

An Anti-Environmentalist Manifesto

by Llewellyn H. Rockwell

The New Socialism

The last Stalinist, Alexander Cockburn, has gone from attacking Gorbachev (for selling out Brezhnev) to defending Mother Earth. His new book, *The Fate of the Forests*, is both statist and pantheist.

Cockburn, a man who supposedly cares about peasants and workers, instead decries their cutting down the Brazilian rainforests to farm and ranch. People are supposed to live in indentured mildewtude so no tree is touched.

But Cockburn is part of a trend. All over Europe and the U.S., Marxists are joining the environmental movement. And no wonder: environmentalism is also a coercive utopianism—one as impossible to achieve as socialism, and just as destructive in the attempt.

A century ago, socialism had won. Marx might be dead, and Lenin still a frustrated scribbler, but their doctrine was victorious, for it controlled something more important than governments: it held the moral high ground.

Socialism was, they said, the brotherhood of man in economic form. Thus was the way smoothed to the gulag.

Today we face an ideology every bit as pitiless and messianic as Marxism. And like social-

ism a hundred years ago, it holds the moral high ground. Not as the brotherhood of man, since we live in post-Christian times, but as the brotherhood of bugs. Like socialism, environmentalism combines an atheistic religion with virulent statism. But it ups the ante. Marxism at least professed a concern with human beings; environmentalism harks back to a godless, manless, and mindless Garden of Eden.

If these people were merely wacky cultists, who bought acres of wilderness and lived on it as primitives, we would not be threatened. But they seek to use the state, and even a world state, to achieve their vision.

And like Marx and Lenin, they are heirs to Jean Jacques Rousseau. His paeans to statism, egalitarianism, and totalitarian democracy have shaped the Left for 200 years, and as a nature worshipper and exalter of the primitive, he was also the father of environmentalism.

During the Reign of Terror, Rousseauians constituted what Isabel Paterson called "humanitarians with the guillotine." We face something worse: plantitarians with the pistol.

The Old Religion

Feminist-theologian Merlin Stone, author of *When God Was a Woman*, exults: "the Goddess

is back!" The "voice of Gaia is heard once again" through a revived "faith in Nature."

Gaia was an earth goddess worshipped by the ancient Greeks and James Lovelock, a British scientist, revived the name in the mid-1970s for "the earth as a living organism" and self-regulating "biosphere."

There is no Bible or "set theology" for Gaia worship, says the Rev. Stone, now making a national tour of Unitarian churches. You can "know Her simply by taking a walk in the woods or wandering on the beach." All of Nature forms Her scriptures. "Industrial civilization is acne on the face of Gaia," says Stone, and it's time to get out the Stridex.

Ancient pagans saw gods in the wilderness,

animals, and the state. Modern environmentalism shares that belief, and adds—courtesy of a New Age-Hindu-California influence—a hatred of man and the Western religious tradition that places him at the center of creation.

Environmentalism also has roots in deism—the practical atheism of the Enlightenment—which denied the Incarnation and made obeisance to nature.

Early environmentalist John Burroughs wrote: we use the word "Nature very much as our fathers used the word God." It is in

Environmentalism is an ideology every bit as pitiless and messianic as Marxism.

Nature's lap that "the universe is held and nourished."

The natural order is superior to mankind, wrote ecologist John Muir more than a century ago, because Nature is "unfallen and undepraved" and man always and everywhere "a blighting touch." Therefore, said the human-hating Muir, alligators and other predators should be "blessed now and then with a mouthful of terror-stricken man by way of a dainty."

Christianity, adds ecologist Lynn White, Jr., "bears an immense burden of guilt" for violating nature. It brought evil into the world by giving birth to capitalism and the Industrial Revolution.

Since we must think of nature as God, says William McKibben, author of the best selling *End of Nature*, every "man-made phenomenon" is evil. We must keep the earth as "Nature intended."

To punish man's desecration, ecologist Edward Abbey urged anti-human terrorism in his influential novel, *The Monkey-Wrench Gang*. And the fastest-growing group in the Gaia liberation movement, EarthFirst!, uses a monkey wrench for its symbol.

Founded by David Foreman, former head lobbyist for the Wilderness Society, EarthFirst! engages in "eco-defense" and "ecotage," from spiking trees (which maims loggers) to vandalizing road-building machinery to wrecking rural airstrips. One of its goals is cutting the world's population by 90%, and it has even hailed

AIDS as a help. Foreman is in prison awaiting trial for trying to blow up the pylons that carry high-power wires (using, I'm sure, environmentally safe bombs), but his example is powerful, even among the alleged non-radicals. One of the mainstream environmentalists, David Brower—former head of the Sierra Club and founder of Friends of the Earth—urged that land developers be shot with tranquilizer guns. He agrees with McKibben: human suffering is much less important than the "suffering of the planet."

We must be "humbler" towards nature and use technology like "bicycle-powered pumps," says McKibben—who lives on an expensive Adirondack farm. But he wants the rest of us "crammed into a few huge cities like so many ants" because "it's best

for the planet. "We shouldn't even have children, for "independent, eternal, ever-sweet Nature" must be disturbed as little as possible.

McKibben does admit to one sin: he owns a 1981 Honda. But a man who lives a properly ascetic life is "Ponderosa Pine."

A life-long leftist, Pine—whose real name is Keith Lampe—was an apparatchik of the black-power Student Non-Violent Coordinating Committee (which didn't have many students or much non-violence) and a founder of the Yippie Party. He rioted at the 1968 Democratic Convention and has been arrested nine times for civil

disobedience.

Converted by Allan Ginsberg to environmentalism, Pine split with his wife and twin sons. She had complained about his "Tibetan vocal energy science"—a continuous, hour-long, top-of-the-lungs shout each morning as an act of "communion with Mother Earth."

