



Background Research and Opening Remarks

For the ITSSD's Presentation at the FIRST GOOD NEIGHBOR FORUM

Greeley, CO

February 24, 2007

What We Should Fear From 'Negative' Fear-Based Sustainable Development

Introduction

Good morning,

My name is Lawrence Kogan. In addition to being a practicing attorney, I operate a nonprofit legal research and educational organization called the Institute for Trade, Standards and Sustainable Development ("ITSSD").

The ITSSD is a small organization with high comprehension and communication skills.

We at the ITSSD are extremely proud of our efforts and accomplishments.¹ We have come very far in a very short period of time, on an extremely tight budget, and despite the continuous efforts of green and socialist groups, foreign government officials and politically opportunistic and left-leaning U.S. congressional representatives to indirectly discount our work and limit our public voice. In addition, the ITSSD has had to overcome the fact that its charitable mission did not initially resonate with many Americans, who were inclined to chastise the United Nations, to deny the existence of international law, and to ignore international economic affairs, in general. This, however, has begun to change.

To reiterate, I am here today to share with you our knowledge about these evolving subject areas. I am also here to provide you with helpful insights about how to counter the international assault against your exclusive private property rights.² There are negative foreign influences that have invaded the American heartland, and they could conceivably, in a future U.S. administration,



result in unnecessary regulatory curtailment of your constitutionally guaranteed right to private property.

Europe, Led by France, Promotes a New Global Regulatory and Civil Society Framework Premised on ‘Negative’ Fear-Based Sustainable Development:

French President Jacques Chirac recently delivered a speech in Paris, France to the “Citizens of the Earth Conference for Ecological Global Governance”. French bureaucrats,³ environmentalists and fear-inciters extraordinaire, including political alarmist former US vice president Al Gore and disputed British political economist Nicholas Stern, also spoke at this event. If you believe that the US federal government has overly intruded into your personal lives and imposed its will and influence over your private property, wait until you hear more about what Monsieur Chirac is calling for!

Mr. Chirac emphasized, in his trademark Gaullist tone and condescending paternalistic manner, that there is an immediate need for a new French-led post-WWII global paradigm due to the ‘environmental emergency’ and ‘environmental crisis’ at hand that could conceivably lead to an international ‘environmental war’. With fear as his motivator, Monsieur Chirac thus recommends the adoption of a new paradigm based on the ‘negative’ Malthusian⁴ notion of environment-centric sustainable development.

The French president extolled the multiple purposes of the Earth Conference as indispensable to saving the planet from such threats. There were three:

“[1] To raise awareness of the urgency of the situation, taking stock together of the threats facing the environment and endangering the broad ecological balances of our planet[;] [2] To decide upon priority measures to combat those threats in order to respond to the global ecological issues for our time and for generations to come[;] [and 3] To take action, at international level, to create a *United Nations Environment Organization (UNEO)* with a view to strengthening environmental governance.”⁵

Monsieur Chirac began by setting the forth the following fear-based rationale for engaging in ‘enlightened’ global environmental governance; a/k/a ‘negative’ sustainable development:

“The planet is sick. The symptoms are its increasingly frequent extreme reactions – hurricanes, floods and droughts. Nature is sick. Species are dying out at an alarming rate. We have proof that human activity is causing these disorders. The day is fast approaching when runaway climate change will spin out of control. We have almost reached the historic point of no return... For years now, in the European institutions, in the G8, in all the international fora, France has been battling – I have been battling – to draw attention to the *environmental emergency* at hand” (emphasis added).⁶

Mr. Chirac then proceeded to chastise humankind and to criticize the current post-WWII paradigm as contributing to such environmental emergency:



“Why are we not taking the steps that need to be taken? Because in our reprehensible selfishness we refuse to face the facts; because we are unable to shake off outmoded mindsets and an economic structure inherited from the nineteenth century; because our international policy-making structure is ill-suited to the crucial issue of the twenty-first century, namely the environment.”⁷

He thereafter made a religious/ethics-based appeal for humankind’s ‘conversion’ from economic neo-liberal materialism to spiritual environmentalism:

“Humankind must stop seeing itself only as the ‘master and owner of nature’... We must move towards a new state – a state of responsible awareness: our intelligence must be devoted to protecting the planet. We must learn to cultivate a harmonious relationship between humans and nature, a new and necessary relationship.”⁸

According to Mr. Chirac, this ethical imperative, is based on the notion of ‘humanist environmentalism’, and must lead to the creation of a new “fundamental...human right – the right to a sound and protected [as opposed to ‘clean’] environment”. In addition, such human right must be universally recognized via the adoption at the UN of a “Universal Declaration of Environmental Rights and Duties”, which would be binding on all nations and peoples.

