

## « Ecolonomy » is the missing policy to face the climate challenge

---

Interview de Steve CHARNOVITZ

*Associate Professor of Law  
George Washington University Law School<sup>1</sup>*

### **You are said to be the inventor of the “ecolonomy” expression, is that true?**

---

At the time I wrote it, I think I was. But anytime there's a good idea in a global world, other people come up with it, at the same time or at a similar time. I wrote about that in the decade of the 90s. The first time was in 1994 for a conference at Harvard wherein my paper was titled “Living in an Ecolomy”, [https://charnovitz.org/publications/Living\\_in\\_an\\_Ecolomy.pdf](https://charnovitz.org/publications/Living_in_an_Ecolomy.pdf). Then again in October of that year in an article I wrote for the Journal of World Trade, titled “The World Trade Organization and Social Issues”, [https://charnovitz.org/publications/JWT\\_Social\\_Issues.pdf](https://charnovitz.org/publications/JWT_Social_Issues.pdf); and then I returned to it in 1996 in a more extensive way, in a book published by Westview press. The title of my contribution was “Competitiveness harmonization and the global ecolonomy”. This text is on my portal, so it's very easy to get ([https://charnovitz.org/publications/Competitiveness\\_Harmonization.pdf](https://charnovitz.org/publications/Competitiveness_Harmonization.pdf)).

This was right after the Rio conference of 1992. A lot of institutional reflection was occurring at that time; and as I began to do a lot of work with the UN agencies, I saw the gap between a community interested in trade, finance and investment and another one of environmentalists and conservationists and naturalists. They weren't talking to each other back then. It seems odd today when they do talk to each other; but back in the early 90s they were not talking to each other at all. They were talking past each other.

---

<sup>1</sup> Interview réalisée par Fabien Bottini qui remercie Steve Charnovitz d'avoir bien voulu relire et valider son compte-rendu.

So what I came up with was the idea that when we talk about the global economy or the world economy we shouldn't be leaving out the environment and when we talk about the ecosphere and the biosphere we shouldn't be leaving out the economy. And yet people were. So I thought what we really need is a term that captures both our concerns about economic growth and the world environment – or about the world economy and the conservation of natural resources and pollution issues.

As I wrote in 1994: "Once it is accepted that humans inhabit one economy, the inadequacy of current international governance becomes apparent. There is a General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade (GATT), but it has no competence for the environment. There is a United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP) but it has limited competence for economic coordination. There are numerous treaties on economic policy and on the environment, but they seldom are linked."

One term that would weave them together was the word "sustainable development." It was in use at that time, for sure, because it had been a concept from the 1987 Brundtland Commission. Then it was used a bit – not a lot – at the Rio conference and in the Agenda 21. But I didn't think "sustainable development" was a good term for what I was trying to say. It was too tautological to me.

### **So what difference do you make between "economy" and sustainable development?**

Well, if you're supporting development – which I've always done – then obviously it needs to be sustainable. Who would argue for unsustainable development?

So it seemed to me the whole concept of sustainable development was a bit meaningless as it was unmeasurable. It was thought to make a good guide for what we were trying to do at that time, to safeguard and preserve the global environment. But it didn't capture all the global community conservation efforts going back a century in which the international community had started to work on birds and whales and dolphins and fisheries. But those efforts were not connected up with the regime created for global economic issues. Similarly, the international economic institutions that focus on the world economy were not thinking about the environment.

So I was trying to put those together with one term that could be used to develop prescriptions and norms sensitive to both the economic growth gains and the improvements in pollution and conservation of natural resources and biodiversity. As I wrote in 1996: "The world economy and the global environment are, to a large and probably ever-increasing extent, two sides of the same coin. I have termed this planetary coin the economy."

In the 1960s, the GATT and the United Nations cooperated to create The United Nations Conference on Trade and Development (UNCTAD) in 1964.

There reflected an understanding that the UN needed an institution focused on economic development. Indeed many efforts to promote economic development were occurring by the 1960s. But at that time those efforts in UNCTAD lacked any ecological component. The ecologists and economists weren't generally coordinating with each other.

So when I joined the environment and development debate in early 1990, I interviewed a lot of experts on both the global economy and the global environment as to how to improve the debate. I learned that development is as important to the environment agenda as environment is to the development agenda. Everyone admitted that the two communities were not talking enough together. So when I had an opportunity to insert the term "ecology" in the debate in 1994, I did so. I recall getting some push back for using my new term because it was a neologism and people don't like neologisms. So I can't say the word "ecology" is in common use today. But I regret my lack of success because it's a useful concept.

