

The twisted world of Maurice Strong

Speaking before the Swedish Royal Academy on April 27, leading malthusian Maurice Strong revealed how close he and his collaborators believe they are to achieving a “new world order” based on an “ecoindustrial revolution.” Strong, who ran the 1992 “Earth Summit” in Rio de Janeiro, presented a detailed history of the movement to convince nations that since environmental problems can only be solved by “an integrated, systems approach,” a restructured United Nations is best suited to provide “the primary multilateral framework of a new world order” to save the planet from “the astounding success of the human species,” which is causing the “accelerating destruction of the Earth’s biological resources.”

This agenda is summed up in Strong’s new bible, “Agenda 21,” which was signed by most nations participating in the Earth Summit. This document, Strong boasted, “constitutes the most comprehensive and far-reaching program of action to secure the future of life on Earth ever agreed to by the nations of the world.”

Couching his remarks in the usual dishonest U.N. “new-speak,” Strong argued that sovereign national governments must be broken on the wheel of Agenda 21. Human threats to the planet “can only be managed on an integrated, cooperative basis,” insisted Strong. “In this governments have a primary responsibility.” “But,” he insisted, “it cannot be left to governments alone.” This “will require a vast strengthening and re-orientation of institutional mechanisms and capacities at every level and an incorporation of the objectives of Agenda 21 into international agreements and arrangements in respect of trade, investment, and finance.”

Indeed, Strong insisted that Agenda 21 become the new measuring rod for human culture in general. “The values on which implementation of Agenda 21 in the final analysis will depend must also be integrated into our cultural and social systems. Each sector of society—business and industry, trade unions, scientists, farmers, educators, religious leaders, communicators, indigenous people, women, children and youth—must be fully committed to and engaged in the implementation of Agenda 21.”

Speaking about the collapse of communism and traditional institutions, Strong reiterated the need for a single world government—run, of course, by such malthusians as Strong himself. He warned that there is a danger that the world will revert to “nationalism” and “parochialism.” “The only conceivable answer” to this threat, “is to establish a new international system of governance.”

Strong pointed out that “the 50th anniversary of the United Nations next year provides a unique opportunity to restruc-

ture and revitalize the U.N. and its system of organizations and agencies, including the Bretton Woods [monetary] institutions, to prepare them for the vastly increased role they must have as the primary multilateral framework of a new world order.” “In this critical area of governance,” he continued, “environmental issues cannot be seen or dealt with as separate and distinct from the other major issues now shaping our destiny. The wasteful and destructive economic practices which have brought us to our present pass are . . . the produces of deficiencies in our economic structures and our processes of governance. National governments need to share with internal jurisdictions, regional and provincial and local, as well as nongovernment actors, responsibility for activities that can be most effectively handled at these levels. In other words, the one-world government should run everything, down to the local level.

A new world religion is also of course required in order to truly succeed, according to Strong. 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.”

Developing countries have to bear the burden of implementing Agenda 21, according to Strong. He noted that “for developing countries to implement Agenda 21, it would cost some \$625 billion per year,” and “some 80% of this must come from developing countries themselves through redeployment of their own scarce resources.” Strong explained that it is just to impose this burden, since developing countries in fact represent the greatest threat to the planet: “The economic growth of developing countries, if it proceeds in the traditional mode, will soon overtake industrialized countries as the principal source of global environmental impacts.” That, claimed Strong, “would increase risks to dangerous levels the world community cannot afford to accept.” These words only thinly conceal his basic, racist argument against any serious economic development of the nations of the Third World.

But of course, the industrialized countries should stop growing, too: “The right of developing countries to grow cannot be denied; nor can it be constrained by conditions unilaterally imposed by the industrialized countries. . . . The only answer to this dilemma lies in industrialized countries reducing their impacts to leave environmental ‘space’ for developing countries to grow, while expanding their support for developing countries in effecting their transition to sustainable modes of development.”

Strong’s hatred of humankind

“The astounding success of the human species” is a grave threat to the planet, according to Strong. “All of the environmental deterioration we have witnessed to date has occurred at levels of population and human activity a great deal less than they will be in the period ahead. The astounding success

of the human species, its proliferation in numbers and in the scale and intensity of its activities, is threatening the future of the Earth's life systems and of the human species itself. And the concentration of population growth in developing countries and economic growth in industrialized countries which has given rise to such serious imbalances in our global society shows no significant signs of changing." Dealing with these problematic human beings is "one of the primary themes of Agenda 21," according to Strong.

The fact that Strong did not present a shred of scientific proof to back up this assertion, should not be surprising, since no such proof exists.

Asian countries represent a particular danger, according to Strong, who said that, "Asia has become the primary engine of the world economic growth. But as a recent U.N. report warned, there is a real danger that many Asian nations will repeat the patterns of environmental destruction which characterized our industrial revolution. With the state of our environmental knowledge to date, this is not only unnecessary, but patently disastrous. It is inconceivable that there could be an effective global transition to sustainable development unless Asia develops sustainably."

Outlawing technological progress

One of the main themes of the Earth Summit was that a new accounting system has to be created in order to stop "the accelerating destruction of the Earth's biological resources." Such an accounting system would in fact closely resemble the disastrous reforms by the Roman Emperor Diocletian (245-313), who in effect outlawed any technological progress as "too expensive," thereby ushering in the Dark Ages.

Let us hear Strong's argument: There is a need for "fundamental changes in our economic life through a full integration of the environmental dimension in economic policies, decision making, and behavior." The answer, said Strong, "lies primarily in attaching to biological resources, and the ecosystems which sustain them, economic values which reflect their real value to humankind." But "this can only be achieved through major changes in the system of incentives and penalties by which governments motivate the economic conduct of corporations and citizens. . . . This needs to be accompanied by the adoption of accounting methods, both in national accounts and business accounting, in which environmental costs are fully integrated into the costs of products and transactions. It is, after all, fully consistent with the principles of market economics that the price of all products and transactions should incorporate their full real cost."

Governmental efforts to ensure a stable agricultural economy are among Strong's primary targets. Such efforts, he said, "provide incentives for high-intensity agriculture which lead to overuse of polluting fertilizers and pesticides, the depletion of soil, and reduction of biodiversity, while exacting heavy costs from consumers and taxpayers." Strong neglected to mention the fact that high-intensity agriculture



Maurice Strong, the Canadian oligarch who ran the 1992 Earth Summit

provides food for the world, and without it, hundreds of millions of human beings will starve.

Energy subsidies are also very bad, according to Strong. Energy prices are "at low levels which do not begin to reflect full environmental costs and provide little incentive for the development of alternatives either to our dependence on fossil fuels or to nuclear energy."

Call for scientific fraud

The promotion of scientific frauds is justifiable to Strong, who candidly acknowledged that this entire world order is being implemented on the basis of scientifically unproven theories. Scientific fraud is justified on the basis of two principles, according to Strong: the "precautionary principle," and the "no-regrets principle."

"I am well aware that on some environmental issues there is less than unanimity in the scientific community—global warming, to take a notable example. The Intergovernmental Panel of Climate Change, under the able leadership of Prof. Bert Bolin, has produced persuasive scientific evidence as to the risks and possible consequences of climate change. Not all scientists agree. But in a matter with such potentially decisive and irreversible consequences, surely the 'precautionary principle' dictates that we take determined remedial action even before we have scientific certainty. A corollary to the precautionary principle is what has been called the 'no-regrets principle.' Its premise is that in taking actions against an apprehended but unproven menace—such as drastically reducing toxic emissions to the atmosphere—you accomplish positive results which justify the action even if the greater threat turns out to be unfounded."