“Our responsibility towards the earth is inseparable from our responsibility to humanity. The environmental imperative opens an unprecedented chapter in human rights. We must assert and enforce a new fundamental right – the right to a sound and protected environment. That is the meaning of humanist environmentalism. We need a revolution in our culture. We must educate everyone, especially the very young, in environmental issues. To ensure that we all become ‘Citizens of the Earth’, let us adopt a Universal Declaration of Environmental Rights and Duties at the United Nations. The Declaration will be an expression of our common environmental *ethics*, which will underpin our public and individual endeavours.”⁹

In addition, President Chirac noted the economic and other sacrifices that ALL developed world nations and individuals, including Americans, must make in the name of ‘negative’ sustainable development.

“[T]he sustainable development revolution...will require a radical transformation in our production and consumption patterns and stewardship of natural resources and environments. It will mean cutting pollution; including environmental quality in calculating GDP; and pricing natural resources fairly. Companies must take on board their environmental responsibilities...The most innovative and environmentally protective economies will be the most powerful economies. To achieve that, however, we need clear and fair competition rules. Either the international community knuckles down, or there will be an ‘*environmental war*’. The burden must be fairly shared. The countries of the North were the first to build their wealth on the massive exploitation of natural resources. They must shoulder their share of responsibility by complying, within a concerted framework, with production rules and environmental standards. These are the focus of the negotiations on combating global warming within the framework of the United Nations Convention, which are to be completed before 2009 and which cover the post-Kyoto Protocol period” (emphasis added).¹⁰



Last, but not least, Chirac called for the creation of a multilateral environmental organization with the authority to ensure environment-centric sustainable development and international peace.

“[T]he environmental imperative is increasingly shaping local and national policies. But this struggle must be waged at a global level. The *environmental crisis* recognizes no borders. Yet we still, all too often, fail to act together. We must build world environmental governance. In this area as in others, unilateralism leads nowhere. Just as multilateralism is the prerequisite for peace, it is the key to sustainable development. The United Nations Environment Programme is outstanding, and I want to pay tribute to it. But it does not have adequate powers or institutional clout. We must aim to transform it into a fully-fledged United Nations agency. This UNEO will act as the world's ecological conscience. It will carry out impartial and scientific assessment of environmental dangers. It will have policy-making terms of reference giving it the legitimacy to implement action jointly decided. It will lend greater weight and greater cohesion to our collective endeavours. The goal of this conference is to mobilize all our citizens and all sections of our societies and to set up a group of pioneer countries prepared to support the United Nations Environment Organization project and to win over those who are still hesitant to join us.”¹¹

French-Born WTO Director General Pascal Lamy Calls for Environment-Centric ‘Negative’ Sustainable Development:

While it may be comforting to think that the thoughts articulated by Monsieur Chirac are embraced only by his fellow European leaders, and perhaps even by socialist UN bureaucrats, think again. Similar thoughts have also been expressed by none other than World Trade Organization Director-General, Pascal Lamy, another Frenchman reared in the socialist tradition who is supposed to defend the rules and principles of free trade against disguised protectionism.

In a recent speech delivered to the UN Environment Programme Governing Council and Environment Ministerial in Nairobi, Kenya, Mr. Lamy, too, sought to incite public fear. He alleged that free trade advocates were seeking to derail the WTO Doha Round trade negotiations by refusing to engage in negotiation of environmental matters. He warned that “failure of the Doha negotiations ‘would strengthen the hand of all those who argue that economic growth should proceed unchecked’ without regard for the environment. He then stressed that ‘trade, and indeed the WTO, must be made to deliver sustainable development’”.¹² “It was the first time a WTO leader had attended the UN Environment Programme's Governing Council meetings, and his attendance was hailed by environmental campaigners.”¹³

“The Doha Round of trade negotiations contains a promise for the environment. A promise to allow for a more efficient allocation of resources — including natural ones — on a global scale through a continued reduction of obstacles to trade (tariffs and subsidies). But it also includes a promise to ensure greater harmony between the WTO and MEAs: a promise to tear down the barriers that stand in the way of trade in clean technologies and services; as well as a promise to reduce the environmentally harmful agricultural subsidies that are leading to overproduction and harmful fisheries subsidies which are encouraging over-fishing and depleting the world's fish stock.”¹⁴



In referring to this need, Lamy invoked the quasi-Pagan name ‘Gaia’ that environmental extremists have long used to personify, worship and protect planet Earth (‘Mother Earth’)¹⁵ against most human interference. He did so, just as he emphasized the urgency of re-launching environmental negotiations at the Doha Round. According to Lamy, global adherence to environment-centric sustainable development is no longer an ‘option’ – it is now a ‘must’. “A sustainable development strategy, linking all international actors, must become our goal. We must not wait for Gaia to react!”¹⁶

“According to the Gaia Hypothesis, we are parts of a greater whole (he said). Our destiny is not dependent merely on what we do for ourselves but also what we do for Gaia as a whole. If we endanger her, she will dispense with us in the interests of a higher value — life itself...In 1987, when the Brundtland Report coined the term “sustainable development”, many of us saw it as *one* option. The other option was the business-as-usual scenario. Twenty years later no one can argue that sustainable development is a choice anymore. It has become a must. Sustainable development should be the cornerstone of our approach to globalization and to the global governance architecture that we create...[T]he WTO stands ready to do its part.”¹⁷

To achieve environment-centric sustainable development, Mr. Lamy called for greater and more integrated global governance. This involves synchronized environmental and trade policies, as well as synchronized global institutions - the WTO, UNEP, and MEAs.

