


The ECO FRAUD

PART 3

black deaths in green custody



**A Strong
STING by
UN IPCC**

**green wasps camouflaged as angels
stinging the weakest,
most underrepresented,
forgotten Australians**

"The whole aim of practical politics is to keep the populace alarmed (and hence clamorous to be led to safety) by menacing it with an endless series of hobgoblins, all of them imaginary."

H.L. Mencken

Part 1 proved that in making its core claim that human production of carbon dioxide (CO2) caused global warming, the UN IPCC falsely and fraudulently contradicts the science. Part 2 showed that basing policy on the UN IPCC's advice will be environmentally catastrophic.

Part 3 considers humanitarian impacts of UN IPCC advice. Firstly, consider history.

Tens of millions of deaths due to UNEP environmental policy based on politics and on activists contradicting science



UNEP led the 1970's campaign to ban DDT. That ban led directly to deaths of tens of millions of people from increased incidence of malaria. Recently, the UN lifted the ban with UN officials scathing in their criticism of the earlier decision to ban DDT.

Lal (2003) provides alarming figures on deaths attributable to banning DDT in India. McLean (2009) discusses South African deaths. **Estimates of African deaths alone reach 20 million. That's 20 million people. DEAD - because of emotive activist campaigns contradicting the science and driven instead by UNEP politics undermining universal human needs for survival.**

Hecht (2006)

"...Hundreds of millions more (people) have severely suffered from the disease.

DDT was banned in the United States in 1972 on the basis of a big lie, not science. In fact, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency held seven months of hearings on the issue, producing 9,000 pages of testimony. The EPA hearing examiner, Edmund Sweeney, ruled, on the basis of the scientific evidence, that DDT should not be banned. "DDT is not carcinogenic, mutagenic, or teratogenic to man [and] these uses of DDT do not have a deleterious effect on fish, birds, wildlife, or estuarine organisms," Sweeney concluded.

But two months later, without even reading the testimony or attending the hearings, EPA administrator William Ruckelshaus overruled the EPA hearing officer and banned DDT. He later admitted that he made the decision for "political" reasons."

"Policy has been determined by the views of those environmentalists who foolishly leave human health out of their schemes ... and mosquitoes are allowed to breed freely."

Refer to UN News Centre (2006) and Wall Street Journal (2009) opinion piece.

The UN killed people with dark skins in poor nations—**black deaths in green custody**

UNEP's desire to **control** extends to developed nations. McLean (2009) provides data questioning UNEP's motives in banning CFC's. The truth took 17 years to emerge.

Data from the UN's World Health Organisation (WHO) shows that by far the greatest threat to human life span is malnutrition (starvation). Raising energy costs via CO2 credits schemes, CO2 taxes or energy restrictions would reduce agricultural productivity causing potentially millions of deaths.

Artificially raising prices of fuels containing carbon makes it more difficult for poor nations to replace unhealthy cooking of food using current fuel—dung—which produces carcinogenic pollutants and lung disease. Why can't the poor be allowed to have clean, effective electricity instead?

Why are Al Gore and UN bureaucrat Maurice Strong advocating CO2 trading? Could it be because of their position on the Board of the Chicago Climate Exchange (CCX) trading CO2 (carbon) credits? Or Al Gore's company being fifth largest shareholder of the CCX?

Activists doing the same in Australia?



Recent writings (2009, 2010) of Noel Pearson, Galarway Yunupingu and Nicholas Rothwell explain the disgraceful plight of Australia's neglected indigenous. Until 2000 I looked away, thinking it was 'their' problem. I know now it is 'our' problem, every Australian's challenge.

Pearson and Rothwell clearly identify the problem's root cause: government meddling. Pearson and Yunupingu show what's needed to solve it: freedom from bureaucratic **control** and then allowing personal enterprise to blossom through private ownership of land by indigenous.

Reportedly, the Queensland ALP government has repeatedly promised a legal structure enabling indigenous ownership. Yet according to Pearson and others, that process remains thwarted by the same government.

In 2009, the Queensland ALP state government made declarations under its 2005 Wild Rivers legislation. It reportedly reneged on earlier agreements with Cape York's indigenous. Instead it manoeuvred to obtain electoral preferences from the greens in Queensland. That further blocked Cape York indigenous working for economic independence and cultural survival—trapping them as slaves of bureaucracy.

