

"Current lifestyles and consumption patterns of the affluent middle class - involving high meat intake, the use of fossil fuels, electrical appliances, home and work-place air-conditioning, and suburban housing - are not sustainable."

- **Maurice Strong**, opening speech at the 1992 Rio Earth Summit

The Green Economy – A Global Economic Suicide Pact

The global green movement places very little value on the modern industrial society that has produced huge improvements in economic prosperity, health care, human rights, education and standards of living. In fact, the green movement hates and fears western-style capitalism. To them, the loss of industrial civilisation is of no great consequence. In fact, it is one of the top priorities of the **Global Green Agenda**.

The green movement has been obsessed with capitalism, especially evil multi-national corporations, since its birth in the 1960s. Long before the advent of 'global warming', the primary objective of the movement was, and always has been, simply the destruction of energy production. They know that the life blood of the industrial society is energy, especially fossil fuels, and a significant reduction in energy availability will deal a fatal blow to Gaia's greatest threat – modern human society. Primitive societies are admired for being sustainable and living in harmony with Gaia. Western capitalist nations are reviled as "destroyers of the earth" which must be subdued. They make no attempt to conceal this agenda:

"Isn't the only hope for the planet that the industrialized civilizations collapse? Isn't it our responsibility to bring that about?"

- **Maurice Strong**, founder of the UN Environment Programme

"A massive campaign must be launched to de-develop the United States. De-development means bringing our economic system into line with the realities of ecology and the world resource situation."

- **Paul Ehrlich**, Professor of Population Studies

"The only hope for the world is to make sure there is not another United States. We can't let other countries have the same number of cars, the amount of industrialization, we have in the US. We have to stop these Third World countries right where they are."

- **Michael Oppenheimer**, Environmental Defense Fund

"Global Sustainability requires the deliberate quest of poverty, reduced resource consumption and set levels of mortality control."

- **Professor Maurice King**

"We must make this an insecure and inhospitable place for capitalists and their projects. We must reclaim the roads and plowed land, halt dam construction, tear down existing dams, free shackled rivers and return to wilderness millions of acres of presently settled land."

- **David Foreman**, co-founder of Earth First!

"Complex technology of any sort is an assault on human dignity. It would be little short of disastrous for us to discover a source of clean, cheap, abundant energy, because of what we might do with it."

- **Amory Lovins**, Rocky Mountain Institute

"The prospect of cheap fusion energy is the worst thing that could happen to the planet."

- **Jeremy Rifkin**, Greenhouse Crisis Foundation

One of the first targets of green movement was the nuclear power industry. Even though nuclear energy offers enormous energy potential with no CO2 emissions they still revile it. They also fiercely oppose any proposals to build new hydro-electric dams based on perceived negative environmental effects. The same argument is used to oppose any proposals to develop new oil fields. They intend to starve the beast not feed it. The only sources of power that the environmental movement is willing to allow are wind and sunlight. Humans will just have to adapt to living with very low volumes of unreliable energy.

Of course the big prize has always been to find some way to control, or even eliminate, the use of fossil fuels. After all, it is fossil fuels that have allowed the human population to blossom from a mere one billion in 1850 to more than six billion today. A single barrel of oil contains 23,000 man-hours of energy. Hence the 20 million barrels that the USA consumes each day is equivalent to 15 billion additional human workers. Oil has empowered each American worker the equivalent of 45 'virtual slaves'. Globally it provides us with the equivalent daily energy of more than 70 billion human workers. Try pushing your car for a few miles to see just how much work oil does for us.

In 1850 more than 85% of people led lives of hard drudgery growing food, today less than 2% of people in western societies are employed in the agricultural sector. In 1850 most people never traveled beyond the next village, whereas we are free to roam the world and learn from other cultures. The average life expectancy in England in 1850 was 34, and infant mortality was nearly 30%. Now the average life expectancy is in excess of 70, and infant mortality is miniscule.

But the green movement looks back with great fondness to a simpler and gentler time. According to them without fossil fuels the world will be transformed into an Ecotopia. We would all live in small sustainable villages, surrounded by lush fields where happy peasants sang love-songs to Gaia as they gently tilled her soil. Without the unbridled power provided by fossil fuels we could no longer dominate the earth, shaping it according to our own will. Humans would learn to once again live humbly alongside all other living beings, and be reconciled with Mother Nature.

