

don't believe it still, even in America, and certainly not in a lot of developing countries.

.....

**STATEMENTS BY ALBERT GORE, JR.
Vice President of the United States**

**Excerpts from Vice President Gore's remarks at the World Economic Forum, Davos
29 January 1999**

...But in the midst of new wealth and opportunity, we have also found new risk and challenge: the growing dangers of the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction; the slowing—and in some cases, the reversing—of reforms in important countries upon whose continued stability and progress the world depends; the breakdown of social order and consequent human suffering in too many struggling, developing societies; the devastation of millions—especially in Africa, by HIV/AIDS; the adding of another China's worth of people to the world's population every decade—95 percent of them in the world's poorest countries; the changes we are causing in the global environment, which threaten to disrupt the relatively stable climatic balance we have known since before the agricultural revolution.

...For our part, the United States is following a growth policy based on three elements never before tried in combination: eliminate the deficit, open markets, and invest in our own people. We replaced the vicious cycle with a virtuous cycle—lower interest rates, more investment, more jobs, more growth—which fuels even greater investment in our future.

...We must never lose sight of the poorest nations. We would like to see, this year, on the brink of a new millennium, decisive progress toward debt relief for the world's poorest and most indebted countries. Debt relief means removal of the overhang—that is, the burden that debts place on investment—and it means more resources for environmental protection and child survival.

...These goals—a strong economy, a clean environment, peace and security—do go hand in hand. As we move beyond the age of bipolar tensions and sharp ideological conflicts—as we deepen and extend our economic and security ties—nations are finding the wisdom that grows from our connectedness.

...There is no greater challenge for our global community than to break the vicious cycle of poverty and ignorance—and create a virtuous cycle of smaller, healthier, better-educated families—with lower child mortality, and higher incomes. In this way, we can seek a new practical idealism—grounded in self-interest, but uplifted by what is right. We have it in our power to build a world that is not just better off, but better.

.....

**STATEMENTS BY MADELEINE K. ALBRIGHT
U.S. Secretary of State**

**Excerpts from Secretary of State Albright's remarks on Earth Day 1998 at the National Museum of Natural History, Washington, DC
21 April 1998**

...The threats we face from environmental harm are not as spectacular as those of a terrorist's bomb or missile. But we know that the health of our families will be affected by the health of the global environment. The prosperity of our families will be affected by whether other nations develop in sustainable ways. The safety of our families will be affected by whether we cut back on the use of toxic chemicals. And the security of our nation will be affected by whether we are able to prevent conflicts from arising over scarce resources.

There is much that we can do through our diplomacy to achieve these goals. Currently, to cite just three examples, we are promoting efficient management of the Nile River Basin; supporting better forestry practices in Southeast Asia; and striving to negotiate a worldwide ban on the release of pollutants such as DDT and PCBs. But if we are to move ahead as rapidly as we would like, we will also need support from our friends in Congress.

For example, we need to gain approval of the President's request for funds for USAID so that we can help other countries grow in ways that balance economic progress, social development and environmental concerns. We need support for the Global Environment Facility (GEF), which embodies the partnerships for sustainable development that was forged in Rio. This partnership is not helped by the fact that, in each of the last three years, we have fallen short of our pledged share to the GEF. We need to do better than that. We need to meet our commitments, in full, this year and every year.

As the President stressed during his recent trip to Africa, we are asking the Senate to approve the Convention Against Desertification. We are also asking the Senate to approve the Biodiversity Convention, for we cannot ensure our future if we endanger the biological base that serves the needs of every human society, no matter how rich or poor.

...A major contributor to the stress we place on the global environment is the growth in the world's population. At current rates, we are increasing by an amount equal to the population of Mexico each year. And more than 90 percent of this increase is in the developing world. As I have seen in visits to South Asia, Africa, Latin America and Haiti, rapidly rising populations make it harder for societies to cope. Even when economies grow, living standards do not rise. Even when there is planning, resources of land and water are depleted. Even when overall production of food goes up, more people go hungry.

The Clinton Administration favors a comprehensive approach that takes into account the environment, development and the rights and needs of women. This accords with the consensus created at the 1994 Cairo Conference, and it is reflected in our Child Survival and Disease Programs, and in our support for international family planning.