### **Is there a link between the ecology concept of yours and ecodevelopment?**

The origin of the regime for economic development goes back to the end of World War II. Europe was in a bad shape and there was a need for actively promoting economic development. It's right after the time that the World Bank was created and at the time that the Marshall Plan was launched. By the 1960s, the concept of dedicated international efforts to promote economic development had become mainstream. But there was a problem because back then both World Bank and other development efforts were not being done in an environmentally sensitive way.

By the advent of the UN Conference on the Human Environment in 1972 (the Stockholm Conference), the world community began to weave together international policies on environment, on development, and on the economy. These efforts were greatly enhanced in the Rio Conference of 1992.

The term "ecodevelopment" does not appear in either the Stockholm or Rio Declarations. I do see a 1978 publication in "Human Development" that has "ecodevelopment" in the title. But I don't know the genealogy of that term or exactly what it means. In January 1994, in research published by the journal *Ecodecision*, I wrote, "If the Uruguay Round is to reach fruition, we must build stronger coalitions from the beneficiaries from trade liberalization. Environmentalists ought to be a central part of the coalition".<sup>2</sup>

<sup>2</sup> [https://charnovitz.org/publications/Ecodecision\\_Four\\_Schools\\_Of\\_Thought.pdf](https://charnovitz.org/publications/Ecodecision_Four_Schools_Of_Thought.pdf)

### **Are the international institutions still separate the economic and the environmental agendas nowadays according to you?**

Nowadays I think the global international institutions constantly talk about the linkages between the two agendas. So the institutions have changed in a healthy way on these issues, as the debate is a lot more integrated today. You don't have these secular siloed communities anymore at the national and international levels.

Look at the WTO today and what is being reported on the WTO portal and in international trade publications. The focus seems more about sustainable development than about trade liberalization. You hear about plastics trade or trade and climate. I would be happier if the WTO's legislative branch was undertaking new trade liberalization and the WTO's judicial branch had revived the Appellate Body that was demolished by the U.S. government under Presidents Trump and Biden.

### **What do you suggest to merge further more the economic and the environmental agendas?**

I was involved in some exercises at UNDP – the United Nations Development Programme – in the early 1990s on how to properly measure good economic growth. The problem is that the measurement of economic activity does not distinguish good economic activity from bad. So expansion of gross domestic product (GDP) is an unreliable indicator of progress. The value of what's being created might be outweighed by the cost of cleanup if the development is not being done right.

Since the Rio Conference, the concept of sustainability has become much more concrete and the metrics for it have improved enormously. But even today, key economic measures widely in use – such as unemployment, economic growth, and productivity – don't capture all of the environmental factors such pollution or excessive utilization of natural resources.

Over the past decade, considerable attention has been devoted to improving so-called ESG (Environmental, social, and that is governance) performance and there are improving metrics for that. But that's focused on companies, not on countries. These days, economy and ecology are more integrated than ever before.

### **Could deglobalization be an alternative to the climate challenge?**

In my view, continued human and economic development is important. We don't want to leave people behind in poverty. Economic development brings not only income but also opportunity thanks to education. The World Bank is an eco-

conomic development agency and has been working to cure global poverty but that campaign has not yet reached fruition. Although I am familiar with the so-called “sustainist” philosophy that is anti-growth and anti-trade and maybe even against economic development, I don’t buy into that radical ethos. I don’t agree that economic or environmental deglobalization, which is another way of saying more localization, will solve our most pressing international problems. Localization is not a solution to climate change because if one company or one country achieves decarbonization, that may contribute little to solving the climate challenge. I still support the multilateral commitment in Article 3(5) of the UN Framework Convention on Climate Change which is that “The Parties should cooperate to promote a supportive and open international economic system...”.

But it’s true that nowadays a lot of people think trade autarky and self-dependence is a better path than more international trade and trade barrier liberalization. Unfortunately today, the ideals in which countries seek to trade more with each other are out of fashion. Instead, the misbegotten protectionists ideas of the past are coming back to haunt the world. The US is an example of how protectionist ideas can spread like a virus through the political system.

The Ukraine–Russia war is exacerbating the international economic and environmental conditions which is hurting the environment and economic growth. Some suggest to decouple Russia and even China from the rest of the world. But such a decoupling is the wrong direction to go with China because that populous country needs to be encouraged to remain in the international law system. In my free trade vision, the world is better with free trade than with protectionism as free trade is a crucial part of economic development and sustainability.

