Studia Ecologiae et Bioethicae
14(2016)4, 129-145

Nikolai MIHAILOV[1]*
Lidia SAKELARIEVA[2]

Environmental alarmism: the Club of Rome and its critics

Summary

The article is devoted to the ideas of the Club of Rome and their modern reading. The Club of Rome, founded in 1968, is an international society of politicians, business leaders, and scientists, who appeal for mutual tolerance, understanding, and solidarity in relation to the real problems of the world, and the environmental problems in the first place. The members of the Club prescribe the setting of limits to human expansion over nature, which is explained with superfluous "anthropocentric confidence", after the words of the foundation member Aurelio Peccei. Recently, these ideas of the Club of Rome have been criticized by economists, philosophers, and politicians, being described as "environmental alarmism", i.e. as groundless alarm relevant to incorrect notions about the inevitability of ecological crisis and its devastating consequences for humanity. However the global environmental crisis is already an undeniable fact and requires a thorough study of the ethical standards of the human behaviour, which are often rooted in moral phenomena such as consumerism, irresponsibility, insensitivity or even selfishness. Nature cannot be only considered as a source of natural resources or benefits to people. The moral motive of nature conservation, despite the power of modern science, is one of the main ideas of the founders

[1] Faculty of Journalism and Mass Communication, Sofia University "St. Kl. Ohridski", 1000 Sofia, Moskovska 49, Bulgaria, *mihailov_n@abv.bg

[2] Department of Geography, Ecology and Environmental Protection, Faculty of Mathematics and Natural Sciences, South-West University, Ivan Mihailov 66, 2700 Blagoevgrad, Bulgaria

and followers of the case of the Club of Rome. It concerns the future where the respect for the value of nature is a new moral principle.

Key words: Club of Rome, economic growth, environmentalism, conservation ethics, alarmism, anti-alarmism, sustainability, market economy

1. Introduction

In 1968 in Rome, in one of the oldest academies in Europe, Accademia Nazionale del Linchey, a community of 30 followers was set up that was united by the concept of future care of nature as it was threatened by increasingly aggressive human impact on it. This community was called by its founder and first president, Aurelio Peccei, the Club of Rome. Its first members were united by the idea that the applied science, technology, industry, and generally expanding knowledge made humanity lose their "sense of reality" (according to Peccei's words).

It was difficult for people to understand the real consequences of human impact on nature. The members of the Club of Rome claim that the modern age and the condition regarding the relationship between man and nature are unique in the world history. According to Peccei beyond the ostensibility of mastery and subordination of nature through science it lies the "predicament for humanity". This difficulty is expressed in a deep crisis, whose global feature people cannot cope with. The reason for it is in the fact that humans have no clear idea of the actual effects of the actions and the interference in the natural environment that it dwells along with other species and even the inanimate nature. Therefore, according to the ideas of the Club of Rome what is necessary to be established is an international organization to bring together people's efforts to prevent the devastating effects that human actions cause to nature.

Subsequently, this idea has been realized through various activities associated with expert assessments and scientific guidelines to restrict the expanding human and anthropocentric domination in the world that the members of the Club of Rome have termed "growth". This position of the Club has been disputed many times, including recent times.

The approach of the Club of Rome is described by its opponents as "environmental alarmism". Antialarmists are different scientists, economists, philosophers, and even politicians with a liberal ideology, according to whom the economic growth and technologies are the only way for humanity to cope with the problems of the modern age in economic, social, and scientific aspect as well as the one of nature protection.

2. The Club of Rome

What is fundamental to Club of Rome are the ideas of such personalities as Aurelio Peccei, an industrialist and a philanthropist, Erich Jantsch, a scientist, an astronomer interested in environmental issues, Jean Monnet, an economist, a politician and others. As Erich Jantsch writes in the preliminary document of the Club of Rome: "Now we begin to give significance to the human society in its environment as a single system whose uncontrolled growth has led to greater instability.... This task (for some control over the system person-environment) can be performed effectively by establishing control over the complex system of dynamic changes in the human society in the context of its environment" (Peccei 1977).