As is well known, there are those who would like to impose crippling conditions on our assistance to family planning. On this issue there are strong feelings on all sides. I know because my own feelings are strong, and I believe international family planning needs and deserves our support. The programs we help are voluntary. They improve people's health; they save people's lives; they reduce significantly the number of abortions; and they contribute to a more livable world.

**Excerpts from Secretary of State Albright's address to the Australasia Centre of the Asia Society, Sydney, Australia
30 July 1998**

Leading scientists agree that greenhouse gases are warming our planet. A warming planet is a changing planet, and not for the better. Unless we act, sea levels will continue to rise throughout the next century, swamping some areas and putting millions of people at greater risk to coastal storms. We can expect significant and sudden changes in agricultural production and forest ecosystems, leading to changing patterns of wildlife migration and forcing more people to leave home and cross borders in search of productive land. We will also see more heat-related deaths, more serious air pollution, increased allergic disorders and more widespread malaria, cholera and other infectious diseases.

...I note that the scientific backing behind the current warming projections is the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change, representing the work of more than 2,000 scientists from more than 50 countries. Their report is carefully worded, factually based and it recognizes the uncertainties as well as the risks. Yet in both our nations, we have those who insist that the scientific warnings are wrong; or that, even if they are right, we can't afford to take the steps required to slow the release of greenhouse gases. But the one thing we truly cannot afford to do is wait and see. For if the warnings are right, the cost of reversing climate change and cleaning up the damage will be infinitely greater than the cost of preventing it.

Our choice is clear. We can keep pumping more gases into the atmosphere every year, invite more severe climate change, and let future generations deal with the consequences. Or we can act prudently to protect our planet, our children's home...I have to say having just recently traveled with President Clinton to China, where it is clear that while the United States is the greatest problem now, they will be the greatest problem. A message that he is delivering is one that I think is key: countries that are so-called developing countries are concerned about how putting in environmentally sound technology will affect their development. And the President argues that no one has the right to tell another country to limit its development. But that those of us that have gone through industrialization can validate the fact that often the economic situation in a country can be actually improved once environmentally sound technology is put in.

I believe ultimately, and I am confident that we can make our environment healthier and keep our economies competitive or even post economic gains through greater efficiency and the use of clean technology.

Our cooperation is also essential to solve the other half of the climate change puzzle, which is to create a global action plan to which both developed and developing nations contribute. This is critical if we want to make not just short-term headlines, but long-term improvements. For it is expected that, within two decades, the largest emitter of greenhouse gases

I want to illustrate some of these problems and their application by talking about some specific treaties that we are working on in one way or another. On the issue of treaties, we have had a very hard time getting environmental treaties approved; to be precise, to get the advice and consent of the Senate of the United States to some treaties, some of which, by common consent, are not even controversial. We have before the Senate now the Law of the Sea Convention, Convention on Biological Diversity, a number of conventions regarding fish, and several others. The only one recently we have had actually ratified is an agreement on straddling fish stocks. We have had a very hard time getting the Senate to take up and agree to treaties.

The arguments against environmental treaty ratification are threefold. The first argument is that in some way, the treaty gives up some degree of sovereignty. The second argument is that the treaty will involve a substantial new bureaucracy, which is true sometimes and not true others. And third, it will cost money. And in the discussions I have had, I have agreed frequently that all three of those may be the case. They are not always the case, but they are frequently the case. The money is not usually very big, but I have had a very hard time getting anyone to discuss these in terms of a cost-benefit analysis. Is the benefit we get [from the treaties] worth these three costs?

It is striking that in none of the agreements that I have just listed that are before the Senate, for example, have we been successful. The Law of the Sea Convention, which was rejected some time back, in the Reagan Administration, because of certain provisions regarding mining and exploitation of the bottom of the international sea, has been corrected. Almost everybody agrees that the present provision deals with the objections that were set forth at that time. But nevertheless, we have not been able to get that past the Senate. We have even pulled out the big guns at Department of Defense (DoD). The DoD has made it clear that it would benefit from the Law of the Sea Convention, and because it has rights of transit enshrined in it. But we have been unable to get that done.

It requires some thinking as to whether [these difficulties in passing treaties] are going to change. What alternative

havhavshmgd in review," for example

r(is wor)-13ms of pethetJTJT*view.(e)-1. 746(The)JTJT1-0.003 Twinxhatthesioy wile not anunheleet thaJTJT quot tr

claim says more wealth means more countries with more middle class, more disposable income, more ability to choose how to spend dollars, and more ability and willingness to deal with environmental issues. Poor countries cannot do it, they do not have that luxury, they do not have the resources. Therefore wealth means better environment. I am putting these in the crudest sense, but that debate is absolutely unresolved in the American environmental community today. And it hurts us in several ways.

