

*Article***When should we care about sustainability? Applying human security as the decisive criterion****Alexander Lautensach<sup>1,\*</sup> and Sabina Lautensach<sup>2</sup>**

<sup>1</sup> Assistant Professor, School of Education, University of Northern British Columbia / 4837 Keith Ave. Terrace, B.C. Canada V8G 1K7

<sup>2</sup> Director, Human Security Institute (Canada) / P.O. Box 34 Terrace, B.C. Canada V8G 4A2

E-Mails: alexl@unbc.ca; salaut@gmail.com

\* Author to whom correspondence should be addressed; Tel.: +1-250-615-3334; Fax: +1-250-615-5478

*Received: / Accepted: / Published:*

---

**Abstract:** It seems intuitively clear that not all human endeavours warrant equal concern over the extent of their sustainability. This raises the question about what criteria might best serve for their prioritisation. We refute on empirical and theoretical grounds the counterclaim that sustainability should be of no concern regardless of the circumstances. We propose that human security can serve as a source of criteria that are both widely shared and can be assessed in a reasonably objective manner. Following the respective classifications established in the literature, we compile comparisons of four forms of sustainability (environmental, economic, social, and cultural) in their relationships with the four pillars of human security (environmental, economic, sociopolitical, and health-related). Our findings, based on probable cause and effect relationships, suggest that the criteria of human security allow for a reliable discrimination between relatively trivial incidences of unsustainable behavior and those that warrant widely shared serious concern. They also confirm that certain sources of human insecurity, such as poverty or violent conflict, tend to perpetuate unsustainable behavior, a useful consideration for the design of development initiatives. Considering that human security enjoys wide and increasing political support among the international community, it is to be hoped that by publicizing the close correlation between human security and sustainability greater attention will be paid to the latter and to its careful definition.

**Keywords:** Human security, assessing sustainability, human ecology, overshoot.

---

## 1. Introduction

To clarify the question, it is intended in two senses. How long can we afford to continue a particular practice before we risk serious undesirable consequences? And what kinds of practices warrant our concern regarding their sustainability? Behind these issues lies the need for prioritizing our concerns for sustainability. Considering the multitude of issues and practices, we need to reserve our attention and efforts for the most urgent concerns. Diverse and opposing views and interests make it difficult to gather the necessary political consensus, which makes it even more imperative to establish convincing criteria for prioritization.

Differences in opinions also tend to arise from different definitions of sustainability. Within the ecological context Lemons' [1] definition seems preferable over the rather vague but widely popularized Brundtland definition [2]. However, where the economic, cultural, and social dimensions of sustainability do not depend on systemic limits, the Brundtland definition serves passably. The diversity of contexts also manifests in a diversity of time frames. While no condition can last indefinitely, reasonable expectations vary between millions of years for the average lifetime of a species (e.g. *Homo sapiens*), millennia or centuries for the lifetimes of ecosystems and cultures, and decades for policies and regimes. The "Seven Generations" standard [3] represents a popular compromise for ecological sustainability although its universal applicability appears questionable in view of regional differences in the fragility and health of local ecosystems.

The concept of human security has attracted increasing attention over the past two decades among theorists, policymakers, and voters. In the UN Secretary General's Millennium Report the UN's human security agenda are summarised as 'freedom from fear', and their development agenda as 'freedom from want' [4]. One reason for this attraction lies in the fact that the value priorities that inform its diverse components are shared widely, priorities that focus on the continued security and well-being of human individuals. Human security has been conceptualized as consisting of the four pillars of sociopolitical, health-related, economic, and environmental security [5]. The four pillars cover the same ground as the 'seven dimensions' of the 1994 Human Development Report [6]. Another strength of the human security approach is its comprehensive coverage of interdependent sources of insecurity that were traditionally considered under the purview of different academic specialties and were (and still are) thus studied largely in isolation from each other. The strength of the comprehensive approach lies in its capacity to detect and characterize synergistic effects and multifactorial causation. Moreover, the comprehensive conceptual models of human security have allowed analysts to develop methods for assessing and verifying diverse aspects of human security. The purpose of this paper is to examine to what extent the precepts of human security could be used as criteria to prioritise among challenges to sustainability. We will differentiate in this analysis between the four pillars of human security and various aspects of sustainability.

