

Positioning Biodiversity in Ecological Modernization: Making Sense of the Advocacies for Eco-Norms for Sustainability

オン・クオック・ライ

On-Kwok Lai

Since the Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD; COP10, in Nagoya October 2010), the soft-targeting biodiversity development strategy, without strong sanctioning –cum- incentive mechanism, is the key policy instrument for global ecological modernization. This brief examines how the CBD can possibly work in 21st Century of informational urban system.... How far the instrumentality of the soft-targeting for environmental governance can functionally proceed in the coming decade requires much beefing-up not just in terms of mass-media and non-governmental organizations (NGOs)-driven activism, but also a set of well-coherent framework of reasoning and discourses, exploitable by the action agencies for biodiversity, to shape more positive and pro-active actions undertaken by nation states – here, this paper attempts to making sense the CBD from bioethical perspectives, aiming to develop an explicit and elaborated- shared ethical-normative framework to inform policy making. Furthermore, it discusses the arguably contradictions between economic developmentalism and biodiversity which define and shape the policy choices-driven dilemma for all stakeholders across different, inter-generational cohorts of ages; they also present a challenge for inter- nation state not to pursue biodiversity friendly policy initiatives for sustainable development – the learned inertia for engaging processes for biodiversity development.

Key Words : Biodiversity, Ecological Modernization, Global Norms, Sustainable Development

キーワード：生物多様性、生態近代化、グローバル規範、持続可能な開発

1. The Convention on Biodiversity in Risk Society

In the informational 21st century, the crisis-ridden capitalism develops with a whole array of contradictions; not just the excessive consumption-driven wastages and high-carbon emissions in our limited-to-growth Earth, but also social calamities driven by the commodification of human life chance and socio-economic reciprocities, resulting in socio-economic and culturally divided and polarizing world with conflicts (no peace)! All these drive humanity towards many crises, let alone global and regional financial crises in the last two decades, under the shadow of global climate change!

1.1 Contradictions of the Evolutionary Convention on Biodiversity

Following the global convention on biodiversity in 1992 United Nations' Earth Summit, the recently agreed Convention on Biodiversity (CBD, 2010) provides an important transnational policy framework for global governance on biodiversity, aiming for sustainable development – though this “soft-targeting” framework for biodiversity development without strong sanctioning –cum-incentive mechanism is arguably the key policy achievement for CBD (COP10) in Nagoya October 2010. The key points and the related policy initiatives consist of the followings:

- To protect 10% (2010: 1%) World's Oceans & 17% (2010:13%) of all Land Mass by 2020, as Natural Reserve.
- Access & Benefit Sharing (ABS): to regulate how developed nations support and benefit from biodiversity, which is mostly located in the developed world and the Third World – Poorer nations would in return receive aids via technology transfers, and cooperation in domains ranging from cosmetics to pharmaceuticals.
- Nagoya Protocol: a framework on how to avoid bio-piracy in the developing world starting in 2020, when it goes into effect.
- A 20-point strategic plan - framework for the protection of fish stocks, and combat ongoing loss and degradation of natural habitats.
- Japan contributes US\$2 billion to Global Fund for Conservations. + Satoyama Initiatives (United Nations University – Institute for Advanced Studies with the Ministry of the Environment of Japan).

But the “soft-targeting” approach of CBD indeed reflects various contradictions embedded in global governance structure for sustainable development, mirror-imaging the inertia against the initiatives for global climate change. The questions around the CBD -- or, the inertia against it, are still unresolved:

- Whether it is another benign (lip-service for) policy initiative for better survival chance for everyone, even the endangered species?
- Is CBD more of a transnational (apolitical) policy steering or diplomacy convenience: soft-targeting biodiversity development without strong sanctioning?
- How far CBD can be influential or shaping for national policy making, as CBD (COP10) agreement is not legally-binding and the proposed measures remains voluntary on the part of signing nations; not the least, USA is not a part of the agreement, and did not attend the conference?

Economic liberalization gives rise to dual/divided cities, great disparity between the rich and the poor; and wider gaps between urban and rural life (the case of hyper-growth economies like China). So far, global economic liberalization and globalization have not improved the daily life of people and their local welfare, with the local labour market declining due to the off-shoring strategies of firms. What has instead developed as a common trend is social dualism: widespread poverty within affluent societies/localities, with the set of deregulatory policy initiatives favouring the private sector and resulting in the commodification and privatization of not just social services, but also of the Nature.

