

Genocide by 'ecology': Senate panel holds love-in for EPA's Reilly

by Marjorie Mazel Hecht

The Senate hearings Jan. 31 on the appointment of William K. Reilly as head of the Environmental Protection Agency should be enough to convince anyone who still has illusions about the moral quality of the U.S. Senate that this body is now just plain evil. As the cameras rolled and the standing-room-only crowd looked on in adulation, one senator after another at the Committee on Environment and Public Works heaped praise on Reilly. And not one word was said about the millions of people in the developing sector who have died as a result of the policies promoted by the two organizations Reilly has headed, the Conservation Foundation and the World Wildlife Fund.

The show of bipartisan support for Reilly featured the fact that he was the first "professional" environmentalist to be nominated for this job, that he was a Republican, and that he was a "world class environmentalist," and that everybody loves him because he "focuses on those things that unite rather than those things that divide." The committee chose to have no outside testimony or questions on the nomination.

Reilly was introduced by no fewer than five senators, starting off with Wyoming's Malcolm Wallop (R). Why is an old conservative whom *Time* magazine has called a "humorless ideologue" supporting an environmentalist? Wallop asked. "He's an excellent choice," Wallop said, a "reasoning and reasoned conservationist," and I'm "pleased, proud, and comfortable to recommend him." Virginia's Senator John Warner (R) then endorsed "this fine American," noting how Virginia was "truly fortunate" to claim him as a resident. The junior senator from Virginia, Charles Robb (D), chimed in about how he was "pleased that he's a Virginian," and pleased at Reilly's "ability to achieve and build consensus." Bob Graham (D) from Florida also praised this "consensus builder," noting how almost every major environmental project in Florida "bears his imprint." The saccharine introductions were concluded by Pete Wilson (R) from California, who stated that the "chorus of praise was deserved" for this "leading proponent of environmental quality by consensus," and that the "President could not have made a better choice."

The members of the Senate committee—all of whom were present for this media occasion—then each gave a five-

minute eulogy, reiterating the compliments to Reilly and noting for the record their own concerns with "environmental protection." The overall quality of the remarks had the aura of an awards dinner in Camelot, where everyone is expected to live happily ever after. New Jersey's Senator Frank Lautenberg (D) beamed, "I am pleased to join the chorus of admirers and welcomers." Connecticut's Senator Lieberman (D) proudly noted the presence of Mrs. Reilly, a Connecticut native (attired in a black leather miniskirt).

Reality?

The question period continued much like the opening statements. The only hints of opposition—and these were so much kinder and gentler than the usual that they might have been missed—came from Senators Alan Simpson (R-Wyo.) and Steve Symms (R-Id.). After the obligatory remarks ("I very much enjoyed our visit. I was very, very impressed with you"), Simpson noted that people have to eat, work, and live, and therefore need fertilizers, pesticides, and power plants. He related how he had once asked a Carter-era official in the EPA, "Is agriculture part of man's ecosystem?" and she said "no." "Whether you like it or not, agriculture is part of man's ecosystem," Simpson said. "That's what's called reality."

Symms questioned Reilly on his work as part of a task force that recommended the taking of private land for environmental purposes without compensation to the private owner. (For example, declaring farmland to be protected wetlands, without compensating the farmer for the loss in not being able to work that land).

No one questioned the basic philosophy of Reilly's 20-year career—putting the protection of trees, wetlands, and animals on a level above the health and welfare of humans.

While Reilly rides into the EPA on a white horse bedecked by garlands, privately some senators are unhappy with the appointment. "The senator shares many of your concerns," one aide told this writer, "but he does not want to embarrass Bush by opposing the nomination." Another aide said that his boss found Reilly to be arrogant, uninformed on the issues, and inexperienced with Washington politics. "He won't last," so we won't oppose him now, said this aide.

