

EIR Feature

Malthusians push 'biodiversity' as new religion

by Rogelio A. Maduro

The Convention on Biological Diversity, known as the Biodiversity Treaty, will come before the United States Senate sometime early this autumn. It is one of the two treaties presented at the U.N. "Earth Summit" in Rio de Janeiro in 1992, calling on all nations to refocus their priorities away from the health and well-being of their human inhabitants, to the well-being of *all* species and ecosystems—with *homo sapiens* at the bottom of the list.

According to the treaty, the constitutional order established two centuries ago by the American Founding Fathers is to be scrapped in favor of one based on the outlandish (and unenforceable) notion that "the environment becomes the central organizing principle of our society and economy," as Vice President Albert Gore stated in his best-selling book, *Earth in the Balance*.

To justify this coup against man's sovereignty over the Earth, it is alleged that the world faces the largest episode of extinctions in the history of the planet. Radical environmentalists claim that anywhere from 300 to 37,000 species are being lost every year because of the activities of man and as a result of man's "exploding populations." Thus, so the argument goes, the Earth's biodiversity has to be protected from human beings. Yet the treaty's proponents cannot produce a single name of a species that has disappeared. Their estimates are all based on theoretical models. Biologists, on the other hand, estimate that at most one species is disappearing every year.

A resounding refusal of nations to ratify the treaty would send a message to those who are already implementing it without ratification. An internal working document of the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA), dated Aug. 5, 1993, states that "the Executive branch should direct federal agencies to evaluate national policies on environmental protection and resource management [to] fulfill existing international obligations (e.g., Convention on Biological Diversity, Agenda 21), [and to] amend national policies to more effectively achieve international objectives."



An Earth First demonstrator poses as a spotted owl at a rally against loggers in Ft. Bragg, California. According to their dogma, worship of created animals and "Mother Earth" is to supplant worship of the Creator.

The EPA document calls upon federal agencies to "present recommendations to Congress for legislative changes necessary to ensure national laws are consistent with national policy for protecting ecosystems, [and to] convene summits for negotiating change in regional economics as an essential means for managing sustainable ecosystems." In this bold "new world order," Congress would become a rubber stamp for global environmental policy.

The Biodiversity Treaty is currently not even a finished document, but is merely a statement of principles. The actual protocols (mandates) will be decided at a United Nations Conference of the Parties scheduled for November. Yet, any nation that ratifies the treaty will be legally bound to implement any protocols adopted by these non-elected agencies.

A supranational private body has already been created to enforce the mandates of the convention. The three environmental organizations that are in control of drafting of the protocols are the World Resources Institute (WRI), the World Wide Fund for Nature (WWF) (formerly the World Wildlife Fund), and the International Union for the Conservation of Nature (IUCN).

These self-styled environmental organizations take most of their funding—and their marching orders—from a network of foundations and corporations that are the repositories of the wealth of the world's most powerful families. In the United States, environmental organizations receive over \$1.2 billion a year from foundations and corporations. The Environmental Grantmakers Association, a conglomerate of

138 foundations led by the Rockefeller Foundation, channels the contributions to environmental groups and determines the overall policies that the greenies will promote.

A pagan cult

Biodiversity has nothing to do with science. Rather, it is a *religious* dogma, which promotes a belief in "biocentrism"—the view that all species have "equal rights," and that man has no rights higher than those of animals or insects. The Biodiversity Treaty effectively mandates signatory nations to turn nature worship into their state religion—in direct opposition to the Judeo-Christian outlook of the American Founding Fathers, that man is created in the image and likeness of God.

The need for this new, synthetic religion was expressed by Maurice Strong, secretary general of the United Nations Conference on Environment and Development (the so-called Earth Summit) in Brazil in 1992, and one of the masterminds of the treaty. In a speech in Stockholm on April 27, Strong stated that the transformation of "our vision of a sustainable civilization into reality . . . will not occur without a major cultural transformation—a reorientation of the ethical, moral, and spiritual values which provide the primary motivations for human behavior" (see article, p. 30).

Let's hear some of the Orwellian "Newspeak" coming out of the biocentrists. The IUCN, one of the organizations in charge of writing the protocols of the Biodiversity Treaty, has as its stated purpose the creation of "a new ethic, embrac-

ing plants and animals as well as people, an ethic that would ensure sustainable development . . . that affirms biocentric . . . values.”

