

The global environmentalist imposture

Riassunto. - L'impostura dell'ambientalismo globale

È innegabile che esista una seria esigenza di tutela dell'ambiente, come dimostrato dai disastri ambientali causati dalla mancanza di critica libera nei paesi già afflitti dalla tirannide comunista. Vi sono tuttavia anche estremismi allarmistici ed antiumani che configurano una vera e propria nevrosi ecologica. Dietro di essa si nascondono ben precisi interessi costituiti, economici ed accademici, che mirano ad impedire una potenziale grande ondata di sviluppo basata sulle nuove tecnologie (nucleare intrinsecamente sicuro, trasporti a levitazione magnetica, biotecnologie basate su organismi geneticamente modificati). Le multinazionali petrolifere e chimiche e l'industria automobilistica, appartenenti ad un'ondata di industrializzazione ormai obsoleta, si oppongono con furiose campagne propagandistiche alla diffusione delle nuove tecnologie che ridimensionerebbe il loro potere. La diffusione degli organismi geneticamente modificati mediante biotecnologie avanzate, invece, danneggia chiusi interessi egoistici degli agricoltori del paesi sviluppati. Se si vuole ridare slancio allo sviluppo e all'occupazione, è indispensabile sconfiggere tali interessi reazionari con una ben mirata campagna di informazione.

Introduction

It is undeniable that there is a serious need for the protection of the environment, and an environmentally responsible policy must be an essential part of any modern political platform. This must be clearly stated at the outset, since the public has been so thoroughly brainwashed about the environment that expressions such "environ-

ment", "Mother Nature", "Gaia", and "overpopulation" have become irresistible catchwords capable of swaying rational reflection on the matter. This said, it must be acknowledged that there are, in the developed world, movements pushing far beyond advocating a sane environmental policy, and leading to extremes of hysteria and catastrophism. It is also necessary to draw a clear line between the respectable science of ecology, and the furious ideology of ecologism, or environmentalism. In fact, after the innumerable disasters brought about by ideologies, any word ending in "-ism" ought to be regarded with the strongest suspicion.

The pounding terrorist propaganda by ecologists aims not only at de-humanizing human beings, reduced to a merely animal or sub-animal level (a logical, unavoidable outcome of atheism and materialism; ancient pagan thinkers also thought, not surprisingly, that man is just an animal), but also to destroy national sovereignties to replace them with a supranational control which, under the excuse of protecting the environment, will be able to decide what technologies to adopt, which firms will be allowed to survive and which instead will close down, where we will be permitted to live and where it will be prohibited, who must be sterilized and who will be have permission to have children, and how many. These projected policies are the inevitable expression of an ideology which regards man as "a cancer", on the line of materialist pessimism of malthusian make (Malthus 1999). It is understood that the tacticians of ecologicistic terror hope to rise to the top of the forthcoming totalitarianism, thus achieving

even higher positions than those they already enjoy, compared with a rest of the world made more and more poor by a stifled economic development. However, some sharper and more honest members of the ecologicistic movement, are beginning to voice serious doubts (Lomborg 2001).

Above all, environmentalism is far from being disinterested. On the contrary, there is an ecological catastrophism massively fed by vested interests, and some industries may come so far as to support campaigns against themselves, if self-interest so dictates, as we shall see, for example, in the case of the so-called freons.

“Greens” (with fear of the new technologies)

It is said that one may become green with fear, and the fear in this case is that of new technologies. The movement of the “greens” can be said to be born officially as a mass movement on April 22, 1970, when in the United States was celebrated for the first time the *Earth Day*, in line with a neognostic rediscovery of heathen-like “values”, cloaked as worries for health and the environment, and aiming from the very beginning against the Judeo-Christian tradition, “guilty” of upholding the dominance of man upon nature. At the same time, that tradition was accused of being responsible for the onset of racialism, having talked of Good as light and Evil as darkness. In an evolutionary perspective, they supported compulsory sterilization, because – they maintained – a merely voluntary birth control would have “deprived the gene pool of responsible people”, leaving the others to breed like rabbits.

High-flown academics like Marcuse blew on the fire. There awoke, in immature and easily influenced minds, a spirit of wholesale rebellion, yearning to unsettle everything and make everything new, which has always been the fuel of revolutions for the unaware followers. For others, the movement was a good excuse to vent their violent instincts. So, on the one hand, “pacifist” and willingly co-operative, politically correct groups were born, given to sweet campaigns to “save the trees”, on the other hand violent gangs of ecoterrorists, Black Blocs, and the like, emerged. Great was (and is) the ideological confusion, but the sponsors of such movements, on the contrary, knew (and know) very well what their goal was (and is), and the way to achieve it, not by logic, but by mastering all available communication channels, screaming, repeating, and insulting (“reactionary”, “enemy of mankind”, and the like) anyone who holds differ-

ent views, and shows to be aware of the true nature of their endeavours.

The main sponsor of the “Earth Day”, to the tune of \$ 200.000, was Robert O. Anderson, then president one of the leading oil companies, the *Atlantic Richfield Oil Corporation* (ARCO), active in the exploitation of North Sea oilfields. He also owned the newspaper *London Observer* and chaired the *Aspen Institute for Humanistic Studies* (an organization for “humanistic studies” founded in Aspen, Colorado, in 1948). He contributed further \$ 200,000 to the ecologist association *Friends of the Earth*. Among the founders of the Aspen Institute it is worth mentioning the chancellor of the University of Chicago, Robert M. Hutchins, a friend of Bertrand Russell and a dedicated malthusian. Hutchins was planning director of the *Ford Foundation* which it advised to finance, in the early Fifties, a research project on hallucinogenic chemicals such as LSD and mescaline. This study contributed to bring forth the counter-culture movement of the following ten years (Gaspari, Rossi & Fiocchi 1991). Of course, it would be hard to say whether this result was intentional. Nevertheless it is certain that such a counter-culture, deeply hostile to Christianity, and narcotics diffusion which went (and still goes) with it, were instrumental in creating, among school and university students, a subversive climate, which became massively channelled into environmentalism. It is also worth stressing that the spread of narcotics is functional in its own right, given its destructive character, just to the containment of the “cancer” of the Earth, the human population.

