

Karl Schlecht Foundation (KSG)
Foundation Global Values Alliance
World Ethos Institute Beijing (WEIB), PKU
Institute for Advanced Humanistic Studies (IAHS) PKU

The Sustainable Development for A Future We Want for All

Prof. Dr. Dr. h.c. Klaus M. Leisinger
President, Foundation Global Values Alliance

節 亮 風 高

我們共同憧憬的
未來的可持續發展

克勞斯·M·萊辛格 榮譽博士 教授
主席，全球價值聯盟基金會

2015 Dialogue on Confucian Entrepreneurs
Peking University
Institute for Advanced Humanistic Studies (IAHS)
November 11-12, 2015

Karl Schlecht Foundation (KSG)
Foundation Global Values Alliance
World Ethos Institute Beijing (WEIB), PKU
Institute for Advanced Humanistic Studies (IAHS) PKU

The Sustainable Development for A Future We Want for All

Prof. Dr. Dr. h.c. Klaus M. Leisinger
President, Foundation Global Values Alliance

節 亮 風 高

我们共同憧憬的未来的
可持续发展

克劳斯·M·莱辛格 荣誉博士 教授
主席，全球价值联盟基金会

2015 Dialogue on Confucian Entrepreneurs
Peking University
Institute for Advanced Humanistic Studies (IAHS)
November 11, 2015

2015 儒商会议

北京大学 | 世界伦理中心

2015 年 11 月 11-12 日

我们共同憧憬的未来的可持续发展
统一治理所有社会行动者的价值观

Klaus M. Leisinger



Klaus Michael Leisinger, 是全球价值联盟基金会

(2013)的创始人和主席，是瑞士巴塞尔大学的社会学（特殊领域发展政策、商业伦理和企业责任）教授，以及联合国全球契约组织中有关 2015 年后发展议程及商业道德的特约顾问。

Leisinger是习理德基金会（Karl Schlecht Foundation）的董事会成员，并负责该基金会的道德相关的项目。他是世界农业研究咨询小组（CGIAR）联盟委员会及联合国可持续发展解决方案网络（由潘基文秘书长开创，并由 **Jeffrey Sachs** 教授指导）领导委员会成员。截止 2013 年，**Leisinger** 已领导瑞士制药公司（Ciba 和 Novartis）合作发展基金会 30 余年。

全球价值联盟基金会
Schönbeinstrasse 23
4056 Basel, Switzerland

info@globalewerteallianz.ch |
info@globalvaluesalliance.ch
www.globalewerteallianz.ch |
www.globalvaluesalliance.ch

简介

在 2015 年 9 月的最后一周，国际社会致力于“改变我们的世界”的议程：2030 年可持续发展议程。¹

该议程为有关“人类、星球和繁荣”的行动计划（以合作的形式实施，且旨在加强公正和尊严）——例如：更自主的世界和平。在此之前世界领导人从未根据如此广阔和普遍的议程采取过共同行动。在此之前从未有过规模更大的协议——从可持续发展的观点出发——所有国家均为“发展中国家”。

该议程根据从“千年发展目标”中学习的成功和经验教训建立了未来 15 年内的全球发展框架。根据基层社区、公民团体组织、科学专家、政治领导人和商业代表广泛的全球磋商，拟建 17 个可持续发展目标（SDG）和 169 个具体目标。整体思路的参与维度确实是史无前例。因此，全球社会假定的 2030 年可持续发展议程“所有者”的范围同样也是史无前例的。

若无联合国系统任务组奠定的基础，则将无法达成广泛的共识（结果如“实现我们共同期望的未来（2012）”报告所示）。² 该任务组以明确的条款清晰地表达了其对新议程的相关建议：

“2015 年后联合国发展议程的主要问题，是如何保证全球化成为一个推动当代和未来全世界人民的正面力量。全球化给我们带来广大的机遇，但是目前全球化带来的利益分布却十分不均衡。如果在消费、生产和资源利用方面没有可持续模式的重大改善，这样不断追求物质福利的进步将会超越自然资源基础所能提供的范围。持续的不平等和争夺有限资源是引起争端，饥饿和暴力的决定性因素；而这些现象进而也阻止了人类发展和实现可持续发展的脚步。”

“虽然商业通常不能成为一个选项，但是仍需要转变与变化。由于各种挑战相互高度依赖，因此需要一个新的更全面的方法以处理此类问题。”³

联合国任务组坚持要求全球、区域、国家和次国家水平政策的高度一致性，以实现 SDG。由于新的议程将由普遍适用的全球目标组成，因此亦将允许根据“符合国际标准的区域、国家和次国家状况”设置目标。

全球政策一致性及本地目标设置的两个基本要求如下：发展共识及共同价值观。

¹ 联合国大会（2015）：改变我们的世界：可持续发展的 2030 年议程。纽约。
http://www.un.org/ga/search/view_doc.asp?symbol=A/69/L.85&Lang=E（最后访问时间：2015 年 9 月 21 日）。

² 有关 2015 年后发展议程的联合国系统任务组（2012）：实现我们共同憧憬的未来。向秘书长报告。纽约。
http://www.un.org/millenniumgoals/pdf/Post_2015_UNTTreport.pdf（最后访问时间：2015 年 9 月 21 日）。亦可参阅该文件附录中中文版本的该报告执行摘要。中文版本的完整报告及执行摘要，可访问以下链接：
http://www.un.org/en/development/desa/policy/untaskteam_undf/report.shtml。（最后访问时间：2015 年 9 月 21 日）。

³ 同上第 i 页。

发展共识

国际社会同意发展受多元经济、社会、文化、生态、政治和法律因素的复杂相互作用影响。此类因素构成了发展的特定情境：不存在可克服具体差异和赤字的全球蓝图。然而，存在“我们共同憧憬的未来是一个这样的世界”的共同愿景。

“一个没有贫穷、饥饿、疾病、匮乏并适于万物生存的世界。一个没有恐惧与暴力的世界。一个人都识字的世界。一个人人平等享有优质大中小学教育、卫生保健和社会保障以及心身健康和社会福利都有保障的世界。一个我们重申我们对享有安全饮用水和环境卫生的人权的承诺和卫生条件得到改善的世界。一个有充足、安全、价格低廉和营养丰富的粮食的世界。一个安全、充满活力和可持续的人类生境的世界和一个每个人可以获得价廉、可靠和可持续能源的世界。”⁴

除人类生活质量的物质方面外，国际社会设想：

“一个普遍尊重人权和人的尊严、法治、公正、平等和不歧视，尊重种族、民族和文化多样性，尊重机会均等以充分发挥人的潜能和促进共同繁荣的世界。一个注重对儿童投资和让每个儿童在没有暴力和剥削环境中成长的世界。一个每个妇女和女孩都充分享有性别平等和一切阻碍她们享有权能的法律、社会和经济障碍都被清除的世界。一个公正、容忍、开放、有社会包容性和最弱势群体的需求得到满足的世界。”⁵

文化

UNESCO 将文化定义为某个社会或某个社会群体特有的精神与物质，智力与情感方面的不同特点之总和；除了文学和艺术外，文化还包括生活方式、共处方式、价值观体系，传统和信仰。⁶

人们普遍认为当今主要由西方视角定形的文化对现存国际发展方法具有可转换性的力量。文化多样性和非西方“追求幸福”将丰富发展辩论，并将更加关注不同文化背景中的低收入民众和发展中国家的人民：

⁴ 联合国大会（2015）：联合国大会主席提交的决议草案。联合国峰会成果文件草案（关于采纳 2015 年后开发议程）。纽约，2015 年 8 月 12 日：3。

http://www.un.org/ga/search/view_doc.asp?symbol=A/69/L.85&Lang=E（最后访问时间：2015 年 9 月 21 日）

⁵ 参阅 http://www.un.org/ga/search/view_doc.asp?symbol=A/69/L.85&Lang=E（最后访问时间：2015 年 9 月 21 日）。

⁶ UNESCO (2001): 世界文化多样性宣言。由 UNESCO 大会第 31 次会议采用。巴黎，2001 年 11 月 2 日。
<http://unesdoc.unesco.org/images/0012/001271/127160m.pdf>（最后访问时间：2015 年 9 月 21 日）。