The fact that modern 'industrial' agriculture would collapse without fossil fuels, and as a result hundreds of millions would starve, seems to be of minor consequence. It's just a bit of short-term pain for long-term gain. Ted Turner, who donated over a billion dollars to the United Nations specifically to fund the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC) thinks that *"A total population of 250-300 million people, a 95% decline from present levels, would be ideal."*

Hence for the green movement Global Warming presents an opportunity to finally and completely destroy the voracious beast of capitalism. They are demanding the imposition of a massive reduction in global emissions of carbon dioxide accompanied by a freeze on such emissions at the sharply reduced level. This would immediately result in the elimination or radical reduction in the supply of all goods and services that depend on fossil fuel

consumption. As Al Gore says it would be a “*wrenching transformation of society*.” Every aspect of daily life would be dramatically altered.

The much vaunted Stern Report called for a 25% reduction in global carbon dioxide emissions by 2050. Given the fact that the world population is expected to increase by third which means the 9 billion people would have to generate 25% less than 6 billion, or a per capita reduction of 50%. This would devastate the global economy and make the Great Depression look like a picnic.

The two leading Democratic Presidential Candidates, Hillary Clinton and Barack Obama, have both called for an 80% reduction by 2050. Factoring in population growth, this would require a reduction of more than 90%. You really have to wonder if they have thought deeply about the implications of this goal. It even makes the climate doom stories seem pleasant:

*"According to the Department of Energy's most recent data on greenhouse gas emissions, in 2006 the U.S. emitted 5.8 billion metric tons of carbon dioxide, or just under 20 tons per capita. An 80% reduction in these emissions from 1990 levels means that the U.S. cannot emit more than about one billion metric tons of CO2 in 2050. Were man-made carbon dioxide emissions in this country ever that low? The answer is probably yes – from historical energy data it is possible to estimate that **the U.S. last emitted one billion metric tons around 1910**. But in 1910, the U.S. had 92 million people, and per capita income, in current dollars, was about \$6,000.*

*By the year 2050, the Census Bureau projects that our population will be around 420 million. This means per capita emissions will have to fall to about 2.5 tons in order to meet the goal of 80% reduction. It is likely that **U.S. per capita emissions were never that low - even back in colonial days** when the only fuel we burned was wood. The only nations in the world today that emit at this low level are all poor developing nations, such as Belize, Mauritius, Jordan, Haiti and Somalia. If that comparison seems unfair, consider that even the least-CO2 emitting industrialized nations do not come close to the 2050 target. France and Switzerland, compact nations that generate almost all of their electricity from nonfossil fuel sources (nuclear for France, hydro for Switzerland) emit about 6.5 metric tons of CO2 per capita." - [Link](#)*

And then we have dear old Al Gore. The Oracle has called for a reduction in global carbon dioxide emissions of **90% within 20 years!** There is little chance that modern society could function with 25% less oil, just imagine the consequences of a 90% reduction. Cities would be deserted and slowly rot. Infrastructure could no longer be maintained. It would surely result in a massive die-off in the human population.

I'm quite certain Al isn't serious about his demands for a 90% reduction. That would be uncontrollable, and the whole purpose behind the Global Green Agenda is to gain control over, transform, and reduce human activity. A more likely outcome will be less severe reductions, combined with the imposition of a global system of carbon permits governed by the United Nations. This would give the UN unprecedented power to regulate individuals, businesses and governments, all in the name of 'saving the Earth'. Carbon markets have already been established in many countries in anticipation of a mandatory system.

In the United States the only operating carbon emissions trading market is the [Chicago](#)

[Climate Exchange](#) (CCX). Coincidentally, or not, Al Gore's hedge fund, Generation Investment Management, is the largest shareholder in CCX. Now that's what I call a conflict of interest! The most vocal Global Warming alarmist is the largest shareholder in the USA's only operating 'carbon market.' On the board of CCX we find our old friend Maurice Strong.

In late 2007 the UN will host a conference in Bali with the intention of formulating an internationally binding Climate Change Treaty to replace the Kyoto Protocol. It is widely expected that this treaty will mandate a global carbon trading system, and possibly a global carbon tax. Many green activists know that Global Warming is a vague and hollow threat. However, it is proving to be a very effective tool in implementing their Global Green Agenda which began more than a decade ago with Sustainable Development and Agenda 21.

"Effective execution of Agenda 21 will require a profound reorientation of all human society, unlike anything the world has ever experienced — a major shift in the priorities of both governments and individuals and an unprecedented redeployment of human and financial resources. This shift will demand that a concern for the environmental consequences of every human action be integrated into individual and collective decision-making at every level."

- UN Agenda 21