“[T]he world has become interconnected to a point, that today it is impossible for a country to live and prosper in isolation of the rest of the world...Clearly, globalization is a phenomenon that requires careful management...The management of globalization would allow us to capture its benefits, while leaving behind its downside [i.e., pollution that crosses borders]...There is no doubt that the world needs more effective ‘global governance’ — governance at a level that transcends national boundaries. Our institutions of global governance must therefore be strengthened. They must also be made to function as a more coherent whole. This applies to the WTO, and to all other international institutions, which should complement each other...In today's world, our policies are not fully synchronized. Greater awareness of the need for this synchronization is, first and foremost, required of governments. We need to turn the page on the era in which governments would bring conflicting positions to different fora. The right hand of government should not compete with its left hand. The WTO, UNEP, and MEAs — as well as all other international institutions — must be put to work towards a shared sustainable development vision.”¹⁸

UN Environment Program Outlook 2006-2007 Report Alarmism: Cites Need for ‘Negative’ Environment-Centric Sustainable Development:

http://www.unep.org/geo/yearbook/yb2007/PDF/5_Overview72dpi.pdf
http://www.unep.org/geo/yearbook/yb2007/PDF/6_Feature_Focus72dpi.pdf



Regulatory Takings of Your Private Property

Fear/Demagoguery Promoted by Self-Proclaimed Elites

Religious/Ethical Bases for Environmental Governance

Global Regulatory Governance Multilateral Treaty-based Frameworks

More Civil Society Intrusion

Rubber Stamp Congress – Elites Intend to Import European Laws that Threaten US Private Property

Subsidiarity Manipulation by Elites

Censorship by the U.S. Congress (Takings of Property in Oneself- Free Speech)

Poisoning the Minds of Our Young through Graduate Studies Programs Which Criticize the Current World Order Established by America

Enlistment of Multinationals and Civil Society Environmental and Health Extremist Groups as Agents of the State to Monitor Your Public and Private Behavior

I. Regulatory Takings of Your Exclusive Private Property

I. **FEAR AND ITS POLITICAL USES:**

“It’s Far Safer to Feared Than Loved”:

[S]ince love and fear can hardly exist together, if we must choose between them, it is far safer to be feared than loved. — Niccolò Machiavelli, *The Prince*, 1513

“The Only Thing We Have to Fear is Fear Itself”:

These immortal words of faith, optimism and encouragement were uttered by former U.S. *President Franklin D. Roosevelt* as he delivered his first inaugural address to our troubled nation in 1933. Many here will remember that he had taken office at the beginning of the Great Depression, amid a time of great economic, social and psychological suffering, both here in the US and abroad. The ‘fear’ that Roosevelt referred to was “nameless, unreasoning, unjustified terror which paralyzes needed efforts to convert retreat into advance.”¹⁹

Fear as a Form of Manipulation:

“To disregard fear is to place ourselves in possibly mortal jeopardy. Even the man who acts heroically on the battlefield, if he is honest, admits that he is scared. To tell people not to be afraid is to give them advice that they cannot take. Our evolved physiological makeup disposes

us to fear all sorts of actual and potential threats, even those that exist only in our imagination. The people who have the effrontery to rule us, who call themselves our government, understand this basic fact of human nature. They exploit it, and they cultivate it. Whether they compose a warfare state or a welfare state, they depend on it to secure popular submission, compliance with official dictates, and, on some occasions, affirmative cooperation with the state's enterprises and adventures. Without popular fear, no government could endure more than twenty-four hours.”²⁰

Fear Can Trigger Public Apathy, If It Is Not Regenerated:

... Fear, like every other "productive" resource, is subject to the laws of production. Thus, it cannot escape the law of diminishing marginal productivity: as successive doses of fear-mongering are added to the government's "production" process, the incremental public clamor for governmental protection declines. The first time the government cries wolf, the public is frightened; the second time, less so; the third time, still less so. If the government plays the fear card too much, it overloads the public's sensibilities, and eventually people discount almost entirely the government's attempts to frighten them further... Fear is a depreciating asset. As Machiavelli observes, "the temper of the multitude is fickle, and ... while it is easy to persuade them of a thing, it is hard to fix them in that persuasion" ([1513 1992, 14). Unless the foretold threat eventuates, the people come to doubt its substance. The government must make up for the depreciation by investing in the maintenance, modernization, and replacement of its stock of fear capital.”²¹

Fear Properly Employed, Produces More Fear:

At least one authoritative British study evaluated the impact of negative information on the formation and persistence of children's fear beliefs. It found not only that a person's fear beliefs increased significantly after hearing negative information (much more so than after hearing positive information or no information at all), but also, that negative information also altered a person's "causal learning". In fact, negative information "led to an overestimation of the frequency of negative outcomes [for future events even] when the causal relationship was incongruent with [the] information and the *actual* frequency of negative outcomes" was much, much less ("20% of the time). In other words, negative information caused them subsequently to over-predict the frequency of negative outcomes. The study concluded such findings to be significant, given that a "key feature of clinical phobias and excessive fears is that they do not respond to verbal reassurances and...that...despite repeated experiences of the phobic object not leading to aversive outcomes, the fear persists..."²²

Keeping the Public in a Constant State of Fear Paves the Way for Regulation, Taxation and Invasions of Private Property Rights:

“... By keeping the population in a state of artificially heightened apprehension, the government-cum-media prepares the ground for planting specific measures of taxation, regulation, surveillance, reporting, and other invasions of the people's wealth, privacy, and freedoms. Left

alone for a while, relieved of this ceaseless bombardment of warnings, people would soon come to understand that hardly any of the announced threats has any substance and that they can manage their own affairs quite well without the security-related regimentation and tax-extortion the government seeks to justify. Large parts of the government and the "private" sector participate in the production and distribution of fear...At every point, opportunists latch onto existing fears and strive to invent new ones to feather their own nests.”²³

The ‘Green Scare’ – “The Only Thing We Have to Fear is the Lack of Fear Itself”:

Meet Al Gore, scaremonger. In 2004, Gore denounced President Bush for ‘playing on our fears.’ Today, he is at the forefront of a ‘green scare’ about global warming intended to terrify Americans into submitting to his environmental policies.”²⁴

Such scaremongering has been undertaken despite the fact that “60 climatologists from around the world who wrote Canada's prime minister that ‘observational evidence does not support today's computer climate models...[Consequently,]...there is little reason to trust model predictions of the future.’ But that's all beside the point to Gore & Co., who say the time for debate is over. And if you disagree, get ready for the witch-hunt. Major news media have gone after scientists who argue there's still time to study global warming rather than plunge into some half-baked environmental jihad that could waste possibly trillions of dollars...As Richard Lindzen, professor of meteorology at MIT, recently lamented in the *Wall Street Journal*: ‘Scientists who dissent from the alarmism have seen their grant funds disappear, their work derided, and themselves libeled as industry stooges, scientific hacks or worse. Consequently, lies about climate change gain credence even when they fly in the face of the science that supposedly is their basis’...[T]o the greens...the only thing we have to fear is *the lack of fear itself*” (emphasis added).²⁵

Environmental scaremongering and misinformation, especially in Europe, can be traced back to the accidental 1986 explosion and subsequent radiation leak at the Chernobyl nuclear plant in the Ukraine. Research performed by the United Nations Development Program found that, “fear, not radiation...truly afflicted the peoples of the region.”²⁶ Later research confirmed that scaremongering and misinformation had served to shape negative public opinion surrounding nuclear energy and to bolster public support for a greater government role in protecting and assisting the public against such hazards in the future.

This had a truly profound impact on Ukrainian public opinion during the ensuing years, despite the fact that little empirical evidence of actual harm was later adduced that justified such fears. According to Kalman Mizsei, former UN Assistant Secretary-General and UNDP Regional Director for Europe and the Commonwealth of Independent States, “[A] lack of information and a Soviet legacy of fatalism have left Chernobyl survivors convinced that they continue to live under a cloud, resulting in a culture of despair and dependency that has stunted development in the impoverished region...Research shows that people still don't know what the effects are...The fatalistic mentality that communism created has shifted to Chernobyl.”²⁷

In other words, says best-selling author, Michael Crichton,

“[T]he greatest damage to the people of Chernobyl was caused by bad information. These people weren’t blighted by radiation so much as by terrifying but false information. We ought to ponder, for a minute, exactly what that implies. We demand strict controls on radiation because it is such a health hazard. But Chernobyl suggests that false information can be a health hazard as damaging as radiation. I am not saying radiation is not a threat. I am not saying Chernobyl was not a genuinely serious event. But thousands of Ukrainians who didn’t die were made invalids out of fear. They were told to be afraid. They were told they were going to die when they weren’t. They were told their children would be deformed when they weren’t. They were told they couldn’t have children when they could. They were authoritatively promised a future of cancer, deformities, pain and decay. It’s no wonder they responded as they did. In fact, we need to recognize that this kind of human response is well-documented. Authoritatively telling people they are going to die can *in itself* be fatal.”²⁸

European Commission ‘Fear Report’:

A 2003 report prepared by the European Commission²⁹ had previously highlighted the negative physical and emotional impacts associated with public fears generated by a host of hazardous human activities. It explained how the public’s perceptions, fears and impressions of uncertain and hypothetical future hazards are often directly responsible for the tensions and psychosomatic ailments that reduce human ‘well-being’ as defined by the World Health Organization, and thereby, the ‘quality of life’. It also found that such fears are largely rooted in cultural and ethical values “which can be different regionally and individually and even change in time.”³⁰

“[A]nxieties stem not from a general and unavoidable fear of the unknown, but partly from the failures of the EU risk communication and technology education, and partly from the ‘unnatural character of new technologies’. These failings have allegedly had a profound impact on Europeans’ perception of self-autonomy and have thus resulted in the public experiencing higher levels of stress and feelings of helplessness.”³¹

The report identified a number of economic activities that the European public perceives as being too risky.³² These include “exposure to health hazards by chemical factors, safety of food and drinking water, natural and manmade poisons, infectious diseases, and new technologies, especially biotechnology. They include also the welfare of companion animals, wildlife and animals in general, as well as the environment as a whole.”³³

Interestingly, the report did not consider the possibility that these higher levels of stress might be traceable in part to the false and exaggerated claims of technological harm put out time and again by extremist environmental organizations and ‘green’ publications. Rather, it concluded that public risk perception and risk communication have a direct bearing on ‘quality of life’ considerations and human ‘well-being’, *whether or not the risks are real*, and that such fears have reduced public confidence in the ability of EU regulators to protect them from harm.

To reduce these negative impacts and improve Europeans’ quality of life, the report called for risk assessments to go beyond the traditional use of ‘hard’ analytical science (e.g., statistical

analyses of likelihood of severity of harm, actual exposure data, and the likely impact on affected exposure groups). In other words, risk assessments would need to encompass also the use of ‘soft’ social science principles that reflected subjective ‘quality of life’ notions. The report thus recommended that aspects of the quality of life beyond traditional risk assessment and risk management are to be included in the [risk evaluation] process via the *Precautionary Principle*.³⁴ In other words, the report called for more and more stringent regulation. Thus, the European Commission had hoped to rely upon the report’s findings to change the scientific risk assessment protocols which it and the EU’s member states could rely upon to justify *Precautionary Principle*-based regulations at variance with World Trade Organization rules.

II. APPEALS TO RELIGION/ETHICS:

Monsieur Chirac’s understated appeal to religion and environmental ethics was in the tradition of similar UN appeals. In other words, this was not the first time that a European official invoked religiosity to promote blind adherence to the ‘negative’ environment-centric doctrine of sustainable development. In a 1999 address to the World Council of Churches,³⁵ a group that participated in the Conference of the Parties (COP-5) to the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change, in Bonn, Germany, former United Nations Under-Secretary General and UN Environment Program Executive Director Klaus Topfer endeavored to imbue the Precautionary Principle and environmental sustainability with a sense of religious urgency.

“We have entered a new age. An age where all of us will have to sign a new compact with our environment...and enter into the larger community of all living beings...A new sense of our *communion with planet Earth* must enter our minds” (emphasis added).³⁶

According to the president of one US-based free market nonprofit organization who attended the preceding service and later heard Mr. Topfer’s address,

“[T]he pastor preached the new ‘earth gospel’ that industrialized countries are doing harm to the environment and that the world needs a far-reaching policy to achieve social and environmental ‘justice’. Industrialized countries must scale back our standard of living (become humble) in order to save the earth. *The WCC has co-opted unsuspecting churches in their mission to save the earth while they have chosen to be mute about the annual holocaust of 1.5 million human babies created in the image of God! The UN spews its propaganda that the earth’s carrying capacity (population explosion) has reached 6 billion people, although they cannot substantiate their numbers nor do they know how many people the earth’s resources can provide for.* Fertility rates in most “industrialized” countries are below replacement: 2.1 children per woman. The UN contends, however, that if the fertility rate in ‘developing’ countries drops to 2.2 children per woman, the world’s population would reach 8.9 billion by 2050 (The Dallas Morning News, “Population Problem Hasn’t Been Solved,” September 11, 1999). These UN numbers require more faith than is required by any of the world’s religions!” (emphasis added).³⁷

Mr. Topfer’s appeal was followed a year later by a newly published book authored by Adnan Z. Amin, former Director of the UN Environment Programme’s New York Office. Within the

introduction to his UNEP book entitled, *Earth and Faith: A Book of Reflection for Action*, Amin, evoked the same religious undertones.

