

'Sustainable development' without scientific progress? What a hoax!

by Mark Burdman

Whether or not the much-debated United Nations Conference on Environment and Development (UNCED) convenes in Brazil next June for its "Earth Summit," the environmentalist elite which has been organizing it has already achieved one of its aims: brainwashing governments and populations to accept the dogma of "sustainable development," sometimes called "ecologically sustainable development." The content of this term has evolved, Orwellishly, to include everything except the one basis for any human activity to be "sustainable"—namely, scientific and technological progress.

Under the flag of "sustainability," the Green Establishment wants policy to be made on the basis of two lunatic assertions: first, that human agro-industrial activity, and concomitant demographic growth, are about to destroy the biosphere or ecosphere, through ozone depletion, greenhouse effect, global warming, acid rain, rain forest destruction, etc.—(or, "Man is trashing the planet"); second, that all considerations of economic policy must henceforth be subordinated to "ecological" considerations (or, "You must kill your family and betray your nation for Mother Earth").

Typically, a recent report entitled, "Caring for the Earth: A Strategy for Sustainable Living," co-authored by the World Conservation Union, the United Nations Environment Program, and the World Wide Fund for Nature (WWF), defines "sustainable" development as "improving the quality of human life while living within the carrying capacity of supporting ecosystems." The pompously titled introduction, "A Message to the World," begins: "Humanity must live within the carrying capacity of the Earth. . . . We must adopt life styles and development paths that respect and work within nature's limits." Elsewhere: "Humans are already pressing the Earth's ecosystems to its limits." Hence, new "physical" economic models must be developed that make such considerations the primary parameter.

Even ecological spokesmen admit that the end result of all this could be the elimination of the human race. Indeed, since no *human* culture ever existed in this way, a global "sustainable development" regime would represent a clear danger to the continued existence of people. Yet even individuals and governments critical of, or even actively oppos-

ing, the Earth Summit, tend to preface their views by reciting the shibboleth, "Of course, you must understand, I'm for sustainable development, but. . . ."

Of course, it is hard to be against something "sustainable," as that would mean one is for something "unsustainable." Obviously, if the Green Establishment called what they want by its true name, something like "denial of development to the Third World," or "regression to a neo-feudal world system," or "collecting the debt for the international banks," matters would be different. "Sustainable development" has a certain "brand name packaging" appeal.

Brainwashing by omission

More important, it must be conceded that the predominant patterns of industrial and economic activity over recent decades have been insane, and, "unsustainable" (although it takes a stretch of the imagination to call them "development"). This is proven by the new outbreaks of diseases and famines threatening whole continents, the spread of irrationalist cults, and the like.

The threatened "unsustainability" is, in fact, a direct consequence of leading institutions' and governments' enforcement of the very "environmentalist" beliefs that the UNCED mob seeks to enshrine in Rio this year as an Earth Charter, complete with police powers. Today's crisis differs in scale but not in quality from those which every human society has faced. Throughout history, each society has been obliged to supersede fixed levels of technology, including reliance on less efficient and less "dense" energy sources—or face catastrophe. The only way out of increasingly "unsustainable" activity, is to force a breakthrough to higher orders of technological and scientific complexity: to develop more efficient, "denser," and cleaner technologies, as Lyndon LaRouche explains the principle, most recently in his *The Science of Christian Economy* (see also page 40). Because man alone, differently from the lower beasts, is made "in the image and likeness of God," as Christian belief expresses this concept, man alone is capable of evolving, not through biological change but through social change. This occurs when individuals successfully act to change the behavior of the species as

a whole—when they use their gift of creativity, which gives humanity its special role as “gardeners” of the universe.

The “sustainable development” ecologist mafia has flipped reality upside down. Whereas, as LaRouche stresses, *universal natural law* is the guideline for determining man’s advisable course of action, the ecologist priesthood invokes a “living planet Earth” supposedly existing by self-regulating mechanisms.

The voluminous literature on “sustainable development” is striking for its omission of any discussion of the manned space programs of the past 30 years, and the potentials these have for expanding man’s vistas beyond fixed limits and providing real solutions to man’s life on Earth. Space exploration removes the concept of limits, by opening up the entire universe, potentially, as mankind’s “environment.” If you remove the “extraterrestrial imperative” from current discourse, you keep mankind earth-bound and susceptible to believing that the “self-regulating mechanisms of the living planet earth Gaia” are primary, rather than the laws of the universe in their totality. Weather is a very complex phenomenon, affected by the behavior of the Sun, and other extraterrestrial events. Write these out of the equation, and one can easily induce the paranoid belief that “man’s activity” is the root cause of all “climate change” problems.

