

Federal agencies are revamped to place 'ecosystems' above humans

by Leo F. Scanlon

Internal working documents of the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) and the Department of the Interior show that these agencies are being reorganized to implement the population reduction policies now being promulgated by the United Nations. This revolution is based on a dogma that rejects the sanctity of human life and asserts that people are merely a "biological resource" which must be managed and cultivated like animals, plants, or insects.

The EPA document highlights the sea-change that is now occurring in regulatory philosophy, stating that "EPA must make ecosystem protection a primary goal of the agency, on a par with human health, as recommended by the EPA Science Advisory Board." This represents a revolution in the theory of environmental regulation, which, up until now, has been sold to legislators on the grounds that human health interests justify the economic burdens and costs of regulation.

Behind the new dogma stands the United Nations and the one-worldist legal conceptions with which it is binding governments internationally. This particular reorganization is based on the environmental dicta which flow from the Biodiversity Treaty.

In practice, once the EPA and other agencies adopt the "biodiversity" and "ecosystem management" dogmas, the policies of these agencies will be shaped by a complex of private organizations—chiefly a group of endowed foundations and raw materials cartels. These are the forces that are promoting the idea that the preservation of "biodiversity" requires halting human activity if it appears to impinge upon any aspect of an (arbitrarily defined) "ecosystem."

One might think that the red tape which such efforts produce would be anathema to the industrial and raw materials cartels. Yet the major corporations are virtually silent in the face of this threat; in fact, they are often leading funders of the private institutes and foundations that are pumping these doctrines into the federal government.

This is not so surprising as it might seem. In the past 25 years of the "post-industrial society," major U.S. industrial corporations have shifted to become primarily *financial* institutions, with only a secondary interest in productive activity. The cartels derive profit from speculating on the price of raw materials, more than from transforming them for human use. The bureaucratic roadblocks which environmentalist regulation creates are minor overhead costs to these cartels, and they welcome the scarcity that "slow growth" policies

produce.

The losers in this scheme are independent raw materials and primary products producers—loggers, miners, farmers, ranchers, and fisherman—as well as the productively employed people who service these industries, and those who transform raw materials into industrial products.

The 'Ecosystem Protection Plan'

The reorganization of U.S. government agencies is proceeding under the supervision of an Executive branch task force which is mandated to bring the environmental and resource management practices of the government into conformity with the doctrines of "biodiversity" and "ecosystem management" which are codified in recent U.N. treaties. Whether or not the Senate ratifies these treaties in their current form, this reorganization will occur as long as the Nature Conservancy, the World Wide Fund for Nature, and similar foundations continue to dominate the work of the government in these areas.

The front end of the current environmental campaign is represented in two memos, one from the EPA, the second from the Department of the Interior. Both reflect a discussion which is at a very advanced phase, and obscured from public view.

The EPA document is part of a new "Ecosystem Protection Plan," which is being drawn up as a multi-agency white paper. A "performance review" of the internal "Ecosystem Protection Team" illustrates the state of development of this plan, as of several months ago.

The prime goal of the operation is to secure presidential approval, via an executive order or Presidential Decision Directive (PDD) to be issued in the fall of 1994, which would mandate federal agencies to carry out a regional ("ecosystem-based") planning process. "Ecosystem" planning will supersede state and local government planning mechanisms on all matters involving environment, raw materials, and resource control.

According to a recent memo from the Bureau of Land Management, budgetary planning of that and other agencies is already based on these concepts, and "by mid-summer, we expect to have a clear signal of congressional acceptance of the new structure. By Sept. 30, BLM will have in place a new fund coding structure to accommodate the changes adopted by the Congress in their actions on the 1995 appropri-

ations.”

The doctrinal elements of this reorganization are based on these definitions, as stated in an EPA internal memorandum (all emphasis is added):

“Ecosystems—the complex of living and non-living components that function together as a unit in a given area such as wetland communities, estuaries, and prairies—form the *core organizational structures of the natural world*. Ecosystems have a degree of inherent stability which helps them to resist some disruption. Significant *man-made stressors* however, such as overgrazing, unbridled commercial and residential development, overpopulation, pollution, and a host of others, can alter ecosystems, affecting their ability to sustain life. . . .