“文化发展同样包含一系列非货币形式的利益，例如：个人和团体更佳的社会包容性、归属感、韧性、创新精神、创造力和企业家精神及当地资源的使用和技能与知识的运用。尊重和支持文化用语有助于加强共同体的社会资本及在公共机构培养信任。文化因素亦可影响生活方式、个人行为、消费方式、与环境管理相关的价值观及我们与自然环境的相互作用。当地或本地知识体系和环境管理实践可为解决生态挑战、防止生物多样性流失、减少土地退化和减轻气候变化的影响提供有价值的洞见。”⁷

可持续发展目标表达全球有效性的要求。为了能够对人类生活质量产生适当的影响，须在相应区域和本地环境中结合相关民众生活现状实施。由于文化多样性为可持续干预措施的相关性、失败及成功的决定因素，因此高效的规划不能忽略文化多样性。

共同价值观

显然，若无共同价值观支持或支撑，则无法实施全面的社会转型（例如：2030 年可持续发展议程中所示）。2000 年 9 月联合国大会第 8 次全体会议中所表明规范性原则为所有可持续发展努力的依据：

- 自由，例如：摆脱饥饿，摆脱暴力恐惧、压制或不公平。基于民众意愿且民主的参与性施政可最有效地确保此类自由权利。
- 平等，例如：所有个体、团体和国家从发展中受益的机会平等。妇女、青少年、青年和儿童作为在全球范围内遭受不平等待遇的最大团体，应享有获得平等权利的优先权。不平等会延续贫穷、减缓发展速度、降低经济效率、阻碍经济增长、威胁社会和谐与稳定并破坏人力资本积累。
- 团结，应团结从全球化及经济增长中获益最少的民众。关心并支持老年人、儿童和病人及其他弱势群体。
- 宽容，例如：宽容信仰、文化和语言的多样性。应积极倡导各种文明之间的和平及对话文化。
- 敬畏自然，即：尊重所有物种的生命并谨慎使用自然资源，只有如此才能保留自然提供给我们当代人的无限丰富的资源财富并将其传递给我们的后代。当前的生产和消费模式是地球生命支持系统的最大威胁。

⁷ 2015 年后 UN 发展议程 UN 系统任务组（2012）：文化：可持续发展的驱动和推动者。Thematic Think Piece。UNESCO. <http://en.unesco.org/post2015/sites/post2015/files/Think%20Piece%20Culture.pdf>（最后访问时间：2015 年 9 月 21 日）。

- 共同责任，即：应共同承担全球经济管理和社会发展及应对国际和平与安全威胁的责任。环境挑战（例如：气候变化）的成本和负担应根据社会公平和公正原则平均分配。

制定正确的价值观取向为所有决策水平的要素。不论在任何时候，国际社会宣布的价值观均应受到所有文化的尊重，应受到所有宗教的认可。该价值观应完全符合可获得的巨大知识储备，例如：

- 由 Hans Küng⁸发展了二十余年的全球伦理基金思想主体（包括全球伦理宣言和全球经济伦理宣言⁹）：此类出版物中所述的原则 – 非暴力、公正与团结、尊重当代和后代人类 – 为人类行为的每个领域（包括可持续发展规划）提供方向。

诚实守信同样适用于当今有关气候变化和环境安全限界的认识。

- UNESCO¹⁰开发的 21 世纪伦理共同框架强调了跨文化核心价值观（例如：关爱、诚实、公平、自由、团结、宽容、责任和尊重生命）的重要性并将其置于“自然关系”、“人类实践”、“个人和团体”之间的关系及公平正义的背景中。

由于可持续性是一个规范的概念，因此，可持续发展价值观最为适当。进一步讲，可持续性是一个基于伦理考虑和规范性原则的道德概念。若我们以这种方式理解可持续性，则将结合政治伦理、商业伦理和个人伦理，对过程、政策及必要的方法和目的进行规范性论述。

虽然在共同价值观和规范性原则方面达成共识极其重要，但并不一定意味着与特定（经济、社会、生态、法律或政治）环境相关。2030 年可持续发展议程中使用了大量具有道德意义的条款，例如：“人格尊严”、“公平”、“正义”、“包容”或“团结”。世界范围内理性的民众可能认为上述观点为重要的价值观。需要我们不断努力并保持警觉，以确保其持久性。人类并不（总是）自然地倾向于按照规范原则行动，即便理性呼吁。价值观的实现取决于适宜的条件；仅在特定环境中获得具体意义。¹¹

⁸ <http://www.weltethos.org>

⁹ Küng H., K.M. Leisinger 和 J. Wieland（2010）：全球经济伦理宣言。全球业务的影响及挑战。dtv, Munich.

¹⁰ Yersu, Kim (1999): 21 世纪伦理共同框架。UNESCO, 巴黎。

<http://nesdoc.unesco.org/images/0011/001176/117622eo.pdf>（最后访问时间：2015 年 9 月 21 日）

¹¹ Walzer M. (1994): 厚与薄：国内外道德论证。圣母大学出版社。

价值观冲突

2030 年议程中表达的价值观为编制可持续的干预措施提供了必要的指导，希望干预成果将在为未来后代保留环境完整性的同时提高当今弱势社会群体的生活。然而，价值观和规范性准则难免导致我们的利益冲突。例如：虽然人权对获得社会、经济和环境可持续性必不可少，但是，旨在可持续性的政策和干预措施可能影响各种人权（受法律保护的、哲学上宣称的、基于宗教的人权）。此外，不同的国家和文化设想，对人权的保护和应用均不同。

环境因素极其重要，上述内容表明了原因。情景化将帮助政府、企业和公民社会致力于 2030 年议程的总体目标的同时设置优先目标（可在特定时间和地点响应最紧急的相关需要）。

当面对不同的选择时，环境因素有助于我们清除相关问题（如下所示）：

- 我们需要多少监管制度和官僚主义/我们是否愿意忍受，以确保可持续性？ 监管制度超出一定界限便会阻碍经济增长所需的企业家积极性，该界限在哪里？ “科学监管”的构成是什么？ 人们如何依赖市场机制为正确的行动方针提供激励措施？
- 我们如何处理当代人的权利和权益与未来后代的权利和权益？ 我们如何解决两者之间矛盾问题？

在看似相互矛盾的价值观和可持续目标之间试图取得平衡的尝试中我们会遇到 “抗解问题”¹²。为了使每个人都满意，“抗解问题”中的一些仅能“温驯”而非“解决”：

- 一个人如果不了解特定环境，则将无法理解阻碍可持续发展的障碍；一个人如果在意识中没有一种解决方案，则将无法意图明确地搜索相关的信息。我们对问题的本质的认知决定问题解决方案的本质。经济学家将寻找经济方案；政治家将寻找政治方案；工程师将寻找技术方案等等。所有人都有其各自的观点，但都难以整体把握。
- “抗解问题”没有停止规则，即：对于何时达到“可持续性”，没有清晰的概念。何种事务环境状态为“足够好”，哪种收入和财富分布为“公平”？ 同一件事对于一些人是接受的，但对另外一些人却可能是丑闻。

¹² “抗解问题”的概念，见 Rittel, H.W.J. 和 W.M. Webber (1973)：一般规划理论的两难选择。政治科学 4:155 pp.