### **The “ecolonomy” concept of yours is it for low durability or strong durability?**

There’s a populist movement away from globalization that militates for protectionism and unilateralist insularity. The underlying idea seems to be that countries can have needed environmental cooperation, and health cooperation, and security cooperation even if they dismiss trade cooperation. I don’t agree that such divisibility works. Countries that engage in trade wars with each other are unlikely to effectuate a shared environmental mission. So in my view, most of the problems we have in the world is from a lack of globalization rather than too much globalization.

The Covid pandemic provides a good example of missing law, in that case, the absence of having in place effective international pandemic law (IPaL). In 2019, there was a need for it and yet there was an absence of strong international rules on what countries needed to do if there was a highly contagious respiratory virus that would spread a pandemic. So in my view, as an international legal scholar, the

planet needs more law to be enforced at the international level for the problems that aren't purely domestic but global. We need global legal norms to deal with the global challenges.

As I explained in the early 1990s, the world trading system should be appreciated as an institution of the global economy. Despite its promising beginnings in 1995, the World Trade Organization (WTO) has underperformed in its legislative branch. Even something as simple as reducing barriers to environmental goods and services, a project that the WTO started in 2001, still has not been achieved.

Other parts of the institutional economy have performed better than the WTO in the 21st century. The various environment regimes have produced many useful treaties as has the International Labour Organization (ILO). But the multilateral environmental treaty that gets the most attention, the Paris Agreement on Climate, was intentionally bereft of any substantive norms, such as an agreement of major economies to impose a carbon tax.

### **So, according to you, the response to global warming is more global norms?**

We have today an attack by Russia on Ukraine. How many times in the world history has one country attacked another? This sort of thing happened a lot over the past 2000 years. But before the UN Charter of 1945, we didn't have a clear international rule saying something like the Russian invasion was legally wrong.

Clearly today our understanding of the UN charter is that Russia violated the international rules. So the response to that should be a more effective globalized legal system that could call out Russia; a legal system ought to be able to say Russia has violated international law. I don't know if that's going to happen in the current International Court of Justice proceeding, but the Security Council showed itself to be ineffective in this matter. The General Assembly did pass a resolution but that's not quite its job.

So to deal with Russia we have set up a fabric of international coordination between governments. We need an unprecedented, unparalleled coordination between governments around the world (including China and India) to confront and put pressure on Russia. Russia is being separated temporarily from the global economic system – I don't think it will be permanent. And the reason why we're able to coordinate all these sanctions, financial transfers, criminal seizing of yachts and so on and so on; all the amazing things going on, it's because of transgovernmental institutions. It's the idea that what's happening in Kiev is part of my world. The whole world is watching and this calls for more globalization to do something about it, not for deglobalization.

### **Do you believe in a sustainable globalization?**

Yes the “ecolonomy” concept seeks sustainable globalization. Globalization needs proper market interventions by governments and international institutions. The market cannot be left unsupervised. But sovereign governments can also not be left unsupervised. That’s why sustainability requires at its base a responsive and enforceable system of international law.

### **How do you explain the lack of success of your “ecolonomy” concept in the legal world today?**

My introduction of the term “ecolonomy” back in the early 1990s was an effort to encourage systematic thinking of how the world economy affected the environment and how the health of the environment would condition the world economy. Both of those ideas are now mainstream today. So what’s important is that the cutting edge of debate in 2022 is a lot different than it was in 1992. The term I introduced wasn’t widely adopted, but other terms were. I mean we’ve made progress as a planet.

I think the UN sustainable development goals (SDGs) project has been successful. When the UN did that in 2015 and set out this SDGs it has an unexpected impact in being normative to international organizations and being normative to the private sector.

Are we closer to achieving the goals and the SDGs today than we were in 2015? New stumbling blocks occurred in 2020 the COVID global pandemic and then again in 2022 with the Russian war and the ensuing food and energy crisis. But I think there had been some progress from 2015 to 2019.

But the 2015 SDGs did have many flaws. One was failing to acknowledge the risk of a global viral pandemic and giving counsel on what should be done to avoid and alleviate the pandemic. Another weakness of the SDGs is inattention to the need for more effective trade liberalization.

There’s been a lot of progress in our institutions, in our norms, in our policies. But they haven’t kept up well to the planet’s needs, to the human ecology. Many problems have gotten worse since 2015, particularly climate changes, biodiversity, plastics pollution, and fisheries.

