

Building a Human Rights Culture
South African and
Swedish Perspectives

Karin Sporre &
H Russel Botman [eds.]

OFFPRINT 2018

HÖGSKOLAN DALARNA

REPORT 2003:11

ARTS & EDUCATION

Building a Human Rights Culture
South African and Swedish Perspectives

Karin Sporre & H Russel Botman [eds.]



UNIVERSITY of the
WESTERN CAPE

www.uwc.za



UNIVERSITEIT•STELLENBOSCH•UNIVERSITY

www.sun.za



HÖGSKOLAN
DALARNA

www.du.se

© 2003:

Karin Sporre and H Russel Botman for selection;

Karin Sporre for editorial material;

individual contributors for their contribution

Report from Arts & Education,

Högskolan Dalarna, 2003:11

ISSN 1403-6878

Second edition, electronic version 2018

ISBN 978-91-88679-19-2

The report is financially supported by SIDA,

Swedish International Development Cooperation Agency,

Department for Democracy and Social Development, Education Division

Graphic design Eva Kvarnström, Oform

Printed by Strållins 2003

CONTENTS

7 Introduction

KARIN SPORRE

ECONOMY AND HUMAN RIGHTS

20 Human Dignity and Economic Globalization

H RUSSEL BOTMAN

35 Economic Equality, Civic Traditions and Human Rights

ULF MAGNUSSON

DEMOCRACY AND CITIZENSHIP

54 Human Rights, Citizenship and Welfare: The Swedish Model

LARS PETTERSON

77 Curbing Women's Suffrage.

Expectations, Apprehensions and Strategies

JAN GRÖNDAHL

102 More Representation or More Participation?

Challenges in Swedish Democracy

ERIK AMNÅ

SOCIAL CONDITIONS AND HUMAN RIGHTS

128 Pretending Democracy. Learning and Teaching
Participation in Two Swedish Schools

ÅSA BARTHOLDSSON

142 Women in the Church. Solidarity in Suffering
in the Context of HIV/AIDS

MIRANDA PILLAY

164 Othering from Within – Sometimes Other,
Sometimes Not. On being a Young Turk in Sweden

JUDITH NARROWE

RELIGION AND HUMAN RIGHTS

179 Freedom of Religion and the Equality and Dignity
of Women. A Christian Feminist Perspective

DENISE M. ACKERMANN

194 Trinitarian Anthropology, Ubuntu and Human Rights

NICO KOOPMAN

GENDER ISSUES AND HUMAN RIGHTS

208 Different Space for Action – a Way to Understand Rape

STINA JEFFNER

220 The Vanishing Father. Changing Constructions
of Fatherhood in Drum Magazine 1951–1965

LINDSAY CLOWES

245 A Profile of Female Genital Mutilation (FGM) and Human Rights

KATHY NADASEN

A HUMAN RIGHTS CULTURE

274 Sentiment and the Spread of A Human Rights Culture

J P ABRAHAMS

288 Women's Human Rights in Sweden – a Feminist Ethical Perspective

KARIN SPORRE

311 On a Human Rights Culture in a Global Era.
Some Ecological Perspectives

ERNST M CONRADIE

CONTRIBUTORS

Mr *J P Abrahams*, Lecturer, Philosophy, University of the Western Cape. Researching the relationship between technology and society.

Dr *Denise Ackermann*, Extraordinary Professor, Faculty of Theology, University of Stellenbosch. Presently researching a feminist theology of praxis in the South African context.

Dr *Erik Amnå*, Associate Professor, Political Science, Göteborg University. Program director of Young Citizens Program, a comparative, multidisciplinary study of adolescents and young adults in 28 countries. Former principal secretary of The Swedish Governmental Democracy Commission.

Ms *Åsa Bartholdsson*, Lecturer, Social Anthropology, Högskolan Dalarna. Presently concluding a PhD thesis concerning ideas about what constitutes normality of children within Swedish schools.

Dr *H Russel Botman*, Professor, Missiology, University of Stellenbosch. Ongoing research: Social ethics, Globalization, Values and Virtues.

Dr *Lindsay Clowes*, Lecturer, Women's & Gender Studies programme, University of the Western Cape. Research interests: representations of African masculinities in the South African media.

Dr *Ernst M. Conradie*, Associate Professor, Systematic Theology and Ethics, University of the Western Cape. Research focus: Ecological theology and Systematic Theology in the African context.

Mr *Jan Gröndahl*, Lecturer, History, Högskolan Dalarna. Presently concluding a PhD thesis concerning Swedish social policy towards single mothers and their children 1900–1940.

Dr *Stina Jeffner*, Associate Professor, Sociology, Högskolan Dalarna. Researching violence against women. Presently working on a project with young women who themselves are using violence.

Dr *Nico Koopman*, Senior Lecturer, Systematic Theology and Ethics; Director of the Beyers Naudé Centre for Public Theology, Faculty of Theology, University of Stellenbosch. Researching public moral and theological issues from the perspective of theological anthropology.

Dr *Ulf Magnusson*, Associate Professor, History, Högskolan Dalarna. Researching the status and role of civic associations in one of the old industrial regions in Central Sweden.

Dr *Kathy Nadasen*, Lecturer, Anthropology/Sociology, University of Western Cape. Embarking on menopausal research amongst Indian women in South Africa.

Dr *Judith Narrowe*, Associate Professor, Social Anthropology, Högskolan Dalarna. Currently researching "Perceptions of Gender, Sexuality and HIV-AIDS among male and female students at an Ethiopian teachers college."

Dr *Lars Petterson*, Professor, History, Högskolan Dalarna. Currently involved in a research project on national values in Swedish historiography.

Ms *Miranda N Pillay*, Lecturer, Ethics and New Testament Studies, University of the Western Cape. Doctoral research centres around the "normative" value of reading a New Testament document ethically in the context of HIV/AIDS in South Africa. Also involved in in-service training/workshops for teachers on integrating human rights and values in the curriculum.

Dr *Karin Sporre*, Associate Professor, Ethics, Högskolan Dalarna. Research: member of the research group "Shared values?" exploring the Swedish school in a growingly more multicultural Sweden, feminist theology and ethics.

ON A HUMAN RIGHTS CULTURE IN A GLOBAL ERA SOME ECOLOGICAL PERSPECTIVES

BY ERNST M CONRADIE

In recent theological discourse on human rights in the South African context a new emphasis on the formation of a human rights culture based on the dignity of all human beings has emerged. The focus is not so much on an academic or legal study of human rights. The emphasis is on the formation of a human rights *culture*, that is, on issues of moral formation, on the realisation that the formulation of a bill of human rights does not guarantee a society in which such rights will be respected. A moral society cannot be secured through legislation. In South Africa it is often said that we now have a new South Africa and an excellent new constitution. What we now need, I will argue in this paper, are new South Africans, communities of people that embody and practise the vision articulated in the constitution.