## 2. The Importance of Timeliness and Selectivity

Many day-to-day activities are unsustainable in principle but are never intended to extend over long enough time frames to warrant any concern over their sustainability. Others may develop into routines but their eventual demise does not cause us any great concern either. In contrast, such concern seems warranted when the activity is planned to continue over the long term, and when its interruption would

bring harm to us or to others. This is particularly true for practices that affect the welfare of many, such as the now infamous examples of fossil fuel combustion or hyperconsumption.

Some critics claim that sustainability does not deserve serious concern under any circumstances, for lack of convincing reasons or obligations. Those claims tend to become particularly vocal in cases where possible concerns would threaten the short-term interests or hidden agenda of powerful groups. Restricting our attention to claims made in good faith, several reasons have been invoked in support of such claims. One is the exclusive concern with the welfare of humans that are presently in existence; this has been referred to as the strong and narrow form of anthropocentrism [7]. It is often accompanied by a particularly pecuniary approach toward commodifying nature, the view that life forms and ecosystems only carry value if they can serve human ends and if their utility can be expressed in terms of monetary figures [8]. Elsewhere [7] we have argued that anthropocentrism in its various forms lacks conceptual consistency in that its end values are shallow and ill-defined, and that it informs behavior that results in unintended and undesirable outcomes, even from the view of the anthropocentrist her/himself. Consequently, anthropocentrism cannot adequately support such an optimistic outlook on sustainability.

Assuming good faith, neglect for sustainability could also be informed by the honest belief that sustainability simply does not matter because human ingenuity will always find ways out of tight spots when it really matters. The belief that the growth of economies and populations can proceed without physical limits is referred to as cornucopianism [9]. Unfortunately the historical evidence for this belief has proven equivocal at best. For every culture that succeeded in meeting sustainability challenges, another one can be found that failed under similar circumstances and paid the ultimate price [10]. Some economists continue to invoke variants of the Theory of Infinite Substitutability [11; 12] claiming that for every scarce resource a suitable substitute will eventually be found once the demand reaches a certain threshold. Leaving aside its questionable moral implications, the logical fallacy in that claim lies in its universality. In addition to the contradictory historical evidence there is the First Law of Thermodynamics that sanctions not only the conservation of energy and matter but their physical limits in supporting growth [13].

Cornucopianism represents one of the greatest conceptual obstacles towards a transition to sustainable living because it makes sustainability appear unimportant. Thus it represents not merely just another conceptual red herring but an extremely harmful ideology. Its dangers stem from the widespread support it still enjoys, much of it implicit, from the damage it causes through the overtaking of environmental support structures, and from the powerful ways in which it tempts the wishful thinking of many, which is continuously reinforced by certain sectors of the media, advertising industry, and political groups [14]. A scientific examination of the term “sustainable growth” reveals it as nonsensical unless applied (disingenuously?) to very short time frames, and “sustainable development” to a qualitative meaning only.

Having safely and unequivocally dismissed any false hopes for infinite growth, and with them any claims that sustainability deserves no concern under any circumstances, we move on to the possible reasons and criteria for concern. Public debates about sustainability inevitably revolve about differences in concern, and it is that diversity of views that turns the prioritization of problems into a challenge. The extent of our concern is influenced by the temporal and physical distance between us and the affected persons, by our idiosyncratic assessment of possible harms, and by different preferences for alternative solutions. Those differences reflect the diversity of analytical approaches

and the diverse relationships we might have with potentially affected persons. As those factors refer primarily to the objects of our concern we might summarise them as object-related.

Often the different concerns are also informed by differences in value orientations and ideological dispositions, attributes that are subject-related. For example, a deep green argument for protecting an ecosystem will differ from a shallow green argument in its assumptions, its reasoning, its goals, and its solutions to the problems [8]. The real stumbling blocks towards a consensus invariably combine object-related and subject-related factors, the differences in people's world views, their convictions about moral standing, their conceptualisations of what constitutes progress, and their diverse ideals and values that inform those notions. Yet, the tragedy of the commons appears unavoidable unless decision makers, which in a reasonably democratic society include most of us, share certain minimal moral concerns and perspectives. They need to agree which unsustainable practices should be considered most dangerous on the basis of their adverse impact, and should therefore receive the highest priority for urgent countermeasures. We will now turn to how that challenge might be addressed.