And our global institutions have not strengthened. For example, the WTO started 2022 much weaker than it had been in 2017 before the United States began its attacks on the WTO appellate tribunal.



**You wrote in 1994 : "With skillfull management  
it may be possible to increase the stock of such resources  
commensurately with a growing economy".  
Do you still believe it today?**

I believe in the capability of mankind to develop policies commensurate with the needs of the planet. This is our planet. It is the only one we have. We ought to be able to manage it through good stewardship. But we're not. According to the optimism that I'd expressed in that article 28 years ago, progress has not been as much as it should have been. Every time we think we have made progress we have a warning. There have been some pretty serious setbacks. But there have also been some gains such as the partly successful WTO Ministerial Conference in June 2022.

It's hard to see a lot of benefits of COVID other than waking us up to the need to do better next time in order to better manage the next global pandemic. The Ukraine War, as bad as it is, could get much worse if Mr. Putin sends a nuclear missile. Such a nuclear strike would be a economic and environmental disaster. On the other hand, if Russia stands down, the War will have left a stronger regional security organization (the North Atlantic Treaty Organization), and a stronger European Union at least on its security dimension. Ukraine's bravery will earn it a more central role in global governance issues including environmental governance. That could be a very positive development.

**Can we say that "ecolonomy"  
is for a free carbon economy?**

We absolutely do need to take on policies to address climate change and global warming. An important part of that is reducing use of fossil fuel carbon energy and this was all talked about going back in 1992, at the Rio conference. It's really been part of the agenda since Rio and the creation of UN Framework Convention on Climate Change.

When you have such a global problem – and nothing could be a more global problem than climate change – the solution has to be global, not just assorted local actions. Climate change can only be fixed with coordinated global policies. That's true of other international challenges that are inherently indivisible. For example gender equality could be achieved in one country and not in another. Carbon neutrality can be achieved in one country but not another. But unless there is a sufficient critical mass of countries achieving carbon neutrality, then the virtuous action by one country won't help much.

All my writings since the 1990s on the need to take action on climate change have pointed to the linkage of climate and trade. I have advocated multilateral



solutions to these linkage problems that are effective, workable, and fair for all countries. That's why my bottom line has always been the ecolonomy rather than just what's good for one national economy or another. Because the trade-climate linkage problems were never addressed in the climate regime, we have individual countries like the United States seeking to address the issues unilaterally using protectionist border, carbon adjustments being disguised as clean energy measures. I have always supported moving toward more development of more sources of energy that are not carbon intensive and that do not consume fossil fuels. Even nuclear energy should be utilized if it can be done safely and with life cycle efficiency. If new fusion technologies become more workable, that would be good news for the ecolonomy too. I reject some of the core beliefs of the sustainists such as depowering the world economy or deflowering human expectations of a better economic future.

**It is as if we have the tools to a really healthy ecolonomy  
but we lack the political will to use it plentifully...**

Yes, I agree that political will is often lacking. But not everywhere. Uruguay is doing a good job. But lack of political will is a stumbling block for the major economies because political leaders think only short term rather than long term. Governments have also lacked the political will to upgrade the institutions in global environmental governance. For example, I have advocated a Global Environmental Organization but that has not been created.

There has also been a lack of will to use the key tool of a gradually increasing carbon tax to promote the phase out of carbon energy. Here in the United States, it would have been conceptually easy to employ a national carbon tax but both political parties were afraid to do it. Instead in recent years, US federal and state governments have expanded subsidies to support clean energy. The presence of market failure does establish the legitimacy of using subsidies. But subsidies are not the best instrument because they are prone to the pathology of using them for protectionist purposes and to channel money from the government to special interest groups. This is what is now happening in the United States with a movement toward flawed sectoral industrial policies. Although the choosing of particular technologies by the government is a flawed approach, what's worse in the current US practice is that the subsidies are being made contingent on domestic production.

As Professor Dan Esty and I pointed out in 2012 in a Harvard Business School project, the key to securing the political will in the United States to implementing a carbon charge was getting prior coordinated agreement of the major economies such as the US, China, EU, and Japan. If they all do it, nobody will be at a competitive disadvantage. That never happened and that was the missing policy.

### **Do you want to add something before we close this interview?**

There has been a missing agenda for a long time. There was a lot of work on promoting freer trade and that's I think has been pushed aside now because many countries have embraced protectionism. Back in the 1980s, I began advocating better systems to use human resources by promoting adjustment to workers who lose their jobs as a result of imports. I advocated that the GATT and then the WTO should make efforts to promote adjustment to trade. So that countries that engage in trade will make themselves better off. There's got to be more attention to the needs of the people who get hurt by trade. We've never built that into international law on trade and I've advocated that for 30 years.

