

Environmental hoaxes are based on population reduction, not science

by Marjorie Mazel Hecht

Environmental policy today is driven by population-reduction ideology, not science. Today's hot-button environmental issues would have flunked even the most cursory science (or sanity) test a half-century ago. There is no real scientific evidence behind the scare stories, just the Malthusian view that the Earth must be protected from greedy, resource-using human beings, of whom there are too many. From the Malthusian point of view, the scare stories and their consequences—such as banning useful pesticides—have proven to be a very efficient means of directly or indirectly killing large numbers of people.

Let's take three examples: DDT, the ozone hole, and global warming.

DDT is the "mother" of environmental hoaxes. The pesticide was banned in 1972 by Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) administrator William Ruckelshaus, for what he admitted were "political" reasons. Ruckelshaus chose to ban DDT, despite the fact that the EPA had held seven months of scientific hearings on DDT, and that the EPA's own hearing examiner had ruled on the basis of the voluminous scientific evidence presented, that DDT should *not* be banned.¹

EPA hearing examiner Edmund Sweeney stated at the time, "DDT is not carcinogenic, mutagenic, or teratogenic to man [and] these uses of DDT do not have a deleterious effect on fish, birds, wildlife, or estuarine organisms." The major scientific organizations testified on behalf of continued use of DDT.

In the past 25 years, despite the repeated lies about the dangers of DDT, the scientific evidence has continued to prove it safe. It does not cause cancer in human beings, eggshell thinning in birds, bird die-offs, or any of the other catastrophic effects attributed to it by the greens.

DDT came under fire because, since its discovery in 1942, it had saved more millions of human lives than any

other man-made chemical. Alexander King, founder of the Club of Rome, a Malthusian outfit, wrote in a 1990 biographical essay: "My chief quarrel with DDT in hindsight is that it has greatly added to the population problem." King was particularly concerned that DDT had dramatically cut the incidence of malaria and the death rate in the developing sector.

Today, without the use of DDT, malaria is the world's leading killer disease, causing at least 100 million deaths per year. Nearly half the world's population is at risk from malaria, and its debilitating effects. Most of the 200 to 300 million new malaria cases each year are among children.

The big lie about the ozone hole

There is *no* scientific certainty whatsoever that the very small amounts of man-made chlorofluorocarbons are depleting the ozone layer. The so-called evidence is the product of computer models, not real data. Yet, the ozone-depletion theory was used to give birth to a 1987 international agreement, the Montreal Protocol on Substances That Deplete the Ozone Layer, that mandates the phaseout of a benign, efficient, and inexpensive refrigerant, which has been responsible in the past 50 years for saving lives by preserving the food supply and keeping it wholesome.²

The individuals behind the Montreal Protocol—for example, Richard Elliot Benedick, the U.S. State Department's ozone negotiator who organized the Montreal Protocol, and who headed the State Department's Office of Population—admitted that there was "no measurable evidence of damage" at the time the treaty was signed.³

There still is no measurable evidence of damage. But as the phaseout of CFCs takes hold, and poorer nations cannot afford the more expensive substitute refrigerants, there will be a breakdown of the refrigeration cold chain, which protects

1. For background information on DDT, see Dr. J. Gordon Edwards, "The Ugly Truth About Rachel Carson," *21st Century Science & Technology*, Summer 1992, and Dr. J. Gordon Edwards, "Malaria: The Killer That Could Have Been Conquered," *21st Century Science & Technology*, Summer 1993.

2. See Rogelio A. Maduro and Ralph Schauerhammer, *The Holes in the Ozone Scare: The Scientific Evidence That the Sky Isn't Falling* (Washington, D.C.: 21st Century Science Associates, 1992).

3. Richard Elliot Benedick, *Ozone Diplomacy: New Directions in Safeguarding the Planet* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1991), pp. 1-2.

crops after harvest and during storage and distribution, and mass deaths will occur. International refrigeration experts have estimated that the ban on CFCs would kill between 20 to 40 million people a year by the end of the 1990s, through starvation and food-borne diseases.

