

## Introduction

We live in an unwilling world. Preoccupied by day-to-day demands and by the ever-present threats of terrorism, oppression, and calamitous nuclear and other conflicts, most people in the world are either unaware of the broader urgent and existential challenges facing humanity or seem unwilling to face them squarely. The rising needs of a rapidly growing global population cast doubt on our hopes for a shared and lasting prosperity for all. The rapidly increasing global pressures on – and the intensifying competition for – our planet’s limited natural resources renew our age-old fears of a war of all against all. The hastening onset of manmade climate change could soon threaten the survival of all. These and other intertwined global challenges demand interconnected global solutions.

Many people everywhere in the world are willing to find these solutions. In networked and worldwide webs of the willing, they are working as hard as they can in search of solutions. Every day, in a vast array of innovative local endeavors and in a vast variety of venues and ways, the willing worldwide strive to address urgent global concerns of all kinds by working together toward a goal they commonly call “sustainable development.” Some focus their attentions on the unending avalanche of challenges threatening the global economy. They labor especially for the impoverished on our planet and for all those who have yet to share in the bounties of globalization. Others dwell on the threats to the global environment. They labor especially for the planet itself. And some of the willing devote their energies equally to both people and planet by connecting solutions for the economy and the environment. With their determined, driving idealism, all of the world’s willing strive to serve humanity and to save the planet by shaping a bright future for everyone everywhere.

Yet, despite all this hard work, their professed goal of sustainable development remains an elusive and distant ideal – seemingly unreachable – and an unwilling world resists making many of the essential transitional changes needed to reach it. Despite all their well-intentioned labors, the willing in the world are increasingly finding they lack all the practical and realistic approaches needed for building the

basic global architecture of a sustainable future. Worse, in every part of the world they lack the popular support indispensable for building it. Undaunted, the willing persist. There is ever the hopeful expectation of achieving, at last, the ultimate universal and comprehensive global solution for “sustainable development” at the next global summit – or perhaps the next.

Without doubt, there are successes worth reporting. But there are not nearly enough – not when compared to all the many more successes we urgently need. The impassioned pursuits of the willing worldwide have so far not come close to securing the sought-for success of global sustainable development. Moreover, their ardent labors have not yet inspired anything approaching the amount of global political will needed even to begin to make the hard choices that must be made to achieve it. The world as a whole remains unwilling to do all that must be done to advance the global economy and to enhance the global environment through international cooperation for sustainable development.

#### THE REACTION AGAINST GLOBALIZATION

In the wake of an unnerving global financial crisis, in the midst of an uneven recovery and lingering global economic uncertainty, and in the face of increasingly dire warnings from scientists of an approaching environmental catastrophe that few understand and many choose to deny, most governments in the world continue to try to come together and work toward common ends. Yet throughout the world many who would lead us are largely in retreat from cooperation and from a shared search for global solutions to our inescapably global economic and environmental concerns.

This retreat by so many of our national political leaders reflects the gravity of a much larger retreat in many places from engagement with the wider world. “Anti-globalization has gone global.”<sup>1</sup> In the United States, in parts of Europe, and elsewhere, we have witnessed what has been widely described as a “populist” revolt against the international economic institutional arrangements established through long decades of determined international cooperation. Some say that the extent of the political reaction against globalization is such that “[t]he new age of deglobalization is on, and it is likely to last.”<sup>2</sup>

In stark contrast to the ambitions of the willing are the apprehensions of the unwilling. In many countries, “populist earthquakes” have erupted in an overflow of anger and anxiety aimed at all things global.<sup>3</sup> As one baffled reporter for the *Washington Post* put it not long after the British vote to pull out of the European Union and the even more surprising outcome of the American presidential election in 2016, “[I]t seems that a nameless rage has seized global politics, and millions of people are voting to burn it all.”<sup>4</sup>

Some of this rage is justified. Insufficient attention has been paid by many of the tribunes of globalization to the human costs of rapid and uprooting economic change. The economic insecurity of those paying those costs is real. So too is the

growing economic inequality that adds to the pain of those costs. Sir Angus Deaton, a Nobel Prize-winning economist and a self-declared “optimistic defender” of globalization, points out that the world today is healthier and wealthier than it would otherwise have been without centuries of economic integration.<sup>5</sup> He adds, though, that this basic truth about globalization is obscured by the inequality resulting from what economists call “rent-seeking” – in his description, “a takeover of government by those who would use it to enrich themselves.”<sup>6</sup>

