

ENVIRONMENTAL COLLAPSE IS NOT HAPPENING

REFUTING FALSE ENVIRONMENTAL CLAIMS

Claims of environmental collapse and resulting global death are opposed to God's stated purpose for the earth given in Isaiah 45:18, that He "formed it to be inhabited." While we must be good stewards over God's earth, the Bible never tells us to "save the earth." That is a manmade agenda. The earth does not need "saving" for two reasons: (1) God has the responsibility of upholding all His creation, including the earth (Hebrews 1:3, Isaiah 45:18); and (2) as the discussion below will show, the environment is not degrading at all! It is getting better.

This may seem very strange considering the steady diet of environmental gloom-and-doom which has issued from the media and the mouths of politicians since about 1970. However, when there is such a discrepancy between public pronouncements and scientific reality, one ought to begin questioning the real motives behind the distortion. Indeed, there are a number of motivations for deceptive scare-mongering about the environment, all of which have been publicly acknowledged by various environmental activists. Some of this documentation is presented at the end of this article.

These include (1) the fact that bad news "sells" better than good news; (2) a belief that the randomness of evolution means the future is unpredictable and that we must try to control it; (3) the rise in contributions to environmental activist groups when the public is scared that the environment is collapsing; (4) the rise in corporate profits when an old, low-profit-margin product is phased out "to protect the environment," only to be replaced by a substitute (often legally mandated) with a much higher profit margin; (5) the increased poverty and resulting higher mortality rates brought to third world countries as part of the UN environmental and population control agenda; (6) the rationale provided by "environmental crises" for higher taxes and more government agencies to deal with the "crises," thus accelerating the drive toward "Big Brother" government; (7) a rationale for re-establishing pagan earth worship, now heavily promoted by the UN.

In short, the environmental movement furthers the agendas of virtually every segment of the power elite, including the media moguls, the evolutionary community, environmental activist groups, mega-corporations, the UN and other population control activists, big government promoters, and the neo-pagans. All of these circles of power are much larger and much more entrenched than is generally realized. It is no wonder therefore that global environmental collapse is continuously predicted regardless of the massive amounts of data demonstrating that God is really taking care of His earth after all!

I. There Is No Manmade Global Warming.

The linchpin of the environmental movement is the false claim that there is a global temperature rise that will eventually cause the entire environment to collapse. To prevent this

catastrophe, we are told, we must reduce our standard of living and allow the governments of the world to extract huge amounts of tax monies to fight the crisis. However -

THERE IS NO MANMADE GLOBAL WARMING

"The Northern Hemisphere ... shows no net warming in the past 55 years."¹ This is significant, because the Northern Hemisphere is where virtually all human population and industrial activity is located. Indeed -

"One of the arguments commonly heard ... is that 'all scientists agree the greenhouse effect is real' followed by the observation that 'the six warmest years in the record are all in the past decade.' An interesting response can usually be elicited by asking, 'How warm were those years in the 1980s?' The common retort is that they were 2°C to 4°C (3.6°F to 7.2°F) warmer than before and that the ice caps are melting. In fact, most apocalyptics are incredulous when they learn that there has been so little warming and that the Greenland ice sheet - the largest glacier in the Northern Hemisphere - is growing. . . . Given that minuscule warming, we must ask ... "[Is there] a deliberate attempt to mislead?"²

II. Carbon Dioxide Levels Are Up, But Not Causing Global Warming.

Carbon dioxide levels have been rising world wide since the onset of the Industrial Revolution about 1800. The environmental movement claims that these rising levels are causing global warming through a mechanism called the "greenhouse effect." This claim has been made so often that most people believe carbon dioxide is a "bad" thing, and the public automatically associates carbon dioxide with global warming. However, there is no connection -

WE NEED THE GREENHOUSE EFFECT, BUT CARBON DIOXIDE DOESN'T HAVE MUCH TO DO WITH IT.

"The greenhouse effect produced by the atmosphere clearly exists. For that matter, without it there would be no more life on Earth than on the Moon. Without it, the temperature would be -150°C during the night and about 100° during the day. But to claim that some 3 and a few 10ths parts per 10,000 of natural CO₂ in the atmosphere will make the Earth's temperature increase reveals either naivete or deceit.

"CO₂ actually plays only a minor role in the greenhouse effect, the essential role being played by water, both in its visible form, little drops or crystals suspended in the clouds, and its invisible form, vapor. I consider as a proof of this that the greenhouse effect is maximal in humid regions and minimal in dry regions, while the proportion of CO₂ is exactly the same: 0.03 percent."³ In other words -

CARBON DIOXIDE IS A MINOR GREENHOUSE GAS.

"Greenhouse gases warm the lowest layers of the atmosphere - where everything lives - by redirecting radiation that would normally escape directly into space. The most common of those is water vapor ... Next most important, with about one-

seventh of the warming potential of water vapor, is CO₂, but its concentration has hardly been constant throughout the earth's history.

"If all the carbon dioxide were removed from the earth's atmosphere, the drop in surface temperature would be 1.5°C (2.7°F), or only 5 percent of the total warming caused by all of the greenhouse gases. That is because the warming caused by those gases does not add up in a simple linear fashion."⁴ In fact, rather than there being too much carbon dioxide in the atmosphere -

CARBON DIOXIDE LEVELS ARE NOW TOO LOW.