### **3. Reasons Why Human Security Can Provide the Decisive Standard for Sustainability**

During most of the past century, the field of security was dominated by experts in strategic studies, political science, and law enforcement. Concepts of security were discussed separately also in health care, economics, anthropology, environmental science, and other disciplines. Consequently, many of the proposed solutions to security challenges suffered from the fact that their design was based on models from one or two disciplines only, models that could not address the complex interrelationships between the various sources of human insecurity. To this day, billions are spent annually on development aid projects that focus solely on either economic security, or health security, or strategic security, or any other single aspect of security, with predictably poor results. Fortunately, an increasing number of prominent projects and programs are being based on the more comprehensive conceptual models of human security, the best known among them, although arguably not the best in design, being the UN's Millennium Development Goals [15].

Notwithstanding some critics who accuse human security as being too inclusive or ill-defined, the concept of human security has been widely accepted as the basis for international cooperation among the signatory countries of the Human Security Network, for numerous national development plans, and for development projects under the UN and its affiliate agencies. The reasons for this acceptance probably include the expanding theoretical basis, the humanitarian focus on the potential individual victims of insecurity, and the increasing evidence for interconnectedness among the various sources of insecurity. Human security models also provided multidimensional assessment criteria in reliable and testable form [16]. It is precisely for those reasons that we suggest that human security can serve as an effective standard in the prioritization of sustainability challenges. We offer some additional reasons in the following paragraphs.

In the past years as environmental security increasingly moved into the spotlight of security debates, the discourse has shifted away from the primarily rights based argumentations – exemplified by the UN's "freedom from want & fear" agenda [17] – towards a more balanced discourse including also duties and obligations. This brings it in line with the discourse on sustainability, which arguably also demands such a balance. The two interests have conflated under the imperatives arising out of the

situation of global ecological overshoot, humanity as a whole consuming more than planetary resources can sustainably deliver [18].

The precautionary principle has played a prominent role in justifying policies aimed at promoting sustainability. It invokes our limited knowledge about the stability and the functioning of ecological systems and advises us to err on the side of caution when estimating environmental impact. According to the precautionary principle we are obliged to choose among alternative analyses in ways that minimize unacceptable though unlikely risks [19]. A community of individuals who share a concern about sustainability will strive to agree on a shared commitment to precautionary solutions, provided that the risks clearly include risks to humans. However, the link between risks to nonhuman populations, species, and ecosystems on the one hand and human interests on the other has often been less than clear. Human security, especially work done on the significance of ecological integrity for environmental security, can contribute helpful information there because it links definitive human security interests with ecological preconditions. Because of our limited understanding of those preconditions, human security arguments for sustainability still rely on the precautionary principle. The benefit of human security arguments comes from a shift in end goals, from the goal of ecological integrity (which is often perceived as ecocentric and thus of little significance to anthropocentrists) towards the goal of human welfare.

The practice of discounting future harms or losses in cost-benefit analyses has often hampered the development of just and effective sustainability regimes. Despite its clear violation of the intergenerational justice principle the practice has endured, particularly in the cost-benefit considerations informing economic policies. Arguments based on human security considerations can help dissuade people from discounting future harms because they take into account all four pillars instead of overstating the economic argument. Moreover, the emphasis on security needs trumps any objections based on accounting preferences or short term profits, in the contexts of both public opinion and national security.

Finally, linking plans to promote sustainability with goals that are formulated according to human security agenda also promises a tactical benefit. Many cultures, especially in Asia, seem to show less concern about sustainability than is evident in “Western” countries in Europe and North America. This is indicated, for instance, by the number of sustainability-oriented NGOs registered in those countries, respectively. Conversely, human security agenda have been adopted globally in a more cross-cultural manner; obviously their potential benefits were clear to people and a need for them was perceived, in spite of diverse definitions. By linking sustainability with human security as an indispensable condition, the attention of those societies could be directed towards sustainability challenges.