The executive director of the United Nations Environment Program (UNEP) is Elisabeth Dowdeswell, who chaired the Intergovernmental Committee on the Convention on Biological Diversity on June 20, and will be responsible for administering the treaty. In her opening comments at the 1994 Intergovernmental Committee Convention, Dowdeswell explained why one should accept everything that creeps and crawls as a member of one’s “family”: “As a family, every element in nature, however small, is part of a whole and contributes in its own fashion to the harmony of the whole and to its overall balance. . . . Likewise, every species has a right to survival because its existence is linked to that of the entire community of life on Earth. . . . The vision of One Earth, One Family presupposes such a new contract between people and nature . . . and among different peoples and nations. . . . The Convention on Biological Diversity . . . provides a unique opportunity and framework for achieving both.”

The ‘sustainable use’ hoax

In addition to ecosystem management, the Biodiversity Treaty mandates the adoption of the doctrine of “sustainable use,” meaning that human activity must not affect the Earth in any way, but leave it untouched for posterity—a mandate that even the troglodytes would have been hard-pressed to comply with. Needless to say, most present-day human activities, including farming, logging, fishing, mining, and manufacturing, violate these tenets of “sustainable use.” The use of fertilizers, pesticides, and insecticides, for example, is considered an “unsustainable use” of the land. Consumption patterns and outdoor recreational activities are “unsustainable,” as are present-day human population levels. The productive development of private property is an obstacle to “sustainable use.”

Livestock and agricultural crops apparently just do not belong in the “family.” Article 8h of the treaty states that “each contracting party shall . . . prevent the introduction, control or eradication of those alien species which threaten ecosystems, habitats or species.”

“Mr. Strong and the gang aren’t talking here about Martians and Klingons,” editorialized the Aug. 7 *Washington Times*. “No sir, they’re talking about cows. They’re talking about pigs. Man has introduced these domesticated species into the environment, you see, where they compete with those more esteemed by environmentalists—Puerto Rican cockroaches, furbish louseworts, and snail darters.”

Dowdeswell, in a talk to journalists at the International Media Conference on Environment and Development in Seoul, South Korea on June 12, asserted: “The achievement of truly sustainable development will require a radical transformation in our values and the way we articulate them in our lifestyles.” Spouting the line which Parson Malthus copied

from the Venetian Giammaria Ortes, she claimed that the “carrying capacity of the planet is between 2 and 6 billion humans, depending on how much we each consume.” The higher the standards of living, and the more technology, the fewer people that the planet can sustain, she argued.

Biodiversity defined

The Biodiversity Treaty rests on a crude scientific fraud. Biological diversity used to refer to the biological richness of a habitat, i.e., the number and species of creatures present, from insects to mammals, determined the biological diversity of a specific habitat. In the mid-1980s, environmentalists twisted this concept, claiming that “biological diversity” is a good in and of itself. If one takes a snapshot of an “unspoiled” area of the Earth, all species, plants, animals, insects, bacteria, etc. in that area must remain exactly as they are. Any disturbance of that “biodiversity,” is a sin against nature, and moreover, areas of the Earth that have been “spoiled” by human beings must return to their pristine existence. Thus, the theory has two fundamental tenets: that the Earth is in a “steady-state,” and that the presence and impact of humans must be erased.

The fundamental refutation of this hoax rests with the nature of the biosphere, the envelope of life that surrounds the Earth. Living systems are characterized by an increase in the amount of energy that they consume and generate (increasing energy-flux density). Decaying or dying systems, in contrast, are characterized by entropy, or the reduction of energy-flux density. Paleontological evidence shows that the history of the planet has been characterized by a series of non-linear increases in the energy-flux density of the biosphere. The human species, with our ability to reason, has created the conditions for the greatest increase in “negentropy” in the history of the biosphere.

The “biodiversity” maniacs, who insist that living systems are in a fixed state that must remain unchanging, are therefore trying to *defy* nature, not save it!

The text of the Biodiversity Treaty drops all pretense of scientific validity when it states in the preamble that “where there is a threat of significant reduction or loss of biological diversity, lack of full scientific certainty should not be used as a reason for postponing measures to avoid or minimize such a threat.” This escape clause is essential, because all major environmental doomsday theories lack any scientific evidence to back them up. These faddish theories include “global warming,” ozone depletion, acid rain, and the “nuclear winter,” which was so popular a few years ago, but has since turned into a laughingstock.