The other point I would make in that while every international organization ought to promote sustainable development, there is a danger of reconceiving all international organizations as seeking the same agenda. The value of international organizations comes from their functional specialization. Many today want the WTO to do more to prevent fisheries subsidies or to clean up plastic wastes. While there may be some value-added in having the WTO expand its mission in that way, I worry that any diversion from the WTO's primary mission of promoting trade liberalization and preventing disguised protectionism will mean that those values will fall by the wayside. If the WTO does not combat disguised protectionism (especially by the US), then no other international organization will take up by mantle. By contrast, if the WTO declines to take on new environmental chores, those projects can be undertaken in the organizations that should be responsible for them, that is, among the various environment regimes. If the current environmental or fishery regimes are not sufficient to deal with fisheries regulation, then governments should upgrade the environmental treaties and institutions. Delegating non-trade issues to the WTO is bad for the WTO and bad for the disregarded environmental regimes.

The World Health Organization should have focused on its original mission of preventing communicable disease. But it got distracted acting as the world doctor. So it would have advice on nutrition and all these things. We didn't need a World Health Organization to give us advice on nutrition. So the World Health Organization should have focused on the problem of communicable disease. That was the whole reason why the league nations set up a Health Organization in 1920s: it was to deal with communicable disease. It wasn't to deal with blood pressure.

Mission creep is a potential problem in any international organization. Adding more missions can undermine value-added. International organizations shouldn't be oblivious to everything else but should focus on their mission. If every international organization tries to do everything, then our world regime will be a lot less effective than it could be.

## Sommaire

<i>Remerciements</i> .....	11
<i>Avant-propos</i> .....	13
par Cédric GLINEUR	
<i>« Concurrents quand c'est la règle, coopératifs quand c'est possible, adversaires quand il le faut ? » À propos des droits (publics économiques) « du monde d'après »</i> .....	19
par Fabien BOTTINI	
<b>Partie I</b>	
<b>Les faiblesses du droit d'avant face à la montée des périls</b>	
<i>Un monde d'après à la croisée des chemins</i> .....	25
par Jean-Paul LECOQ	
<i>Le double défi fiscal du « droit public économique du monde d'après »</i> .....	33
par Michel BOUVIER	
<i>La transition écologique face à la transition technologique...</i>	39
par Lucien CASTEX	
<i>« Perspectives historiques sur la protection des données personnelles »</i> .....	45
par Élodie CRETEAU	
<i>La régulation de l'économie numérique : l'émergence d'un droit des plateformes ?</i> .....	53
par Arnaud SEE	

*Les aides publiques économiques : stade suprême  
du désengagement de l'État dans l'économie ?* ..... 69  
par Denis JOUVE

*« Ecolonomy » is the missing policy to face the climate  
challenge* ..... 81  
par Interview de Steve CHARNOVITZ

## Partie II

### Les incertitudes liées aux résistances face au changement de paradigme juridique

*L'assouplissement du cadre européen* ..... 93  
par Sébastien BERNARD

*Retour à la Pyramide ?  
Brèves remarques sur la reconfiguration en cours de la liberté  
de choix des modes de gestion des services publics* ..... 101  
par Léo VANIER

*Quelle place pour le contrôle juridictionnel des gestions  
publiques ?* ..... 109  
par Christian MICHAUT

*La mobilisation du droit des assurances par l'État  
dans l'affrontement du défi climatique* ..... 115  
par Rodolphe BIGOT, Amandine CAYOL

*L'École est finie (à propos de la suppression de l'ENA)* ..... 129  
par Guy QUINTANE

*La constitution économique du « monde d'après »* ..... 145  
par Alexis LE QUINIO

*La jurisprudence « écolomique » du Conseil constitutionnel...* 155  
par Maxime CHARITÉ

*Le verdissement du droit public financier :  
réalité et marges de progression* ..... 167  
par Émilie MOYSAN

## Quelles fait

*Le devenir du patri*  
par Jacques CHEVALLIER

*Transition écologi*  
par Gilles LEBRETON

*Concept d'éconor  
et environnement*  
par Laurence POTVIN-SOL

*Plaidoyer pour un  
économique et éc*  
par Michel BRUNO

*Transports et déve  
d'expérimentation*  
par Aurore LAGET-ANNAN

*Commande public  
concurrentiel ?* .....  
par Mathias AMILHAT

*L'État pilote est m*  
par Raphaël RENEAU

*Vers un État post-  
Contribution à une  
de l'État en France*  
par Philippe ALCOUFFE

*Vers un troisième  
Réflexions sur la p  
« écolomique » au  
hérités de 1980 et*  
par Fabien BOTTINI

Table des matières

# LE DROIT (PUBLIC ÉCONOMIQUE) DU MONDE D'APRÈS

Fabien BOTTINI (dir.)