"In ... the past [before the Flood] ... the CO₂ concentration of the atmosphere has been greater than it is today. ... Only since the beginning of the ice [age] ... have temperatures and CO₂ fallen to current levels. When it was really cold, at the height of the ice [age] ... the concentration of CO₂ fell to values that were a hundred parts per million (ppm) of being able to support life. ... The atmosphere is currently impoverished in CO₂. An additional historical peculiarity is that gas bubbles trapped in Antarctic ice tell us that the temperature dropped before the CO₂ concentration changed, not after."⁵

Even more, rather than being "bad," carbon dioxide is a nutrient for plant growth. This means that since the onset of the Industrial Revolution -

THE EARTH HAS BECOME GREENER.

"Plants take in CO₂, and fix it in the form of carbohydrates in their roots, stems, and leaves. CO₂ in current concentrations is what is known as a "limiting nutrient": there is currently so little of it in the atmosphere that plants cannot get enough. Increasing the concentration increases the growth of almost all plant species, and both laboratory and field experiments have demonstrated that [p 11] plants flourish as CO₂ concentration goes up. Further, there is no doubt that human industrial activity has increased the CO₂ concentration in the atmosphere and that most (85 to 95 percent, depending on the estimate) of that increase is a result of burning fossil fuels - the same carbon that was deposited in the earth's crust when CO₂ was in excess.

"... The planet is becoming greener. ... The finding, which indicates that plants are taking in more CO₂ than they did, should not be surprising, because the atmosphere is merely returning to CO₂ levels that were characteristic during ... history."⁶ This means that continued increases in carbon dioxide concentration will not hurt the environment, but that -

MORE CARBON DIOXIDE WILL ACTUALLY IMPROVE CLIMATE.

"To claim that the increase of the CO₂ in the atmosphere will drive up its temperature shows either an insufficient analysis of the causes of the greenhouse effect, or a certain bad faith. It is insufficient analysis, because one forgets that an eventual increase of the waters of the surface of the earth - primarily oceans - and the transpiration of plants. This will increase nebulosity, which will decrease temperatures during the day and increase them at night. Nebulosity, for that matter, will increase the albedo of the planet, that is, the reflection into

space of the solar energy received from the Sun. All of this implies a significant self-regulation of temperature."⁷

III. There Are No Signs of Global Warming.

Environmentalists typically predict that global warming will cause global droughts, deserts to grow, rain forests and other forests to disappear, and glaciers to melt with the melt-water inundating all coastal cities. None of these predictions shows any signs of coming to pass. In fact -

RAINFALL IS UP.

"According to long-term records, global precipitation is increasing. ... The U.S. record also reveals (contrary to the blizzard of news reports about this drought or that crop failure or the pictures of dead chickens that accompany every summer heat wave) that the 1980s, followed by the 1970s, were the wettest decade in our reliable weather history."⁸

TROPICAL FOREST IS INCREASING.

"Tropical deforestation increased from 78,000 square kilometers in 1978 to 230,000 square kilometers in 1988 while tropical forest habitat ... increased from 208,000 square kilometers to 588,000 square kilometers."⁹

THE SAHARA DESERT IS SHRINKING.

"Despite the widely held impression that the sands of the Sahara are relentlessly expanding, consuming villages and contributing to famine in Africa, a new analysis of satellite images ... shows the greatest desert on earth has stopped growing and is now shrinking.

"For years, researchers and agencies have assumed the Sahara's advance was implacable, but scientists who examined 4,500 satellite pictures taken over the past decade say it is clear the Sahara essentially reversed its expansion in 1984, and has since contracted dramatically."¹⁰

GLACIERS ARE GROWING, NOT SHRINKING.

"[A] glacial record, published in 1988 by Fred Wood in Arctic and Alpine Research, tells a story that seems ... opposed to the Popular Vision of what is happening to the atmosphere.

"It is well known that mountain glaciers are very sensitive to slight changes in temperature. For example, paintings of the Alps in the [p 79] 17th century - at the height of the period known as the "little ice age" - show terminal glaciers that are a mile or more down the slope from where they are today. In the early 1960s park rangers at Glacier National Park in the United States, which contains a large number of very small glaciers obviously very near their summer limit, lectured the public about dramatic recessions that could melt them all within a few years.

"Fred Wood examined a worldwide sample of mountain glaciers and found that: `Between 1960 and 1980, on the basis of data for about 400 to 450 glaciers observed each year, advancing

glaciers are shown to have increased from about 6 percent of observed glaciers to 55 percent. ... Preliminary data from 1981 to 1985 suggest that the mixed glacial regime is continuing.

"Because so many features of glaciers are very sensitive to slight temperature changes, it appears that there is no dramatic greenhouse warming ..."11

IV. The Ozone Layer Is Not Disappearing.

Another favorite prediction of the environmental movement is that cancer rates will shoot up because the ozone layer is disappearing. Ozone depletion is supposed to be the fault of man, especially via the use of refrigerants (CFCs) in refrigeration and air conditioning. But virtually all CFC technology is in the Northern Hemisphere, but the famous "ozone hole" is in the Southern Hemisphere. This means that -

THE OZONE HOLE IS IN THE WRONG HEMISPHERE.

"How is it possible that nine-tenths of the CFC's called freons are made and used in the Northern Hemisphere - the hemisphere that is also the more populated and the more industrialized - yet it is in the Southern Hemisphere, which is for the most part uninhabited, that one sees the now famous "ozone hole"? ...

