

# ***“Pathways to Environmental Security”***

**Chairman’s Summary<sup>1</sup> of the Proceedings of  
The Hague Conference on Environment, Security and Sustainable Development  
9-12 May, 2004**

**Tom Spencer, Chairman  
Johannah Bernstein, Rapporteur**

••••

**1 June 2004**



## **Conference Secretariat**

Institute for Environmental Security  
Anna Paulownastraat 103  
2518 BC The Hague  
The Netherlands

Tel: +31 70 365 1074 / 365 2299

Fax: +31 70 365 1306 / 365 1948

Eml: [conference@envirosecurity.org](mailto:conference@envirosecurity.org)

Url: [www.envirosecurity.net/conference](http://www.envirosecurity.net/conference)

---

<sup>1</sup> This summary is presented by the Conference Chairman based on informal consultations with plenary and roundtable session moderators and rapporteurs. A full conference report will be prepared separately.

The views expressed are not necessarily those of all participants, their organizations, the Institute for Environmental Security, the co-organizers, or the sponsors of the conference.

## ***“Pathways to Environmental Security”***

### **Chairman’s Summary of the Proceedings of The Hague Conference on Environment, Security and Sustainable Development 9-12 May 2004**

#### **TABLE OF CONTENTS**

I. Introduction	2
II. Thematic Conclusions & Recommendations	3
A. Diplomacy Theme	3
B. Law and Governance Theme	5
C. Finance Theme	8
D. Education Theme	9
E. Science Theme	10
III. Actor-Specific Recommendations	10
A. EU Institutions and Member States	10
B. United States Congress and Administration	11
C. United Nations System	12
IV. General Recommendations on the Environment and Security Challenge	12
ANNEXES	
List of Participants	14
Conference Organising Committee	21
Sponsors	22

### **I. INTRODUCTION**

The political salience of the debate on environment and security has fluctuated since its inception in the 1970s, but has been brought into relevance by the changed security situation since 2001.

There has been an impressive range of academic studies in this area. Nevertheless, the issue has not been sufficiently seriously addressed by military and geo-political strategists, or, in many cases, by the environment and development communities.

The environmental security issue is a multi-disciplinary undertaking requiring both strategic vision and tactical collaboration between ministries, governments, academia, business and civil society. To that end, it is recognised that efforts are needed to define with more precision the nature of the environmental security challenge.

There is a need to renew interest in environmental security and make every effort to put the debate on a firm footing that will lead to practical steps to mainstream the issue in the policies and practices of governments, international organisations, civil society, the private sector and other actors.

The Conference Chairman submits the following conclusions and recommendations as a contribution to the public debate.

## II. THEMATIC CONCLUSIONS & RECOMMENDATIONS

### A. DIPLOMACY THEME

#### General Conclusions

Despite the pervasive threat of international terrorism and the terrifying prospect of regional nuclear wars in the 21<sup>st</sup> century, the reality is that security in this new millennium is not just about protection from external aggression, but also from other threats such as disease, poverty and social exclusion, dispossession, economic shocks, failed states, environmental degradation and resource scarcity.

In his keynote address, Pieter van Geel, State Secretary for Housing, Spatial Planning and the Environment, The Netherlands, highlighted the importance of linking environmental policy to security. He noted the significant humanitarian consequences of serious ecological problems, most notably, climate change and the far-reaching impacts of failure to deal with that challenge. He also asserted the importance of addressing the nature and scope of institutional reform that will be needed to solve the emerging global survival challenges. Mr. van Geel pointed out that current UN reform processes have not adequately addressed the environmental security challenge. While the international community may not be ready for a UN Environmental Security Council, he did maintain that fundamental changes within the UN system were essential. To that end, he suggested that working towards environmental security could form a “bridge between the two extremes of the UN’s objectives, namely education and poverty reduction, and Security Council issues.”

The issue of the inadequacy of peace and security institutions was also a point taken up in the opening remarks of Professor John McNeill of the Walsh School of Foreign Service at Georgetown University. He asserted that conventional approaches to security based on national sovereignty cannot adequately deal with transboundary conflicts related to the exploitation of natural resources, migration, terrorism, disease or crime. Quite to the contrary, the current system of international relations perversely encourages the “survival of the dirtiest”. Mr. McNeill referred to the concept of “security anxiety”, which has driven states to devote disproportionate levels of resources towards the prevention of war, through deterrence, and towards preparation for war, which in many cases generates greater impacts than the actual conflicts themselves.

On the role of the EU, State Secretary van Geel recommended that just as the United States introduced the Marshall Plan to assist the financing of Europe’s reconstruction after WW II, the EU should be called upon to assist with the environmental reconstruction of its new member states. And in a message from Environment Commissioner Margot Wallström, delivered by Margaret Brusasco-McKenzie, reference was made to the December 2003 European Security Strategy, which refers to security as precondition for development. The EU’s Security Strategy also notes that competition for natural resources, which will undoubtedly be aggravated by global warming, is likely to create further turbulence and migratory movements. Ms. Wallström’s message further expressed the EU’s commitment to further “reflect together on how to ensure an even more integrated approach to environment, security and sustainable development in the enlarged EU and in all our policies worldwide.”

While discussion focused on the important links between resource scarcity and security, it was also felt that the wide range of causal factors of resource-related conflicts must be better addressed by the international community. These include for example, the erosion of natural resource-based livelihoods, lack of incentives for sustainable development, excessive resource dependence, corruption, proliferation of small arms and light weapons, lack of economic opportunities, the accelerated population shift from rural to urban areas and the related dispossessed young men who become the ready recruits of militias and terrorism in newly expanded urban centres, and as well, the manipulation of perceptions of injustice by “conflict entrepreneurs” in order to seize power and resources.