This, Deaton says, “is the crux of the matter” behind the backlash against globalization. After decades of highlighting the human progress made possible by globalization, he worries now that there may be “an inextricable link between progress and inequality.”<sup>7</sup> The Paris-based Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development, an international organization of the world’s wealthiest countries, points to “the stagnation of the well-being of many in the lower half of the income distribution in a number of OECD countries, in contrast to the situation at the top end of the income distribution.”<sup>8</sup> Meanwhile, “In developing and emerging economies, while poverty levels have decreased significantly, income inequality levels have remained very high.”<sup>9</sup> These are understatements.

In the United States, the pain of the human costs paid by those who have not benefited as they should from globalization is intensified not only by ever-widening economic inequality, but also by a deep-felt sense of injustice. Millions of people suffered in the United States, as many millions of other people did elsewhere, from the fallout of the global financial crisis of 2008. In the aftermath of that crisis, not one high-ranking executive of any of the major US financial firms that contributed to causing the crisis was held accountable. No one was fired. No one went to jail. Eventually some corporate fines were paid, but they added up to only a drop or two in Wall Street’s money bucket.

Feeding this feeling of injustice in the United States is the fact that, when the American economy at last began to recover following the Great Recession, the financial “elites” and the “1 percent” in the uppermost income bracket were the ones who benefited the most, and not those in the middle class and down below who had suffered the most. In this context, a political reaction against know-it-all “elites” is not at all surprising.<sup>10</sup>

In 2017, one exemplar of the global “elite,” the German finance minister, Wolfgang Schäuble, declared at yet another global gathering of the willing, “Nationalism and protectionism are never the right answer.”<sup>11</sup> He is absolutely right. All the same, growing numbers of people in the world are unpersuaded, and more and more of the unpersuaded have been ascending to places of power with the surge of the reactive worldwide wave. The defenders of globalization are everywhere on the defensive, and the affirmative case for continued global economic integration can scarcely be heard above the protests.

The economic distress driving this reaction is mixed in many places with the cultural, ethnic, religious, and racial resentment of a resurgent and virulent

nationalism. In the United States and elsewhere, we have witnessed the triumph of a so-called economic nationalism dictating an insulating protectionism. This is a triumph of economic myopia and mythic cultural nostalgia. It is in many respects equally “the triumph of those who preach strong action over rule of law, unilateralism instead of cooperation and the interests of the majority above the rights of ethnic and religious minorities.”<sup>12</sup>

There is in this latest of the recurring historical outpourings of the poison of nationalism an aggressive hostility toward foreigners, immigrants, other races, other ethnic groups, other faiths, those of different sexes, sexual preferences, or lifestyles – toward all those who may think, look, act, believe, or live differently from how “we” do, whoever “we” may be in our different parts of the world. This widespread political revolt is not only an expression of a palpable fear of the economic changes wrought by globalization. It is also an expression of the timeless fear of the “other” that has, for millennia, kept our singular species from seeing that humanity is one and thus must act as one.

The worst of this popular reaction is manifested as an invitation to authoritarianism. In many countries – rich and poor alike – anger at supposedly arrogant “elites” and frustration with the slowness, the messiness, and the sheer lack of responsiveness of democratic institutions have created political openings for the ruthless who seek to exploit this anger and this frustration to secure a monopoly of personal power. Lost and alone, all too many are easy prey for those who promise them purpose and security in an authoritarian state. Demagogues reduce the complex to the deceptively simple for the gullible and the uninformed, blame the foreign “other” for all that ails the nation, and proclaim that they alone embody the answer. The democratic habits of the disillusioned then bend until they yield to authoritarian impulses. The center does not hold. It folds. The rule of law succumbs to the rule of one “strong man.” The call for more popular rule leads to precisely the opposite.

