
Conference Report

Ecological economics and the perilous hoax of sustainable development

by Torbjørn Jerlerup

In a time when starvation and disease are devastating the less developed countries, and the developed world is being hit by what potentially could be the worst economic and cultural crisis since the time of the Black Death in the mid-14th century, nothing could be more timely than a discussion on how to rebuild the world and stop the collapse. But this is not being done. Why?

One can begin to understand why, by looking at what is called the field of “ecological economics” and the notion of “sustainable development.” An ever-increasing number of “experts” are traveling around the world to visit conferences and to spread the idea that there are too many human beings on Earth and that the products of man’s creative intellect—scientific and technological progress—should be halted and abolished.

One such conference took place in the capital of Sweden at the beginning of August—the second conference of the International Society for Ecological Economics (ISEE). Gathered in Stockholm was almost the entire elite responsible for millions of people’s deaths with their brainchild known as “sustainable development.” Among the participants were several World Bank advisers, such as Herman Daly, Jostein Aarestad, John Dixon, and Swedish senior adviser Erik Arrhenius; Robert Costanza, the president of the ISEE; as well as several advisers from the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA), and population “experts” like Paul “Population Bomb” Ehrlich and Colin Clark. In all, 425 people participated.

Investing in genocide

The keynote for the conference was struck by Herman Daly from the World Bank on the first day. He laid out the idea that we have to have a policy shift from an era in which man-made capital such as power plants, dams, and industrial capacity was most important in economics, to an era in which investments in so-called natural capital should be emphasized. This distinction between man-made and natural capital was repeated over and over at the conference, but what does it mean?

One of the books presented at the conference was *Environmentally Sustainable Economic Development: Building*

on Brundtland (1991, Goodland, Daly, et al.). Daly begins his chapter in this book, “From Empty-World Economics to Full-World Economics,” by stating: “The thesis argued here is that the evolution of the human economy has passed from an era in which human-made capital was the limiting factor in economic development to an era in which remaining natural capital has become the limiting factor. . . . This means that economic policy should be designed to increase the productivity of natural capital and its total amount, rather than to increase the productivity of human-made capital.”

Daly argues that we are entering a new era, and that traditional economists have failed to notice that the world has been transformed “from a world relatively empty of human beings and human-made capital to a world relatively full of these,” which means that the traditional ideas about economics must be scrapped.

“The productivity of human-made capital is more and more limited by the decreasing supply of complementary natural capital. Of course in the past when the scale of human presence in the biosphere was low, human-made capital played the limiting role. The switch from human-made to natural capital as the limiting factor is thus a function of the increasing scale and impact of the human presence. Natural capital is the stock that yields the flow of natural resources.” This means that “for example, the limiting factor determining the fish catch is the reproductive capacity of fish populations, not the number of fishing boats; for gasoline the limiting factor is petroleum deposits, not refinery capacity.”

Daly means that instead of putting man’s capacity to transform and improve the Earth first, and with that the emphasis on our capability to find new resources when the old ones are running out, through scientific and technological progress, we should go back to the old idea of a “Mother Earth” which puts limits on the development of the human society. Hence, humans can be treated as slaves: “We can substitute labor for capital, or capital for labor, to a significant degree . . . for example, we can have fewer carpenters and more power saws, or fewer power saws and more carpenters and still build the same house.”

This means that we must replace the use of machinery in heavy work with slave labor because it is more environmen-

tally “sustainable.” In that case, we will arrive at the same situation as in China under Mao Zedong when they built tractors, roads, and houses with only manual labor instead of machinery, and work which was done by two men in Europe, using machines, required the work of 50 men using only muscle power and no machines, in China; i.e., slave labor!

Condoms instead of industries

After explaining that we have to get rid of the practice of always trying to produce our physical products “with less natural resources and more capital,” Daly further elaborates his ideas on how to reorganize investments.

“In this new full-world era, investments must shift from human-made capital accumulation toward natural capital preservation and restoration. Also technology should be aimed at increasing the productivity of natural capital more than human-made capital,” he writes.

