

Contrast Between Freedom 21 and Agenda 21 In Attaining Sustainable Development

	Freedom 21	Agenda 21
	<p>Based on the principles of John Locke and individual rights that form the basis of the U.S. Constitution and private property rights. Focuses on self-government where “all men are created equal” and have equal opportunity. Administered by a minimum of government.</p> <p>Power to make decisions rests primarily in the hands of the people thereby encouraging risk-taking. Laws are principally crafted to enforce common law, which are limited to those laws which prohibit individuals from conducting activities that harm another person or their property. Creativity to find new and better ways of doing things is encouraged by minimal regulatory structure.</p> <p>Establishes and protects private property rights, which allows the creation of needed capital for impoverished nations and provides the <i>best</i> proven way to eliminate poverty. It is why genuine capitalism works in Western nations and doesn't within centrally managed ones.</p> <p>Encourages protection of asset value of privately owned property because of pride of ownership and the need to maintain environmental health for continued production or use. Private property rights have generally helped, not harmed the environment in Western nations. It is primarily those environmental features that are owned in common (air, rivers, public lands, etc.) that have been harmed by pollution or misuse.</p> <p>Depends on free enterprise with minimum of regulations to create incentives to maximize efficiencies of production through creativity and entrepreneurship.</p> <p>As citizens are allowed to own the value in property for production and collateral purposes, their previously hidden wealth will provide the basis for future wealth and permits them to prosper.</p> <p>Human population will likely limit itself to a maximum of 9-10 billion people and then will decline to 6-7 billion as increasing wealth in impoverished nations creates an incentive for smaller families.</p> <p>Land use by citizens of any nation necessarily changes biodiversity. Change in biodiversity, however, does not make land use bad. It changes the mix of age classes, species and structural components of biodiversity, but not in a way that necessarily harms ecosystem health. Biodiversity typically benefits from man-caused disturbance utilizing scientifically proven management techniques. Many European nations have intensively managed their biodiversity for centuries without overall detrimental effects.</p>	<p>Based on the principles of Jean Jacques Rousseau and the “general will” (public good) as determined by a nation's governing leaders. All people, in principle share more equally in the wealth. Administered by strong government regulation that ultimately harms people <i>and</i> the environment.</p> <p>Power to make most decisions resides primarily in the hands of government and unelected officials. Corruption and arbitrary and capricious enforcement of ever expanding regulations is a constant problem. Stifles creativity to find new and better ways to do things because production and activities are limited by one-size fits all regulation.</p> <p>Minimizes property rights to only those favored by state regulations to reduce risk of possibly harming the environment. It places nature's perceived needs ahead of man's real needs. By limiting property rights there is little ability to generate the capital needed to reduce or eliminate poverty.</p> <p>Invokes the Law of the Commons where property is held in common by the state through deed or regulation. No one person, family or organization has a vested interest in protecting the property for the benefits it can provide. Unless specific regulation mandates compliance with ever expanding laws to protect the environment, damage to the environment results because there is no incentive to protect it.</p> <p>Depends on government regulated markets to achieve predetermined social and environmental goals based on the precautionary principle.</p> <p>Corporate investments from developed nations may slowly increase the wealth of the nation, but in general those in greatest poverty will <i>not</i> benefit since most corporate profits go to corporate headquarters in the West and the wealthiest class within the nation.</p> <p>Human population will rapidly increase to 10-11 billion people or more because poverty cannot be eliminated. The only means of population control will be by government programs to compel fewer children.</p> <p>Any type of land use except that which follows “natural patterns” is viewed as potentially detrimental to biodiversity and ecosystems. The Convention on Biological Diversity calls for government to withdraw large blocks of land into wilderness reserves, surrounded by buffer zones to protect the wilderness reserves. The UN funded Global Biodiversity Assessment calls for as much as 30 to 50% of the land area to be so protected. This requires huge areas be taken out of production for human use, further reducing the ability for those in poverty to ever improve themselves.</p>
Principles		
People		
Land Use		

