

---

## Book Reviews

---

# Brundtland Commission proposes ecologists' fascist world order

by Mark Burdman

---

### **Our Common Future**

The Report of the World Commission on Environment and Development  
Oxford University Press, Oxford and New York, 1987  
400 pages paperback, £5.95, \$9.95.

---

The back cover of the *Our Common Future* edition released by Oxford University Press in the United Kingdom makes the modest claim: "This is the most important document of the decade on the future of the world." The book, based on the findings of the World Commission on Environment and Development (WCED) headed by Norwegian Prime Minister Gro Harlem Brundtland, "serves notice that the time has come for a marriage of economy and ecology," it claims.

The policy perspectives of this book, insofar as they are influencing and transforming the policies of governments and institutions, are not leading the world to a marriage, but to "our common funeral"—which would be a more appropriate title for the book. Would that the contents were nothing more than deranged world-federalist ravings. Regrettably, they are not. The "Brundtland Commission" is the regroupment of the world malthusian movement under a new organizational framework, with the sanction and participation of many governments and prominent institutions around the world.

It proposes, and is seeking to implement, a new international financial, economic, political, and legal order, that would "enforce," as the report states, the genocidal notion of "sustainable development" globally. This should be accomplished, in the commission's view, by "transforming" the Brundtland Commission into a permanent "U.N. Program on Sustainable Development" that would "change human attitudes" through "a vast campaign of education, debate, and public participation." As a commission declaration made in Tokyo, on Feb. 27, 1987, said, "A successful transition to a sustainable development through the year 2000 and beyond

requires a massive shift in societal objectives. It also requires the concerted and vigorous pursuit of a number of strategic imperatives. The World Commission on Environment and Development now calls upon all the nations of the World, both jointly and individually, to integrate sustainable development into their goals and to adopt the following principles to guide their policy actions."

To accomplish what ends? 1) To "limit" global population to appropriate "ecological" limits. 2) To reinforce the notion of "limits" in the minds of the world's population. 3) To implement deindustrialization, by phasing out "energy-intensive" modes of industry. 4) To skew international financial aid flows, to bring about aims 1, 2, and 3. 5) To establish an international legal policing system, to force these aims to be accomplished with the power of the law, by bringing about "changes in the legal and institutional frameworks that will enforce the common interest." Less politely put, to create an international ecologists' gestapo.

Behind all the rhetoric, liberal phraseology, and populist-participatory images that ooze throughout *Our Common Future*, what the WCED is substantively calling for is a universal-fascist world order that would implement genocide, with the appearance of "democracy." As is usual with the past years' programs for "fascism with a human face," a big-shot in the Socialist International, in this case, Mrs. Brundtland, has been appointed to oversee the project.

### **From Brandt and Palme to Brundtland**

The World Commission was mandated in December 1983, by the United Nations. As Mrs. Brundtland writes in the "Chairman's Foreword": "My reflections and perspective were also based on other important parts of my own political experience: the preceding work of the Brandt Commission on North-South Issues, and the Palme Commission on Security and Disarmament Issues, on which I served. I was being asked to help formulate a third and compelling call for political action: After Brandt's 'Program for Survival and Common Crisis,' and after Palme's 'Common Security,' would

come 'Common Future.' "

It is noteworthy that the commission was launched not long after the launching of the Helmut Schmidt and Takeo Fukuda's Inter-Action Council of Former World Leaders, which also grew out of initiatives by the United Nations, in the latter case the U.N. Development Program in New York City. Together, these two entities represent an upgrading of the malthusians' structure to include heads of state and former heads of state.

Under the chairmanship of Brundtland and the vice-chairmanship of Sudan's Mansour Khalid, some of the leading individuals brought onto the commission, include:

- Susanna Agnelli, Italian senator and undersecretary of state for foreign affairs, and sister of Fiat magnate Gianni Agnelli;

- Volker Hauff, vice chairman of the West German Social Democratic Party Parliamentary Group, and former minister for research and technology in the late 1970s, who mandated anti-nuclear policies within Helmut Schmidt's government;

- Saburo Okita, Executive Committee member of the Club of Rome, and chairman of World Wildlife Fund-Japan;