As with the DDT ban, the population control lobby brags about its institution of the ozone hole hoax. For example, in a 1992 update of the Club of Rome's 1972 book *Limits to Growth*, the authors devote an entire chapter to praising the Montreal Protocol, as follows:

"The world's nations acknowledged that they had overrun a serious limit. Soberly, reluctantly, they agreed to give up a profitable and useful industrial product. They did it before there was any measurable economic, ecological, or human damage and before there was complete scientific certainty."⁴

What global warming?

Until the early 1970s, it was generally assumed that long-term astronomical cycles—those measured in tens or hundreds of thousands of years—were the way in which an understanding of climate had to be situated.⁵ The 100,000-year and shorter cycles of Ice Ages are determined by the periodicities in the eccentricity, tilt, and precession of the Earth's orbit. In between Ice Ages, there are roughly 10,000-year periods known as interglacials, when relatively milder climates prevail. Right now, the Earth is at the end of an interglacial, and probably already entering a period of glacial advance.

The Ice Ages of the past, and the coming Ice Age, have a timetable of their own, quite independent of man's industrial output of carbon dioxide. No scientist who knows these astronomical cycles could be honestly worried about the ups and downs of local or global temperatures in time spans of years or even decades, or seriously concerned with short-term computer modelling and associated scare stories.

How then, have we come to the point where an international climate treaty is on the table, buttressed by a "consensus" that flies in the face of the reality that, based on the last several million years of history, the world is inexorably moving into another Ice Age?⁶ Again, we can look to a leading Malthusian activist, Dame Margaret Mead, for an explanation: Mead chaired a conference in November 1975

4. Donella H. Meadows, Dennis L. Meadows, and Jørgen Randers, *Beyond the Limits: Confronting Global Collapse, Envisioning a Sustainable Future* (Post Mills, Vt.: Chelsea Green, 1992).

5. For a historical review of climate science, see Laurence Hecht, "The Coming (or Present) Ice Age," *21st Century Science & Technology*, Winter 1993-1994.

6. The story of how the shift from an ice age scare to global warming was accomplished is told in Robert E. Stevenson, Ph.D., "An Oceanographer Looks at the Non-Science of Global Warming," *21st Century Science & Technology*, Winter 1996-1997; and Rogelio A. Maduro, "Orbital Cycles, Not CO₂ Determine the Earth's Climate," *EIR*, May 16, 1997.

on "The Atmosphere: Endangered or Endangering." Mead told the assembled scientists:

"The unparalleled increase in the human population and its demands for food, energy, and resources is clearly the most important destabilizing influence in the biosphere. We are facing a period when society must make decisions on a planetary scale. Unless the peoples of the world can begin to understand the immense and long-term consequences of what appear to be small immediate choices: to drill a well, open a road, build a large airplane, make a nuclear test, install a liquid fast-breeder reactor, release chemicals which diffuse throughout the atmosphere, or discharge waste in concentrated amounts into the sea, the whole planet may

British Empire pushes treaty after treaty

Since the end of World War II, the United Nations has drafted and ratified more than 50 treaties that dictate that the primary concern of nations must become the "protection of the environment," "ecosystems," "endangered species," the "atmosphere," and whatnot. While these treaties pay lip service to the idea that all of these environmental and population-control policies are intended to benefit mankind by preserving Mother Earth, their primary purpose is to destroy scientific and technological progress, thus depriving mankind of its most important tools to nurture nature, and to drive the world's natural resources into the hands of multinational corporations that are an integral part of the present-day, reorganized British Empire known as the British Commonwealth.

The treaties also explicitly are aimed at replacing national sovereignty with rule by the United Nations and non-governmental organizations (NGOs). While most people assume that these treaties have been drafted by the representatives of sovereign governments, in fact, most were drafted by a gaggle of NGOs. The most influential of these are the International Union for the Conservation of Nature (IUCN), also known as the World Conservation Union, and the World Wildlife Fund, also known as the World Wide Fund for Nature (WWF). More recently, the World Resources Institute, an offshoot of the WWF, has been playing a major role in drafting such treaties.