“As we enter a new century, characterized not only by sweeping and fundamental new changes and immense new opportunities, *but also by greatly increased risks*, the need to foster a new spirit of international cooperation has never been greater. As trade, economic and physical barriers among countries have progressively fallen and as *wealth has increased in some countries, poverty and misery continue to be the lot of a large and growing segment of humanity*. It is in this context that we increasingly witness *new challenges to the security and sustainability of the planet*. At the same time, we are also witnessing an era where *the fundamental lessons for humanity contained in the religious and faith traditions of the world are increasingly coming to the fore and guiding and motivating our actions to meet those challenges*. One of those challenges, *environmental sustainability, is based on the realization that we can no longer blindly trust in the regenerative capacity of ecosystems*...UNEP’s “Global Environment Outlook 2000” confirms that the environmental crisis confronting humanity in the new millennium is a world threatened, either because people have too much or too little. The continued poverty of the majority of the planet’s inhabitants and excessive consumption by the minority are the two major causes of environmental degradation” (emphasis added).³⁸

¹ Our work has been recognized published in peer-reviewed scholarly, trade and professional journals, and our organization has been increasingly recognized and referenced internationally - by foreign governments located in Europe, Asia and Africa; Geneva-based intergovernmental organizations such as the United Nations, the World Trade Organization (WTO) the World Intellectual Property Organization (WIPO), the Association of Southeast Asian Nations (ASEAN), and the Asia-Pacific Economic Cooperation; by numerous international universities and think-tanks located in Asia, Europe, Latin America and the United States; and by industry and professional associations representing multinational firms based in Europe and North America. In fact, the ITSSD was recently designated by the United Nations Economic and Social Commission for Asia and the Pacific (UNESCAP), as “an information source on trade and the environment”. We are proud of these achievements.

² See Lawrence A. Kogan, *U.S. Private Property Rights Under International Assault*, ITSSD, Oct. 14, 2006, at: <http://www.itssd.org/pdf/LAK-PrivatePropertyRightsUnderInternationalAssault.pdf> .

³ See “Biography, Committee of Honour”, “Citizens of the Earth” Conference for Global Ecological Governance at: <http://www.citoyensdelaterre.fr/conference/?Biography-Committee-of-honour> ; “Steering Committee” , “Citizens of the Earth” Conference for Global Ecological Governance at: <http://www.citoyensdelaterre.fr/conference/?-Steering-Committee-&lang=en> .

⁴ In his famous work, *An Essay on the Principle of Population*, eighteenth century English economist Sir Thomas Malthus wrote that “the realization of a happy society will always be hindered by the miseries consequent on the tendency of population to increase faster than the means of subsistence.” See “Thomas Robert Malthus 1766-1834”, Online Encyclopedia at: http://encyclopedia.jrank.org/MAL_MAR/MALTHUS_THOMAS_ROBERT_1766_1834.html . In other words, Malthus “opined that poverty and distress are unavoidable because population increases faster than the means of subsistence. As checks on population growth, Malthus accepted only war, famine, and disease but later added moral restraint.” See “Biographies – Political Theorists and Activists” at: <http://www.blupete.com/Literature/Biographies/Philosophy/BiosPol.htm> . “[B]oth historically and philosophically the doctrine of Malthus was a corrective reaction against the superficial optimism diffused by the school of Rousseau. It was the same optimism, with its easy methods of regenerating society and its fatal blindness to the real conditions that circumscribe human life, that was responsible for the wild theories of the French Revolution and many of its consequent excesses...[Malthus] and his followers appear to have greatly exaggerated both the magnitude and the urgency of the dangers to which they pointed. In their conceptions a single social imperfection assumed such portentous dimensions that it seemed to overcloud the whole heaven and threaten the world with ruin.

This doubtless arose from his having at first omitted altogether from his view of the question the great counteracting agency of moral restraint. Because a force exists, capable, if unchecked, of producing certain results, it does not follow that those results are imminent or even possible in the sphere of experience.” See Robert Malthus 1766-1834”, Online Encyclopedia, *supra*.

⁵ See “Presentation”, “Citizens of the Earth” Conference for Global Ecological Governance at: <http://www.citoyensdelaterre.fr/conference/?-Presentation,10-> .

⁶ “See Speech by M. Jacques Chirac, President of the Republic, on the Occasion of the “Citizens of the Earth” Conference for Global Ecological Governance (2/2/07) at:

<http://www.diplomatie.gouv.fr/actu/bulletin.gb.asp?liste=20070202.gb.html&submit.x=6&submit.y=9> ;

<http://www.citoyensdelaterre.fr/conference/?Appel-de-Paris> ; <http://www.citoyensdelaterre.fr/conference/?-English->