In this contribution I will remind us of some of the underlying problems that have to be addressed in any theological discourse on human rights. In the third section I will offer a substantive contribution to the theme by investigating two recent ecological discourses on a global ethos. The essay will conclude with a few comments on the role of religious traditions in general and Christian theology, more specifically in this regard. This will reflect my own interests as a South African Christian theologian with a strong research interest in ecological theology (see Conradie & Field 2000, Conradie 2000, 2001a, 2001b).

Some disputes on a human rights culture

a) The rights and wrongs of a right

The South African Bill of Rights enshrines the rights of all people in our country and affirms the democratic values of human dignity, equality and freedom.¹ The various rights enshrined in the bill of rights are based on everyone's "inherent dignity and the right to have their dignity respected and protected."² The significance of this formulation is evident to most South Africans, especially

1 Section 7(1) of the South African constitution (1996).

2 Section 10 of the South African constitution (1996).

given the way in which the dignity of human beings has been violated through centuries of colonialism, patriarchal systems, racial discrimination, cultural elitism and apartheid. This has to be understood in the light of the numerous gross violations of human rights as documented in the hearings of the Truth and Reconciliation Commission. Furthermore, the many more subtle but equally degrading ways in which some people have been treated as inferior by others – through their tone of voice, jokes, body language and studied disregard – also have to be kept in mind. Indeed, the many contemporary manifestations of violence bear witness to an “unrelenting assault on human dignity” (Huber, 1996).

Notwithstanding the contextual urgency of an affirmation of each person’s rights, we have to remind ourselves of the difficult problem of describing the very foundations of human rights. Why does a human person have rights in the first place? Why should we honour the rights of others? Some rights are due to us on the basis of agreements, treaties, promises or legal decisions. However, these are rights that only apply in particular circumstances, they are not *basic* human rights.³ The South African constitution grounds such basic human rights in human dignity, equality and freedom. Yet a number of questions persist. Why should the dignity of every human being be acknowledged? Who has ordained that humans should have (equal) dignity? Why is such dignity considered to be “inalienable”?⁴ Where do we get such dignity from? From the constitution? From society? From the very nature of things (natural law)? From a particular worldview (based on the notion of ubuntu)? From God? From being created in the image of God?⁵ There are obviously a number of deeply rooted convictions about human personhood at stake in a discussion of such questions.

Such questions may sound somewhat esoteric but they are crucial in order to guard against various aberrations of human rights discourse. Some regard human rights primarily in an egocentric way, i.e. in terms of the demand that

3 Josef Pieper (1966, p 47) notes that: “The concept of ‘being due to,’ of ‘right’ is such a primordial idea that it cannot be traced back to a prior, subordinating concept.”

4 Moltmann (1999, p 119) answers this question concisely: “Human rights exist in the plural, but human dignity is simply and solely singular. Human dignity is one and indivisible. There is never a greater or a lesser degree of human dignity. It exists only entirely or not at all.”

5 See Huber (1996, pp 113–149) on the rootedness of an affirmation of human dignity in the Jewish-Christian notion that every human being is created in the image of God. Huber suggests that the revolutionary significance of the affirmation of human dignity in the Jewish-Christian tradition is precisely this emphasis on equality. Human dignity assumes the equality of God’s children – irrespective of official positions or duties, social status, talent or wealth, gender or nationality (1996, p 115).

their own rights have to be conceded. Human rights discourse is also a handy weapon that may be used to accuse others of violating certain rights. In such cases, discourse on human rights may play into the hands of the notorious culture of entitlement and the widespread culture of consumerism in South Africa. “Life owes me something.” “I have a right to this, that and the other thing.”

Such a view of human rights would miss the relational roots of the concept of “rights”. I only have rights because of the dignity attributed to me (externally). Moreover, within the context of basic scarcity on a finite planet, one’s rights cannot be separated from the rights of others. If distributive justice demands that everyone should receive what is due to her or him, I have to ensure that others receive what is due to them at the same time as I demand whatever is due to me. This also indicates the conceptual relatedness of discourse on human rights and human responsibilities.

b) Humans and humus

The distinction between so-called first, second and third generation of human rights is well known.⁶ In addition to the classic individual rights to freedom⁷ and the economic, social and cultural rights to housing, health care, food, water, social security and education,⁸ the South African constitution also acknowledges the rights of each citizen to a clean and healthy environment. Section 24 of the Bill of Rights in South Africa’s constitution reads:

Everyone has the right –

- a) to an environment that is not harmful to their health and well-being; and
- b) to have the environment protected for the benefit of present and future generations, through reasonable legislative and other measures that –
 - i) prevent pollution and ecological degradation;
 - ii) promote conservation; and
 - iii) secure ecologically sustainable development and use of natural resources while promoting justifiable economic and social development.

6 I find Moltmann’s distinctions in this regard illuminating too. He says: “In the wake of the crimes of the Fascist dictators, and after the Second World War, the North Atlantic states formulated individual human rights, over against the powers of state and society. In the struggle against capitalism and class rule, the socialist states emphasized economic and social human rights. And the wretched and impoverished people of the Third World are demanding the right to existence, the right to live and survive.” (Moltmann 1999, p 119). He also distinguishes between protective rights, rights of freedom, social rights and rights of participation.

7 See sections 12–22 of the South African constitution (1996).

8 See sections 26, 27, 29 of the South Africa constitution (1996).

It is pertinent to note that the stipulation of the right of human beings to a clean and healthy environment focuses on a concern for the well-being of human beings. The reason why environmental degradation should be prevented is the risk that this poses to other human beings. This formulation remains anthropocentric in orientation.⁹ It is one of the weaknesses of a human rights approach to environmental concerns that humans are placed at the centre whereas the interdependence of all life requires a more decentred approach. This may create the impression that everything on earth is there for the sake of human beings. Only human beings are there for their own sake. To counter such anthropocentrism, some environmental ethicists have argued that nature has an intrinsic value. This requires a different moral vision, a vision that dreams of a world in which people want to save the rose coloured periwinkle of Madagascar for its own sake, not because it happens to contain a cure for cancer in people.¹⁰ On this basis, some have argued for the acknowledgement of animal rights, biotic rights and the rights of nature¹¹ and have subsequently also affirmed the moral significance of inanimate forms of nature upon which all forms of life ultimately rely.¹²

This raises numerous further questions: How could the rights of nature be legally accounted for? How should the rights of humans be balanced with the rights of other living beings, also in the context of predator-prey relations, the expansive nature of basic human needs and biotic threats to human health? Does the malaria-carrying mosquito have a right to flourish too? And the HI-virus? Moreover, is it not equally problematic to assign “human” rights to other living beings on human terms? If we acknowledge that all discourse on rights is necessarily *human* discourse, does this not imply that a certain anthropocentrism is hermeneutically inevitable? Can rights language really be used to describe the responsibilities that human beings have in relation to animals and plants?

9 See also Moltmann & Giesser (1999, p 120). “But to base human rights on human dignity also shows the limits and dangers of their anthropocentrism. Human rights must be brought in conformity with the rights of nature, from which, with which and in which human beings live.”