The massive support of world financial and oil lobbies to the ecologicistic movement gave quick results. What was still a little known opinion trend, became all of sudden a protest movement with violent fringes of anarchoid hue. The unrest, begun in Sixty-eight, still lingered, so that heterogeneous and confused protest movements merged and strengthened one another: the illusion arose in many a youth to be instruments of a global and beneficial change. The Vietnam war provided additional fuel the the fire of protest. The lobby fanning the fire, however, never lost sight of the initial goals. The perfume of oil given off by the dollars and the pounds, accounts perfectly for the fact that nuclear energy was the chief target from the very beginning.

The “Friends of the Earth” established their headquarters in London. There they organized, in 1971, an international demonstration against nuclear power stations, the first of a long sequel,



some of them exceedingly violent. Under the new president of the Aspen Institute, Joseph Slater, another big boss of world finance (he was director of the Ford Foundation), the ends of the ecologist movement were put into focus: a ban against nuclear power stations, a reduction of economic activities, especially of intensive agriculture, and of building programmes of large transport lines, and, above all, zero growth of the population of the world to be achieved in all possible ways, from mass sterilization to abortion, forcing a halt to demographic growth as a precondition to obtain aid, i.e. blackmailing the underdeveloped countries. This has prompted many of them to counterfeit birthrate data in order to qualify for aid. The latter went often not to the populations but to local satraps.

After the first oil crisis of 1973, several countries had put forward plans for nuclear development, but the worldwide massive propaganda campaign set up by ecologist movements succeeded in forestalling such projects alternative to oil. If we need to put an exact birthdate to the oil lobby we can take September 17, 1928, when Sir John Deterding of Shell invited to his castle of Achnacarry, in north Scotland, Walter C. Teagle of Esso and Sir John Cadman of British Petroleum to reach an agreement for the formation of an oligopoly: like Chicago gangsters, but on a global scale. The fact that they all were top members of the Freemasonry helped no doubt to achieve a satisfactory (for them) understanding. These individuals divided among themselves the planet into spheres of influence, decided to crush any kind of external competition, to fix by common consent the prices of oil products, to exploit Soviet oil together.

The plan of the oil tycoons was applied to the letter and without the slightest scruple. The trade in Soviet oil by the Western oil companies was linked to the support by great Western capitalism to the USSR, a support that was for many years a decisive factor of the Communist regime and its gulags, where tens of millions of people died or were brought down to a subhuman level. The long and complex story of the unswerving support of Free Masons to the Soviet regime is still to be written. As to crushing the competition, Italy was hit particularly hard, with the murder, in 1962, of Enrico Mattei, the founder of the national oil company ENI (*Ente Nazionale Idrocarburi*).

Another result of this kind of pressure was the transformation of ENEA: this organization went off with the tail between its legs, after a covered but highly persuasive hostile campaign by foreign oil magnates and their ecologists, and its acronym

was transformed from *Ente Nazionale per l'Energia Atomica* (National Authority for Atomic Energy) first to *Ente Nazionale per le Energie Alternative* (National Authority for Alternative Energies), and then to *Ente Nazionale per l'Energia e l'Ambiente* (National Authority for Energy and Environment). Exxon, strongly present in Italy under the name Esso, first supported with donations the ruling parties of the Centre, later on it was extremely generous with those of the Centre-Left from 1962, the year of the murder of Mattei: these parties evidently were more pliable and gave a better guarantee of controlling protest movements.

In this way was born the sinister empire of the "seven sisters" (ready to defend their interests with nail and teeth): the *Royal Dutch Shell* (an Anglo-Dutch giant floated in 1907 from the merger of two pre-existing societies), the *British Petroleum* (BP, floated in 1909 as Anglo Persian Gulf Company), plus five more American ones. Initially, all oil sold in the United States was controlled by the family Rockefeller, which had floated in 1870 the Standard Oil. Convicted as a monopoly in 1911, the society was broken up, and a number of societies were born: *Exxon*, *Mobil*, *Chevron*, *Texaco*, *Gulf Oil* (an exceptional one, being the only large American oil company not controlled in some some way or other by the Rockefeller). The management boards of all seven "sisters" have always been filled with people engaged at the same time in leading positions in the various ecologicistic movements.

The command structure of the ecologicistic movement is practically made up entirely by financial magnates (a veritable flood of dollars has come from the family Rockefeller through the banks and the foundationis it controls), by the leaders of the great oil companies and by the most highly selected character of the European aristocracy, among whom the Prince Consort of Elisabeth II, His Royal Highness Philip, Duke of Edinburgh. The high-ranking nobleman was initiated into the free-masonry by the Grand Master of the "Marina" lodge, with the number 2612. He would have liked to become Gran Master of the Great Mother Lodge of England, but that office went instead to Edward Duke of Kent, due to the opposition of the uncle Lord Mountbatten, probably worried about the bad figures that the eccentric Prince Consort (relentless ecologist, but supporter of the fox hunt), would have done, causing the austere British Freemasonry to blush. On the blunders of Philip of Edinburgh a huge literature exists. In an interview to an American television



network, he complained that the royal annuity was "only" £ 700 million a year, and when the interviewer hinted at the increase of unemployment in Britain, he replied that he failed to understand what reason did the Britons had to complain, since earlier they had complained about having not enough leisure time. On August 8, 1988, Philip outdid himself when, in a statement released to the Deutsche Presse Agentur, declared himself to be exceedingly happy about the death caused by AIDS: "Were I born again, - he said - I would like to be a letal virus like that of AIDS, to contribute solving the problem of overpopulation" (Engdhal *et al.* 1991).

The *World Wildlife Fund* (WWF), which has an annual budget to the tune of tens of million dollars, was founded in 1961 by the Duke of Edinburgh and Prince Bernhard of Holland: the defence of nature has become a pretext to force poor countries into sterilization, abortion projects with low technological level. The inspectors of WWF, instructed by the World Bank, visit the areas involved in infrastructural projects (dams, railways, roads, canals, nuclear power stations, steel plants, projects for intensive agriculture and animal husbandry), and advise to finance only the low technology ones (dubbed "appropriate technology projects" or "with a low environmental impact"): these just worsen underdevelopment (Engdhal *et al.* 1991). The *Guardian* (September 4, 1990) reported that, from February 1987 the WWF entered into an agreement with the government of Zimbabwe for the protection of the black rhino: sophisticated equipment for trasport and surveillance were put at the disposal of the Zimbabweans, as well as weapons. The rhino was "protected" by hunting the poachers: many tens of them were killed. Poachers are men and the rhino is only an animal, but for the ecologists, and the materialists in general, man is worth less than animals.

