

Sustainable Development: Expanded Environmental Destruction

By David Orton

Introduction

In Halifax, Nova Scotia, a conference was held on 15-17 October 1989, based on the concept of "sustainable development". The conference was organized by the Nova Scotia Department of the Environment and was called "*Building Partnerships for Environmentally Sound Development in Nova Scotia*". One of the conference objectives was "*to initiate the process of drafting a sustainable development strategy in Nova Scotia*". The conference featured various corporate and government speakers, a U.N. spokesperson, "environmental consultant" Susan Holtz, long associated with the Ecology Action Centre, and Ray Côté of the Dalhousie School for Resource and Environmental Studies and chairman of the Pest Control Products Advisory Committee, set up by the Nova Scotia government to legitimize pesticide use in the province. All of the keynote address speakers – Noel Brown of the U.N., Ray Côté, Roy Aitken of INCO, and Susan Holtz – were supporters of sustainable development.

A number of environmentalists in Nova Scotia took part in the Halifax conference. The Ecology Action Centre publicly defended its participation on the radio and in the newspapers. Cristina Pekarik, co-executive director of the Ecology Action Centre, was reported as saying, "*The conference is needed to build links between the environmental movement and business.*" (Halifax **Daily News**, 14 October 1989). Notwithstanding this endorsement, some environmentalists opposed taking part, and the Green Web issued a press release asking Nova Scotians and environmentalists to repudiate the conference and the concept of sustainable development.

Even prior to the Halifax conference, sustainable development had been supported by some environmental groups in Nova Scotia. Thus a statement dated 15 November 1988, dealing with Stora Forest Industries, endorsed by the Coalition for Alternatives to Pesticides, Ecology Action Centre Forestry Committee, Northeast Margaree Environmental Association, and the New Waterford Fish and Game Association noted:

Such activities indicate that environmentally sustainable development is being ignored. Sustainable development, a principle endorsed by the Canadian government, stresses that we must integrate environmental considerations into economic activity if we are to leave a healthy legacy to future generations. It is time for these goals to be integrated into policy and decision-making.

In New Brunswick, the Conservation Council, the province's equivalent of the Ecology Action Centre, organized a joint workshop in Fredericton, 23-24 April 1988, with the provincial Federation of Labour. Funding was from Environment Canada and "support" from business groups like Brunswick Mining and Smelter Corporation, McCain Foods, and Miramichi Pulp and Paper, was publicly acknowledged. A June 1988 publication, **Jobs and Environment**, reporting on the workshop, presented the general theme that we are all in the same boat and stated that "*a joint press release supporting sustainable development and opposing 'job blackmail'*" was issued. New Brunswick cabinet ministers were in attendance at the jointly sponsored workshop.

The Ecology Action Centre and the Conservation Council have provincial equivalent organizations across the country. On a national level, equivalent groups would be Friends of the Earth and Pollution Probe. These organizations, with their paid staff, can be said to represent that tendency within the environmental movement which solicits government and corporate handouts and which explicitly advocates working with, not against, the provincial and federal governments. As shown very clearly in Nova Scotia, such groups are the environmental organizations which the media consult for an instant "environmental" voice on any issue. It apparently does not matter that these groups often have little or no practical involvement with the issues at the grass roots, issues on which they so willingly speak out with voices of authority and moderation on behalf of the whole environmental movement.

Sustainable Development Defined

The term "sustainable development" has been popularized through the publication in 1987 of the 400-page United Nations document **Our Common Future** by the World Commission on Environment and Development, popularly referred to as the **Brundtland Report** after its chairperson. However, the term is part of the subtitle of an earlier influential document, the 1980 **World Conservation Strategy: Living Resource Conservation for Sustainable Development**, prepared by the International Union for Conservation of Nature and Natural Resources, with the assistance of the World Wildlife Fund and several U.N. organizations.

The U.N. publication **Our Common Future** defines sustainable development as follows:

Sustainable development is development that meets the needs of the present without compromising the ability of future generations to meet their own needs. (Page 43)

The lack of concreteness in such a definition and the juxtaposition of such apparently contrasting terms as "sustainable" and "development" have meant that there are many different interpretations of sustainable development. However, the **Brundtland Report** provides plenty of evidence for what the Commissioners had in mind.