## Recommendations

1. Mainstream environmental security thinking into the military, defence and security debates. Develop a shared analysis of environmental threats both as geo-political problems and stresses undermining the livelihoods of local communities. Require the environment, development, foreign policy, disaster and security policy communities to interact and cooperate to ensure that the environmental security debate is more effectively elevated on the political agenda and in operational practice.
2. Ground conflict resolution in the concept of preventive environmental diplomacy and effective and participatory governance of natural resources. Harness “indigenous institutions” for conflict management and engage and integrate local expertise in research as well as project design and implementation. Develop good practice guidelines for engaging with local communities.
3. Ensure that security be perceived not just as the absence of threats but the presence and indeed protection of sustainable livelihoods. Address environmental security concerns based on sound early-warning mechanisms. Establish an Environmental Security Plan, modelled on the Marshall Plan, to generate rural livelihoods in the restoration of the environment and thus reduce the risk of conflict.
4. Governments should promote participatory forms of environmental security decision-making and should ensure that a public “space” is created where the debate and dialogue on environment and security can be sustained. This should include participation as envisaged by Principle 10 of the Rio Declaration on Environment and Development and the Aarhus Convention.
5. Address the negative impacts of globalisation and trade liberalisation in the context of the environmental security agenda, with particular reference to the elimination of agricultural and other perverse subsidies.
6. Submit trade agreements to robust Sustainability Impact Assessments (SIAs) to assess how unfair terms of trade may exacerbate security threats.
7. Build on the positive examples of collective environmental peace-building around shared water resources. Ensure that technical cooperation is understood as a basis for peace-building. Donor agencies must address environmental security concerns in a broad and comprehensive manner.
8. Consider the possible use of the Clean Development Mechanism as a mechanism for linking financial transfer, environmental restoration and the generation of sustainable livelihoods.
9. Ensure increased interaction between the scientific community in order to catalyse a dialogue that fosters multidisciplinary research on the linkages between environment and security.
10. Increase attention to the special needs of women in the context of environmental conflict and address the causal factors that have led to the growing oppression of women.

## **B. LAW AND GOVERNANCE THEME**

### **General Conclusions**

UN Secretary-General Kofi Annan asserts that global governance reforms are needed to ensure the transition from an “international to a global world”. Global governance must accordingly be grounded in a robust, multilateral international legal order. At the same time, good governance is needed to ensure respect for the rule of law and ultimately, implementation of international environmental legal agreements. In that same vein, the Secretary-General of the Permanent Court of Arbitration, Tjaco van den Hout, noted at this conference that collective security requires the collective respect by all Member States for the legal instruments that underpin the international system.

Conference participants unanimously confirmed that humanity faces serious global environmental challenges. A large majority felt that current international institutions are inadequate for the task and confirmed the need for a new approach to global environmental governance. Environmental security concerns demand urgent and swift action beyond conventional measures. Incremental change to existing institutions and human behavioural patterns will not reverse negative environmental trends. In addition to mobilising all possible measures to halt the deterioration of global public goods and life support systems, a fundamentally new mindset must be catalysed along with a common vision for the relationship of humanity to the greater community of life. In this regard, only a multi-scale and multi-dimensional global environmental governance structure can adequately respond to the new global survival challenges. One proposal features the establishment of an information clearing-house, a global environmental “campus” and a series of implementation mechanisms.

On a related point, it is important to elaborate the corpus of international law that governs environmental security disputes. International courts and tribunals often rule that many political disputes involving environmental security concerns are indeed non-justiciable. Moreover, the International Court of Justice has noted that only those disputes “capable of being settled by the application of principles and rules of international law” are justiciable.

Entry into force of and implementation of the existing multilateral environmental agreements (MEAs) is one of the greatest challenges to ensuring respect for the rule of law, and ultimately, the achievement of important substantive goals enshrined in these instruments. To this end, it is important to consider the respective difficulties mobilising political will and the other challenges faced by developing and developed countries in honouring their international sustainable development commitments.

Most, if not all international legal remedies are reserved for States. Consequently, NGOs and individuals that have suffered environmental damages generally have no effective forum for enforcement of their human rights to a clean and healthy environment. Thus, increasing access to justice is a particularly important challenge to environmental security.

Reconciling the desire of developing countries to participate in protection and preservation of the environment through international environmental agreements, and their ability to do so is another important challenge for the advancement of environmental security. To this end, the international community must develop more effective mechanisms for the prevention and resolution of environmental disputes before they become actual conflicts.

## Recommendations

1. The incentive structure within environmental governance must be improved to ensure that political will is more effectively generated. For example, efforts are needed to improve communication between governments and the relevant international bodies.
2. Consider the practicality of an “honest broker” institution to strengthen priority-setting processes that can generate specific targets and timetables. These in turn will facilitate the matching of the scope and degree of problems and priorities with the relevant actors and necessary level of resources.
3. Facilitate the development of a stronger sense of mutual interest in global and regional public goods through continuous interaction and communication, focused attention to concrete goals and the clear articulation of priorities.
4. A stronger international environmental organisation is critical to ensure effective global environmental governance. The role of UNEP as the environmental centrepiece in the UN system is critical. Further work is needed to assess and maximise the role and functioning of UNEP in terms of its mandate, financing, normative and operational activities. Consideration should also be given to mandating UNEP with a stronger role in the prevention of conflicts over environmental problems. As well, it is critical to examine the role of other bodies within the global governance system and their mandate in the environmental security arena.
5. Establish an information clearing-house to perform the critical functions of data collection, verification and comparison and to assess global environmental security trends and risks.
6. Enhance the training of the judiciary of developed and developing countries. Legal and judicial capacity building in developing countries requires innovative approaches and partnerships, given the limited financial and human resources available. The UNEP Global Judges Programme and UNDP’s Partnership Project with the American Bar Association serve as two important models.
7. Promote awareness building of the potential for access to justice to all affected actors, States and non-States alike, through international legal instruments such as the Aarhus Convention and the Espoo Convention. Ensure that domestic courts are made more accessible to individuals affected by environmental harm.
8. Strengthen public access, including access to information and participation in decision making, as well as access to justice as key elements to strengthening the role of international law in advancing environmental security.
9. Examine the potential role of the Permanent Court of Arbitration in The Hague in providing conflict de-escalating and confidence building dispute resolution services including fact-finding, conciliation, and arbitration to States and non-States alike.
10. Examine new corporate responsibility and accountability mechanisms as well as dispute resolution schemes such as arbitration that levels the playing field. Develop new environmental liability regimes taking into account the UNECE Civil Liability Protocol.
11. Focus on the development of preventive instruments for addressing disputes that arise before harm has occurred. Preventive approaches including negotiation, education, capacity building, etc. should be combined with judicial instruments. Compliance procedures can play a major role in ensuring that international legal instruments more effectively promote environmental security.