⁷ *Ibid.*

⁸ *Ibid.* The religious undertones of Chirac’s appeal are clear if, for no other reason, than France is one of three Catholic-denominated nations in Europe. However, his appeal has also seemed to resonate with American Catholic scholars and clergy. “Mark Stoll, a history professor at Texas Tech University, in Lubbock, Tex., argues that Catholics have not been prominent environmentalists in the past because their religious worldview encouraged a sense of sacredness among a community of people rather than with nature. In a paper entitled *The Catholic Ethic and the Spirit of Environmentalism*, Stoll writes, ‘Religiously-minded Catholics dedicated themselves in service to the Church, or to the poor, or to the unconverted – to society, in other words...and by and large left nature writing to Protestants, alone in the woods with their God.’ While Catholics have certainly always appreciated the natural world, their passion for ecology has usually been an afterthought to their commitment to social concerns. But, as Stoll points out, ecology is becoming a social concern. In his statement for the World Day of Peace in 1990, Pope John Paul II said, ‘the ecological crisis is a moral issue [that] has assumed such proportions as to be the responsibility of everyone.’ In response, the U.S. Conference of Catholic Bishops issued *Renewing the Earth*, in which they insist that ‘the ecological problem is intimately connected to justice for the poor’...Paul Gorman, executive director of the National Religious Partnership for the Environment, argues that people are not going to make the environment a critical issue until they have ‘an awareness of the question of human purpose in the greater web of life.’ The environment cannot be reduced to one issue among many, he warns. Rather, environmental awareness must take the shape of a ‘religious awakening.’ Until it does, no one is going to pay attention to a sermon about global warming. Also calling for a new way to understand our relationship to the environment is Sister Miriam Therese MacGillis, OP, the founder of Genesis Farm in Blairstown, N.J. A proponent of ‘the new cosmology’, Sister MacGillis, like Mark Stoll, believes that the traditional Catholic commitment to justice is centered on ‘the human in [the] beginning, middle, and end of our concerns.’ To change the environment, she proposes, we have to change our entire cosmology. *Fundamental is a sense of humanity as part of creation, rather than as master of it, and an acknowledgment of all creation as worthy for its own good, rather than for the good of human beings. ‘You reverse everything when you do that. You see that the future of humanity is totally aligned with the future of the planet’...* Sister Elizabeth Johnson writes that there are two ways to approach the ecological crisis in good faith: the stewardship model, which envisions the Earth in the service of humans; and the kinship model, which envisions humans in the service of the Earth....” See Jeffrey J. Guhin, “America: Whatever Happened to Catholic Environmentalists?” Catholic Online (2/3/06) at: http://www.catholic.org/national/national_story.php?id=18579 .

⁹ See Speech by M. Jacques Chirac, *supra*.

¹⁰ *Ibid.* France and Great Britain, with the support of the European Commission, have pushed for this result. They have also sent emissaries to the United States in the hopes of persuading federal congressional and state level action on climate change. See “Britain Leads EU Charge to Undermine US Federal Climate Change Policy”, Press Release, Institute for Trade, Standards and Sustainable Development (7/17/06) at: <http://www.itssd.org/Press%20Release/BritainUndermines.pdf> . See also Lawrence A. Kogan, “Beware of the Flying Dutchman When Traveling to Brussels”, Institute for Trade, Standards and Sustainable Development (Aug. 2006) at: <http://www.itssd.org/Publications/Beware-Flying-DutchmanIII.pdf> .

¹¹ See Speech by M. Jacques Chirac, *supra*.

¹² See Speech by Pascal Lamy, “Globalisation and the Environment in a Reformed UN”, (2/5/07) at p. 3, at: http://www.polity.org.za/pdf/Lam5_2.pdf.

¹³ See “Interview – Free Trade Can Help Guard the Environment – WTO”, Planet Ark (2/6/07) at: <http://www.planetark.com/dailynewsstory.cfm/newsid/40201/story.htm>.

¹⁴ *Ibid.*

¹⁵ “The Gaia hypothesis is an ecological theory that proposes that the living matter of planet Earth functions like a single organism...[T]he Gaia theory is more commonly referred to as earth system science, and is a class of scientific models of the geo-biosphere in which life as a whole fosters and maintains suitable conditions for itself by helping to create an environment on Earth suitable for its continuity...[According to one advocate of this theory,] life on Earth provides a cybernetic, homeostatic feedback system [i.e., life maintains the stability of the natural environment, and that this stability enables life to continue to exist] operated automatically and unconsciously by the biota, leading to broad stabilization of global temperature and chemical composition. [However, there is disagreement among Gaia advocates about whether Earth is or is not a living organism. According to another advocate]...only homeorhetic and not homeostatic balances are involved: that is, the composition of Earth's atmosphere, hydrosphere, and lithosphere are regulated around ‘set points’ as in homeostatis, but those set points change with time. Also...there is no special tendency of biospheres to preserve their current inhabitants, and certainly not to make them comfortable. Accordingly, the Earth is not a living organism which can live or die all at once, but rather a kind of community of trust which can exist at many discrete levels of integration. But this is true of all multicellular organisms; not all cells in the body die instantaneously...[Rather it is]...an emergent property of interaction among organisms[, a]...series of interacting ecosystems that compose a single huge ecosystem at the Earth's surface.” See “Gaia Hypothesis” Wikipedia at: http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Gaia_hypothesis.

¹⁶ See Speech by Pascal Lamy, “Globalisation and the Environment in a Reformed UN”, *supra*.

¹⁷ *Ibid.*

¹⁸ *Ibid.*

¹⁹ See “Only Thing We Have to Fear Is Fear Itself”: FDR’s First Inaugural Address”, History Matters – The U.S. Survey Course on the Web” at: <http://historymatters.gmu.edu/d/5057>.