Another tenet of biodiversity is that there is a massive dying-out of species as a result of the activities of man. Environmentalists have created several new definitions of species, allowing them to claim that the world does not have just the 1.4 million species which have currently been named and described by scientists, but rather anywhere from 5-30 million species, or more, the vast majority of which are



The highly toxic chemicals used to process the coca plant into cocaine are a major cause of loss of animal species. Yet the promoters of the biodiversity dogma say not a word about it, preferring to target farmers who grow food.

undiscovered insects.

According to the biodiversity dogma, the world is undergoing the greatest extinction event since the era of the dinosaurs. Depending on the base number, biodiversity argues that between 300 and 37,000 species are lost to extinction each year. Some Cassandras forecast that total losses of species may reach 1 million by the year 2000. One of them, Peter Raven of the Missouri Botanical Gardens, estimates that more than 10% of the world's species could be extinct by the turn of the century, and more than 25% in the following few decades.

A further argument is that "once a species becomes extinct, it is not renewable," and that other species, including man, will go the way of the dinosaurs because of this loss of biodiversity. The assumption here is that it is somehow "unnatural" for species to become extinct. As paleontologists scoff, the history of the Earth has in fact been punctuated by mass extinctions, with extinctions also constantly taking place in between these special periods. Extinctions are part of nature, just as is the emergence of new species.

Why species disappear

According to the biodiversity dogma, the leading cause of species extinction is habitat destruction. Its advocates claim that this is caused by "exploding human populations." The argument is that the increase in the number of human beings on the planet causes people to turn more areas of forest, savannah, and desert into farms, and to turn more trees into firewood. They conclude that population growth "will result in unprecedented loss of biological diversity."

This argument discounts the role of scientific and technological progress in solving all of these problems, whereas in

fact, it is only with massive new infusions of the highest technology that we will succeed, for example, in transforming the Sahara Desert into rich farmland.

Another leading cause of extinction, according to the biodiversity dogma, is competition from introduced and domesticated species. The argument is that when human beings transplant animals or plants into an environment to which they are not native, the introduced species can edge out the native ones, because they may be able to exploit ecological niches that native species can't. This is considered a particular problem on islands, where many native species have evolved in complete isolation from certain predators. Cattle, sheep, and pigs, labeled "alien species," are considered some of the most offending species that have to be restrained or eradicated from ecosystems.

Dope, Inc. ruins the environment

These claims are fraudulent. The fact is that *the cultivation of mind-altering drugs* is currently a leading cause of "biodiversity loss." Giorgio Giacomelli, director of the United Nations International Drug Control Program, gave a keynote speech at the Earth Summit in Brazil, in June 1992, where he stated:

"Drugs not only mean the pollution and deterioration of the mind. They are also a threat to the ecosystem of some of the most fragile regions of our planet, the Amazon basin in particular. Indeed, among the major causes of deforestation and soil and water pollution in tropical zones can be found illicit cultivation and production of drugs. Under pressure from the traffickers, clandestine cannabis, coca, and poppy growers penetrate into more and more remote and more and more fragile forest environments. These growers are often

migrants from the most impoverished slums of mega-cities. They have no real agricultural experience, and, unlike traditional farmers, they have no respect for the environment and the Earth which surrounds and supports them. In such cases the methods employed to clear land or remove forests are nearly always devastating. Forests are destroyed manually, mechanically, or by fire. No vegetation survives to stabilize or renew the soil. Land is used until its complete exhaustion over a few years, with no restorative fallow period and with no rotation of crops. It is then abandoned in favor of newly deforested areas. When such practices occur on steep slopes, there is rapid erosion of soil, as the layer of topsoil is especially thin.

“The production of drugs themselves has an even more devastating effect. The operators of clandestine heroin and cocaine laboratories dump thousands of tons a year of highly toxic chemicals into water courses in tropical zones. Ecological experts note that many rivers have already lost all trace of many species of flora and fauna that used to be found there. Drug production thus threatens to intensify the disappearance of species.”

The most shocking aspect of these statements is that all of the leading participants of the Earth Summit heard the speech, received copies of it—and then did nothing about it! Every major environmental group has received copies of this speech, in addition to several UNDCP reports detailing the destructive effects of drug cultivation, and yet they have remained silent. Hundreds of leading biologists and other scientists have been warning publicly about this destruction, but environmentalists held not a single demonstration against it. Something smells mighty fishy here.