Similar goals has *Greenpeace*, founded in 1970 under an essentially antinuclear brief: among its main supporters the usual Duke of Edinburgh, the Swedish royal family, the royal family of the Low Countries, and a number of private foundations; similar are also the huge budgets which have enabled the association to open 35 headquarters in 22 countries, and to possess a true fleet and a highly sophisticated equipment for communication, intelligence and propaganda. A huge scandal was the documentary film "Survival in the Great North", produced in 1989, in which Greenpeace tried to point an accusing finger against the seal hunters. Later it was shown that tortures had been

inflicted to the animals by members of the same Greenpeace; and the reason of that will be immediately evident bearing in mind that the annihilation of the fur trade would leave the monopoly of this lucrative economic activity in the hands of the synthetic fur makers. And what raw material is used for such products? But oil, of course.

The mass media are staunch supporters of ecologicistic campaigns, following transversal alliances ignoring political divides. Highly instructive in this regard if the story of the founder of the CNN, the most influential television network in the United States (Gaspari, Rossi & Fiocchi 1991): Dallas born Ted Turner. He began to rise by signing a contract for the utilization of a Tv satellite, in order to set up a world-wide network. After a classical puritanical education of a calvinistic hue, he openly rejected it, declaring: "I have grown under the terror of eternal damnation, and have been saved seven or eight times. But every time I get farther from salvation I feel better (...). Christianity is the religion of losers". He has been the major supporter of the "Big Green" referendum, sponsored (and lost) by Californian environmentalists, and has suggested to replace the Ten Commandments with a grotesque environmentalist parody.

Quite often, the champions of ecologism are the worse polluters. For example, none of the environmentalist organizations which dubbed "a criminal action" the dyoxin accident in Seveso (July 10, 1970), apparently "remembered" that Dr. Luc Hoffman, owner of Icmesa, a branch of the multinational Hoffman-Laroche, was honoray vice president of the WWF. Russell Train, cofounder of WWF, director of the department "Environment, Health and Safety" of the chemical multinational Union Carbide, was elected president of the WWF in 1978. The Union Carbide is the owner of the Bophal factory, in India, which, on December 2, 1984, ejected a toxic cloud that poisoned 170,000 people, of whom 2,600 died. Train, who had previously expressed his high approval of plans to force a decrease of the world population, has defined "excellent" the environmental programme of the Union Carbide. Evidently, toxic clouds improve the environment by reducing the population. On March 24, 1989, the oil tanker "Exxon Valdez" went aground in Prince William Bay, Alaska, polluting the sea with 40,000 tons of crude oil, which contaminated the coast on a length of 1,600 kilometres, killing 36,000 migrant birds and utterly destroying the salmon fisheries. The owner of the tanker was Exxon, one of the "seven sisters", and the president of Exxon, and at the same time of the American WWF, was Eugene McBrayer,



which accounts for the fact that WWF, instead of loudly denouncing the incident as one more piece of evidence on the environmental hazards, has kept singularly quiet about the whole business.

It is not necessary to examine in detail the various environmentalist groups, more or less alike in terms of aims, philosophy and (double) standards of behaviour, neither would it be any use to consider the further developments of ecologism, which has tediously continued to harp constantly on the same tune. What would be the outcome, were this kind of environmentalism to be entirely successful? Probably nothing different than a worsening of what is already taking place: (i) a huge increase in wealth of the financial and oil lobbies sponsoring the movement; (ii) stagnation in the poorer countries and a halt to the positive effects of globalization; (iii) continued dominance of the Anglo-Saxon north Atlantic economic bloc, which controls huge oil reserves, upon Germany, France, Italy, and the rest of Europe, countries far less well provided with oil, whose interest would be rather to rely on nuclear power. However, in view of the strength deriving to terrorist organizations, such as Al Qaeda, precisely from oil, it is quite possible that the USA and the UK may decide to lessen the dependence on oil for political considerations overriding the interests of oil tycoons, and this will give a boost to the adoption of other energy production methods, including nuclear power.

It seems that the nuclear industry tries to influence the environmental movement too, and the campaign against carbon dioxide increase in the atmosphere began, having as a major target all fossil fuels. This attempt by opposing lobbies to have the environmentalists side with them, leads the ecologist movement to attack any kind of development (though some lip service is paid to "sustainable development", whatever this may mean, or "alternative paths to development", just another expression of quite uncertain meaning). This is exactly what a definite section of the industrial world wants: i.e. all those who have invested huge amounts of capital in long mature technologies: oil, cars, rubber, and all linked activities.

Ecological totalitarianism

Many of the founder members of the Friends of the Earth came from the associations Planetary Citizens and World Federalists, closely linked with the Free Masons. The cream of the financial aristocracy of the Anglo-Saxon world belongs to these

two associations, whose goal is the union of the world under a single government. The world government idea is not new. It was one of the strong pieces of the Enlightenment, such as in the pamphlet *Zum ewigen Frieden* of 1795, by Immanuel Kant, who suggests that a government of that kind could guarantee "eternal peace". It may well be asked how could this be reconciled with reality and with Christian doctrine, which promises peace only on an eschatological perspective and prophesizes that war (Armageddon) will be with us to the end of time, which will be time of the Antichrist. The Enlightenment, it is well known, rejects the Christian Revelation and, being a form of neognosis, maintains that mankind can achieve peace by its own efforts, becoming united in brotherly embrace which can only be that of the masonic brotherhood. It must also be borne in mind that most Free Masons have no idea of what their sect is all about: there is a great number of initiation steps, and only the puny clique at the top, is in the know; the others are just led by the nose and most probably they have joined merely in the hope to gain advantage for their careers in the first place.