Why did the ALP renege? The Greens apparently wanted to tie up even more land in national parks. What did the ALP get in exchange? Greens preferences at state level. Pearson, quote: *"The problem is that environmental groups ran away from the Cape York Heads of Agreement. They started cutting deals with the Beattie government at the 2002 election and the 2004 election."*

Meanwhile, the state government and greens sweet-talk their Brisbane members comfortably sipping lattes and preening their resource-hungry Priuses. Cocooned in their self-congratulatory smugness they've seemingly been misled into thinking the government and greens care for indigenous. Like hell. The government seems more interested in sacrificing the indigenous for shallow political gain to remain in power at the next election.

That's the extremist greens' supposedly 'humanitarian' side. The dark greens reportedly selling the indigenous down the drain.

Federally, this was extended in the recent Greens and ALP preference deal aimed at keeping the ALP in power, to give the Greens **control** of the senate and secure passage of CO2 'trading'.

That's the Greens' real 'humanitarian' side. Power is far more important, it seems, to the Greens than are people. Why? Power gives them **control**. **Control** is the aim.

At least the ALP and Greens are not racist - they'll screw everyone for **control** of CO2 credits, **control** of energy and threats of massive regulation of people's lives to **control** everyone.




Look at governments' sorry record of **controlling** the indigenous



Lets broadly explore history to identify patterns. Consider this timeline:

- ◆ 1788-onwards. In ignorance, early settlers damaged the indigenous when two differing cultures clashed;
- ◆ 1869-1969. Churches and state and federal governments of all parties forcibly removed indigenous children from families causing enormous distress still prevalent in indigenous communities. That pain and loss of spiritual connection with the land created an ache intermittently relieved yet deepened by drugs, violence, sexual abuse and suicide. Governments and churches were driven largely by care—misguided care based on misunderstanding indigenous people's universal human needs;
- ◆ 1972. Thinking it to be the solution, Whitlam dramatically increased welfare. Although welfare was driven by care, the misunderstanding of universal human needs caused more damage and deepened hopelessness and dependencies as evidenced in writing by modern authorities including Pearson;
- ◆ 2006-2007. The then government minister Mal Brough, with his likely aboriginal ancestry, and Noel Pearson started addressing people's basic universal human needs;
- ◆ 2008-2010. The Rudd-Gillard government promised almost a billion dollars for the cleverly named Strategic Indigenous Housing and Infrastructure Program. Reportedly it has been a spectacular flop riddled with waste through funds being siphoned off to consultants and bureaucratic overheads. The apology to the indigenous for forcible removal was followed by what are increasingly seen as empty promises to reduce the gap between indigenous and other Australians.
- ◆ With the apparent exception of the Brough-Pearson attempt based on indigenous expressing their understanding of their needs, bureaucratic government intervention has been the really 'sorry' aspect of the history of indigenous since 1788. It seems politicians have often been window-dressing and the care from consultants and bureaucrats often damagingly misguided.

Why did the Greens-ALP do their deal? Because they can. With the indigenous population scattered across the nation, their 3% of votes mean nothing in any single electorate. They are Australia's most underrepresented people. The indigenous could be screwed and were screwed by political parties—yet again.



Control freaks made the twentieth century humankind's bloodiest



When I recall Pearson's and Rothwells articles I fume and feel ashamed and powerless. Anger wells and eyes moisten. What are our governments doing to these people who take responsibility yet are not given the same basic rights to run their lives as are people in white communities? Indigenous freedom has been usurped by bureaucrats in Brisbane, Darwin and Canberra. The indigenous are incarcerated by rules of bureaucrats who infrequently fly in and **control** the indigenous communities by fiat, decree.

Private land ownership is fundamental to free enterprise. Yet bureaucrats keep **control** of that for the indigenous who are not allowed to plan and work for their future. As Pearson and others repeatedly highlight, without private property rights why should the indigenous work hard only to see their efforts ended when yet another bureaucrat drives yet another spin-laden Canberra or Brisbane program over yet another cliff?

The campaigns change. The buzz-words change. The result is the same. Bureaucratic **control** of indigenous. The same murderous recipe used by the butchers of the twentieth century—**control**.