"I am quite familiar with [Antarctica], having led four volcanological expeditions there between 1973 and 1979, right into the heart of the continent - near latitude 78, to the volcano Erebus, halfway between the magnetic and geographic poles, not simply skirting its edges as did some self-appointed Antarctica "experts."

"Since this 'ozone hole' was Antarctic, I was stimulated to get to the bottom of the question - of the why. The conclusion of my inquiry was that this hole was most probably in existence at the time of the Shackleton expedition in 1909, and that most probably, it is a natural phenomenon. Consequently, it has nothing to do with CFC's, which did not exist at that time."12 Even more to the point -

CFC'S DO NOT HARM THE OZONE LAYER.

"CFC's are chemically stable, nontoxic, non-flammable, and nonexplosive. Now ... CFC's are the subject of a worldwide campaign blaming them for destroying the ozone layer. ...

"They tell us that CFC's, molecules much heavier than air, lift themselves up to the stratosphere, 10 to 15 kilometers high. There, because of the energetic solar ultraviolet, they lose the chemical stability that characterizes them within the biosphere and liberate their atoms of chlorine, which, they say, destroys the ozone."

"On the other hand, the millions of tons of chlorine that are belched out annually by the volcanoes of the world (I know of what I speak: for more than 40 years my collaborators and I have been studying volcanic gas emissions) would have but a very secondary effect upon this destruction of the ozone, we are told, compared with CFC's, whose mass of chlorine is but infinitesimal compared with that of volcanic eruptions. The alleged harmlessness of volcanic chlorine is not invoked ... simply to better incriminate the chlorine of the CFC's."13

So the chlorine from human technology is not responsible for the ozone hole, but is volcanic? Indeed -

ATMOSPHERIC CHLORINE IS FROM VOLCANOES, NOT CFC'S.

"One of the authors (Roger Maduro), then a believer in the ozone depletion theory, was gathering evidence to write an article to show that the global warming theory was a scientific fraud. In the course of an interview with Reid Bryson, head of the Institute for Environmental Studies in Madison, Wisconsin, the author was startled to be told [p 2] not to pay attention to the ozone depletion theory because there was a volcano in Antarctica that pumped more chlorine into the atmosphere than did the entire annual production of CFC's on Earth. If chlorine were indeed responsible for the Antarctic ozone hole, then it would be this volcano that was responsible, not CFC's, said Bryson.

"This information set the author, a geologist by training, on a quest. A few phone calls later, the top volcanologists in the United States had confirmed what Bryson had said. Mt. Erebus in Antarctica pumps more than 1,000 tons of chlorine a day into the atmosphere. This meant that Mt. Erebus was lofting more chlorine into the atmosphere in one week, than an entire year's production of CFC's!"14 It is no secret to industry leaders that -

THE OZONE SCARE IS NOT BASED ON REAL DATA.

"At Elf Atochem, one of the leading suppliers of CFC substitutes in the world, the company president said, "It is my understanding that the current theories are developed from modeling a series of chemical reactions that can neither be scientifically proven as occurring in the real world nor reproduced in a laboratory."15

V. Nuclear Power Is Not Bad for the Environment.

Another scare tactic of the environmental movement is to conjure up all the disease and death that nuclear power will cause. These claims are totally false, for the fact is that -

NUCLEAR POWER IS SAFE.

"These two assertions can safely be made: First, a nuclear power plant cannot explode any more than can a jar of pickles, as physicist Fred Hoyle ... put it. (Chernobyl is no exception: it was not an explosion.) Second, the problem of safeguarding the processed waste from year to year is much less difficult than is safeguarding the national gold supply at Fort Knox, and much less risky than safeguarding against terrorist explosions of nuclear weapons. ...

"The accident at Three Mile Island in 1979 gave many people the impression that nuclear power is more dangerous than previously thought. But that accident would seem to demonstrate quite the opposite: Despite almost every possible error being made, no one suffered any harm. And the Chernobyl accident throws no light on safety in the United

States because the reactor design was so different from plants in the West, and the projections provided in the West are not provided there."¹⁶

Even the medical establishment agrees with these conclusions: "An 'official' report from the American Medical Association gives nuclear power an excellent bill of health, saying it is 'acceptably safe.'¹⁷ Coal-supplied energy is assessed to cause eighteen times more deaths per unit of electricity than nuclear power, because of both mining and transportation deaths. And solar energy is 'less safe' than nuclear power due to construction and maintenance costs. ..."¹⁸

"Perhaps the most surprising finding by the AMA report concerns Chernobyl: 'No member of the general public received a dose capable of producing radiation sickness,' though plant and rescue workers were killed. As to long-run effects ... the cancer rate in the surrounding population would increase 'by less than 2%, and this effect would be difficult to detect.'¹⁹

The Chernobyl disaster happened because of the inferior construction and safety codes practiced in the Soviet Union, so the causes of casualties there cannot be applied to nuclear power in general. Another claim of the environmental movement is that nuclear waste is a public health threat. But -

NUCLEAR WASTE IS NOT A PROBLEM.

