
Conference Report

Earth Day quacks push environmental 'global ethic'

by Marsha Freeman

"We are all pursuing self-destructive policies," and to change these will require changing people's "ethics," declared former U.S. senator and Earth Day founder Gaylord Nelson, in a speech on April 5. Nelson, who bragged that he had introduced the legislation in the early 1970s that led to the banning of the pesticide DDT, was the keynote speaker at a conference on "Understanding Earth: Retrospectives and Vision," held in celebration of the 25th anniversary of the pagan Earth Day "holiday." The conference, sponsored by the Environmental Research Institute of Michigan and held at the National Press Club in Washington, D.C., was dominated by top-level international green ghouls, many claiming how yet another aspect of man's activities was creating an impending catastrophe. The message was that the first principle of society must be protecting the Earth—not social progress, economic development, or even "sustainable development."

As *EIR* has documented (see issues of Oct. 28, 1994 and Jan. 13, 1995), the top-down controllers of the international environmentalist movement are the British oligarchy, and most notably Prince Philip, the founder of the World Wide Fund for Nature.

At the Washington conference, Nelson called for a massive education program to indoctrinate young children with his environmental "ethic," so they would police themselves and their parents, since "we can't have a policeman at every door." Without this ethic of protecting the Earth from man, no further progress will be made through more environmental laws, Nelson warned.

U.S. Interior Secretary Bruce Babbitt gave his support to such demands for self-policing. We have "passed through the exhortative phase and are now in the implementation phase [of enforcing environmental policies] that effects the daily lives of people. . . . We've scored the easy victories that didn't require large-scale engagement" on the part of the population, but now, environmental policy "will affect every citizen. The problem is in all of our lifestyles." It was relatively easy to bully companies, power plant owners, and

other large industrial polluters into meeting new environmental standards in the first phase, he explained. But now, he said, we are going to have to take on the average American who drives a car, likes to barbeque, and uses air conditioning in his automobile and home.

Babbitt scored the Republican advocates of the Contract with America, whom he said are running a "sneak attack rather than frontal assault" against environmental legislation, by proposing regulatory reform that would "effectively repeal these laws." The sponsors of this new environmental assault "don't want to confront the American people directly" with their agenda. This is a "small crowd of ideologues" who recast their anti-environmental issues with an anti-regulatory face, Babbitt said. This, after having stated that the "small crowd" of *environmental* ideologues was not going to be able to get support for their agenda from the American people, either.

Target: China

China, the largest nation in the world, in a region that the British are committed to destabilize politically and economically, was used by conference speakers as the leading example of how continued growth would overwhelm the world's resources, and threaten life as we know it, even in the United States. The president of the WorldWatch Institute, Lester Brown, said that his State of the World report for 1995 shows that we are "running into more and more of Earth's natural limits." These include the decline in the catch from fisheries, drops in water tables and underground aquifers worldwide, and a decline in the application of fertilizers because the productivity gains from their use has reached a limit.

Brown, who established WorldWatch in 1974 with support from the Rockefeller Brothers Fund, is the recipient of the 1990 World Wide Fund for Nature Gold Medal, the 1989 United Nations Environment Prize, and other mementos of appreciation for his ideas, including the one that the Earth has a natural "carrying capacity" which supposedly

Hoaxes refuted: There is no global warming

The Washington, D.C.-based George C. Marshall Institute on April 3 released a study, "The Global Warming Experiment," demonstrating that world temperature measurements show that computer model predictions of global warming are just full of hot air.

"The overwhelming evidence is that the computer models are not able to predict changes in global temperatures based on carbon dioxide levels," said Dr. Sallie Baliunas, the Harvard astrophysicist who authored the report.

Dr. Baliunas presented a chart of temperature records from the Arctic, where computer models predict the most warming to occur. The satellite data show that temperatures have gone down more than 0.5°C, and ground measurements show that they have gone down more than 2°C—exactly the opposite of what the models predicted.