It is far from difficult to grasp what kind of world government would arise from extreme environmentalism: a dictatorship swayed by the élite financial world, to the serious detriment of true entrepreneurship and of mankind in general. Who these paladins of such "new order" are, is clear from the offices held by them and the kinds of projects they like to foster. Norman Cousins, founder of the World Federalists, belonged to the board of Directors of the Friends of the Earth, member of the Aspen Institute and manager of the Saturday Review. Douglas Dillon, a powerful Wall Street banker, founded in 1961, upon advice of Bertrand Russell, the Institute for World Order (IWO), aiming at bringing about a world government and sponsor of the project Mobilization for Survival, with the declared purpose of phasing out nuclear power and bring about a decrease of the population. In 1980 President Jimmy Carter sponsored the study Global 2000, which called for draconian measures for the reduction of the population of developing countries. In 1989, the then Soviet foreign minister Eduard A. Shevardnadze proposed at the United Nations to turn the UN environmental programme into an Environmental Council with mandatory powers, with attendant severe curtailing of national sovereignties. It is fitting that such a proposal should come from the Soviets, who have been the inventors of "limited sov-

ereignty”, as all their former satellites well know.

One episode, reported by the news in 1992 is highly significant of the level reached by the ecologicistic paranoia. A buzzard (*Buteo buteo*) had been attacking the inhabitants of a small French village, Mezière-sur-Issoire, by Limoges. After fifteen aggressions and some serious injuries, under the frowning eyes of the “greens” and the Forestry Service, the villagers had to resort to the law courts. On account of an Act of 1976, the buzzard is a protected species, and cannot be killed, under threat of heavy fines and even jail. It is an absurdly rigid law, that leaves no room for exceptions, even for species far from threatened with extinction (in France only there are about 60,000 buzzards). Some ornithologists, policemen and foresters were eventually sent. Their first occupation was to inform, by registered mail with return receipt, the ministry of the Environment, the only one concerned in similar matters. Thereafter, the “experts” vainly tried to catch the dangerous bird. The aim, they explained, was to understand whether the buzzard suffered of physical or psychological ailments, in order to tend it and educate it. It is unclear how this could have been achieved: perhaps by psychoanalysis, in order to check whether it had suffered some trauma when still in the egg?

“Silent spring”?

The celebrated “Silent spring” by Rachel Carson, published in 1962, has become, from the very date of its publication, one of the sacred texts of the incipient environmentalist movement. Like all fables, it begins with “Once upon a time ...”, and ventures into an idyllic description of an America “where all creatures seemed to live in harmony with the environment”, a place enlivened by the songs of many little birds. And goes on transfixing with fiery words the use of pesticides and of DDT in particular, singled out as the chief culprit for the disappearance of the little birds and for making the spring “silent”. The romantic sweetness of the descriptions and the tender regret for a world which never more, hélas, will return, makes a stark contrast with the harsh psychological warfare which it wages, filled as it is of “subliminal messages, childish fears, guilt complexes, terrifying images which become suggestive literary devices to manipulate the reader and lead him to believe acritically the content of the message” (Gaspari, Rossi & Fiocchi 1991). The book opens with a quotation from Albert Schweitzer: “Man has lost the ability to

look at the future and act in advance. In the end he will destroy the Earth”, but without informing the reader that Schweitzer was talking of the atomic warfare, and certainly not of pesticides, and that just concerning DDT he had expressed himself in a highly positive way, in the hope it could help to destroy insect pests.

Actually, DDT, whose properties as an insect killer were discovered by the Swiss chemist Paul Müller (who was awarded the Nobel Prize for this discovery), did exactly what Schweizer hoped it would do. On the wake of the emotion caused by “Silent spring”, and of “researches” which demonized it in every possible way, DDT was banned. It was “useless”, they said (because of new varieties of resistant insects), and “dangerous” (because it tended to become concentrated at the top of the food pyramid) The disappearance of DDT has caused an immediate revival of malarial fever and of parasites attacking the plants. The harvests of cotton, peanuts and potatoes, where DDT had been employed, had doubled. Before DDT, in 1961, in Pakistan there had been 7 million cases of malaria; after a sustained campaign of DDT spraying they had declined, in 1967, to 9,500 only; but in 1975, three years after the ban, they had risen to 10 million. The same things happened in India and Sri Lanka. At present, malaria cases in the world are hundreds of million, and half the world population is at risk.

And birds? Between 1941 and 1961, at the climax of DDT spraying, they increased in the whole North America. After these data of the Audubon Society were published, the strategy changed: DDT is no longer a bird killer, but an egg weakener. Carson’s book reported research according to which it seemed that Japanese quails fed with a diet containing DDT did not sit on their eggs: a perusal of the original study by Dr. J.B. De Witt has shown that this was far from true: there was a minimal difference on the percentage of normal clutches between quails which had been fed DDT (80%) and the control that had not received it (83.9%). Moreover, Mrs. Carson omitted to mention a similar study of the same author on pheasants: normal clutches were 80% for the group which had taken DDT and only 57% in the control group. A further hoax was the theory of DDT accumulation “forever” in the oceans. On the contrary, it is degraded quite rapidly: in a month about the 90% vanishes, and the rest follows. Attempts to show that DDT causes cancer in man were unsuccessful.

Why such a rage, then? For political reasons. A too swift population increase would bring about a



threat to extant political and economic balances. An official of the Office for population control of the American State Department, declared in the early Seventies: "Using DDT we made a serious mistake. Malaria, one of the most widespread sicknesses in the world, has been practically eliminated. In this way we have upset the natural balance. Too many human beings have remained alive. We would be lucky if a more deadly virus appeared" (cit. in Gaspari, Rossi & Fiocchi 1991).

The return of the marshes and the devastation of agriculture

Once upon a time there was reclamation. Marshes were drained to save men from malaria, today there is a dominant tendency to re-establish them, evidently because the anopheles, being "natural", deserves more respect than human beings. Whereas the conservation of extant humid areas can be meaningful for fishing and tourism, and also for preserving ecosystems, within a proper balance between economic activities and ecology, aimed at the paramount needs of mankind above all, it is utterly unacceptable to flood again ponds already drained, that would at once become breeding grounds for countless mosquitoes. By yearning an impossible "primigenial purity" of "unpolluted nature" we tend to forget that nature has wiped out millions of species and whole ecosystems, sometimes gradually, sometimes by means of dreadful catastrophes. Backwards in time, we might attempt to recreate Precambrian conditions, before the "pollution" by oxygen caused by the chemical activities of bacteria produced an oxydizing atmosphere which damages rocks and allows aerobic organisms to live, including the obnoxious human species. Is this unpolluted nature idyllic enough? Are you satisfied, environmentalists?