#### **4. Making it Work: How Can the Human Security Concept Strengthen Sustainability?**

From a human security perspective there are two reasons for communities at all levels to strive for sustainability. By making a practice sustainable they can prevent harm to themselves and their immediate families and interests; they can also prevent harm to future generations and to non-human entities regardless whether their direct utility for human interests is understood. Those reasons have been summarized under the term ‘enlightened self interest’ [20], because in either case they promise to avert the consequences of excessive ecological overshoot [21; 18]. In the past they relied to a considerable extent on ethical arguments of moral considerability. Without subtracting from those

more altruistic arguments, the human security perspective can add weight to them by attracting those whose motivations are dominated by more immediate self interest. Much of this attraction relies on semantic differences in the way people interpret sustainability and security; the word “sustainability” seems value neutral, somewhat abstract and removed into the future, compared to the term “human security” which invokes images of families leading lives unencumbered by threats to their health, livelihood, liberty, and peace.

That difference depends of course entirely on the images and ideas that people subconsciously associate with those words. For that reason alone it seems desirable to create closer connections between the two concepts by linking them together in people’s minds through common discourse – a strategy that has been used to great effect by the advertising industry. In reality, the two concepts are already closely linked through common cause-effect relationships. The proposition that unsustainable behavior can proceed without at some point endangering someone’s security seems dubious. Yet, to state this in the form of a universal truth seems equally wrong, as we asserted at the onset. The question, then, becomes one of specifics: Which dimensions of sustainability tend to support most strongly which pillars of human security? Or, even more to the point, which dimensions of unsustainable behavior constitute the greatest threats to which pillars of human security? By devising and implementing timely countermeasures to protect humans from those security threats, and by garnering adequate public support for our efforts through appropriate advertising as suggested above, we can hope to ease the transition of global and regional societies to sustainable living. We will attend to these questions after introducing the biggest common threat to both sustainability and human security.

One consequence of large scale unsustainable behavior whose direct endangerment of the lives and welfare of future generations should require no further substantiation is subsumed under the concept of global overshoot [21; 22]. Overshoot occurs when the environmental impact of a population (i.e. its demands for resources, waste processing, and other ecosystem services) exceed the capacity of the supporting ecosystems. In practice this situation is always short lived as the population either expands its resource use or it is reduced through a range of possible biological mechanisms of population control. Those mechanisms generally include infectious disease, predators, malnutrition, aggressive territorial behavior, and infertility. All but the last mechanism increase mortality to the effect that the population shrinks until its impact once more measures below the system’s carrying capacity.

Overshoot directly threatens human security through those control mechanisms; a further expansion of resource use seems unlikely in view of our present global appropriation of over forty percent of the planet’s net primary photosynthetic productivity [23]. In the case of the human species the major threats are epidemics, malnutrition, and violent conflict. To varying extents those threats are triggered by essential resources becoming scarce and eventually disappearing [24; 25], and by the deterioration of key ecosystems [26].

As a secondary consequence of overshoot, the ecological carrying capacity gradually decreases because of irreversible damage to ecological support structures [21]. This lends particular urgency to the imperative to reduce the extent of overshoot. Other secondary effects, such as the erosion of the rule of law and of civil society [27], as well as the threat of more widespread armed conflict over diminishing resources [24], add to that urgency. Those consequences tend to compromise human security across a broad range of aspects, extending over all four pillars: the traditional area of military/strategic security of the state; economic security, particularly its conceptualization through

heterodox models of sustainable economies; the area of population health as described by epidemiology and the complex determinants of community health and health care priorities; and environmental security that is primarily determined by the complex interactions between human populations and the source and sink functions of their host ecosystems.

At the global level overshoot is caused by the combined demands for resources and ecological services by seven billion plus individuals. These demands, when represented as humanity's global ecological footprint [28], exceed the planet's total bioproductive area by over forty percent [29]. The fact that the majority consumes only small per capita amounts while a minority consumes an obscenely excessive amount at their expense has no bearing on the fact that collectively we live "beyond our means" [18]. The most worrying aspect of the problem is that all current trends still indicate that overshoot is worsening, while elected officials everywhere remain obliged, at pain to their careers, to call for more "economic growth".

The challenge of global overshoot represents a clear conflation of imperatives, where the urgent need to improve human security directly informs an equally urgent need for restraint, mitigation, adaptation, and gains in efficiency [30]. Effective action in those directions begins at the local or regional levels. However, achieving local sustainability does not guarantee that other regions achieve likewise, and so an element of global coordination and cooperation seems indispensable, informed by considerations of global environmental justice. This is where the UN's Millennium Development Goals Initiative carries much promise but is sadly lacking in results [31]. In contrast, numerous examples exist of local efforts successfully moving communities towards sustainable practices. Those efforts are dominated by questions about the priority, relative potential, relevant time frame, and efficacy of alternative strategies – questions where human security considerations can help.