10 *Rescue Mission: Planet Earth. A Children's edition of Agenda 21*, (United Nations: East African Educational Publishers, 1994), p. 29.

11 See especially the many contributions by Holmes Rolston (e.g. 1988, 1994) in this regard.

12 Within the context of the World Alliance of Reformed Churches, see the contribution by Vischer (1990) on the rights of future generations and the rights of nature.

These questions may again be somewhat facetious but they do point towards the need to clarify the anthropological presuppositions of human rights discourse. How should the inalienable dignity of human beings be understood? To what extent is human dignity derived from a secularised version of the Jewish-Christian notion that human beings have been created “in the image of God”? May human dignity be rooted in an African sense of ubuntu too? What is the relation between human dignity and the dignity of the other animals?¹³ What is the link between humans and humus? How can human activity enrich the fertility of the topsoil? Or are we ourselves nothing but dry dust? This begs the more pivotal anthropological question: What is the particular place of the human species within the earth community?¹⁴ Discourse on human rights that fails to address this question will remain vulnerable to the suspicion of anthropocentrism.

c) Universal, global or common rights?

The rise of modernity is associated with the search for a reliable foundation upon which society may be built. After several decades of religious wars it became clear that religion could no longer provide such a foundation. It was no longer clear what all people could have in common. Where in a world that has lost its cosmological and religious foundations can a basis for the construction of society be found? In the Cartesian cogito? In the humanist discovery of selfhood? In the neat Newtonian cosmology? In the social contract of Hobbes? In the ethos of freedom, equality and brotherhood of the French revolution? In the will of kings or in the will of the people? In the Kantian categories of universal reason and the categorical imperative?

If these proposals were at first characterised by a sense of urgency, a “Cartesian anxiety” and a hypothetical tentativeness, the (universal) legitimacy of the pillars of modernity was soon assumed with a sense of self-assurance.¹⁵

13 Frits De Lange (1997, p 170) suggests that human dignity is not denigrated by an emphasis on the continuity between the human species and other animals (e.g. in the observation that humans are “nothing but animals”). Instead, an emphasis on human dignity calls for an appreciation of the dignity of all other animals too. Thus there is no need for special pleading regarding human uniqueness in order to secure human dignity. See also Moltmann (1999, p 120): “Human dignity is not something that elevates men and women above all other things. It is merely a special instance of the dignity of all natural life.”

14 My current research project on an ecological anthropology, entitled “The earth is not our home yet!” uses this question as a point of departure for theological reflection.

However, the reliability of these foundations is now steadily being eroded due to a range of postmodern suspicions. After a century dominated by two world wars, the Holocaust, the nuclear bomb, the collapse of old-style colonialism and the failure of “development”, there is a broad recognition of the moral ambiguity of the roots of Western civilization. Following the rise of a historical consciousness, the hermeneutical turn, the linguistic turn and the sociological turn, there is now an acknowledgement that our most basic presuppositions are influenced by our contexts, by the categories of gender, race, class, culture, language and religion.

It also became clear that human rights could hardly be called “universal”. If anything, such rights could apply only to this planet and more specifically to one very recent species on this planet. The question is therefore whether human rights discourse can (or should) escape from its Kantian roots. On what basis can we maintain that *all* human beings have an inalienable dignity and that *all* human beings therefore have certain human rights?¹⁶ Any philosophical investigation into the connotations of specific human rights would reveal a thoroughly contextual description of the connotations of such rights, different listings of such rights and different interpretations of the relationship between various rights. Even when we use common words to articulate basic human rights, we can hardly assume that we have a common understanding of the meaning of such words. The meaning of moral discourse depends on the context of such discourse. The meaning of a word is constituted by its use in a particular context. The tentativeness of human rights discourse therefore has to be acknowledged – which is, quite surprisingly, not often the case. In fact, the legitimacy of various rights is often affirmed (in South Africa) with a sense of extreme urgency, if not quasi-religious zeal. That we are quite desperate to identify rights that are *common* to all people is certainly understandable given the legacy of colonialism, apartheid, racism, patriarchy and poverty in this country. Moreover, it is highly desirable to find a way of enforcing such rights legally in an international context through acceptable international institu-

15 See Toulmin (1990) for a description of the historical context in which Descartes’ anxiety has to be understood.

16 See the distinction by Juergensmeyer (in Hodes & Hays 1995, pp 46f) between universalist and comparativist positions on the search for common values. Universalists argue that you could conceive of a universalist ethics based upon categories of analysis developed under the Western philosophical tradition (especially Kant), while comparativists argue that you had to start at the other extreme, i.e. where people are in their living traditions in order to build up some sense of a collectivity of shared values.

tions. An awareness of contextual diversity need not lead to an ethical relativism but should encourage a more careful, cautious and responsible search for what may indeed be common despite such diversity.¹⁷

The same sense of urgency characterise attempts to formulate a *global* ethos (and to which I will return below).¹⁸ Again this is understandable given the well-known litany of woes that dominate international agendas: violent conflict of various kinds, economic injustices and deprivation, and environmental destruction. There can be little doubt that a global ethos is urgently needed. However, any attempt to formulate such a global ethos is bound to meet with postmodern suspicions. There can be no doubt that we now live in a “global era” where whatever happens in Sweden will have repercussions in South Africa and vice versa. However, any description of the new global dispensation will be fiercely contested as long as the current forces of economic globalisation continue to reign supreme.

d) Human rights and right humans

Human rights discourse is dominated by an interest in the *values* that we have in common and that may be used as a point of departure for a global ethos and for the protection of each person’s human rights. However, the formulation of a bill of human rights does not guarantee that a society will be established in which such rights will be respected. This is not so much the result of the tentativeness of any description of common values. The formulation of a bill of rights has to be supported by a human rights *culture*, that is by the moral will of citizens to live by the vision and values articulated in the bill of rights.

The contours of a human rights culture in South Africa were moulded by the years of struggle against apartheid and for a non-racist, non-sexist democracy. Although the exact shape that “democracy” should take in South Africa remains fiercely contested, a culture of participatory decision-making is by now deeply

17 See also Huber’s suggestion of a “relative universalism” (i.e. historically impermanent ethical insights, transcending religion and culture, that are so basic that they can also attain legally binding form) instead of a radical universalism or radical relativism (Huber 1996, 144, pp 144–149).

18 Sissela Bok suggests that the search for shared values need to identify, as a starting point, some minimalist values that are shared across all cultural, religious and other boundaries. She mentions as examples of such minimalist values the responsibility to care for children and certain moral constraints on killing, lying and breaking promises. At the same time, every community, family, country and religion also needs to work out a set of maximalist values that could govern its particular ethos. Bok notes that many international documents trying to arrive at a common statement of values fail to distinguish between the search for minimalist and maximalist values. See Bok’s panel presentation in Hodes & Hays (1995, pp 27–35).

embedded in numerous spheres of civil society. Nevertheless, if we may have liked to believe that we could occupy the moral high ground in this regard in the early 1990's, almost all South Africans have by now become deeply disillusioned about the quality of the fabric of civil society. This comes as no surprise given the many destructive forces of violent crime, corruption, murder, rape, social fragmentation, the HIV/AIDS pandemic, consumerist greed and environmental destruction that continue to torment the South African society. The prisons in South Africa are nowadays always too full.