After stating that we should increase productivity in natural capital (and develop the economy by eating more nuts!), he continues to talk about the future role of the World Bank: “The role of the multilateral development banks in the new era would be increasingly to make investments . . . that increase the productivity of natural capital. In the past, development investments have largely aimed at increasing the stock and productivity of human-made capital. Instead of investing mainly in saw-mills, fishing-boats and refineries, development banks should now invest more in reforestation, restocking of fish populations and renewable substitutes for dwindling reserves of petroleum. . . . Pollution reduction also increases in priority. . . . Investments in limiting the growth-rate of the human population are of greatest importance in managing a world that has become relatively full.

“Perhaps the clearest policy implication of the full-world thesis is that the level of per capita resource use of the rich countries cannot be generalized to the poor, given the current world population. . . . As a policy of growth becomes less possible, the importance of redistribution and population control as measures to combat poverty increase correspondingly. In a full world both human numbers and per capita resource use must be constrained. Poor countries cannot cut per capita resource use . . . so their focus must be mainly on population control. . . . Investments in the areas of population control and redistribution therefore increase in priority for development agencies.”

Redefining infrastructure

Daly continues by redefining the word infrastructure: “Investing in natural capital is essentially an infrastructure investment on a grand scale and in the most fundamental sense of infrastructure—that is, the biophysical infrastructure.” And that is something the World Bank should invest in instead of what usually is termed infrastructure, according to Daly. “Indeed, in the new era the World Bank’s official

name, The International Bank for Reconstruction and Development should emphasize the word reconstruction and redefine it to refer to reconstruction of natural capital devastated by rapacious ‘development.’ ”

To further develop his fascist ideas, Daly says that the U.N. should take the leading role in this global dictatorship: “Since much natural capital is not only public but globally public in nature, the United Nations seems indicated to take a leadership role.”

The “sustainable development” crowd usually try to paint themselves as “outsiders.” Within the ISEE, they even say that Daly and other members of the World Bank who work with them as ecological economists are “good people” who are trying to reform the World Bank from within. But those who know how the World Bank and other “development agencies” are killing millions of humans by halting the industrialization of the underdeveloped countries and by sterilizing dark-skinned people in the name of “saving the environment,” know that it is a hoax.

‘No’ to industrialization

Sustainable development is a dangerous hoax because it leads to poverty for every nation which tries to implement it. To be able to save both human civilization and the so-called environment, we *must* have continuous technological development with a corresponding growth in the standard of living. No nation has ever achieved prosperity by “sustainable development” and, in fact, no human society can ever exist in this way. This is something of which these genocidalists behind the “sustainable development” fraud are well aware.

In *Environmentally Sustainable Economic Development: Building on Brundtland*, the authors put forward this question in the introduction: “Can development without throughput growth (sustainable development) cure existing poverty? Our belief is that it cannot; qualitative improvement in the efficiency with which resources are used will greatly help, but will not be sufficient to cure poverty.”

If development never can lead to any kind of prosperity, what do the authors propose that we should do to eradicate poverty? In the introduction, they say that one actually requires “considerable growth as well as development” to be able to do that. So far, so good, but the authors of this book do not mean that we should industrialize the poorer parts of the world; when they talk about the need for “growth” and “development,” they mean something else.

They propose, first, that the developing countries must reduce their population. The World Bank, they say, should finance sterilizations and the distribution of condoms in the poor nations instead of financing dams, irrigation systems, and modern farming. As Robert Goodland from the World Bank says in his chapter of the book: “Per capita resource use must decline as well as population.”