More Economic Growth

The Report emphasizes that economic growth is needed and advocates a five- to tenfold increase, worldwide, in manufacturing output:

The world manufactures seven times more goods today than it did as recently as 1950. Given population growth rates, a five to tenfold increase in manufacturing output will be needed just to raise developing-world consumption of manufactured goods to industrialized-world levels by the time population growth rates level off next century. (Page 15)

In case anyone doesn't get the message, we are told:

The Commission's overall assessment is that the international economy must speed up world growth while respecting environmental constraints. (Page 89)

Yet, much of our existing economic activity is already destroying the natural world around us, as global warming, species extinction, ozone destruction, worldwide toxic contamination, rising sea levels, acid rain, etc. demonstrate, for those who want to see.

To have a truly sustainable economy, much of the economic activity in the polluting "developed" world has to be reduced, not further expanded. The Green Web, therefore, characterized sustainable development as **ecopornography** at the time of the Halifax conference. That is, prostituting the Earth for economic growth, regardless of environmental costs, despite claims to the contrary.

Ecology Is Not Primary

In the **Brundtland Report**, ecology or ecological sustainability is not primary, but merely one among a number of factors to be considered:

The ability to choose policy paths that are sustainable requires that the ecological dimensions of policy be considered at the same time as the economic, trade, energy, agricultural, industrial, and other dimensions -- on the same agendas and in the same national and international institutions. That is the chief institutional challenge of the 1990s. (Page 313)

Human-centered Orientation

This is made clear in the Foreword by Brundtland herself:

But first and foremost our message is directed towards people, whose

well-being is the ultimate goal of all environment and development policies. (Page xiv)

Other species of animals and plants do not have intrinsic value in their own right, but are considered "resources" for human use. The **Brundtland Report** has a resourcist view of the world. "Resources", from this perspective, do not have value until they are made into products useful for humans.

Conservation of living natural resources -- plants, animals, and micro-organisms, and the non-living elements of the environment on which they depend -- is crucial for development. (Page 147)

The **Brundtland Report** accepts the elimination of some species and advocates that conscious choices be made by humans to this end:

Explicit efforts to save particular species will be possible for only relatively few of the more spectacular or important ones. Agonizing as it will be to make such choices, planners need to make conservation strategies as systematically selective as possible. (Page 164)

Is this ecological sustainability?

Population Growth Accepted/Projected

This U.N. Report projects a world population of 8.2 billion persons by the year 2025 (see page 101). Yet if humans share the planet on a basis of equality with other forms of life, then as human numbers expand, other life forms and their habitats are destroyed. An ecologically sustainable planet for nonhuman life forms (and for humans!) requires a vast decrease in human populations. This is particularly true in the polluting developed world, with its nonsustainable lifestyle. As this Report itself points out, about 90% of the hazardous wastes generated in the world come from the industrialized countries (see page 226). Yet the **Brundtland Report** seems to accept the ecologically destructive lifestyle of the developed world as something to be strived for by the rest of the world.

No Transfer of Productive Wealth

There is much to learn from the **Brundtland Report** concerning the deterioration of the world environment. Also, the Report gives the data to show how the underdeveloped world, with a few significant exceptions, is becoming poorer in comparison to the developed world and that countries which are poor, have massive debt repayments, little productive land available, rapidly increasing populations, etc. put environmental concerns on the back burner. But, apart from moral exhortations, there is nothing offered about the **necessity** to transfer much of the existing productive wealth from the "developed" to the underdeveloped world. The Green Web in its press release on sustainable development called for a massive global transfer of wealth and for the "cancellation of third-world debts". Also, it is obvious that within countries there is a class structure which concentrates the existing wealth in a relatively few hands. So environmental

protection also means an internal redistribution of productive wealth. People are not going to starve to death to preserve the planet. We live in a global ecological commons, and the solutions to the rapidly developing disaster we all face have to be global in nature. This, in addition to addressing more "site specific" pollution problems, which fall within existing national jurisdictions.

Greater Use of Chemical Fertilizers/Pesticides Advocated

The conventional thinking of the Commissioners is nowhere better shown than in their comments on this topic. The environmental damage from the use of fertilizers is acknowledged (page 126) and the thousands of people who die and are injured from pesticide poisoning are recognized (page 126). Yet, it seems, being committed to economic growth means learning to live with the dangers:

The use of agricultural chemicals is not in itself harmful. (Page 126)

Many countries can and should increase yields by greater use of chemical fertilizers and pesticides, particularly in the developing world. (Page 135)

Canadian Support for Sustainable Development

Given the actual definition of sustainable development, with its various features as outlined in this Green Web Bulletin, why has it been so widely endorsed? This section of the paper addresses this interesting question.