This has stimulated numerous calls to rebuild the moral and religious foundations of society. In the words of Nelson Mandela: We not only need a Reconstruction and Development Programme, we also need, as a matter of urgency, "an RDP of the soul". Political, business and religious leaders have reiterated calls for moral regeneration.¹⁹ Although many remain sceptical about the impact of such movements, it is abundantly clear that talk about a human rights culture and not only about human rights is needed. This shifts the focus to issues of moral formation. To reiterate what was said in the introduction: We do have a new South Africa and an excellent new constitution. What we now need are new South Africans, communities of people that embody and practise the vision articulated in the constitution. We do not only need human rights; we also need right humans, citizens of moral character and integrity. The discourse about common values underlying human rights therefore has to be supplemented by discourse about appropriate *virtues*. Moral discourse has to attend to the full range of moral concepts, including the quest for an alternative **vision** of the good society (given the failure of socialist experiments, the injustices of the current global economic order and the hegemony of the American dream), the quest for **virtuous** people, citizens of moral character and the quest for appropriate **values** that could guide responsible decision making within the domestic, national and planetary households.²⁰

19 See Neville Richardson's paper on "Not another moral summit! Problems and possibilities for moral regeneration" (*Scriptura*, forthcoming) for a critical review of various recent South African initiatives towards moral regeneration.

20 A foundation course on Ethics that is offered at the University of the Western Cape for students from various faculties is structured on the basis of this distinction between three ethical quests. See also Larry Rasmussen and Charles Birch (1989) for a similar mapping of the landscape of moral concepts.

Two contributions towards a global ethos

a) The project towards a global ethos

In several contributions, Catholic theologian Hans Küng has argued that a new global ethos is necessary to address the global challenges that the earth community is faced with. The globalisation of the economy, technology and the media has brought a globalisation of problems such as poverty, organised crime and environmental degradation. These problems now require global solutions and a globalisation of ethics (Küng in Küng & Schmidt 1998, p 105). This does not call for a uniform ethical system but a minimum of shared ethical principles on which all people can agree. The global society cannot be held together by a random pluralism that promotes indifferentism, consumerism and hedonism (Küng in Küng & Schmidt 1998, p 108). Although any modern democracy allows for a diversity of worldviews and ideologies, some basic ethical consensus, some minimum of common values, norms and attitudes, is required for peaceful co-existence.

It should be noted though that the project towards a global ethos is nevertheless often criticised because it does not take the ethical plurality (that is not only the religious, cultural and ethnic plurality) in today's world seriously enough (see, for example Huber, 1996, p. 135). Huber (1996, p. 136) therefore suggests that:

the demand for agreement on a planetary ethos must concentrate on the minimal conditions necessary for the survival of humanity, the preservation of nature, and the rights of future generations to live.

He concludes:

Only where variety is alive can an insight into the basic conditions of coexistence of different people grow. Only where people display their difference can they learn that there are minimum standards for coexistence, and that coexistence is endangered or destroyed if these are not obeyed. (Huber 1996, p. 149).

Such a global ethic is not possible without taking into account both the liberating possibilities and the authoritarian, tyrannical and reactionary dangers that are inherent to the world's religious traditions. For Küng, a global ethic does not imply a uniform religion or ideology. At the level of religious visions of the ultimate, there should be room for differences among the world's religious traditions. However, it should be possible (at a penultimate level) to formulate a global ethos to which adherents of different religious traditions can

subscribe to. Küng's argument is simple and persuasive: There is no survival possible without a global ethos and a global sense of responsibility. There is no world peace without peace between the religions (with ample examples). And there is no peace between religions without dialogue between the religions (see Küng 1991).

In his work on *Global responsibility* Küng identified various aspects of a global ethos that *all* religious traditions have in common, despite many other differences on matters of doctrine, rituals and prescriptions. These include a commitment to human well-being, especially five maxims of basic humanity (Do not kill; Do not lie; Do not steal; Do not practise immorality; Respect parents and love children), a "reasonable" middle way between libertinism and legalism, between hedonism and ascetism, and some form of the "golden rule" (Küng 1991, pp 56–60). Küng argues that there are indeed *universal* ethical criteria that may be used to judge religions, i.e. the common commitment to human dignity (the humanum). At the same time, religions also offer a powerful grounding for the humanum, i.e. in the divinum (Küng 1991, pp 84f, 89f). Religious traditions can therefore not be reduced to the ethos that they may share with one another.

At the 1993 meeting of the Parliament of World Religions, Küng was instrumental in formulating a *Declaration toward a global ethic* that was endorsed by a significant number of representatives at that meeting. Küng (in Küng & Kuschel 1995, p 53) notes that there were no prior historical models that could be used to draft this declaration: "... for the first time in the history of religions a declaration on an ethic was to be worked out which was to be acceptable to the adherents of all religions." This document does not express a single unified ideology (which people have become rightly weary of) but a certain minimum consensus of what the religions of the world already have in common in terms of binding values, standards and personal attitudes (Küng & Kuschel 1995, p 8).²¹ This document expresses a sense of urgency and is born from the conviction that there can be no new global order without a global ethic that supports it

21 Juergensmeyer (in Hodes & Hays 1995, p 48) notes that this statement "... was in a large part to counteract the public sentiment that religion is a problem for human rights and for social order." This observation is born from "the vicious spiral of violence that has emerged between religious communities and secular political orders." Juergensmeyer furthermore argues that the signatories of the document represent the liberalist wings of their own religious traditions and that there is an increasing polarisation between liberals and fundamentalists in each religious tradition. He then raises the following important question: "As much as anything else, this was a parliament of liberal spokespersons for religious traditions. Sadly, they have more in common with liberals of other religions than most of them have with their compatriots at the fundamentalist extreme of their own religious traditions. So for us the questions are: What do the liberal

(Küng & Kuschel 1995, pp 18f). The heart of this document is the conviction that every human possesses an inalienable and untouchable dignity and the demand that every human being must therefore be treated humanely (Küng & Kuschel 1995, p 23). This leads to four directives and a commitment to a culture of: 1) non-violence and respect for life, 2) solidarity and a just economic order, 3) tolerance and a life of truthfulness, 4) equal rights and partnership between men and women (Küng & Kuschel 1995, pp 24–34). These four directives follow the four elementary imperatives for humanity that Küng finds in all religious traditions, i.e. not to kill, steal, lie or to commit adultery (Küng & Kuschel 1995, pp 24–34).