In the history of its existence the Club of Rome remains most vividly with its idea of limiting the human technological, industrial, and scientific presence in nature, called by the members of the Club "limits to growth". As stated by Aurelio Peccei, the purpose of the club is to reach "the roots themselves of the real problems of the world" (Peccei 1977) that are global and concern everyone, but they are not limited to any ideologies, doctrines or interests. One of the emblematic events of the Club in this regard was the publication in 1972 of the report *The Limits to Growth* (Meadows *et al.* 1972), developed with the active participation of Dennis L. Meadows, a mathematician and at that time a researcher at MIT[3]. In Peccei's words the

[3] At the beginning of the 21st century it was issued a revised and updated version of this report Donella Meadows Jorgen Randers Dennis Meadows, "The limits of growth. Thirty years later", Earthscan, London, 2006.

idea of the report can be summarized as follows: "If current trends of growth continue, as well as the human, demographic and economic expansion on factually restricted area of our planet, the latter will reach its limits even during the life of the next few generations and will lead to uncontrolled system disorder and destruction. There is still time to prevent the catastrophe… provided that the growth is limited and regulated and its objectives are changed" (Peccei 1977). The Club members say that the resources and the potential of the planet are limited and therefore the uncontrolled, aggressive and exponential expansion of the human presence in it will lead to disastrous consequences. In other words, the material growth cannot continue indefinitely (Peccei 1977). In addition, the report presents a mathematical model which according to its authors proves or at least illustrates the limit of some resources, and the environment and growth rates that deplete them. Some critics of the report claim that according to it gold as a raw material could have been depleted as early as in 1979, and by 1999 it would certainly become a fact. The prediction was based on reserves of this metal found in 1970: 10,980 tons (Lomborg 2012). Likewise, in 1970 the found reserves of copper were about 280 million tons. Today, however, according to other estimates, there are around 700 million tons and therefore there is no danger of their depletion (Lomborg 2012). Due to such calculations and arguments, which we will discuss later, some scientists attempt to refute the ideas of the Club regarding the scarcity of raw materials in nature and therefore the need to reduce the human impact on the environment. This criticism of the ideas of the Club defines them as "environmental alarmism", unjustified anxiety about something for which there is no conclusive evidence, but rather hasty conclusions from limited research methods. Peccei defends the Club's report stating that this is not about prediction or prophecy of doom or the end of nature and humanity, but rather a warning and attention drawn to neglected issues. In his words, "I wonder if our proud conviction that we are the determined by the fate masters of the world is not one of the main reasons for the impasse we have reached alone…. What in any case is not in doubt

is that the time has come to change your whole outlook and vision for our place in it, including the whole chain of relations between us and the flora and fauna" (Peccei 1977). It is obvious that besides purely scientific purposes, the report *The Limits to Growth* also sets worldview tasks. The authors want to convince mankind of the need for change in the understanding of the relationship between man and nature, i.e. the emergence of a new outlook, new values and new principles through which persons determine themselves and their presence in the environment.

Peccei and his followers set themselves not only scientific, technological, and enlightenment tasks. They pursue moral purposes too, as far as they try to establish practical motives for a new behaviour and attitude towards nature.

3. Alarmism and anti-alarmism

The authors' allegations of *The Limits to Growth*, despite being supported by research and based on mathematical relationships, have provoked not only consents, but also criticism. Most of the scientists dealing with similar problems are skeptical about the Club's prescriptions. Peccei himself acknowledged the doubts in a book, published in 1972, titled *Anti-Roman Club*. Even today the criticism of the ideas of the Club continues and intensifies. One of the most prominent critics is Dane Bjorn Lomborg, an author of *The Sceptical Environmentalist*. Lomborg begins his observations by searching for inaccuracies in the calculations of the model presented in the original version of *The Limits to Growth* (Meadows *et al*. 1972). According to this model the Danish author writes that even before 2012 the world reserves of aluminium, copper, gold, lead, mercury, natural gas, and six other crucial resources would be depleted, a total of 12 out of the 19 monitored resources (Lomborg 2012). However, this is not confirmed. Does this fact, this discrepancy in the predictions, mean some error of principle in the approach to limiting the human growth and total interference in the environment? Lomborg gives an example with the use of mercury. According to Meadows's

model its price increased by 500% over the past 20 years from 1952 to 1972 when the report was written. But Lomborg points out that the technological innovations have led to the replacement of mercury in batteries, dental fillings, and even thermometers. As a result, the consumption of mercury decreased by 98% in 2000 and its price dropped by 90% (Lomborg 2012).