- Sir Shridath "Sonny" Ramphal, secretary general of the Commonwealth, who is also chairing the Inter-Action Council Policy Board panel on the "economy of black Africa," at the policy board's next meeting, in Harare, Zimbabwe, from March 20-22 of this year;

- William D. Ruckelshaus, former head of the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency in both 1970-73 (when his action to ban DDT was responsible for spreading disease and famine that killed millions of people worldwide) and 1983-84, senior vice president for law and corporate affairs of the Weyerhaeuser Company in the 1976-83 period, and acting director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation and deputy attorney general in the U.S. Department of Justice in 1973;

- Vladimir Sokolov, director, Institute of Evolutionary Animal Morphology and Ecology, Soviet Academy of Sciences;

- Maurice Strong, Canadian energy magnate, top patron and member of the Aspen Institute for Humanistic Studies and the Club of Rome, executive director of the United Nations Environment Program from 1973-75, and secretary general of the 1970-72 United Nations Conference on the Human Environment.

The annex to the book lists close to 1,000 collaborators, advisers, etc., and reads almost like a telephone directory of the world-federalist, malthusian movement:

- Worldwatch Institute, U.S.A. (Lester Brown, President)

- International Federation of Institutes for Advanced Studies (IFIAS)

- International Union for the Conservation of Nature
- Ramphal's Commonwealth Secretariat
- Global Tomorrow Coalition, U.S. A. Greenpeace
- World Association of World Federalists

- Indigenous Survival International
- Stockholm International Peace Research Institute
- Sussex University Science Policy Research Unit (SPRU)

- International Institute for Environment and Development

- World Council of Indigenous Peoples

- World Wildlife Fund-U.S.

- World Resources Institute

- Natural Resources Defense Council

- Friends of the Earth

- Conservation Foundation

- Earthscan

- Society for International Development

- World Vision International

- Canadian Association for the Club of Rome

- various U. N. bodies, including UNCTAD, UNESCO, UNEP, and the "U.S.-based International Development, Environment, and Population NGOs" or non-governmental organizations.

### **It's a small world**

In terms of the "moving forces" actually pushing this report and its follow-up forward, it is safe to say, that for the "small is beautiful" crowd, it is indeed a small world, although a world very largely patronized by oligarchist interests, in foundations, multinational corporations, banks, and the like.

Take, for example, the International Institute for Environment and Development (IIED), which has its headquarters in London, and which was created by the late Lady Barbara Ward Jackson, the guru of the 1972 U.N. Conference of the Environment. This was the conference where, for all intents and purposes, the environmentalist-ecologist movement was launched in earnest. The IIED provided numerous advisers and consultants to the WCED, and is now attempting to mobilize U.N. NGOs, at a conference in April, to carry out the next phases of the *Our Common Future* perspective, to establish a permanent WCED office, and so on.

The IIED's chairman is Robert O. Anderson, chairman of Atlantic Richfield, whose initial funding to Friends of the Earth in the late 1960s financially launched the environmentalist movement. Its treasurer is Sir Arthur Norman, former chairman of the World Wildlife Fund, United Kingdom. Among its board members and advisory board, there are several Brundtland Commission members, including Jim MacNeill, Saburo Okita, Sir Shridath Ramphal, and Maurice Strong. The directors and advisers' group also includes former World Bank President Robert McNamara; Lazard's banker and former British Steel Corporation chief Sir Ian McGregor; Inter-Action Council founder Bradford Morse; British liberal establishment scientist Lord Zuckerman; and ARCO and RCA chief Thornton Bradshaw, Robert O. Anderson's alter ego.

The IIED's own activities are closely intertwined with those of numerous other world-federalist, ecologist groups, including the World Wildlife Fund, the European Cultural Foundation, the Institute for European Environmental Policy, and more.