The intuition behind this document is that a declaration towards a global ethic has to be more than a reiteration of human rights (e.g. as expressed in the UN Declaration on Human Rights), although it could render much needed support for human rights. What is at stake is not only what can be legally prescribed or politically imposed but also the inner convictions, the binding values and basic attitudes that shape people's lives (Küng in Küng & Kuschel 1995, p 58). Küng (1998, p 115) also notes that the English word responsibility emphasises the inner responsibility rather than the external law. By contrast, the German "Pflicht" in the sense of duty has been shamefully abused to legitimise presumed duties towards superiors, to the Führer, the Volk and the party. This indicates that an emphasis on responsibilities can be misused, but so can an emphasis on rights, i.e. when rights are constantly and exclusively used for one's own advantage.

Subsequently, Küng was also instrumental in the drafting on a *Universal Declaration of Human Responsibilities* (1997). This document was produced

wings of religions have in common in supporting human rights, and what do the fundamentalist wings have in common in opposing human rights? And how can we discover resources within religious traditions for uniting people who are of the same faith but at polar ends of the spectrum on issues that are so important for so many of us?" (Juergensmeyer 1995, p 48–49).

This raises the classic debate on the universal and the particular. Can one assume the existence of universals or should one work from the particular in search of the common? Should particular religious traditions be understood as particular expressions of underlying (supposedly universal) moral values based on human dignity? Or should religious traditions be understood in terms of their own particularity – in which case one may search for (but not assume) shared (not universal) values? This paper supports the latter position. My argument is that the moral codes in any particular religious tradition have to be understood within the context of the particular construction/perception of ultimate reality (to use one possible term) in that particular religious tradition. For most religious traditions what is penultimate (morality) has to be understood within the context of what is ultimate (e.g. God). The ultimate cannot be reduced to a particular expression of what is penultimate. This does not diminish the importance of the quest for shared values but it does question universalist assumptions on what the content of such values would be.

by the InterAction Council, a distinguished body of elder statesmen and other leading public figures. The intuition behind this initiative is that a concern with human rights is important but insufficient. If all pursue their own rights exclusively and do not accept any kind of obligations and responsibilities, the result can be hostilities, conflicts and ultimately chaos (Küng in Küng & Schmidt 1998, p 75). A society in which people insist on their rights against others without recognising the responsibilities that they have towards others cannot be conducive to the formation of a human rights culture (Küng in Küng & Schmidt 1998, p 110). Küng's views here are influenced by the situation in Germany. He notes that:

... in many spheres of our society the responsibility of every individual is hardly taught and therefore hardly perceived either. Many politicians, many business executives, do not meet their obligations, nor do many universities or television channels. A largely permissive education is orientated all too one-sidedly on basic rights, and there is virtually no mention of basic obligations. Heedless egotistical 'personal fulfilment' appears as an ideal, while the common good is an empty phrase (Küng 1998, p 80).

It is therefore necessary to balance a concern for human rights with a recognition of human responsibilities – for individual conduct and for political authorities. The first article of this declaration states the fundamental principle for humanity:

Every person, regardless of gender, ethnic origin, social status, political opinion, language, age, nationality, or religion, has a responsibility to treat all people in a humane way (quoted in Küng & Schmidt 1998, p 12).

This is followed by four principles that correlate with the four directives of the Declaration of the Parliament of the World's religions. These responsibilities describe the global ethos that is required while human rights stipulate the legal responsibilities of both the state and individual citizens. The law cannot prescribe such an ethos but depends on it for its proper functioning: *Quid legis sine moribus!* Where there is a gap between law and ethics, the law cannot function either (Küng in Küng & Schmidt 1998, p 120). A better world cannot be created with laws, conventions and ordinances alone. No codification of rights will make any long-term difference if the values of societies do not reflect those rights.²²

22 Huber (1996, p. 140) notes that the very stimulus for including human rights in international law historically came out of the experience that a total separation of law and morality can only lead towards a destruction of law. It was born out of an attempt to find agreement in legal terms on what obligations are

Although the formulation of the *Declaration toward a global ethic* was the result of a consultative process too, it may be criticised for a certain aristocratic elitism. The dominant role of Hans Küng begs the question whether it does not remain Hans Küng's global ethic?! What is required is not the formulation of a global ethos by a small commission of people but a widespread discussion of the responsibilities facing humanity (see Huber 1996, p. 148). This is precisely the significance of the Earth Charter process to which we now turn.

b) The Earth Charter process

The *Earth Charter* is perhaps the most significant contribution within the context of civil society around the world to foster a global ethos. The Earth Charter is the product of a decade long, worldwide, cross-cultural conversation about common goals and shared values.²³ It was born from the recognition that civil society needs an inspiring and shared ethical vision of fundamental values that can guide planning, policy-making and action. This leads to the realisation that effective policy-making and problem-solving in an interdependent world require partnerships and cooperation including all nations and peoples in all sectors of society.

The Earth Charter process followed a 1987 call from the United Nations World Commission on Environment and Development for the creation of a charter that would set forth fundamental principles for sustainable development. It builds on more than 50 international declarations and treaties and more than 150 non-governmental declarations, charters and treaties adopted since the UN conference on the Human Environment in Stockholm in 1972. These declarations include the World Charter for Nature (1982) and many

due to every human person, despite the immense differences in basic ethical convictions on earth. Huber suggests that although a planetary ethos is certainly required it will not be possible to stipulate individual obligations (in the form of responsibilities) for such a common ethos since such obligations will not be able to take the immense differences in basic ethical convictions into account. In other words: human rights discourse already formulates the required minimum consensus in legal terms. To stipulate more than that (e.g. individual responsibilities that are required for a global ethos) will scarcely be able to take ethical diversity into account. Moreover, the expansion of human rights discourse to include all the goals that should be given ethical priority may actually weaken or erode the legally binding character of human rights. The tendency to declare everything that is ethically desirable "human rights" hollows out the legal character of human rights. Not everything can be described in law (see Huber 1996, p. 144).

23 On the background to and history of the Earth Charter, see the Earth Charter website (<http://www.earth-charter.org>), especially the *Earth Charter Initiative Handbook* (2000, pp 21–33) as well as Rockefeller (2001).

others. Representatives from government and non-government organisations worked to secure the adoption of an Earth Charter during the UNCED “Earth Summit” in Rio in 1992. This was intended to serve as the ethical framework for Agenda 21. However, this did not materialise. In 1994 a new Earth Charter initiative was launched by the Earth Council (led by Maurice Strong) and Green Cross International (led by Mikhail Gorbachev). An Earth Council was subsequently formed to pursue the unfinished business of UNCED and to promote the implementation of Agenda 21. In 1997 An Earth Charter Commission was formed to oversee the drafting of the Charter and the participation of people from different continents and diverse religious traditions in the process.²⁴ The drafting process was spearheaded by Steven Rockefeller. After several drafts and contributions from thousands of individuals and hundreds of organisations from different regions, cultures and sectors of society all over the world, the final version of the Earth Charter was issued on 24 March 2000.²⁵ The Earth Charter initiative has now entered a new phase that focuses on the implementation of its principles into action.²⁶ The objectives are to disseminate the Earth Charter as widely as possible, to promote its educational use, and to encourage the use and endorsement of the Earth Charter by civil society, businesses and governments. The Earth Charter Handbook (2000, p 7) suggests that the Earth Charter can be used in the following ways: a) as an educational tool to develop an understanding of the critical choices facing humanity, b) as an invitation for internal reflection on fundamental attitudes and ethical values, c) as a catalyst for dialogue on global ethics and globalisation, d) as a call to action and a guide to sustainability, e) as an integrated ethical framework for policies and plans towards sustainable development, f) as a framework for designing professional codes of conduct and accountability systems, and g) as a soft law instrument that provides an ethical foundation for ongoing developments in the field of environmental law.