- 有一些社会、经济、生态或其他问题可能通过未来的科学知识解决且不会对未来后代产生影响，我们可以将其中的哪些视为“过渡问题”？¹³
- 观察者的世界观决定什么是可接受的，什么是不可以接受的。因此，一个可行的行动计划在很大程度上已成为主观判断问题。

为了帮助我们更自信地接近可持续发展 2030 年议程的宏伟目标，我们可以将世界人权宣言的序言作为实例。根据 UDHR 的相关措辞，我们可以将可持续发展定义为“作为所有人民和所有国家努力实践的共同标准，以期每一个人和机构经常铭记可持续发展道路的必要性，努力促进一致性行动并渐进地实施先进的国家和国际措施，以得到普遍和有效的承认和遵行；”

走可持续发展之路是每个人的责任

从全球角度来看

提及全球化带来的挑战时，全球化的治理改革不可避免：没有一致的全球化治理方案，那些想搭全球公共产品顺风车的人就会从中获得非法利益，全球可持续发展也会受短期的国家政治利益影响。联合国的相关领导机构在此方面制定了详细制度，例如：《可持续发展网络解决方案》和《联合国全球契约》的 LEAD 倡议会促进持续型学习的发展，而且对提高国际化水平起到指导作用。

从国家角度来看

从国家角度出发，2030 议程是否能达成一致主要取决于对以下关键问题的回复：在社会责任分配中如何处理效率与公平？政府、企业和民间团体的理想形象到底是什么——对于所有人来说他们的职责是什么？这样的问题不可能得到一一回答；适用于某个国家或某种文化的东西不一定适用于其他国家或文化，而且我们也很难想象一个获得大部分人认可的提议在其他文化背景下会遇到何种障碍？经验显示当一个国家的社会各部门之间责任分工清晰而且彼此相互协作时，这个国家的经济和社会目标能够达到最佳状态——前提是各个国家要有共同的人文价值观并且就共同的目标达成一致意见。没有人会为所有的事承担责任，也没有人会主动放弃权利。

¹³ 该种情况，见 Popper K. (1957)：历史决定论的贫困，伦敦。

政府职能

将一个国家可持续发展计划提上日程的首要责任在于各国政府及其行政机关。建立合适的次序、根据问题的严重性分配可利用资源、以最佳的成本效益组织工作。¹⁴无论全球经济和地方经济带来何种机遇，也无论地方纳税人或国际社会能利用何种资源，可利用的经济、社会、文化、政治、科技和其他资源仍然是促进可持续发展中重要的因素。也许会有人举出一些特例或认为下面所列举的因素重要性不一，但是没有人会否定他们之间的基本联系。

- 政策和社会决策透明度
- 对优先需求的反响能力
- 所有社会部门中决策者承担的决策责任和工作责任
- 法律规则
- 独立高效的司法制度
- 制度多元性和群众对影响自己人生的决策的参与程度

虽然这种总纲一般都不会引起争论，但它们转化成实际行动后就要面对来自全世界的许多困难：决策者会面临一个艰难时期，在这段时期他们会有一段时间感到选民带给他们的压力和推行改革的艰难，而他们还需日后依靠这些选民继续连任。只有那些价值信念极强的人才会在面对有损自己利益的做法时依然选择该做的事。

企业的作用

商业部门在社会责任分配中也有自己的义务与责任。他们的首要责任就是为消费者提供满足客户需求的产品和服务，并且能在市场竞争价格中获得利润，但前提是不能违背法律规定。商品和服务通过市场实现其各种各样的社会价值，而且还能使我们的日常生活变得更加丰富便利。在此我仅举一个例子：良药利病，良药能够减轻病痛保护我们的生命，提高患者的生活质量（减轻痛苦、提高自理能力，副作用小）让患者有一个相对正常的生活和工作。

成功的企业参与时经济增长最有力的推动者。包容性经济增长也增加了“金字塔底端”¹⁵的选择与机遇，从而还能减轻可持续发展工作的难度。在增加就业、提高收入、

¹⁴ 详见莱辛格 K.M. (2004)：他对于战胜贫困、尊重人权十分慎重：牛津布莱克维尔出版社代表联合国科教文组织（UNESCO）出版的国际社会科学期刊第 180 期：313-320.

¹⁵ 此处我参考了普哈拉的说法，意思是如果一个人不再将“穷人”认定为受害者或者不再把他们作为负担而是将他们视为有创造力的人，那么他就有可能成为新的企业家，开辟出新的市场和机遇（他在他

发展提供技术及管理技能、增加社会效益、纳税、缴纳养老基金和为经济、社会及环境问题提供解决方案方面，企业及其管理人员是它们永远的主力军。

事实上，“是企业而不是抽象的经济因素或政府在创造和分配着绝大部分的社会财富、科技创新、商业贸易和提高生活水平”¹⁶

那些成功企业带来的利润往往不是零和博弈的结果，在零和博弈中其他的参与者失败了：公司通过和其他行业部门的连锁效应成功地拉动经济增长，因此把“蛋糕”越做越大。在许多新兴市场国家中，商业合作为社会提供了大量的工作岗位，提高了居民收入，从而大大地缓解了当地的贫困。

当然，也并不是企业家本身令人满意。诚信¹⁷竞争，也就是企业家的那种负责的品质引导着他们按国际标准来做，例如将《联合国全球公约》¹⁸为共同责任。当然，“负责任”是避免造成伤害的首要要求也是必须承担的责任。不论人类的世界观多么差别多大，目标和期望值---全世界的人大部分都会赞同应避免一切可能造成伤害的因素。若考虑到子孙后代的福祉，要做到无害无疑是一项十分具挑战性的任务。许多今天的企业与以前一样---使用不可再生资源的方式或由于缺乏低碳生产路径¹⁹而有悖当今行星界限和气候变化成因知识。²⁰

开明的管理者知道不公平的劳动条件、有害的工作环境或更糟糕的是侵犯人权式的“间接伤害”是得不到认可的。他们也意识到如今商务活动的许多方面都需要依靠现在的技术进行转型。国家法律不完备也不能成为他们不承担责任的借口。开明的管理者会实施自我约束而且不参加商务活动，虽然这一点与 2030 年可持续发展议程不符。

如果我们将“诚信”定义为诚实，按照自己的价值观生活、能意识到自己的个人或社会行为所造成的后果，那么商业活动就会不符合 2030 议程提出的构建诚信社会的目标。同样对于那些老生常谈、陈词滥调的“可持续发展”言论也是如此。

“共同的责任”就是在游说议员在制定立法和监督规定时加大授权力度。若果支持 2030 年议程中国际社会提出的价值观那就要付诸实践，那么共同的关键绩效指标、目标设定、绩效考核和奖金制度就应包括各自的计量标准。

我们必须感谢企业部门，正如政府部门就出现了诱发性问题：没有任何因素显示管理人员应进行投资或缴纳“庇谷税”---各地的股东为日后能获得利润而缴纳的一种税。实际上所有公司的估计值都离不开财务分析师准确无误的决策---这些都要求短期业绩并且使用各自的基准。正如我们定义的一样，诚信感会打压短期盈利主义并促使各企业投资与 2030 议程相符的新领域、新产品和新服务。

的《金字塔底端的财富》---五周年纪念更新版，新泽西州：沃顿商学院出版社，2010，一书中提到：通过利润消灭贫困）

¹⁶ 高厦，伯金沙尔以及皮拉玛：《高厦管理法：优胜推动力》，皮尔森教育出版社，2005。

¹⁷ “诚信竞争”是一本仍受到专业人士推崇的书的书名：狄乔治 R.：《国际商务中的诚信竞争》，纽约：牛津大学出版社，1993。

¹⁸ www.unglobalcompact.org。

¹⁹ <http://unsdsn.org/what-we-do/deep-decarbonization-pathways/>

²⁰ <http://climate.nasa.gov>

游说诚信---在企业交流和企业事务中不存在矛盾

持续性创新：关键绩效指标要结合可持续发展目标、相关的激励机制、绩效评估、红利和晋升体制、供应连锁管理

持续性想象：与非政府组织、学术界及政府间的合作关系

关于技术转让、差别定价、知识产权管理（道德想象力）方面的可持续标准

已经对发展计划进行了交流并且其目标也已经达到---仍旧是就面临的障碍和尚未解决的问题展开的最重要的是：我们所有人的做法

半个世纪以前，当时美国的总统约翰·F·肯尼迪在华盛顿的美利坚大学做了一篇关于世界和平²¹的演讲。在当时可持续发展的大背景下他做的评论非常具有实时性。首先，他提到他所追求的世界和平并不是一种“美式和平”（美国强权下的世界安定和平），而是一种所有人都能获得人生价值的和平，“一种所有民族及其人民都能发展、追求并为他们的子孙后代创造更美好生活的和平---不仅是美国人民的和平而是全人类的和平---不仅是我们这个时代的和平而是永久的和平”而这些都是可持续发展之路涉及到的。他还提到：“我所说的并不是绝对的，我们对于世界和平及其美好的愿景多少会存在一些幻想。我并不排斥拥有希望和梦想的价值观但是我们在制定近期目标时对此事很少产生怀疑和退缩的。