They also say that poor countries should not be allowed to industrialize. “Developing countries often argue, for ex-

ample, that they cannot afford environmentally sound techniques . . . and that it is now their turn to benefit from the technologies the industrial world has been using for a long time," say P. Dogse and B.v. Droste from Unesco in their chapter. They continue: "However, as so much of today's technology is not environmentally sustainable, it is therefore not economically sustainable. . . . Developing nations . . . cannot invest in environmentally unsound techniques without facing rising domestic environmental costs. . . . Industrial countries should, therefore be prepared to compensate the developed world for these closed options. This could be done partly by financing sustainable technology investments in developing countries." Further, "the North has to reduce input growth and waste, using both economic and legal instruments, while at the same time providing the South with capital and environmentally sound technologies through various arrangements, such as green-funds and debt-for-sustainable development swaps."

What this means is nothing but installing a global environmental dictatorship where poverty-ridden countries are forced to halt all "unsound" investments in nuclear power plants and irrigation systems. And the "development banks" should steer all investment toward "biodiversity programs" and "soft" technologies as those we in the industrialized world used centuries ago—solar power, hand-pumps, and hand-plows.

To be able to implement this global dictatorship we should, according to Daly and his co-authors, let the United Nations be a global police force. Nobel laureate Trygve Haavelmo says in his chapter that an "internationally accepted body should be given the authority and power to choose the future path of development and enforce it."

Resistance against genocide

Fortunately, the conference met some resistance from demonstrators who exposed it as a hoax. The European Labor Party, the Swedish branch of the international movement affiliated with Lyndon LaRouche, demonstrated against it and challenged participants at the conference to stand up for the truth. In that respect the conference was a failure. It became obvious to participants that not everybody was willing to accept a "new world order" based on "sustainable development."

Confirming the genocidal intent in their own words, on the first day, Paul Ehrlich attacked "certain groups" even before the demonstrations had started: "Certain groups are demanding 100% proof on the effects of the global warming . . . but that is not efficient, we have to act now to stop it," he said. "One or 2 billion people with a high standard of living is better than 8 billion with a low standard of living, but immediately when I say this, some newspapers are crying out that I want to murder 6 billion people, when in fact we have to lower the amount of people in a time period of perhaps 100 years."

Candidate LaRouche to address Schiller-ICLC

Independent presidential candidate Lyndon H. LaRouche, Jr. will be one of the featured speakers at the Sept. 5-6 conference of the International Caucus of Labor Committees (ICLC), the philosophical association he founded, at the Sheraton Premiere Hotel in Tysons Corner, Virginia. The conference is sponsored by the Schiller Institute.

LaRouche is expected to address the conference through an audiotaped message although he is in prison, the victim of a frameup consummated during the last presidential campaign in 1988, at which time he was also an independent candidate against Bush and Dukakis. LaRouche and six associates were accused of vague fraud and conspiracy charges in late 1988, and convicted in a trial which shocked the world for its flagrant violation of defendants' rights.

Despite this persecution, LaRouche is running again as an independent candidate, with veteran civil rights leader Rev. James Bevel as his running-mate. In a statement released on Aug. 12, LaRouche warned that the world has entered a new downturn in the economic depression that has been in progress since the October 1987 stock market crash. Moreover, he said, "We have in fact World War III in progress. This is not the way World War III was supposed to break out, according to the accepted mythologies of nuclear exchange which we heard back in the 1950s, '60s, and '70s." Rather, so-called little wars are inflicting mass deportations, mass killings, famine, and disease in many parts of the world; he pointed especially to the Balkans, the Middle East, Africa, and Ibero-America.

These "wars will continue to spread as long as the current economic and related policies of the United States and London continue," he said. Yet, the two leading presidential campaigns will not discuss the economy: "Only the Lyndon LaRouche and Rev. Jim Bevel campaign, so far, are discussing the economy and the threat of World War III."

The ICLC came into being 20 years ago in 1972, when the National Caucus of Labor Committees, a political and philosophical grouping which LaRouche rescued out of the student ferment of the 1960s, was founded in western Europe. It is now present on five continents. The theme of the September conference is, "A Planet Cannot Survive Half-Slave and Half-Free," expanding on the famous dictum of Abraham Lincoln in the 1860 presidential campaign.