More similar examples can be cited. Technologies lead to the discovery of new sources of raw materials that are considered almost depleted by the authors of the initial report. For example, oil and natural gas reserves should have been depleted respectively in 1990 and 1992. But now those reserves are much larger than the ones found in 1970, despite the fact that the consumption of these raw materials has increased significantly, says Lomborg (Lomborg 2012). The main argument of the antialarmists is highly anthropocentric. It focuses on the purely human ability to discover and innovate (Lomborg 2012). Man is unique in nature and that unique feature is thanks to the human abilities, including skills to change nature and the environment, which they inhabit. The antialarmists think man is in the centre of nature as the one who is able to adapt it to their needs. Lomborg gives an example with the technology of so-called fracking, a method which has helped the United States to double their gas reserves since 2006. But what the geopolitical reasons for this change are and especially to what political conflicts it leads is not taken into account, but perhaps this is not central for the author's attention. He notes that he agrees that the raw materials are finite and limited, but according to him the amount of them that can be detected by human ingenuity is much higher than it is necessary for human consumption (Lomborg 2012). This is the reason why the prices of basic raw materials such as chromium, copper, nickel, tungsten and tin decrease.

Another idea of the Club of Rome is highly criticised, that of environmental pollution due to human activity. The anthropogenic pollution of nature and the catastrophic consequences of it are serious problems that humankind faces. In the early 1960s Rachel Louise Carson in her widely quoted book *Silent Spring* described the impact of chemical pollutants, including the insecticide DDT, on the animate

and inanimate nature. The authors of *The Limits to Growth* do not skip this issue either. According to their pollution index pollution will increase dramatically by 2030 as the air pollution will increase fastest. The latter is somehow synonymous or rather an indicator of pollution ever as, firstly, it is a direct consequence of industrialization and technology, and secondly, it affects all people and creatures, as it spreads globally and is not confined to a particular area. But here Lomborg argues that the air pollution can be divided into two types: outdoor and indoor ones. Outdoor air pollution is really increasing in the developing countries and kills many people, almost 650,000 per year (Lomborg 2012). But indoor air pollution (from using fuels for cooking and heating) kills even more, almost two million per year (ibid). The problem according to the antialarmists does not arise mainly from technology and industry but rather the lack of them. From that point of view, the idea of the Club of Rome for some past time, free of contamination, is utopian and rather misleading. According to Lomborg pollution in recent decades has not gone out of control. On the contrary, it has decreased permanently in the developed countries. There the indoor pollution does not kill almost anyone because there are new technologies developed, including domestic activities such as cooking and heating that minimize the risk of it. Likewise in the developed countries, legislation is to be enacted concerning smoking as one of the main sources of the indoor air pollution.

Finally, there are objections against the environmentalism especially regarding its most popular idea of the so called three R's – reduce, reuse, recycle – as part of the moral education of children (Lomborg 2012). According to Lomborg the recycling of various substances requires material resources and human effort that can be directed to other social activities such as building roads or training hospital staff. Lomborg writes: "And so as the price of paper has declined and the value of human work has risen dramatically, today we pay tribute to the pagan god of token environmentalism by spending countless hours sorting, storing, and collecting used paper, which, when combined with government subsidies, yields slightly lower quality paper in order to secure a resource that was never threatened

in the first place" (Lomborg 2012). The conclusion of the antialarmists is that environmentalism is a delusion that conceals the true causes of global problems. They are searched where they should not be. For example, hunger in a worldwide perspective is caused not by the fact that people do not produce enough food but due to the fact that not everyone can afford it. Therefore, the economic growth is beneficial and the world needs not to be restricted but expanded.