让我们把注意力集中在比较实际的、比较能实现的和平上。这种和平不是建立在人性突变的基础上，而是建立在人类制度逐步演变的基础上，建立在符合众人利益的一系列具体行动和有效协议的基础上。要实现这种和平，没有任何捷径可走，也不是一两个大国采用任何宏伟、奇妙的方案所能实现的，真正的和平时许多国家采取许多行动才能实现的。它必然是充满活力而不是静止的，并能不断变化以应付每一代人所发出的挑战，因为和平是解决问题的过程和途径。

将“和平”一词换为“可持续发展”并将众所周知的这枚“钉子”钉到头上。最后同样重要的是，约翰·F·肯尼迪说：“

“我们的问题都是人为的，因而能够由人来解决。事在人为。有关人类命运的问题，没有一个人是不能解决的。人靠自己的立志和精神解决了一些似乎无法解决的问题。我们相信，他们还能这么做。”

每个人在社会中的角色有很多，他们是家庭中的一员，市民、消费者、选民、学者等，他们每天做出的决定都会对可持续发展产生影响。每个人对于可持续发展的责任不能由其他人来承担。做出有违正确标准的“错事”不能归因于缺乏有效治理、财政激励政策不当或市场环境所限。希望是全世界的人类不论是扮演社会角色还是个人角色都能接受可持续发展的责任而且在其所在领域承担共同的责任和义务。

²¹ http://www.npr.org/documents/2006/oct/american_speeches/kennedy.pdf

但是---通常在政治和经济范围---我们也存在一种激励问题。各地的人民通常很难接受消费习惯的变化，因为他们认为这对全球可持续发展只能做出“小小的”贡献。我们大部分人都不愿接受现今的人口流动性受到限制，因为这对预防日后的问题起不到什么作用---例如，印度洋中已被海水淹没的岛屿。但是我们每个人都是政治、经济、学术、社会和教会公民的最终决策者：

没有任何一个机构、政治体或经济体会作为个体默默付出，它们作为致力于可持续发展的有限控股体，通过许多人在不同岗位上的付出达到他们的目的。如果我们将可持续发展作为道德观的内容，或缺乏道德---由群众及他们的价值观、世界观及他们的个人行为造成。那可以确定的是，每种机构都会发展自己的制度体系。然而这并不意味着我们可以推卸个人责任，相反的，我们要更加积极地承担自己的责任。如果我们也错误的认定各机构应对所有事承担责任，那唯一可能的结果就是更改“现行秩序”。在这样的框架中，我们人类建立的“现行秩序”就会成为责任承担者渐渐消失。

但是我们确实有责任和能力来改变或者决定这种秩序的性质。而且我们不得不这样做。不同秩序下的每个阶层的人都是他们领域中都是佼佼者，他们富有工作经验并且精于世故。因此在这些人都要承担责任，为了他们自己，为了他们统治下的人，也为了达到各自秩序下的目标。他们也有责任去拥护他们所坚持的信念。假设，不论何种原因，他们没有这么做，他们会为自己缺乏实际的道德意识和道德勇气而感到惭愧。

所以人类，不论他们生命中的制度体系是什么，都必须作为责任人承担责任。当今社会不会将集体视为活动的对象。活动的对象通常是个人。因此关于可持续发展的著述必须围绕两个关键因素展开：可持续发展的道德角度和心理角度。

术语“可持续发展”保留了它的积极涵义。我们仍将它视为一种令人满意、有价值和对全人类有利的发展。我么都知道“人类不仅仅靠着面包生存下去”可持续发展反映出来的一些问题引导着我们去探求一些疑题，例如“我人生的真正意义是什么？”或“到底什么才是美满、幸福的人生？”²²当然，此议题的实质性论点是很重要而且一直很重要。但是有关人生目的和人生幸福或“人生幸福”的含义的回答已经超越了经济或物质范畴。我们也有理由坚持“乐观主义”：“人类是一种富有天赋的生物，他们一种有自我意识的生命体，他们对自我，亲朋、过去甚至未来都是有思想意识的。”²³关怀、责任、尊重和知识---“爱”按埃里希·弗罗姆的话说---是有理性的人基本性格中的一部分，同样也包括执着和怜悯。没有精神家园和形而上学理论的支撑，人类不可能和平相处、繁荣昌盛。没有社会资本的哺育人类社会也不可能兴旺发达。植入到可持续发展中的精神价值和心理价值也不是有意的神秘侧重。

刺激人们对主观感受到的“消费需求”和我们日后想为后代争取的迫切需要的客观东西不同，将价值尺度转化成可持续发展的论述很有可能会将不良习惯或伪学者的做法放入到观点中。

²² 埃里希·弗洛姆，《现代人的道德责任》美林，帕尔默，首次印刷，1958；底特律：《行为与发展》季刊第 5: 3-14.卷，由冯克博士和卡尔·施莱希特共同整理发表。

²³ 埃里希·弗洛姆（1956）：《爱之艺术》第 6 页由冯克博士和卡尔·施莱希特共同整理发表，哈珀出版公司首次印刷，纽约，1956；另请参阅埃里希·弗洛姆，纽约：《占有还是生存》？哈珀与罗出版公司，1976。

初步结论

仅当以共同的价值观作为支撑、通过统一的治理框架编排且受促进性措施支持时，全面改革的进程（例如：2030 年可持续发展议程所设想的进程）才可获得成功 – 但是，可持续发展的最重要的单一因素为：被赋予了意识、具有学习和改变的意愿、被赋权作出有益于实现我们共同期望未来的决定的人类个体。

大多数科学家、公民社会代表及企业部门中数目不断增长的开明的领导者的共识为：现代人 – 截止 2050²⁴ 年为 97 亿 – 为了地球生命支持系统的完整性将不得不调整其生活方式。

Giovanni Pico della Mirandola 在其 1486 年的人类尊严演说²⁵中将人类描述为“世界上最美好的造物”，“生物之间的媒介；与其之上的上帝相熟；是其之下的众生的主人；通过其敏锐的感知、理性的探究及其智慧之光，他是自然的阐释者；在亘古的永恒和万变的瞬态之间设置中途岛；是生命的集结、世间的赞美，仅稍逊于天使。”而且，Pico 让上帝教授人类一些有关在各个领域做决定的重要知识即：

“你具有自由选择的权利和尊严，你可以将自己塑造成你选择的任何形式。你被赋予了将自己退化成更低级的生命（畜性）形式的权利，你亦被赋予了继续保持自己的智慧和判断的权利，你可以蜕变成更高级的形式 – 神圣的生命。”

不能将有关可持续性的个人责任推卸至他人。不能将违反我们更好的判断的行为归因于缺乏良好管理、错误的财政激励政策或市场状况阻碍。我们要通过自己的设备和资源塑造我们共同的未来。让我们期望每个人均能了解利害攸关的状况，期望每个人均能唤起自己的意愿真诚地与他人共同努力。对于代表结合人类的共同纽带的全球共同价值观，已达成坚定共识。²⁶

²⁴ http://esa.un.org/unpd/wpp/Publications/Files/Key_Findings_WPP_2015.pdf。

²⁵ http://www.andallthat.co.uk/uploads/2/3/8/9/2389220/pico_-_oration_on_the_dignity_of_man.pdf。

²⁶ 有关全球价值观和可持续性的讨论，见 Leisinger, K.M. (2014)：全球发展与全球价值观。巴塞尔。
(<http://unsdsn.org/resources/publications/global-values-for-global-development/>)

联合国系统后 2015 发展议程任务小组

实现我们共同憧憬的未来

摘要

此报告涵盖联合国系统任务小组向秘书长提供的关于后 2015 联合国发展议程的主要研究结果和意见。秘书长建立联合国系统任务小组，是为了与相关人员磋商，构建系统范围内的新的发展框架。自 2012 年一月启动以来，小组包含了由超过 50 个联合国系统部门和其他国际组织根据规定指定的资深专家。

后 2015 联合国发展议程的主要问题，是如何保证全球化成为一个推动当代和未来全世界人民的正面力量。全球化给我们带来广大的机遇，但是目前全球化带来的利益分布却十分不均衡。如果在消费、生产和资源利用方面没有可持续模式的重大改善，这样不断追求物质福利的进步将会超越自然资源基础所能提供的范围。持续的不平等和争夺有限资源是引起争端，饥饿和暴力的决定性因素；而这些现象进而也阻止了人类发展和实现可持续发展的脚步。