NDPC: 'We oppose EPA as well as Reilly'

From the testimony of National Democratic Policy Committee (NDPC) to the Senate Environment and Public Works Committee on the nomination of William Reilly as administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency, Jan. 31, 1989:

The NDPC is opposed to the appointment of William Reilly as administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency, for the same reason that we are opposed to the existence of the EPA. Both Mr. Reilly and the agency itself represent a political lobby rather than a department of government—a lobby, we contend, that does not operate in the national interest.

The policies that Mr. Reilly has advocated in his capacity as head of the World Wildlife Fund and the Conservation Foundation are those of a feudal oligarchy concerned with hunting wildlife for personal pleasure, not an industrial nation that since its inception has developed science and technology for the purpose of advancing the material and cultural standards of its own people as well as those of the rest of the world.

As his career demonstrates, Reilly is a malthusian who places a higher value on preserving wildlife and so-called natural habitats than on preserving human life. He sees "Nature" as some sort of pagan force that must be worshiped and allowed to run its course without the messy intervention of man. This is contrary to the goals of this nation as expressed in the U. S. Constitution, as well as the Judeo-Christian ethic. In our present economic crisis, any further environmental restraints can only result in reducing world food reserves and increasing the possibility of a worldwide famine. Such restraints would also introduce insupportable taxes to industries already at the point of bankruptcy.

The two organizations that Mr. Reilly has headed are devoted to overturning the American belief in scientific and technological progress. To quote from an annual report of the Conservation Foundation: "Increasing population causes a drain on natural resources which is geometric, not arithmetic. . . . Science cannot be expected to supplant the vital processes of nature." Such population reduction policies run counter to the philosophy of a majority of the American people, as does the anti-science bias.

The role of the EPA

The Environmental Protection Agency came into being 20 years ago because of the lobbying of environmentalist groups. Its major proper functions can be maintained through the normal activities of the Department of Agriculture, the Department of the Interior, the Department of Energy, the Department of Commerce, and the Food and Drug Administration. Among the other advantages of such a reorganization would be the reduction of the present cost of running the EPA, now one of the largest governmental bureaucracies.

The EPA functions by manipulating ignorant opinions of a population that has been conditioned to fear and ignorance, of a public worried by daily horror stories of big bad industrialists poisoning their food, water, land, air, and so on, in order to carry out a secret agenda. Its decisions have been made for political reasons only, having little to do with actual

Reilly's agenda

In his speech to the Senate committee and in his answers to the questions on issues, Reilly stressed that he intends to mount "aggressive enforcement" of regulations, "significantly higher degrees of international activity and cooperation with other countries in the global village," and the kind of "economic growth . . . that doesn't shorten our breath or our lives." Reilly praised the Montreal Protocol, saying that he expected that the United States would go even further, virtually phasing out all chlorofluorocarbons. He promised new legislation on acid rain.

". . . We have established the most comprehensive regulatory framework for pollution control in the world. Enormous investments have been made by the public, by industry, by government at all levels. And these investments have paid off handsomely. . . .

"Yet the domestic environmental agenda seems only to have lengthened and grown more complex with time. It turns out that we didn't know all that was being put into the air and water. New, more sensitive measurement techniques and more extensive monitoring have revealed toxic substances of great variety, distributed widely in air, water, land, and wildlife. In some places, 'sanitary landfills' of a decade ago have become today's environmental hazards. Air pollution indoors appears to be threatening many Americans more than air pollution outdoors. Abandoned toxic waste dumps dot the landscape. Pollutants of all sorts have seeped into the vast, unseen reserves of groundwater from which millions of Americans draw their drinking water."

facts and actual risks. By taking an adversary role against science and against industry, the EPA has seriously damaged the quality of life for our citizens and those of other nations, and has caused actual deaths. For example, the political rulings banning life-saving pesticides like DDT have meant the deaths and illnesses of millions in the developing sector.

Given its political history as an agency that has often arbitrarily supported the extremist views of environmentalist lobbying groups, we believe that any necessary regulatory activities could be better carried out by other existing government agencies. To subsume the role of the EPA into these other departments would remove the governmental sanction from an environmentalist "religion" that worships "Nature."