Local initiatives towards sustainability are informed by the environmental, economic, cultural, and social dimensions of sustainability. They invoke different ideals and values and they require different approaches. Resource limitations often require that priorities among be clarified. As well, popular opinion may well reflect different priorities than does an academic cost-benefit analysis. A widespread example is the conflict between environmental conservation programs and local goals for economic development. Although the two are by no means mutually exclusive in principle, they are often portrayed as such by interested parties, and to some extent their expectations and aspirations clash.

Human security can provide a new lens through which to adjudicate such questions and disputes. This leads to the question about dimensions and pillars. In our discussion so far we have treated sustainability as an implicit condition for human security. However, in some situations the reverse relationship seems equally plausible. Only a society that feels reasonably secure will be in a position to implement effective initiatives towards sustainability. However, the fact remains that sustainability in its four dimensions is often more readily assessed than is human security in its complex four pillars. To observers on the scene it is often quite clear whether a situation or practice is sustainable. In our effort to relate specific dimensions of sustainability to specific pillars of human security we therefore chose the matrix approach illustrated in Table 1 where sustainability and human security are treated as independent and dependent variables, respectively.

**Table 1.** The four dimensions of sustainability are likely to exert different effects on the four pillars of human security. Key explanatory concepts are added (*italicized*), some of which are expanded in the text.

	<b>Probable Effects of the Absence of ...</b>			
	Environmental Sustainability	Economic Sustainability	Cultural Sustainability	Social Sustainability
Environmental Security	Declines ( <i>erosion of ecol. capacity</i> )	Variably affected ( <i>fate of colonialism</i> )	Little affected ( <i>e.g. hunting practices</i> )	Variably affected
Economic Security	Declines ( <i>poverty linked to ecol. deterioration</i> )	Declines	Declines eventually ( <i>e.g. aboriginals</i> )	Declines eventually ( <i>e.g. growing inequality</i> )
Health Security	Declines ( <i>e.g. problems with waste, pathogens</i> )	Declines somewhat ( <i>via poverty</i> )	Declines ( <i>e.g. aboriginals</i> )	Declines eventually ( <i>e.g. growing inequality</i> )
Sociopolitical Security	Declines eventually ( <i>secondary effect</i> )	Declines ( <i>via poverty</i> )	Variably affected	Declines

Table 1 lists the diverse effects of unsustainable practices on human security. The entries are informed by historic precedents and probable outcomes of example scenarios. They show that environmental sustainability exerts a strong influence on all pillars of human security, in line with Myers' [27] dictum of the 'ultimate security'. This indicates that environmental sustainability should receive priority in cases where it seems to compete with considerations of economic, cultural, or social sustainability. Because of its overarching effects the competition is probably superficial anyway. Unsustainable economic practices, as evident in the current global economic crisis, are likely to have broad impacts beyond economic security, compromising health, political stability, and eventually ecological integrity as impoverished masses attempt to carve out subsistence lives from already stressed bioregions. An absence of cultural sustainability, as exemplified by many disappearing indigenous languages and cultures, is unlikely to affect environmental security but can give rise to social tension and invariably affects the socioeconomic status and health of affected indigenous populations. Unsustainable social trends, such as increasing socioeconomic stratification, is likely to affect all aspects of human security through poverty, poor governance, and violent conflict.

The data in Table 1 can also be interpreted as reciprocal relationships, indicating that situations exist in which sustainability suffers as a result of insecure conditions. For example, an overpopulated rural region with malnourished populations where marginal areas increasingly come under agricultural use is likely to experience irreversible ecological damage, which makes it even more difficult to achieve any kind of sustainability in the future. War zones and post-conflict situations abounding with crime,



exploitation, human rights abuses, and anarchy result in unsustainable political disorder. Somalia seems to qualify on both accounts, but other examples are provided by Chechnya, Tibet, and Kurdistan. Thus, certain sources of human insecurity tend to perpetuate unsustainable behavior, a useful consideration for development initiatives.

Linking specific domains of sustainability with specific pillars of human security also provides help for settling disagreements over the appropriate time frame of sustainability initiatives. By invoking the appropriate human security pillar and taking into account data on past changes [16] it is possible to identify priorities for intervention.