12. Enhance the capacity of MEAs to timely address environmental degradation and thus prevent environmental insecurity causing social tensions and (potential) conflicts.
13. Create a “campus” in The Hague for international environmental negotiations, including the Conferences to the Parties to Multilateral Environment Agreements so as to improve communication between governments and other actors, allow for issue linkage, bargaining and better policy coordination.
14. Develop improved financing and technology transfer mechanisms as well as flexible and sophisticated monitoring mechanisms to ensure continuous evaluation of achievements and challenges as well as reassessment of goals and objectives.
15. The Institute for Environmental Security, benefiting from its base in The Hague, is encouraged to actively promote the application of international environmental law and assist stakeholders in ecological risk situations with access to the body of such law.

## **C. FINANCE THEME**

### **General Conclusions**

The realisation of environmental security goals must be understood in the context of ongoing challenges in the mobilisation of the necessary levels of funding to ensure the realisation of sustainable development goals. There is a serious under investment in alternative energy solutions and in eco-system maintenance and restoration. This eco-investment gap exceeds \$100 billion a year. In this light, efforts are needed to reverse declining ODA flows, accelerate and improve debt relief efforts, strengthen the international financial architecture and ensure that foreign direct investment flows take into account environment and security imperatives. In line with the Monterey process, new and innovative financial mechanisms are needed to provide additional resources for sustainable development.

Efforts are needed to set the political framework to drive economies towards increased resource efficiency. Economic analysis and insurance statistics show an accelerating and unsustainable trend in terms of natural resource use. Markets offer an important financial solution to complex situations. They condense the plethora of information into prices and so enable the efficient allocation of resources. However, at present they are not working for environmental security problems, even when the solution is obvious, as in the case of renewable energy and climate change. This is particularly surprising since renewable energy sources provide many other “security” benefits beyond contributing to the stabilisation of climate, for example, employment, short supply lines, and technology transfer.

The macro-economic reasons for the inability of markets to deliver on environmental security goals are diverse. These include: the difficulty of valuing environmental benefits; the delays in internalising these values and to compare the global economic loss of these services with the benefits of conserving them; the impact of perverse subsidies; and the lack of information on environmental performance.

In addition, there are numerous barriers within the finance sector. Often there is no internal nucleus within financial institutions to take up the cause of renewables. The incentive system (and even performance measures) are short-term. Financial companies are still reeling from the stock market collapse, which has reduced the capital available for investment in the renewables sector.

Nevertheless, a number of new tools have been developed to address these problems. Prediction markets - also called idea or information markets - show promise in dealing with highly uncertain situations (i.e. the entry into force of the Kyoto Protocol) or new markets (i.e. carbon market). Other tools include “eco-insurance”, which would generate funds for eco-

investment in proportion to risk, ability to pay, and ecological impact. Moreover, comprehensive natural accounts such as the ecological footprint assist in the tracking of the ecological performance of key actors such as governments or the private sector. This informs investment decisions and enhances the ability to manage them in a way that serves the needs of humanity and the natural environment. Governments can institute such accounts parallel to GDP to strengthen their ability to manage their ecological assets and minimize ecological risks to the economy. Natural accounts can also support analysis of potential conflicts and help set performance targets.

### **Recommendations**

1. Reflect the value of ecosystem services in economic activities through taxes, incentives, standards and the removal of perverse subsidies.
2. Promote, through regulatory bodies and the private sector, the monetisation of environmental security and the reporting of environmental performance.
3. Strengthen the place of environmental management in corporate governance and shift measurement and remuneration systems towards long term goals.
4. Governments must set through national budget processes a wide array of meaningful targets for investment in environmental issues.
5. Fully implement existing commitments (including the Kyoto Protocol) and introduce policies and measures that reflect financing horizons and minimise policy risk.
6. Ensure the shift away from the dependence on fossil fuels and accelerate the use of renewable energy sources.
7. Track the ecological performance of state and non-state actors through the development of comprehensive natural capital accounts, such as the ecological footprint.
8. Use comprehensive natural accounts to translate the ecological bottom-line condition for sustainability into specific measures by addressing key questions such as how much of the planet's bio-capacity should be preserved, by when should that bio-capacity target be achieved, and what investment levels are necessary to achieve that target?
9. Explore the development of legislative, regulatory and voluntary mechanisms that encourage greater disclosure by financial institutions of direct and indirect impacts of cross-border portfolio activities in conflict-prone zones. Develop conflict indicators and conflict assessment tools for the financial services sector.
10. Set market incentives for publicly-traded firms that require disclosure of environmental risks and liability.
11. Enhance efforts to develop conflict assessment tools for the financial services sector by using indices of risk and natural capital accounts.
12. Consider the introduction of financial mechanisms such as eco-insurance, facilitated by complementary fiscal and economic incentives, which has the potential to mobilise necessary investment capital for strategic investment in community-based sustainability programmes.
13. Support UNEP-IISD efforts to convene an international expert group of financial institutions, regulators and civil society representatives to further explore the role of financial services in supporting investment in stability.

## **D. EDUCATION THEME**

### **General Conclusions**

The present environmental and security crises raise a number of fundamental questions about the role that educational systems should play. Both informal and formal systems of education must produce a new generation who are capable of dealing more effectively with the new generation of global challenges. Education must promote creative problem-solving and must enhance awareness and engagement in environmental security and sustainable development issues.