Sous le Haut Patronage de  
l'Institut Universitaire de France

**LEGI**<sup>F</sup>  
*éditeur juridique*

**Du même auteur :**

*L'action économique des collectivités publiques. Ses enjeux, son droit, ses acteurs*, Bayonne,

IFDJ-Legitech, 2020, 912 p.

(dir.), *La police de la liberté*, Luxembourg, Legitech, 2021, 430 p.

(dir.), *Le pluralisme à l'épreuve du néopluralisme. L'avenir du droit des Lumières en question*, Legitech, 2023 (à paraître)

**Autres ouvrages du même éditeur :**

Livre des impôts 2023, édition 2023, Legitech

Le droit du pilotage des crises et de la gestion des risques, édition 2023, Marc Burg

Les SCI, Aspects juridiques, comptables et fiscaux, édition 2023, Denis Colin

L'objet et la fonction de la propriété intellectuelle – Réflexions à partir de la jurisprudence de la CJUE, édition 2022, Pablo Mohr (sous la coord.)

The Anywhere Organisation, édition 2022, Nadia Alter, Matthias Ansorg

Luxembourg Holding Companies Domestic and International Tax Aspects, édition 2022, Olivier Dal Farra

Dans les méandres de la fraude fiscale, édition 2022, Julien Briot

Les défis actuels de l'Union européenne, édition 2022, Michel Bruno (sous la dir.)

Commentaire annoté de la Convention belgo-luxembourgeoise préventive de la double imposition,

Christophe Lenoir, édition 2022

Guide pratique relatif à la lutte contre le blanchiment et contre le financement du terrorisme, OEC, édition 2022

Le regroupement des collectivités publiques, édition 2022, Fabien Bottini (sous la dir.)

S'y retrouver au sein du droit de la protection des données, édition 2022, Jean-Luc Sauron, Jackeline Patricia

Céspedes Arteaga, Léa Paravano

A guide to the Luxembourg-Germany tax treaty, édition 2022, Oliver R. Hoor, Andreas Medler

EFPA ESG Handbook 2022, édition 2022, EFPA Luxembourg

Le règlement des différends dans les accords entre le Royaume-Uni et l'Union européenne, édition 2022,

Jean-Grégoire Mahinga

Lutte contre le blanchiment de capitaux à l'ère des crypto-monnaies, édition 2022, Amaury Grevesse-Sovet

Mémento de droit fiscal (7<sup>e</sup> édition), édition 2022, Alain Steichen

La gestion fiscale des entreprises et ses limites, édition 2021, Émilien Lebas

Le consentement, édition 2021, sous la direction de Jean-Marc Roy

Green Ethica (2<sup>nd</sup> édition), édition 2021, EFPA Luxembourg

Alternative Investments, édition 2021, Oliver R. Hoor

Vos données personnelles : que savoir et comment faire pour qu'elles le restent !, édition 2021, Jean-Luc Sauron et Alice Vitard

L'ordonnance européenne de saisie conservatoire des comptes bancaires, édition 2021, Gilles Cuniberti,

Sara Mughorim

Droit de la sécurité privée, édition 2021, Marc Burg

Pierre Papier : quel support choisir ?, édition 2021, Thierry Slama

Droit du Patrimoine, édition 2021, Rêmi Blondelle, André Culot, Philippe De Page, François Derème,

Anna-Lisa Heyne, Arnau de Meeûs

@ by Legitech, mai 2023

10 A, rue des Mérovingiens, L - 8070 Bertrange

Tél.: 26 31 64 1 – Fax.: 26 31 64 99

- Impression -

Ciaco

Rue du Rodeuhaie, 27

1348 Louvain-la-Neuve, Belgique

@ Copyright 2023 Legitech

Tous droits réservés

Des reproductions peuvent être autorisées par luxorr  
(Luxembourg Organisation For Reproduction Rights)

www.luxorr.lu.

ISBN 978-2-919814-76-3