Federal and Provincial Governments

It was Canada which originally proposed the idea of the U.N. creating a World Commission on Environment and Development. The Commission, which was formed in 1983, was strongly supported in its work by Canada.

In a U.N. speech after the publication of **Our Common Future**, Tom McMillan, then Canada's environment minister, gave an enthusiastic endorsement, noting how in Canada a "**National Task Force on Environment and Economy**" was formed in anticipation of the **Brundtland Report**. McMillan noted:

The Government of Canada believes that environmentally sound policies are not a brake on the economy; they are an integral part of the engine of growth. (Address by McMillan to the U.N., 19 October 1987.)

Lucien Bouchard, the current federal minister of the environment, endorsed sustainable development in an October 1989 speech to the U.N. He commented that "sustainable growth" is possible and pointed out:

The sustainable development prescription has now been endorsed as a guiding concept by this Assembly and the U.N. system, by

the G-7 Economic Summit nations, the Commonwealth, the Francophone Summit and many others. Individual governments all levels in Canada and elsewhere have adopted it as a fundamental objective. (Bouchard to the U.N., 23 October 1989.)

Bouchard in his speech also noted the creation by the federal government of a "Winnipeg Centre for the Promotion of Sustainable Development".

Various provincial governments in their respective provinces have established "task forces" or "round tables" to promote sustainable development. Nova Scotia has a "Round Table on the Environment and the Economy", of which Susan Holtz is a member. An environmental award has now been established by the provincial government *"for projects supporting sustainable development, judged by the Nova Scotia Round Table on Environment and Economy"*.

Business

The **Report on Business** magazine, published by the **Globe and Mail** (July 1989), spoke of the "remarkable success" of the concept of sustainable development. The enthusiasm of business is, in part,

Because they have finally discovered a form of environmentalism they can live with. It is known as sustainable development. (Page 44)

The business magazine quotes, with approval, Colin Isaacs, then with Pollution Probe:

Brundtland says you can have all the growth you want as long as it doesn't destroy the biosphere. (Page 44)

Roy Aitken of INCO – one of the keynote speakers at the Halifax conference – is quoted in the same article "The Greening of the Boardroom" as saying:

I give a great deal of credit to Brundtland for creating an intellectual climate in which industry could move ... (Page 44)

Aitken, the spokesperson for the biggest sulfur dioxide polluter in Canada, went on to make the arrogant claim in a CBC national radio program (**Sunday Morning**, 29 October 1989) that only industry can solve the problems of environmental pollution!

After the Halifax conference on sustainable development, a story in the New Glasgow **Evening News** (18 October 1989) spoke of the "unabashed enthusiasm" for the concept of sustainable development by the largest pulp and paper mill in the province:

Stora president Tom Hall, whose company was one of the conference sponsors, emphasized that the concept has already had an impact on his pulp and paper company. Stora has a worldwide policy that calls for company operations to be carried out "in such a way that we do not damage or endanger the environment for the world of the future and the new generation

whose home it will be."

In Nova Scotia, Stora Forest Industries (Swedish-owned) has been under continual attack by environmentalists working on forestry/pesticide issues for its ecologically destructive pulpwood forestry policy and pulp and paper mill emissions. Stora has been unique, so far, among pulp mills in the province for threatening its critics on several occasions with legal suits. These threats seem to many to be an attempt to silence the criticism through the use of legal intimidation.

Labour

The Canadian Labour Congress Environment Committee has produced a 25-page document called **The Basis for a National Environmental Policy** (April 89) in which sustainable development is supported:

National environmental policy should, as far as feasible, be compatible with controlled economic growth, sustainable development, the creation of wealth, and full employment.
(Page 1)

The growth orientation of the basically human-centered policy contradicts the number of progressive measures, e.g. zero emission of pollutants and rejection of risk-benefit analysis, which are advocated. The policy supports pesticide use (page 13) and rallies behind the chemical industry:

A flourishing Canadian chemical industry and the employment it generates can be compatible with effective environmental protection. Most chemicals can be produced and used without harm to health or the environment. Even some of the smaller number of chemicals which may be harmful in some circumstances can be handled safely. (Page 16)

Significantly, the CLC policy makes it apparent that there is to be no transfer of productive wealth from Canada to the industrially underdeveloped countries:

What is quite clear is that "sustainable development", in the sense that broad Canadian levels of development are spread throughout the world, is impossible. (Page 14)

It is clear that the CLC sees itself working with the social democratic New Democratic Party of Canada (page 5).