我们不能视若无睹，我们需要革命性的改变。既然挑战如此相互关联，我们就需要一套新的以及全方位的方法来处理。依此，联合国系统内任务小组关于后 2015 联合国发展议程准备的第一个报告建议：

- 建立一个以人权、平等和可持续为核心价值观的未来愿景。

联合国系统后 2015 发展议程任务小组

- 一个建立在有切实的最终目地和具体目标基础上的议程形式，是千年发展目标框架的一个强项应当保留，可是这需要由四个长远考虑的方面来重新整合：(1) 全面的社会发展；(2) 全面的经济发展；(3) 环境可持续性；(4) 和平与安全。这个有所侧重的方式是与千年宣言中的原则相一致的，也铺垫出在可持续发展这三个核心基础上，为当代和下一代人建立一个没有贫穷与恐惧的前景。
- 为了能够实现我们共同憧憬的未来，在全球、区域、国家和次国家层面上高度的政策一致性是必须的。“发展推动者”的核心内容应当被定位为确保政策一致的指引方针，这样不会过于依赖后 2015 议程的指引。从建立议程上来说，我们应当认识到没有可以广泛适用的单一模板。因此，在遵循总体规划和根本原则的基础上，议程在国家政策设定和因地方制宜方面上应留有比较大的灵活空间。
- 后 2015 联合国发展议程应当作为真正的全球议程来规划，让全世界国家都能共同承担责任。相应的，全球发展合作也需要重新定义，在众多发展伙伴中寻求更平衡的道路，而使要达成一个围绕人权的，公平的，和可持续途径的全球发展所须要的革命性改变成为可能。这也将包括全球治理机制的改革。
- 现在要定义切实的后 2015 联合国发展议程最终目地和具体目标还为时过早。首先各项进程都将需要首先走过场。里约+20 可持续发展峰会的成果和后续都将为后 2015 议程提供重要指导作用。提出的前景和框架都必须与里约+20 结果坚决保持一致。而且，关于后 2015 议程提出的愿景进行的全面性地广泛磋商过程仍然在进行中，这也将会成为共同规划愿景重要组成部分。

联合国系统后 2015 发展议程任务小组

当前的挑战在于如何就议程的轮廓达成共识，以便能够适当的认定当代和后代的发展需求，并且能将首要考虑凝聚成为清晰并且易于沟通的可持续发展目标，从而有助于指导全球、区域、国家和次国家层面上的政策一致性。

此报告旨在为今后更大范围内的磋商提供基本材料。

Karl Schlecht Foundation (KSG)
Foundation Global Values Alliance
World Ethos Institute Beijing (WEIB), PKU
Institute for Advanced Humanistic Studies (IAHS) PKU

The Sustainable Development for A Future We Want for All

Prof. Dr. Dr. h.c. Klaus M. Leisinger
President, Foundation Global Values Alliance

節 亮 風 高

我们共同憧憬的未来的
可持续发展

克劳斯·M·莱辛格 荣誉博士 教授
主席，全球价值联盟基金会

2015 Dialogue on Confucian Entrepreneurs
Peking University
Institute for Advanced Humanistic Studies (IAHS)
November 11, 2015

Confucian Entrepreneur Conference 2015
World Ethics Institute | Peking University
11–12th November 2015

Sustainable Development for A Future We Want for All

A Values–Driven Approach for Coherent Governance of all
Societal Actors

Klaus M. Leisinger



Klaus Michael Leisinger, founder and President of the Foundation Global Values Alliance (2013), is Professor of Sociology at the University of Basel (special areas Development Policy, Business Ethics and Corporate Responsibility), and Special Adviser of the UN Global Compact on the Post 2015 Development and Business Ethics. Klaus Leisinger is a member of the Board of the Karl Schlecht Foundation and oversees the Foundation's ethics-related programs. He is member of the Consortium Board of the Consultative Group for International Agricultural Research (CGIAR), as well as of the Leadership Council of the Sustainable Development Solutions Network, initiated by UNO Secretary General Ban Ki-moon and directed by Professor Jeffrey Sachs. Until 2013, Leisinger headed the development cooperation Foundations of the Swiss pharmaceutical corporations Ciba and Novartis for more than 30 years.

Foundation Global Values Alliance
Schönbeinstrasse 23
4056 Basel, Switzerland

info@globalewerteallianz.ch | info@globalvaluesalliance.ch
www.globalewerteallianz.ch | www.globalvaluesalliance.ch

Introduction

In the final week of September 2015, the international community committed to an agenda that is meant to “transform our world”: the *2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development*.¹ The agenda is a plan of action for “people, planet and prosperity”, implemented in partnership and meant to strengthen justice and dignity – i.e. universal peace in larger freedom. Never before have world leaders committed to common action across such a broad and universal agenda. Never before was there a larger agreement that – from a sustainability point of view – *all* countries are “developing countries”.

The Agenda establishes the global development framework for the next 15 years, building on the successes and lessons learned from the *Millennium Development Goals*. The 17 *Sustainable Development Goals* (SDGs) and 169 targets have been drafted following extensive global consultations with grassroots communities, civil society organizations, scientific experts, political leaders and business representatives. The participatory dimension of the whole approach is indeed unprecedented. Unprecedented therefore is also the extent to which the global community assumes “ownership” of the *2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development*.

The broad consensus would not have been achieved without the groundwork laid by the UN System Task Force, resulting in their report *Realizing the Future We Want for All* (2012).² The Task Force articulated its recommendations for the new agenda in very clear terms:

“The central challenge of the post-2015 UN development agenda is to ensure that globalization becomes a positive force for all the worlds’ peoples of present and future generations. Globalization offers great opportunities, but its benefits are at present very unevenly shared. The continuous striving for improvements in material welfare is threatening to surpass the limits of the natural resource base unless there is a radical shift towards more sustainable patterns of consumption and production and resource use. Persistent inequalities and struggles over scarce resources are among key determinants of situations of conflict, hunger, insecurity and violence, which in turn are key factors that hold back human development and efforts to achieve sustainable development.”

¹ United Nations General Assembly (2015): Transforming Our World: The 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development. New York. http://www.un.org/ga/search/view_doc.asp?symbol=A/69/L.85&Lang=E (last access September 21, 2015).

² UN System Task Team on the Post-2015 UN Development Agenda (2012): Realizing the Future We Want for All. Report to the Secretary-General. New York. http://www.un.org/millenniumgoals/pdf/Post_2015_UNTTreport.pdf (last access September 21, 2015). See also the Chinese Version of the Report’s Executive Summary in the Annex of this paper. For the Chinese Version of the full report and the executive summary follow this link: http://www.un.org/en/development/desa/policy/untaskteam_undf/report.shtml (last access September 21, 2015).

“Business as usual thus cannot be an option and transformative change is needed. As the challenges are highly interdependent, a new, more holistic approach is needed to address them.”³

The UN Task Force insisted that a high degree of policy coherence at global, regional, national and sub-national levels will be required to achieve the SDGs. And while the new agenda was to consist of *global* goals that are *universally* applicable, it was also to allow for target settings *adapted to regional, national and sub-national conditions* in adherence to international standards.

Two basic requirements for global policy coherence and local target setting are the following: a *shared understanding of development* and *shared values*.

A Shared Understanding of Development

The international community agrees that development is influenced by a complex interaction of multiple economic, social, cultural, ecological, political and legal factors. That makes development context-specific: There is no universal blueprint to overcome the specific disparities and deficits. There is, however, a common vision that the *Future We Want for All* is a world

“free of poverty, hunger, disease and want, where all life can thrive. We envisage a world free of fear and violence. A world with universal literacy. A world with equitable and universal access to quality education at all levels, to health care and social protection, where physical, mental and social well-being are assured. A world where we reaffirm our commitments regarding the human right to safe drinking water and sanitation and where there is improved hygiene; and where food is sufficient, safe, affordable and nutritious. A world where human habitats are safe, resilient and sustainable and where there is universal access to affordable, reliable and sustainable energy.”⁴

Beyond these material aspects of the quality of human life, the international community envisages

“a world of universal respect for human rights and human dignity, the rule of law, justice, equality and non-discrimination; of respect for race, ethnicity and cultural diversity; and of equal opportunity permitting the full realization of human potential and contributing to shared prosperity. A world which invests in its children and in which every child grows up free from violence and exploitation. A world in which every woman and girl enjoys full gender equality and all legal, social and economic barriers to

³ Ibid. Page i.