Machines defeated fatigue and increased productivity in agriculture. To harvest wheat in a hectare of land with a scythe took a hundred hours work, with a sickle about seventy-five hours, with a mowing machine little more than three hours, with a combine harvester one hour. Chemistry contributed to the defeat of fatigue too: to weed a field with a hoe is a back-breaking effort which evidently neither eurobureaucrats nor executives of multinationals have ever experienced; after the introduction of herbicides this work has become accessible even to people with white hands as they are, if only they condescended to soil them with some real work.

In 1950 a farmer could feed fifteen people.

Thanks to herbicides and pesticides, he can feed today nearly fifty. But, under the ecologicistic imposture, the age of the reversal of reclamation has dawned. Eurobureaucrats are doing their worst to restrain agricultural production: quotas, set aside, joint liability taxes for actual or alleged pollution caused by fertilizers, budget cuts for agriculture, incentives for the slaughter of cattle and the uprooting of vines, cuts to financial support to agricultural export, price rises of fertilizers and pesticides. At the same time we have a proliferation of farms producing according to the so-called "biological agriculture" (what does it mean?), as if using pesticides and fertilizers meant "mineralogical" agriculture.

Indictments to fertilizers as causes of algal blooms at sea are utterly groundless. Fertilizers are largely made up of nitrates and/or phosphates, it is true, and if these chemicals fertilize the land, they, washed away by rainfall, can also "fertilize" rivers and the sea. At least in theory. In practice it should be explained why algal blooms (which involve essentially microscopic algae belonging to the Flagellata or the Diatomeans) are taking place since the preindustrial age, when fertilizers (and phosphorated detergents, also accused of being responsible for blooms) did not exist. Moreover, nutrients capable of supporting a bloom are present in the waters in quantities more than sufficient to support a bloom at any time, as reserves are accumulated by river discharges at the geological time scale, before man appeared. Finally, how do we account for the fact that these blooms involve *one species only at a time*? This is compatible only with the action of *specific biostimulants* as the vitamins, contained in large amounts in rivers and "clean" effluent from water treatment plants. Biostimulants do not favour indiscriminate proliferation, but each acts on a given species only (Biagini 1990). Algal blooms can cause serious *anoxia*, due to the huge algal biomass which cannot produce oxygen during the night but keeps consuming oxygen. Anoxia plays havoc among organisms, damaging the fisheries and forming huge amounts of putrefying organic matter. Man is by no means responsible for anoxia: this event occurs in a high pressure regime, under good and stable weather conditions, which cause no mixing of the water column, so that the deep anoxic layers receive no oxygen from surface waters. It is a paradox: we are confronted by totally natural events, perhaps even worsened by depollution measures, and yet accusing fingers are pointed against man, the "great polluter".

And pesticides? We pointed out already to the



catastrophic results (and the true motives) of the ban on DDT. But there are many more pesticides. Shall we to give up them? What for? They are already present in huge amounts in the food we eat (sometimes up to 5-10% of dry weight). Plants have developed natural defenses against parasites. They produce natural pesticides, usually alkaloids, often as poisonous as those produced by man. Anise, apple, banana, basil, carrot, cauliflower, celery, fennel, grapefruit, melon, pineapple, potato, raspberry, are just some of the species producing pesticides. Unlike man-made pesticides, which are sprinkled on the produce and are then washed away by rain and/or by washing in the kitchen prior to consumption, natural pesticides are a part of the fruit, leaf or tuber, and are swallowed with it. The only way to avoid them is to stop eating. After a long enough fast, the environmentalist dream of a world finally healed from the "cancer" which is mankind would come true.

The hysteria about transgenic foods and the SRI paradigm

Another, and more recent, environmentalist bogey is that of transgenic foods. The first transgenic tomato was obtained in the USA in 1987, and the sale of this kind of food was authorized in 1992. Transgenic foods are those derived from plants or animals which are genetically modified. Thanks to the intimate knowledge of DNA, the technologies aimed at changing the gene pool are by now highly advanced. It is possible to use them on man as well, and this should not be allowed, for self-evident reasons, at least self-evident for anyone who does not regard man as an animal like all others (or worse than all others). But if genetic engineering is used to obtain plants and animals with useful characters such as high productivity and resistance to parasites, why should we oppose it?

Incredibly, on the contrary, a furious campaign of environmentalist terrorism was unleashed against these new products, but *only in the West, where agricultural protectionist lobbies are evidently worried by the possible competition of new crops*. Genetically modified plants and animals are pictured as monsters ready to devour mankind, in graphic and verbal caricatures so rough as to warrant the conclusion that environmentalism mongers think they have to deal with a mass of mentally disabled, or hope to have so heavily conditioned public opinion by now that it is no longer necessary to mount a propaganda campaign having a modicum of likeness to reality. Not surpris-

ingly, producers and sellers of food advertised as "biological", ie "not manipulated", prosper. "Biological" agriculture is big business, and sells its produce at a high price, whereas transgenic foods could be marketed in huge amounts at low price. But this is probably the true goal: keep prices up, screaming at the same time against world-wide hunger. The public opinion must be lead to believe that transgenic agriculture is not the solution, and that the only ones who worry about the "third world" poor are the environmentalists themselves.

The absurdity of this propaganda appears not so much from the fact that there is absolutely no evidence that any transgenic food ever caused any health problem, but rather from another undeniable circumstance: *nearly all* food comes from genetically modified organisms. If we did not possess such organisms we would simply starve. Leaving aside venison, berries occasionally gathered during some outing and, in part, mushrooms, and some wild greenery, we subsist on organisms whose gene pool has been altered by controlled breeding and artificial selection. This has been going on since the "agrarian revolution" of the Neolithic Age, and the modified species, if left to themselves, would be rapidly overcome and destroyed by wild species, far better equipped to compete and fight: a corn field would swiftly become covered by weeds, and it takes little imagination to picture the destiny of a sheep flock left to itself in the wild. What difference is there between gene manipulations of the past and the present ones? None, except that today they are now performed more effectively and with a more accurate view of what achievement is intended, being the result of a more advanced science and not of empiricism.