1.2 Back to the Nature: Calling for What Biodiversity?

Human and animals rights are disposable under hyper-capitalism of globalization! Individual rights, e.g., labour standards, social protection and welfare entitlements, are downgraded by the call for deregulation and flexible labour market initiatives under the reform banner of economic liberalization towards globalization. Although the provision or extension of all kinds of welfare services (social security in particular) is supposedly assured to a citizen (a status conferred by the nation state), the concept of social citizenship itself is eroding under the strong currents and waves of economic globalization and pro-market initiatives – Biodiversity is also at the minimalist consideration vis-à-vis hyper-economic development. Unbridled

capitalism is also exploiting natural resources, hence taking away biodiversity for the sake of economic pro-growth developmentalism: ecological disasters are normalized as daily costing for hyper-economic development.

The state of the globalization project is anti-biodiversity! Economic liberalizing processes hence have put state-society and people-nature at very peculiar position, as both are exposed to the challenges of 'external' forces. Capital, goods and labour (jobs) are more mobile than the previous international economic order. Nature and biodiversity are subject to economic logics for exploitation and having no intrinsic value of their own. Socio-ecological impacts are eminent! In response, anti-globalization campaigns at various international economic institutions' (WTO, G7/G8 and G20) meetings have become more than often, with the battle cries based on the demands for global social justice and a sustainable future (Lai 2011).

More specific at the regional level, the Asia Miracle (1970s to 1990s) and the rise of China (1990s-) seemingly is a new form of hyper-economic Darwinism: questing for the survival of the fittest? Ecological diversity is demising, and malignant forces of globalizing capitalism are withering away biodiversity at local and regional levels.... Yet, the unbridled capitalism has been reinforcing socio-ecological degradation, exploiting the weak and demising ecological diversity, resulting with developmental dualism, between the poor and the rich, the haves and the have-nots.

Notwithstanding that all of these are the consequences of the globalization project! Not without exception, all developing economies aided by transnational corporations (TNCs) networking have been integrated hierarchically into the global system of capitalism, and the globalizing process of integration widens the gaps and causes socio-economic divisions and divides between communities, countries, and regions. Even the neo-liberal economic ideologies - oriented international bodies, like the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD) recently questions the globalization-driven global problems, aiming to re-examine the global mitigation for poverty and development problems – shortfall of bilateral and multi-lateral aid for developing economies in the midst of global change (<http://www.aideffectiveness.org/>). In this regard, the belated, if not procrastinated, global initiatives of the

Rio Earth Summit (1992) and the Nagoya CBD (2010) are welcoming one.

As shown by recent local and regional conflicts which are documented by the World Development Report (World Bank 2011): without a sustainability worldview, it is almost impossible to develop any peace initiatives. In other words, conflicts between/among the developing nations (and tribal groups) are somewhat biodiversity-deficit driven, resulting in worsening of eco-social conditions for development.

The profit-driven growth of economic globalization has been instrumental in shaping the course of unsustainable development, with the demising biodiversity – a process of normalizing the “endangered” species in the hyper-modernizing localities. This process is further aggravating within a global framework of deregulation –cum-liberalization driven global capitalism, from which the exploitation (or privatization) of nature is possible without regrets...

Deriving from the CBD, the new institutional framework indeed could provide a reminder for re-activating the processes for biodiversity! But how far the instrumentality of the soft-targeting (under the UN Framework) for environmental governance can functionally proceed in the coming decade is still questionable.

2. Activism for Global-Local Developmentalism: Whose Biodiversity – and- for Whom?

The struggle for sustainable biodiversity is undoubtedly politicking for the under-dog, as the issues have been out-of-agenda for the globalization project. This has the lineage with the 1989 Seattle anti-WTO protest, global peace movements (15. Feb. 2003), the annual 1st of May anti-capitalism campaign and the more recent (2011) one of Occupy Wall Street. Here, the 'Anti-Globalization' information and ideas in/beyond cyberspace, bypassing the mass media, have been turning into global real time social actions – the most important one is the message for change for better sustainable, just world for all!