Some broad definitions:

- ◆ Communism – state ownership and state **control** of resources of production;
- ◆ Socialism – private ownership and state **control**;
- ◆ Personal enterprise – private ownership and private resource allocation.

Understanding the basic forms of government and recalling history shows that socialism always ends in violence or stagnation followed by upheaval. Of course, it doesn't always seem so at the time. It is fundamental that **control** always leads to more **control** and eventually to violence—often at the hands of those who claim to be protecting the people they **control**.

Consider socialists in Earth's recent history who sought to **control** and justified their means by their ends: Hitler, Stalin, Mao. All of last century's butchering mass murderers were socialists who publicly stated their goal was protection of people, yet in office **controlled** and butchered people.

Perpetuating socialist government requires enforcing subjective **control**—ending personal liberty, freedom.

Noel Pearson's writing is refreshing. He is a leader for all Australians. As history demonstrates, Pearson shows that self-care is the only sustainable form of objective discipline—while enshrining freedom and responsibility.

The words of Dr Maria Montessori, arguably the greatest observer of human development based on a profound understanding of children's and adults' universal human needs are powerful, quote: ***"Discipline and freedom are so co-related that, if there is some lack of discipline, the cause is to be found in some lack of freedom."***

Pause to consider her words essential to developing responsibility. Her insight is fundamental in management yet often misunderstood and breached. It is fundamental in developing children's responsibility yet parents and teachers often contravene. It is fundamental yet many people's behaviour contradicts. We have become a society that has believed the lie that authorities know best. Yet ultimately authority is enforced by bureaucrats. We turn to governments for 'protection' yet they are riddled with vested interests and rule subjectively through bureaucracies.

Bureaucracy is driven fundamentally by subjectivity. That is why it eventually ends in dispute and hastens to control.

Understanding fundamentals of developing responsibility and understanding that humans care shows why Pearson passionately believes self-care is the best path to ensuring an indigenous future. He explains how federal and state ALP governments are undermining indigenous endeavours towards securing a future.

Until recently, despite knowing of the horrendous plight of our indigenous, my conclusion was that they needed to just have a go. Thanks to Noel Pearson's writing and speaking and my own recent observations it's easy to see how government has repeatedly thwarted the indigenous. Government is preventing the indigenous from building a secure future. The core problem is government **control** stifling people through misguided care via remote subjective bureaucracies.

The Greens' promise...more control



In protecting vested interests and **control**, the rifle and jackboot have been replaced by the spin doctor, consultant, factional back-room deals, lobbyist and regulatory nooses. This is augmented by bureaucrats protecting the arsenals of politicians fabricating spin and wasting money with no accountability.

Ironically, all over the world 'command' economies have failed. China is now on the march to higher living standards for its people because of its 1980's release of **controls**. Yet, here in Australia, Greens want to command and **control**.

The Greens want to **control** land use by all Australians and smash private property rights, fundamental to personal enterprise. Trampling private property rights has been an easy way for the Rudd-Gillard bureaucracy to ensure compliance with the UN's Kyoto Protocol at huge cost to landowners.

The greens willingly sacrificed the indigenous to get **control**. Their policies show they want to extend this across Australia—through regulatory nets, 'trading' of CO2 credits and CO2 taxes.

Scrape away the 'science' and we find faith based socialist agenda. Consider Greens' policies in this election campaign:

- ◆ introduce the same accountability and transparency frameworks for government funding to non-government schools as applies to public schools (**control** of personal enterprises even though under the BER, spending by some state government schools was extravagantly wasteful)
- ◆ return the company tax rate to 33% and broaden the company tax base by reducing tax concessions (**control** of enterprises).
- ◆ establish binding national emission targets for 2012, 2020 and 2050 supported by a detailed strategy to reduce emissions from the energy, transport, industry, waste and land management sectors (**control**)
- ◆ drive the equitable transition to a low carbon economy through a range of market-based and regulatory mechanisms reflecting the real costs of greenhouse gas emissions (**control** of enterprise. Note: in reality trading CO2 credits is 'market-based' in name only)
- ◆ oppose the establishment of new coal mines and the expansion of existing mines (**control**)
- ◆ take a leading role in negotiating a multilateral emission abatement treaty which includes binding emission targets for all countries (global **control** of energy aligned with socialist senior UN bureaucrats)

Tasmanian Greens Senator Christine Milne stated on ABC TV 7.30 Report: ***"We want to see deep cuts, we want to see a carbon price as quickly as possible because we want transformation of the whole economy and society"***. Using **control**.