Would transgenic food solve the problem of world hunger? We will never know without putting them to the test, and it is unlikely we will ever come to that, in view of the demonization they are being subject to. Like for the CFC, DDT and other products which came under environmentalist fire, the problem is remote from rational examination and the results of scientific research, and rather subject to the SRI paradigm (Scream, Repetition, Intimidation). After the screams and the squawking of environmentalists, come excommunications in the form of bans, through laws accompanied by civil and penal sanctions, cutting out all argument. It is not difficult to understand why it is so. If the ruling circles mentioned earlier regard mankind as a cancer, evidently everything that could help to feed it must be destroyed. Absurdly,



the very same circles deem it perfectly moral and logical to apply transgenic technology to man, in order to get "spare parts" and the "perfect" human being, with a revolting disregard of human dignity as an image of the Creator and a brutal materialism that would have been highly pleasing to Hitler.

The violence of animalists

The concern about pain inflicted to animals is fully justified, bearing in mind, among other things, that the physiological differences from one species to another are such that a medical experiment carried out on animals is often meaningless if referred to man. It is therefore fully understandable the student protest unleashed after a practical demonstration of vivisection at the University of Norwich in 1876, which led to the passing of the Cruelty to Animals Act. However, the so-called "animalists" go much further. The "father" of animalists and feminism (see Campos Boralevi 1980) is the English philosopher Jeremy Bentham (1748-1832), founder of utilitarianism, the theory according to which man is moved essentially by the search of pleasure and the rejection of pain. Starting from this assumption, Bentham maintained that the State has four goals: to provide citizens with means of subsistence, to favour abundance, to guarantee security, to strive for equality. Materialistically, he rejects any distinction between man endowed of an immortal soul and the animals, bestiality in man should not be repressed, but allowed every opportunity to vent itself. "Do as you please", was his motto: the initiation to satanism of the infamous Hell-Fire Clubs of 18th century England. He defended usury and homosexuality.

The degradation of man to the level of animals brings as a consequence the rejection of every human claim to control and use nature for his own ends. This is the basic contention of the Animal Liberation Front (ALF) and the Earth Liberation Front (ELF). ALF was born in Great Britain in 1982 and swiftly spread in Europe and North America. Animalists have performed attacks to research and breeding centres to free the animals (usually left loose in a non congenial environment, where they quickly meet their death), damaging research and fur producing firms (to the advantage of artificial fur garment makers, and the oil industry, as pointed out above). Further exploits of theirs include sabotage and bombing attacks to firms and universities, destruction of vehicles and earth moving equipment. This kind

of action is widespread in the United States, where it is known as monkey-wrenching. In Britain, instead, animalists dig tunnels under trees destined to be cut down and hide in them, defying the firm to carry the cutting and risk the collapse of their tunnels; in order to avoid being captured by the agents who pursue them; they go as far as to block the tunnels by installing steel doors; alternatively, they climb on the trees and nail themselves to them. All this results in loss of time, money and jobs. From 1980, animalist attacks have intensified, with uprooting of genetically modified vegetables and (in the United States) fires of houses located in places judged "ecologically wrong".

Edward Skidelsky (*New Statesman*, June 5, 2000), has published an updated review and a pressing critique of the animalist ideology. He writes: "To put a stray dog on the same footing as your brother, only because both are sensitive to pain, would not only be odd, but also wicked (...). To talk of 'animal liberation' is even more absurd than to speak of 'animal rights'. The notion of collective liberation is of a vaguely marxist origin (...). Sentimentalism inevitably hurts those it wishes to protect. The minks 'freed' last year from a stock farm by protesters will have to be killed, because they have no space in the environment we have created. We should accept the fact that animals can only be our dependents, and treat them as lovingly as possible within this kind of relationship. This paternalism belongs to the tradition of all three monotheistic religions. God grants Adam the 'dominion' over animals. Our power over nature is constitutional, non autocratic. Animals are entrusted to us, but we cannot do whatever we please to them. The erosion of religious faith (...) is partly responsible for the present disorder in our relation with animals". This is the very point: lost the centre everything is lost. The centre of man is God. If man gives up his natural centre, he ends up revolving on himself with no compass to guide him, a prey to his own conceit which, paradoxically, degrades him to the level of an animal. Also, we must never forget the solid vested interests cynically exploiting the crooked idealism of gullible youths to turn them into askaris of the environmentalist movement, into antiglobals and Black Blocs.

The demise of tropical forests

Environmentalist propaganda concerning tropical forests has found a slogan often pounded into our eyes and ears from countless television



screens: we are destroying the "green lung" (sic) of the planet. The contention is based on the simplistic line of reasoning that forests produce oxygen, therefore fewer trees mean less oxygen. Brazil is particularly under attack. It is alleged that it is destroying "a heritage belonging to the whole of mankind". The activities of the International Monetary Fund and the World Bank, tend to "internationalize" the Amazon forest, meddling with Brazil's agricultural development, to cut its potential competition. An obviously neocolonialist policy which, though in highly different conditions, recalls the destruction of vines in the provinces of the Roman Empire, seemingly ordered by Diocletian about 92 AD to protect Italy's production of wine (Lo Cascio 1991). The Brazilian government attempts to react to the international impositions. The minister of Foreign Affairs Francisco Rezek went on record for saying that "the government will not allow environmental problems and the native question to be politically exploited in Europe and the United States (...). These countries forget principles such as territorial sovereignty. They act like an independent authority engaged in building up an international environmental government" (*Italia Oggi* 20/4/1990).