As regards the need to enhance public awareness, campaigns should be developed to raise civil society awareness of environment, security and sustainable development issues. These should be community-based and culturally appropriate. The expertise of local users of resources should be recognised and drawn on to inspire and enrich informal educational approaches regarding environment, security and sustainable development issues. It is important to target collaboration with artists, the media, filmmakers, writers, computer game developers and board game makers to inspire the creation of new mechanisms for sensitising society to environmental security and sustainable development concerns.

### **Recommendations**

1. Support the United Nations Decade for Education for Sustainable Development as an important opportunity to deepen understanding and awareness about environmental pressures and the need to integrate security concerns. Identify the specific actions needed to strengthen education for environmental security addressing both the needs in the formal and informal sectors.
2. Establish an environmental security network to input to the Decade for Education for Sustainable Development. Create a database of organisations who are engaged in education initiatives that focus on environment, security and sustainable development and map out the relevant initiatives. Distance education institutions should collaborate and coordinate to establish a worldwide distance education infrastructure to promote environmental security.
3. Promote the Earth Charter as an important tool for promoting the Decade for Education for Sustainable Development.
4. Ensure the overall improvement in the quality of leadership at all levels and in all spheres. Undertake case studies to examine what constitutes effective leadership in the sustainability and environmental security domains. Consider how best to strengthen, catalyse and improve the quality of leadership in the promotion of environmental security.
5. Develop a thematic stream on “Learning for Environmental Security and Sustainability” for the Distance Education conference that will take place on October 21-23, 2004 under the auspices of the Dutch EU Presidency.
6. Develop vocational training approaches to build environmental knowledge capital as important components of life-long learning.
7. Encourage the media to provide more and better coverage of environmental security issues as an important mechanism for raising public awareness and engagement.

## **E. SCIENCE THEME**

### **General Conclusions**

The scientific study of ecological systems has advanced considerably in the last thirty years. However, there remain considerable knowledge gaps in humanity's understanding of the natural world, let alone the link between resource scarcity and degradation and conflict. The open exchange and wide application of new knowledge is essential to the achievement of environmental security. Of particular importance is the need for independent scientific research on the key drivers of environmental conflict.

### **Recommendations**

1. Promote scientific research and development on environmental security problems in all countries, especially the developing countries. Address the potential impacts on human well-being of ecosystem change and consider the current vulnerability of populations affected and their potential adaptive capacities.
2. Strengthen endogenous capacity-building for environmental security through exchanges of scientific and technological knowledge and enhance the development, adaptation, diffusion and transfer of new and innovative technologies.
3. Promote the preservation and dissemination of indigenous knowledge especially as regards linkages between environment and security.
4. Make better use of available data from space and remote sensing technologies. Ensure that remote sensing is used to facilitate environmental security and especially for the development of operational monitoring of potential conflict zones. Promote the use of remote sensing data together with socio-economic and political data layers and ensure their access on the internet to promote transparency.
5. Mobilise increased funds to facilitate the access of important data that is within the public domain. To this end, develop special agreements between the suppliers and users of data where data can be acquired free of charge or at minimal costs.

## **III. ACTOR-SPECIFIC RECOMMENDATIONS**

*While the conference endorsed the 'Horizon 21' integrated approach to the five themes outlined above and involving action by all stakeholders and all countries, it was felt useful at this stage of the debate to make certain specific recommendations to the EU, USA and the UN System.*

### **A. THE EU INSTITUTIONS AND MEMBER STATES**

1. Urgently address the environmental security aspects of EU enlargement and assess the environmental security situation in the European Union's "new neighbours".
2. Close the credibility gap between the EU's rhetorical leadership on sustainable development and actual implementation.
3. Strengthen the work of the Green Diplomacy Network and add a specific environment and security aspect to its work.
4. Promote linkages between EU Security and External Dimension Strategies. Efforts should be directed towards integrating the EU Security Strategy (A Secure Europe in a Better World) with the EU External Dimensions Strategy (Global Partnership for

Sustainable Development) in combination with the review of the EU Sustainable Development Strategy.

5. Integrate the security dimension in the EU Water and Energy Initiatives. The EU's two WSSD partnership initiatives on water and on energy should better reflect the environmental security dimensions.
6. Promote the EU's successful river basin approach to other environmental challenges.
7. Consolidate EU legislation on conflict diamonds and explore its application to other examples of the trade and conflict nexus.
8. Use the adoption of the European Constitution, with its new initiatives on issues of foreign and security policy, to take advantage of this unique opportunity to mainstream the concepts of environmental security in European strategic thinking.
9. Invite the sixth European Parliament, elected in June 2004, to make the relationship between environment and security issues a central theme of its work in the period 2004-2009.
10. The Member States of the European Union should seize opportunities for working through established institutions to introduce environmental security into the water, energy and trade subsidies discussions and should seek to build ad hoc coalitions in the WTO, World Bank, etc. using the opportunity presented by the G8 and recognizing that, while international treaties are desirable, joint programmes of joint action with the United States and other developed countries may be easier to achieve in the immediate future.

## **B. THE UNITED STATES CONGRESS AND ADMINISTRATION**

1. Promote pragmatic collaboration with European nations and other G8 partners.
2. Promote military-to-military exchange on environment and security issues with an initial concentration on dealing with post-Soviet toxic sites and intensifying actions under the Nunn-Lugar CTR programme
3. Ensure that the next US National Security Strategy focuses on the environmental security aspects of failed and failing states and significantly increase and further strengthen US AID programmes that reflect this priority.
4. Intensify US involvement in transboundary water issues in the context of the World Bank and the United Nations, etc.
5. Give further attention to the environmental security aspects of US policies on transparency, governance and anti-corruption measures.
6. Ensure that US commitments to the Millennium Development Goals (MDGs) and the work of the Millennium Challenge Corporation are fully funded and directed towards those states that face the most urgent environmental security problems and explore the potential for collaboration with the European Union in this context.
7. Recognise that environmental security is a global imperative with direct impact on the interests of the United States. In the words of Colin Powell, "*Sustainable development is a compelling moral and humanitarian issue, but it is also a security imperative. Poverty, environmental degradation and despair are destroyers of people, of societies, of nations. This unholy trinity can destabilise countries, even entire regions.*"

8. Encourage the further development of public-private partnerships and the application of US business expertise in the service of environmental security issues.
9. Fund further research on the national security implications of global warming as examined by the recent Pentagon-commissioned report.
10. Encourage jurisdiction of US courts under the Alien Tort Claims Act for international environmental and human rights abuses occurring outside the United States.