#### THE NEED FOR GLOBAL ECONOMIC SOLUTIONS

Amid this worldwide reaction against globalization, global economic solutions are needed more urgently now than ever. The world is not only interconnected; it is interdependent. One expert group of the willing – the global “thought leaders” who help set the annual global agenda of the World Economic Forum – has peered through all the political rhetoric and joined Deaton in seeing the top two global trends that are likely to have the biggest impact on the world as deepening income inequality and persistent jobless growth.<sup>13</sup> To these two global trends can be added, in much of the world, the closely related concerns of stagnant wages; vulnerable jobs; missing and mismatched job skills; racial, sexual, ethnic, religious, age, and other forms of job discrimination; and widespread structural unemployment. Periodic cyclical upswings in national economies and in the global economy may mask but do not mitigate – much less erase – these structural impediments to a

widely shared prosperity. At the core of the economic reaction against globalization is this: More and better economic opportunities for good jobs and for secure livelihoods are needed by billions of people everywhere in the world. These opportunities will not be found unless we respond to our economic interdependence with more economic integration.

Additional economic integration through further economic globalization offers untold new opportunities for good jobs and secure livelihoods in a global transition to a sustainable economy. Yet, in the eyes of many wary people, globalization seems a threat, not an opportunity. In a globalized economy connected by ever-lengthening global supply chains, workers and businesses alike in wealthier countries fear competition from poorer countries. And, for their part, workers and businesses alike in poorer countries are in equal fear of competition from wealthier countries. There is a pervasive global fear of being swept away by the rising force of the allegedly “unfair” flow of foreign competition resulting from globalization.

Everywhere in the world, people fearful of change are clinging as best they can to what they have and know and think they can trust. Economically, the young are trying to get in, the old are trying to hold on, and the rest in between are just trying to get by without being passed by technologically or globally. All too many of all ages and all nationalities are lost between the past and the future and are lined up in the lines of the jobless and the hopeless. All of us everywhere are trying somehow to find some purchase and some piece of the future in a world that seems to be turning faster and faster, and that seems to be turning away from us. All of us are looking for something more and better, and the poorest among us are looking hardest of all.

Poverty still prevails in many parts of the world. The United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) speaks of poverty as “multidimensional.” The willing of the world who work for the UNDP explain that measures of poverty are typically based on income or consumption, which can reveal much about deprivation but provide only a partial picture. As they point out, people can be deprived of many things besides income. “They may have poor health and nutrition, low education and skills, inadequate livelihoods and poor household conditions, and they may be socially excluded.”<sup>14</sup> By their reckoning, 1.5 billion of the more than 7 billion people in the world live in “multidimensional poverty,” and an additional 700 million are “vulnerable” to such poverty.<sup>15</sup> They add that three-fourths of the world’s poor live in rural areas, “where agricultural workers suffer the highest incidence of poverty, caught in a cauldron of low productivity, seasonal unemployment and low wages.”<sup>16</sup> Moreover, many of those who recently joined the middle class “could easily fall back into poverty with a sudden change in circumstances.”<sup>17</sup>

We are not condemned to a world afflicted by immiseration. Our recent record of success in reducing global poverty gives us reason to believe we can do better still in reducing poverty, and particularly extreme poverty. Even with the setbacks of the global financial crisis of 2008, twenty-eight countries classified by the World Bank as “low income” made the jump to middle-income status between 2002 and 2015.<sup>18</sup>

The number of people in the world living in extreme poverty has diminished by about 1 billion since 1990.<sup>19</sup> Still, about 1.2 billion people in the world continue to live in extreme poverty on less than \$1.25 per day.<sup>20</sup> This is about 15 percent of the world's population.<sup>21</sup>

The Pew Research Center underscores the concern expressed by the UNDP that recent global gains against poverty are precarious.<sup>22</sup> Many of those who have recently escaped the worst forms of poverty are “only a moderate step up the income ladder” and still on the edge of being poor.<sup>23</sup> In a world with few and often faulty safety nets, these new members of the global middle class could easily fall back down the ladder. Only about 16 percent of the people in the world live on incomes that put them safely above the official US poverty line of about \$23,000 annually for a family of four.

Meanwhile, amid the vast wealth and opulence of the United States, the bottom 50 percent of Americans in income got just 3 percent of the gains from growth since 1980, and their income share diminished from more than 20 percent in 1980 to 13 percent in 2016.<sup>24</sup> A combination of stratification and stagnation helps explain the fear of many middle-class Americans that they, too, could descend the economic ladder into poverty. Confronted with the pressures of their own increasingly fragile economic existence, many Americans have little time left over to ponder the far more perilous position of so many others facing extreme poverty elsewhere. Instead, they strike back politically at the “elites” they believe have betrayed them.