It might be noted here that Ed Broadbent, former national leader of the NDP, pledged party support for sustainable development and the Brundtland Report at a farewell speech in Winnipeg on 30 November 1989. Broadbent said this support illustrated his party's commitment to the importance of the environment. He spoke glowingly of the social democratic affiliation of Ms. Gro Brundtland, the Norwegian chairperson of the Commission. Broadbent of course did not allude to the notorious practices of Norway, which has been a major player in the killing of whales and harp and hooded seals by considering them merely as "resources" for human use.

An important union in Nova Scotia is the Steel Workers Union. A **Policy Paper on the Environment** from the United Steelworkers of America (April 1989) supported the **Brundtland Report** and the concept of sustainable development. The policy paper states that the U.N. Report: *Opens the door to working people to play a role in the environmental revolution by debunking the often-posed dilemma of the conflict between growth or development or jobs on one hand and environmental quality on the other. It changes the focus of the debate by introducing the idea of sustainable growth.* (Page 1)

The paper goes on to say:

The International Metalworkers Federation, of which our union in Canada is a member, has also identified metalworkers clearly with the fight for sustainable growth. (Page 2)

We have earlier noted in this Bulletin the support for sustainable development expressed by the New Brunswick Federation of Labour in collaboration with the Conservation Council of New Brunswick.

The Green Web, like many others in the environmental and green movements, believes that it is necessary to try to work closely with workers and link common concerns, e.g. occupational health issues at work places and environmental degradation from polluting plant emissions. But we must not deny the real conflicts of interest. Workers, because of where they often live – in proximity to polluting industries – are normally the first to feel the effects of pollution. Thus workers often suffer a double exposure to toxic contaminants, at work and in their community. Yet basically their unions have become integrated into the capitalist social order. Also, the social base of the environmental and embryonic green movements in Canada are not "proletarian", and many of the environmental and green issues are not traditional working class issues. In West Germany, Die Grünen (the federal green party) collectively define themselves as a left party and their policies are far more radical than those of the social democrats. However, the social base of the West German social democrats is the traditional working class.

As well as the obvious commitment to economic growth shown above, our experience is that unions are often reactionary on environmental and wildlife issues, where the issue is seen as affecting in some way the economic interests of union members. The positions of immediately involved unions on asbestos, the cutting of old growth forests on the West Coast, and here in Nova Scotia on forest management/pesticides/pulp and paper mill emissions, the killing of seals, "defence", etc. are obvious examples. The union voice is essentially the same as that of the employers and the government.

The Green Web has come to see that a crucial gauge of the level of "green" consciousness is whether or not groups or individuals would oppose their own economic interests for environmental concerns. We believe that there are vast changes needed for everyone to live in an ecologically nondestructive manner. Replacement jobs cannot be guaranteed to anyone before

shutting down operations that are ecologically destructive. But serious attention has to be paid to green economics and how livelihoods will be obtained in a green, ecologically sustainable economy.

Environmentalists and Greens

We have already indicated the support extended to sustainable development by some environmental groups in Nova Scotia and New Brunswick. Similar support was also manifested by some Newfoundland environmentalists at a "Symposium on the Environment" held in Corner Brook, 9-11 July 1989. A Newfoundland and Labrador "Conservation Strategy Committee" has been established to set forth a "blueprint" for sustainable development. And support for sustainable development has generally extended right across the country. This well reflects the confusion on theoretical matters in the movement.

Jim Bohlen, who was one of the co-founders of Greenpeace and played an instrumental role in founding the British Columbia Green Party and the federal Green Party, wrote a flattering review of **Our Common Future** in the Fall 1987 issue of **The New Catalyst**, a British Columbia green movement publication:

Our Common Future should be in every Green activist's library if not on the bedside table. It is a guidebook for planetary survival that rationalizes Green politics.

Another early review that was very positive and noncritical of the **Brundtland Report** was by Rafal Serafin, in the Canadian academic environmental journal **Alternatives**. (See Dec/Jan 1987/88, Vol. 15 No. 1.)