### Some special roles

At the same time, the preparation and composition of *Our Common Future*, reveal certain interesting features of what is happening in the neo-malthusian environmental movement. One is the extraordinarily high percentage of participants from Indonesia and Brazil, evidence in itself of strong gnostic-environmentalist movements in these countries. The second is the extraordinary participation of representatives, from within government institutions and otherwise, from Canada; of the 1,000 or so listed advisers and collaborators, about 300 are Canadians or individuals from organizations based in Canada. Purely from the evidence presented on paper in *Our Common Future*, one would draw the conclusion that Canada has become the ecologists' playground. On a coordinating level, there is not only the case of Canadian Maurice Strong, but the fact that Jim MacNeill was former Canadian deputy minister for urban affairs, and Canadian commissioner general at the U.N. Conference on Human Settlements, both in the mid-1970s, before becoming direc-

tor of environment for the Organization for Economic Co-operation and Development in Paris from 1978 to 1984.

Brundtland's Norway is also a key contributing country. Not only does that involve herself, yet another Socialist International figure engaged in promoting genocidal policies, but one special adviser to the report was Norway's current Defense Minister, Johan Holst, a friend of convicted Soviet spy Arne Treholt. Whether or not Norway's key role in such a report has anything to do with the recent decision by the Norwegian State (Lutheran) Church to drop the *Filioque* creed in services with the Orthodox Church is not known, but certainly both events indicate a strong movement of gnosticism and pro-Eastern sentiment in this NATO-member country.

### The Soviet angle

Which brings us to the third singular feature of the report: the prominent role of East bloc, particularly Soviet, institutions, in preparing the report. Two among them worth noting are Nikita Moiseyev, of the Computer Center of the Soviet Academy of Sciences, and Ivan Frolov, former editor-in-chief of the theoretical magazine *Kommunist*, and the key Soviet link to the Club of Rome, to ecological movements, and to Western "New Age" institutions. On page 39, Frolov is quoted: "We need new social, moral, scientific, and eco-

## Zero growers form unified command

Discussions to implement the findings of the Brundtland Report were held on Feb. 1-10, 1988, in Costa Rica, during one of the largest environmentalists' meetings of the postwar period.

Under the auspices of the Geneva-based International Union for the Conservation of Nature, some 1,000 environmental scientists and administrators, as well as financiers and representatives from international development aid agencies, met under the overall theme, "Sustainable development and economics."

According to the IUCN's mid-February newsletter, the meeting resolved to implement "recommendations of the World Commission on Environment and Development Report to the United Nations—the Brundtland Report of 1987." To achieve this end, the meeting took the important step of merging the "conservation of nature" and neomalthusian population-reduction movements into one tighter bureaucratic command structure. It also set up an international lobbying mechanism to pressure for redi-

recting financial aid flows to the developing sector, to favor: phasing-out of heavy industry; "ecological" projects; and so-called "debt-for-nature" swaps. A new "economics of conserving resources" was discussed, as justification for such ends.

The IUCN has been the coordinator of the "conservation" movement since its founding in the late 1940s, on the basis of joint initiatives from the same British gnostic crowd around Julian Huxley which created UNESCO, and those Swiss oligarchical families that, in the early 20th century, had launched the ecological-environmental movement by creating the Swiss League for the Protection of Nature in 1909. Today, it shares the same office complex in Geneva as Prince Philip's World Wildlife Fund.

The IUCN has several hundred member-organizations. Among those attending in Costa Rica were such Western-based groups as the Conservation Foundation, World Wildlife Fund-U.S., the Center for Environmental Education, the World Resources Institute, and Wildlife Conservation International. The East bloc also sent representatives from the U.S.S.R. Academy of Sciences, the Turkmenistan Society for the Conservation of Nature, and others, including from Czechoslovakia and Poland.

An IUCN release on the conference stated: "The 17th Triennial General Assembly of the IUCN was the biggest and most productive in the Swiss-based Union's 40-year

logical concepts, which should be determined by new conditions in the life of mankind today and in the future.”

Moiseyev is the co-author, with Carl Sagan, of the “nuclear winter” hoax. During February 1988, he has been featured in both the internationally circulated magazine *New Times* and in the Russian-language *Kommunist* magazine, writing world-federalist “New Age” articles nominally from the standpoint of discussing the ideas of the great Russian scientist V.I. Vernadsky. In the *New Times* article, he introduces the bizarre notion of “Russian cosmism,” as one important component of an emerging “ecological” state of mind.