The hard-core agenda

The ratification of the Biodiversity Treaty will surrender national sovereignty over internal affairs. The question is, is that a deliberate part of the Green operation, or an unintended result? Perhaps we should consult them on what their real plans are.

The actual environmentalist agenda has been laid out by Maurice Strong. Both at the Earth Summit and in later speeches, Strong has emphasized the need to replace national sovereignty with a “new world order.” During the closing speech of the Earth Summit, Strong told the thousands of delegates and over 100 heads of state present: “The carrying capacity of our Earth can only sustain present and future generations if it is matched by the caring capacity of its people and its leaders. We must bring our species under control, for our own survival, for that of all life on our precious planet. . . . We now have a unique opportunity to do this.”

Strong noted that in order to “bring our species under control,” then: “the new world order . . . must unite us all in a global partnership which . . . [must] recognize the transcending sovereignty of nature, of our only one Earth.” Strong called for a complete transformation of the world’s economic system, demanding that “the remainder of this

decade . . . must be a time of transition which will truly move us on to the pathway to a new economy . . . that the present economic system is simply not adequate. . . . It needs to be radically revised to bring it into tune with eco-realities. We need to move to a real economic system.”

Events over the intervening two years since the Earth Summit follow the script laid out by Strong during his closing statement. He said: “When we leave here we must surely build, on the foundations that we have established here, a new global partnership, the partnership needed to give effect to the decisions you have made here. Specifically, we must build further and quickly on the Climate Change Convention, on the Biodiversity Convention, and move quickly in the negotiation of a Desertification Convention, continue to move negotiations toward a Forestry Regime that will be acceptable to all, and advance from the Rio Declaration to the Earth Charter. As to Agenda 21, it is up to you, Presidents and prime ministers, distinguished delegates, to go back to your countries—and many of you have encouragingly said that you intend this—and translate Agenda 21 and the decisions that you have taken at the global level into your own national policies and practices. And we must do this within the U.N., and at the regional level, at the local level, and at the level of organizations and people.”

Agenda 21

The issue of Agenda 21, as outlined by Strong and other environmental leaders, is of crucial importance. This 900-page compendium of mandates, signed by most countries present at the Earth Summit, is the bible of this movement. Implied within this document is the elimination of national sovereignty. This is explicitly stated in paper No. 107, published by the Worldwatch Institute shortly before the Earth Summit. Written by Hillary French, the paper, titled “After the Earth Summit: The Future of Environmental Governance,” states:

“National sovereignty—the power of a country to control events within its territory—has lost much of its meaning in today’s world. . . . International treaties and institutions are proving ever more critical to addressing ecological threats. Nations are in effect ceding portions of their sovereignty to the international community, and beginning to create a new system of international environmental governance as a means of solving otherwise unmanageable problems.

“Paradoxically, one way to make environmental agreements more effective is in some cases to make them less enforceable—and therefore more palatable to the negotiators who may initially feel threatened by any loss of sovereignty. So-called ‘soft law’—declarations, resolutions, and action plans that nations do not need to formally ratify and are not legally binding—can help to create an international consensus, mobilize aid, and lay the groundwork for the negotiation of binding treaties later. Agenda 21 [will be] an action plan on nearly all aspects of sustainable development [as it] emerges from the Earth Summit.”

The 'Global Biodiversity Assessment'

The Biodiversity Treaty is at present merely a statement of principles. The details of this treaty are currently being drafted by a vast body of environmentalists, non-governmental organizations, and U.N. bureaucrats, under the Global Biodiversity Assessment (GBA) which is mandated by the treaty. This is a massive undertaking. Just the outline of one of the 12 sections of the GBA is almost as long as the Biodiversity Treaty itself. The protocols that will come out of the GBA will be quite specific.

A document released by the World Resources Institute demonstrates that this massive operation is under the control, not of sovereign nation-states, but of private environmental groups, particularly the World Resources Institute, the World Wide Fund for Nature, and the International Union for the Conservation of Nature. Furthermore, no scientist or group that has challenged this unproven theory, is in a leadership or advisory position within the GBA.