Also noticeably missing from such literature are discussions about fusion power, whether “hot” fusion or “cold” fusion, or other revolutionary twenty-first-century technologies as lasers, plasmas, and magnetohydrodynamics (MHD). Development of these would make man’s activities “sustainable,” in the sense of “successful survival,” elaborated by LaRouche.

Group of Seven lauds sustainable development

The tragedy is how much human mental resources and money go into the push for sustainable development. The conferences, media events, and so on, building for the Rio extravaganza are running into billions of dollars.

Last October, Spain’s King Juan Carlos helped launch a new “Industrial Council for Sustainable Development,” together with the Confederation of Spanish Industries, with 500 companies expected to join. In Winnipeg, Manitoba, an “International Institute for Sustainable Development” was set up in 1990, a non-profit corporation with \$25 million in support from the government of Canada and the Province of Manitoba. Its mandate: to “promote the concept and practice of sustainable development in decision-making internationally and in Canada.”

At the July 1991 Group of Seven summit in London, the final “Economic Declaration” asserted that “our economic policies should ensure that the use of this planet’s resources is sustainable and safeguards the interests of both present and future generations,” and issued a ringing endorsement of the Earth Summit as a “landmark event.” Among the measures the G-7 pledged by the time of UNCED, the most ominous

was “further development of international law of the environment.”

G-7 host Prime Minister John Major had made a big organizing push behind the Earth Summit. The colorless British prime minister was prodded into this role by ecologist circles around Prince Philip, and by his predecessor Margaret Thatcher, who has been mooted to become the formal adviser, or quasi-plenipotentiary, for the Rio affair.

‘The real enemy is humanity itself’

The G-7 statement, issued by the governments of the seven “leading industrial nations,” shows how private oligarchical institutions are dictating policy.

One of these is the Aspen Institute. Its “Working Group on International Environment and Development Policy” which met in Colorado last July recommended the creation of a “Commission for Sustainable Development,” that would function as a kind of permanent UNCED. Meanwhile, the report called for an “interim arrangement to facilitate coordination within the U.N. system.” Aspen’s chief benefactor, Robert O. Anderson, former chairman of the Atlantic Richfield oil company, provided much of the seed money for the original 1970 Earth Day.

In September-October 1991, the establishment drumbeat for “sustainability” grew to a din. It was then that the Club of Rome and the World Wide Fund for Nature-World Conservation Union-United Nations Environment Program released their reports, while the Trilateral Commission put its 1990 report out in book form. The latter two homed in on creating a global “sustainable development” regime. The Club of Rome made this one prominent feature in a rambling book-length report, *The First Global Revolution*.

The Club of Rome Council endorses the “concept of sustainability,” demanding “that a *Worldwide Campaign of Energy Conservation and Efficiency* be launched. To be successful, this will require world leaders to express strongly their conviction that it is necessary and show the political will to implement it. It would be appropriate for the scheme to be launched by the United Nations in association with the United Nations Environment Program, the World Meteorological Organization and Unesco. A corollary would be the setting up in each country of an *Energy Efficiency Council* to supervise the operation on the national scale.”

Not to leave these Green policing powers to such unreliable entities as nations—which sometimes respond to *people*—the Club of Rome urged supranational policing bodies, such as “a *U.N. Environmental Security Council* parallel to the existing Security Council on military matters. . . . If not constituted earlier, this could be a major outcome of the United Nations Conference on Environment and Development to be held in Brazil in 1992.” They also sought, “possibly under the auspices of the Environmental Security Council, regular meetings of industrial leaders, bankers and governments of the five continents. These *Global Develop-*

ment Rounds, envisaged as something similar to the Tariff Rounds of GATT, would consider the need to harmonize competition and cooperation in the light of environmental constraints.”

The report immodestly suggests that the Club of Rome should play a central advisory role for an emerging world governmental apparatus. The Club of Rome, whose late founder Aurelio Peccei praised cannibalism as an appropriate behavior, remains true to form: Their report dismisses “pollution, the threat of global warming, water shortages, famine” as mere “symptoms.” Rather, the report concludes starkly: “The real enemy is humanity itself.”