This remarkable document notes in its preamble that:

- 24 The brochure available on the Earth Charter claims that: “The Earth Charter initiative has involved the most open and participatory consultation process ever conducted in the drafting of an international agreement.” Indeed, the drafting process was as important as the final product (Rockefeller 2001, p 107).
- 25 The Earth Charter Council has reserved the right to make adjustments to the text, if after four or five years there are very compelling reasons to do so (Rockefeller 2001, p 107).
- 26 See the two documents on the dissemination of the Earth Charter that are available on the Earth Charter website, i.e. *The Earth Charter Initiative Handbook* and *The Earth Charter in Action 2000*.

We stand at a critical moment in Earth's history, a time when humanity must choose its future. As the world becomes increasingly *interdependent* and fragile, the future at once holds great peril and promise. To move forward we must recognize that in the midst of a magnificent *diversity* of cultures and life forms we are *one human family* and *one Earth community* with a *common* destiny. We must join together to bring forth a sustainable global society founded on respect for nature, *universal* human rights, economic justice and a culture of peace. [my emphasis].

The expanded sense of a community of life and an inclusive moral vision lie at the heart of the document. In a paragraph on influences shaping the Earth Charter, the *Earth Charter in Action 2000* (2000, pp 46–47) notes the following:

In addition to international law instruments and NGO declarations, the ideas and principles in the Earth Charter are drawn from a variety of sources. The document Charter is influenced by the new scientific worldview, including the discoveries of contemporary cosmology, physics, evolutionary biology, and ecology. It draws on the wisdom of the world's religions and philosophical traditions. It also reflects the social movements associated with human rights, democracy, gender equality, civil society, disarmament, and peace. It builds on the seven UN summit conferences on children, the environment, human rights, population, women, social development and food security, held during the 1990s.

The Earth Charter then articulates 16 principles, grouped in four categories, for building a just, sustainable and peaceful global society. These principles are based on respect and care for the community of life (the first group of principles that serve as a statement of the Earth Charter's moral vision).²⁷ This is concretised in three further sections on ecological integrity,²⁸ social and economic justice, and democracy, non-violence and peace. In this way the Earth

27 Rockefeller (2001, p 113) notes that the nonhuman world is commonly treated in a utilitarian way as an object to be used. He suggests that the most fundamental cause of the environmental problems that afflict the planet is the lack of respect for nature that pervades modern industrialised countries. If understood within the context of solidarity within the community of life, such respect for otherness correlates with a Christian ethics of love in which the bonds of community and an appreciation for the possibilities of an enriching diversity is acknowledged. In this way the fundamental importance of love and compassion for the healing of Earth and social renewal is acknowledged.

28 Rockefeller (1998, pp 24f) notes that the Earth Charter is not organised around human rights as a dominant theme. It is concerned with the moral significance of the whole community of life and all its members, human and non-human. It calls for respect of all individual living beings. Although the issues addressed by the Earth Charter is closely related to human rights law it does not use human rights language. It also does not adopt rights language with reference to non-human species (the rights of animals or the rights of nature). Rockefeller (2001, p 119) also notes that the concept of the rights of nature has not won broad international acceptance. Instead, the Earth Charter recognises the moral thrust of the idea of the rights of nature in that it holds that human relations with non-human species and individual living beings involve moral responsibilities.

Charter seeks to inspire in all peoples a new sense of global interdependence and shared responsibility for the well-being of the human family and the larger earth community. It serves as a vehicle for addressing the issues facing the global community and for stimulating change. It calls on all people to search for common ground in the midst of diversity and to embrace a new moral vision.

One of the expressed aims of the Earth Charter initiative is to seek endorsement of the Earth Charter by the United Nations General Assembly, although it should primarily be considered as a people's treaty more than as an inter-governmental instrument (for example a soft law document such as *Agenda 21*). This will enhance its status as a soft law document and increase its influence on governments and international law. Steve Rockefeller (2001, p 233, note 4) explains:

Unlike a hard law treaty, a soft law document such as the Universal Declaration of Human Rights is regarded as a statement of intentions and aspirations and it is not considered to be legally binding. Soft law documents ... frequently evolve over time into hard law. In addition, any declaration of fundamental ethical principles that gains wide acceptance can function as a soft law document that influences the development of international law even if it has not been formally endorsed by the United Nations.²⁹

The specific contribution of religious traditions towards a global ethos

These initiatives indicate the sustained need in a global era to identify common values. After the historical, hermeneutical, linguistic and sociological turns we can no longer simply *assume* the universal validity of such values. However, there remains a sense of urgency in the *search* for a global ethos, precisely as a result of the conflicting plurality within which the global community finds itself.

A few comments on the possible role of religion and specifically of Christianity with regard to such initiatives to foster a global ethos may be noted here:

a) The media regularly feed us with information and stories about the many well-known problems on the global agenda: violent conflict (including ethnic and religious violence, domestic violence and violence against women and children), poverty, crime and corruption, diseases such as malaria and HIV/

29 The Earth Charter has been drafted in coordination with a hard law treaty designed to provide an integrated legal framework. This draft International Covenant on Environment and Development is being prepared by the Commission on Environmental Law at the World Conservation Union (IUCN). On the relationship between the Earth Charter and human rights environmental law, see especially Casey and Morgante (1998).

AIDS and various environmental disasters. We are, for example, confronted with daunting statistics about deforestation, the extinction of species, global warming, population growth, the virtual collapse of fishing industries and insurmountable waste dumps. Despite this huge effort and although the global community has made some progress on issues such as acid rain and ozone depletion, we have not been able to turn the tide of consumption, pollution, increasing population, deforestation, over-fishing and the exploitation of non-renewable resources. Why is this the case?

The problem is that even those who have become thoroughly conscientised often find it difficult to translate an awareness of ecological concerns into appropriate praxis. One may take some modest steps such as recycling, reducing the use of electricity, water, transport, chemicals, re-using resources, etc. Such steps would be highly appropriate to challenge the consumerist habits of the middle class. However, a guilty conscience and a 10% reduction in the use of resources would not be enough. As Patricia Mische (2000, p 592) comments:

... most people now know that we have serious ecological problems. But there is a lingering gap between knowing that we face serious ecological problems and acting on this knowledge in our personal, political and social choices. While more people have taken some modest steps, such as recycling, changes in people's worldviews, attitudes and behaviour have not been commensurate to the gravity and global scale of the problems. Moreover, when in conflict, economic concerns and desires usually trump environmental ones.

