded as answering to a conception of global citizenship involving global management; but answering to this conception need not imply sharing in the managerialism of elitist international

bureaucrats, contrary to what Falk implies. Such supporters will sometimes be found as transnational activists, for example as members or staff of environmental NGOs, sometimes as local campaigners, such as members of the United National Association, and writers of letters to their elected representatives on international issues, and sometimes as managers themselves, whether at national or international level. Their global citizenship consists in recognition of cosmopolitan principles and loyalties, applied to global as well as local issues, and in attempts to apply them in practice. Understood in this light, Falk's third and fifth conceptions of global citizenship, involving respectively support for global management and for global activism, merge into a single, distinctive and commendable conception. This global citizenship will often involve participation in citizens' networks (and sometimes in networks of global citizens), which are sometimes held to be necessary for democracy, and arguably necessary also if global environmental problems are to be consistently tackled with sufficient urgency. (Thus, it is important that the British Department of Education has in 2013 decided to retain teaching about the United Nations, human rights and international law in its Key Stage 4 citizenship curriculum, after pressure from internationalists to reverse its previous plan to omit these topics.) Indeed, given the global ethic defended in this book, the sphere of concern of global citizens cannot be regarded as confined to human fellow citizens and their successors, but extends to all present and future fellow creatures of the planet.

CIVIL SOCIETY

Citizens' networks comprise an important part of civil society. Civil society, in current usage, incorporates associations independent of the state,[25] such as trade unions, churches, NGOs, political parties and societies for neighbourhoods, hobbies or sports. 'Civil society' can also refer to the market,[26] and this helps explain the critique of the later Marx of civil society as exploitative;[27] indeed where civil society, broadly conceived, involves systemic evils such as racial discrimination, class or caste distinction and the oppression of women, this is a reasonable verdict. But a different verdict is in place, as O'Neill remarks, where 'civil society' primarily refers to voluntary associations and networks;[28] indeed the presence of these in a country is often thought to be necessary for the maintenance of democracy there.[29]

Just as good procedures and wise decision-making are plausibly facilitated by a vigorous civil society at local and national level, global issues are much more likely to be properly addressed and tackled only

when global civil society is in place, at least embryonically, ventilating problems and lobbying for constructive solutions. In Marx's sense, for which global civil society includes global markets, civil society is part of the problem at this level too, but in the sense of international networks of voluntary NGOs and their individual members, it is frequently an ingredient of possible solutions. In this sense, international civil society partly comprises committed international non-governmental bodies like Greenpeace and Amnesty International, or like the International Red Cross, Médecins sans Frontières and the International Campaign to Ban Land Mines. It also incorporates countless private individuals, striving for the common good. Thus, on 15 February 2003, 'between six and ten million people in up to 400 cities in 60 countries around the globe demonstrated against the war in Iraq' (seeking to prevent its outbreak), 'from perhaps three million people in Rome to tiny demonstrations in such remote places as Antarctica and the Pacific Islands.'[30]

International civil society also includes such non-governmental international bodies as the World Council of Churches, the Roman Catholic Church, and other worldwide religious bodies, or again the International Soccer Federation,[31] for bodies can contribute to global civil society without embracing the preservation of the global environment among their aims. International peace groups, federations of trade unions, and networks of organisations of indigenous people, minorities and ethnic groups (such as the Environmental Justice Movement) should not be forgotten. But it is also comprised by individual citizens and pressure-groups, and the networks in which they participate, including those harbouring concerns for environments other than their own, such as the Antarctic or the Amazon Basin (or, as mentioned in Chapter 1, for the global environment); fortunately, as Thompson points out, people do develop such concerns, and without this the prospects for the global environment might well be slender.[32] Campaigning focuses not only on international conferences (such as Kyoto) and organisations (like IMF) but also on transnational corporations, as when the World Development Movement (WDM) persuaded Del Monte to allow independent trade unions in its banana plantations in Central America, and as in WDM's subsequent lobbying of other large banana companies to do likewise, and to curtail the aerial spraying of bananas, the environment and plantation workers alike with herbicides and pesticides.

Recently, campaigning websites have proved capable of generating very considerable international support for a wide range of causes, many of them environmental. Thus, change.org has secured signatures

from no less than fifteen million people for one or another social justice campaign, while 350.org, which campaigns for radical action on climate change, has received the support of millions more. So has avaaz.org (with twenty-five million participants), whose international campaigns have frequently sufficed to halt injustices, often in places distant from where the majority of participants live. Nor are these websites the only ones. Just in Britain alone, 38degrees.org (which, by August 2013, had 1.7 million supporters) amassed 500,000 signatures in 2011/2 in opposition to the privatisation of national woodlands, and (as one of a chain of successes) brought about a reversal of government policy thereby, while supporters of Greenpeace successfully lobbied the European Parliament, which, in February 2013, voted overwhelmingly in favour of fisheries reforms, including a ban on 'discards', the practice of throwing dead fish back into the sea to meet fishing quotas. (Roger Harrabin, the BBC environmental analyst, described this vote as a 'victory for citizen power'.) In ways such as these, the Internet has made it possible for individuals to adopt the role of global citizens and to exercise an influence previously undreamed of, and, at the same time, to re-enliven democracy through powerful and effective citizen participation.