### **C. THE UNITED NATIONS SYSTEM**

1. The incentive structure within environmental governance must be improved to ensure that political will is more effectively generated. For example, efforts are needed to improve communication between governments and the relevant international bodies.
2. A stronger international environmental organisation is critical to ensure effective global environmental governance. The role of UNEP as the environmental centrepiece in the UN system is critical. Further work is needed to assess and maximise the role and functioning of UNEP in terms of its mandate, financing, normative and operational activities. Consideration should also be given to mandating UNEP with a stronger role in the prevention of conflicts over environmental problems.
3. Promote conflict-sensitivity in the work of all international organisations and ensure that efforts are directed towards the establishment of environmental security prevention mechanisms and the strengthening of methodologies for environment and security assessment and monitoring. The Peace and Conflict Impact Assessment tool should be more regularly used in UN peace-keeping activities and in the exercise of the responsibilities of the UN Security Council.
4. The UNEP/UNDP/OSCE Environment and Security Initiative is an important model of cooperation that should be emulated.
5. Develop legal instruments open to all actors potentially affected by environmental insecurity, giving such actors recourse to dispute resolution procedures and to seek redress in national or international forums.
6. Develop methodologies for assessing the potential environmental security impacts generated by economic globalisation.
7. Establish a database of NGOs working on environmental security, building on the UN Department of Economic and Social Affairs (DESA) data base on work in the sub-Saharan region.

### **IV. GENERAL RECOMMENDATIONS ON THE ENVIRONMENT AND SECURITY CHALLENGE**

1. Promote a common vision and language to support a new approach to environmental governance at global, regional and national levels.
2. Work toward replacing the overriding culture of violence and conflict with a new culture of peace. Strengthen and democratise institutions of peace and security to better respond to and prevent violence, war and conflict. Develop at all levels and in all spheres of life, a complex of attitudes, values, beliefs and patterns of behaviour that promote the peaceful settlement of conflict and the quest for mutual understanding, and opportunity for

individuals to live harmoniously with each other and the larger community of life.

3. Promote a new form of political leadership in the new millennium. World leaders must recognise that the new path to peace and sustainability into the 21<sup>st</sup> century requires a fundamental change in the culture of conflict and a change in the way humanity relates to the greater community of life. Leaders must have the moral courage to transcend narrow national self-interests and recognise that new global survival problems are only resolvable through multilateral channels in a true spirit of global solidarity.
4. Commit all countries to multilateralism as a necessary pre-condition for the achievement of international environmental security and to enhancing the capacity of the developing world to fully take part in this debate.
5. Recognise the weight of oppression that women have faced in conflict situations throughout history, acknowledge our personal responsibility as equal members of the human family and affirm that the elimination of the modern forms of oppression faced by women involves redressing the factors that dispossess and disorientates young men caught up in the population shift from the land; and, therefore, promote an Environmental Security Plan built around the concept of the "Livelihood Conflicts Approach".
6. Invite the launch of a new NATO Committee on the Challenges of Modern Society (CCMS) study on environment and security linkages in the 21<sup>st</sup> century, recognizing that success in mainstreaming the debate requires the equal involvement of the environment, development, foreign policy and military communities.
7. Recognize that mainstreaming, which Norman Myers refers to as the 'meta-problem of environmental security', requires an intensification of the academic debate, re-doubling efforts to integrate disciplines, broaden the research constituencies, work with researchers from affected countries and study the interactions between stresses and outcomes and to build on the UNEP sponsored meeting at the Woodrow Wilson Institute, held in December 2003, by convening a follow-up in the near future.
8. Recognize the urgent need to assemble a body of work that defines environmental security in different political cultures and different languages which is essential if we are to move from academic thought to political action.
9. Encourage individuals and participating organisations to build upon the results of this conference to devise and implement a follow-up action plan and further resolve to meet again to review progress in The Hague, the global capital of Justice.

-----

**THE HAGUE CONFERENCE ON  
Environment, Security and Sustainable Development**

The Peace Palace, The Hague, The Netherlands

9 - 12 May 2004

**List of Participants**

- Dr Emad ADLY**  
General Coordinator  
*Arab Network for Environment and  
Development  
Egypt*
- Ms Meredith ALEXANDER**  
Head of Campaigns  
*People & Planet  
UK*
- Dr Saleem ALI**  
Assistant Professor  
*Environment and Natural  
Resources  
University of Vermont  
USA*
- Mr Patrick ALLARD**  
Adviser  
*Policy Planning Staff  
Ministry of Foreign Affairs  
France*
- Dr Agni ARVANITIS VLAVIANOS**  
President and Founder  
*Biopolitics International  
Organisation  
Greece*
- Mr John ASHTON**  
CEO  
*E3G: Third Generation  
Environmentalism  
UK*
- Mr Sirodzhiddin ASLOV**  
Chairman  
*Executive Committee  
International Fund for saving the  
Aral Sea  
Tajikistan*
- Mrs Rosalinda BACOSA**  
Project Director  
*Palawan Tropical Forestry  
Protection Programme  
Palawan Council for Sustainable  
Development  
The Philippines*
- Ms Rosario BENTO-PAIS**  
Administrator  
*DG Environment  
European Commission  
Belgium*
- Ms Johannah BERNSTEIN**  
International Environmental  
Lawyer  
*Johannah Bernstein and  
Associates  
Belgium*
- Dr. Deniz BETEN**  
Head of Section T&C  
*PD Division  
NATO  
Belgium*
- Drs Esther BLOM**  
Member  
*Working Group Ecology and  
Development  
The Netherlands*
- Ambassador Ton BOON von  
OCHSSEE**  
Ambassador for Sustainable  
Development  
*Ministry of Foreign Affairs  
The Netherlands*
- Mr Rajeb BOULHAROUF**  
Coordinator  
*External Relations and Public  
Information Unit  
UN Convention to Combat  
Desertification  
Germany*
- Mr Duncan BRACK**  
Associate Fellow  
*Royal Institute of International  
Affairs  
UK*
- PD Dr Hans Guenter BRAUCH**  
Chairman  
*AFES-PRESS  
Germany*