Soviet participation in the report is further evidence of intensified Soviet cultivation of United Nations-centered world-federalist institutions, a subject which *EIR* has recently reviewed (most recently, Vol. 14, No. 45, Nov. 13, 1987, “Mayor Zaragoza caper at UNESCO tickles the Soviets . . . pink”). Toward such ends, the Soviets have expanded the international activity of Raisa Gorbachova’s Soviet Cultural Fund, and have created, in the first weeks of 1988, a new “International Fund for the Survival and Development of Humanity,” whose founding meeting included Armand Hammer and Robert McNamara.

### An agenda for genocide

While the verbiage of the report is world-federalist, ecol-

ogist mush, the idea-content is genocidal in policy effect. The first chapter is entitled, “From One Earth to One World.” Under a subheading, “The Global Challenge,” the chapter begins with a compendium of disasters, ranging from drought in Africa, to Chernobyl, that occurred in the period from the time that the WCED first met in October, 1984, to the time it published its report 900 days later.

Soon thereafter, there is a subheading, “Sustainable Development.” These two words are the *leitmotif* for the whole report, repeated with an obsessiveness reminiscent of a rock n’ roll song or Hare Krishna chanting.

“Sustainable development” is the content of the “marriage” of ecology and economy, and really amounts to the way in which the ecologists destroy economy, if the latter is properly understood as *physical economy*. The term “sustainable development” grew out of the early 1970s work of such as the Club of Rome’s co-founder, Dr. Alexander King of Great Britain, and as elaborated by such institutions as the Austria-based International Institute for Applied Systems Analysis (IIASA). Both derive “sustainability” from a correlated notion, “carrying capacity.” The latter perverts a real idea, namely, what is the *relative potential population-density* of a region or nation, into a purely reductionist, formal idea of what is the maximum population and resources that can be “carried” in such an area. IIASA has worked out a

history. . . . For the first time, the World Bank, the Inter-American, African and Asian Development Banks, development aid agencies, and a number of major U.S. philanthropic foundations participated strongly. . . . In San Jose, the Union reviewed a World Conservation Strategy for the 1990s that will feature the interaction of population and conservation tactics.”

Highlights of the meeting were speeches by Dr. Nafis Sadik, Executive-Director of the U.N. Fund for Population Activities and Bradman Weerakoon, president of the International Planned Parenthood Federation, who outlined how the IUCN could serve as the body through which the “population and conservation movements” might collaborate more closely.

In 1986-87, the IUCN had made first moves to integrate the structures of the two movements which, while sharing a common gnostic worldview, had been somewhat separated in day-to-day practice. The IUCN had brought to Geneva Perdita Huston, formerly a staffer in Washington for Helmut Schmidt’s Inter-Action Council of Former World Leaders, to head its new “population studies” division.

A related focus of the Costa Rica meeting was the “economics of conserving resources.” Reports the newsletter: “Economics was a thread weaving through all the official hearings and the busy marketplace of contacts,

lobbying, and fund raising in the corridors. Costa Rica provided one of the first examples of a new mechanism for financing conservation called ‘debt-swap for nature.’ This involves a donor purchasing government dollar debt from private banks at a discount—currently around 75%—and turning it back to the government through a foundation in exchange for bonds paying interest and principal in national currency at full value.”

Costa Rican Minister of Natural Resources, Energy and Mines Dr. Alvaro Umana “lobbied at the meeting for direct donations of debt-for-conservation by creditor banks. In the U.S., such donations are partially tax-deductible. He announced a \$254,000 donation from the Fleet/Norstar National Bank of Rhode Island, and said that another, for more than a million dollars, was being negotiated in the U.S. He also announced new debt-swap arrangements for \$5.4 million (non-discounted value) with the World Wildlife Fund-U.S., the Nature Conservancy and other conservation groups and foundations.

“The debt-swap innovation was praised by HRH, The Prince Philip, Duke of Edinburgh, who addressed the delegates as vice-president of IUCN and president of the World Wildlife Fund for Nature, and by Dr. Mostafa Tolba, Executive Director at UNEP. Environmental ministers from 13 countries were among participants following new financing ideas closely.”

number of projects, with the Food and Agriculture Organization and other institutions, to provide the supposed theoretical infrastructure for justifying the neo-malthusian arguments of the 1970s-1980s “ecologist,” “environmentalist,” “conservation,” and other movements.