Prince Philip seeks legal ban on growth

The Trilateral Commission’s book, *Beyond Interdependence: The Meshing of the World’s Economy and the Earth’s Ecology*, is based on the work of a Trilateral task force under the direction of Canada’s Jim MacNeill, a senior policymaker in the U.N.-centered institutions involved in environmentalism. The book’s foreword is written by Chase Manhattan’s David Rockefeller, who set up the Trilateral Commission in 1974, and its introduction was written by UNCED head, Maurice Strong.

The report’s proposals converge on the usual ecological police state. MacNeill et al. call for the creation of a “new, standing U.N. Commission on the Environment, or a Special Independent Commission on Environment and Sustainable Development to service the Security or Trusteeship Councils through the secretary general.” Alternatively, there could be a “continuing forum on environment and development . . . called, perhaps, a World Environment and Development Forum.” “Sustainable development” ideas should be proliferated through a Maoist-modeled policy of “letting a thousand flowers bloom,” MacNeill et al. write; the forum would give this “a steering mechanism.”

The authors foresee an “Earth Council,” which would have “greater authority to make decisions and to enforce regulations.” Whatever institutional form were found, the Earth Summit should “place the world community on a new course toward a sustainable future,” such that by the year 2012, “obsolete notions of national sovereignty” will have been superseded.

The WWF’s “Caring for the Earth” calls on national governments to legally and constitutionally *mandate* “sustainability” as the legal-economic basis of, or guideline for, policy, by setting up “cross-sectoral capability,” inside governments. Such mechanisms are overtly designed to dodge national constitutions like that of the United States, the preamble of which explicitly mandates the promotion of the “general welfare.” But WWF also seeks to change constitutions: “Second, all countries should have *comprehensive systems of environmental law* that safeguard human rights, the interests of future generations, and the productivity and diversity of the Earth. *The principles of a sustainable society*

should be incorporated in the constitutions or other fundamental definitions of a nation’s governance and policy. Existing legal and administrative controls should be reviewed and weaknesses (including those of implementation and enforcement) corrected.”

The WWF of Prince Philip—whose wife, Queen Elizabeth, the richest woman in the world, pays *no* taxes—advises the use of fiscal policies, like “the Polluter Pays Principle and the User Pays Principle and by the careful use of taxes, subsidies and other incentives” to force conformity with the oligarchy’s priorities. “By the end of the century, national laws should have been reviewed everywhere with the aim of re-shaping them towards sustainable living, and, with the same aim, reviews of economic policies and administrative approaches should have been completed in higher-income countries.”

A new totalitarian atheism

Not only national sovereignty is junked if it gets in the way, but religion. Here, the Green Establishment presents its true face as the new form of totalitarian atheism, rising on the ashes of the communist dictatorships. The Judeo-Christian belief in the supreme value of the human individual should not only be abolished, but police agencies must be empowered to enforce its abolition, say the Earth Summiteers. The WWF report affirms, “States should adopt a Universal Declaration and Covenant on Sustainability that commits them to the world ethic (for sustainable living), and should incorporate its principles into their national constitutions and religions.” And, “a new world organization should be established to watch over the implementation of the world ethic and draw public attention to major breaches of it.”

Last September, Prince Philip was the main invited speaker at a conference in Brussels co-sponsored by the European Parliament and the WWF. Philip called for eliminating the principle of economic growth from Europe, as highlighted in the *WWF News* of November-December 1991: “His Royal Highness also expressed WWF’s desire for all EC institutions to urge a change in the article in the Treaty of Rome [Article Two] referring to the goal of achieving expansion of economic activities along with accelerated improvements in living standards.” He insisted that this be replaced by protocols mandating “sustainable development” as the guiding policy of the European Community for the future. According to the *WWF News*, “over 300 high-level governmental and NGO delegates at the gathering . . . stressed the need for sustainable development to become a key principle of the Treaty of Rome—the EC’s basic charter—and for inter-governmental cooperation on environmental issues.”

To kill off mankind?