This is not an unexpected situation. The chairman of the Global Biodiversity Assessment is Robert Watson, one of the top promoters of the ozone depletion scare. In March 1988, Watson gave the famous press conference which led directly to the total ban on chlorofluorocarbons (CFCs). Watson, speaking as the chairman of the Ozone Trends Panel, announced the release of a report that contained evidence showing a 3.5% depletion of the ozone layer in northern latitudes, which he blamed on the release of CFCs. (Interestingly enough, that report was not produced for another three years. All that was handed out at the press conference was a press release.)

The conclusions of the Ozone Trends Panel were immediately attacked by leading scientists. Unfortunately (or perhaps deliberately), since the report had not been issued, no scientific journal would print a rebuttal of a nonexistent report. The report was finally issued in 1991. It revealed some of the raw data from ozone measuring stations that had been used as the basis of their analysis of ozone thickness.

One of these stations was the ozone station in Uccle, a suburb of Brussels, Belgium. In a documentary, "Fair Skin, Stay In," that appeared on Belgian national television, the Belgian scientists in charge of the Uccle station denounced the Ozone Trends Panel report, noting that their ozone data had been falsified. These scientists placed their measurements in front of the camera, side-by-side with the data that the Ozone Trends Panel claimed had come from Uccle. The data were different. While the original data showed no ozone depletion, the data fabricated by the Ozone Trends Panel showed ozone depletion! These Belgian scientists have repeatedly accused Robert Watson of being behind this scientific fraud.

It should be pointed out that chairing the GBA is not Watson's only job. He is in one of the most powerful scientific positions in the United States: the environmental director for the White House Office of Science and Technology Policy.

The Ozone Trends Panel set another precedent for the Global Biodiversity Assessment: Most of the major promoters of the ozone depletion scare were panel members. Not a single dissenting scientist was represented in this biased body.

The Montreal Protocol

The model for the Biodiversity Treaty and all other present-day global environmental treaties, is the Montreal Protocol, which bans the use of CFCs. Signed in 1987, this was the first international treaty in which a whole range of chemicals was banned on the basis of a perceived threat for which there was no scientific evidence. The U.S. State Department official who negotiated the Montreal Protocol, Richard Elliot Benedick, an admitted malthusian, describes this massive deception in his book, *Ozone Diplomacy*:

"The Montreal Protocol on Substances that Deplete the Ozone Layer mandated significant reductions in the use of several extremely useful chemicals. . . . By their action, the signatory countries sounded the death knell for an important part of the international chemical industry, with implications for billions of dollars in investments and hundreds of thousands of jobs in related sectors. The protocol did not simply prescribe limits on these chemicals based on 'best available technology,' which had been a traditional way of reconciling environmental goals with economic interests. Rather, the negotiations established target dates for replacing products that had become synonymous with modern standards of living, even though the requisite technologies did not yet exist. At the time of the negotiations and signing, no measurable evidence for damage existed. Thus, unlike environmental agreements of the past, the treaty was not a response to harmful developments or events but rather a preventive action on a global scale."

As documented in *The Holes in the Ozone Scare: The Scientific Evidence that the Sky Is Not Falling*, by Rogelio A. Maduro and Ralf Schauerhammer (Washington, D.C.: 21st Century Science Associates, 1992), there is no scientific evidence to back the claims that the ozone layer has been depleted, or that CFCs pose any danger to ozone. The book argues that the entire ozone scare is a scientific fraud.

Regardless of the scientific evidence, the Montreal Protocol was signed and implemented, and the production of CFCs will be banned in most countries of the world by the end of next year. The costs of the ban are staggering: over \$5 trillion by the year 2000. Furthermore, CFCs are the lifeblood of the world's refrigeration systems. Since there are no drop-in replacements, tens of millions of refrigerators will have to be scrapped worldwide as they lose their charge due to leakage. The result, as refrigeration experts warn, is that millions of human beings will die every year from hunger, starvation, food-borne diseases, and spoiled medicines and vaccines.

Returning to Robert Watson: A few years ago, Watson acknowledged during an interview with syndicated columnist Alston Chase, that more people would die as a result of the ban on CFCs than from skin cancer resulting from ozone

Groundswell of opposition to biodiversity treaty

In a mobilization that had U.S. Senate staffers flabbergasted, State Department officials screaming, and greenies weeping, Senate offices were flooded with hundreds of thousands of phone calls and faxes over Aug. 3-5 in a full-scale mobilization to defeat the Biodiversity Treaty. It was this steamroller that succeeded in waking up the Senate, moving 35 Republican senators to sign a letter requesting postponement of the vote on the treaty until September.