In order to examine the extents of these causal relationships we should also try to identify areas where the causality breaks down. Are there sustainable practices that nevertheless compromise human security? Colonialist exploitation of labour and resources can be environmentally sustainable while its eventual breakdown through social tensions and economic mismanagement is inevitable. Similar scenarios seem plausible for an environmentally responsible dictatorship.

Are there secure situations that are nevertheless unsustainable? Economic growth, while allowing the illusion of perfect security, is only sustainable while the environmental impact remains below the carrying capacity of the supporting ecosystems. It is only through the prolonged influence of clever propaganda that many people have become convinced that “sustainable economic growth” is a reasonable idea. In fact, any form of physical growth is neither sustainable nor does it help human security once the sustainable limits have been breached.

Lastly, our findings suggest that the criteria of human security allow for a reliable discrimination between relatively trivial incidences of unsustainable behavior and those that warrant widely shared serious concern. This follows from the fact that some unsustainable practices are unlikely to affect any pillar of human security to any serious extent. Examples range from excessive jogging or other unsustainable lifestyle choices through professional activities and social fads. Conversely, our findings also reiterate the dangers to human security that arise from behavior that has been traditionally regarded as sustainable and secure but that is now turning out to contribute to the greatest challenge humankind has ever encountered: unrestrained human reproduction.

## **5. Conclusions**

Given the urgency of the global environmental crisis, the transition to sustainability is proceeding much too slowly for comfort. Apart from a confusing diversity of definitions and a much too long list of do's and don'ts, a major hindrance comes from the widespread perception of sustainability as a concept too academic and abstract to invest much personal initiative into. Human security, on the other hand has been gaining considerable recognition among the international community. In this paper we proposed to make use of that recognition to provide some momentum towards sustainability.

This momentum comes from the realization that our failure to meet the most important sustainability targets will gravely compromise human security in its four pillars. More specifically, the lack of environmental sustainability is likely to jeopardise all of environmental, sociopolitical, health-related, and economic security in the immediate future. At the global level, the primary reason is the condition of overshoot that humanity entered in the mid-1980s and the biological mechanisms of population control that serve to bring an overshooting population back below the system's carrying capacity.

As far as concerns the big picture of humanity's ecological overshoot, human security is undoubtedly gravely compromised. We state this in full recognition of the fact that the world's major development initiatives appear to largely neglect the connection between overshoot and insecurity. Conceptual obstacles such as strong and narrow anthropocentrism and cornucopianism still prevent many people from drawing the right conclusions from the signs of crisis that emerge in many aspects of human security. Another obstacle lies in the political context of a global political system dominated by corporations, with their typical pattern of sociopathic behavior [32]. Nevertheless, linking the lack of sustainability to key sources of human insecurity allows us to identify which aspects of sustainability should receive priority consideration, and which sources of human insecurity are slowing the transition to sustainability.

### Acknowledgments

The authors acknowledge support received from the University of Northern British Columbia and from the Human Security Institute (Canada).

### Conflict of Interest

The authors declare no conflict of interest.

### References and Notes

1. Lemons, John. Afterword: University education in sustainable development and environmental protection. In *Earth summit ethics: Toward a reconstructive postmodern philosophy of environmental education*. Callicott, J. Baird and Fernando J.R. da Rocha (eds), 193-217. Albany New York: State University of New York Press, 1996.
2. WCED (World Commission on Environment and Development). *Our Common Future: The Brundtland Report*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1987.
3. Gordon, A. and Suzuki D. *It's a matter of survival*. North Sydney, NSW: Allen & Unwin Pty Ltd, 1990.
4. United Nations. 2000. We the Peoples: The role of the United Nations in the 21st century. New York: United Nations. [www.un.org/millennium/sg/report/key.htm](http://www.un.org/millennium/sg/report/key.htm)
5. Lautensach, A.K. Expanding Human Security. *Journal of Human Security*, vol. 2, issue 3 (2006): 5-14
6. UNDP (United Nations Development Programme). 1994. *Human Development Report: New Dimensions of Human Security*. New York: United Nations.
7. Lautensach, A. 2009. The Ethical Basis for Sustainable Human Security: A Place for Anthropocentrism? *Journal of Bioethical Inquiry* vol. 6 (4): 437-455.
8. Curry, P. *Ecological Ethics: An Introduction*. Cambridge, UK: Polity Press, 2<sup>nd</sup> edition 2011.
9. Ehrlich, Paul R. and J. Holdren. (1971). The Impact of Population Growth. *Science* 171, 1212-1217.
10. Diamond, Jared. *Collapse: How societies choose to fail or succeed*. London: Viking Penguin 2005.
11. Barnett, H. and C. Morse. *Scarcity and growth: The economics of national resource availability*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1963.