2.1 New Media-driven Advocacies for the Endangered Survival?

For biodiversity sake, the endangered (species) calling has been for the minorities of bio-animal

worlds but more recently, it is as if a normalization process for every living one – the majority is at risk as well. Hence, the survival rights of everyone are within the biodiversity paradigm! The intertwining of oneself and others is imminent and structurally link to system sustainability of all (sub-) systems. More specific, the CBD articulates for survival rights of everyone, and extends the territorial-cosmological relevance of biodiversity rights at all domains and arena of bio-ecological worlds. The CBD also enables the “endangered”, and seemingly non-referential(?), ones, to have influence in co-determining the locally and regionally specific, territorially defined, biodiversity (survival) rights.

The offerings from CBD (2010) might be soft(-targeting) for nation states’ policy initiatives for biodiversity, but they can provide a solid foundation for different advocacies at transnational spaces. This is particularly the case, if coupled with the advanced application of new media and information and communication technologies (ICT). The new praxis of transnational advocacies networks (TAN) should be noted (Keck and Sikkink 1998, 1999; Lai 2008, 2011). TAN are firmly established and embedded in the new communicative flows of new media and the identity politics of social activists within and outside the cyberspaces. Cyber-politics challenges traditional political establishment as well as the behavioural repertoire of political agencies.

New media not only has a strong impact on global politics, but also has become the weaponry of individuals and groups who have been excluded from traditional mass media making (Thompson 2005):

In this new world of mediated visibility, the making visible of actions and events is not just the outcome of leakage in systems of communication and information flow that are increasingly difficult to control: it is also an explicit strategy of individuals who know very well that mediated visibility can be a weapon in the struggles they wage in their day-to-day lives. Once again, the war in Iraq provided us with countless reminders of this fundamental truth: the macabre beheadings carried out by (among others) Abu Musab al-Zarqawi’s Tawhid and Jihad group, videoed and shown live on the Internet and then recycled with varying degrees of explicitness through the mass media of television and the press, are only the most dramatic illustration of a new political theatre that is played out in the world of the media, where spatial distance is irrelevant, communication

instantaneous (or virtually so) and – especially with the rise of the Internet and other networked media – the capacity to outmanoeuvre one’s opponents is always present (Thompson 2005: 31–32).

Similarly, James N. Rosenau in his seminal work (Rosenau 1997, 1998), *Globalized Space*, stresses that the new media and their networking capacities are one of the functional equivalents of democratic governance where transnational issues are beyond the control of the nation state as well as a state-sponsored institutionalized regime, such as the UN:

The widespread growth of the Internet, the World Wide Web and the other electronic technologies that are shrinking the world offers considerable potential as a source of democracy... by facilitating the continued proliferation of networks that know no boundaries, these technologies have introduced a horizontal dimension to the politics of Globalized Space. They enable like-minded people in distant places to converge, share perspectives, protest abuses, provide information and mobilize resources – dynamics that seem bound to constrain vertical structures that sustain governments, corporation and any other hierarchical organizations (Rosenau 1998: 46).

2.2 The Universal-Cosmopolitan Biodiversity towards Ecological Modernity?

David Held’s (1998, 1999) *Theory of Cosmopolitan Democracy*’ argues that in a world of overlapping communities of fate, *Cosmopolitan Democracy* is the creation of new political institutions and a diversity of NGOs in global civil society, with the democratic principle and praxis of broad access to avenues of civic participation on national, regional, and international levels. More specifically for our discussion here, TAN is the new wave for the democratization process aided by new electronic communication technology through various forms of electronic-mobilization – and the rich content of CBD should provide NGOs’ renewable and rejuvenated articulation and advocacies for sustainable development.

The emergence of global civil society is obvious: with NGOs’ activism – articulating human, bio-eco ethical demands through non-institutional politics of protest movements for biodiversity and global sustainability. Differential activism for biodiversity, reflecting a shift towards bio-eco ethics

for sustainability, is a norm for global ecological movements since 1990s, as exemplified by NGOs like Greenpeace International, World Wildlife Fund, Friends of the Earth, International Union for Conservation of Nature (IUCN), as well as local groups and community-based networks. Their weapon for activism is high-tech new media like the Youtube, Facebook and Twitter, with user-created content to reveal the (alternative) reality!

Here, the ideas (ideal?) and questions of biodiversity focus on a rejuvenated harmonious relationship between homo sapiens and their natural habitat, with progressiveness and democracy's extension beyond the nation state – the articulation of international (universal cosmopolitan humanity and biodiversity) norms and justice calls for a more open and participatory regime of global governance. These echoes the ideas of global civil societies, cosmopolitanism and social movements for global and local justices: these movements are multi-dimensional, ranging from local human rights to global environmentalism.