The World Bank has adopted the goal of reducing the percentage of those in the world living in extreme poverty to less than 3 percent by 2030, and this goal was embraced by the United Nations in identifying a whole host of “Sustainable Development Goals” (SDGs) as part of its 2030 Agenda.<sup>25</sup> There is bold talk in abundance at the global “summits” about ending poverty. With the adoption of the Sustainable Development Goals by the United Nations, the whole world has now endorsed this goal. Eradicating global poverty will, however, be far from easy. Based on the latest projections by the World Bank of likely global growth by 2030, “growth is unlikely to be high enough across all developing countries to reduce poverty to the level sought by 2030. Developing countries would have to grow at an average of 4 percent each year – even higher than the growth rate of the 2000s and much higher than that of the 1980s and 1990s.”<sup>26</sup>

By far the best way to jumpstart growth not only in the developing countries of the world, but in *all* the countries of the world, would be to eliminate many more of the tariff and non-tariff barriers to international trade and foreign direct investment. We have reduced global poverty as much as we have in the past generation in no small part because we have lowered the vast numbers of global barriers to trade and investment while embracing markets and market principles more widely in the world. But our global efforts to free trade and to free investment have faltered and fragmented as developing and developed countries alike have turned inward and largely away from the further economic integration that is intrinsic to most needed global economic solutions.

The willing of the world have long since lost count, to cite one glaring example, of just how many times at just how many summits in just how many places the world's governments have promised to conclude in some form and with some success long-deadlocked global trade negotiations under the auspices of the World Trade Organization. After years on life support, the latest round of talks seems at last to have expired. Trading countries are trying to regroup and to redirect their global negotiations. Making their task harder is talk, among the “economic nationalists” and other “anti-globalists,” not merely of abandoning global trade talks, but also of abandoning the WTO itself. With the ascendancy in the United States of a protectionist presidency, there is danger that this talk could turn into destructive action.

#### THE NEED FOR GLOBAL ENVIRONMENTAL SOLUTIONS

Global environmental solutions, too, are more urgently needed now than ever. For now comes climate change to complicate, all the more, our complex challenge economically with an unprecedented challenge environmentally. In 1896, a Swedish scientist, Svante Arrhenius, first predicted that increases in the levels of carbon dioxide in the atmosphere caused by the burning of fossil fuels could heat the surface temperature of the Earth.<sup>27</sup> For some time now, the overwhelming consensus of the world's climate scientists has been that he was right. The Earth is warming and the climate is changing as we release more and more carbon dioxide and other greenhouse gas emissions into the atmosphere.

Responding to this reality, in 1988 the World Meteorological Organization and the United Nations Environment Programme established a broadly representative international group of climate scientists called the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC). The IPCC consists of about 800 climate scientists drawn from all over the world, including scientists from the National Aeronautics and Space Administration (NASA) and the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA) in the United States. In reaching their conclusions and recommendations, these climate scientists draw on the results of the latest scientific research and on the ongoing reviews of their results by thousands of other scientists from across the globe.

The IPCC works under the auspices of the United Nations. It has been endorsed by the United National General Assembly and supports the work of the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC), which is the UN treaty that forms the basis for global climate negotiations. The IPCC has been asked by the member states of the United Nations in their negotiating role as the “Conference of Parties” of the UNFCCC to assess and report periodically on the risks to the world of “anthropogenic” – human-induced – climate change and on the ways we might mitigate or adapt to it.

The IPCC has made five such assessments. The most recent assessment was finalized in 2014, when the consensus conclusion of these leading climate scientists

was that the evidence of climate change is “virtually certain.” Their consensus conclusion, too, was that we humans are causing it. They reported, “Human influence has been detected in warming of the atmosphere and the ocean, in changes in the global water cycle, in reductions in snow and ice, in global mean sea level rise, and in changes in some climate extremes . . . It is *extremely likely* that human influence has been the dominant cause of the observed warming since the mid-20th century.”<sup>28</sup>

The climate scientists have explained that by “extremely likely” they mean that they are “95 to 100 percent certain” that human activities – especially fossil fuel emissions – are the primary drivers of planetary warming.<sup>29</sup> Human emissions of carbon dioxide and other greenhouse gases began in earnest with the invention of the steam engine in the eighteenth century, have grown steadily since, and have rapidly accelerated in the past half-century. About half of all the CO<sub>2</sub> emissions resulting from human activity have occurred since 1970. As with the steam engines that began to fire the Industrial Revolution in the eighteenth century, these modern emissions are still largely due to our overwhelming reliance on fossil fuels.