“Ecosystem sustainability can be defined in a variety of contexts. For purposes of this document, it is the concept that humankind’s interaction with the environment should strike a balance between the need to . . . 1) use natural resources to maintain a *good* standard of living; 2) prevent the destruction of natural resources. . . .

“Sustaining the ecosystems that comprise our natural world *will require us to shift to a more holistic and coordinated approach to environmental protection—one which recognizes that protecting human interests ultimately requires us to protect the natural systems upon which we depend for survival*. Only in this manner will our efforts begin to match the interrelatedness that is the *defining characteristic* of ecosystems themselves. Recognizing that . . . should be the first step toward reinventing our governmental and societal” institutions.

These definitions are representative of the loaded, arbitrary notions which occur throughout government and U.N. treaty documents. The U.N. documents themselves admit that there is no agreed-upon definition for many of these terms, and leave it to various committees and conferences to determine what they actually mean. In historical context, it is clear that these terms are interpreted by the U.N. network to imply that man is a creature of the environment, rather than the master of nature.

Once this premise is established, the EPA document gets to the primary matter, and calls for the U.S. government to “develop human population policies that are consistent with sustainable economies and ecosystems.”

New terms for old and discredited ideas

To examine the meaning of this term, “sustainable economies and ecosystems,” it is only necessary to quote Paul Ehrlich, guru of the modern environmental movement, who explained, in the early 1970s:

“I think our first move must be to convince all those that we can that the planet Earth must be viewed as a space ship of limited carrying capacity. It must be made crystal clear that population growth must stop, and we must arrive at a consensus as to what the ideal size of the human crew of the Earth should be. When we have determined the size of the

crew, then we can attempt to design an environment in which that crew will be maintained in some sort of an optimum state.”

“Sustainability” and “biodiversity” are simply the new vocabulary of the zero-growth hoaxsters. Ehrlich recently modernized this notion in an article co-authored with E.O. Wilson, in an issue of *Science* magazine devoted to the subject of biodiversity (August 1992):

“The first step . . . would be to cease ‘developing’ any more relatively undisturbed land. Every new shopping center built in the California chaparral, every hectare of tropical forest cut and burned, every swamp converted into a rice paddy or shrimp farm means less biodiversity. . . . [Even so] ending direct human incursions into remaining relatively undisturbed habitats would be only a start. . . . *The indispensable strategy for saving our fellow living creatures and ourselves in the long run is . . . to reduce the scale of human activities.*”

Writing in his latest book, *Extinction*, Ehrlich explains that these concepts flow from the “religious” belief “that our fellow passengers [other species] on Spaceship Earth . . . have a right to exist.”

That is, the Biodiversity Treaty involves a *religious revolution*—a juridical attack on the Book of Genesis, which aims to overturn those basic premises of Judeo-Christian culture which inform our existing laws.

A working document prepared for a March summit of the Bureau of Land Management reiterates the point, stating that a key objective of the new ecosystem management is that “all ecosystem management activities should consider human beings as a biological resource.” It adds, “Status: Attempts to introduce this subject have been made, but models need to be built. Some ethno-ecology studies in some states, plus research by some other agencies, provide a beginning to this process.”

The BLM, like the EPA, now makes no pretense that its regulatory authority and enforcement powers are derived from or wielded in the interests of the people of the United States. These powers are in the service of “the ecosystem,” and people will just have to learn to know their place.

The new bureaucracy

The structural reorganization which will facilitate the spread of the biodiversity “pseudo-science” is outlined by the EPA:

First, the “Office of Environmental Policy should organize a series of ‘sustainable ecosystem summits’ comprised of agency representatives, academics, and *stakeholders* to establish this operational government definition and to set common goals for ecosystem management.

“The President must issue an executive order that establishes a national policy for ecosystem management . . . *viable populations, sustainable use, maintenance of biodiversity*.”

“All federal agencies should establish and incorporate

A huge bureaucracy

The National Biological Survey (NBS) is a highly controversial entity, not directly funded by Congress, but created through resources drawn from the Interior Department's budget. The Environmental Protection Agency's literature makes it sound as if this agency were a supra-cabinet-level entity, and perhaps it is. Even without congressional approval for its activities, the NBS has 1,850 employees, four Ecoregional Offices, 13 Research Centers, over 60 cooperative Research Units, and 100 field stations.

ecosystem protection goals at all levels of activity. . . .