Campaigning NGOs cannot be assumed to be flawless, sometimes oppose each other, and are sometimes open to significant criticism, as over the failure of the feminist lobby at the Cairo Population Conference to stress the structural requirements of development (see Chapter 7). But more often they work together, as in the Real World Alliance in Britain;[33] and they probably represent the best hope of kindling willing compliance with what the Commission on Global Governance sensibly claims to be vital to good global governance, a global civic ethic.[34] Rights and responsibilities are proposed by the Commission in this connection for all members of humanity. The details of its (rather anthropocentric) lists cannot be debated here, but it is significant that the responsibilities include 'consideration of the impact of . . . actions on the security and welfare of others' and 'protection of the interests of future generations by pursuing sustainable development and safeguarding the global commons'.[35] The Commission rightly applies this ethic not only to governments and NGOs, but also to transnationals, academia and the mass media.[36] International civil society (and the global citizens who comprise it) has, I suggest, a substantial capacity to affect the degree to which power is wielded ethically in all these bodies.

The Commission includes in its list of human rights a right of equal access to the global commons,[37] recognition of which (as was seen in

Chapter 5) could have radical implications for carbon emissions regimes. As Tim Hayward relates, recent European constitutions have included declarations of citizens' environmental rights, and as he argues, the further spread of this practice when constitutions are drafted and ratified could well make the pursuit of sustainable policies harder to destabilise, and thus itself more sustainable.[38] (The 2009 constitution of Bolivia, as updated in 2011, supplies a fine example: see: http://pdba.georgetown.edu/Constitutions/Bolivia/bolivia09.html.) This is one among many instruments usable to enhance the prospects of a sustainable world society, committed to a strong global ethic, and also a sustainable world.

Meanwhile the widespread adoption of a global ethic along the lines commended by the Commission, or along the general lines of the global ethic of Hans Küng and Karl-Josef Kuschel (see Chapter 1), preferably in a version with a biocentric and consequentialist basis such as that advocated in this book, could help to solve the problem of motivation, that is, the widespread reluctance of individuals and communities to accept self-restraint or, in some cases, to welcome (or at least tolerate) change for the sake of the planetary environment, of future generations or of the common good. For the adoption of such an ethic, whether or not associated with a matching metaphysic (see below), can confer the kind of self-transcendence and sense of meaningfulness noted in Chapter 4 (above) as a widespread psychological need; once such an ethic is shared among fellow members of a society, or of a campaigning group, it can also (as mentioned there) become psychologically self-reinforcing.[39] The sharing of an ethic of environmental concern is important for sustainability, at least at a local level; communities willing to take responsibility for their shared environment are also much more likely to care about the global environment than others, even if parochial or local concern is not the only route to commitment at the global level. However, the sharing of a global ethic that crosses spatial and temporal boundaries is no less important, together with attitudes or motivations such as identification with fellow-people or fellow-creatures, a sense of awe or humility before nature or creation, or a sense of global justice. This ethic also needs to be institutionalised in networks and systems of co-operation, such as the United Nations family of organisations, without which it could be rendered fruitless. But this is not the place for further discussion of political systems for environmental decision-making. Systems are in any case inert without ethical values, and without attitudes such as love of what is valuable.

But a recent comment from Susan George deserves to be added

here. Different sections of civil society, and even of campaigning NGOs, often fail to encounter one another, and thus to support one anothers' efforts. George's example concerns her own erstwhile ignorance, as an active participant in environmental and social justice groups, of the peace movement and its numerous campaigns and groups, until several years ago she came across hundreds of them at a gathering in Holland.[40] Her own chapter on how environmental disputes (for example, about water) can lead to conflict, and how military budgets impede solutions to environmental issues, shows how these diverse campaigns intersect and need one another.[41] Her message is that the environmental, social justice and peace movements share a common struggle, and need to work together if they are to have any chance to win it.[42]