The ever-increasing evidence of climate change that is caused by the ever-increasing concentration of carbon dioxide and other greenhouse gases in the Earth’s atmosphere is all around us. The IPCC tells us in no uncertain terms that climate change is no longer coming; it has arrived. “Warming of the climate system,” the scientists tell us, “is unequivocal, and since the 1950s, many of the observed changes are unprecedented over decades to millennia.”<sup>30</sup> Our greenhouse gas emissions are causing the climate to change 170 times faster than natural forces.<sup>31</sup> Rising seas. Melting ice caps. Scorching heatwaves. Intensifying storms. Spreading floods. Prolonged droughts. Loss of natural habitats. All these and other reported damaging consequences of climate change are already threatening our food, water, health, safety, and security.

Every passing year adds to the urgency of addressing the unprecedented global challenge of climate change in a global way. Climate scientists have documented a relentless rise in overall global temperatures in the more than two centuries since the dawn of the industrial age. The ten warmest years in recorded history have all been since 1997. The hottest year on record was 2016;<sup>32</sup> 2017 was the second-hottest year on record – and the hottest year without the temporary warming effect of an El Niño event in the Pacific Ocean.<sup>33</sup>

Scientists insist this will only be the beginning of the heat from climate change if we do not find the right way to come together and act together now. The IPCC anticipates that, without additional efforts to slow emissions, temperatures will rise by between 3.7 degrees and 4.8 degrees Celsius by the end of this century – by 2100 – over what temperatures were in the pre-industrial year of 1750. (For my fellow Americans, that’s between 6.6 degrees and 8.6 degrees Fahrenheit.)

Climate scientists have warned us for some time that setting a limit on the increase in global temperatures of no more than 2 degrees Celsius (3.6 degrees



Fahrenheit) above the pre-industrial levels is necessary to prevent the worst effects of climate change. Global temperatures have already risen since pre-industrial times by about 1 degree Celsius (about 1.8 degrees Fahrenheit).<sup>34</sup> Unfortunately, and for all the fanfare attending what we have, belatedly, agreed on globally, nothing on which we have so far agreed globally is expected to keep us from exceeding that “2C” limit.

In concluding a global climate agreement in Paris in 2015, the governments of the world pledged to do all that must be done to keep global temperatures from rising above that limit. The consensus of the UN science panel is that, to keep global warming below 2 degrees Celsius since 1750, global emissions of carbon dioxide and other greenhouse gases must be cut by between 40 percent and 70 percent below 2010 levels by 2050, and cut to “near zero or below” by 2100. These cuts would be much deeper than the insufficient pledges of emission cuts that have been made so far by the world’s governments under the Paris Agreement. What is more, there may be no effective means of knowing or ensuring that even those insufficient promises will be kept.

An analysis by one thinktank, Climate Interactive, of the initial national climate pledges made under the Paris Agreement concluded that keeping those voluntary pledges would shift the world away from a course in which global emissions were expected to rise significantly to one in which emissions would remain the same by 2030. This shift would suffice to keep global warming “somewhat under control.” It would not, however, be nearly enough to meet the 2C goal. Furthermore, 21 percent of the promised initial emissions cuts are expected to be made by the United States. If the United States does not keep its climate commitment, global emissions will keep rising through 2030.<sup>35</sup>

Such a course seems all too likely now that the United States – which was previously one of the strongest advocates for global climate action – has, under a new president, announced its intention to withdraw from the Paris climate agreement. Driven by a combination of climate denialism, economic nationalism, and sheer “know-nothing-ism,” the new president of the United States announced in June 2017 the intention of the United States to back out of the agreement. The willing of the world held their collective breath in awaiting the global response to this perhaps worst of all the worldwide reactions against globalization. Would other countries rally and lift their own ambitions by taking additional climate action? Or would they follow the example of the United States and turn inward and away from global cooperation in addressing perhaps the ultimate global issue?