Petr Beckmann hailed from Eastern Europe where governmental controls stifled innovation. He was shocked to find that fears of nuclear waste were resulting in lack of innovation in the United States. According to Beckmann, "Nuclear wastes are 3.5 million times smaller in volume than fossil wastes producing the same electric energy; high-level wastes ... which contain 99% of the radioactivity, but only 1% of the volume, are the first type of industrial waste in history that can be completely removed from the biosphere; their volume per person per year [is] that of 1-2 aspirin tablets; what is put back into the ground has less radioactive energy than what was taken out; after 100 years, the wastes are less toxic than many ores ... in nature; after 500 years they are less toxic than the coal ash produced from the same electricity supply; the artificial and irrational arguments against disposal in stable geological formations ... help to perpetuate the present way of disposing of fossil-powered electricity wastes - some of them in people's lungs."²⁰

V. Motivations Behind the Environmental Movement.

A. Bad News Sells.

The profit motive has enticed many media pundits to conjure up terrible predictions of environmental collapse. These predictions, past and present, have been false. In fact -

PAST PREDICTIONS WERE NOT OF GLOBAL WARMING, BUT GLOBAL COOLING.

"These quotations collected by Anna Bray illustrate the prevailing thinking about climate in the early 1970s, only a decade before the hooah about warming began in earnest.

"[Climatologist] J. Murray Mitchell, then of the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, noted in

1976: 'The media are having a lot of fun with this situation. Whenever there is a cold wave, they seek out a proponent of the ice-age-is-coming school and put his theories on page one. ... Whenever there is a heat wave ... they turn to his opposite number, [who predicts] a kind of heat death of the earth.'

'The cooling has already killed hundreds of thousands of people in poor nations. It has already made food and fuel more precious, thus increasing the price of everything we buy. If it continues, and no strong measures are taken to deal with it, the cooling will cause world famine, world chaos, and probably world war, and this could all come by the year 2000.' [Lowell Ponte, *The Cooling*, 1976]

'The facts have emerged, in recent years and months, from research into past ice ages. They imply that the threat of a new ice age must now stand alongside nuclear war as a likely source of wholesale death and misery for mankind.' [Nigel Calder, former editor of *New Scientist* and producer of scientific television documentaries, "In the Grip of a New Ice Age," *International Wildlife*, July 1975]

'At this point, the world's climatologists are agreed ... Once the freeze starts, it will be too late.' [Douglas Colligan, "Brace Yourself for Another Ice Age," *Science Digest*, February 1973]²¹

Scary stories are also made up about non-existent ozone depletion:

A TYPICAL SCARE-MONGERING PREDICTION ABOUT THE OZONE LAYER

"The unprecedented assault on the planet's life-support system could have horrendous long-term effects on human health, animal life, the plants that support the food chain, and just about every other strand that makes up the delicate web of nature. And it is too late to prevent the damage, which will worsen for years to come."²²

Scary but false predictions have been the stock in trade of the environmental movement ever since it began. Time enough has passed to show that these early predictions were not even close to the truth -

A FALSE PREDICTION OF GLOBAL FAMINE

"The battle to feed humanity is over. In the 1970's the world will undergo famines - hundreds of millions of people are going to starve to death in spite of any crash programs embarked upon now. ... Nothing could be more misleading to our children than our present affluent society. They will inherit a totally different world, a world in which the standards, politics, and economics of the 1960's are dead."²³

No such famines happened in the 1970s, and in fact the world's peoples are better fed now than in the 1960s. Ehrlich cited no real evidence for his prediction of famine, but simply continued to dogmatize: "The battle to feed humanity is already lost, in the sense that we will not be able to prevent large-scale famines in the next decade or so. It is difficult to guess what the exact scale and consequences of the famines will be. But there will be famines."²⁴

Evolutionism is a random process with an unpredictable future. This causes a lot of fear in the minds of serious evolutionists. One of the current fears is that the earth will be wiped out by a massive meteorite impact in the not too distant future. This fear comes straight out of the evolutionary attempt to explain the extinction of the dinosaurs without having to invoke any kind of flood. Evolutionists ask -

**DID AN IMPACT CAUSE DINOSAUR EXTINCTION?
COULD IT HAPPEN AGAIN?**

The belief is now common that dinosaurs somehow became extinct due to a massive ancient impact forming the Chicxulub crater in Mexico 65 million years ago. Thus evolution seeks to explain animal extinctions without recourse to the biblical flood.

If the Chicxulub crater were volcanic, then it could have nothing to do with global dinosaur extinction. Nevertheless, as the Chicxulub crater has been increasingly popularized as "proof" of dinosaur extinction by impact, a mythology has surrounded the Chicxulub crater which goes something like this: "The Chicxulub crater is a fairly new discovery from the 1980s. It has never been claimed to be a volcanic feature."

This popular mythology is false, as is shown by the following statement: "The Chicxulub structure was first suggested as a possible impact site in 1981 ... That suggestion received little attention until the 1990s, when it became the *preferred* site for the hypothesized impact..."

"The Chicxulub structure was first observed in outline from gravity and magnetic surveys. ... The Chicxulub surveys were conducted for Pemex, the national petroleum company of Mexico..."

"Exploratory drilling in the 1960s by Pemex showed that the geophysical anomalies at Chicxulub are related to an andesitic, i.e., volcanic, body at a depth 1,200 to 2,000 meters."²⁵

It is significant that the Chicxulub is not mentioned in a comprehensive compendium of all claimed "astroblemes" (meteor craters) in the world as of 1979.²⁶

With the apparent "success" (read "consensus") of the Chicxulub crater for "explaining" dinosaur extinction (or more precisely, Cretaceous-Tertiary extinction), other "impact" structures have appeared in the literature as the "proof" of extinctions by impact in other evolutionary epochs, and the belief now pervades the media that such devastating impacts will again occur in the future.