With his civil disobedience campaign against logging, and environmental news service, newspaper columns, and newsletter (he refers to paper, in other contexts, as "dead tree flesh"), Pine has been extremely influential, though there is some dissent about his demand that we go barefoot to be in "more intimate touch with the earth." David Brower goes further, denouncing the Pinian nom de terre; did he, Brower asks angrily, have "permission from the Ponderosa Pines to use their name"?

But even Brower agrees with the knotty Pine's crusade to collectivize the U.S., return us to a primitive standard of living, and use the Department of Defense to do it. "I want to change the military's whole focus to environmentalism," says Pine.

In the meantime, however, it is possible to do something good for the earth as your last act. A recent issue of *EarthFirst! Journal*, notes *Washington Times* columnist John Elvin, had some advice for the lifelorn. "Are you terminally ill with a wasting disease?" asks the journal. "Don't go out with a whimper; go out with a bang! Undertake an eco-kamikaze mission."

"The possibilities for terminally ill warriors are limitless. Dams from the Columbia and the

**I reject
the Gaia
liberation
movement.**

Colorado to the Connecticut are crying to be blown to smithereens, as are industrial polluters, the headquarters of oil-spilling corporations, fur warehouses, paper mills...."

"To those feeling suicidal, this may be the answer to your dreams.... Don't jump off a bridge, blow up a bridge. Who says you can't take it with you?"

Nature Without Illusions

Ron James, an English Green leader, says the proper level of economic development is that "between the fall of Rome and the rise of Charlemagne. "The "only way to live in harmony with Nature is by living at a subsistence level," as the animals do.

The normal attitude for most of human history was expressed by the Pilgrims, who feared a "hideous and desolate wilderness, full of wild beasts and wild men." Only a free society, which has tamed nature over many generations, enables us to have a different view.

"To us who live beneath a temperate sky and in the age of Henry Ford," wrote Aldous Huxley, "the worship of Nature comes almost naturally." But "an enemy with whom one is still at war, an unconquered, unconquerable, ceaselessly active enemy"—"one respects him, perhaps; one has a salutary fear of him; and one goes on fighting." Added Albert J. Nock, "I can see nature only as an enemy: a highly respected enemy, but an enemy."

Few of us could survive in the wilderness of, say, Yellowstone Park for any length of time (even though the environmental-

ists let it burn down because fire is natural). Nature is not friendly to man; it must be tempered.

Environmental Hysteria

Because they know that the vast majority of Americans would reject their real agenda, the environmentalists use lies, exaggerations, and pseudo-science to create public hysteria.

EXXON The environmental movement is cheering the criminal indictment of the Exxon Corporation for the Alaska oil spill, with the possibility of more than \$700 million in fines. The one shortcoming, say the Sierra Club and the Natural Resources Defense Council, is that Exxon executives won't be sent to prison.

Exxon cannot be allowed to get away with an "environmental crime" which despoiled the "pristine wilderness of Alaska," says Attorney General Richard Thornburgh. But the legal doctrine underlying this indictment is inconsistent with a free society, notes Murray N. Rothbard.

Under feudalism, the master was held responsible for all acts of his servants, intended or not. During the Renaissance with growing capitalism and freedom, the doctrine changed so there was no "vicarious liability." Employers were correctly seen as legally responsible only for those actions they directed their

employees to take, not when their employees disobeyed them. But today, we are back in feudal times, plus deeper-pocket jurisprudence, as employers are held responsible for all acts of their employees, even when the employees break company rules and disobey specific order—by getting drunk on duty, for example. From all the hysteria, and the criminal indictment, one might think Exxon had deliberately spilled the oil, rather than being the victim of an accident that has already cost its stockholders \$2 billion. Who is supposedly the casualty in the Justice Department's "criminal

act? Oiled sand? In fact, Exxon is the biggest victim. Through employee negligence the company has lost \$5 million worth of oil, a supertanker, and compensation to fishermen, or the cost of the clean up. The total bill

could be \$3 billion.

Yet every night on television, we were treated to maudlin coverage of oily water and blackened seagulls, and denunciations of Exxon and oil production in "environmentally sensitive" Alaska. Though why it is more sensitive than, say, New Jersey, we are never told. In fact, environmentalists love Alaska because there are so few people there. It represents their ideal.

Despite all the hysteria, oil is—if I may use the environmen-

Nature is not friendly to man; it must be tempered.

talists' own lingo—natural, organic, and biodegradable. As in previous oil spills, it all went away, and the birds, plants, and fish replenished themselves.

The Exxon oil spill was hardly the "equivalent of Hiroshima," as one crazed Alaska judge said. And who knows? Oil might be good for some wildlife. This year, the salmon catch is almost 50% bigger than anytime in the past.

WETLANDS One of the great engineering achievements of the ancient world was draining the Pontine Marshes, which enabled the city of Rome to expand. But no such project could be undertaken today; that vast swamp would be protected as wetlands.

When John Pozsgai—an emigrant from communist Hungary—tried to improve some property, he found this out. After buying a former junkyard and clearing away the thousands of tires that littered it, Pozsgai put clean topsoil on his lot in Morrisville, PA. For this, the 57-year-old mechanic was sentenced to three years in prison and \$200,000 in fines. His property was classified as wetlands by the federal government.

After ordering a bureaucrat to "get the Hell off my property," Pozsgai was arrested, handcuffed, and jailed on \$10,000 bail. Quickly tried and convicted, Pozsgai's brutal sentence will—

said the prosecutor—"send a message to the private landowners, corporations, and developers of this country about President Bush's wetlands policy."

John Pozsgai has a different view: "I thought this was a free country," he told *The Washington Post*.