The political aims of the “sustainable development” crowd are fully cogent: an agenda of shocking evil, for the sole purpose of maintaining an elite’s political and financial

power. In contrast, the “scientific” arguments are quite incoherent, but their meanderings sometimes let through a ray of truth. We cite a contribution by one representative ecologist, Frank B. Golley, writing the lead item in a volume entitled, *Towards an Ecologically Sustainable Economy*, a report from a Jan. 3-4, 1990 policy seminar in Stockholm, arranged by the Swedish government’s Environmental Advisory Council and the Swedish Council for Planning and Coordination of Research.

Golley, an American, begins his article, entitled “The Ecological Context of a National Policy of Sustainability,” by confessing that “sustainable development” is a contradiction: “Thus, sustainable development is continuous development. If development is defined as expansion of the physical structure of the built environment or numbers of people, sustainable development is an oxymoron. Development can never be sustained indefinitely, since it requires resources for expansion and an environment to receive wastes, and neither resources nor environments are infinite. Rather, . . . development becomes a code word meaning the capacity to respond positively to change and opportunity; that is, to enhance survival. In this sense, sustainable development calls for maintenance of the dynamic capacity to respond adaptively, which is a property of all successful species and societies.”

‘Stable end points’ and ‘bioregions’

Golley goes on to argue that the life of mankind must be seen as a process no different than a “natural” process. “Ecologists and the general public,” he writes, “have been impressed with the sustainability, constancy or stability of the natural world. . . . In the last hundred years, partly in response to the rapidly changing conditions of the century, we have discovered and applied the concept of equilibrium in the physical sciences, the social sciences and in ecology.” After mentioning such terms as “stable end points, called the climax,” “stable systems,” “ecosystems,” and the like, Golley says: “In other words, ecologists worked out the general concepts of constancy, sustainability and equilibrium on ecological systems, converting into scientific terms the popular sense that nature has natural balance and stability. . . . Humans have found value in natural patterns of constancy and stability. *We might look to those properties of ecological systems that produce sustainability and imitate or translate these properties into human systems.* Alternatively, we might conclude that natural stability deserves our respect and we could then form an ethical position to guide our actions so that we avoid disturbances of ecological sustainability” (emphasis added).

From these assumptions, Golley concludes that mankind’s life had best be organized around what he calls “bioregions”:

“Finding a balance between order and disorder is clearly very difficult and it is probably regulated partly by the size

of the group. I argue here that human groups are organized heterarchically (many simultaneous hierarchies), and that the source of creativity and responsiveness is in the relatively small units of people adapted to their local environments. These small units or bioregions provide the stage upon which human social evolution can act and create solutions which are ecological and social. While national, regional and global constraints act on and impact the local scales, they must be prevented from creating homogeneity for the sake of efficiency and power. Strong constraints from higher order systems may be effective in the short run, but in the long term adaption and evolution at the individual and local scale will provide the basis for human survival and well-being and these processes are manifested at the local scale in individual humans.”

In case the reader had trouble slogging through these verbal wetlands, this is ecologist jargon to justify the program of Aspen, World Wide Fund for Nature, Trilateral Commission, and the Club of Rome: Since man is not qualitatively different from any other part of “nature,” any institution large and complex enough to organize a way out of the present ecological crisis—like a nation, capable of launching a space program, building a water management system, or fostering research and development in fusion energy—must be replaced by tribe-like fragments struggling to survive in little “bioregions.”

In the same volume, a Prof. Per Brinck, chairman of the Natural Resources Committee of the Swedish Council for Planning and Coordination of Research, is quoted, with the stock-in-trade view of man’s interventions into nature as “destructive”: “It is quite obvious that man contributed at an early stage to changes that were accepted by nature and consequently led to transformations of nature. Man was part of nature. Since then man, through his technical capacity and his capacity to exploit natural resources, has contributed to the destruction of nature, including the massive use of resources. And this destruction of nature has been achieved by man at rather a late stage of evolution.”

Brinck impales himself on his contradiction between “natural” and “technical” man, and ends up by confessing, “Thus we inherited a nature strongly affected by man. I am well aware of the fact that we, as far as possible, must try to conserve natural forests and original environments, but I am also aware of the fact that man affects and changes everything in the world we are now living in. Since we do not want to do the only radical thing—i.e., kill off mankind—we shall have to tolerate that the Earth is and will continue to be affected.”

It reflects perhaps an internal dialogue within the ecologist movement that usually is held from the public view. But Brinck hits at the precise point: The policies of “sustainable development,” the policies of Prince Philip, the Trilateral Commission et al., can only have one result: to “kill off mankind.”