C. The Quest for Higher Profits.

In our ethics-starved culture, mega-corporations powerful enough to affect public policy have not uncommonly stirred up environmental "crises" to justify removing low-profit-margin products from the market, replacing them with more expensive products. One of the most fascinating cases in recent years involved the case against CFCs concocted by the very industry producing them.

Most people are unaware of the corporate interest in promoting environmental fears, because most people believe that environmentalism has a scientific basis and are totally in the dark about -

**THE PROFIT MOTIVE BEHIND
ENVIRONMENTALISM.**

"The giant chemical corporations, which are slated to make hundreds of billions of dollars selling replacements for the now-banned CFC's, are working with the environmental movement, which has already made millions of dollars in revenues from the ozone depletion scare. The U.S. environmental groups are able to finance the promotion of environmental hoaxes like ozone depletion through the more than \$500 million they receive a year from the major philanthropic foundations run by this nation's financial elite - Rockefeller, Ford, MacArthur, and other foundations. But money is not the only motive driving the ozone hoax. Behind the actions to ban CFC's - and to cut back on refrigeration - is the Malthusian ideology that the world needs fewer people."²⁷

D. The Population Control Agenda

Population control advocates seize upon many fears to justify cutting world population. Their tactics have worked so well that now the UN predicts that world population will peak at some 8-9 billion around 2050. If current trends continue, world population will decline to only 1/4 billion in a few centuries. Such an outcome would be a true economic disaster for all the countries of the world, for it has been shown overwhelmingly that rising population, not falling population, generates economic prosperity. (Such an outcome is consistent with the biblical command, belittled even by many Christians, in Genesis 1:28-30 and repeated in Genesis 9:1-3, to "multiply" and "replenish" the earth.)

Population control (actually *reduction*) proponents prove the biblical statement that, "They who hate me love death" (Proverbs 8:36), for the tactics envisioned for population reduction are not benign, but involve deliberately caused murder and death.

One reason population control advocates "want" global warming to be real is that in their minds there is a connection between -

GLOBAL WARMING AND POPULATION CONTROL

"The latest environmental justification for slowing or halting population growth is supposed global warming A World Bank paper on the subject concludes, 'The global negative externality represented by rapid population growth in developing countries provides a strong, new rationale for developed countries, in their own interests, to finance regimes that would reduce population growth in developing countries'²⁸ That is, the old rationales for World Bank population control regimes - economic growth, resource conservation, and the like - having been discredited, a new "rationale" has been developed on the basis of speculative assumptions about global warming's economic effects derived from controversial climatological science."²⁹

The population-control exploitation of environmental "crises" was explicitly voiced in the 1960s by one of the early environmentalists who advocated using -

"Our position requires that we take immediate action at home and promote effective action worldwide. We must have population control at home ... by compulsion if voluntary methods fail. ... And while this is being done we must take action to reverse the deterioration of our environment before population pressure permanently ruins our planet. ... We can no longer afford merely to treat the symptoms of the cancer of population growth; the cancer itself must be cut out. Population control is the only answer."³⁰

There is nothing benign in Ehrlich's vision of population control. He views "excess" population as a "cancer" which must be "cut out." Elsewhere, he clarifies that he means that "excess" population should be made to die of starvation, and perhaps it should be eliminated by even more direct methods. To make his inhumane attitude appear reasonable, Ehrlich made false predictions of coming disaster:

"The undeveloped countries of the world face an inevitable population-food crisis. ... It now seems inevitable that it will continue to its logical conclusion: mass starvation. ... The next nine years will probably tell the story."³¹

Ehrlich outlined what methods should be used to bring population down. He recognized that -

THE REAL REASON FOR ADVOCATING ABORTION MUST BE POPULATION CONTROL.

"Abortion is a highly effective weapon in the armory of population control."³² But Ehrlich did not stop with abortion, for global abortion rates are simply not enough to cut population to the low levels Ehrlich wants -

EHRlich'S SOLUTION TO THE "POPULATION CRISIS": COMPULSORY STERILIZATION

"So the first task is population control at home. How do we go about it? ... Some sort of compulsory birth regulation would be necessary to achieve birth control. One plan often mentioned involves the addition of temporary sterilants to water supplies or staple food. Doses of the antidote would be carefully rationed by the government to produce the desired population size. ... [But] the option isn't even open to us, thanks to the criminal inadequacy of biomedical research in this area."³³

Ehrlich's sentiments are not unique. As example of how pervasive this "pro-death" mentality has become, Prince Philip of the English royal family, and Jacques Coustaeu, the french oceanographer beloved by millions of TV viewers and readers of *National Geographic*, have publicly and explicitly expressed "pro-death" ideas like those of Ehrlich. It is fairly well known that even the public education system is now promoting a preoccupation with death.

E. The Big Government Movement

Crises, real and imagined, have been occasions when government grows the fastest. In a crisis, citizens consent to taxes and controls ordinarily recognized as foolish. Advocates of big government exploit the environmental movement to cause -

A PATHOLOGICAL GROWTH OF REGULATION

"The Congress of the United States has created a huge, multistatutory regulatory machinery. ... By 1990, EPA [Environmental Protection Agency] was required to administer 11 major statutes and over 9000 regulations. Since then ... the number of regulations continues to grow. Other agencies are required to issue regulations, and in total, agencies employing 125,000 bureaucrats are busily engaged in formulating additional regulations. The direct cost of meeting these mandates is more than \$500 billion. Additional indirect costs have been estimated at another \$500 billion.