Despite all the hysteria, oil is -- if I may use the environmentalists' own lingo -- natural, organic, and biodegradable.

RUBBISH Urban Archeologist William L. Rathje of the University of Arizona says there have always been garbage disposal problems. The difference is that today we have safe and efficient methods to deal with them, if the environmentalists would let

us. They warn of a country covered by garbage, but in fact Americans generate less than Mexico City today or America 100 years ago. And 62% less than the environmentalists claim.

Most landfills will be full in ten years or less, the environmentalists warn, and that's true. But most landfills are only designed to last ten years. The problem is not that they are filling up, but that businessmen are not allowed to create new ones, thanks to lobbying by the environmental movement.

The environmentalists complain most about disposable diapers and fast-food containers, revealing their anti-family and pro-elite biases. But Rathje discovered that fast-food containers and disposable diapers take up only 1.1%, with all plastics totalling less than 5%. The real

culprit is paper—especially telephone books and newspapers.

We're ordered to save our newspapers for recycling, so the market is flooded with newsprint. In New Jersey, this drove the price of used newspapers from \$40 a ton to minus \$25. Collectors once bought old newspapers. Now people must pay someone to take them away.

Sometimes it makes economic sense to recycle. Sometimes it doesn't. But bureaucrats, acting at the behest of environmentalists, want us to recycle as a sacrament of the earth religion. Yet it is only through a free price system, as Ludwig von Mises demonstrated 70 years ago, that we can know the value of goods and services. We must privatize the entire garbage system. Only then can we know if it is economically efficient to recycle.

MCDONALDS I've always admired McDonald's. It put restaurant dining within the reach of the average American, and made cross-country travel less of a culinary roulette. But these days, the gold on those arches is looking a little bit green.

For 15 years, McDonald's put its hamburgers in styrofoam boxes, and no wonder. The containers kept the food hot, clean, and dry, and the foam even absorbed grease.

Styrofoam was a wonderful invention, as anyone who's ever held a paper cup of hot coffee can testify. Light, strong, cheap, and insulating, styrofoam was a consumer godsend. So naturally, the environmentalists—whose declared enemy is the consumer

society—despised it.

The Environmental Defense fund persuaded McDonald's to ban styrofoam as "bad for the environment." By this, they do not mean the customers' environment, since paper leaves a hamburger cold and soggy much more quickly than styrofoam.

The environmentalists say that styrofoam doesn't biodegrade. But so what? Rocks don't biodegrade either. Why should we mind styrofoam buried under our feet as versus rocks? Because styrofoam is man-made, and therefore evil, whereas rocks are natural, and therefore good.

Non-ecological factors may be at work, however. Edward H. Rensi, president of McDonald's U.S.A., said the company can "switch to paper and save money." And if the customers don't like it? What are you, a spotted owl murderer?

But McDonald's may not be getting off so easily. The Audubon Society criticizes the deal, saying that "a lot more paper means a lot more pollution."

I guess the environmentalists won't be satisfied until McDonald's slaps the burger directly onto our outstretched hand. If it is a burger. An agreement with the animal rights movement may be next. Anyone for a McTofu?

And Portland, Oregon—in a move that other cities are studying—has hired ex-New York bureaucrat Lee Barrett as a "styrofoam cop." Since January 1990, no restaurant or other retail food seller in Portland has been able to use products made of the wonderful insulating foam. It is Barrett's job to swoop down on businesses to make sure they are not

styro-criminals. If they are, he can levy \$250 fines for the dread offense—with \$500 for hardened offenders.

ALAR Just before the publication of a National Research Council study extolling fresh fruits and vegetables (why do government scientists get paid to repeat what our mothers told us?), and pooh-poohing the trivial pesticide residues on them, the environmentalists arranged an ambush.

A PR man for the Natural Resources Defense Council was featured on *60 Minutes*, points out syndicated columnist Warren Brookes, and Ed Bradley denounced Alar as the "most potent carcinogen in our food supply." This was disinformation.

Alar—used safely since 1963—helps ripen apples, keeps them crisper, and retards spoilage. Using an EPA-mandated dosage 22,000 the maximum intake of even an apple-crazy human, one rat out of the thousands tested developed a tumor. This was the extent of the "scientific proof" used not only to harm the manufacturer, Uniroyal, which had to pull Alar off the market, but the entire U.S. apple industry.

A saner voice—Dr. Sanford Miller, dean of the medical school at the University of Texas at San Antonio—noted that "the risk of pesticide residues to con-

sumers is effectively zero." But apple sales dropped, and apple growers lost more than \$250 million, with many driven into bankruptcy.

Says Dr. Miller: 99.9% of the pesticide carcinogens now eaten by humans are natural. And as man-made pesticides and fungicides are banned, we are endangered. "Fungi produce the most potent carcinogens in nature."

RATS The attack on Alar was based on rodent testing. And many other helpful products have been forced off the market, and companies and consumers

harmed, through such panics. And now it turns out, as many of us have long thought, that such tests are defective.

Two recent articles in the journal *Science*—by Dr. Bruce Ames of the University of California, Berkeley, and Dr. Samuel Cohen of the University of Nebraska Medical College—have shown that it is the massive dose itself, no matter what the substance, that causes tumors.

The hyperdosages, explain these scientists, kill cells in the test animals, which their bodies then replace. The more this takes place over the animal's lifetime, the greater the chance of a cell mutation leading to cancer.

As with Alar, take thousands of rats and fill them full of a chemical for their whole lives,

The environmentalists say that styrofoam doesn't biodegrade. But so what?

and it can be no surprise when one develops a tumor. This shows us that no one should try to live on Alar, but it tells us nothing about an infinitesimal residue, so small as to be barely measurable, of this helpful chemical.