The 1985 annual report of IIASA has a description of its “Environment Program,” whose lead subsection is titled, “Ecologically Sustainable Development of the Biosphere,” in which subsection one finds IIASA publications referenced, such as, “Sustainable Development of the Biosphere.”

As for the Brundtland Commission’s view on “sustainable development,” we read, “Sustainable global development requires that those who are more affluent adopt lifestyles within the planet’s ecological means—in their use of energy, for example. Further, rapidly growing populations can increase the pressure on resources and slow any rise in living standards; thus sustainable development can only be pursued if population size and growth are in harmony with the changing productive potential of the ecosystem.”

All this, of course, soon leads to the modern-day voice of Malthus: “In many parts of the world, the population is growing at rates that cannot be sustained by available environmental resources. . . . The issue is not just numbers of people, but how those numbers relate to available resources. . . . Urgent steps are needed to limit extreme rates of population growth.”

Elsewhere, the point is made this way: “Many of us live beyond the world’s ecological means, for instance in our patterns of energy use. Perceived needs are socially and culturally determined, and sustainable development requires the promotion of values that encourage consumption standards that are within the bounds of the ecological possible [sic] and to which all can reasonably aspire. . . . Growth by itself is not enough. . . . An expansion in numbers can increase the pressure on resources and slow the rise in living standards in areas where deprivation is widespread. Though the issue is not merely one of population size but of the distribution of resources, sustainable development can only be pursued if demographic developments are in harmony with the changing productive potential of the ecosystem.”

What level, or quality, of relative population potential-density does this polemic imply? The answer is given in this form: “Tribal and indigenous peoples will need special attention as the forces of economic development disrupt their traditional life-styles—*life-styles that can offer modern societies many lessons in the management of resources in complex forest, mountain, and dryland ecosystems*” (emphasis added).

The international financial and legal system, says the report, should be re-adapted to enforce such aims: “The sustainability of ecosystems on which the global economy depends must be guaranteed. . . . Multilateral financial institutions have a crucial role to play. The World Bank is presently reorienting its programs toward greater environmental

concerns. This should be accompanied by a fundamental commitment to sustainable development by the Bank. It is also essential that the regional Development Banks and the International Monetary Fund incorporate similar objectives in their policies and programs. A new priority and focus is also needed in bilateral aid agencies.”

Similarly, “growth rates” could be “environmentally sustainable if industrialized nations can continue the recent shifts in the content of their growth towards less material and energy-intensive activities and the improvement of their efficiency in using materials and energy. . . . The energy-industry connection is also changing, with a strong tendency towards a decline in the energy intensity of industrial production in industrial countries.”

As for the application of the force of law to the WCED’s aims: Under the heading, “Providing the Legal Means,” the report states, “National and international law is being rapidly outdistanced by the accelerating pace and expanding scale of impacts on the ecological basis of development. Governments now need to fill major gaps in existing national and international law related to the environment, to find ways to recognize and protect the rights of present and future generations to an environment adequate for their health and well-being, to prepare under U.N. auspices a universal Declaration on environmental protection and sustainable development and a subsequent Convention, and to strengthen procedures for avoiding or resolving disputes on environment and resource management issues.”

Later, the point is made more bluntly: “Sustainability requires the *enforcement* of wider responsibilities for the impacts of decisions. This requires *changes in the legal and institutional frameworks that will enforce the common interest*” (emphasis added).

All of this is being codified, we read in *Our Common Future*, in another report of the WCED with the title, “Legal Principles for Environmental Protection and Sustainable Development.” In a “summary of proposed legal principles for environmental protection and sustainable development adopted by the WCED experts group on environmental law,” a principle for “Conservation and Sustainable Use” is put forward: “States shall maintain ecosystems and ecological processes essential for the functioning of the biosphere, shall preserve biological diversity, and shall observe the principle of optimum sustainable yield in the use of living natural resources and ecosystems.” Another principle on “Sustainable Development and Assistance” states: “States shall ensure that conservation is treated as an integral part of the planning and implementation of development activities and provide assistance to other States, especially to developing countries, in support of environmental protection and sustainable development.”

A Soviet-backed world ecologists’ police state? That is what stares us in the face, if the authors of “our common funeral” have their way.