12. Pilzer, Paul Z. *Unlimited wealth: The theory and practice of economic alchemy*. New York: Crown Publishers, 1990.
13. Rees, William. Waking the Sleepwalkers – Globalisation and Sustainability: Conflict or Convergence. In *The Human Ecological Footprint*. Guelph, Canada: University of Guelph, pp.1-34, 2004.
14. Lautensach, A. & S. Lautensach. 2011. Human Insecurity Through Economic Development: Educational Strategies to Destabilise the Dominant Paradigm. *International Journal on Environmental, Cultural, Economic and Social Sustainability* vol. 7: 347-360.
15. United Nations. End Poverty 2015: Millennium Development Goals. UN, 2009. <http://www.un.org/millenniumgoals/>
16. Hastings, D. The Human Security Index: An Update and a New Release. International Symposium on Geoinformatics for Spatial Infrastructure Development in Earth and Allied Sciences 2010. <http://www.humansecurityindex.org/>
17. Annan, Kofi. 2005. *In Larger Freedom: Towards Development, Security, and Human Rights for All*. Executive Summary. New York: United Nations. <http://www.un.org/largerfreedom/executivesummary.pdf>
18. UNEP-MAB (Millennium Assessment Board). (2005) *Living Beyond Our Means: Natural Assets and Human Well-being*. London: UNEP-WCMC 2005. <http://www.millenniumassessment.org/en/products.aspx>
19. Myers, Nancy. 2002. The precautionary principle puts values first. *Bulletin of Science, Technology and Society* 22 (3): 210-219.
20. Lovelock, J. *The Revenge of Gaia*. New York: Basic Books, Perseus Books Group, 2006.
21. Catton, W.R. Jr. *Overshoot: The ecological basis of revolutionary change*. Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1980.
22. Wackernagel, M., Schulz, N.B., Deumling, D., Linares, A.C., Jenkins, M., Kapos, V., Monfreda, C., Loh, J., Myers, N., Norgaards, R., & J. Randers. (2002). Tracking the ecological overshoot of the human economy. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences (USA)* 99, 9266-9271.
23. Vitousek, P.M. Ehrlich, P.R. Ehrlich, A.H. and P.A. Matson. Human appropriation of the products of photosynthesis. *BioScience* 36 (1986): 368-373.
24. Homer-Dixon, Thomas. 1999. *Environment, Scarcity, and Violence*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
25. Meadows, Dennis, Randers, Jorg & Donella Meadows. 2004. *Limits to Growth: The 30-Year Update*. White River Junction, VT: Chelsea Green Publishing Co.
26. McMichael, A.J., C.D. Butler & C. Folke. 2003. New Visions for Addressing Sustainability. *Science* 302 (12 Dec.): 1919-1920.
27. Myers, Norman (1993). *Ultimate Security: The Environmental Basis of Political Stability*. New York: W.W. Norton & Co.
28. Wackernagel, Mathis and William Rees. (1996). *Our ecological footprint: Reducing human impact on the earth*. Oxford: John Carpenter.
29. World Wildlife Fund (WWF). 2010. *Living Planet Report 2010*. [http://wwf.panda.org/about\\_our\\_earth/all\\_publications/living\\_planet\\_report/](http://wwf.panda.org/about_our_earth/all_publications/living_planet_report/)
30. Lautensach, A.K. 2010. *Environmental Ethics for the Future: Rethinking Education to Achieve Sustainability*. Saarbruecken, Germany: Lambert Academic Publ.

31. Millennium Development Goals Gap Task Force. 2009. MDG Gap Task Force Report. New York: United Nations.
32. Beder, Sharon. *Suiting themselves: How corporations drive the global agenda*. London: Earthscan, 2006.

© 2011 by the authors; licensee MDPI, Basel, Switzerland. This article is an open access article distributed under the terms and conditions of the Creative Commons Attribution license (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/3.0/>).