GREENHOUSE On the first Earth Day in 1970, environmentalists warned that we faced a new ice age unless the government took immediate and massive action. Today, using much of the same data, they claim we are endangered by global warming. These are the same climatologists who can't tell us whether it will rain next Friday, but who are certain that the earth's temperature will be x degrees celsius higher in 2,011 than today. Increased levels of carbon dioxide in the atmosphere will melt the polar icecaps and coastal areas will flood, we're told. As temperatures increase, Dallas will become a desert and Baked Alaska more than a dessert.

The proposed solution to this "Greenhouse Effect" is, surprise!, more government spending and control, and lower human standards of living. President Bush's new budget has \$375 million for greenhouse research.

Yet the "net rise in world surface temperature during the last century is about one degree Fahrenheit," nearly all of it before 1940, notes syndicated columnist Alton Chase. "And the northern oceans have actually been getting cooler. The much-vaunted 'global warming' figures are concocted by averaging equatorial warming with north temperate cooling."

And a recently concluded

10-year satellite weather study by two NASA scientists at the Huntsville Space Center and the University of Alabama found zero warming.

There is no evidence of global warming, and even if it were to take place, many scientists say the effect would be good: it would lengthen growing seasons, make the earth more liveable, and forestall any future ice age.

CLEAN AIR ACT

Bush's Clean Air Act, signed into law in October 1990, gives the EPA dictatorial power over every American business whose products might be harmful if burned. Since almost everything is toxic if burned, this is the establishment of Green central planning.

The bill also subsidizes ethanol, methanol, and compressed natural gas, and orders manufacturers to produce expensive cars that run on them.

Ethanol, a corn-based fuel beloved of Sen. Bob Dole (R-IRS) and his Trilateralist ethanol-producing mentor, Dwayne Andreas of Archer-Daniels-Midland, gives off other forms of pollution, and is much more expensive than gasoline. (Note: this provision, by artificially increasing this demand for corn, will also raise food prices by about \$10 billion.)

Methanol is a highly corrosive fuel that destroys the normal automotive engine, requiring super-expensive alternatives. It costs more than gasoline, is only

half as efficient, and is so toxic as to make gasoline seem almost benign in comparison.

Compressed natural gas requires massive steel tanks. A container holding the energy equivalent of a normal gasoline

tank is much bigger and weighs 30 times as much, lowering mileage and wiping out most trunk space. And even a minimal number of refueling stations will cost \$15 billion.

The Clean Air Act also has higher CAFE standards (fleet-wide economy regulations) that will have the effect of mandating lighter and therefore

more dangerous automobiles.

The bill also places new and heavy regulations on hundreds of thousands of small businesses, in the OSHA tradition. OSHA is the quintessential Establishment regulatory agency, since the Exxons of the world can easily handle its depredations, while small businesses cannot. It has been a tremendous relative benefit to big business, and a barrier to entrepreneurs and small firms.

The new Clean Air Act replicates this, in spades. Any business using one of 200 common chemicals will have to undergo a lengthy and expensive licensing process. This includes your corner dry cleaner and print shop. And if the owner violates any regulations, knowingly or unknowingly, he will be subjected to heavy civil and even criminal penalties.

There is
no
evidence
of
global
warming.

If a business gets new equipment, it will need a new permit—another bar to innovation for small companies. And if a factory changes its production method, it too will need a new permit. Again, this is no problem for Dow Chemical, only for Dow's would-be competitors.

As bad as all these provisions are, the most serious and expensive aspects of the Clean Air Act involve "acid rain" and the ozone layer.

ACID RAIN Environmentalists are adept at PR, and the very name acid rain conjures up images of drops eating through your umbrella and dissolving your hair. In fact, it means only that litmus paper turns a different color.

The environmentalists tell us that America's streams, rivers, and lakes are becoming dangerously acidic, and that the villain is coal burning by utility companies. However, the government's own ten-year, \$600 million National Acidic Precipitation Assessment Project—which the EPA is seeking to censor—found that acid rain is a non-problem.

Virtually all of the few acidic lakes have been that way since before the Industrial Revolution, thanks to water running through topsoil heavy with decaying

vegetation. This is also why the naturalist Alexander von Humboldt found the giant Rio Negro river system in South America acidic and fishless two hundred years ago.

Ironically, the fish in some Adirondack lakes—where there has been the most publicity—are affected by reforestation. Cutting down trees in the early part of the

century led to less acidic soil, and a more neutral pH in the water, and artificially stocked fish thrived. Replanting over the last few decades has meant more acid.

OZONE The other major focus of the Clean Air Act is the alleged deterioration of the ozone layer. We're told that we need a

robust layer of ozone to prevent too much ultra-violet B radiation. But this is another non-problem. Since 1974, when we began measuring the UVB radiation level, it has declined 10%. Less is getting through, despite alleged anti-ozone chemicals.

Ozone is created by the action of sunshine on oxygen, so it should be no surprise that over the South Pole in the winter, when there is little sunshine, the ozone layer might thin, or even develop a temporary hole. This has happened, it is the only place it has happened, and it was first recorded in the middle 1950s,

long before the alleged chemical villains were in significant use.

Ozone is harmed, we're told, by chlorofluorocarbons, the wonder chemicals used in air conditioners, refrigerators, and spray cans, and which are essential to the computer industry as well. Stable and non-toxic, CFCs cannot catch fire, and they are tremendously energy efficient. Yet the Clean Air Act will heavily tax, and eventually ban, all CFCs and related chemicals.

The planned substitutes are not only poisonous and energy inefficient, they can catch fire and even explode. The exploding refrigerator: it seems a perfect symbol of what the Clean Air Act, and the entire environmental movement, will inflict on us for the sake of the mythical Mother Nature.