**Mrs Margaret BRUSASCO-MACKENZIE**  
Member  
*Green Globe Network*  
*Belgium*

**Ms Francesca Chantal CAPOSTAGNO**  
Intern  
*Coalition for the International Criminal Court*  
*The Netherlands*

**Mr Alexander CARIUS**  
Managing Director  
*Adelphi Research gGmbH*  
*Germany*

**Mrs Annica CARLSSON**  
OSCE Environmental Officer  
*Office of the Co-ordinator of EEA*  
*OSCE*  
*Austria*

**Mr Paul CLEMENTS-HUNT**  
Head of Unit  
*Finance Initiative*  
*UNEP*  
*Switzerland*

**Mr James COOKE**  
IT & Design Consultant  
*jclTconsulting*  
*UK*

**Dr Fayen D'EVIE**  
Special Assistant to the Rector for Programme Development  
*University for Peace*  
*Costa Rica*

**Dr Geoffrey D. DABELKO**  
Director  
*Environmental Change and Security Project*  
*Woodrow Wilson International Center for Scholars*  
*USA*

**Dr Andreas DALLY**  
Director of Studies  
*Loccum Protestant Academy*  
*Germany*

**Mrs Irene DANKELMAN, M.Sc.**  
Senior Advisor SD  
*Head Sustainable Development*  
*University of Nijmegen and WEDO*  
*The Netherlands*

**Mr Eric DANNENMAIER**  
Director  
*Institute for Environmental Law and Policy*  
*Tulane University*  
*USA*

**Mr Yvo de BOER**  
Director  
*International Environmental Affairs*  
*Ministry of the Environment*  
*The Netherlands*

**Drs Guido de GRAAF BIERBRAUWER**  
Coordinator  
*Lobby and Communication Unit*  
*European Centre for Conflict Prevention*  
*Netherlands*

**Mr Tom DELIGIANNIS**  
Doctoral Candidate  
*Political Science*  
*University of Toronto*  
*Canada*

**Dr Andrew DLUGOLECKI**  
Principal  
*Andlug Consulting*  
*UK*

**Mr Juan DUMAS**  
Director General  
*Fundacion Futuro Latinoamericano*  
*Ecuador*

**Ms Christina EDLUND**  
Research officer  
*FOI NBC-protection*  
*Sweden*

**Drs Doeke EISMA**  
Chair  
*IUCN Netherlands*  
*The Netherlands*

**Mr Mersie EJIGU**  
President & Chief Executive Officer  
*PAES*  
*Uganda*

**Mrs Elizabeth EVANS**  
Desk Officer  
*Environmental Policy Department*  
*United Kingdom Foreign & Commonwealth Office*  
*UK*

- Dr Alexander FEDOROV**  
Council Chairman  
*Centre for Environmental  
Initiatives, NGO  
Russia*
- Prof John FORGACH**  
McCluskey Fellow  
*School of Forestry &  
Environmental Studies  
Yale University  
USA*
- Dr Chris GEERLING**  
Chairman  
*Working Group Ecology and  
Development  
The Netherlands*
- Ms Silvia GIADA**  
Professional Officer  
*DEWA  
UNEP  
Kenya*
- Ms Dari GLASS-ROYAL**  
Executive Director  
*Foundation for Environmental  
Security and Sustainability  
USA*
- Mr Harris GLECKMANN**  
Chief  
*New York Office of UNCTAD  
United Nations Conference on  
Trade and Development  
USA*
- Mr Alexander GRITSININ**  
Project Manager  
*OECD  
France*
- Mr Pekka HAAVISTO**  
Chairman  
*Post Conflict Assessment Unit  
UNEP  
Switzerland*
- Mr Abey HAILU SENBETA**  
Researcher  
*Development  
LIEIS  
Luxembourg*
- Ms Kate HAMPTON**  
GGN Convenor  
*Green Globe Network  
UK*
- Dr Victor HENNY**  
Founder  
*Global Solutions Initiative  
UK*
- Ir Jan HENSELMANS**  
Senior Policy Officer, Global  
Environmental Affairs  
*The Netherlands Society for  
Nature and Environment  
The Netherlands*
- Prof Ellen HEY**  
Chair of Public International Law  
*Faculty of Law  
Erasmus University Rotterdam  
The Netherlands*
- Ms Maartje HILTERMAN, MSc**  
Secretary  
*Working Group on Environment  
& Development  
NC-IUCN  
The Netherlands*
- Ms Amy HINDMAN**  
Legal Adviser to the Executive  
Director  
*UNEP  
Kenya*
- Dr Ir Dirk H. HOEKMAN**  
Scientific Director / Associate  
Professor  
*SarVision / Wageningen  
University  
The Netherlands*
- Mr Robert HULL**  
Director  
*European Economic and Social  
Committee  
Belgium*
- Ms Jeanna HYDE HECKER, MSc**  
Researcher  
*IES  
The Netherlands*
- Ms Maria IVANOVA**  
Project Director  
*Global Environmental  
Governance Project  
Yale University  
USA*
- Dr Anders JAGERSKOG**  
Deputy Secretary  
*Expert Group on Development  
Issues  
Ministry for Foreign Affairs,  
Sweden*
- Dr Paul JEFFERISS**  
Head of Environmental Policy  
*Royal Society for the Protection  
of Birds  
UK*