"In the 1970s, industry was the principle target of regulation issued by EPA. ... The new targets of the EPA enforcers are state and local governments and small companies.

"The EPA estimate of the costs to companies, public works facilities, and taxpayers of meeting its regulations in 1990 was \$115 billion nationwide. The EPA projection for the year 2000 is that the cost could be \$180 billion. However, estimates by EPA tend to be low. Municipalities have reported instances in which real costs exceeded EPA estimates by a factor of 20 or more. ...

"Regulations are having an increasing impact on small businesses ... that cannot afford to develop environmental expertise. ... One mandate regulates 328 chemicals and requires firms to keep inventories of their use [and] report the presence to local safety officials and federal authorities ... This is only one of hundreds of regulations that small companies must implement. ... Failure to comply with environmental laws can mean huge fines and jail sentences ... [R]egulatory pathology impairs their health.

"... In its implementation of statutes EPA can be criticized on many grounds. ... Risk assessments of chemicals by EPA often exaggerate hazards by a factor of 100 and more. ... EPA has set maximum concentrations level goals of zero for some major chemicals of doubtful carcinogenicity. ... Thus EPA has an invitation to require expenditures of trillions of dollars at sites around which few if any excess deaths have been seen."³⁴

Presently the very regulations mentioned he cost every American about \$10,000 per year. Some of this shows up in higher taxes, but most of it shows up in higher prices for all the things we buy, since much of the regulatory cost is borne by the manufacturing concerns which then pass their higher costs on to the consumer. How much could you do with an extra \$10,000 per year?

F. The Anti-Industry Stance of the Neo-Pagan Movement.

There is a burgeoning neo-pagan movement which sees any human use of the earth as "bad." In this neo-pagan view, all industry should be demolished, and we should all return to the evolutionary simplicity of the lives of our "primitive" ancestors. While the foundation of the neo-pagan movement is evolutionism, this movement is much more explicitly anti-Christian than conventional evolutionism. The conventional evolutionism of the past century and a half was a transition in which respect for the Bible, and especially for a literal reading of Genesis 1, was totally swept away. Now that even the Church and most Christians no longer take the Bible seriously or

literally, the stage is set for the establishment of an evolutionary neo-paganism which is much more overtly evil.

The neo-pagan agenda is to (1) establish a non-atheistic "New Age" evolutionism with (demonic) "vital forces" seen as driving the evolutionary process; (2) eventually place all of the lands of the earth under central control so that the sacred earth will not be "desecrated"; (3) force all peoples to live under centrally controlled third world conditions to prevent the earth from being "raped" by human technology; (4) promote the idea that the earth is really a living being, the ancient Greek goddess called "Gaia"; (5) eventually force a global worship of the earth goddess by all the peoples of the earth.

This agenda is much farther advanced than the average person realizes, being promoted behind the scenes by the majority of people in places of power. All of this plays into end-time prophecy, though there is not space to discuss that here. Suffice to say that it appears the anti-christ will preside over an earth seen as a sacred feminine goddess which on some level must be worshipped by all. The feminist movement, socialist movements, and other seemingly diverse movements have over the past several decades converged to support this same agenda.

Once we understand this agenda, we begin to understand why, although environmental problems have been solved one after another, the "crisis" mentality of the environmental movement never seems to fade. We also begin to understand, for example, the -

IRRATIONAL OPPOSITION TO NUCLEAR POWER

"Energy from nuclear fission is at least as cheap as other forms of energy, and is available in inexhaustible quantities at constant or declining prices. Its safety record in the West shows it to produce energy at a lower cost in lives than any other form of energy, on average. The opposition to it is mainly ideological and political, as indicated by this statement by the noted activist, Amory Lovins: 'If nuclear power were clean, safe, economic, assured of ample fuel, and socially benign per se, it would still be unattractive because of the political implications of the kind of energy economy it would lock us into.'"³⁵

In speaking of the "theological" opposition to nuclear power, we must understand that Simon was speaking as a Jew, not a Christian. Further, environmental radicals themselves have been open about their neo-pagan agenda. As long ago as 1968 -

ERHLICH RECOGNIZED AND ADVOCATED THE PAGAN BASIS OF RADICAL ENVIRONMENTALISM.

"The attitudes of Western culture toward nature are deeply rooted in Judeo-Christian religion. ... This entire problem has been elegantly discussed by Professor Lynn White, Jr., in *Science* magazine. He points out, for instance, that before the Christian era trees, springs, hills, streams, and other objects of nature had guardian spirits. These spirits had to be approached and placated before one could safely invade their territory. As White says, 'By destroying pagan animism, Christianity made it possible to exploit nature in a mood of indifference to the feelings of natural objects.' ... It is obvious that the Christian view is the one held by most of us. God designed and started the whole business for our benefit. ... Basic changes are needed, perhaps of the type exemplified by the much-despised "hippie"

movement - a movement that adopts most of its ideas from the non-Christian East. ... Here is what White, a churchman, has to say: '... Since the roots of our problem are so largely religious [i.e., Christianity is the problem], the remedy must also be essentially religious, whether we call it that or not.'"³⁶

Ehrlich has been involved with the "Wildlands Project," a plan to achieve a neo-pagan vision for the earth. The Wildlands Project is not benign. It is being implemented in lightly populated areas of the US with the support of the EPA, Fish and Wildlife Service, and other government agencies, as well as in countries with strong central governments (e.g., China and South American countries) where people are not free to dissent. In these countries, and increasingly in the US, implementation of the Wildlands Project has involved the forcible resettlement of human population, because -

THE ULTIMATE WILDLANDS GOAL IS RESERVATIONS FOR HUMANS.