But unfortunately, international pressures weigh heavily, due to the imbalance in financial power. Brazil needs international support to start a nuclear power programme, but its appeals for having it financed were checked by the granitic opposition of the World Bank and the International Monetary Fund. So, Brazilians must use a traditional energy source: charcoal. Similar conditions occur in many other tropical countries, obliged to fell forests to get energy. The very same financial potentates attempt to prevent sovereign countries from exploiting their own forests. No nuclear energy, no coal because it pollutes, no charcoal because it destroys forests, no other option is left than run after wind (when it's there) or the sun (when the sky is clear), or purchase oil from the masters of the universe. As compensation, thanks to shameful refereeing, the world soccer championships often see the triumph of "third world" countries, for the sake of entertainment and pride satisfaction of the impoverished populations. If Roman emperors offered *panem et circenses* to the mob, the new financial emperors grant *circenses* only. It is true, then, that the world order is deeply wrong, but for exactly opposite reasons from the contentions of the noisy protesters, who do not realize to be misled by the very lobbies they think to be opposing. Lobbies have the strongest vested interest to paralyse develop-

ment, preserving at all cost things as they are: non transgenic agriculture, oil, cars.

Is the cutting of tropical forests such a serious environmental hazard? Locally it is, because on the surface thus laid bare, due to eluviation, a reddish clay rich in iron oxydes, called laterite, forms a hard crust which makes agriculture and the regrowth of vegetation extremely hard. On the contrary, if no sufficient time is left for laterite to form, the environmental impact may be lessened.

The greenhouse effect

A furious environmentalist campaign has been unleashed on the greenhouse effect, though this is actually absolutely natural, and necessary to the survival of life on Earth, otherwise the planet would be in the grip of a permanent glaciation. The average surface temperature is 15 °C, without that effect it would be -18 °C. Greenhouse gases have the same concentration both in the moist equatorial forests and in tropical deserts: but temperatures inside the former stay constantly above 30-35 °C, while in the latter violent excursions occur from 70 °C to below 0 °C. As the two areas have an equal concentration of carbon dioxide, and the only difference concerns the concentration of water vapour, the latter, therefore, appears to be a far more important greenhouse gas. Even the consequences of greenhouse gas changes are far from clear. A considerable heating could increase evaporation, producing a thick cloud cover which would reflect solar radiation and, after an initial temperature raise, the main trend would be towards cooling. Environmentalists weave tales of a dreadful rise of the sea level due to a fabled melting of polar ice. Catastrophic cartoons and maps, showing highly hypothetical effects of sea level rises of many tens of metres effectively contribute to ecologicistic terrorism. The whole is based on totally theoretical computer models of climate change, loaded with utterly arbitrary average temperature increases of one, two or more degrees. Computers just produce results based on the data fed into them, neither are they able to make out whether the algorithms used to develop the model are realistic or not.

Geomorfologists eventually supplied solid data, showing that the huge eastern Antarctic ice sheet, which contains by far the largest amount of ice of the planet, has undergone no change at least in the last 14 million years (Sugden 1996). Even the western Antarctic ice sheet shows no hint of melting. Moreover, a temperature increase over



Antarctica, even of 5 or 10 degrees, would bring about a rise from -40°C to -35°C or -30°C , with the sole result to ease evaporation and therefore the formation of clouds and snowfall, which would make ice grow rather than melt.

The only data on which there is some agreement are those on carbon dioxide concentration increase in the atmosphere, from the preindustrial age to the present time, from 270 to 330 parts per million, and a limited swelling of surficial ocean layers of about 1 mm a year. Average temperature trends, however, when allowance is made for distortions due to dislocation of meteorological stations and urban growth (with attendant expansion of the urban heat island), do not show a definite increase, or rather they show increase in some regions and decrease in others. No certitudes exist on climate change. Catastrophists who, so they say, are so frantic about "saving the planet", in order to persuade us that we are truly facing an "ecological catastrophe" due to our own fault, should do three things: show that there are *strong* short term climate alterations (not mere normal oscillations), that these alterations are necessarily negative for mankind (heating in Canada and Siberia could only be welcome), and that they are caused by man (the extreme complexity of climatic factors makes it rather problematic).

At the present time, it is not possible to satisfy any of these conditions. But all this means nothing, as any serious scientific debate has been literally censored by the media, which report only the rages of catastrophists. They are the only ones interviewed by television networks, and every time climate is mentioned, images of disintegrating glaciers appear on video, accompanied by a voice expressing the sharpest fears on the "changing climate", the "sick planet", the greenhouse effect "threatening life on Earth". The audience is under neither obligation of possessing degrees in physics, geology or natural science, nor of being expert on a subject far from simple, in which even "experts" are likely to lose the way. The upshot is that people start to be worried. Just what environmentalists wish.

The ozone "hole"

The Antarctic ozone anomaly is a natural phenomenon discovered in 1956 by Gordon Dobson during the International Geophysical Year, when the chlorofluorocarbons or "freons" (the CFCs, used in spray cylinders and fridges) were still rare. It was "rediscovered" in 1982 by Shigeru Chubachi

of the Japanese Polar Research Institute. It was again "rediscovered" for the third time in 1985 by Farman, Gardiner & Shanklin (1985), of the British Antarctic Survey, who claimed the merit ignoring the previous discoveries (see Engdhal *et al.* 1991). This "discovery" was the starting point of a furious television and press campaign against the CFCs. It was necessary to outlaw them, in order to launch new products protected against competition, and freons became a deadly threat to mankind. Weak brains used to weak thinking swallowed unquestioningly the whole story. The manoeuvre was reported by Haroun Tazieff (1991), the leading volcanologist, so an expert in atmospheric gases. The present writer obtained a direct, though confidential, confirmation by the manager of a chemical multinational.

The multinational of chemistry DuPont and ICI produced new propellers, in which chlorine is replaced by hydrogen, giving rise to a new family of gases called hydrofluorocarbons (HFCs). Unlike the CFCs, these substances, which cost five times more, are more corrosive and more poisonous, they blow off at the slightest contact even with the puniest embers, such as those of a lighted cigarette, disfiguring horribly the unlucky smoker, as it happened more than once. "Edgar Bronfman, owner of the chemical giant DuPont (...) more than anyone else has advocated the Montreal agreement and, in general, the initiative to ban the CFCs. Members of the DuPont family, whom Bronfman has reduced to minority associates in the management of the Group, have made known that, by the speculation on the 'ozone hole' and the CFCs, he was going to profit to the tune of 10 billion dollars" (Engdhal *et al.* 1991).