But ozone is good, we're told, only in the upper atmosphere. To cut down on its incidence at street level in Los Angeles, the entire country will be fastened with additional anti-automotive and anti-industrial controls, with more bad economic effects.

A GREEN GNP? The environmentalists feel they have a PR problem. Since their explicit agenda is to make us consume less, that is, to be poorer, they worry that this may not be popular. So they have a solution: the Green GNP.

GNP—gross national product—is already a deficient statistic. For example, as government spending grows, so does the GNP, even though government growth subtracts from real wealth. Nevertheless, as the statistical avatar of

The exploding refrigerator: it seems a perfect symbol of the environmental movement.

American business activity, the GNP has tremendous political significance.

To hide the fact that their legislation and regulation makes us poorer, the environmentalists want "environmental quality" incorporated into GNP. The Environmental Protection Agency and similar bureaucracies in Western Europe are funding research to make this possible.

The federal government already owns more than 40% of the United States. Say, under environmentalist pressure, another billion acres is taken out of production to save an endangered weed. Green accounting will claim that our environmental quality has been improved by x billion dollars, and add this to the GNP. Already, the GNP figures disguise how poor we're getting along thanks to government intervention in the economy. A Green GNP will take us even further from reality.

SPOTTED OWLS When I visited a logging area in northern California, I found no environmentalists. As the Sierra Club's own studies demonstrate, environmentalists are upper-class types who live in places like Manhattan and Malibu, not in the woods. Those who do have no illusions about the Earth Goddess Gaia.

Loggers know that mankind's very existence depends on bending nature to our will, and that if we ever stop doing so, the jungle will reclaim our cities.

The livelihood of 30,000 working families in the Northwest will be destroyed by Bush administration-approved anti-

logging regulations on millions of acres, so spotted owls can continue to live in the style to which they have become accustomed. If you think that wiping out 15 human families per owl seems excessive, it just shows how unenlightened you are. (Note: if the spotted owl really is "endangered," and environmentalists want to save it, they should buy some land and set up an owl sanctuary. But using their own money somehow never occurs to them.)

The environmentalists privately admit, however, that the owl is not their major concern, which is outlawing all "old-growth" logging, a controversy which cuts to the heart of the environmentalist movement (unfortunately not with an ax).

Old-growth trees are precious because they were not planted by man, the Great Satan of the enviro-druidic religion. Pollution questions, although they make use of them, are irrelevant to these people. Old trees produce much less oxygen than new trees, so according to the "rain-forest criterion," we should harvest all old trees and plant new ones. I don't notice anyone recommending that, however.

To drive through far northern California is to be reminded of the aptness of Ronald Reagan's "if you've seen one tree, you've seen them all" remark. The monotony is broken only by the occasional town, an oasis of civilization in a green desert. Yet the environmentalists would turn these into ghost cities. As one affluent environmentalist told me, "those people have no business living there." Now if I can only find an Audubon Society meeting so I

can wear my new logger t-shirt: "I Love Spotted Owls. Fried."

OIL With the U.S. government prepared to go to war over oil, one would think that the environmental stranglehold on domestic energy production might be questioned. In fact, it has been made tighter, with millions more acres, off-shore and within the U.S. forever barred—or so the environmentalists hope—from energy production for humans.

The Arctic National Wildlife Reserve is full of oil, perhaps eight to nine billion barrels worth—even more than Prudoe Bay, points out columnist Stan Evans. So full of oil is this government wildlife reserve that oil seeps out of the ground and into the water, for some reason causing no media hysteria at the "desecration" involved. Yet this mammoth resource has been locked up by the feds through environmentalist pressure.

Production off the California, North and South Carolina, and Florida coasts is also banned, although there is probably 30 billion barrels there.

Through a coalition of rich people in places like Santa Barbara who don't want their free views disturbed by a distant drilling platform, and environmentalists who feel drilling contaminates Mother Earth, and might injure a seagull, the American people have been made poorer.

All federal lands should be privatized, but so long as they are government owned, they should at least be opened to productive human use, including oil production, coal and other forms of mining, and tree harvesting.

Animal Lovers and People Haters

One of the fastest growing and most radical parts of the environmental movement is the animal rightists. They too worship nature, but make a cult out of animals whom they equate with human beings, and in fact place above us.

BABY SEALS About ten years ago, we were subjected to a barrage of photos and news stories about big-eyed seal pups hunted for their fur. Greenpeace stirred a worldwide propaganda campaign, and the European Community and others banned the import of the pelts.

This not only wiped out the livelihood of the natives who hunted the seals, but it harmed the fishing industry. With no hunting to keep the seal population under control, the animals are devouring increasingly scarce fish and damaging nets.

Some bureaucrats are proposing a government seal hunt (no private hunters, of course), but the environmentalists have prevented it. Meanwhile, stocks of cod and other fish continue to drop. Do the environmentalists care? We "shouldn't eat anything with a face," one told me.

FLIPPED OUT One environmentalists' Victim of the Month was the dolphin. Some of the animals were caught inadvertently by tuna fishermen, but Flipper re-runs on TV must have convinced millions of Americans that dolphins are intelligent, so the environmentalists were able to persuade them to spear the tuna industry.

Santa Barbara, California,

has now declared a Dolphin Awareness Day; school children all across America engaged in letter-writing campaigns (those who still could, despite the government schools); and San Francisco kids were denounced if they brought tuna sandwiches to school.

The Audubon Society, the Humane Society, the Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals, Greenpeace, People for the Ethical Treatment of Animals (PETA), and a host of similar organizations wanted an end, in effect, to the organized American tuna industry, and they may get it.

The Marine Mammal Protection Act, passed by Congress and signed by President Reagan in 1981, imposed convoluted regulations on the industry in the name of saving dolphins. But that's not good enough, says Congresswoman Barbara Boxer (D-CA): dolphins "have creative centers larger than humans." Or at least larger than members of Congress. So new federal restrictions are needed.