4. Possible answers

The antialarmists' reasoning expressed in Lomborgs's article needs further clarification. In fact, scenarios that are described in the first edition of *The Limits to Growth* are not being developed, and it is unlikely to be realized at least in the foreseeable future. But the question here is whether the purpose of enthusiasts from the Club of Rome was to make any prognoses (Lomborg even call them predictions) or to urge thinking in a different way regarding the times they lived in. As already stated, the idea of growth described by Donella and Dennis Meadows and their co-authors (Meadows *et al*. 1972) is that it is realized exponentially both in a demographic and economic way and through the environmental pollution, i.e. extremely fast compared to the limited resources of the planet. With regard to the pollution it is obvious that human activity leads to devastating consequences for the environment. As stated by Frances Beinecke (2012), the obvious pollution of the environment in the United States led to enacting most of the numerous pieces of legislation related to clean air, water, drinking water and so on. Similarly, the impact on the environment leads to negative consequences not only in the world but also on a regional and local scale. Even if the scenarios of the authors of the *The Limits to Growth* literally have not been realized it is obvious that their ideas are valid.

Dennis L. Meadows (2012) raises another question in response to the antialarmists. The latter claims that the Club of Rome in its publications make catastrophic predictions about the total depletion of raw materials and the Earth's resources even before 2000. Actually,

Lomborg cites the fact that aluminium, for example, was such a rare element that Napoleon III in the mid-nineteenth century gave the order the most honoured guests to be served with aluminium utensils and the not so high guests with "ordinary" golden utensils. Currently there have already been found around 700 million tons of aluminium in the world and according to Lomborg new deposits are found more quickly than the older ones are depleted (Lomborg 2012). But in the published reply Meadows states that nowhere in *Limits to Growth* it is mentioned anything about restriction or depletion of a resource to 2000 (Meadows 2012). The idea of the report is to provide a model to prevent the negative consequences of the scenario for unlimited development. In this sense the pathos of environmentalism is not to make any predictions or prognoses for a bleak future. Rather environmentalists' analysis aims at offering a new way, or as they call it, a new model of attitude towards the environment. In this respect their efforts include moral issues insofar as it affects the motivation of human behaviour as an internal commitment. Often human ingenuity, says Dennis L. Meadows (2012), acts against reasonable efforts to achieve sustainable development. There are many examples at both the global and local level. Here it refers to a special interpretation of the so-called good acts and regulations regarding the environmental protection, as well as to the ingenuity of those who benefit from private interests and do everything possible to protect them. The moral emphasis and call for reflection on an "individual's personality and the goals set by them" (Peccei 1977) to overcome the crisis in which mankind is in regarding the nature are among the greatest achievements of environmentalists – and Peccei concludes – we are facing a cultural (we would also add moral) rather than physical or political crisis. "A prerequisite is our long-term policy for environmental protection to be inspired by a new ethic of life based on the knowledge that any damage inflicted on the ability of the planet to sustain life will return to us like a boomerang" (Peccei and Ikeda 2008).

The ideas for negative impact and even destruction of the natural environment through the human activity are influential in the history of philosophy. Perhaps the most famous philosopher of the twentieth