A chart of ice core records presented by Baliunas showed that between 135,000 and 115,000 years ago, temperatures declined sharply, but the carbon dioxide concentration remained constant. Her conclusion is that there is *no correlation between CO₂ and temperature*, which is the fundamental tenet of the global warming

theory. Furthermore, the ice core record, if anything, shows that temperature increased first, followed later by an increase in CO₂, most likely as a result of increased vegetation.

Dr. Baliunas pointed out that the climate models cannot even account for the basic effects of water vapor and clouds. She noted the fact that over 90% of the greenhouse effect is determined by atmospheric water vapor, not carbon dioxide or other "greenhouse gases" produced by man. She said that if the actual role of water vapor is not even understood yet, how could anybody make a model of the atmosphere to predict future climate?

Dr. Baliunas agreed with the evidence that temperatures had increased half a degree in the past century, but said that most of the increase happened before World War II, and was well within the range of natural temperature variability.

She concluded that there was insufficient evidence to warrant any action to try to limit greenhouse gas emissions by the U.N. Climate Conference in Berlin, adding that the consequences of such policies to the world economy, particularly developing countries, would be devastating.

The Marshall Institute was founded in 1984 by several scientists who wanted to fight environmental irrationality with scientific evidence. The founders include Dr. Fred Seitz, former head of the National Academy of Sciences, and Dr. Robert Jastrow from the Goddard Institute for Space Studies.—*Rogelio Maduro*

places limits on the growth of the human population (actually, this idea was concocted, not by Lester Brown, but by the Venetian hoaxster Giammaria Ortes, in the 18th century).

Speaking as if there were no financial and political policies that have created these "natural" limits, Brown stated that there has been a "loss of momentum in the growth of food production," because since 1984, grain production has been growing worldwide at 1% per annum, but population is growing at 2% per annum. As an example, Brown zeroed in on China.

China "may become a massive food importer" by the turn of the century, Brown warned. This, because its 1.2 billion people are "moving up the food chain" (perhaps he thinks they are animals on a World Wide Fund for Nature preserve). The problem, claims Brown, is not that China cannot produce enough grain to feed its growing population and prevent famine; the problem is that economic growth in China is increasing the rate of consumption and demand for meat and other animal products, and this could "overwhelm world supplies."

Brown said that feeding a country that counts its people in billions rather than millions is virtually inconceivable. For example: the Chinese government has promulgated the goal of annual per capita egg consumption rising from an average of 100 in 1990 to 200 at the turn of the century—an enormous task. He recited a litany of statistics on how many hens that would mean (1.3 billion), how much grain those chickens would consume (24 million tons), and concluded that we may "find ourselves competing with the Chinese for *our* own grain." And, yes, they "can afford to import all of our grain." This year's trade surplus with the United States would allow China to import all of our grain for export, two times over.

In response to a question by a Chinese-American attendee, as to whether this means that China will have only two choices in the future—deliberate mass starvation of its own people, which has happened in the past, or going to war—Brown said China could mitigate the situation through increases in efficiency in water use, smaller families, and using bicycles and trains rather than reducing agricultural land to build roads.

In an article for the September/October 1994 issue of *WorldWatch* magazine, titled "Who Will Feed China?" Brown dismissed the use of alternatives such as fish protein to improve the diet of the Chinese, pointing to the "biological limits" of the world's major fisheries, as if the number of free-roaming buffalo in America limited the number of people able to live here for all time. For Lester Brown, there are no scientific breakthroughs that will prevent a malthusian war of each against all. (For a fuller analysis of Brown's article, see *EIR*, Nov. 25, 1994, "Malthusians Threaten China with the Food Weapon.")

More hoaxes and scare stories

Under the rubric of "retrospectives of key global environmental issues," looking back to the first Earth Day, 25 years ago, "scientists" promoting the best-known environmental scare stories made their appearance.