FURTHER GENERAL CONCLUSIONS

Many of the conclusions adopted in the preceding chapters (and some of those of earlier sections of this chapter) could be adopted on either a realist basis or a communitarian basis. Consider first some possible realist grounds for accepting national quotas for carbon emissions. This acceptance could be a matter of enlightened self-interest, if enough people were prepared to vote for it to make supporting it politically popular, or if there were profits to be made for local industry from an early switch to energy-efficient technology, which quotas would make more profitable. Or there could be allies to be made and business deals to be secured through early support of bodies like the Association of Small Island States if Southern states with larger markets were thought likely to champion its cause. (But note how most of these grounds depend on others recognising the intrinsic merits of the case for carbon-emission quotas, as opposed to contingent advantages.) Similarly realists could endorse biodiversity conservation, whether on grounds of votes or business or alliances. However, they could just as easily reject environmental principles and policies on the same grounds, if votes or business or alliances so indicated. Thus a better foundation for global sustainability and global justice is needed. However, the very flexibility of egoistic reasoning to the values of its social environment underwrites the importance of proponents of less shallow kinds of ethic spreading their values as vigorously as possible. For egoists are always likely to be on hand, adapting their direction to the way the wind is blowing.

Communitarianism too can endorse (for example) principles of intergenerational equity, as de-Shalit has ingeniously shown, as long

as this endorsement expresses a community's current values.[43] Such endorsement could readily be extended to support for Third World development, population policies, and other policies commended here, and is to be welcomed. But, as Dower has observed, such endorsements are entirely contingent on community values being and remaining more or less what they are; in the absence of these valuations, the related obligations would not only forfeit recognition, but would become groundless, or, from the communitarian perspective, non-existent.[44] If, as I have been maintaining and as most people believe, agents' obligations remain in place even when the values held by those agents cease to affirm them, then communitarian theories of their grounds and status are inadequate. As was argued in Chapter 8 with relation to preservation, communitarian arguments, despite their local or temporary resonance, are no substitute for arguments of a more pervasive and perennial, cosmopolitan kind. (These considerations could also be harnessed to an argument for meta-ethical objectivism, which, however, falls beyond the scope of this book; I have presented such an argument elsewhere.)[45]

Among kinds of normative ethics, only cosmopolitanism does justice to the objective importance of all agents heeding ethical reasons, insofar as they have scope for choice and control over their actions, and working towards a just and sustainable world society. The universal values that it upholds include many of the values in which communities and nations take pride (in Britain, values such as freedom, tolerance and fair play), for these are implicitly universal and cosmopolitan values, for which communitarians can claim no monopoly. And among cosmopolitan approaches, as I have argued at several points above, only consequentialist theories take future needs (including the needs of our possible successors) adequately into account, at the same time as those of contemporaries. (Consequentialism based on needs should be carefully distinguished here from utilitarianism, a quite different form of consequentialism based either on happiness or on well-being defined in terms of preferences.) And only biocentric theories do this in a manner which transcends human interests, taking account of the importance of biotic systems, but doing so without prioritising these systems over the valuable creatures which they sustain.

As Dower has pointed out, we should avoid the anthropocentric view that the resources of the planet are the common heritage of humankind alone.[46] But humanity has a related inheritance, in the form of trusteeship of the biosphere; this view was at least argued in Chapter 3 to be a coherent one, whether on a theistic basis or a secular

one. Strictly this is a metaphysical view, which transcends ethics, both in its religious versions and in its secular version (for which current agents are answerable for the care of the planet to the intergenerational community of humanity). Nevertheless it readily coheres with the consequentialist ethic of global, interspecies and intergenerational equity (see Chapters 2 and 10), and with the principles of the intervening chapters, of securing the future of the human enterprise, conserving renewable resources, husbanding non-renewable resources, pursuing sustainable development, alleviating poverty, avoiding overpopulation, preserving biodiversity and promoting global justice. At the same time, by expressing the relation of humanity to the planetary biosphere, it can inspire commitment to the kind of ethic just described, and in this way supplement the reasons for action internal to that ethic.

For readers unconvinced of the metaphysic of stewardship, all the ethical reasons for the kind of global citizenship that I have been defending remain available undiminished, for the intrinsic value which is pivotal to a consequentialist ethic consists precisely in the existence of non-derivative interpersonal reasons for promoting or preserving whatever bears this value. But for those dissatisfied until offered an ampler self-understanding, or the possibility of lives of participation in a larger scene, in which humanity is related to nature and to the shared but vulnerable natural environment[47] of the planet, I commend the metaphysic (whether in theistic or secular form)[48] in which human beings are global stewards as well as global citizens, and the planetary biosphere is a trust.

NOTES

1. Robin Attfield, *Value, Obligation and Meta-Ethics,* pp. 115–19.
2. Paul Gomberg, 'Self and Others in Bentham and Sidgwick', *History of Philosophy Quarterly*, 3, 1986, 437–48. See also Attfield, *Value, Obligation and Meta-Ethics*, pp. 186–9.
3. Gary E. Varner, *Personhood, Ethics, and Animal Cognition: Situating Animals in Hare's Two-Level Utilitarianism*, Oxford and New York: Oxford University Press, 2012, p. 270.
4. John S. Dryzek, *Rational Ecology: Environment and Political Economy*, p. 187.
5. Ibid., p. 207.
6. Ibid., p. 187.
7. Ibid., p. 207.
8. Dryzek, *Rational Ecology,* p. 202. See also Jürgen Habermas, *Legit-*

imation Crisis, pp. xvii–xviii, where his translator, Thomas McCarthy, expounds Habermas's original use of this phrase. For a clear-headed and comprehensive overview of Habermas's philosophy, see Andrew Edgar, *The Philosophy of Habermas*, Chesham: Acumen, 2005.