Have the Greens submitted their policies to be costed? Have they done an Environmental Impact Statement on both the natural and human environments? Has their data been independently audited?

Within areas of the ALP the Greens find allies. ALP Senator Wong's statement at her National Press Club address, July 16, 2008, quote: ***"It is not business as usual; there will be a fundamental transformation of the entire economy. There will be an enormous economic transition."***

The Rudd-Gillard government rushed approval of a massive new coal development in Queensland. Apparently, despite their then desire for trading CO2 credits to reduce coal usage they wanted to increase coal exports. It seems the ALP believes that Aussie coal burned in China is beneficial yet Aussie coal burned in Australia is harmful. Imagine the policy and social disaster if the Greens are added to this mess?

Greens leader, Bob Brown, has stated he wants to shut every coal mine—immediately. Has he considered the economic and social impacts of shutting Australia's number one export income earning industry and the source of almost all our domestic electricity?

The foundation of the Greens' policy is 'trading' CO2 credits. Part 2 showed that will have serious destructive environmental casualties and serious negative humanitarian consequences—with no impact on climate. Add to that the Greens seeking electoral **control** by sacrificing indigenous freedom. Now it's the indigenous culture under the heel of the Greens jackboot. Indigenous teenagers stumbling through life as mates commit suicide. **Black deaths in Green custody**. Hopelessness cultivated by the Greens.

The Greens have carefully nurtured a media image of being caring. The reality is starkly different. For their god of **control** the Greens appear willing to sacrifice the indigenous. Combined with the nature of their socialist agenda it shows Greens are carelessly rushing us to disaster pushing yet another religion based on guilt and fear. The difference is that their religion is falsely camouflaged as science.

Is this typical? Consider other famous dark greens and their cheery words dripping with fear, guilt, and falsities:

Are the inmates in **control** of their asylum?



Kenneth Watt, ecologist and extreme dark green, making predictions from the first Earth Day, 1970:

"If present trends continue, the world will be about four degrees colder for the global mean temperature in 1990, but eleven degrees colder in the year 2000. This is about twice what it would take to put us into an ice age."

"We have about five more years at the outside to do something."

"At the present rate of nitrogen build-up, it's only a matter of time before light will be filtered out of the atmosphere and none of our land will be usable."

"By the year 2000, if present trends continue, we will be using up crude oil at such a rate... that there won't be any more crude oil. You'll drive up to the pump and say, 'Fill 'er up, buddy,' and he'll say, 'I am very sorry, there isn't any.'"

The infamous yet once acclaimed Paul Ehrlich, Earth Day, 1970:

"In ten years all important animal life in the sea will be extinct. Large areas of coastline will have to be evacuated because of the stench of dead fish."

Reid Bryson: *"The continued rapid cooling of the earth since WWII is in accord with the increase in global air pollution associated with industrialisation, mechanisation, urbanisation and exploding population."* From "Global Ecology; Readings towards a rational strategy for Man", (1971)

John Shuttleworth: *"The only real good technology is no technology at all. Technology is taxation without representation, imposed by our elitist species (man) upon the rest of the natural world."* Friends of the Earth manual writer quoted in Toxic Terror.

Stewart Brand: *"We have wished, we ecofreaks, for a disaster... to come and bomb us into the Stone Age, where we might live like Indians in our valley, with our localism, our appropriate technology... our homemade religion – guilt free at last!"* Author of Whole Earth Catalog.

Larissa Waters: *"Australia to achieve net zero greenhouse gas emissions as soon as is feasible and by no later than 2050 with a minimum of 40% reduction on 1990 levels by 2020"* Greens candidate in 2010 election discussing Greens' policy, November 2009.

With significant population growth since 1990, achieving the Greens' target requires massive per capita reductions in energy use. Other nations have already proven, it is not possible for renewables to deliver any significant reliable energy supply, nor at reasonable cost. Nonetheless, as shown by their current behaviour the Greens will try regardless of the pain and with disregard for science, practicality and human tragedy.