⁴ UN General Assembly (2015): Draft resolution submitted by the President of the General Assembly. Draft outcome document of the United Nations Summit for the adoption of the post-2015 development agenda. New York, August 12, 2015: 3. http://www.un.org/ga/search/view_doc.asp?symbol=A/69/L.85&Lang=E (last access September 21, 2015).

their empowerment have been removed. A just, equitable, tolerant, open and socially inclusive world in which the needs of the most vulnerable are met.”⁵

Culture matters.

UNESCO defines culture as a set of distinctive spiritual, material, intellectual and emotional features of a society or a social group, that encompasses, in addition to art and literature, lifestyles, ways of living together, value systems, traditions and beliefs.⁶ Culture is seen to have a transformative power on existing international development approaches, which today are mainly shaped by Western perspectives. Cultural diversity and non-western “pursuits of happiness” will enrich the development debate and make it more relevant to the needs of people in low-income and emerging countries in a different cultural settings:

“Culture-led development also includes a range of non-monetized benefits, such as greater social inclusiveness and rootedness, resilience, innovation, creativity and entrepreneurship for individuals and communities, and the use of local resources, skills, and knowledge. Respecting and supporting cultural expressions contribute to strengthening the social capital of a community and fosters trust in public institutions. Cultural factors also influence lifestyles, individual behaviour, consumption patterns, values related to environmental stewardship, and our interaction with the natural environment. Local and indigenous knowledge systems and environmental management practices provide valuable insight and tools for tackling ecological challenges, preventing biodiversity loss, reducing land degradation, and mitigating the effects of climate change.”⁷

Sustainable development goals express claims of global validity. In order to have a desirable impact on human quality of life they must be operationalized in regional and local contexts, in the realities of life of the people concerned. Efficient programming cannot ignore that cultural diversity is a determining factor for the relevance, failure and success of sustainability interventions.

Shared Values

It is obvious that a comprehensive societal transformation such as the one suggested by the *2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development* cannot be implemented if it is not inspired and carried by shared values. The normative principles that were expressed at

⁵ Ibid: 5. See http://www.un.org/ga/search/view_doc.asp?symbol=A/69/L.85&Lang=E (last access September 21, 2015).

⁶ UNESCO (2001): Universal Declaration On Cultural Diversity. Adopted by the 31st Session of the General Conference of UNESCO. Paris, 2nd November 2001.
<http://unesdoc.unesco.org/images/0012/001271/127160m.pdf> (last access September 21, 2015).

⁷ UN System Task Team on the Post-2015 UN Development Agenda (2012): Culture: a driver and an enabler of sustainable development. Thematic Think Piece. UNESCO.
<http://en.unesco.org/post2015/sites/post2015/files/Think%20Piece%20Culture.pdf> (last access September 21, 2015).

the 8th plenary meeting of the UN General Assembly in September 2000 are the foundation of all sustainable development endeavors:

- *Freedom*, e.g. from hunger and from the fear of violence, oppression or injustice. Democratic and participatory governance based on the will of the people were seen to best assure these rights.
- *Equality*, e.g. in the opportunity for all individuals, groups, and nations to benefit from development. Priority must be placed on advancing the rights of women, adolescents, youth and children as the largest groups facing systematic inequality worldwide. Inequalities perpetuate poverty, stall development progress, reduce economic efficiency, hinder growth, threaten social cohesion and stability, and undermine human capital accumulation.
- *Solidarity* with those who benefit least from globalization and economic growth. Care and support for the elderly, children, and sick people, as well as for other vulnerable groups.
- *Tolerance*, e.g. with regard to diversity of belief, culture and language. A culture of peace and dialogue among all civilizations should be actively promoted.
- *Respect for nature*, i.e. reverence for the life of *all species* and prudence in the use natural resources, so that the immeasurable riches provided to us by nature be preserved and passed on to our descendants. The current patterns of production and consumption pose the greatest threat to the integrity of our Earth's life support systems.
- *Shared responsibility*, i.e. for managing worldwide economic and social development, as well as threats to international peace and security. The costs and burdens of environmental challenges such as climate change ought to be distributed along the principle of *equity* and *social justice*.

Making the right value choices is constitutive on all decision levels. The values proclaimed by the international community are respected in all cultures, recognized by all religions and at all times. They are fully compatible with the huge store of knowledge available through, e.g.

- The body of thought of the *Global Ethic Foundation* developed over more than two decades by Hans Küng⁸, including the *Declaration Toward a Global Ethic* and the *Manifesto Global Economic Ethic*⁹: The principles outlined in those publications – non-violence, justice and solidarity, respect for present and future generations of humanity – provide orientation for every sphere of human action, including for

⁸ <http://www.weltethos.org>

⁹ Küng H., K.M. Leisinger and J. Wieland (2010): *Manifesto Global Economic Ethic. Consequences and Challenges for Global Businesses*. dtv, Munich.

sustainable development programming. The same is true for honesty, applied to, for example, today's knowledge about climate change and planetary boundaries.

- The *Common Framework for the Ethics of the 21st Century* developed by UNESCO¹⁰ stresses the importance of cross-cultural core values such as love, truthfulness, fairness, freedom, unity, tolerance, responsibility and respect for life, and puts them in the context of "relationship to nature", "human fulfillment", the relationship between "individuals and communities", and justice.

A value-driven approach to sustainable development is most appropriate, because sustainability is a *normative* concept. I would go one step further and say, sustainability is a *moral* concept based on ethical considerations and normative principles. If we embrace sustainability in this way, normative discourses about processes, policies, means and ends become necessary, with *political* ethics, *business* ethics, and *individual* ethics at their center.

A consensus on common values and normative principles is important, but this does not necessarily imply that they are relevant in specific (economic, social, ecological, legal or political) contexts. The *2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development* uses plenty of terms of moral significance, e.g. "human dignity", "equitableness", "justice", "inclusiveness" or "solidarity". Reasonable people all over the world will probably agree that these *are* important values. It takes our constant effort and watchfulness to ensure they are sustained. Human beings are not (always) naturally inclined to act on normative principles, even if reason calls for it. The *realization* of values depends on congenial conditions; they acquire concrete meaning only in a specific context.¹¹

Conflicting values

The values expressed in the 2030 Agenda provide an essential guidance for programming sustainability interventions, in the hope that the outcomes will improve the lives of today's disadvantaged societies while preserving the environmental integrity for future generations. Values and normative principles do not, however, spare us conflicts of interests. For example, human rights are essential to achieve social, economic, and environmental sustainability. But policies and interventions aiming for sustainability can affect various human rights, both those that are legally protected and those that are claimed on philosophical or religious grounds. In addition, different countries and cultures conceive, protect and apply human rights differently.

This is why context is so important. Contextualization will help governments, businesses, and civil society set priority targets that respond to the most urgent and relevant needs at a specific time and place, while still contributing to the overall

¹⁰ Yersu, Kim (1999): *A Common Framework for the Ethics of the 21st Century*. UNESCO, Paris.
<http://unesdoc.unesco.org/images/0011/001176/117622eo.pdf> (last access September 21, 2015).

¹¹ Walzer M. (1994): *Thick and Thin. Moral Argument at Home and Abroad*. Notre Dame University Press: 2.

objectives of the 2030 Agenda. When confronted with difficult choices, it is helpful to clear some questions such as the following:

- How much regulation and bureaucracy do we need/are we willing to tolerate to ensure sustainability? Where is the limit beyond which regulation hinders entrepreneurial initiatives needed for economic growth? What constitutes “smart regulation”, and where can one rely on market mechanisms to provide incentives for the right course of action?
- How are we dealing with the rights and entitlements of the current generations versus those of future generations – and how are we solving dilemmas?