Even before the politicians could act, however, Greenpeace and other environmental groups pressured the four major tuna companies to stop using fish caught by nets because an occasional dolphin might be caught. The livelihood of American tuna fishermen, with the life savings of whole families invested in expensive boats and equipment, was,

of course, irrelevant. The companies will now only buy tuna from the western Pacific, where there are no dolphins, and no American fishermen.

The environmentalists admit, be it noted, that they also cherish the life of the tuna, and want it also protected from fishermen, but they will have to wait. Charlie hasn't had his own TV show yet.

EXTINCTION From the snail darter to the furbish lousewort, every existing animal and plant species must be kept in existence by the government—claim the environmentalists—even if

human rights are violated. But why?

Most of the species that have existed since the creation, from trilobites to dinosaurs, are now extinct through normal processes. Why not allow this to continue?

If, for scientific or entertainment purposes, some people want to preserve this species or that on their own land and at their own expense, great. Zoos and universities do this already. But the rest of us should not be taxed and regulated, and have our property rights wiped out, to save every weed and bug. The only environmental impact that counts is that on humans.

FUR In Aspen, Colorado, voters defeated a proposed ban on fur

Most of the species that have existed since the creation are now extinct through normal processes. Why not allow this to continue?

sales, but in most places it is the furaphobes who make themselves felt, especially since they are willing to use almost any tactic.

They spray paint women in fur coats, slash coats with razors, and burn down fur stores. Last year, they put incendiary bombs in the fur-selling areas of department stores all over the San Francisco Bay area. Police suspect the Animal Liberation Front (ALF), which has been charged with using identical devices elsewhere. But such is the environmentalist influence in the media that there was little publicity.

ALF, which the California attorney general calls a terrorist organization, admits it seeks "to inflict economic damage on animal torturers," from fur sellers to medical researchers.

MEDICAL RESEARCH A physician researching Sudden Infant Death Syndrome, Dr. John Orem, "conducted ground breaking—and painless—research on cats," notes Katie McCabe in *The Washingtonian*, "until his lab was trashed by the Animal Liberation Front." Children may die as a result, but ALF says: so what? Anything is justified to stop the use of animals.

Congress listens respectfully to animal-rights lobbyists, and has passed legislation making medical research more expensive. One amendment from then-Sen. John Melcher (D-MT) requires researchers to protect the "psychological well-being" of monkeys (whom Congressmen must feel close to) at an estimated cost of \$1 billion.

This plays, however, directly into the hands of people-killers. Who knows how many

cures will go undiscovered because of these restrictions? Thousands of babies have been saved because we know about the Rh factor, which was discovered through the use of rhesus monkeys. But animal rights advocates say it is better that babies die than that monkeys be used to save them.

Even Rep. Bob Dornan (R-CA) has pushed animal-rights legislation that would add billions to medical research costs. Not that he goes all the way with these people. Although named "Legislator of the Year" by the radical PETA, Dornan still "wears leather shoes." Until PETA outlaws them, that is, for the animal rightists see cow leather as no different than human skin.

Fred Barnes reports in *The New Republic*—itself pro-animal rights—that the Bush administration has buckled under animal rights pressure (Barbara is rumored to be a supporter) and "strongly opposed" legislation empowering the FBI to investigate terrorist attacks on medical research facilities.

In a cover story on the subject, *New Republic* senior editor Robert Wright says he was converted by the "stubborn logic" of the animal-rights movement, although he—like Dornan—doesn't go all the way. He still believes in "the use of primates in AIDS research."

ANTS AND SWANS The animal rights lobby wants them to outlaw any use of animals in medical research, food, or clothing. There is "no rational basis for saying that a human being has special rights," says Ingrid Newkirk, director of PETA. "The smallest form of life, even an ant or a clam, is equal to a human being."

The "murder of animals," says Alex Pacheco, chairman of PETA, is equivalent to the "murder of men." Eating oysters on the halfshell makes you Charles Manson.

Recently there was an uproar in southern Connecticut. The state's wildlife division had proposed, in the face of an out-of-control swan population, to "shake eggs." The swans—large, heavy, aggressive birds with no natural predators in the area—were attacking children. The swans couldn't, of course, be hunted, so rangers were deputized to rattle fertilized eggs to prevent hatching.

Thousands of residents protested this violation of the swans' rights, many proponents of human abortion among them. If children were injured by the swans, so be it. (Note: This is in the tradition. Rousseau abandoned his five children as "an inconvenience" and animal-rights activists are typically pro-abortion.)

Eating
oysters
on the
halfshell
makes
you
Charles
Manson.

Let's get serious, says a PETA spokeswoman: "Six million Jews died in concentration camps, but six billion broiler chickens will die this year in slaughter houses."

The Politics of Environmentalism

From FDR to the present, the Democrats have been bad on environmentalism. It played an important part in the New Deal and the Great Society (Lyndon Johnson called himself "the Conservation President"), and any day I expect to see the Democrats designate trees as what Joe Sobran calls an Officially Accredited Minority, with a certain number of seats (plastic, of course) in their national convention.

But environmentalism got its political start under the original liberal Republican: Teddy Roosevelt. As no one who knows Washington will be surprised to learn, there were special interests at work.

When the federal government established the national parks system, and locked up millions of acres, it made other land—held especially by the timber and railroad interests associated with J.P. Morgan, Roosevelt's mentor—much more valuable. Some of these interests were the funders of the original conservation lobbying organization.

Unfortunately, Richard Nixon continued this tradition when he established—by executive order—the Environmental Protection Agency. Not surprisingly, the EPA's budget has been dominated by sewage-treatment and other construction contracts for well-connected big

businessmen. But small and medium businesses, and the American consumer, have suffered from its endless regulations.