Next week I am going to be in Geneva, at a high-level symposium of trade people and environment people. It was proposed by the President in his speech last year. And the idea is to see whether we can make this trade body environmentally more responsible. At least half of the American environmental community did not really want to do that, I think, because they think this trade body is fatally flawed. And fixing it up is not the answer. Curbing it is the answer, or building a parallel and competitive environmental organization may be the answer, but that is a hopeless organization if you believe some people. We are working on the opposite assumption: that it is an organization that can, over time, successfully take account of environmental considerations. We will have to see. But the issue of how to deal with this phenomenon, and whether the phenomenon helps or hurts the environment, the phenomenon of globalization, is an element in today's environmental negotiation that simply did not exist twenty years ago. If it existed, people did not think of it in those terms and they did not accord it those values.

I think of those five issues, five phenomena if you will, shaping environmental diplomacy in this century and the next. And none of them are by any means intellectually resolved, and they certainly are not resolved in terms of negotiations. And they come up again and again in almost every discussion we have and every dispute we have. Let me just say a couple specific words about the climate change negotiation, because it is, in a sense, the "biggie." We certainly spend more effort on that and I see people in the audience who spend equally much time on that, and are equally or more knowledgeable about that [issue].

We have two big problems. The one I alluded to already: we have a global problem, and we do not have a global agreement. We have an agreement, the Kyoto Agreement, which only consists of the developed world. That is understandable in the sense that in a decision made some time back. The developed world sort of gave the developing world a bye, and said "we will go first." This is called the Berlin Mandate. I think it was a decision that is now technically no longer in force because it was overtaken by Kyoto, but it is in force in people's heads. But it will not work that way, I think. It will not work that way because very soon the developed world will not be the biggest emitter of greenhouse gases that cause the global climate change. If you look at the curves of the two, you will find that agreement among the developed world is simply not going to cut it. It is not going to make a big enough difference. So, for that reason, an agreement among the Kyoto parties alone is not going to work. And secondly, politically, as I alluded to earlier, the Senate of the United States has made it

very clear that it is not going to ratify an agreement that is not in some way global in reach. So there are two reasons why [developing country participation] is necessary. I just came from two days in Mexico last week (a self-defined developing country, according to them), and we made some progress. But as I left I had my pen out and they did not choose to grab it and sign anything. So we will have to wait.

The other problem is cost. There is no question that there is a cost to taking the measures that are necessary in order to reduce greenhouse gases. Now, our argument is there is not a net cost, in the sense that the cost of the damage done by climate change is substantially greater than the cost of trying to curb climate change. But there is a cost. How much that cost is, is a matter of substantial debate. And two things about that cost need further work. One of them is, what is the difference between the cost of reducing greenhouse gases if you do it all in your home territory, and if you do some in your home territory and for the other you use the trading mechanisms that are built into the Kyoto Agreement? It sounds like a terribly arcane subject matter, but it is not arcane, and the reason it is not is because we ke].yingasonhugl debate(easAgrsrat cost)]TJ19*10.001 Tc10.12 go

wwder

to

w

climate]TJiT*1-.044

Tw.



management.

The purpose...is to generate dialogue between governments, business and industry representatives, trade unions, NGOs and other major groups on the role and responsibilities of industry, which, if exercised wisely, will lead to higher living standards, increased social development and enhanced quality of the environment.

.....

**STATEMENTS BY JULIA V. TAFT
U.S. Assistant Secretary of State for Population,
Refugees, and Migration**

**Excerpts from Assistant Secretary Taft's remarks to participants in the International Diploma in Humanitarian Assistance Center for International Health and Cooperation and City University of New York, Hunter College, New York, NY
6 July 1998**

...Because you're working in the international humanitarian field, it may be useful to understand U.S. policy on international family planning, an issue that has become unfortunately politicized. U.S. population policy is a critical element in our comprehensive strategy for sustainable development. Sustainable development integrates goals for population and health with those of protecting the environment, building democracy, and encouraging broad-based economic growth—again, linking us back to several of the national Center

fh—againmy



that exist today. If we've learned anything in this crusade, it's that to succeed everyone must participate. Whether it means donating food during a local food drive, or volunteering at a food bank, or working full-time in an anti-hunger organization, or farmers gleaned from their harvest, we all can play a part we all can make a difference.