	Freedom 21	Agenda 21
Land Use (con't)	<p>Having a multitude of private property owners who have a range of different land use objects creates biodiversity – not perfectly, but usually adequately. Very few species have become extinct due to land use activities by people. The greater the wealth that is generated, the better the land will be managed and protected. Furthermore, protecting land from human use creates monotypes, which decreases biodiversity and increases fire hazards.</p> <p>There is little evidence of catastrophic human-induced global warming. Most alleged warming comes from land-based data contaminated by the urban “heat island” effect and inaccurate climate models. Increasing CO₂ levels have a proven “fertilizer effect” and could increase crop production by up to 50 percent, greatly benefiting food availability to developing nations at no cost to them. The wise course of action is to determine the causes of, and costs and benefits of mitigation vs. adaptation to, global warming before harming the economic base of the world.</p> <p>Except in a few localized areas, safe water is available for human use. There are problems associated with proper water management – and poverty. Both problems are best addressed with proper application of property rights for citizens, free enterprise, minimal bureaucratic red tape and the mitigation of hostilities between peoples and nations.</p>	<p>Heavy government regulation of land use is necessary to protect biodiversity, ecosystems and adequate housing for the poor. The loss of creativity and productivity resulting from such regulations is an acceptable loss. The need to set aside large areas of land into wilderness to protect some aspects of biological diversity is greater than the loss in biodiversity as protected reserves gradually mature into monotypes.</p> <p>The <i>possibility</i> of man-caused global warming warrants immediate international action based on the precautionary principle (better safe than sorry). The goal is to stabilize or reduce CO₂ emissions without harming the poor. The danger is so serious that the potentially huge increases in global food production possible with increased CO₂ emissions must be forgone. Likewise, the UN’s admission that the Kyoto Protocol does <i>nothing</i> to stop or reverse CO₂ emissions is an acceptable pretense; needed to demonstrate that the world is committed to taking any steps to reduce CO₂ emissions.</p> <p>The UN claims water is the number one problem in the twenty-first century and is developing a huge government program to “solve” this problem. Although property rights and business activities will be heavily regulated, stifling the very capital and creativity that are needed to provide solutions to this problem, the loss is acceptable in order to guarantee adequate water.</p>
Air & Water	<p>There have been a host of false chemical scare stories and demands to limit or eliminate all man-made chemical use. While hazardous chemicals should always be treated with care and proper precautions, toxic chemicals do not always present a high risk if handled appropriately. <i>All</i> things of nature are made of chemicals. There are far more <i>natural</i> pesticides in plants than in synthetic pesticides used by farmers. About the same percentage of these <i>natural</i> pesticides are carcinogenic as is found in man-made pesticides. Eliminating the use of pesticides would likely cause 26,000 additional cancer deaths in the U.S., while saving fewer than 20 lives. Investing in health care and residential, occupational or transportation safety is known to save lives at a tiny fraction of the cost of saving the same lives from environmental risks. It becomes a matter of how we spend limited resources.</p>	<p>The reduction, and in some cases the elimination, of the use of all man-made chemicals must occur to remove the threat of deteriorating health of humans and the environment. It is the natural conclusion to the precautionary principle (better safe than sorry). Mankind must learn to use “natural” mechanisms to meet the needs of mankind while ensuring the safety of human health and the environment; even though it is admitted that such an approach would cut food production by half and eliminate many modern conveniences.</p>
Toxic Chemicals	<p>Property rights and genuine free markets provide incentives to find better ways to meet challenges. Property rights also provide critical capital to get the poor out of poverty by giving them ownership and pride. Without property rights, laborers cannot invest in their own wealth-building capital projects and are therefore condemned to perpetual poverty. Freedom 21 offers the best hope to meet the needs of people and the environment.</p>	<p>Land cannot be treated as an ordinary asset, controlled by individuals. Public ownership or effective control of land and industry in the public interest is the single most important means of protecting the environment and achieving a more equitable distribution of the benefits of development. The provision of decent dwellings and healthy conditions for the people and the environment can only be achieved if land is used in the interests of society as a whole. Public control of land use for the common good is therefore indispensable.</p>
Summary		