century, Martin Heidegger, thinking over these issues, reveals a lack of sense in the historical pattern. Moreover, he believes that the economic law itself is an illusion and a wrong path for philosophy to follow, but also for mankind as a whole. One can dispose of this harmful illusion only by trusting the person "thrown into the world" and their doom of death. In the 1950s, Heidegger adds to the global criticism of technology. Under technology he understands primarily technical change and the impact that it makes on social development. This also applies to the sciences that deal with the theoretical understanding of the human presence in the world. The new scientific systems are not interested in such concepts as meaning, existence and reason. The new sciences are "cybernetic, i.e. technical" (Heidegger 1993). The technique and technologies continuously expand and spread their influence on a people and the society. "The technique firmly forms and directs the phenomena of the world in general and the situation of man within him" (Heidegger 1993). The technological progress according to the German author sometimes replaces social progress and thus becomes a social regression. In this respect Heidegger's ideas are similar to Meadows's ones insofar as in one of his speeches in 2012 he criticized the so-called growth advocates for not having changed their paradigm, but rather trying to change the way to justify it. From this perspective, the next objection of Meadows (2013) is that in modern times we act as if technological progress can replace the necessary social change. "Operationalism and modality of calculative thinking aspires to domination" (Heidegger 1993). Therefore, according to Heidegger technology is "guilty" about everything: war, death, destruction, and Nazism, to name a few of the more disastrous consequences. Technology creates economy and demonstrates a lack of economic laws. Aiming at increasing the productivity of manufacturing and commerce has a profound effect on the overall system of the economy and morality, but also on nature. Nowadays a distinction is made between traditional and high technologies as the common thing between them is "implemented intelligent practical purpose as key to the subject" (Ferre 2003).

In the social field of knowledge the theory of increasingly deepening crisis in people's attitude towards the environment is called "risk society". It is the work of the renowned German sociologist and philosopher Ulrich Beck (1991). As he writes more in the preface to his work: "The central focus is on the risks and consequences of modernization that settle in irreversible threats to the life of plants, animals, and humans. They can no longer be restricted to certain regions and groups, as industrial and occupational risks in the nineteenth century and the first half of twentieth century, but they show tendency towards globalization, which covers the production and reproduction, undermines the borders of national states and in this sense leads to the emergence of supranational and non-specific class global threats that develop novel social and political dynamics" (Beck 1991). Redefining the idea of progress in the modern societies such as rising activity exclusively in the field of technologies and manufacturing, creates globally a huge imbalance in the relationship man-nature.

What is obvious is the diversity of relationships of economy-moral--nature occurring in these theories. The economy sometimes interacts with nature through culture; sometimes it is an interaction through technology or generally speaking science determines the economy, but also affects nature. Liberalism and individualism are phenomena in which many researchers and ordinary people recognize the morality of the modern times, eliminate the economic regularity and continuity aiming at giving a starting point of the so-called free initiative and entrepreneurship. According to the liberal theories the active personality creates the economy, directed by the ideas of progress, i.e. dominion over the nature with the products of human ingenuity and industry. Surely the twenty-first century will give rise to their own schemes of explanations of the above phenomena. The idea of antialarmism is one of them. But there are others who we might call "environmental" such as that of "global bioeconomy" (Chichaki and Braun 2016). As stated by the two researchers, the future will require different types of innovations and breakthroughs in technology to comply with the new culture of relations between man and nature. Firstly, these are the technological innovations (for example, systems

or technical tools that reduce emissions of greenhouse gases and the overall negative impact on the environment), secondly, organizational innovation (those that affect the organization of corporations and various types of agents that interact with the nature) and thirdly, social that comprise of increasing activity in the expansion of occupations associated with environmental protection and the study of the ecological regularity (biology-based industries) (Chichaki and Braun 2016).

The problems of the impact of technology on nature will remain crucial in the near future. They can be overcome by the common efforts of ethicists, sociologists, ecologists, biologists but also by all those that determine the application of these technologies to achieve immediate social, political or economic targets – politicians, businessmen, financiers, engineers. In our opinion the central role in this process is played by ethics as knowledge of the norms and values that describe the purposes of the human behavior towards nature. Knowledge that ecology gives us has its consequence as a whole of the human presence in the world and therefore has their own ethical and moral context. For example, there is a specific value in nature that is irreplaceable, which people must comply with. This value may not concern people relations among themselves, but it is necessary for their relations with nature or for the environment they inhabit. Usually this value is unconditional; it is the nature itself as a medium in which man should find their realization. On the other hand, each different type of morality in the case of attitudes towards nature determines the structure of ethical knowledge of it, too. An environmental ethic cannot be interdisciplinary, as far as knowledge and facts are necessary about the state of the environment and the consequences of human interference on it. In relation to this we can understand the pathos of the members of the Club of Rome, concerned about the negative consequences of man's immoral attitude towards nature. In a conversation between Arnold Toynbee and Daisaku Ikeda both share the opinion that in the past mankind was often threatened with destruction by the forces of nature that it did not know and therefore could not control. However when it appears the idea of technological science and growth as a fundamental principle of civilization and