But as time has passed, we have seen a number of critical assessments of the **Brundtland Report** in Canadian journals like **The New Catalyst**, **The Trumpeter**, **Canadian Dimension**, and **Alternatives**. However, we have not yet seen any critical evaluation of **Our Common Future** in **Green Party News**, the publication of the British Columbia Green Party.

Despite a growing critique of sustainable development, we have seen that some environmentalists and greens do not seem to hesitate to give their support. A recent example outside of the Maritimes is that of Nick Ternette. Ternette, who has presented himself as a green socialist in various publications, recently ran as a green candidate for mayor of Winnipeg under the banner of "**Alternative ... The Greens**". His literature expressed support for sustainable development:

Development expressing an ecological vision of life in the future guided by principles and technologies of sustainable development.

Why Some Environmentalists and Greens Support Sustainable Development

These are some of the reasons it seems to us why sustainable development has enjoyed some support from environmentalists and greens:

- A genuine belief that the **Brundtland Report** is a big step forward for the environmental/green

movements. This amounts to a selective reading, where the data on environmental degradation and poverty is emphasized, and the growth economics and "resource" orientation of the Report is ignored or downplayed. This point of view says that given the **Brundtland Report's** endorsement of sustainable development, activists can now point out some particular environmental atrocity and say, "This is not sustainable development". However, environmentalists are thereby accepting a "development" framework for discussion. Most importantly, for people with *power*, such as corporations and governments, it is not a matter of intellectual persuasion. Corporations and governments will very seldom be persuaded or publicly admit that what they are doing or sanctioning are not examples of sustainable development.

- A belief that taking part in a "forum" with business and government (and perhaps labour) at least gives an opportunity to have an environmental view publicly expressed. People with such a position have told us that taking part in such forums doesn't allow the other side to have its own way completely.

- A belief in the *necessity* to work together with governments and business, that "this is the only realistic way." The implicit (sometimes explicit) belief here is that capitalism can be made ecologically responsible. We believe that environmental organizations which have actively solicited government and corporate funds throughout their existence and worked with various government departments on "reforms" of this bit of legislation/regulation or that (e.g. pesticide regulations in Nova Scotia) find it quite natural to get on board with business and government to promote sustainable development. Thus a fundraising letter of November 1989 by Lois Corbett and Cristina Pekarik of the Ecology Action Centre to members and supporters notes that this organization is "*representing concerned citizens on the federal and Nova Scotia Round Tables on the Environment and Economy*".

Appeal to Environmentalists and Greens

We should not support sustainable development. This concept provides the ideological cover or legitimization for greatly expanded economic growth; hence expanded or accelerated environmental destruction. As has been said, sustainable development is all about sustaining development. Environmentalists and greens should understand this and not remain indifferent and on the sidelines in the public debate now underway. It is an important debate which concerns the future of the planet.

At the same time we appeal to environmentalists, greens, and the concerned public not to join with industry, governments, and labour unions in promoting sustainable development. The experience of activists who have worked over the years on a number of environmental issues in Nova Scotia should demonstrate that economic development is paramount, and that concern by the government or industry for the environment and for public participation is a smoke-screen. Sometimes, through a major public mobilization, some spraying permit might be cancelled or an aquaculture lease terminated, but these are the exceptions.

Sustainable development will not change the policy of approving most applications to exploit the "resources" of Nova Scotia. Why should the Nova Scotia Department of the Environment, the leading approval agency in all this and the organizer of the Halifax conference on sustainable development, have suddenly changed its spots?

An influential book which appeared in 1972, **The Limits to Growth**, from "The Club of Rome", makes the **Brundtland Report** seem a giant step backwards. This earlier publication, while still human-centered, put forward the position that in a finite world there must be limits to growth; that we should stop equating growth with "progress"; and that we should look to a world model of a nongrowing state of global equilibrium, where population and capital are essentially stable. Thus **The Limits to Growth**, unlike **Our Common Future**, advocates a nongrowth economy. For the **Brundtland Report**, there are no limits to economic growth and growth is equated with progress.

A New Vision of Sustainability

We ask environmentalists and greens to face up to the necessity of putting forth an alternative ecological vision to that offered by sustainable development. This vision has to offer a way forward which responds to the public's deepening concern about the growing destruction of the Earth and the need for decisive action. It means having a tool for organizing against the provincial and federal promotion of sustainable development.

