

INGOMAR KLEIN AND WOLFGANG TRIEBEL: International Terrorism in the 21th Century

The paper disputes the widespread assertion that the September 11, attacks in New York and Washington marked the beginnings of »a new era of terrorism«, and questions whether this allegation has no other purpose than to heighten fears, justify warfare, and pursue a range of economic and political objectives. These acts of international terrorism must be condemned, as any other terrorist act elsewhere in the world. The new international situation in the aftermath of 11 September is a challenge for humanity as a whole and requires adequate political solutions from all UN member states in order to eliminate the causes of terrorism. Bombing alleged »terrorist or rogue states« is nothing more than government-controlled terror inflicted upon innocent people which could ignite the cruel flame of a world war. Terrorists must be brought before a peoples' court. We must strengthen International Law, promote equal rights of all peoples, overcome political and economic dependence in inter-government politics, to eliminate the social suffering of people in underdeveloped regions of the world, and to protect nature and environment. In one word: Peace is the main requirement for enforcing human rights and the rights of peoples.

WOLFRAM ADOLPHI: November 16 2001

Continuing his reflections on the consequences of the September 11th terrorist attacks in New York and Washington (see »UTOPIE kreativ« No. 133 November 2001), the author this time analyses the Parliamentary debates that took place November 16th and December 22nd in the Federal German Bundestag centering on German troops participation in the US war on terrorism and in the UN-mandated security forces for the provisional Afghan government in Kabul. He discusses the general political climate in Germany following Chancellor Schröder's declaration of »unlimited solidarity«, and how the PDS and critical Members of other parties in the Parliament sought ways to fight terrorism without war.

NORBERT REUTER: The Myth of Growth between Economy and Ecology

Economy and ecology stand traditionally in antagonistic contrasts to one another, explainable by their respective political-economic implications: Whereas economists generally consider higher growth-rates of the gross domestic product (GDP) to be the top-priority solution to economic problems, ecologists see exactly this increasing growth-rate as the main problem. The essay offers an empirical summary of long-term growth tendencies in developed industrial nations. It makes a diagnosis of a general trend of falling growth rates and gives an imperative theoretical explanation. Today's low growth rates are interpreted as an immanent consequence of a long-term, intensive process of economic growth so that ecological reforms and a policy of distribution (of income as well as of working hours) can no longer be made dependent upon the restoration of a high GDP-growth.

JOACHIM H. SPANGENBERG: Sustainability and Economic Growth

Sustainable development requires the integration of economic, social, environmental and institutional objectives and criteria. What does such an integration mean for the debate on the limits to growth that has been going on for 30 years? If operationalizing social sustainability is to be seen as reducing unemployment and the environmental dimension is to be understood as dematerialization, i.e. less physical throughput of our economies, then the question can be formally answered. Economic growth must therefore be higher than the increase in per capita production (workers' labour productivity) in order to increase the number of jobs. On the other hand, it must be lower than the increase of resource productivity to ensure a declining throughput. That such policies are possible has been demonstrated in a recent German research project. Main results of a scenario, the criteria is developed and the core fields of political action are identified and briefly described.

YASH TANDON: Global Governance and Justice

Anyone working in the area of global justice has a challenging task. To begin with, there are so many rival concepts of it. Most of them are influenced by Real World situations with unavoidable biases and prejudices. John Rawls provides us with a useful solution with his concept of justice being fairness derived from the »original condition« by individuals in a »veil of ignorance«. In this paper this concept is simply extended to the community of nations. It is argued that justice being fairness is a better concept than justice being charity or welfare. The welfare oriented notions guiding most contemporary thought in such agencies as the World Bank and UNDP have serious flaws: justice being charity is humiliating. Both avoid the reasons why the poor are getting poorer and the rich, richer. Rawls' concept of what he calls »procedural justice« has much merit. How rules are made is equally – if not more important – as the rules themselves. Fairness, above all, is fairness in the making of rules of global governance. And civil society organisations are the only agencies that can be relied upon to be agents of the Rawlsian concept of justice as fairness.