The CBD (COP 10) calling for biodiversity is (locked-in) multilateralism of international governmental organizations (IGOs), with soft-targeting and weak sanctioning force, but it has strong normative-developmental appeal for bio-animal rights! Furthermore, socio-cultural diversity has been articulating by NGOs and the transferability from social to biodiversity is synergized with activists who are witnessing the demising biodiversity at local level, in the name of bioethics of development.

New opportunity in the information age is not just new media but the contents of CBD: both the high-tech media and the contents in/beyond new media are crucial leverage to empower the (presumably) powerless minorities or the underprivileged: bio-ecological activists have learned quick, adopting wire and wireless communication set up to champion their project, in cyber and mass media, towards global ecological movements for biodiversity and universal cosmopolitanism....

3. Anti-Development Advocacies in Risk-Biodiversity – Eco-Rights for All?

Glo(bal-lo)cal communicative actions – using of all wired and wireless media of communications in both cyber / real communications – enable people's participation in socio-ethical debates and communication for biodiversity sake. More specific,

biodiversity and eco-rights become the currencies for agenda setting for global and local development; influencing (both IGOs and NGOs sponsored) developmental projects at large.

3.1 NGOs' Activism for Biodiversity: Empowerment derived from CBD?

For several decades, NGOs' critical engagements with governmental and business organizations to articulate local bio-ecological concerns are more than obvious. Advocacies for biodiversity take various forms of struggles and appeals, not least with the well choreographed and visualized case studies to re-making bio-ecological reality, highlighting the crisis-driven economic pro-growth development, with new bioethics and norms for bio-ecological rights:

- binary code(s) for the profit-oriented winner and losers of the biodiversity
- dramatized clearly the role and identity of the victims and their predators
- bioethical and morality appeal to support for the victims and biodiversity at large
- back to humanity and bio-ecological (fundamentalist) appeals
- appeal for personal / individual actions to save biodiversity

Taking the CBD as a framework of benchmarking and norms setting, transnational advocacies of NGOs can be instrumental in shaping global and local politics for sustainable development in general, the promotion of biodiversity in particular. More specific, NGOs' advocacies are the voices (sometimes noises) for bio-communities at large and serve the following functions:

- Focal point, platform and network for information gathering and research required to challenge, as well as creating new policy, for biodiversity, like Greenpeace International, World Wildlife Fund.
- Foundation for articulating particular biodiversity (abuse) issue: like the Sea Shepherd, for anti-whaling at the Antarctic.
- Mobilizing agencies for articulating various forms and modes of confrontational protests and demonstrations, targeting to IGOs and against TNCs.
- Facilitating agency for transnational advocacies and communication networks in pushing local, regional and international government bodies to react to biodiversity loss or abuse.

- With good local supports, international NGO activities can reshape the contours (for the benefits of biodiversity or bio-animal rights) for national policy or constitutional domain, which are more likely to promote a shift in the worldview towards global-local environmental governance.

Reinforcing by the Internet (cable, wireless and satellite) multi-modal of communications (one to one, one to many and many-to-one and many-to-many) and more recently, the cloud computing, representing both micro as well as mass media functioning, initiatives for biodiversity, within and beyond the CBD framework, will likely open up participation at global / regional / local scale for questioning the existential biodiversity rights, like the access and benefit sharing (ABS) for all, as well as the ethical trading issues.

In other words, despite its limitations in terms of lacking in legal-binding and sanctioning power, the CBD does serve a very important advocacy function, as a bench-marking framework for progressive roadmap for protecting and enhancing biodiversity!

3.2 The Eco-Ethics driven Development: Bhutan's Exceptionalism?

Far from the hegemonic neoliberal economic approach for developmentalism, as agenda set by IGOs like WTO and the World Bank, nor the Asia Miracle and ASEAN-4, the Bhutan's (alternative) development approach has been instrumental for managing bioethical green development with eternal peace: to mediate human wishes for (moral-religious pursuit of) happiness, spiritual eternity and the preservation of natural environment. In spite of its under-development in terms of the traditional, pro-economic growth criteria (contrasting the export-led economic miracle in the region), it has been endowed with much not just natural resources of hydropower and forest-based assets, but also the specific gifts of cultural-ethics of Buddhism, in pursuing the "Middle Path" development strategy (the so-called Gross National Happiness, GNH), and so far resulting in progress for the alternative developmental regime towards the betterment of (well being of) the people, poverty alleviation and sustainable development (Uddin et al. 2007; Zurick 2006).