I close with the words of Woodrow Wilson, "America is not anything if it consists of each of us. It is something only if it consists of all of us." It will take all of us to really defeat hunger and malnutrition. As the world's food superpower, if we succeed, we will set a standard for the entire community of nations, where all people have ready access to good health, nutritious food and a decent standard of living.

Editor's Note: The full text of Secretary Glickman's speech can be found at <http://www.usda.gov/news/releases/1999/03/0133>. A pdf version of the plan is available at <http://www.fas-usda.gov/icd/summit/usactpl.pdf>.

.....

**STATEMENTS BY BILL RICHARDSON
U.S. Secretary of Energy**

**Excerpts from Secretary Richardson's remarks to the U.S. Oil & Gas Association Meeting, San Antonio, TX
16 October 1998**

...There used to be a robust government dialogue on energy, spearheaded by a federal interagency group called the "International Energy Security Group." This group was charged with assessing the implications of—as well as for—the energy sector on our national, economic and environmental security. Energy was deemed so important that the National Security Council had the lead in running this effort.

Unfortunately, we have lost a little of this sense of purpose—along with the valuable clarity it provided—and it is my sincere hope that when I leave DOE [Department of Energy], I will have helped turn complacency into commitment, and apathy into action.

.....

**STATEMENTS BY CAROL M. BROWNER
Administrator, U.S. Environmental
Protection Agency**

**Excerpts from Administrator Browner's prepared remarks to the Committee on Finance, United States Senate, Washington, DC
28 January 1999**

Official Statements

least as likely to be imperiled in the first half of the next century by the consequences of inadequacies in the energy options available

across national frontiers are among the quintessential “problems without passports” which, like crime, drug-trafficking and the spread of disease, cry out for an international response.

But the global perspective is not the only one. While global threats and the global dimension of modern life have received the lion’s share of attention in recent years, it is the local level that is closest to the world’s people, and it is at the local level that the most creative and tangible problem-solving is being done.

The local level is also where the United Nations and its system of agencies and programs are most present in people’s lives, helping countries to meet their peoples’ needs. Indeed, for most men, women and children the struggle for sustainable development begins not at United Nations conferences or policy sessions but at home, amid grinding poverty, with the daily search for basics like clean water, sanitation, shelter and some fuel with which to cook and heat.

So if the role of the multilateral system is clear, still we must have a multilateral system that works. The Earth Summit served as a catalyst for changes at the United Nations which have brought us closer to that goal. The Commission on Sustainable Development, created immediately after Rio, has become a central forum to review and promote implementation of Agenda 21 and other agreements. The Global Environment Facility has emerged as an innovative financial mechanism.

We have also, in the spirit of Rio and the spirit of United Nations reform, closely examined the United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP) and Habitat, the United Nations Centre for Human Settlements. For more than 25 years, UNEP has monitored the state of the environment, raised awareness and provided invaluable policy guidance. Today, as a focal point, within and beyond the United Nations system, for the environmental dimension of sustainable development, a strong UNEP is essential for us all.

Towards that end, following a comprehensive review, the Secretary-General has submitted to the General Assembly a set of recommendations aimed at revitalizing both UNEP and Habitat. The recommendations covering UNEP are designed to improve coordination, forge closer links between UNEP and the environment-related conventions, and in general give UNEP greater political and financial backing. UNEP must have the status, strength and resources it needs if it is to function effectively as the environmental agency of the world community.

The changes at UNEP and Habitat are also part of the broader process of reform initiated two years ago by the Secretary-General. That effort has brought better coordination among the Organization’s disparate entities, enabling them to make the necessary linkages among issues and working more effectively together at the country level.

.

STATEMENTS BY JAMES GUSTAVE SPETH
Administrator, United Nations Development
Programme (UNDP)

Excerpts from Administrator Speth’s remarks on World
Environment Day
5 June 1998

I am pleased to pay tribute to 1998 World Environment Day’s theme, *For Life on Earth: Save our Seas*. The world’s oceans are resilient and powerful, but they are finite ecosystems, which are heavily affected by human activity. Managing oceans responsibly today will determine whether they remain a vital and renewable resource for everyone in the next millennium.