"Federal agencies . . . need to identify *barriers to full implementation . . . and identify statutory mandates and policies which conflict with the national policy of ecosystem protection.*

". . . assess impacts of . . . subsidies (e.g., grazing fees, mining, timber, agricultural water-use).

"The Executive branch should submit a restructured budget that is fully consistent with the interagency coordination needed for ecosystem protection and research necessary for protecting ecosystems.

"Target/Action category: A federal policy should be developed that accounts for *ecological values equally with economic values.*

". . . direct the OMB and the . . . CEA [Council of Economic Advisers] . . . to work with all federal agencies to . . . *revise GDP indices and other economic measures to include the loss of natural resources through exploitation.*

"The Executive branch should revise Executive Order 12291 requiring *cost-benefit analyses to reflect all societal and ecological costs and benefits over the long term (e.g., 100 years) including non-market values.*

"The United States should ensure that *national policies take into account protecting global ecosystems.*

"Federal summits for *negotiating change in regional economics* should be created as an essential means for managing sustainable ecosystems. Coalitions of *stakeholders* in an ecosystem should examine ways in which to accommodate their respective interests while protecting the ecosystem.

"Agencies with primary responsibilities for *biological inventory* monitoring and assessment should coordinate [and cooperate with] . . . the USDI's National Biological Survey (NBS), the lead agency, in ecological inventories [see box].

"The Executive branch (e.g., DOJ [Department of Justice], OMB [Office of Management and Budget], and Treas-

ury, EPA) should work with Congress to develop appropriate legislation that establishes a 'Green Bank Program,' in which permit fees, use fees, and enforcement penalties collected by federal agencies (e.g., USFS [U.S. Forest Service], USDI [U.S. Department of Interior], NOAA [National Oceanographic and Atmospheric Administration], NMFS [National Marine Fisheries Service]) can be earmarked for ecosystem protection and restoration."

This is the outline of the world government that the U.N. hopes to bring into existence. Any tactic of resistance which limits itself to a defense of mere "property rights" will certainly be rolled over by this steamroller.

The issues of law

The legislation which enabled the construction of the federal environmental apparatus is, like the environmental movement itself, largely a product of the alliance between the Nixon administration and the population control movement. What unites the "environmentalist" and the "population control" movements is the very unscientific assumption that an increase in the number of human beings represents a "net cost" to a fixed and limited natural environment. Or, as the slogan of the first "Earth Day" put it: "People Pollute."

The authority of such plainly ideological assertions is rooted in a 150-year-old battle which has raged throughout the biological sciences. The source of contention has been the effort by some, to argue that there is no lawful, or knowable quality to creation, and their related assertions that there is either no creator, or that the creator is an agent of chaos. Darwinian theories of random evolution are only the most notorious example of this tendency.

As a result, modern science is deeply divided over the definition of the most basic elements of biology. There is, in fact, no working definition of what constitutes "life" which would be accepted across a spectrum of scientists today. Likewise, there is confusion over what comprises a "species." Yet we have written laws which give awesome power to agencies mandated to protect these ill-defined "species."

The Endangered Species Act (ESA) is a classic example of a regulatory catastrophe. First passed in 1969, but substantially modified and upgraded in 1973, the act was one of the major legacies of the Nixon administration, and is considered by many to be the most powerful environmental law in the nation, and probably the world.

Since 1973, there has been a continuous brawl over the scientific validity of its basic elements: what constitutes a species or sub-species; what defines the range and habitat of an insect; and, therefore, what transformations of that habitat constitute a "threat."

The courts have consistently ruled in favor of the right of federal agencies to bring any and every type of human activity—industrial, agricultural or recreational—to a dead halt, as soon as an assertion is made that the activity threatens a species of animal or plant. The very successes of the ESA

illustrate the bizarre character of the law—most of the “recoveries” of species listed as endangered under the act are attributable to discovery of populations of the “endangered” species which were simply not known to exist at the time of the listing.