To examine the Bhutan case in ecological ethics and peace terms, three major eco-human development ethics stand out as alternative

paradigm(s) for sustainability (self-sufficiency within the bio-regionalism):

- (1) Geo-territorial specificity for self-sufficiency (that is fundamental for bio-regionalism, in a geo-territorial closed system, following the metaphoric life-cycle-analysis): Bhutan is a landlocked country, geo-politically enclosed by regional nuclear giants of China and India. Its bio-diversity is much protected, if not isolated, by its unique geo-historic-political position.
- (2) The practice of spiritual teachings of folklore and/or religion(s), in the Bhutan case, it is the specific 'framing' of Buddhism unto daily (socio-cultural-driven) praxis. Bhutanese unique integration of folklore, quasi-religious-informed, daily practices with specific geo-cultural objects, like river and forest-wood assets, synergizes survival needs (towards happiness) to ecological-sound energy use.
- (3) The interfacing between social praxis and modern form of policy governance: people's specific socio-cultural attachments to the nature and its assets, in exploiting natural resource, in daily praxis on the one hand; the (derivatives of) policy learning, like the Clean Development Mechanism (CDM) from IGOs and donors in shaping national policy for natural resources exploitation and preservation.

3.3 Transnational Advocacies for Biodiversity – the Timeliness of Activism!

Advocating biodiversity requires the change not just in terms of policy initiatives of nation states, but also the reasoning for bioethics and global norms towards biodiversity. For the latter one, it has to be demonstrated that the moral imperative to stop exploitation against the endangered species. Yet, the attempt so far is far from successful. But new strategic calls for biodiversity are instrumental in making the advocacies legitimate and hence, there is legitimacy for NGOs to re-making international agenda for pro- ecology development, vis-à-vis economic globalization per se (cf. Lai 2011).

By 'parallelization' of international events organized by international organizations (IGOs; like APEC, G7/8, G20, IMF, World Bank and WTO), NGOs can put forward their alternative advocacies for sustainable development. By challenging as well as embarrassing the status quo and the legitimacy of the pro-economic liberalization bodies, NGOs contribute a service towards the promotion of biodiversity rights with real life stories, including

visualization, of the victimization of individuals and biological groups.

For instance, Amnesty International (AI) has attacked a consortium involving two American oil giants, Exxon Mobil and Chevron, and Petronas of Malaysia, which are extracting the African oil in Chad and pumping it to the Cameroon coast via a 665-mile (1,070-km) pipeline. This is a \$4.3 billion project in Africa, the biggest foreign investment in Africa. NGOs have been fearful of the impact of the project on one of the poorest and most ill-governed parts of the world, has exposed the one-sided and anti-people and anti-nature of the project (The Economist, 8.September 2005).

Against the context that oil firms have often been damned by association with human-rights abuses in similar places, not least Royal Dutch/Shell in Nigeria and Unocal in Myanmar, AI was not just accusing the consortium of any specific human-rights abuses in the Chad-Cameroon project (though protesters against it have been abused in government crackdowns). Instead, the AI's preventive and precautionary report focuses on the potential harm that may be done, as a result of the contracts governing the deal. At the heart of these contracts is a "stabilisation of law" clause, under which the consortium will be compensated for any economic harm caused to it by changes in the legal regimes governing the project – a protective clause for the oil firms against the risk of the unscrupulous governmental ripping off foreign investments. But, AI argued that one effect of the clause may be to impose a financial penalty on any government that tries to improve human rights by, for example, requiring higher minimum safety standards or quicker redress for lost land and natural biodiversity.

NGOs are now assuming the role of "morality (ethics) checker", providing guidance on bioethics and animal/ecological rights, usually using tactics of blacklisting and embarrassment publicity for the offenders of international norms on biodiversity such as governmental agencies and TNCs. This is the reason why some TNCs, stung by anti-animal rights labels, now respond with their so-called corporate social responsibility (CSR) initiatives (cf. Batruch 2011, Dermirag 2005). Hence, the morality checker role extends to preventive and precautionary one, with suggestive problem-solving options for TNCs and governments to consider in enhancing human rights and biodiversity.