Unfortunately, we have not been good stewards of our oceans and coasts. Rapid coastal population growth and the resulting increase in waste disposal, along with intensive agricultural and industrial pollution on or near shorelines, have damaged reefs and other vital marine habitats. More than two-thirds of the world’s people live in coastal areas, and more than half the world’s coastal wetlands have been destroyed by urban development. The loss of these wetlands may be costing coastal fishing communities as much as 4.7 million tons of fish a year. These pressures, combined with the vast over-capacity of international fishing fleets, have contributed to the well-publicized collapse of major fisheries around the world. Moreover, the erosion of ocean biodiversity is alarming. For the people whose livelihoods depend on our oceans, these trends could spell disaster, pushing thousands into poverty.

UNDP supports an expanding portfolio of projects that build capacity in the areas of fisheries management, mariculture, aquaculture and the sustainable use of coastal and deep-water marine ecosystems. Many of these projects are being funded by the Global Environment Facility, which UNDP co-sponsors with the World Bank and the UN Environment Programme (UNEP). UNDP is also assisting UNEP in translating regional coastal management policies into action.

In January, UNDP launched a Strategic Initiative for Ocean and Coastal Management to protect the world’s seas by exchanging information about the marine environment among countries and project managers and alerting scientists and policymakers to coastal management issues and the resources to deal with them. Such efforts are part of UNDP’s Water Strategy, which combines the management of fresh water resources with the management of aquatic ecosystems, ranging from watersheds, rivers, streams, lakes, aquifers, deltas, wetlands, coastal zones and oceans.

Oceans must remain at the top of the global agenda. In recognition of the importance of our water resources, the United Nations has declared 1998 the International Year of the Ocean. This action, along with the adoption of the UN Convention on the Law of the Sea, are milestones in the international community’s commitment to reversing the rapid depletion of marine ecosystems. All countries must redouble their efforts to ensure that such agreements are honored and that marine resources are managed sustainably. Nations must learn to share

international water bodies, wetlands and biodiversity.

Projects that are especially close to this year's theme of World Water Day involve international river basins. One example is UNDP's support for the Nile Basin Framework Initiative and the related UNDP-World Bank Partnership Agreement on the International Waters Initiative. The goal of the riparians of these shared river basins is not only that individual nations benefit but also that there is an optimal use of the resource and the sustainable development of the basins for the benefit of all. Herein lies a shared vision that may be adopted by the global community for the benefit of the world as a whole, and as a guide for the future of water management on this World Water Day.

.....

**STATEMENTS BY KLAUS TÖPFER
Executive Director, United Nations Environment
Programme (UNEP)**

**Remarks by Executive Director Töpfer at the signing of an agreement strengthening cooperation between UNEP and United Nations Population Fund, Geneva, Switzerland
9 April 1999**

A stabilized population is increasingly seen as an essential ingredient of environmental sustainability at local, national and global levels. Similarly, balanced patterns of consumption and production, which foster sustainable resource use and prevent environmental degradation are seen as key elements of an integrated approach to achieving societies' population and development goals. This new Agreement will help UNEP and UNFPA better understand the complexities of the issues involved and thus facilitate the search for solutions.

.....

**STATEMENTS BY JACQUES DIOUF
Director-General, Food and Agriculture Organization
of the United Nations**

**Excerpts from Director-General Diouf's remarks on the occasion of the release of the *U.S. Action Plan on Food Security*, Woodrow Wilson Center, Washington, DC
26 March 1999**

The *U.S. Action Plan* sets out priorities and actions to address hunger both at home and in the developing world. While recognizing that the vast majority of households in America are food secure, the Plan finds that 12 million households in the United States are food insecure, that of these, nearly four million are hungry at some point over the course of a year, and that in a recent opinion poll, Americans said they considered domestic hunger to be one of the most serious

national problems.

At the Summit countries pledged to reduce the number of undernourished people by half by no later than the year 2015. This was a minimum goal, not a maximum goal. So it is gratifying to note that the United States has adopted an even broader commitment as a domestic goal, and is developing a target for reducing food insecurity in the U.S. through its national Healthy People 2010 initiative.

At the same time, the Plan observes that the link between world food security and the well-being of Americans is not clearly understood. To address this problem, the United States will conduct a national "Food for All" campaign and will highlight the linkages among domestic and international agriculture, hunger, food security and poverty by sharing such information with Congress, the public, and the U.S. agricultural community.