In any case, by confirming Mr. Reilly as head of the existing EPA, Congress will be adopting the World Wildlife Fund and the Conservation Foundation as a government agency, in effect increasing the fund's annual multimillion-dollar budget for its anti-people activities by about \$5 billion (the EPA 1988 budget). We believe that this nation cannot afford to give such power to an organization characterized by the elitist views of its leading spokesman worldwide, England's Prince Philip.

If the United States is to survive as an industrial and scientific nation, it must return to the American System idea, popularized during the Lincoln administration, that "people are wealth" and that man must have dominion over nature. The appointment of William Reilly will take us in the opposite direction—giving an oligarchic elite dominion over this nation's future in the name of "protecting the environment."

21st Century: 'Reilly a costly blunder'

From the testimony of 21st Century Science Associates to the Senate Committee on Environment and Public Works on the nomination of William Reilly as administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency on Jan. 31, 1989:

The appointment of William Reilly as administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency would be a costly blunder for an administration committed to seeing this nation remain as an industrial leader.

Mr. Reilly has headed up two organizations, the World Wildlife Fund and the Conservation Foundation, that are dedicated to policies that 200 years ago would have kept the United States as a backward, rural colony, perhaps where the European elite could have come on hunting expeditions in the vast Western lands. Fortunately, our Founding Fathers had other ideas. They fought a war to establish this nation as a republic dedicated to progress—progress achieved by ad-

vancing science and technology. They fostered industry and the building of infrastructure to facilitate development. Their idea was sound: Man's mind was capable of inventing the means of making muscle-power and primitive technologies obsolete. Therefore, to grow, the nation should do everything possible to ensure the development of the minds of the population.

Today, the organizations Mr. Reilly heads are the champions of the same feudalist views that this nation was established to eliminate. Such environmentalists place Nature on a higher level than man, and give animals—and even insects and weeds—"equal rights." This political philosophy of environmentalism is not just another opinion. When put into practice, as it has been throughout the history of the EPA, environmentalism *kills people* in the name of protecting the environment.

We will be very specific, taking the cases of DDT and dieldrin, both of which were life-saving pesticides banned by two former administrators of the EPA who are the mentors of Mr. Reilly.

First, DDT:

In 1971, the EPA held seven months of hearings on the DDT issue, with testimony that filled 9,000 pages. The EPA hearing examiner, Edmond Sweeney, made his official decision April 26, 1972, stating: "DDT is not a carcinogenic hazard to man. DDT is not a mutagenic or teratogenic [creating birth defects] hazard to man. The uses of DDT under the regulations involved here do not have a deleterious effect on freshwater fish, estuarine organisms, wild birds, or other wildlife. . . . The evidence in this proceeding supports the conclusion that there is a present need for the essential uses of DDT."

The EPA administrator, William Ruckelshaus, who now is a board member of the Conservation Foundation, single-handedly overturned this EPA ruling and banned DDT in 1972 for what he admitted were "political" reasons. As Ruckelshaus said in 1979, "Science, along with other disciplines such as economics, has a role to play. The ultimate judgment remains political. In the case of pesticides in our country, the power to make this judgment has been delegated to the administrator of EPA."

Second, the dieldrin case:

Russell Train, who succeeded Ruckelshaus as EPA administrator in September 1973, and who is now the chairman of the World Wildlife Fund and the Conservation Foundation, banned the chemical dieldrin in October 1974. Train took this action contrary to the advice of the Aldrin/Dieldrin Advisory Committee to the EPA as well as several other committees appointed by other government agencies. In addition, Train redefined the word "carcinogenic," which previously had been defined by all scientific agencies concerned to mean substances that cause cancerous tumors. Train decided that carcinogenic would henceforth be synonymous with "tumorigenic."

These political decisions of EPA administrators Ruckelshaus and Train were at the behest of the environmentalist lobby, the same lobby for which Mr. Reilly is working. This lobby still brags about its role in banning these and other pesticides. The consequences can be measured in human lives lost.

