

## SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT A CRITIQUE

### Why the fraud of sustainable development will cause the collapse of civilization

To summarize this essay, “sustainable development” (SD) will cause the collapse of civilization and the elimination of the human species from the face of the earth because it does not and cannot exist and is used to avoid advising humanity that both economic and population growth must cease sometime in the very near future. SD implies that economic growth can forever continue into the future and that humanity will not be required to change every aspect of society in order to survive. Now to prove that summary.

The most common and most used definition of SD was stated in the report of the United Nations Commission on Environment and Development commonly known as the Brundtland Commission after its chairwomen, Gro Harlem Brundtland.

“Sustainable Development is development that meets the needs of the present without compromising the ability of future generations to meet their own needs” Brundtland 1987

However, without changing that definition, the UN World Summit on Sustainable Development in Johannesburg 2002 modified the concept of SD to include social inclusion, environmental sustainability, economic and social development, and environmental protection. That modification did not clarify anything and only made the definition more difficult to understand and interpret in the real world. Next the UN expanded the concept of SD in the final outcome document for the Rio + 20 Summit (The Future We Want) by stating the aim of SD as:

“We also reaffirm the need to achieve sustainable development by: promoting sustained, inclusive and equitable economic growth, creating greater opportunities for all, reducing inequalities, raising basic standards of living; fostering equitable social development and inclusion; and promoting integrated and sustainable management of natural resources and ecosystems that supports inter alia economic, social and human development while facilitating ecosystem conservation, regeneration and restoration and resilience in the face of new and emerging challenges.” (UN General Assembly 2012, para 4)

The Sustainable Development Goals (SDG) called for in the same outcome document, are to be based on the three part framework. Here is how the SDGs were announced in “The Future We Want”

[The SDGs] should address and incorporate in a balanced way all three dimensions of sustainable development and their inter-linkages... . We also underscore that SDGS should be action-oriented, concise and easy to communicate, limited in number, aspirational, global in nature and universally applicable to all countries, while taking into account different national realities, capacities and levels of development and respecting national policies and priorities... Governments should drive implementation [of the SDGs] with the active involvement of all relevant stakeholders, as appropriate.” (UN General Assembly 2012, paras 246-7)

After reading the two paragraphs quoted above, I can state with absolute certainty that no one on the face of the earth can give an intelligent definition of “Sustainable Development”. The UN, by setting forth the two paragraphs quoted above, has made SD an overall program to change every aspect of society of many nations of the world. It is clear, in my opinion, that these two paragraphs were set forth by the UN to satisfy the demands Third World countries that something be done to

permit them to attempt to catch up with the advanced nations of the world. The two paragraphs quoted above, add nothing to the definition of SD, except confusion.

Now let us examine the Brundtland definition of SD. The Brundtland definition does not state or even indicate the amount of time that development is to be sustained. The Brundtland definition did not state, for example, that development could be sustained for 10, 20, or any other number of years. Therefore, a logical reading of the Brundtland definition means that development shall continue forever into the future. If the Brundtland definition did not intend sustainability to mean forever into the future, it should have made the time period very clear by setting forth a time limit as to the “sustainability. The Brundtland definition used the word “development” without further defining it. “Development” as used in the term SD means, in my opinion, growth or expansion. In my view, the term SD means the continuous growth or expansion of something that can be seen, touched, or felt which would benefit humanity either economically, socially, medically or in some other manner.

Webster’s New World Dictionary and Thesaurus, Second Edition, defines “develop” as “to make fuller, bigger, better, etc.” Webster’s New World, College Dictionary, Fourth Edition, 2006, defines “development” as “a step or stage in growth, advancement, etc.” That dictionary has many definitions of the word “develop”. However, the most applicable definitions of the word “develop” are “to build up or expand (a business, industry, etc.)” ; “to bring(something latent or hypothetical) into activity or reality”; “to make (housing, highways, etc.) more available or extensive”; and “to become larger, fuller, better, etc., grow or evolve, esp. by natural processes”. Webster’s Universal Encyclopedic Dictionary, 2002, has many definitions of the word “develop”. However, the most applicable definition is “to make available or usable (develop natural resources)”.

Based on the dictionary definitions of the words “develop” and “development” and based on the failure of the Brundtland definition to limit sustainability to a certain period time. the term SD means economic growth forever into the future. I cannot think of a realistic situation such that economic growth can continue without the use of something physical. Professor Jeffrey Sachs in his book “The Age Of Sustainable Development” did not set forth an example of economic growth or any growth without the use of something physical. Since most of the resources the earth provides to humanity are finite and limited and since almost every theoretically renewable resource presently being used by humanity is being used at a rate greater than nature can replace it, those theoretically renewable resources are actually finite and limited. The phrase SD is an oxymoron, as economic growth cannot forever continue into the future. And for all practical purposes, economic growth cannot continue even for a short period of time into the future due to the power of compound growth.