culture and way of attitude towards the environment we inhabit, people for the first time in its history understood that their future depended on what they could or could not do (Toynbee and Ikeda 1989). In other words man is faced with a moral choice that should be made not only for themselves but also for the sake of nature and the future of the entire planet. This is the basic idea of all those who are united in the Club of Rome – not the alarmism, referring to non--existent (according to Lomborg and his supporters) problems but the focus on the moral responsibility of man and their imaginary technological omnipotence about the existence of the world around us. Both Ikeda and Toynbee agree that it is necessary to overcome those moral shortcomings among us who seem to come together with the development of technological science and are caused by the feeling of omnipotence that it gives – greed, selfishness, striving for domination. "It is a shame and therefore immoral to assume self--destruction because of our refusal to make an effort that is apparently in our power and which will also save us if we are willing to make this effort. Inaction in such a situation is tantamount to suicide, it is actually self-destruction" (Toynbee and Ikeda 1989).

The following example could be given. The so called Paris Agreement, a global agreement on reducing carbon emissions and limiting global warming to less than 2 degrees °C compared to pre-industrial levels, was negotiated at the 2015 UN Climate Change Conference held in Paris, France. The Agreement is based on the Fifth Assessment Report (AR5) of the United Nations Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC) released on 2 November 2014. These concerted measures against the climate change and the risks that resulted from it show that the theory of "human impact on climate" has already received scientific credibility. This fact proves the models regarding the necessity to limit technological pressure on nature suggested by the researchers of the Club of Rome. This is a common moral cause that, despite sounding radically through its insistence on limiting and even self-restraining man in their presence in the world, offers a reasonable but worthy alternative to the grim future related to the perception of nature only as a source of raw materials and place where

waste from human activity is accumulated. The Club's scientists' aim is not to hinder or impede the economic and technological progress, as Lomborg and the antialarmists claim, but to create an overthought theory of the limits within which a person can develop their potential without becoming a threat neither to nature, nor to themselves.

5. Conclusion

The problems of the relationship between the human technologies and nature turn into such ones whose solution depends on the future of the mankind. That is why they are often described as "global", i.e. such ones that affect not only the entire planet geographically and ecologically, but require for their solution the intervention of scientists from all fields of the human knowledge. What is particularly important is the place of ethics as knowledge of proper human existence for self-perfection, purpose, and meaning of human presence in the world. Ethics as theoretical knowledge cannot create new morality. This error in the "omnipotence" of applied ethics leads to many misunderstandings. For example, it seems that "business-ethics" creates a new moral image of "entrepreneur" to whom everything or at least a lot is permitted morally in the name of profit. Another issue is that each different type of morality in the case of attitudes towards nature defines the structure of ethical knowledge about it. In this sense, an environmental ethic cannot be interdisciplinary, to the extent that what is necessary is knowledge and facts about the state of the environment and consequences for it by human intervention or any scientific predictions about the consequences of this intervention. In this respect the Club of Rome – this union of industrialists, scientists, politicians, and economists, concerned about the negative consequences of immoral attitude of man to nature – are a model for the emergence of a new culture that can be called ecological one. In the history of its existence the Club of Rome remains most vividly with its idea to limit human technological, industrial, and scientific presence in the natural environment as a basic moral principle called by the members of the Club "limits to growth". Various critics argue

against this idea, but their main assumption is that technology and expanding its scope is the key to creating a significant relationship with the nature, even if they are not symmetrical, i.e. a person definitely "to control" the environment using the scientific technologies. What we support regarding the position of the members of the Club of Rome is the idea that in a seemingly purely positive attitude towards the environment we inhabit there should be a preceding moral principle, and it lies in the motive for the restriction of purely human claims of unlimited power over the nature through technology and science. The global environmental crisis which is already an undeniable fact requires a thorough study of the ethical standards of the human behaviour, which are often rooted in moral phenomena such as consumerism, irresponsibility, insensitivity or even selfishness. Nature cannot be only considered as a source of natural resources or benefits to people. The moral motive of nature conservation, despite the power of modern science, is one of the main ideas of the founders and followers of the case of the Club of Rome. It concerns the future where the respect for the value of nature is a prerequisite and basis for honouring people.