To recapitulate, the nexus between business and human and biodiversity rights is that there are many (financial, ethical, regulatory) reasons why alternative rights have become a business issue. As a key player in the globalization process, many TNCs have been, taking their technological and capital advantages, destroying local customs and cultures, exploiting workers, bankrupting local poor and widening the gap between the rich and often politically repressive elite and the rest of society; as well as the demising biodiversity. What is more critical now as argued by new global norms is that, apart from legal obligations set down by the host country, moral responsibilities and ethical leaning towards local and international norms, TNCs can – through their foreign direct investment and business practice – make important contribution to the promotion of economic and social welfare, the improvement of living standards, the creation of employment opportunities and the realization and enjoyment of basic human rights and the biodiversity at large (Batruch 2011).

4. Eco Ethics for Development after the Nagoya COP10-CBD

Juxtaposing the CBD initiatives, the Climate Change (post-Kyoto) protocol is still in negotiation. Up to late 2011, global initiatives for climate change have not been successful, especially in nurturing global green house gases emission limits after the Kyoto Protocol.... The United Nations' climate change summit in Copenhagen (COP15; 7-18.December 2009) disappointed not just environmentalists and political leaders, but global society at large, by failing to produce a legally binding treaty on reducing greenhouse gas, carbon dioxide (CO₂). Seemingly, it is also a double-failure of the United Nations' initiatives on Climate Change for both the Bali Conference on Climate Change (3-14.December 2007) and the COP15.¹ More specific, the post-Copenhagen preparative meetings for United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC) have been repeatedly toning down for a "flexible" and "comprising" approach for achieving something just for non-legally binding agreement for Cancun (Mexico) Climate Change Summit (COP16), 29.November to 10.December 2010 – while the next hope will be another series of talks after the partially successful 2011 Climate Change Summit in South Africa Perhaps more and more global summits (until the end of human civilization?) are needed prior to the consensus building and formation of the global will for (the dying?) human and biological

1 See <http://unfccc.int/2860.php> and http://unfccc.int/meetings/cop_15/items/5257.php, for the COP15 and COP16.

species and for ecological urban-modernization – But we are running out of time!

4.1 The CBD New Regime towards Biodiversity?

For protecting global biodiversity, time is not on our side therefore a new regime for global governance is urgently called for: bio-eco-ethics as the main consideration for development projects at large. For ecological modernization in 21st Century, three major inter-related issues need to be addressed for. First, the CBD claims that the advancement of broadly defined biodiversity is not possible without eco-friendly (conservation) development.... Second, development is the key endeavor of IGOs and NGOs; but large amounts of resources continue to flow to agencies which are systematically creating (rather than protecting) “endangered” species ...and they have shown little commitment to protecting the natural resources, biodiversity at larger scale, on which human beings depend. Last but not least are know-how and financial supports to translate bio-eco-ethics for positive pro-active conservation, as well as stronger sanctioning power.

After 2010 Nagoya COP10-CBD, there will be follow-ups for the UN Earth Summit 2012: Rio+20 (UN Conference on Sustainable Development) and the UN Decade on Biodiversity 2011-2020, with progressive experimental projects, like the Satoyama Initiatives....All these initiatives will shape biodiversity activism in 21st Century, with new institutions, funding and processes (for novices as well as veteran activists) to promote learning-by-doing, action-oriented praxis initiatives at both local, regional and international levels of critical engagement. For global civil society, the CBD will enhance new biodiversity activism of NGOs’ praxis with broad access avenues of civic participation at national, regional, international levels. And new platforms and gateways are evolving for exchanges of information, action-strategies and recruitment of volunteers for mobilization of bio-ecological issues – constituting global citizenship and guardianship for humanity and biodiversity: articulating biodiversity for all in Blogs, SMS, MMS, SNS onto e-platform of the Facebook, MySpace, Twitter and YouTube alike.

Obviously, the new paradigm for biodiversity-centered development is embedded with two contesting forces, the one oriented towards universal cosmopolitanism versus the individual’s existence and survival. Creation of new policy institutions nurtures bioethics and ecological norms with

burgeoning NGOs in global civil society: global environmental governance for others’ survival, or the otherness over the individualism? New global discourse (critical engaging) is for principles, praxis and soft-targeting with civic participation, for eco-biodiversity, at national, regional and international levels.