²⁰ See Robert Higgs, “The Political Economy of Fear”, Ludwig von Mises Institute (5/16/05) at: http://www.mises.org/story/1819#_ftnref1.

²¹ Robert Higgs, *supra*.

²² See Andy Peter Field and Robin Banerjee, “The Role of Information in the Development of Fear Beliefs: End of Award Report”, Economic and Social Research Council (ESRC) (July 2005) at: <http://www.statisticshell.com/research/childfear.htm>.

²³ Robert Higgs, *supra*.

²⁴ See Jonah Goldberg, “Conveniently Missing the Truth”, National Review Online (4/21/06) at: <http://www.nationalreview.com/goldberg/goldberg200604210711.asp>.

²⁵ Jonah Goldberg, *supra*.

²⁶ See “Fear, Not Radiation, the Sad Legacy of Chernobyl”, United Nations Development Program, Europe and the Commonwealth of Independent States (Sept. 2005) at: http://europeandcis.undp.org/?menu=p_cms/show&content_id=A4CC9963-F203-1EE9-B777058EE3F5D77D, citing the Chernobyl Forum report, “Chernobyl’s Legacy: Health, Environmental and Socio-Economic Impacts,”

²⁷ *Ibid.* Indeed, “The experts concluded that the majority of people who had been living in the contaminated area received only low doses of radiation. There is no evidence of decreased fertility, or of an increase in birth defects. There have been 4,000 cases of thyroid cancer caused by the blast, mainly in children, but except for nine fatalities, all of them have recovered. Moreover, the accident has been far less damaging to the environment than originally feared. Except for the still closed, highly contaminated 30-kilometre area surrounding the reactor, and a few lakes and restricted forests, radiation levels have mostly returned to acceptable levels. While the report makes clear that Chernobyl was a ‘very serious accident with major health consequences,’ it also found that ‘the mental health impact of Chernobyl is the largest public health problem unleashed by the accident to date’. Misinformation has led many Chernobyl survivors to believe that they are doomed to die from the radiation. Ironically such fatalism has caused many to disregard their health, exacerbating existing problems such as poor diet, excessive drinking and tobacco use. ‘Fear is not allowing [these people] to get on with their lives,’ said Burton Bennett, chairman of the



ITSSD

INSTITUTE FOR TRADE, STANDARDS,
AND SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT

Chernobyl Forum and an authority on radiation effects. The real problem of the Chernobyl area, as for much of the former Soviet Union, is poverty, said Mr. Mizsei, but misperceptions have helped to keep moneys from being used effectively for development.” *Ibid.*

²⁸ See Michael Crichton, “Fear, Complexity, & Environmental Management in the 21st Century”, Washington Center for Complexity and Public Policy (11/6/05) at: <http://www.michaelcrichton.com/speeches/complexity/complexity.html> .

²⁹ See “Final Report on Setting the Scientific Frame for the Inclusion of New Quality of Life Concerns in the Risk Assessment Process”, adopted April 10-11, 2003, European Commission, Health & Consumer Protection Directorate-General, at: http://ec.europa.eu/food/fs/sc/ssc/out362_en.pdf .

³⁰ See Lawrence A. Kogan, “Exporting Europe's Protectionism”, *National Interest* No. 77 (Fall 2004), pp. 91-99 at 93-94, at: <http://www.itssd.org/Publications/Kogan%20TNI%2077FINAL.pdf> .

³¹ Lawrence A. Kogan, “Exporting Europe's Protectionism” at 94.

³² *Ibid.*, at 94.

³³ “Final Report on Setting the Scientific Frame for the Inclusion of New Quality of Life Concerns in the Risk Assessment Process”, at pp. 3-4, *supra*.

³⁴ *Ibid.*, at pp. 3, 22-23, 30, 33.

³⁵ Mr. Topfer’s address followed a “ceremony organized by the Protestant Churches of Germany...The WCC Program based in Geneva, Switzerland, parallels the prophetic ‘one-world religion’ with its three-pronged agenda: justice, peace and creation.” See Cathie Adams, “Eagle Forum Alert United Nations Conference in Bonn, Germany: Reports IV, and V”, Texas Eagle Forum at Report IV, at: <http://www.texaseagle.org/alert/1999/bonn2.html> .

³⁶ See Klaus Topfer, United Nations Under-Secretary General and Executive Director, UN Environment Program, in an address to the World Council of Churches (10/31/99) in Bonn, Germany, cited in *Earth and Faith: A Book of Reflection for Action*, Libby Bassett Ed., John T. Brinkman and Kusumita P. Pederson Co-Eds., Interfaith Partnership for the Environment, United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP ©2000).

³⁷ See Cathie Adams, “Eagle Forum Alert United Nations Conference in Bonn, Germany: Reports IV, and V”, *supra*.

³⁸ *Ibid.*