Carbon dioxide lingers in the air for an average of 100 years before breaking down. Even when emissions are cut, so long as they continue, CO<sub>2</sub> keeps accumulating in the atmosphere. The World Bank warns of what it describes as “the new climate normal” in the absence of much deeper cuts in global greenhouse gas emissions: “There is growing evidence, that even with very ambitious mitigation action, warming close to 1.5 [degrees] C above pre-industrial levels by mid-century is already locked-in to the Earth’s atmospheric system and climate change impacts such as

extreme heat events may now be unavoidable. If the planet continues warming to 4 [degrees] C, climatic conditions, heat and other weather extremes considered highly unusual or unprecedented today would become the new climate normal – a world of increased risks and instability. The consequences for development would be severe.”<sup>36</sup>

In addition to all its other impacts, climate change is a leading driver of poverty. The rising seas harm the impoverished coastal areas of Southeast Asia and drown the poor island economies all over the world. The droughts cause crop failures that lead to more starvation in Africa. The natural disasters intensified by climate change devastate entire economies in the developing world.<sup>37</sup> The many and varied effects of climate change constrain growth in ways that will make it all the more difficult to achieve the World Bank’s lofty goal of shrinking the percentage of extreme global poverty to only 3 percent by 2030. World Bank president Jim Yong Kim is entirely correct in speaking of “the intrinsic link between climate change and poverty.”<sup>38</sup>

Adding to this challenge is the knowledge that climate change is only one of the many and interrelated environmental challenges so many in the world seem all too unwilling to face. Others abound. Air and water pollution. Water shortages. Ocean acidification. Deforestation. Desertification. The loss of fisheries stocks. The unprecedented loss of other plant and animal species. The depletion of all natural resources. The list goes on. And each and every one of these and numerous additional environmental challenges is complicated by the effects of climate change.

Moreover, each and every one of these challenges, while affecting all of us, affects the poorest among us the most. The poor know better than the rest of us the connections between the economy and the environment because the burden falls more heavily on the poor when those connections are ignored. Pope Francis rightly reminds us in his historic encyclical on climate change of “the intimate relationship between the poor and the fragility of the planet.”<sup>39</sup> As he explains, “Both everyday experience and scientific research show that the gravest effects of all attacks on the environment are suffered by the poorest.”<sup>40</sup>

#### THE NEED TO UNITE ECONOMY AND ENVIRONMENT FOR SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT

The highest hopes of the willing are on display in a full flowering of all their optimism in the Sustainable Development Goals of the United Nations. Enormous effort has been invested by the willing all over the world in these SDGs as the shining centerpiece of the UN’s 2030 Agenda. Literally hundreds of thousands of people from all points of view and from all over the world contributed to reaching global agreement on these supposedly shared goals. The list of economic, environmental, and social goals is long. The list of “targets” and means of implementation is longer. Going forward, the SDGs are meant to guide the UN’s “global development

agenda” toward full success in 2030. The global goals agreed by the nearly 200 member countries of the United Nations are designed to attain numerous noble and uplifting ends by blending a whole host of targeted means together in making an inclusive and uplifting sustainable development.

The distance we have to travel to accomplish these global goals is far. One study by some of the willing has concluded that no country in the world currently meets the needs of its people in a sustainable way.<sup>41</sup> As one commentator summarized the study’s results, “The nations of the world either don’t provide the basics of a good life or they do it at excessive cost in resources, or they fail at both.”<sup>42</sup> The United States, for example, provides Americans with a relatively high quality of life when compared with other countries, but it “fails on every measure of sustainability in the study.”<sup>43</sup> The study’s threshold for carbon dioxide emissions per person per year was 1.6 metric tons. The United States emits 21.2 metric tons of carbon dioxide per person per year.<sup>44</sup>

From this imposing starting point, the questions inspired by these global ambitions are many. To be able to transform ours from an unwilling into the willing world, the willing among us must ask and answer: Are the Sustainable Development Goals of the United Nations the right goals for the world? If so, how can we, at a time when so many in the world seem to have turned away from global cooperation on global solutions, somehow help summon the necessary political will throughout the world to implement them? If we can help inspire the political will to try to implement these global goals, what are the best approaches for doing so? How can we best transform these hopeful words into global reality? Have we truly thought through how to unite economy and environment as one in achieving these global goals? Do we in fact know how to grow and how to govern the global economy in ways that will work economically *and* environmentally by shaping a sustainable development we all can share?

Do we even know and agree on what we mean when we say “sustainable development”?