The shift effected by the mobilization was dramatic. On the morning of Aug. 3, Senate staffers still considered that there was absolutely no hope of preventing the ratification of this treaty. Most senators had no idea of its contents, and were thought to be too busy with health care to pay any attention. There was absolutely no media coverage. Environmentalists had controlled the entire passage of the treaty through the Senate Foreign Relations Committee. In addition to the greenies, major corporations, led by the pharmaceutical giants Eli Lilly and Merck, were strenuously lobbying the Senate for passage. It seemed to be a hopeless situation.

But meanwhile, the "wise use" and "property rights" movement had been cranking up a massive grassroots campaign. The Alliance for America went onto red alert. Using their extensive national network of facsimile machines, the alliance—an umbrella group of nearly 600 property rights and wise use organizations—alerted all of their member organizations of breaking developments. Fax alerts went out to more than 4,000 organizations and individuals, and many fax recipients re-transmitted them so that within 24-48 hours, between 1 and 5 million citizens were alerted.

The same was done by the Environmental Conserva-

tion Organization, an umbrella group for over 500 organizations. They cranked-up their fax network, and also mobilized a network of city councils across the country which is fighting unfunded federal mandates. On top of this, many other leading wise use and private property rights organizations deployed their and grassroots networks. These included Putting People First, People for the West, the Blue Ribbon Coalition, the National Federal Lands Conference, the American Land Rights Association, the National Wilderness Institute, the Maine Conservation Rights Institute, and the National Fishermen's Coalition.

Trade associations were also involved. The American Farm Bureau and the National Cattlemen's Association lobbied in Washington to ensure that the American livestock and farm industries would not be destroyed by the ratification of the treaty. They also mobilized their membership to put pressure on the Senate. An important factor was the distribution of a series of reports by the American Sheep Industry Association (ASI), detailing the true nature of the Biodiversity Treaty. For the first time, a highly respected trade association had the courage to put forward the actual dangers represented by a piece of radical environmental legislation.

Shortly after the faxes were sent, the flood of calls and messages began. By Aug. 5, it was simply impossible to get through to the Capitol Hill switchboard.

The mobilization ended up turning an otherwise certain ratification of the Biodiversity Treaty into a potential rout for the environmentalists and the population control advocates. Leading greens had even warned that if the treaty was not quickly ratified, it would endanger the U.N.'s Conference on Population and Development, scheduled for Sept. 5-13. The entire Ecosystem Management Task Force set up by Vice President Albert Gore depended on the ratification of the treaty to legally justify the actions that it is taking.

Leaders of the wise use movement have stated that they intend to continue their mobilization, targeting governors and state legislatures, and broadening their coalition to include churches, the anti-abortion movement, and the civil rights movement.—*Rogelio A. Maduro*

depletion. Despite this knowledge, Watson backed the ban on CFCs. What kind of regard for human life does this individual have? Is that who should be making international policy through the Biodiversity Treaty?

And of course, the whales

During the month of July, activists from Greenpeace and Sea Shepherd launched a series of naval assaults against Norway's whaling fleet. These assaults led to a series of confrontations with Norway's whaling boats, its Coast

Guard, and Navy. Most confrontations occurred in the territorial waters of that nation, and in several instances, they nearly cost the lives of several Norwegian whalers.

In a press release widely distributed at the start of their cruise, Sea Shepherd announced that the destination of their ship was "the northern coast of Norway," and that they would have "a showdown with any whaling ship found to be in violation of the worldwide ban on commercial whaling." At a press conference before their departure from a Dutch port, Lisa Distefano, the strategist of the terror campaign, told

the press that "we have already sunk two Norwegian pirate whalers," and that "we intend to sink more. . . . This is a whale war. I would be very nervous right now if I were a Norwegian whaler or an underwriter of a Norwegian whaling ship."

The Norwegian Coast Guard was waiting for the Sea Shepherd ship when it arrived, and they attempted to prevent it from violating Norway's territorial waters. Sea Shepherd's ship, *Whales Forever*, ignored messages from the Norwegian Coast Guard to turn back. Suddenly, as shown in film footage taken by helicopters and broadcast on Norwegian national television, the Sea Shepherd ship made a hard turn to starboard and violently rammed the Norwegian Coast Guard vessel *Andenes* amidships. Following the attack, *Whales Forever* fled into international waters.