In one celebrated case, an Oregon developer has been prevented by the Fish and Wildlife Service from building a community on a strip of coast land which is inhabited by the silverspot butterfly, because the FWS could not determine whether the developer’s efforts to preserve the butterfly would be adequate.

The caterpillars of the butterfly feed exclusively on the common blue violet, which grows only on open coastal grassland. Naturally, these open grasslands are eventually overrun by shrubs and then pines, which wipe out the butterfly habitat. For uncounted centuries, the beneficial species *Homo sapiens* has periodically cleared out such brushland, thus allowing the blue violet and the silverspot butterfly to reestablish themselves.

The developer proposed to preserve acreage of violets in order to sustain the butterfly. The FWS, despite \$250,000 worth of studies supporting the proposal (the studies were funded by the developer), would not allow the plan unless an amount of acreage were set aside which would make the development economically unfeasible. Result: no development, nature takes over, no butterfly.

The “wetlands” laws are similar. The definition of what constitutes a “wetland” is based on a complex system, the Cowardine Classification System, promulgated by the FWS in 1975. In recent years, the EPA and the Army Corps of Engineers have gone wild, ruling that all manner of moist ground is a “wetland,” protected from human activity under the terms of the wetlands preservation laws.

Farmers have been jailed for creating “wetland” habitats for ducks; they have been jailed for filling and draining swamps and planting crops. In urban areas, patches of ground have been declared wetlands, even when the moisture in them is found to originate in a break in a water main!

The legal question which the courts have allowed to be debated throughout the life of the ESA involves the economic consequences to a particular landowner of federal actions taken on behalf of a listed species. Usually, these actions halt some profitable activity, or prevent the future development of some resource, and the owners rightfully complain of the uncompensated taking of their private property. A series of rulings recently made in lower courts indicates that some legal protection for property owners may be forthcoming. However, even the legal theorists behind those cases admit that this will not cause the reform of the ESA or related laws.

This is so because the “property rights” defense against the overreaching powers of the federal government is a deeply flawed approach. It is based on the widely, and wrongly, held view that the Constitution supports John Locke’s formu-

lations about a natural right to property. This view was considered *and rejected* by the Founding Fathers, and is countereposed to the Constitution’s actual defense of the right to “life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness.” It is the right of the individual to economic prosperity—development—that the Constitution protects. Property, and the state itself, are mere tools, however essential, to secure that end.

The foundations and cartels that so cleverly manipulate environmental law to steal the property of farmers and ranchers—and deny entire nations in the underdeveloped world their right to develop resources—are fanatic defenders of *their* right to property. It is your attempt to productively employ property that they oppose.

The biodiversity surveys now being conducted by the Department of the Interior are the building blocks of an entirely new set of political maps of the United States. Under the terms of the Biodiversity Treaty, “ecosystems” will be the *de jure* political boundaries of the land, and will constitute a national zoning system which will subordinate local laws to the theories of the ecologists who will define what an “ecosystem” or “species” is.

This entire process, especially the control over the cataloguing and resource identification work which will control local economic activities, is under the direction of the multi-billion-dollar private foundations that control the environmentalist movement. In the case of the major project which is mapping the distribution and habitat factors alleged to control species vitality, the data are coming from the Nature Conservancy, a private foundation which developed the techniques now being adopted by the federal government. Such foundations dominate the funding for research in this area, and effectively run a controlled loop, in which no contrary scientific outlook is allowed to exist.

The source of the power that these agencies wield is not located in the ability to override the “property rights” of landowners. It resides in the fact that 226 elected representatives of the United States Congress voted in 1987 *against* giving the secretary of the interior the power to waive the provisions of the ESA, when deemed necessary to protect human life.

Rep. George Miller (D-Calif.), the chairman of the Natural Resources Committee which has power over ESA-related issues, was asked by former Rep. William Dannemeyer (R-Calif.), “Would the gentleman be willing to accept an amendment . . . which would say that in America humans are more important than animals?” Miller responded that he “would not accept his amendment.”

This degraded image of man, and not the destruction of “property rights,” is the source of the real crime being committed against the American people. Economic and scientific development for all the world’s people is the only policy which can restore the United States to its rightful heritage, and bring to an end the tyranny of the new imperialists at the United Nations.