The problem has clearly not been simply a lack of information or planning. It is a liberal fallacy to suppose that information and education is enough to ensure moral action. The problem is not merely one of ignorance but also of the moral will to change our consumerist lifestyles. Solving the environmental crisis will therefore demand much more than what science and new technologies may offer. It is less a problem of know-what or know-how than of know-why and know-wherefore (Rasmussen 1996, p 74). The problem cannot be addressed only through legislation and government policies either. The crisis that we have to face is not primarily an ecological crisis but a cultural crisis. The problem lies not outside but inside ourselves, not in the ecosystem but in the human heart, in the collective psyche. What is required is a fundamental change of orientation. In their series foreword to the edited volume on *Christianity and ecology*, Tucker and Grim (2000, p xix) articulates a similar concern:

It is becoming increasingly evident that abundant scientific knowledge of the crisis is available and numerous political and economic statements have been formulated. Yet we seem to lack the political, economic, and scientific leadership to make necessary changes. Moreover, what is still lacking is the religious commitment, moral imagination, and ethical engagement to transform the environmental crisis from an issue on paper to one of effective policy, from rhetoric in print to realism in action.

Patricia Mische (2000, p 592–3) adds the following:

Science and technology alone cannot resolve ecological threats. Nor can governments or the laws they promulgate. ... Sustaining the integrity of creation thus requires not only the external laws governments enact to deal with belligerent behavior, but also inner governance, laws internalised in our hearts and minds and the will to live by them. The need for inner governance is relevant not only to personal behavior, but also collective behavior through the economic, social and political systems we create and help maintain. Church praxis has special relevance for the development of inner governance and a culture of ecological responsibility. Religions carry the archetypes, symbols, meanings, values and moral codes around which people coalesce and define themselves, their sense of the sacred, and their relationships with each other and the natural world.

The problem therefore seems to be one of a lack of moral vision, imagination, will and leadership. The problem is one that has to be addressed through moral *formation* and not merely through more *information*. It is not simply a matter of agreeing with a memorandum spelling out some common values either. This will remain the limited value of initiatives such as the Earth Charter campaign. Since moral formation typically takes place within faith communities, this implies that the ecological transformation of religious traditions is critical to the emergence of an ecological ethos.

b) Larry Rasmussen (1996, p 10) argues that all religious and moral impulses of whatever sort must now be matters of unqualified earthbound loyalty and care. Each faith has to become an earth-centred faith. Steve Rockefeller (2001, p 103) notes that the aim is not the creation of a new religion. Instead,

The hope is that each of the religions will adopt a planetary consciousness that involves awareness of global interdependence, acceptance of religious diversity, and commitment to promotion of shared values and interreligious cooperation in pursuit of world community.

Paul Knitter suggests that there is a need for a “deep ecumenicity”, i.e. the need for religious traditions to find common ground on a common earth. Such a “deep ecumenicity” implies that

the more the religions of the world can ground themselves in this earth and the more deeply they can connect with nature and the needs of this planet, the more they will find themselves interconnected. (Knitter 2000, p 365).

Knitter suggests that such a common ground between religious traditions will probably be primarily of an ethical nature. The ecological problems that the world is faced with are indeed common problems. We can therefore speak of the need for and possibility of a universal environmental ethic. In terms of Hans Küng's motto "No world peace without peace between the religions," Knitter adds that there is "No peace with the earth without peace between the religions." (Knitter 2000, p 372).

Where such inter-religious dialogue will lead, is not quite clear yet. Whether the history of the earth (as described by modern science) would provide a context for religious *unity* (as Thomas Berry suggests) remains doubtful. To explore possibilities for inter-religious dialogue will remain both crucial and controversial in the decades ahead. Whether the earth can become the focus of inter-religious dialogue will obviously be shaped by different assessments (including different theological assessments) of such inter-religious dialogue. The emerging ecological consciousness has, at the very least, lead to a new awareness of the one earth community to which all species, cultures, nations and religions belong. In fact, the picture emerging from the sciences and environmental movements alike is that everything in the cosmos is interrelated, that everything is radically kin. Everything, including human beings, are genetically related. We are all made from the ashes of dead stars (see McFague 1993, p 44). As Brian Swimme puts it: "No tribal myth, no matter how wild, ever imagined a more profound relationship connecting all things in an internal way right from the beginning of time. All thinking must begin with this cosmic genetic relatedness." (quoted in McFague 1993, p 106). This sense of relatedness and community may still have a profound effect on inter-faith dialogue and the self-understanding of particular religious traditions. This is well captured in the title of Knitter's book *One earth, many religions* (1995). Sean McDonagh (1990, p 192–3) expresses the same sentiment:

There are no Catholic lakes, Protestant rivers or Muslim forests. We all share a common earth and in the face of a threat to the survival of the planet we should unite our efforts and forget which institutions should have precedence, and other ecclesial niceties.

Remarkably, this sense of relatedness and community does not imply a levelling of differences and particularity or a lack of individuation. The history of the cosmos has been yielding an incredibly complex, highly individuated variety of things. No two specimens from the same species are, or have ever been, exactly the same (McFague 1993, p 105). In fact,

nature depends on diversity, thrives on differences, and perishes in the imbalance of uniformity. Healthy systems are highly varied and specific to time and place. Nature is not mass-produced (quoted in Rasmussen 1996, p 114).

c) Perhaps this comment also indicates a way forward. The common earth, which all human beings and all other forms of life share with one another, is something that transcends all our particularities; it is something that is bigger than ourselves. The one earth community also unites people from different bio-regions (from Sweden to South Africa) who share a concern for the well-being of the whole. A concern for the environment is also a place where, in a still divided country, all South Africans (i.e. those who love the land and its topography, the soil, the air, the waters, the plants, the animals, the people) can meet one another and commit themselves to something which is bigger than ourselves: the well-being of the land itself. In this way it can become a point of convergence for all other social agendas – the numerous struggles for political peace, economic justice, gender equality and civil society.

The earth that we share as our common home is indeed something that transcends ourselves, but only in a penultimate way. Religious traditions have tried to express that which transcends the cosmos itself. The claim of the Christian tradition is that the best clue to the ultimate meaning of the world (*and* whatever may transcend the world) may be found in the story of Jesus Christ. This particularist claim should be the focus of a Christian contribution to a dialogue with people of other living faiths on an appropriate ethos for an “earth community”.