David Foreman: *"We must... reclaim the roads and the ploughed land, halt dam construction, tear down existing dams, free shackled rivers, and return to wilderness millions and tens of millions of [acres of] presently settled land."* Founder of Earth First! from his book Ecodefense: A Field Guide to Monkey Wrenching.

David Brower: *"Childbearing [should be] a punishable crime against society, unless the parents hold a government license...All potential parents [should be] required to use contraceptive chemicals, the government issuing antidotes to citizens chosen for childbearing."* Quoted by Dixy Lee Ray in Trashing the Planet.

The late Stephen Schneider, self-declared environmentalist, 1970's proponent of catastrophic global cooling caused by use of fuels containing carbon who later switched to playing the role of vigorous proponent of supposedly catastrophic global warming caused by use of carbon fuels: **"We are ethically bound to the scientific method, in effect promising to tell the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but... On the other hand, we are not just scientists, but human beings as well. And like most people we'd like to see the world a better place, which in this context translates into our working to reduce the risk of potentially disastrous climate change. To do that we have to get some broad-based public support, to capture the public's imagination. That, of course, entails getting loads of media coverage. So we have to offer up scary scenarios, make simplified, dramatic statements, and make little mention of any doubts we might have. This "double ethical blind" that we frequently find ourselves in cannot be solved by any formula. Each of us has to decide what the right balance is between being effective and being honest."** He became a prominent UN IPCC contributor and at his death was a professor at the prestigious Stanford University, USA.

Instead of being driven by science, we've been harnessed to drive humanity to Schneider's vision of a better place using **control** by fear. The supposed cause is irrelevant—just fabricate one or two. Cooling? warming? What's the difference? They can both be made scary.

Want more? Read Christine Milne's speech to The National Press Club, June 17, 2009. A moving, emotive speech by a talented orator sadly devoid of facts supporting her unfounded and misguided claim for action on global warming.


Dark green Eco-Fraud. Brown policies. Black death?



Improving efficiency and energy use makes common sense and economic sense. It needs to be done for sound reasons. To be effective care needs to be based on sound understanding not fraud. Misguided care is often disastrous—especially when driven by **control**.

It seems the Greens are really the watermelon party. Green on the outside, red on the inside. Hell bent on **control**.

Control breeds deadly ignorance and neglect. Instead, the key to responsibility and care is driven by understanding and freedom.



References:

Hecht, MM, 2006, September. WHO Backs DDT Use To Stop Malaria [http://www.larouchepub.com/other/2006/3339who_oks_ddt.html] Accessed August, 2010.

Lal, D, 2003, January. Cultural Imperialism and the Ban on DDT. Project Syndicate. [<http://www.project-syndicate.org/commentary/lal2/English>] Accessed August, 2010.

McLean, J, 2009. Climate Science Corrupted - How the IPCC's sponsor, the UNEP, and key IPCC individuals have misled Governments into supporting the notion of manmade warming. SPPI. [http://scienceandpublicpolicy.org/images/stories/papers/originals/climate_science_corrupted.pdf] Accessed August, 2010.

Pearson, N, 2009 and 2010. Numerous articles published in The Australian newspaper.

Pearson, N, 2010. Abbott's bill would reverse the injustice of Wild Rivers laws. The Australian newspaper. [<http://www.theaustralian.com.au/news/opinion/abbotts-bill-would-reverse-the-injustice-of-wild-rivers-laws/story-e6frg6zo-1225849056462>] Accessed August, 2010.

Rothwell, N, 2009 and 2010. Numerous articles published in The Australian newspaper.

UN News Centre, 2006, September. Reversing its policy, UN agency promotes DDT to combat the scourge of malaria. UN News Centre. [<http://www.un.org/apps/news/story.asp?NewsID=19855&Cr=malaria&Cr1>] Accessed August, 2010.

Wall Street Journal, 2009, May. Malaria, Politics and DDT. Opinion Piece [http://online.wsj.com/article/NA_WSJ_PUB:SB124303288779048569.html] Accessed August, 2010.

Yunupingu, G, 2009 and 2010. Numerous articles published in The Australian newspaper.

Dictionary definition of fraud: Presenting something as it is not, to secure unfair gain