The command structure

The way these UN treaties work, is that a draft proposal is issued at the highest levels of the British Empire, that is,

become endangered. What we need from scientists are estimates, presented with sufficient conservatism and plausibility, that will allow us to start building a system of artificial, but effective warnings, warnings which will parallel the instincts of animals which flee the hurricane. Only by making clear how physically interdependent are the people of all nations, can we relate measures taken by one nation, to measures taken by another, in a way that will draw from the necessary capacity for sacrifice, of which human beings, as a group, have proven capable. It is therefore a statement of major possibilities of danger, which may overtake humankind, on which it is important to concentrate attention.”

Scientists who attended that conference warning about a coming Ice Age, such as Stephen Schneider, left the conference promoting global warming. Since then, the global warming propaganda has continued to be “artificial,” yet very effective in scaring populations and governments so much about a hypothetical danger that they are willing to accept the imposition of measures that will actually kill large numbers of people. It is absolutely certain that the proposed cutbacks in emissions from energy generation and industry will stifle development, lower living standards, and increase the environmentalist death toll.

The current negotiations on carbon dioxide emissions are based on a much ballyhooed scientific “consensus” put

the Club of the Isles. These policies are written down into proposals or draft conventions by the IUCN, WWF, and, in the final stages, the World Resources Institute. The non-governmental organizations are mobilized to promote these conventions and provide a popular call for their implementation. Of particular importance in this phase are Greenpeace, Friends of the Earth, the Nature Conservancy, the Environmental Defense Fund, and the Natural Resources Defense Council.

These UN treaties, however, could not be ratified unless some governments provided the crucial early backing. How this works is outlined in the *Green Globe Yearbook*, published by the Fridtjof Nansen Institute in Norway. The *Yearbook* provides an overview of the status of all UN environmental treaties and conventions, including maps and charts of which countries have signed and ratified which treaties (the yearbook tracks 49 treaties). What is immediately apparent from the charts—and apparent to anyone who has attended any of the meetings where the treaties are drafted and ratified—is that, almost invariably, the British Commonwealth nations are the first ones to sign and ratify these treaties.

The significance of this is that, according to the individual rules of each treaty, and the rules of the UN, it takes anywhere from 20 to 50 nations to ratify a treaty so that the treaty becomes international law. Thus, all it takes for a treaty to become international law, is the ratification of the British Commonwealth nations, of which there are 56!

Major treaties on the environment

Here are some of the major treaties now being negotiated or implemented. Most of these impose severe penalties, all the way up to total economic embargo, even against nations that don't sign them:

- *Framework Convention on Climate Change*

The objective of this treaty is to “stabilize greenhouse

gas concentrations in the atmosphere.” To accomplish this, nations will gather in Kyoto, Japan in December 1997 to set industrial emissions limits. The effect will be to shut down industries around the world and prevent the industrialization of the Third World.

- *Vienna Convention for the Protection of the Ozone Layer (better known as the Montreal Protocol)*

This treaty bans the production of chlorofluorocarbons (CFCs) and other halogenated chemicals. Millions of people will die around the world as a result of this treaty, from the collapse of the world's refrigerated cold-chain, which depends on CFCs (refrigerants).

- *Antarctic Treaty*

This treaty seals off an enormous area of the world, the Antarctic Continent and surrounding oceans, from development and commercial use.

- *World Heritage Convention*

This treaty sets aside huge areas of the world in which economic development, and even the presence of man, are prohibited.

- *Convention on Biological Diversity*

This treaty sets nature and animals on an equal, if not a higher footing than man, and prohibits any kind of economic activity anywhere in the world that would harm an endangered ecosystem, whatever that may be.

- *Convention on International Trade in Endangered Species of Wild Fauna and Flora (CITES)*

This prohibits international trade in so-called endangered species.

- *International Convention to Combat Desertification*

Now in negotiation, this treaty would restrict any kind of human activities in areas that are deemed to be in danger of desertification. It is perhaps one of the most dangerous conventions, because its definition of “desertification” is so broad, for example, that more than half the United States would qualify as “desertified.”—*Rogelio A. Maduro*

together by the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change. This group, in its 1995 report, stated, “The balance of evidence suggests that there is a discernible human influence on global climate.” The IPCC backed up this statement by citing a series of scientific articles. Upon examination, however, none of the cited studies actually supports the IPCC suggestion!⁷

The green transmission belt

Each enviro-hoax has been launched into popular orbit with a media barrage, large amounts of foundation funding, and government and private grants for those scientists who are willing to go with the politically correct flow.⁸ In print, on the air, and on the screen, news and opinion reports play up the scare. The lies and misinformation are repeated so often, that even the unwitting recipients of the propaganda begin to believe it.