**Dr Patricia KAMERI-MBOTE**  
Senior Lecturer  
*Private Law*  
*University of Nairobi*  
*Kenya*

**Mr Ronald A. KINGHAM**  
Deputy Director  
*Institute for Environmental Security*  
*The Netherlands*

**Dr Yannis KINNAS**  
Senior Fellow  
*ICTSD Geneva*  
*Greece*

**Dipl-Ing Annika KRAMER**  
Research Fellow  
*Adelphi Research gGmbH*  
*Germany*

**Ms Helen KUYPER**  
Intern  
*Coalition for the International Criminal Court*  
*The Netherlands*

**Prof Dr Henricus LEEMANS**  
Professor  
*Environmental Systems Analysis*  
*Wageningen University*  
*The Netherlands*

**Mr René LEFEBER**  
Legal Advisor  
*Legal Department*  
*Ministry of Foreign Affairs, The Netherlands*  
*The Netherlands*

**Dr Gottfried LEIBBRANDT**  
Chairman  
*EuroCampus Institute*  
*The Netherlands*

**Ms Hongxia LIU**  
Director  
*ABA/UNDP International Legal Resource Center*  
*American Bar Association*  
*USA*

**Mr Steven LOVINK**  
President  
*TransGlobal Ventures, Inc*  
*USA*

**Amb Frank E. LOY**  
Former Under Secretary for Global Affairs  
*U.S. Department of State*  
*USA*

**Mr Peter LUFF**  
Director  
*Action for a Global Climate Community*  
*UK*

**Dr Helen MARQUARD**  
Head of Europe Environment Division  
*Environmental Protection Strategy Directorate*  
*Department for Environment, Food and Rural Affairs*  
*UK*

**Ms Julia MARTON-LEFEVRE**  
Executive Director  
*LEAD International*  
*UK*

**Mr Kenneth McCALLION**  
Attorney  
*McCallion & Associates LLP*  
*USA*

**Ms Susan Wallace McCALLION**  
Executive Director  
*McCallion & Associates LLP*  
*USA*

**Prof John McNEILL**  
Professor of History and Environmental Affairs  
*School of Foreign Service*  
*Georgetown University*  
*USA*

**Prof Dr Andjelka MIHAJLOV**  
Expert on Environmental Management and Environment  
*Former Minister*  
*University of Novi Sad*  
*Serbia and Montenegro*

**Mrs Sylvie MOTARD**  
Liaison Officer to the EU  
*Regional Office for Europe*  
*UNEP*  
*Belgium*

**Drs Jeannette E. MULLAART**  
Programme Officer  
*EU Office*  
*Environment & Development Resource Centre*  
*Belgium*

**Ms Isabel MUNILLA**  
Development Coordinator  
*Global Forest Watch*  
*World Resources Institute*  
*USA*

**Prof Dr Frans A. NELISSEN**  
 Director  
*T.M.C. Asser Instituut*  
*The Netherlands*

**Dr Leif OHLSSON, PhD**  
 Researcher  
*Dept. of Peace & Development*  
*Research*  
*Goteborg University*  
*Sweden*

**Mr Derek OSBORN**  
 Chair  
*UNED/UK*  
*UK*

**Prof Marc PALLEMAERTS**  
 Senior Research Fellow  
*Institute for European Studies*  
*Vrije Universiteit Brussel*  
*Belgium*

**drs Ben PAPENDORP**  
 Lobbyist  
*The Hague Facility for Nature*  
*and Environment*  
*The Netherlands*

**Ms Anu PARMANEN-LANDTMAN**  
 Counsellor  
*Department for Global Affairs*  
*Ministry for Foreign Affairs of*  
*Finland*

**Ms Sonia PENA MORENO**  
 Junior Professional Officer  
*Policy, Biodiversity and*  
*International Agreements*  
*IUCN- The World Conservation*  
*Union*  
*Switzerland*

**Ms Lindsey POWELL**  
 Research Assistant  
*Global Environmental*  
*Governance Project*  
*Yale University*  
*USA*

**Mr Nigel PURVIS**  
 Senior Scholar and Director  
*Environment and Energy Project*  
*The Brookings Institution*  
*USA*

**Mr Dane RATLIFF**  
 Legal Counsel  
*Permanent Court of Arbitration*  
*The Netherlands*

**Mr Michael RENNEN**  
 Senior Researcher  
*Worldwatch Institute*  
*USA*

**Dr Alfred REST**  
 Academic Director  
*Institute for Public International*  
*Law*  
*University of Cologne*  
*Germany*

**Dr Jake REYNOLDS**  
 Assistant Director  
*Programme for Industry*  
*University of Cambridge*  
*UK*

**Dr Martin ROCHOLL**  
 Director  
*Friends of the Earth Europe*  
*Belgium*

**Ms Léna SALAMÉ**  
 Project Coordinator  
*Division of Water Sciences*  
*UNESCO*  
*France*

**Mr Oliver SCHAEFER**  
 Policy Advisor  
*European Renewable Energy*  
*Council*  
*Belgium*

**Mr Fritz SCHLINGEMANN**  
 Director  
*UNEP Regional Office for*  
*Europe*  
*Switzerland*

**Prof Dr Wolfgang SCHLUCHTER**  
 University-Professor  
*Environmental Science*  
*University of Cottbus*  
*Germany*

**Mr Urs SCHMID**  
 Head of International Security  
 Section  
*Centre for International Security*  
*Policy*  
*Federal Department of Foreign*  
*Affairs*  
*Switzerland*