9. Dryzek, *Rational Ecology*, pp. 206–7.
10. John S. Dryzek, 'Green Reason: Communicative Ethics for the Biosphere', in Lori Gruen and Dale Jamieson (eds), *Reflecting on Nature: Readings in Environmental Philosophy*, 159–74, p. 167.
11. Robyn Eckersley, *Environmentalism and Political Theory: Towards an Ecocentric Approach*, pp. 106–16.
12. Michael Jacobs, *The Politics of the Real World*, p. 26.
13. Robin Attfield and Barry Wilkins, 'Sustainability', *Environmental Values*, 3.2, 1994, 155–8.
14. Proposals along these lines have also been put forward in Edith Brown Weiss, *In Fairness to Future Generations: International Property Law, Common Patrimony and Intergenerational Equity.*
15. See Paul Vallely and Ian Linden, 'Doing Battle with Globalisation', 1, 'Are We Masters or Servants?', *The Tablet*, 9 August 1997, 1004–5.
16. Richard Falk, 'The Making of Global Citizenship', in Bart van Steenbergen (ed.), *The Condition of Citizenship*, 127–40, pp. 132–4.
17. Janna Thompson, 'Toward a Green World Order: Environment and World Politics' (unpublished), p. 6.
18. Falk, 'The Making of Global Citizenship', p. 134.
19. Martha Nussbaum, 'Patriotism and Cosmopolitanism', *Boston Review*, XIX.5, October/November 1994, 2–4, p. 3; also 'Asking the Right Questions: Martha Nussbaum Responds', *Boston Review*, XIX.5, October/November 1994, 33–4, p. 34.
20. Immanuel Kant, 'Perpetual Peace: A Philosophical Sketch', in Hans Reiss (ed.), *Kant: Political Writings*, 93–130.
21. Falk, 'The Making of Global Citizenship', pp. 135–6.
22. Ibid, pp. 136–8.
23. Ibid, pp. 138–9.
24. Michael Grubb and Dean Anderson (eds), *The Emerging International Regime for Climate Change: Structures and Options after Berlin.*
25. Michael Walzer, 'Introduction', in Walzer (ed.), *Toward a Global Civil Society*, 1–4, p. 1.
26. John O'Neill, *Ecology, Policy and Politics*, 1993, p. 177.
27. Barry Wilkins, 'Civil Society', in Michael Payne (ed.), *A Dictionary of Cultural and Critical Theory*, 102–3.
28. O'Neill, *Ecology, Policy and Politics*, pp. 177–8.
29. Michael Walzer, 'The Civil Society Argument', in Ronald Beiner (ed.), *Theorizing Citizenship*, 153–74, p. 170.
30. Ian Sinclair, *The March that Shook Blair: An Oral History of 15 February 2003*, London: Peace News Press, 2013.
31. David A. Crocker, *Transitional Justice and International Civil Society* (Working Paper no. 13), p. 39.

32. Thompson, 'Toward a Green World Order', p. 10.
33. See Jacobs, *The Politics of the Real World*, written for the Real World Coalition.
34. Commission on Global Governance, *Our Global Neighbourhood*, p. 335.
35. Ibid., p. 337.
36. Ibid., p. 335.
37. Ibid., p. 336.
38. Tim Hayward, 'Constitutional Environmental Rights and Liberal Democracy', unpublished paper presented at European Consortium for Political Research, University of Warwick, 1998.
39. See Nigel Dower, *World Ethics: The New Agenda*, ch. 6.
40. Susan George, *Whose Crisis, Whose Future?*, Cambridge, UK and Malden, MA: Polity Press, 2010, p. 193.
41. George, 'The Wall of Conflict', *Whose Crisis*, pp. 161–93.
42. Ibid., p. 193.
43. Avner de-Shalit, *Why Posterity Matters: Environmental Policies and Future Generations.*
44. Dower, *World Ethics,* ch. 10.
45. Attfield, *Value, Obligation and Meta-Ethics,* chs 12–14; Robin Attfield, *Ethics: An Overview*, London and New York: Continuum/Bloomsbury, 2012, ch. 5.
46. Dower, *World Ethics,* ch. 10.
47. For an elucidation of the concepts of nature and natural environment, see Chapter 1.
48. See Chapter 3.