The old ways of gearing up each year for the endless piecemeal battles over particular environmental issues are no longer sufficient. In the forestry sector, for example, the environmental war is being lost. While there is a growth in public awareness, each year there is more clear-cutting, more destruction of hardwoods, more spraying, more destruction of wildlife habitats, more demand for pulp fibre. The Nova Scotia government proudly boasts of its "sustainable" forestry, as shown by the 4 million softwood seedlings planted by the province in 1978, 30 million in 1988, and a projected 60 million in 1998.

This pulpwood forestry program also has an "educational" side, one particularly directed at the young. Hence the various forest industry promoted school programs like "Project Learning Tree" for teachers and students from primary through grade 12 and recently the opening of what is officially called a "dual-purpose forest nursery and education centre" in the Musquodoboit Valley in September 1989.

Reactionary newspapers like **The Chronicle Herald** suddenly have "green" columnists dispensing environmental advice. The Dalhousie School for Resource and Environmental Studies, which essentially trains "resource managers" and which has provided faculty to justify forest herbicide spraying, now also writes an "*Environmentally Speaking*" column for the **Herald**! If environmental activists are to avoid being swallowed alive by the green merchants of business-as-usual, then it is necessary to become more theoretically conscious and to project this new consciousness to the public at large. Each of us has to face the new realities or history will pass us

by.

Toward a New Green Consciousness

The following points are offered by the Green Web as a contribution to a needed theoretical discussion among environmentalists and green-thinking activists. We realize that others will have different ideas, but let us get the discussion underway and break the theoretical monopoly of the advocates of sustainable development:

- *Reject resourcism and advocate and adopt a biocentric or life-centered philosophy:* We have shown in this Bulletin that resourcism is the perspective of the **Brundtland Report**. It is also the dominant perspective in our society shaping how we look at the natural world. A biocentric viewpoint sees the human species as one among billions of other life forms on the planet. Humans have no special privileges or "rights" to dominate or eliminate other life forms. The rights of seals, cormorants, and coyotes are on an equal footing with human interests. The preservation of the ecology is the first consideration, not one among several factors, when deciding for example whether or not to build a coal-fired generating station like the Point Aconi power plant in Cape Breton or expand a pulp and paper mill. Such preservation means placing any local situation in a global context. Biocentrism means a position of zero discharge (total containment) for all industrial pollutants. It means outlawing the strategy of "legal" toxic discharges which, as we have found out, has contaminated our planet.

- *Accept that capitalist industrialism as an economic system is anti-ecological:* This system is based on the growth of capital and necessarily promotes mindless consumerism as a part of this growth. The continual expansion of the individual corporation – for instance Stora or Scott or Bowater in the forestry sector in Nova Scotia – makes individual corporate economic sense. But it makes no sense ecologically or socially, taking the total picture into consideration. The government or the business class will never be convinced, no matter what evidence we muster, that pulpwood forestry is destroying our environment for all living things. The Green Web recognizes that countries presently calling themselves socialist or communist have also destroyed their environments through their own forms of industrialism. However we do not believe that "growth" has to be intrinsic to socialism.

- *Start consciously building a grassroots green political movement in Nova Scotia:* Such a movement will also establish links with greens across Canada and around the world. Through discussions and debates within this green movement we must put forward a theoretical alternative to the nonsustainable practices in forestry, the fishery, agriculture, the energy sector, and so on. We have to start projecting guidelines for an alternative economic model. How do we organize green sustainable economic activity for Nova Scotia, Canada, and the world? The human side of the greens needs to stress such ideas as:

- * grassroots democracy
- * putting collective interests ahead of individual interests
- * decentralization of productive industry
- * local control of economic activity

- * population reduction
- * space and respect for all life forms
- * reducing consumption
- * recycling
- * simpler, ecologically sustainable ways of life

We also need to discuss how to go about cancelling Third World debts; how to transfer productive wealth to people in have-not countries; and how to develop a world consciousness in every individual. All this adds up to the necessity for a new green ethics, a new morality.

Ecological sustainability, not economic growth, has to become the goal of society. We hope for the input from green and environmental activists everywhere in developing a life-centered vision, one which will stand as a clear alternative to sustainable development.

February, 1990

To obtain any of the Green Web publications, write to us at:

Green Web, R.R. #3, Saltsprings, Nova Scotia, Canada, BOK 1PO

E-mail: greenweb@ca.inter.net

Back to

[The Green Web](#)

[Taste of Green Web Writings and Left Biocentrism](#)

http://home.ca.inter.net/~greenweb/GW16_Sustainable_Development.pdf

Last updated: December 31, 2008