"[The Wildlands Project] calls for nothing less than resettling the entire continent."³⁷

This description is from *Science*, the premier science journal in the States. *Science* continues in greater detail: "The Wildlands Project ... calls for a network of wilderness reserves, human buffer zones, and wildlife corridors stretching across huge tracts of land - hundreds of millions of acres, as much as half of the continent. ...

"On the Oregon coast, for example ... the Wildlands approach calls for 23.4% of the land to be returned to wilderness, and another 26.2% to be severely restricted in terms of human use. Most roads would be closed; some would be ripped out of the landscape. The plan does not specify what would happen to the nearby inhabitants. Similar alterations are called for in Vermont, Florida, the mid-Atlantic region, and the rest of the country."³⁸

Science down played the extent to which the Wildlands Project had been implemented even by 1993. A Wildlands map already existed then for Florida and was depicted in this article. Project planners have been explicit about -

THE PAGANISM LURKING BEHIND THE WILDLANDS PROJECT

"What Soule wants is ... so extensive that it includes a moral and spiritual dimension in addition to a geographic one. Only much larger areas, he says, can preserve what he calls 'wildness.' Along with the conservation of biodiversity, restoring wilderness is a major goal of the Wildlands Project. Wilderness is difficult to define, Soule readily concedes. Still, he says, two of its constituents are 'bigness' and 'fierceness.' Bigness, in his view, 'implies space, and space implies entire mountain ranges and entire aquatic ecosystems.' Fierceness, by contrast, 'implies wild animals, like wolves, moose, and wolverines.' Because fierceness is involved, wild areas are more than place where human beings have little impact. Wildness is 'a state of nature where danger is involved because of the amount of space and the presence of large animals. Being there involves an increased probability of dying or being hurt.'"³⁹

VI. Conclusions

The environmental movement is not based on science but is motivated by various anti-biblical agendas, one of the strongest being the resurgence of neo-paganism. This neo-pagan agenda envisions clearing the earth of "excess population," by force if necessary, then resettling and controlling those who remain.

Christians need to be aware of these trends, for was it not our Savior who said, "Can ye not discern the signs of the times?" (Matthew 16:3). Of course, it is hard to discern the signs of the times if we listen to only the network news. We need to be serious students of the Bible and current events! We also need to learn that our hope is not in this world, "For when these things begin to come to pass, then look up, and lift up your heads; for your redemption draweth nigh" (Luke 21:28).

References

- 1 P.J. Michaels, *Sound and Fury: The Science and Politics of Global Warming*, Cato, 1992, p. 61.
- 2 *ibid.*, p. 62.
- 3 R.A. Maduro and R. Schauerhammer, *The Holes in the Ozone Scare*, 21st Century Science Associates, Washington, 1992; Forward by Haroun Tazieff, p. xiv.
- 4 Michaels, *op. cit.*, p. 9.
- 5 *ibid.*, p. 10.
- 6 *ibid.*, pp. 10, 12.
- 7 Maduro Schauerhammer, *op. cit.*, pp. xiv, xv.
- 8 Michaels, *op. cit.*, p. 98.
- 9 David Skole and Compton Tucker, "Tropical Deforestation and Habitat Fragmentation in the Amazon: Satellite Data from 1978 to 1988," *Science*, Vol. 260, June 25, 1993, p. 1905.
- 10 Julian Simon, *The Ultimate Resource 2*, Princeton University Press, 1996, p. 133; citing the *Washington Post*, July 21, 1991, p. A18.
- 11 Michaels, *op. cit.*, 1992, p. 73; citing F.B. Wood, "Global Alpine Glacier Trends, 1960s to 1980s," *Arctic and Alpine Research*, Vol. 20, 1992, pp. 404-413.
- 12 Maduro and Schauerhammer, *op. cit.*, pp. x-xi.
- 13 *ibid.*, pp. ix, x.
- 14 *ibid.*, p. 1.
- 15 *ibid.*, pp. xiii, xiv; citing *Industrie et Development*, No. 28, June 26, 1991.
- 16 Simon, *op. cit.*, p. 204.
- 17 Simon, *op. cit.*, p. 207; citing the *Journal of the American Medical Association*, 1989, p. 2729.
- 18 *ibid.*, p. 207; citing *JAMA*, *op. cit.*, 2728.
- 19 *ibid.*
- 20 Petr Beckman, "Nuclear Hospital Waste," *Access to Energy*, Vol. 18 no. 11, July 1991, p. 1.
- 21 Simon, *op. cit.*, pp. 266-267; citing Anna J. Bray, "The Ice Age Cometh," *Policy Review*, Fall 1991, pp. 82-84.
- 22 *ibid.*, p. 270; citing *Time*, February 17, 1992, quoted in *MediaWatch*, March 1992, p. 1.
- 23 Paul R. Ehrlich, *The Population Bomb*, Ballantine, 1968, p. 11.
- 24 *ibid.*, p. 36.
- 25 Charles Officer and Jake Page, *The Great Dinosaur Extinction Controversy*, Addison-Wesley, 1996, pp. 151-152.
- 26 G.J.H. McCall (ed.), *Astroblemes - Cryptoexplosion Structures*, Dowden Hutchinson & Ross, 1979, 437 pp.
- 27 Maduro and Schauerhammer, *op. cit.*, p. 2.
- 28 Simon, *op. cit.*, p., 433-434; citing Nancy Birdsall and Charles Griffin, "Population Growth: Externalities and Poverty," *The World Bank*, February, 1991, abstract.
- 29 *ibid.*, pp. 433, 434.
- 30 Ehrlich, *op. cit.*, p. 11.
- 31 *ibid.*, pp. 17, 21.
- 32 *ibid.*, 1968, p. 88.
- 33 *ibid.*, pp. 135, 136.
- 34 Philip H. Abelson, "Pathological Growth of Regulations," *Science*, Vol. 260, June 25, 1993, p. 1859.
- 35 Simon, *op. cit.*, p. 211; citing Amory B. Lovins, *Soft Energy Paths*, Ballinger, Cambridge, 1977.
- 36 Ehrlich, *op. cit.*, pp. 170, 171, 172.
- 37 Charles C. Mann and Mark L. Plummer, "The High Cost of Biodiversity," *Science*, Vol. 260, June 25, 1993, p. 1868.