Entomologist J. Gordon Edwards, who has taught biology and entomology at San Jose State University in California for 40 years, estimated that 100 million people die per year as a result, directly and indirectly, of these and other anti-pesticide activities here in the United States. Edwards, who is a longtime member of the Sierra Club and the Audubon Society and a fellow of the California Academy of Sciences, says that this estimate is probably conservative.

There is every indication that Mr. Reilly will continue in the tradition of Mr. Ruckelshaus and Mr. Train, making decisions that will kill people in the name of protecting the environment.

Watkins and the need to go fully nuclear

From the testimony of 21st Century Science Associates on the hearings to consider the nomination of Adm. James Watkins as Secretary of the Department of Energy to the Senate Committee on Energy and Natural Resources, Feb. 2, 1989:

We support the nomination of Admiral James Watkins for Secretary of the Department of Energy. In our view, Mr. Watkins enters this position at a time when crucial decisions will have to be made in his department in six basic areas:

First, the sabotage of the civilian nuclear power industry and electric utilities over more than a decade, through regulatory and antinuclear "environmental" organizing, has resulted in severe shortages of electric power in various parts of this nation. This situation will get worse before it gets better. There are *no* legitimate reasons not to go full speed ahead with nuclear power.

This requires the timely completion of all plants under construction; the end to regulatory and financial warfare against the nation's utilities; the availability of low-interest credit to begin to build our way out of the shortages; and the implementation of the modular, standardized, and most advanced nuclear fission power designs, so the nation can return to a healthy 6-7% rate of electricity growth per year, using the most economical technology.

Second, the defense production situation requires a crash program approach to complete not one but at least three different "next-generation" tritium production facilities, while keeping on line as many of the current reactors as needed to

keep the nation's defense effort adequately supplied with tritium. The key here is redundancy of facilities—and no capitulation to the so-called environmentalists whose purpose is actually to force unilateral U. S. disarmament.

Third, research and development spending by the Department of Energy is the only way to ensure the energy future of this country. Over the past eight years, under the rubric of the "free market," the nuclear fission budget has been reduced and research and development has stagnated, while entire projects, such as spent nuclear fuel reprocessing, have been abandoned. Funding for research in thermonuclear fusion, the unlimited energy that must be ready to play a major role in U.S. energy supply by the beginning of the next century, has declined by about 25% in absolute dollars.

The nuclear fission and fusion research and development budgets both must be brought back to a level where they can develop new energy technologies. The nuclear budget should include funding to develop prototype reactors and facilities for breeder reactors, spent fuel reprocessing, advanced technologies for fuel enrichment, and fission-fusion hybrids for a variety of functions.

Fusion energy should be proceeding with the goal of producing an engineering test reactor as quickly as possible, close to the turn of the century. This effort must include adequate funding to proceed with tritium testing in the Princeton Tokamak Fusion Test Reactor, the construction of the Compact Ignition Torus, the acceleration of the other tokamak and also non-tokamak magnetic fusion energy concepts as well as the inertial fusion programs, and the most broad-based approach to solving the remaining scientific questions in fusion research.

Fourth, the x-ray laser and other portions of Strategic Defense Initiative research that are overseen by the Department of Energy and carried out in DOE national laboratories must be funded with the goal of producing a layered system of defense that will meet President Reagan's initial 1983 mandate to make nuclear weapons "impotent and obsolete." Impressive results have been produced in these directed-energy weapons technologies over the past four years, and they should not be held back by limitations in funding.

Fifth, is the question of radioactive waste. The main problem here, aside from the fact that waste disposal has become a political football, is that this nation decided not to complete the nuclear fuel cycle, therefore necessitating the burial of 100% of the waste, instead of a very small percentage—the 4% that cannot be recycled. Reprocessing is a known and tested technology; we should join with the rest of the nuclear nations and begin reprocessing spent fuel.

Sixth, is the area of education. On the graduate level, the department must ensure through special programs that top-quality students are recruited into nuclear engineering and nuclear research programs. Without such recruitment, we will not have the talent to run the nuclear plants of the near future. . . .