In the case of Greenpeace, two large oceangoing ships, the *MV Solo* and the *MV Sirius*, led repeated assaults against a tiny Norwegian whaler, the *Senet* (crew of three). Greenpeace activists, using several fast-moving assault boats, repeatedly boarded the whaling vessel and attempted to destroy its cannon. This was an extremely dangerous operation; once a harpoon is loaded into the cannon, its grenade, which contains high explosives, is armed. Had these attacks succeeded, either the gunpowder charge in the cannon, or the grenade, could have exploded, killing any member of the *Senet's* crew which was on deck. The Norwegian fishermen were saved on several occasions by the intervention of the Coast Guard, who ended up arresting several dozen Greenpeace activists and impounding their two ships.

The connection between these incidents and the Biodiversity Treaty is crucial. A leader of Sea Shepherd declared that United Nations laws provide them with the legal precedent for the right to conduct campaigns against sovereign nations in order to protect whales or any other threatened species. In an article posted on July 8 on the Internet, Sea Shepherd leader Nick Voth claimed that a 1982 United Nations resolution called the World Charter for Nature justifies their actions against nations and individuals in order to save the lives of endangered species.

This precedent is extremely dangerous, since the Convention on Biodiversity goes much further than the World Charter for Nature in protecting allegedly endangered species. The Biodiversity Treaty not only protects species, it even protects entire ecosystems.

If Sea Shepherd's reasoning were to be applied to the Biodiversity Treaty, environmentalists would be justified in murdering human beings on the basis that those individuals had disrupted the habitat of an endangered species. Furthermore, if the U.S. Senate ratifies the Biodiversity Treaty, it could legally bind the United States to use its military forces to protect endangered species and ecosystems regardless of the cost.

Nick Voth's argument is extremely important. In his Internet article, he cites the sections of the World Charter for Nature which in his view authorize forceful actions (all em-

phasis in original):

Section I, Paragraph 2: "The genetic viability on the Earth shall not be compromised; the population levels of all life forms, wild and domesticated, must be at least sufficient for their survival, and to that end, necessary habitat shall be safeguarded."

Section II, Paragraph 10(a): "Living resources shall not be utilized in excess of their natural capacity for regeneration."

Section II, Paragraph 11(a): "Activities which are likely to cause irreversible damage to nature shall be avoided."

Paragraph (b): "Activities which are likely to pose a significant risk to nature shall be preceded by an exhaustive examination; their proponents shall demonstrate that expected benefits outweigh potential damage to nature, and where potential adverse effects are not fully understood, the activities should not proceed."

Section III, Paragraph 21 and sections (c,d,e): "States and, to the extent they are able, other public authorities, international organizations, individuals, groups and corporations shall:

"(c) Implement the applicable international legal provisions for the conservation of nature and the protection of the environment;

"(d) Ensure that activities within their jurisdictions or control do not cause damage to the natural systems located within other states or in the areas beyond the limits of national jurisdiction;

"(e) Safeguard and conserve nature in areas beyond national jurisdiction."

Voth emphasizes that "this in itself is all the authority the Sea Shepherd, and any other organization, need to sanction countries like Norway who wantonly flaunt their illegal activities."

Voth proceeds to present unreliable "scientific" evidence claiming that Norway's whaling activities represent a danger to the species, ending with the incredible statement:

"Finally, as I am sure everyone realizes, science is only a tool used to gain an edge in the battle. It is a very important factor, but must not overshadow the moral issues at stake. At its core, whaling boils down to a moral fight. No science, debate, or action is likely to change the minds of the few who still support whaling. This is where the stalemate takes over, and where governments begin to tread lightly. Meanwhile, whales, dolphins, spotted owls, grizzly bears, wolves, old growth forest, ozone and thousands of other 'causes' continue to be eroded.

"So this is where a few dedicated and devoted people step in and try to make a difference. Sea Shepherd being only one of the many, who in their own way, are trying to gain ground in the struggle."

If the Biodiversity Treaty is ever established as national and international law, then the entire apparatus of non-governmental organizations will assume the powers of sovereign states. There is still time, however, to defeat this treaty.