And now the EPA is to be elevated by President Bush—the "Environment President"—into a cabinet department.

President Bush has also proposed a New Deal-style \$2 billion program to plant a billion saplings, none of them members of Congress.

Are we short of trees? No, but the president is "genuinely fond of trees," says a White House aide. And although no one thinks it will "cure the Greenhouse effect," it's "symbolic of his commitment to the environment." America's foresters, farmers, landowners, and homeowners don't know the proper number of trees, but Washington, D.C., does.

World Government and the Environment

Some problems, like alleged global warming, are so enormous, say the environmentalists, that only world government can solve them. And the one-world-types who infest the national Democrats and the resurgent Rockefeller wing of the Republican Party are glad to comply.

Right now, the State Department and the EPA are negotiating a plan, based on the new Clean Air Act, to issue pollution permits world wide.

Third World countries would get "excess" permits, which they could then sell to Western companies, bringing about another transfer of wealth from the West to the Third World, which will undoubtedly be used to pay back the big bank loans of Third World governments.

Establishmentarian Elliot L. Richardson, writing in *The New York Times*, says that "nothing will be done" environmentally "without an institutional mechanism to develop, institute, and enforce

regulations across national boundaries."

To build "a global Environmental Protection Agency," perhaps run like "the United Nations General Assembly," that could levy taxes and impose controls to make sure there is "equitable burden sharing," the U.S. government must lead the way in the "interest of the entire world community."

Ever since Woodrow Wilson, liberals have been infected with the idea of world government. With the melding of the European Community and the coming establishment of its tax authority and central bank, the Trilateralist ideal has come closer.

The Economics of Environmentalism

Once we reject utopianism, and realize that—for example—

President Bush wants to plant a billion saplings, none of them members of Congress.

eight million people can't live in Los Angeles and have air like rural Colorado's—we can set about solving real environmental problems through the only possible mechanism: private property and the price system.

When the price system functions freely, it brings supply and demand into rough equality, ensuring that resources are put to their most-valued uses. To the extent that government meddles with prices, it ensures waste, hampers entrepreneurship, and makes people poorer.

If coffee—for whatever reason—becomes scarcer, its price goes up, which tells consumers to drink less. If more coffee comes on the market, its price goes down, telling consumers they can drink more. Prices thus constitute a system of resource conservation.

But environmentalists pretend—like Soviet central planners—to know economic values without prices. They claim we are "running out" of everything, and thus we need government controls on consumption. But if we really were running out of, say, oil, its price would skyrocket, telling consumers to use less and entrepreneurs to seek substitutes.

Neither do the voluntary ecorestrictions work as intended. The environmentalists are forever telling us to be poorer and use

less water, less gasoline, less toilet paper, etc. But if they reduce their consumption, it lowers the price for the rest of us, and we can use more. (P.S.: Don't pass this on to the environmentalists; it's the one favor they do the rest of us.)

When anything is commonly owned—like air and water—we see all the bad effects of socialism. People abuse the resource because they do not have to bear the price.

To solve this problem, anyone who is personally harmed, or his business damaged, by air pollution ought to be able to sue to stop it, and receive damages. But the federal government intervened in this common-law process in the 19th century to favor special interests, making it impossible, to take a real example, for a farmer to sue a

railroad whose spark emissions burned down his orchard.

The federal government also nationalized the coasts and waterways specifically to smooth the way for industrial special interests.

If, as is the case with many waterways in England and other countries, people had property rights in the streams and rivers running through their land, they could prevent pollution just as they prevent trash dumping in their front yard. And if fishermen and homeowners held property

rights in the coasts and adjacent waters, they could prevent pollution and properly allocate fishing rights.

The recent hysteria over African elephant tusks was another problem of property rights. If people were allowed to raise elephants and sell their tusks—as even the Zimbabwean government pointed out—there would be no more and no fewer elephant tusks than there should be. The same principle applies to all other resources. If left in common ownership, there will be misuse. If put in private hands, we will have the right amount: supply will meet demand.

An example of market conservation was the Cayman Turtle Farm in the British West Indies. The green sea turtle was considered endangered, thanks to over harvesting due to common ownership. The Farm was able to hatch eggs and bring the hatchlings to maturity at a far higher rate than in nature. Its stock grew to 80,000 green turtles.

But the environmentalists hated the Cayman Turtle Farm, since in their view it is morally wrong to profit from wildlife. The Farm was driven out of business and the green turtle is again on the endangered species list.

GREENOMICS Greens—like all liberals—justify government intervention because of what economists call "public goods" and "externalities."

A "public good" is supposed to be something we all want, but can't get, unless government provides it. Environmentalists claim everyone wants national parks, but the market won't provide them, so the government

But environmentalists pretend, like Soviet central planners, to know economic values without prices.

must. But how can we know, independent of the market, that everyone does want these expensive parks? Or how many parks of what sort?

We could take a survey, but that doesn't tell us the intensity of economic demand. More important, it is not enough to know that people want, for example, diamonds. That means something economically only if they are willing to give up other things to obtain them.

Amazingly, liberal economists have never developed a way to identify these so-called public goods, so—objective scientists that they are—they use intuition. Paul Samuelson's favorite example was the lighthouse, until Ronald Coase demonstrated that private entrepreneurs had provided lighthouses for centuries.

If we realize that only the market can give us economic information, the alleged problem of public goods disappears. Absent government prohibitions and subsidies, or competition from "free" parks, the market will ensure that we have exactly the number and type of parks that the American people want, and are willing to pay for. Moreover, if we sell all the national parks, we can pay off the federal debt.