This essay plus three other things ( two essays entitled “The Sustainable Development Fallacy” and The Paris Agreement of 2015 Relating to Climate Change/Global Warming—An Alternative Analysis” plus a packet of exhibits written by Albert Bartlett and other) being sent to you form the basis for the conclusions I will set forth below. There is overlap among the essays as they were written at different times for different purposes and readers. It would be beneficial for you to read everything being sent to you before reading the conclusions on the next page.

In order to evaluate the conclusions set forth below two concepts must be considered-- -- risk analysis and burden of proof. Risk analysis requires the evaluation of two ideas-- -- the chance that an event will occur in the future and the harm caused by the event, if it were to occur. For example—if the probability of an event occurring in the future was 99.9% and if the event were to occur one million people were to die, that event would be very horrible for the million who died, but would be irrelevant for the future of humanity. A second example-- --if the probability of an event

occurring in the future was only 5%, but if the event occurred 11 billion of the predicted 11.213 billion in 2100 were to die horrible deaths and cause the destruction of civilization never to rise again, that event would be very relevant for humanity.

Therefore, even though the chance of the event occurring was only 5%, humanity, if it had any intelligence, must do all in its power to reduce the probability of the event occurring to zero percent and/or dramatically and substantially reduce the harm the event would cause

## CONCLUSIONS

Now is the time for the political, social, religious, ethical, intellectual and academic leaders of humanity, at all levels, to stop being hypocrites, stop deluding themselves, stop deluding all of humankind, stop deluding foundations to obtain money, stop deluding governments, and stop convincing themselves and every human being on the planet that humanity is properly attempting to solve even one single major problem facing humanity today. The concepts of “sustainable growth” and “sustainable development” do not describe reality and are misleading all of humanity to believe that economic and/or population growth can continue and, in addition, to believe that every aspect of society will not need to be changed and/or be substantially modified in order for humanity to survive on this planet for even a very short period of time.

One extremely important fact—the UN’s demographers, among the best in the world, predicted/projected/estimated-medium variant- that the human population will exceed 11.213 billion in the year 2100 and still be growing. While no one and no group is able to guarantee the future, that prediction is the one that humanity must use to determine what action humankind must take to avoid the elimination of the human species from the face of the earth. That number includes every fact necessary to make an accurate prediction—the fact that a number of nations have fertility rates below replacement, that additional nations may have fertility rates below replacement by the year 2100, and future of fertility rates for all the nations of the world. The number 11.213 billion represents an increase of greater than 3.9 billion in just 84 years or an increase of substantially greater than 50% in just 84 years. You can debate the accuracy of the prediction, but you cannot debate the fact that it was made by a group of demographers who are among the best in the world, if not the very best on the planet.

However to the best of my knowledge, all other demographers are in total or almost total agreement with the UN’s predictions. There is one exception-- -Hans Rosling gave a TED talk that predicted a much lower population for the year 2100. Rosling may be correct or incorrect, but humanity cannot afford to gamble that he is correct in view of the UN’s numbers set forth above and the general agreement of other demographers.

A second extremely important fact-- -the average human life span. Babies born today and within the next few years in the industrialized nations of the world have a very good chance of being alive in the year 2100 and with improvements in the delivery of clean water, the elimination of disease, and other actions presently being taken in the third world could substantially increase the chance of babies born today in the third world being alive in the year 2100. Therefore, if action is needed to save humanity from destruction before or shortly after the year 2100 due to the exploding population, action must be taken today or within the next very few years. Action cannot wait; decisions must be made today; action cannot wait until tomorrow!

Now let us apply the predicted increase in population and the total number of people predicted to be alive in 2100 to the problems faced by humanity today:

1. The Israeli/Palestinian Problem-- -the combined INCREASE in the population of both sides in the conflict is predicted to be 19 million. That increase added to the current population levels together with the lack of resources of all types in the location in which the parties reside almost guarantees war between them before 2100.

2. India/Pakistan-- -Similarly the combined INCREASE of 525 million by the year 2100 almost guarantees war between those two countries.

3. African Continent increase of over 3 billion almost mandates a migration out of Africa of an exceedingly large number of Africans into Europe and the Near East causing a massive, social and violent upheaval.

4. Population gains in Islamic countries with no effective or limitedly effective governments. Afghanistan will gain more than 25 million, Algeria more than 21 million, Iraq more than 127 million, Egypt more than 109 million, Pakistan more than 175 million, Saudi Arabia more than 16 million, Palestine more than 10 million and Yemen almost 24 million. Changing the numbers into percentages—Afghanistan more than 77%, Algeria almost 54%, Iraq over 350%, Kuwait almost 67%, Kyrgstan more than 52%, Egypt over 119%, Pakistan almost 93%, Saudi Arabia almost 51%, Palestine over 232%, Sudan over 216%, Syrian Arab Republic almost 106%, Tajikistan almost 119% and Yeman over 89%. These numbers almost guarantee a clash of civilizations between Islam and the West resulting in the deaths of billions.

5. An increase of almost 4 billion will not permit the elimination of poverty by the year 2100 and a very strong argument can be made that increase will not permit the reduction of the percentage of humanity living in extreme poverty by the year 2100.