**Ir Vincent SCHUT**  
 Remote Sensing Specialist  
*SarVision BV*  
*The Netherlands*

**Dr Emile SERVAN-SCHREIBER**  
 CEO  
*NewsFutures.com*  
*France*

**Mr Ray SIMMONS**  
 Executive Director  
*Foundation for Environmental*  
*Security and Sustainability*  
*USA*

**Maj Gen (ret) Joseph SINGH**  
Executive Director  
*Conservation International*  
Guyana

**Mr Scott SPENCE**  
HSP Hague Researcher  
*Org for the Prohibition of*  
*Chemical Weapons*  
The Netherlands

**Mrs Liz SPENCER**  
Director  
*The European Connection*  
UK

**Mr Tom SPENCER**  
Executive Director  
*European Centre for Public*  
*Affairs*  
UK

**Mr Barry SPERGEL**  
International Lawyer and  
Environmental Financing  
Consultant  
USA

**Mr Jeff STARK**  
Director of Research and  
Studies  
*Foundation for Environmental*  
*Security and Sustainability*  
USA

**Mrs Elke STEINMETZ**  
Advisor  
*Division for Nature*  
*Conservation/Sustainable Use*  
*Federal German Ministry for the*  
*Environment*  
Germany

**Mr Jakob STROM**  
Head of Section  
*Div for International Affairs*  
*Ministry of the Environment*  
Sweden

**Mr Jason SWITZER**  
Sr Project Officer  
*IISD*  
Switzerland

**Mr Bert-Axel SZELINSKI**  
Head of Division  
*German Federal Ministry for the*  
*Environment, Natur*  
Germany

**Prof Attila TANZI**  
Professor  
*Faculty of Laws*  
*University of Verona*  
Italy

**Mr Jaco TAVENIER**  
Policy Advisor  
*International Environmental*  
*Affairs*  
*Ministry of the Environment*  
The Netherlands

**Dr Katsuaki TERASAWA**  
Associate Director  
*Croft Institute for International*  
*Studies*  
USA

**Mr Steven VAN HOOGSTRATEN**  
General Director  
*Carnegie Foundation*  
The Netherlands

**Prof Dr Rietje VAN DAM-MIERAS**  
Professor of Natural Sciences  
*Faculty of Natural Sciences*  
*Open University of the*  
*Netherlands*  
The Netherlands

**Mr Tjaco VAN DEN HOUT**  
Secretary-General  
*Permanent Court of Arbitration*  
The Netherlands

**Mr Puk VAN DER LINDE**  
Project Manager  
*European Conference on*  
*Corporate Responsibility*  
*Foreign Economic Relations*  
*Ministry of Economic Affairs*  
The Netherlands

**Mr Pieter VAN GEEL**  
State Secretary  
*Ministry for Housing, Spatial*  
*Planning and the Environment*  
The Netherlands

**Mr Wouter VEENING**  
Chairman  
*Institute for Environmental*  
*Security*  
The Netherlands

**Mrs Geneviève VERBRUGGE**  
Service des Affaires  
Internationales  
*Direction Générale de*  
*l'administration, des finances*  
*Ministère de l'Ecologie et du*  
*Développement Durable*  
France

**Drs Ing Patrick VERKOOIJEN, MPA**  
*Nature, International Affairs*  
*Ministry of Agriculture, Nature &*  
*Food Quality*  
The Netherlands

**Prof Nico VISSER**

Senior Advisor International  
Nature Management  
*Department of Nature  
Ministry of Agriculture, Nature &  
Food Quality  
The Netherlands*

**Mr Martin VON HILDEBRAND**

Director  
*Fundacion COAMA  
Colombia*

**Dr Mathis WACKERNAGEL**

Executive Director  
*Global Footprint Network  
USA*

**Ms Annica WALEIJ, MSc**

Scientist  
*Swedish Defence Research  
Agency, division of NBC  
Sweden*

**Dr Claire WEILL**

Senior Fellow  
*IDDR  
France*

**Ir Niels WIELAARD**

Project Engineer  
*SarVision  
The Netherlands*

**Mr Lars WIRKUS**

Researcher  
*Bonn International Center for  
Conversion - BICC  
Germany*

**Ir Pieter WIT**

Director  
*Syzygy  
The Netherlands*

**Mr Nasser YASSIN**

Assistant Convenor  
*Green Globe Network  
UK*

**Drs Bertram ZAGEMA**

Policy Advisor  
*Novib / Oxfam Netherlands  
The Netherlands*

## **Conference Organising Committee**

- Adelphi Research
- Andlug Consulting
- Biopolitics International Organisation (BIO)
- Brookings Institution
- Carnegie Foundation
- Environment & Development Resource Centre (EDRC)
- Environmental Change and Security Project, Woodrow Wilson International Center for Scholars
- EuroCampus Institute
- European Centre for Public Affairs (ECPA)
- European Commission - DG ENV
- Green Globe Network
- Global Environmental Governance Project, Yale Center for Environmental Law and Policy
- Heinrich Böll Foundation
- Institute for Environmental Security
- International Institute for Sustainable Development (IISD)
- IUCN — World Conservation Union
- Ministère de l'Ecologie et du Développement Durable, France
- Ministry of Housing, Spatial Planning and the Environment, The Netherlands
- Netherlands Working Group on Ecology and Development
- Permanent Court of Arbitration (PCA)
- SarVision
- TransGlobal Ventures, Inc. (TGV)
- United Nations Environment Program (UNEP)
- University for Peace

## **Programme Committee**

- Ronald A. Kingham
- Steven Lovink
- Margaret Brusasco Mackenzie
- Jeffrey McNeely
- Jeannette E. Mullaart
- Norman Myers
- Tom Spencer
- Jason Switzer
- Wouter Veening

**The Hague Conference on  
Environment, Security and Sustainable Development**  
The Peace Palace, The Hague, The Netherlands  
9 - 12 May 2004

Organised with the support of:

 VROM  
Ministry of Housing, Spatial Planning and  
the Environment  
The Netherlands



North Atlantic Treaty Organisation



  
Ministry for Foreign Affairs  
Finland



Foundation for Environmental Security and  
Sustainability, USA



Department of Global Development  
Sweden



Nationale Commissie voor Internationale  
Samenwerking en Duurzame Ontwikkeling  
The Netherlands



Swiss Agency for Development and  
Cooperation



The International Development Research  
Centre, Ottawa, Canada



The City of the Hague  
The Netherlands