In 21st Century, people question the vitality of globalization, the prolonged food and energy crises in this decade, and all these have been recently reframed by 2008 global financial crisis and its aftermaths like the Euro crisis.... Which version of (anti-)globalization is much articulated in the Occupy Wall Street movement (OWS; Calhoun 2011)? Obviously, OWS movement is challenging the status quo of the globalization project; and more importantly, questing for a civilized modernization with global emerging progressive forces to promote global socio-eco just and equitable sustainable development. Juxtaposing these, the non-market approach for socio-ecological exchanges between human agencies is emerging too: local exchange trading system, local capacity building, self-and-mutual help cooperatives, corporate social responsibility, social enterprises, and benevolent regime for know-how transfers alike. For the emerging alternative development approaches, we can witness a shift from the unjust globalization with biodiversity deficits towards the one with sustainability concern for the future – in between; there is also new, or rejuvenated, bio-eco ethics and global norms for eternal peace.

4.2 The Anti-Globalization Project-driven Reflexive Eco-Modernity?

Sharing strong affinities with Doreen Massey’s (2004, 2005, 2007) calling for geographies of responsibility, the social agency in geo-politics thesis of Iris M. Young (2003, 2004, 2007) proposed a ‘social connection’ model in which political responsibility is derived from the ways in which different actors are shaping, as well as being shaped, in structural social processes. The new (green, biodiversity) political responsibility represents a collective practice, articulating social justice with the evaluation of individual conduct and social interaction in a non-reductive way. This alternative is a new model of “shared responsibility” between individuals and the communal one in which responsibility is distributed across complex networks of causality and agency (Barnett 2011: 252). Here, the normative challenge for the World City, the

globalization project at large, is echoing the critiques on the inequalities derived from new labour and ecological processes in capitalism.

The mistaken functional specific land use in cities throughout the 20th century is doomed to failure! For future, a socio-cultural compatible, small scaling and mixing-up of urban land/space use is the key for sociable, liveable cities: people need spaces for socio-economic reciprocities, aiming and achieving socially sustainability. To achieve this, we need both normative appeals and positive logical reasoning, taking into account of multiplicity of (greening) urbanity in a globalizing world; say the least is the respect for social, economic and cultural human rights and biodiversity at large.

Without a significant change of the pro-growth development model as championed by the market-friendly international governmental organizations, like IMF, World Bank and WTO, human civilization will be destined to be suicidal. Perhaps, Karl Marx and Friedrich Engels' characterization on the inherent contradictions of the crisis-ridden capitalism is partially right, as in the context of 21st century, the pro-growth development model is grave-digging: strong population growth in urban centres, along with multiple mobilities, excessive global consumption and rising carbon emissions... all are destroying human life and ecological worlds (Urry 2010: 192) – global climate change is an irreversible destiny: frequent flooding and drought, and (un-)seasonal disasters and catastrophes, plus extreme weather conditions become the norm, with no exception. And the only way for human survival is more or less to mitigate such global crisis in the coming decades, pursuing ecological modernization for biodiversity.

Obviously, the problems of (and solutions for) climate change and biodiversity are more than politics and technologies per se; the contradictions and mitigating strategies are socio-political therefore need “re-politicking”. But we should be reminded that too much of the concept of ‘climate politics’ castrates climate politics; or the global policy framework (-driven inertia?) for biodiversity are paralyzing the local wisdom and self recovery processes for bio-ecological sustainability? It ignores the fact that climate –cum- biodiversity politics is precisely not about climate nor bio-ecology per se but about transforming the basics of bioethics, socio-ecological norms, which are embedded into/onto socio-economic institutions of the modernity. Here, the calling is for a transformation of our life world

(Beck 2010: 256). Hence, the new worldview for sustainable development should be a fundamental shift of developmental course for the greening of economy and society -- reflexive ecological modernization for global-cum-local sustainability (Lai 2008, 2011).

At this historical conjuncture, in the midst of the informational risk society, the normative call for social justice and bioethics, vis-à-vis, the globalization project, is more than obvious timely. Rather than thinking in philosophical terms of social justice as idealized models, there is an identifiable shift for global actions of transnational advocacies for economic, social and cultural rights in the realm of human rights and biodiversity of living worlds other than human beings as well – with the down-to-earth experience and feelings for intuitive understandings of injustice and social calamities resulting from the free flows of capital. All species living in the limited Earth can only survive if the rejuvenated bioethics and normative judgments for peace, socio-economic developmental justice, and sustainable development, can turn people for greater responsibility for knowledge creation and global actions – envisioning new green utopia with progressive cosmopolitan realpolitik for peace!