An "externality" is a side-effect. Your neighbors' attractive new landscaping is a positive externality; their barking dog is a negative one. One is a blessing, the other an irritant, but you

If we realize that only the market can give us economic information, the alleged problem of public goods disappears.

voluntarily purchase neither.

Environmentalists say, for example, that trash is a negative externality of consumerism. So they advocate more regulation and bureaucracy to solve it. Yet the free market solves this much more justly and efficiently through property rights. Privatize everything and the externalities are "internalized," that is, those who ought to bear the costs do. But to environmentalists, human prosperity is itself a negative externality.

How To Think About Environmentalism

Chicken or chicory, elephant or endive, the natural order is valuable only in so far as it serves human needs and purposes. Our very existence is based on our dominion over nature; it was created for that end, and it is to that end that it must be used—through a private-property, free-market order, of course.

The environmental movement is openly anti-human and virulently statist. Is it any coincidence that the Nazis exalted animals, nature, and vegetarianism above humans, civilization, and civilized eating, or that our environmentalists have an air of green goose step about them?

The environmentalists must be opposed—if they will excuse the expression—root and branch. But it will not be easy.

On a recent Saturday morning, I sat down with my nine-

year-old daughter to watch a cartoon. The villain, Mr. DeForest, wanted to cut down trees on his property and build a lakeside hotel. He and his employees were thuggish and greedy, whereas the characters who deprived this man of his property rights, and prevented the establishment of a business that would have improved the life of every human in the area, were heroes. The schools and media spread similar propaganda. There is even a "Pledge of Allegiance to the Earth."

Earth Day 1990 was celebrated on April 22nd, which by no coincidence was Lenin's birthday. Rather than joining the earth-worshippers with their missals of *50 Simple Things You Can Do To Save the Earth* and *The Sexual Politics of Meat: A Feminist-Vegetarian Critical Theory*, I took a different tack.

I spritzed some hairspray at the sky (not having enough hair to justify pointing it at me), used up a whole roll of paper towels, turned the refrigerator thermostat down, mixed newspapers with my garbage, filled up my car at an Exxon station, turned on all the lights, and took my daughter to McDonald's for cheeseburgers, since they still had those nice, clean styrofoam containers. Unfortunately, it wasn't cold enough to wear my fur hat. ●

N.B.: An earlier and substantially shorter version of this article appeared in Patrick J. Buchanan's *From the Right*, 2020 Pennsylvania Ave., N.W., Suite 175, Washington, D.C. 20006. \$49 a year and highly recommended.

Good News! Election Roundup

by M.N.R.

It was, all in all, a deeply satisfying national election. Some of the high spots, some of which were not exactly featured in the media:

Exit Two Nasty Neo-Cons

Election Day, or thereabouts, saw the exit of two leading neo-cons, one of my least favorite ideological aggregations. Both are matchless bullies and macho thugs, each being what the English call "a nasty piece of work." Both, too, enjoy pretensions to intellectual eminence (Yuckk!), and are indeed arrogant egomaniacs, each sporting his Ph.D. union card to the House of Learning. Both are statisticians to the core.

I refer, of course, to Dr. Bill Bennett and Dr. John Silber. Bennett is a cop-type ruffian and blowhard, leaping from one government spot to a higher one, interested only in using these "bully pulpits" to advance his own prospects and to get media attention. Predictably, after milking the bully pulpit of Drug Czar for all it was worth, after talking as tough as they come, and after his act began to fade and actual administrative work stared him in the face, Dr. Bill got out, in a hasty and unseemly fashion. Predictably again, Bennett, faced with a bogged-down and expensive Drug War that is going nowhere fast, adopted the immortal advice

of Senator Aiken in the Vietnam War: he declared victory and got the Hell out. He announced that his objectives had been accomplished, contradictorily worried about threats to his family, and then added his own characteristic twist to the Aiken formula: blaming everyone else in sight for his failures, including Congress, Mayor Barry of Washington, D.C., and the media.

The country, alas, is still not rid of Dr. Bennett, who has moved to the chairmanship of the Republican National Committee, from whence he will try to neoconize the GOP and make our lives miserable.

As for Dr. Silber, his loss is one of the true glories of the 1990 election, because if he had won, he would have been a real threat for becoming a neo-con President of the United States. Like all typical neo-cons, Silber is at heart a right-wing Social Democrat, a Hubert Humphrey Democrat (same thing) who takes an ultra-statist line in behalf of Big Government and the Welfare-Warfare State, but objects to the cultural leftism that hit the United States in the post-Humphrey era, an era symbolized by George McGovern and McGovern's constituency.

But am I not charmed by the famous "Silber shockers," in which Silber took potshots at

pampered and petted Accredited Victim groups? The answer is No. For one thing, Silber attacked these groups, not out of any sort of libertarian or anti-statist principle or instincts, not out of any sort of opposition to centralized government, but solely out of irritation and dislike. It is clear from any observation of Silber in action that here is a sour, crabbed, irritable little pickle of a man. There is no *joie de vivre* there, no joy in combat, no laughter at the shocked reaction of his enemies. In fact, like all neo-cons, Silber is totally devoid of wit or humor, a solemn *serioso* to the hilt. Not once, at least from what I saw in forays on television, did Silber so

much as crack a smile.

Apparently, Silber may have lost the election by snapping irritably at a popular television interviewer who asked him a standard question: "What are your strengths and weaknesses?" Instead of saying a pleasantry or cracking a joke, Silber flared up, apparently indignant that anyone could think he had any weaknesses. Characteristically, he blamed his defeat, not on

any possible missteps of his own, but on the voters and on the media, who apparently proved themselves unworthy of his greatness.

Silber is a sour, crabbed, irritable little pickle of a man. Like all neo-cons, he is totally devoid of wit or humor.