In the attempt to strike a balance between seemingly conflicting values and sustainability goals we will meet “wicked problems”¹². Some of them may only be “tamed” rather than “solved” to everyone’s satisfaction:

- One cannot understand the barriers to sustainable development without knowing the specific context, and one cannot meaningfully search for information without having a kind of solution in mind. Our perception of the nature of the problem determines the nature of the approach to a solution. Economists will look for economic solutions, politicians for political ones, engineers for technical solutions, and so on. All have their points, but all miss the whole.
- “Wicked problems” have no stopping rule, i.e. it is not clear when *sustainability* is reached. What kind of an environmental state of affairs is “good enough”, which income and wealth distribution is “fair”? What is acceptable for some, can present a scandal for others.
- Which social, economic, ecological or other problems are we willing to accept as “transitional issues”, because they are likely resolved by future scientific knowledge and are not problematic for the wellbeing of future generations?¹³
- The worldview of the observer determines what is acceptable and what not. A feasible plan of action therefore becomes to a great extent a matter of subjective judgment.

To help us to confidently approach the bold objectives of *2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development*, we could take the preamble of the *Universal Declaration of Human Rights* as an example. Along the lines of the UDHR, we could define sustainable development “as a new common standard of practices for all people and all nations, to the end that every individual and every organ of society, keeping the necessity for a sustainable development path constantly in mind, shall strive to promote coherent action and

¹² For the concept of “wicked problems” see Rittel H.W.J. and W.M. Webber (1973): Dilemmas in a General Theory of Planning. In: Policy Sciences Vol. 4: 155 ff.

¹³ See in this context also Popper K. (1957): The Poverty of Historicism, London.

implement state-of-the-art national and international measures *progressively*, to secure universal and effective recognition and observance.”

Sustainability is everybody's business!

The global dimension

As we talk about a global challenge, reforms on the global level of governance are indispensable: Without coherent global governance, free riders on global public goods will reap illegitimate benefits, and global sustainability will be subordinated to short-termed national political interests. The United Nations system is of particular importance in this respect, and leadership institutions such as the *Sustainable Development Solutions Network* and the *LEAD Initiative* of the *UN Global Compact* must be supported to facilitate a continuous learning process and to guide action on an international level.

The national dimension

On the national level the chances for a successful implementation of the 2030 Agenda depend significantly on the answer to the following crucial questions: What is a fair and efficient division of responsibility within society? What exactly is the ideal role for government, business, and civil society – and for all of us as individuals? Such questions cannot be answered for all; what is appropriate in one country or culture might not be in another, and what will be met with majority approval in one context can meet resistance in another. Experience shows that a nation's economic and social objectives are served best when there is a clear and mutually agreed division of duties between the different societal sectors – provided that the respective society shares human values and an understanding of its goals. No one can assume responsibility for everything; and no one can claim sweeping rights.

The role of governments

The *primary responsibility* for designing and implementing a national sustainable development agenda rests with national governments and their administrations. It is their duty to create the political framework, to set appropriate priorities, to allocate the available resources according to the severity of problems, and to organize the work in the most cost-effective way.¹⁴ Whatever opportunities the global and local economies offer, whatever resources are made available by local taxpayers or the international community, *good governance* with regard to the management of the available economic, social, cultural, political, technical and other resources remains the single most important factor for sustainable development. One might disagree on specificities or the weight of the following factors, but not on their basic relevance:

¹⁴ See Leisinger K.M. (2004): Overcoming poverty and respecting human rights: ten points for serious consideration. In: International Social Science Journal Vol. 180. Published on behalf of UNESCO by Blackwell Publishing, Oxford: 313-320.

- Transparency in policy and social decision-making;
- Responsiveness to priority needs;
- Accountability for the policies and work undertaken by all decision makers in all societal sectors;
- Rule of law;
- Independent and efficient judicial system; as well as
- Institutional pluralism and participation of the people in all decisions affecting their lives.

While these general principles are more or less uncontroversial, their conversion into practical action is confronted with a huge incentive problem all over the world: Policy makers have a difficult time inflicting short-term burdens and inconvenient change processes today on electoral constituencies by whom they want to be re-elected tomorrow. Only individuals with deep value convictions will decide for the right thing to do even if it is to their personal disadvantage.

The role of business

The business sector has specific duties and responsibilities in society's division of responsibility too. What comes first is the responsibility to provide goods and services that meet customer needs and that can be sold profitably at competitive prices, while adhering to laws and regulations. The goods and services made available through markets generate social value of various sorts and can make daily life easier and more productive. To give just one example: Effective medicines can reduce the severity of diseases, protect life by reducing morbidity, improve the quality of life of patients (less pain and disability, fewer side effects) and allow for a (relatively) normal private and professional life.

Successful entrepreneurial engagement is *the* most important driver of economic growth. Inclusive economic growth increases choices and opportunities also at the "bottom of the pyramid"¹⁵ and thereby helps making all other sustainable development efforts easier. By creating employment and income, developing and providing technical and managerial skills, generating social benefits, paying taxes, contributing to pension funds and deriving innovative solutions to economic, social and environmental problems, corporations and their management are a substantial force for good:

¹⁵ I do share C.K. Prahalad's notion that if one stops thinking of the "poor" as victims or as a burden and start recognizing them as creative people, potential entrepreneurs and consumers new opportunity will open up (as so well described in his book: *The Fortune at the Bottom of the Pyramid: Eradicating Poverty through Profits*. Updated 5th Anniversary edition. Wharton School Publishing, New Jersey 2010.

Indeed, "it is companies, not abstract economic forces or governments, which create and distribute most of a society's wealth, innovate, trade and raise living standards."¹⁶

The profits generated by successful companies are usually not the result of a zero-sum game in which all other actors lose: Corporate success stimulates economic growth through linkage effects with other sectors, triggering further economic activity and more income, thus making 'the cake' bigger. In a number of emerging economies, business engagement has created substantial employment and income, thereby contributing significantly to poverty reduction.

Of course, it is not entrepreneurial engagement *per se* that is desirable. It is competing with integrity¹⁷, i.e. entrepreneurial engagement conducted in a responsible manner in line with international norms such as those underlying the corporate responsibility platform of the *UN Global Compact*.¹⁸ By definition, "being responsible" is first and foremost the non-negotiable duty to refrain from causing harm. No matter how different human beings' world-views, goals and expectations – people all over the world largely agree on what is harmful or should be avoided. *Doing no harm* becomes a much more challenging task when potential harm of future generations is taken into consideration. A lot of today's "business as usual" – i.e. the way of using non-renewable resources or the lack of de-carbonization pathways¹⁹ become unacceptable in the light of the today's knowledge about the planetary boundaries and the causes of climate change.²⁰

Enlightened managers know that unfair labor conditions, harmful environmental practices, or – worse – 'collateral damage' in the form of human rights violations, are not acceptable. They are also aware that many aspects of today's business practices will have to be transformed in the light of the new knowledge. Inadequate national law is no excuse for *not* assuming responsibility. Enlightened managers exercise self-restraint and avoid business practices that are not compatible with the *2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development*.

If we define "integrity" as being honest, living in the spirit of one's values and being aware of the consequences of one's action in one's private and professional spheres of influence, then business practices incompatible with the goals and targets of the 2030 Agenda constitute a lack of integrity. The same is true for decorating communication statements with clichés and stock phrases referring to "sustainability" and

¹⁶ Birkinshaw J. and G. Piramal, Eds. (2005): *Sumantra Goshal on Management: A Force for Good*. FT Prentice Hall, Harlow: 2.

¹⁷ "Competing with Integrity" is the title of a book that still merits professional attention: De George R. (1993): *Competing with Integrity in International Business*. Oxford University Press, New York.

¹⁸ www.unglobalcompact.org

¹⁹ <http://unsdsn.org/what-we-do/deep-decarbonization-pathways/>

²⁰ See e.g. <http://climate.nasa.gov>

“corporate responsibility” while investing heavily in lobbying for legislative and regulatory provisions that serve the opposite. If support of the values expressed by the international community in the 2030 Agenda should be more than lip service, then corporate key performance indicators, target settings, performance appraisals and bonus systems have to include the respective measurement criteria.

One must acknowledge that the business sector, just like the government sector, has an incentive problem: Managements have no incentive to make investments or to pay “Pigou taxes” *today* for the sake of a *future* return that may benefit *anonymous* stakeholders *elsewhere*. Practically all corporate success measurements are interlinked closely with the success perceptions of financial analysts – and these request short-term results and use respective benchmarks. A sense of integrity, as defined here, will lower the weight of short-termism and invest in new business models, new products and new services compatible with the 2030 Agenda:

- Lobbying with integrity – no discrepancy between corporate communications and corporate affairs;
- Sustainability innovations: Key performance indicators aligned with Sustainable Development Goals, coherent incentive structures, performance appraisals, bonus and promotion systems, supply chain management;
- Sustainability imagination: partnerships with NGOs, academia and governments;
- Sustainability criteria on transfer of technology, differential pricing, management of intellectual property (moral imagination!);
- Communication about progress made and targets achieved – but also about obstacles faced and problems not solved.