With DDT, the barrage was so successful, that EPA administrator Ruckelshaus was able to cite “public perception” as playing a more important role than scientific evidence in making his decision to ban DDT. From that point on, “perception” and not truth became the operative concept in environmental policy.

Today, the term “scientific consensus” has been added to the green arsenal. The hoaxes are defended by citing body counts of the scientists who are for it. At Congressional hearings on global warming, for example, an EPA spokesman put up a chart that listed on one side, hundreds of scientists who allegedly backed global warming, and on the other side, the three scientists who were testifying that day against the hoax. This idea that scientific truth lies in majority opinion is accompanied by an atmosphere of intimidation and harassment for those scientists whose research goes counter to the prevailing ideology, or who criticize any aspect of a hoax.

Many environmentalist groups rode their way to million-dollar budgets and fame on one or more hoaxes. The Environmental Defense Fund, for example, made its name by promoting the DDT scare in the early 1970s. In the 1980s, the Natural Resources Defense Council hired a public relations firm to convey the Alar scare into a money- and member-maker for the organization. The World Resources Institute received millions of foundation dollars in the 1980s, specifically to promote the ozone and global warming scares.

7. Hugh W. Ellsaesser, an atmospheric scientist with 43 years of experience, has analyzed the IPCC pronouncement and the scientific studies upon which it is based in “What Man-Induced Climate Change?” *21st Century Science & Technology*, Summer 1997, p. 61. Another aspect of the fraud, including how certain scientists “adjusted” their data to fit the global warming ideology, can be found in Zbigniew Jaworowski, Ph.D., “Another Global Warming Fraud Exposed: Ice Core Data Show No Carbon Dioxide Increase,” *21st Century Science & Technology*, Spring 1997.

8. Oceanographer Robert E. Stevenson gives a first-hand view of the funding process on global warming in the article cited in footnote 6.

How the green fascist movement was created

Unesco: The United Nations Education, Scientific, and Cultural Organization, founded in 1948, is a Paris-based, specialized UN organization that was designed by Sir Julian Huxley, one of the leading figures of war-time British intelligence. Huxley was also its first director general. In his 1946 document which called for the group’s creation, Huxley defines Unesco’s two main aims as popularizing the need for eugenics, and protecting wildlife through the creation of national parks, especially in Africa. With a \$550 million annual budget, Unesco funds a vast network of conservation groups; it defines protection of the environment as one of its three main goals.

IUCN: The Swiss-based International Union for the Conservation of Nature was formed in 1948 by Sir Julian Huxley. Its constitution was written by the British Foreign Office. It brings together 60 nations, 95 government agencies, and 568 non-governmental organizations. Together with the UNEP and the World Resources Institute (see below), the IUCN launched the “Global Biodiversity Strategy,” which guides the conservation planning of many nations. Today, its staff directly plans the conservation strategies and administers the national parks systems of many former colonies. It sees the preservation of biodiversity as its main mission. The IUCN president is Sir Shridath Ramphal, the former secretary general of the British Commonwealth, 1975-90; its director general, Martin Holdgate, was a senior official of the United Kingdom’s Department of the Environment.

The Nature Conservancy: Founded by royal charter in 1949, the Nature Conservancy is one of the four official research bodies under the British royalty’s Privy Council. Known as the “world’s first statutory conservation body,” it became one of the most powerful postwar covert operations of the Crown. Max Nicholson, the permanent secretary to the deputy prime minister, wrote the legislation for the Conservancy, then left his government post to head it. Nicholson personally developed most of the major strategies and tactics of the world environmentalist movement for the next decades. The group started the campaign against DDT, drafted the constitution for the IUCN, and set up the committee which established the World Wildlife Fund (WWF) in 1961. The subtitle of Nicholson’s 1970 history of the postwar environmental movement is “A Guide for the New Masters of the Earth.”