Such an action will undoubtedly constitute a major step in spreading the awareness that in today's interdependent world, hunger anywhere is a problem for all. I believe that the seed will fall on fertile ground, for I have always been convinced that there is an important constituency in the United States which is firmly and unselfishly dedicated to the goal of freedom from hunger. This was the ideal which led to the founding of FAO, and I need hardly recall that the United States was instrumental—indeed the leader—in that process.

I take heart from the results of the University of Maryland public opinion study which found that a strong majority of the

The message which comes through in the Plan, loud and clear, is that there are solutions to hunger, but that unless effective action is taken now, we will not meet even the minimum target set by the Summit.

We in FAO also share the conclusion that solutions are expensive, but affordable. Although different approaches and



Left to right: Geoffrey D. Dabelko, Daniel R. Glickman, and Jacques Diouf

methodologies can lead to varying quantitative estimates of the resources to be mobilized internationally, it is acknowledged that present downward trends in official development assistance must be reversed, and that the increase required is not beyond reach. The Plan calls it "sustained but modest."

We trust that the donor community will respond to this challenge, for much depends on it. Primary responsibility for ensuring the food security of their peoples rests with countries and national governments. This is an incontrovertible fact, reaffirmed in the Summit Plan of Action.

But the playing field is not level, the gap between the "haves" and the "have-nots" in our global community is widening, and national responsibility must be complemented by international solidarity.

I can only echo the call in the Plan for a concerted partnership of all nations to reach the World Food Summit goal, and reiterate my hope—and my conviction—that the United States will continue to be in the forefront of progress towards a food-secure future for humanity. This Plan provides a beacon along the way.

.....

STATEMENTS BY NAFIS SADIK

Executive Director, United Nations Population Fund (UNFPA)

**Remarks by Executive Director Sadik at the signing of an agreement strengthening cooperation between UNEP [United Nations Environment Programme] and UNFPA, Geneva, Switzerland
9 April 1999**

It is imperative that a holistic approach be undertaken to address complex global challenges. The current growth and character of world population, the pressure on the environment and natural resources, whether on water, land, air or energy, demand our joint collaborative experiences and foresight. Building a better future for developed and developing nations alike calls for urgent action and worldwide participation. Our

joint efforts will serve as a great outreach possibility for both our organizations to promote the development of new, sustainable policies for the future. Sustainability is key for population concerns as it is for environmental concerns. The future of this planet earth and its people depend on the decisions we make today; population and environmental issues are interdependent and must be resolved as such.

.....
**STATEMENTS BY GRO HARLEM BRUNDTLAND
Director-General, World Health Organization
(WHO)**

**Excerpts from Director-General Brundtland's remarks at the Woodrow Wilson Center, Washington, D.C.
22 September 1998**

...I feel in many ways that I have spent much of my time on these specific linkages [between population, environment, health and security issues], and trying to understand them.

...We have to continue our fight against communicable diseases, which still haunt the world, especially the poor. We are engaging across a broad spectrum, and many gaps that we see between rich and poor are at least as wide as they were half a century ago, and some of them are even widening between



Gro Harlem Brundtland

nations and within nations. So while in most countries people live longer, life expectancy is decreasing in some others. Between 1975 and 1995, 16 countries, with a combined population of 300 million, experienced such a decrease. To

many people this is surprising. Many of those countries are African countries, and recently even European countries experienced a reduction in life expectancy.

The first World Health Assembly, in June of 1948, listed its top priorities in the following order: malaria, maternal and child health, tuberculosis, sexually transmitted diseases, nutrition, and environmental sanitation. Looking at it today, we see that they are all critical issues we have to deal with. Malaria is hitting back again, killing 3000 children every day, especially in Africa. In defining the Roll-Back Malaria Project of WHO, we will do all we can to learn from the successes and failures of the past, and mount a realistic combat to significantly reduce morbidity and mortality from malaria. WHO was created 50 years ago, and the founding fathers and mothers knew perfectly well, even then, that there are no health sanctuaries. The suffering of the many must be a common concern in an interdependent world.

We also have to mobilize in our fight against the non-communicable diseases too well known in the North, but now spreading like an epidemic in developing countries. We have to look ahead to grasp the changing time, ready and able to give the best advice on aging, on mental health, and on the

Official Statements