38 *ibid.*

39 *ibid.*, p. 1870.

Newer Resources

Nearly half of the books listed below date from 2000 or later; newer research reveals that radical environmental claims are still false, and the **conclusions** discussed above are still accurate. The two most highly recommended books below are the one by Lomborg (long but very thorough), and the one by Moore and Simon (short and an easy read).

- Adler, Jonathan H. (editor), *The Costs of Kyoto: Climate Change Policy and Its Implications*, Competitive Enterprise Institute, 1997.
- Arnold, Ron, *Eco-Terror: The Violent Agenda to Save Nature*, Free Enterprise Press, 1997.
- Bailey, Ronald, *Eco-Scam: The False Prophets of Ecological Apocalypse*, St. Martin's, 1993.
- Bailey, Ronald (editor), *Global Warming and Other Eco-Myths: How the Environmental Movement Uses False Science to Scare Us to Death*, Prima/Random House, 2002.
- Bast, Joseph L., Peter J. Hill, and Richard C. Rue, *Eco-Sanity: A Common Sense Guide to Environmentalism*, Madison Books, 1994.
- Beckerman, Wilfred, *Through Green-Colored Glasses: Climate Alarmism Reconsidered*, Cato, 1996.
- Botch, Ben, and Howard Lyons, *Apocalypse Not: Science, Economics and Environmentalism*, Cato, 1993.
- Bradley, Robert L., *Climate Alarmism Reconsidered*, IEA, 2003.
- Chafetz, Morris E., *Big Fat Liars: How Politicians, Corporations, and the Media Use Science and Statistics to Manipulate the Public*, Nelson Current/Thomas Nelson, 2005. Chapters on environmental topics.
- Coffman, Michael S., *Saviors of the Earth: The Politics and Religion of the Environmental Movement*, Northfield Publishers, 1997.
- Dini, Jack, *Wrestling Zeus: Challenging Environmental Mythology*, Scitech, 2003.
- Easterbrook, Gregg, *A Moment on the Earth: The Coming Age of Environmental Optimism*, Penguin, 1995.
- Flynn, Daniel, *Intellectual Morons: How Ideology Makes Smart People Fall for Stupid Ideas*, Three Rivers Press, 2004. Chapter 3 on Ralph Nader.
- Goklany, Indur M., *Clearing the Air: The Real Story of the War on Air Pollution*, Cato, 1999.
- Hogan, James P., *Kicking the Sacred Cow: Questioning the Unquestionable and Thinking the Impermissible*, Baen/Simon and Schuster, 2004. Chapters on environmental topics.
- Lewis, Martin W., *Green Delusions: An Environmentalist Critique of Radical Environmentalism*, Duke University, 1992.
- Lomborg, Bjorn, *The Skeptical Environmentalist: Measuring the Real State of the World*, Cambridge, 2001.
- Maurice, Charles, and Charles W. Smithson, *The Doomsday Myth: 10,000 Years of Economic Crises*, Hoover Institution, 1984. One of the first books critiquing the excesses of the radical environmentalists.
- Michaels, Patrick, and Robert C. Balling, *The Satanic Gases: Clearing the Air about Global Warming*, Cato, 2000.
- Moore, Stephen, and Julian L. Simon, *It's Getting Better All the Time: 100 Greatest Trends of the Last 100 Years*, Cato, 2000. Most items are about the improving environment.
- Moore, Thomas Gale, *Climate of Fear: Why We Shouldn't Worry About Global Warming*, Cato, 1998.
- Ray, Dixie Lee, *Trashing the Planet: How Science Can Help Us Deal with Acid Rain, Depletion of the Ozone, and Nuclear Waste (Among Other Things)*, HarperCollins, 1990.
- Sanera, Michael, and Jane S. Shaw, *Facts, Not Fear: A Parent's Guide to Teaching Children About the Environment*, Regnery, 1996.
- Simon, Julian L., *Population and Development in Poor Countries*, Princeton, 1992.
- Stroup, Richard L., *Eco-nomics: What Everyone Should Know about Economics and the Environment*, Cato, 2003.
- Swanson, Holly, *Set Up and Sold Out: Find Out What Green Really Means*, C.I.N. Publishing, 1998.