Conclusion

This essay fathomed the roots of human rights discourse in modernity. The quest of modernity was to find a new foundation for society given the political turmoil associated with the Protestant reformation. The Cartesian anxiety that initially characterised the modern quest soon made way for a self-assured confidence in the human subject and the universality of human reason. A humane

society could be built on the basis of a common humanum. Human rights discourse is typically based on these assumptions of modernity. These assumptions have been questioned by the postmodern suspicion that the formulation of any such “universal” truths are deeply influenced and often distorted by allegiances of race, gender, class, language, culture and religion. Nevertheless, the fervour of human rights discourse, especially in South Africa, demonstrates that the modern quest has lost nothing of its urgency. The need for common values in a globalised but fragmented and deeply divided world, the need for a global ethos for the endangered earth community, is evident more than ever before. What the global community have in common cannot be simply assumed though. Consensus will have to be continuously constructed anew. Moreover, it is now also clear that human rights discourse has to be supported with a commitment to a human rights culture. The rule of law is only possible where moral formation takes place. This can only take place within the context of civil society and in local communities. Religion and, in South Africa, more specifically Christianity, will continue to play a crucial role in this regard. However, any religious community can contribute to moral formation only on its own terms. Religion cannot merely serve as an instrument for moral formation. The fallacy of modernity and much of political rhetoric is that religious traditions may at best be regarded as particular expressions of a universal ethos. In this way religion is reduced to morality. Religion is tolerated only when it expounds the virtue of tolerance and when it refrains from making particular truth claims. By contrast, it has to be emphasised that common values can only be identified through an ongoing dialogue between different cultures, different language groups and different religious traditions.

References

- Casey, Helen Marie & Morgante, Amy 1998. *Women's views on the Earth Charter*. Boston: Boston Research Center for the 21st century.
- Casey, Helen Marie & Morgante, Amy 1998. *Human rights environmental and the Earth Charter*. Boston: Boston Research Center for the 21st century.
- Conradie, Ernst M & Field, David N 2000. *A rainbow over the land. A South African guide on the church and environmental justice*. Cape Town: Western Cape Provincial Council of Churches.
- Conradie, EM 2000. *Hope for the earth – Vistas on a new century*. Bellville: University of the Western Cape.
- Conradie, Ernst M 2001a. *Ecological theology: A guide for further research*. Study Guides in Religion and Theology 5. Bellville: University of the Western Cape.
- Conradie, Ernst M 2001b. *Ecological theology: An indexed bibliography*. Study Guides in Religion and Theology 2. Second revised edition. Bellville: University of the Western Cape.
- De Lange, Frits 1997. *Gevoel voor verhoudingen: God, evolutie en ethiek*. Kampen: JH Kok.
- Earth Charter Secretariat 2000. *The Earth Charter Initiative Handbook*. Costa Rica.
- Earth Charter Secretariat 2000. *The Earth Charter in Action 2000*. Costa Rica.
- Hodes, Nancy & Hays, Michael 1995. *The United Nations and the world's religions. Prospects for a global ethic*. Boston: Boston Research Center for the 21st century.
- Huber, Wolfgang 1996. *Violence: The unrelenting assault on human dignity*. Minneapolis: Fortress Press.
- Knitter, Paul F 1995. *One earth, many religions. Multifaith dialogue and global responsibility*. Maryknoll: Orbis Books.
- Küng, Hans & Kuschel, Karl-Josef (eds) 1995. *A global ethic: The Declaration of the Parliament of the Worlds Religions*. New York: Continuum.
- Küng, Hans & Schmidt, Helmuth (ed) 1998. *A global ethic and global responsibilities. Two declarations*. London: SCM Press.
- Küng, Hans 1991. *Global responsibility: in search of a new world ethic*. New York, NY: Crossroad.
- Küng, Hans 1997. *A global ethic for global politics and economics*. London: SCM Press.
- McDonagh, Sean 1991. *The greening of the church*. New York: Orbis Books.
- McFague, Sallie 1993. *The body of God. An ecological theology*. Philadelphia: Fortress Press.
- Mische, Patricia M 2000. The integrity of creation: Challenges and opportunities for praxis. In: Hessel, Dieter T & Ruether, Rosemary R (eds) 2000. *Christianity and ecology. Seeking the well-being of earth and humans*, 591–602. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
- Moltmann, Jürgen 1999. *God for a secular society. The public relevance of theology*. Minneapolis: Fortress Press.
- Moltmann, Jürgen & Giesser, Elisabeth 1990. Human rights, rights of humanity and rights of nature. In: Vischer, Lukas (ed) 1990. *Rights of future generations, rights of nature. Proposal for enlarging the Universal Declaration of Human Rights*. Studies from the World Alliance of Reformed Churches 19, 15–24. Geneva: World Alliance of Reformed Churches.
- Pieper, Josef 1966. *The four cardinal virtues*. Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame Press.
- Rasmussen, Larry L 1989. *Bible & Ethics in the Christian Life*. Minneapolis: Augsburg Press.
- Rasmussen, Larry L 1996. *Earth community. Earth ethics*. Maryknoll: Orbis Books.
- Rescue Mission: Planet Earth. *A Children's edition of Agenda 21*, (United Nations: East African Educational Publishers, 1994),

- Richardson, Neville 2002. Not another moral summit! Problems and possibilities for moral regeneration. *Scriptura* (forthcoming).
- Rockefeller, Steven C 1997. The Earth Charter process. *Earth Ethics* 8:2 & 3, 3–8.
- Rockefeller, Steven C 1998. The Earth Charter and human rights. In: Casey, Helen Marie & Morgante, Amy 1998. *Human rights environmental and the Earth Charter*, 21–29. Boston: Boston Research Center for the 21st century.
- Rockefeller, Steven C 2001. Global interdependence, The Earth Charter, and Christian faith. In: Hessel, Dieter T & Rasmussen, Larry L (eds) 2001. *Earth habitat: Eco-injustices and the church's response*, 101–124. Minneapolis: Fortress Press.
- Rolston, Holmes 1988. *Environmental ethics: Duties to and values in the natural world*. Philadelphia: Temple University Press.
- Rolston, Holmes 1994. *Conserving natural value*. New York: Columbia University Press.
- Toulmin, Stephen 1990. *Cosmopolis. The hidden agenda of modernity*. New York: The Free Press.
- Tucker, Mary Evelyn & Grim, John M (eds): *Worldviews and ecology. Religion, philosophy and the environment*. Maryknoll: Orbis Books.
- Tucker, Mary Evelyn 1996. The role of religions in forming and environmental ethics. In: Hessel, Dieter T (ed) 1996. *Theology for earth community: A field guide*, 143–152. Maryknoll: Orbis Books.
- Vischer, Lukas (ed) 1990. *Rights of future generations, rights of nature. Proposal for enlarging the Universal Declaration of Human Rights*. Studies from the World Alliance of Reformed Churches 19. Geneva: World Alliance of Reformed Churches.

What societal processes contribute to a human rights culture? What violations are actually taking place? How can gender, ecological and global economic perspectives enlighten these issues?

These and other questions are discussed in this interdisciplinary collection of texts by sixteen scholars from South Africa and Sweden.



UNIVERSITY of the
WESTERN CAPE

www.uwc.za



UNIVERSITEIT • STELLENBOSCH • UNIVERSITY
jou kennisvenoot • your knowledge partner

www.sun.za



HÖGSKOLAN
DALARNA

www.du.se