Most important of all: The role of all of us

More than 50 years ago, the then President of the United States, John F. Kennedy, spoke to students of the American University in Washington about World Peace.²¹ He made remarks that are highly topical in the context of sustainable development. First of all, he said that the peace he seeks is not a “Pax Americana” enforced on the world by American weapons of war, but a “kind of peace that makes life on earth worth living, the kind that enables men and nations to grow and to hope and to build a better life for their children – not merely peace for Americans but peace for all men and women – not merely peace in our time but peace for all time.” So it is with sustainable development. And:

“I am not referring to the absolute, infinite concept of universal peace and good will of which some fantasies and fanatics dream. I do not deny the value of hopes and dreams but we merely invite discouragement and incredulity by making that our only and immediate goal. Let us focus instead on a more practical, more attainable peace – based

²¹ http://www.npr.org/documents/2006/oct/american_speeches/kennedy.pdf

not on a sudden revolution in human nature but on a gradual evolution in human institutions – on a series of concrete actions and effective agreements, which are in the interest of all concerned. There is no single, simple key to this peace – no grand or magic formula to be adopted by one or two powers. Genuine peace must be the product of many nations, the sum of many acts. It must be dynamic, not static, changing to meet the challenge of each new generation. For peace is a process – a way of solving problems.”

Exchange the word “peace” by “sustainable development”, and hits the proverbial nail on the head. Last but not least, John F Kennedy said:

“Our problems are man-made – therefore, they can be solved by man. And man can be as big as he wants. No problem of human destiny is beyond human beings. Man’s reason and spirit have often solved the seemingly unsolvable – and we believe they can do it again.”

Individual human beings in their roles as family members, citizens, customers, voters, professionals, etc. make dozens of decisions every day that have an impact on sustainable development. Individual responsibility for sustainability cannot be shifted onto others. Not doing “the right thing” against better judgment cannot be attributed to a lack of good governance, to wrong financial incentives or obstructive market circumstances. The hope is that human beings all over the world in all their professional and private roles accept responsibility for sustainable development and act coherently in their sphere of influence in a spirit of shared values and shared responsibility.

But – as is the case in the political and business spheres – we, too, do have an incentive problem. Human beings everywhere usually have problems accepting inconvenient changes in consumption habits for what *they think* is a “minor” contribution to global sustainable development. Most of us must be hard pushed to put up with uncomfortably restricted patterns of individual mobility today for an infinitely small contribution to the prevention of future problems – e.g. submerged islands in the Indian Ocean. But each of us *is* the ultimate decision maker in politics, business, academia, civil society and churches:

No institution acts solely as an anonymous legal, political or economic construct, but always through a multitude of people working at its various levels. Institutions are limited holdings where commitment to sustainability is concerned. And if we look at sustainability as a moral concept, morality – or the lack of it – is brought into institutions by people, along with their values, their worldviews, and their personal conduct. To be sure, every kind of institution develops an institutional life of its own. Yet this fact does not lessen individual responsibility, but rather the exact opposite. If we give in to the fallacy of making institutions responsible for everything, the only possible conclusion is that “the system” must be changed. In such a framework we, the humans that constitute “the system”, disappear as responsible actors. But *we* do

have the responsibility, and the power, to change or to determine the nature of the system. We only have to have the will to do so.

People at every level of all institutions are knowledgeable in their field, have career experience, and are socially proficient. It is therefore incumbent on them to assume responsibility, for themselves, for those affected by the decisions they make, and for the achievement of institutions' objectives. They also have the duty to stand up for the convictions they hold. If, for whatever reason, they fail to do so, they become guilty by lack of applied moral consciousness and moral courage.

So it is people who, no matter what their institutional station in life, must be held accountable as agents of sustainability. No modern society can treat the collective as the subject of action. The subject of action is always the individual. Therefore the discourse on sustainable development must explore two vital factors: the moral and the psychological dimensions of sustainable development.

The term "sustainable development" continues to have a positive connotation. We still think of it as an evolution that is desirable, valuable and good for all human beings. We all know that "man does not live by bread alone". Reflecting about sustainable development leads us to asking questions such as "What is the true meaning of my life?" or "What is a good, a felicitous life?"²² Material issues are, of course, important and continue to be so. But answers to questions on life's purpose and wellbeing, or the meaning of "happiness", transcend the economic and material spheres. And here is reason for optimism: "Man is gifted with reason; he is life being aware of itself; he has awareness of himself, of his fellow man, of his past, and of the possibilities of his future."²³

Care, responsibility, respect and knowledge – "Love" in the words of Erich Fromm – are part of the basic elements of the character of sane people, so are compassion and empathy. Humanity cannot live in peace and prosper without its spiritual and metaphysical aspirations duly considered. Communities cannot flourish without the continuous fostering of their social capital. Adding spiritual and psychological values dimensions to the sustainable development discourse is not an esoteric obliquity. It makes good sense to motivate people to reflect on the difference between subjectively perceived "consumption needs" and objective desiderata for a future we want for our own children and grandchildren. Bringing a values dimension into the sustainable development discourse is likely to help putting convenient habits or pseudo-prestigious practices into perspective.

²² Fromm E. (1958): The Moral Responsibility of Modern Man. First published in Merrill-Palmer. Quarterly of Behavior and Development, Detroit, Vol. 5: 3-14. Made available by courtesy of Dr. Rainer Funk and Karl Schlecht.

²³ Fromm E. (1956): The Art of Loving. Originally published by Harper, New York 1956., p. 6; made available by courtesy of Dr. Rainer Funk and Karl Schlecht. See also Fromm E. (1976): To Have or To be? Harper and Row, New York.

Preliminary conclusions

Comprehensive reform processes such as those envisaged by the *2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development* can only be successful if and when they are carried by commonly shared values, orchestrated through a consistent governance framework and supported by facilitative measures – but: The single most important factor for sustainable development is the individual human being, who is endowed with awareness, with the willingness to learn and change, and with the empowerment to make decisions that contribute to a future we want for all.

The shared understanding of the majority of scientists, of representatives of civil society as well as of a growing number of enlightened leaders from the corporate sector is that modern human beings – 9.7 billion by the year 2050²⁴ – will have to adapt their lifestyles for the sake of the integrity of our Earth's life support systems.

In his *Oration on the Dignity of Man*²⁵ of 1486, *Giovanni Pico della Mirandola* characterized humans as “the most wonderful creation of the world”, “the intermediary between creatures, familiar of the gods above him, the lord of the beings beneath him, by the acuteness of his senses, the inquiry of his reason, and the light of his intelligence, he is the interpreter of nature, set midway between the timeless unchanging and the flux of time; the living union, the very marriage hymn of the world, little lower than the angels.” And, Pico lets God teach humanity something important for all spheres of decision-making, i.e.

“with free choice and dignity, you may fashion yourself into whatever form you choose. To you is granted the power of degrading yourself into the lower forms of life, the beasts, and to you is granted the power, contained in your intellect and judgment, to be reborn into the higher forms, the divine.”

Individual responsibility for sustainability cannot be passed on to others. Acting against our better judgment cannot be attributed to a lack of good governance, wrong financial incentives or obstructive market conditions. We are left to our own devices and resources to shape our common future. Let us hope that everyone understands what is at stake, and that everyone summons up the will and contributes in good faith to the endeavors of others. There is a robust consensus on globally shared values representing the common tie that binds humanity.²⁶

²⁴ http://esa.un.org/unpd/wpp/Publications/Files/Key_Findings_WPP_2015.pdf

²⁵ http://www.andallthat.co.uk/uploads/2/3/8/9/2389220/pico_-_oration_on_the_dignity_of_man.pdf

²⁶ For the discussion of global values and sustainability see Leisinger, K.M. (2014): *Global Values for Global Development*. Basel. (<http://unsdsn.org/resources/publications/global-values-for-global-development/>)

節亮風高