References

Beck U., 1991, *Risk society*, London, Sage.

Beinecke B., 2012, *Environmentalists do not oppose growth*, Foreign Affairs, 91, 5, 163-165.

Chichaki B., von Braun J., 2016, *Five cornerstones of a global bioeconomy*, Nature, Vol. 535/July, 221-223.

Ferre F, 2003, *Technology and ethics*, in: *Encyclopedia of science and religion*, Macmillan, 2, 863-868.

Heidegger M., 1993, *Същности* [*The essences*], Gal-Iko, Sofia, (Bulgarian translation).

Lomborg B., 2012, *Environmental alarmism, then and now. The Club of Rome's problem – and ours*, Foreign Affairs, 91, 4, 24-40.

Meadows D.L., 2012, *Patterns not Predictions*, Foreign Affairs, 91, 5, 165-167.

Meadows D.L., 2013, Perspectives on the Limits of Growth: It is too late for sustainable development https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=f2oyU0RusiA, 23.10.2013.
Meadows D.H.,. Meadows D.L, Randers J., Behrens W., 1972, *The Limits to Growth*, Universe Books, New York.
Peccei A., 1977, *The human quality*, Oxford, England Pergamon Press.
Peccei A., Ikeda D., 2008*, Before it is too late: a dialog*, I. B. Tauris & Company.
Toynbee A., Ikeda D., 1989, *Choose Life: A Dialogue Between Arnold Toynbee & Disaku Ikeda*, ed. R.L. Gage, Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Alarmizm środowiskowy: Klub Rzymski i jego krytycy

Streszczenie

Artykuł poświęcony jest koncepcjom zaproponowanym przez Klub Rzymski i ich współczesnym odczytaniom. Klub Rzymski, powołany do życia w 1968 r., jest międzynarodowym zrzeszeniem polityków, ludzi biznesu i uczonych, którzy apelują w wzajemną tolerancję, zrozumienie i solidarność wobec rzeczywistych problemów świata, a kwestii środowiskowych przede wszystkim. Członkowie Klubu proponują ustanowienie granic dla ludzkiej ekspansji wobec przyrody, która znajdują uzasadniana w nadmiernym antropocentrycznym zaufaniu, zgodnie ze słowami członka założyciela Kluby Aurelio Pecceiego. Ostatnio koncepcje Klubu Rzymskiego były krytykowane przez ekonomistów, filozofów i polityków, którzy oskarżali je o alarmizm środowiskowy, to znaczy o sianie bezzasadnego niepokoju wywołanego błędnym przekonaniem o nieuniknionym kryzysie ekologicznym i jego katastrofalnych skutkach dla ludzkości. Globalny kryzys ekologiczny jest jednak niezaprzeczalnym faktem i wymaga gruntownego przyjrzenia się etycznym standardom ludzkiego zachowania, które często mają u swoich korzeni takie zjawiska o wymiarze moralnym, jak konsumpcjonizm, nieodpowiedzialność, bezduszność a nawet egoizm. Przyroda nie może być postrzegana wyłącznie jako źródło zasobów naturalnych albo innych korzyści dla ludzi. Moralne motywacje ochrony przyrody oprócz uzasadnień wynikających ze współczesnej nauki są głównymi koncepcjami założycieli

i kontynuatorów idei Kluby Rzymskiego. Dotyczą one przyszłości, w której szacunek wobec przyrody jawi się jako nowa zasada moralna.

Słowa kluczowe: Klub Rzymski, wzrost ekonomiczny, enwiromentalizm, etyka ochrony przyrody, alarmizm, antyalarmizm, zrównoważony rozwój, gospodarka rynkowa