Dr. Susan Solomon, senior scientist at the Aeronomy Laboratory of the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, presented charts and graphs to make her case that it is necessary to "heal the ozone layer." Banking on the ignorance of the audience, Solomon made absolute statements that she would not have been able to defend, had there been time for questions. For example, she stated that "the ozone hole opened in 1975," even though the seasonal thinning of the ozone layer had been observed by atmospheric scientists in the 1950s. "Volcanoes do not inject chlorine into the stratosphere to any significant degree," Solomon said with absolute assurance, while this has been disputed by volcanologists around the world.

While the banning of aerosol cans in the United States has supposedly helped, and, according to Solomon, we are "now seeing a slowing down, and this year the stop in the growth rate of chlorine in the atmosphere," she warned that the substitutes for the outlawed chlorofluorocarbons are "too similar to CFCs," so the problem has not been solved.

Dr. Robert Watson, Associate Director for Environment of the White House Office of Science and Technology Policy, and formerly top climate-hoax spokesman at NASA, spoke on climate change, by which he means global warming. Watson complained that the climate conventions that nations have agreed to have "no teeth" and are non-binding. "Interpreting the mandates is as much political as scientific," he said.

We should learn the lessons of the ozone hole, Watson said. We waited to discover the cause and effect relation between chlorine and ozone depletion before taking corrective action, and now it will take 40 years to regain the ozone layer. "If you do that for climate, it will take centuries" to fix it, because "these pollutants have such long lifetimes" in the atmosphere. It is "crucial to have action now."

Although he admitted that the half-degree increase measured in average global temperature over the past century is within the range of natural variation, he lied that "confi-

dence has grown in the last few years in modelling climate." (See box.)

Watson said that we must stop the use of energy sources and other industrial technologies that release so-called greenhouse gases, for the sake of the Third World, because "most changes will be in the tropical regions" and these countries "are least able to cope with them."

Watson tried to assure the audience that this did not mean that there should not be economic "development" in the Third World—energy efficiency and renewables such as solar and bio-fuels, and maybe hydrogen, "go hand-in-hand with economic growth," he said. These post-industrial schemes are the best option, for the advanced sector as well as the developing countries, he claimed.

Even 'sustainable development' is rejected

Thomas Lovejoy, counselor to the Secretary for Biodiversity and Environmental Affairs of the Smithsonian Institution, who coined the term "biodiversity," warned that people call all sorts of projects "sustainable development," but many of these projects would wipe out entire species. He said that a new organizing principle must be applied, that sustainable ecosystem management equals sustainable development. Otherwise, sustainable development will lead to a loss of biodiversity. The ecosystem comes first.

Lovejoy was echoed by Elizabeth Dowdeswell, secretary general and executive director of U.N. Environment Programs. Speaking by teleconference from Berlin, where the Framework Convention on Climate Change was taking place, Dowdeswell said that sustainable development "needs a reality check" to make sure it really does make the environment better. It is "not going to be technology that fixes" things, she said. You have to "look at the values people hold dear" and encourage "ethical and caring behavior for human needs."

After the 1992 U.N. Conference on Environment and Development (UNCED) in Rio de Janeiro, we "lulled ourselves into a false sense of security," Dowdeswell said. We must "find ways of extending the constituencies" for these programs, including in the developing countries.

The fact that there is resistance to the world dictatorship of a green "ethic" was reflected in remarks by Maurice Strong, who was the secretary general of the 1992 UNCED meeting. He described the process since Rio as a "mix of disappointments and progress." This, because in many cases, "governments are preoccupied with other pressures and haven't moved ahead." For example, at the meeting in Berlin, he said, we see a "recession of political will and budgetary austerity."

Most developing nations seem little concerned about conserving energy, a number of speakers observed. That is not exactly surprising, since they are facing a world financial blowout, with the real-life consequences of a collapsed world economy.