REFERENCES

- Barnett, Clive (2011). *Geography and Ethics: Justice Unbound*. *Progress in Human Geography*. 35(2): 246-255.
- Batruch, Christine (2011) *Does Corporate Social Responsibility Make a Difference? Global Governance: A Review of Multilateralism and International Organizations*: 17(2): 155-159.
- Beck, Ulrich (2010). *Climate for Change, or How to Create a Green Modernity? Theory, Culture & Society*. 27(2-3): 254-266.
- Calhoun, Craig (2011). *Evicting the Public: Why has occupying public spaces brought such heavy-handed repression?. The Social Science Research Council Communication*: <http://www.ssrc.org/calhoun/2011/11/18/evicting-the-public-why-has-occupying-public-spaces-brought-such-heavy-handed-repression/>
- Demirag, Istemi (Ed., 2005). *Corporate Social Responsibility, Accountability and Governance*. Sheffield: Greenleaf Publication.
- Held, David (1998) ‘Democracy and Gloablization’, in: D. Archibugi, D. Held and M. Koehler (Eds), *Re-imagining Political Community*, Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Held, David (1999) *The Transformation of Political Community: Rethinking Democracy in the Context of Globalization*, in: Ian Shapiro and Casiano Hacker-

- Codon (eds), *Democracy's Edges*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Keck, Margaret E. and Sikkink, Kathryn (1998), *Activists Beyond Borders: Advocacy Networks in International Politics*, Ithaca, NY: Princeton University Press.
- Keck, Margaret E. and Sikkink, Kathryn (1999) *Transnational Advocacy Networks in International and Regional Politics*, *International Social Science Journal*, 51 (issue 159):89-101.
- Lai, On-Kwok (2008). *Rediscovering Kosmopolis in the Cyber-Information Age? Social Agencies and Activism in their Geo-Historical Place*, In: Rebecka Lettevall and My Klockar Linder (Eds. 2008). *The Idea of Kosmopolis. History, Philosophy, Politic of World Citizenship*. Huddinge: Södertörn University College. pp.121-142.
- Lai, On-Kwok. (2011). *Critical Engagements of NGOs for Global Human Rights Protection*. *International Journal of Social Quality*, 1(2, Winter 2011): 5-18.
- Massey, Doreen (2004). *Geographies of Responsibility*, *Geografiska Annaler*. 86B(1):5-18.
- Massey, Doreen (2005). *For Space*. London: SAGE.
- Massey, Doreen (2007). *World City*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Rosenau, James N. (1997) 'Material and Imagined Communities in Globalized Space', in D.H. McMillen (ed.), *Globalization and Regional Communities*, Toowomba: USQ Press.
- Rosenau, James N. (1998) *Governance and Democracy in a Globalizing World*, in Daniel Archibugi, David Held Martin Koehler (eds.), *Re-imagining Political Community*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- The World Bank (2011). *World Development Report*. <http://wdr2011.worldbank.org/>
- Thompson, John B. (2005), *The New Visibility, Theory, Culture & Society*, 22(6): 31-51.
- Uddin, Sk N., Taplin, Ros and Yu, X. (2007). *Energy, Environment and Development in Bhutan*. *Renewal and Sustainable Energy Reviews*, 11: 2083-2103.
- United Nations The Convention on Biodiversity (CBD, 2010). *United Nations Convention on Biodiversity*, 2010. <http://www.cbd.int/>
- Urry, John (2010). *Consuming the Planet to Excess*. *Theory, Culture & Society*. 27(2-3): 191-212.
- Young Iris M. (2003) *From Guilt to Solidarity: Sweatshops and Political Responsibility*. *Dissent*. 50(2): 39-44.
- Young Iris M. (2004) *Responsibility and Global labor justice*. *Journal of Political Philosophy*. 12(4): 365-388.
- Young Iris M. (2007). *Global Challenges: War, Selfdetermination and Responsibility*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Zurick, David (2006). *Gross National Happiness and Environmental Status in Bhutan*. *Geographical Review*, 96(4): 657-681.