Basic researches running counter these disturbing rumours were simply ignored. Kanzawa & Kawaguchi (1990) have shown that the dynamics of the atmosphere, the temperature in particular, plays a decisive role in the appearance and disappearance of the "hole". A group of Italian scientists of the Institute of Physics of the Atmosphere in Rome has demonstrated the dependency of the phenomenon from sunspot changes. Dean Hegg, of the University of Washington has shown that at least a part of the CFCs (perhaps all), held responsible of the ozone depletion in the stratosphere, are actually far heavier than air, so that they tend to settle on the ground. Meaningful amounts of CFCs are destroyed there (Khalil & Rasmussen 1989). Thus the CFCs ecocatastrophe is but a myth. The production of these chemicals, has reached a peak of 1.1 million tons a year, containing 750,000 tons of chlorine. A part of this may



reach the stratosphere, carried by rising air currents, especially during storms and hurricanes, contributing to turning ozone into oxygen. However, each year 300 million tons of chlorine evaporate from the oceans, of which a certain amount also reaches the stratosphere, carried by the same vertical motion.

One more giant natural source of chlorine is given by volcanic eruptions: one historic event, that of Tambora, in the Indonesian island Sumbawa, in 1815, gave out 210 million tons of chlorine, largely thrown directly into the stratosphere by the violence of the volcano. Volcanoes on the planet are over 10,000, 96% under the sea, and a given percentage of all these volcanoes is erupting at any given time. Some, especially those formed by basaltic oceanic crust, are erupting continually. In the years in which no great eruptions take place, volcanoes let out from 11 to 36 million tons of chlorine. Is it conceivable that only man-made chlorine reaches the stratosphere, while the natural one, emitted in amounts hundreds of times greater, does not get there? Only in the tropics 44,000 storms a day take place, generating very strong convective currents which carry upwards huge amounts of gas (Gaspari, Rossi & Fiocchi 1991). Bearing in mind that most of sea evaporation takes place in the tropics, we can have a hint as to the order of magnitude of natural chlorine in comparison with the puny anthropogenic production.

But F.S. Woolard, called by Bronfman to chair the DuPont, has clearly expressed, in a speech to the Chamber of Commerce of London, a clear-cut refusal of the facts: "Too often we give importance to technical and scientific data rather than to what people want. We must learn to act differently" (cit. in Engdhal *et al.* 1991). Of course "what people want" is nothing else than what has been pounded into millions of heads by the ever present video controlled by the multinationals like the DuPont, and by "scientists" made suddenly sensitive to the threats of the CFCs by papery means which can be easily imagined. DuPont controlled the 25% of the world market of the CFCs and alogenated liquids, but until the patents that allowed the multinational to make big money had not yet expired, it defended them with all its might. In 1986, when the patents expired, the chemical giant suddenly "realized" their "hazard". All of a sudden the very convenient "discovery" by Farman and his co-workers popped up: the previous ones had strangely been passed over, there being no vested interest to turn them into a media "case".

Market competition for CFCs was on the in-

crease, especially by medium and small firms, which have always been the lifeblood of the economy, in terms of diffused development and job generation, and hoped to defy the multinationals. The environmentalist initiative of the "rescuers of the Earth" crowded out all these obnoxious competitors. The DuPont, the ICI, and a few other giants, can again control the market of the new HFCs of which they possess the patents and exclusive rights. But those who suffer more from these chicanery are just the poorer countries, where vast amounts of food are being lost every year for lack of refrigeration. Hundreds of millions of fridges might have been built in such countries using the cheap CFCs, whereas nowadays the programmes for the diffusion of refrigeration, which might have saved hundreds of millions of people from hunger and dangerous food intoxications, have been stopped on account of the exorbitant cost of the HFCs. In this, as in many other cases, the extreme danger of environmentalist campaigns, which go to the exclusive advantage of some financial sharks is quite plain. There is no danger of an unwarranted conspiracy theory: the names are well known.

A perspective of development for Europe

Contrary to the vested interest of environmentalists, the interests of Europe are totally opposed to the continuing dominion of the oil sheiks and the "seven sisters". A bold innovative choice is needed, including, as we have seen, besides the development of intrinsically secure nuclear energy, of the Transrapid magnetic levitation transport method. The latter was defined by Tietze, not without some justifiable enthusiasm, "the most significant innovation in land traffic from the invention of the wheel" (Tietze 1998, Tietze & Steinmann-Tietze 2001). The early experiments in the field of magnetic levitation go back to 1912, but the pionieer, the French Emile Bachelet, had to give up his attempts due to the exceedingly high energy consumption. The feasibility of a railway with no wheels and using magnetic fields along the rails to move the trains was demonstrated in 1935 by the German Hermann Kemper, who took a regular patent for it. The early working vehicles (Transrapid) were built between 1969 and 1972 in Germany. In 1989 the Transrapid 07 reached, on the experimental Emsland track, the speed of 435 kmh. Also the Japanese have entered the race, and have already built a few short working lines. In 1997 a magnetic levitation train established in Ja-



pan the world speed record on rails at 530 kmh.

The installation of 235 million Gigawatt of electronuclear power and the doubling of transport capacity of transport systems thanks to a high speed magnetic levitation rail lines make up the core of a development programme, outlined by Engdahl *et al.* (1991). This would benefit Europe greatly, turning its central part into an economic megalopolitan core of world significance, easily overcoming, among other things, the problem of high energy consumption by magnetic levitation rail lines: a classical case of linked innovations increasing the synergy of the economic system, as was the case of the relation between steam engines and textile machines in the First Industrial Revolution. The intrinsically secure nuclear power reactors might be a solution to the energy problem, if governments sufficiently determined could be found to oppose a strong political will and a suitable information campaign to the hysterical raving of most environmentalists, which explodes as soon as nuclear energy is mentioned. It is certainly true that traditional reactors are at risk of leaking radioactive gases, although it must be borne in mind that the only truly serious accident, that of Chernobyl, was caused by the obsolete structure of the station, devoid of a suitable cover, and by the idiotic management of the technicians, who were testing the cooling system to see up to what point the core would melt, till the core really melted.

Traditional nuclear reactors in the Western countries, are far better built than the Soviet ones, they have sturdy covers and sophisticated multiple control systems which have more than once prevented disasters. Even the Three Mile Island accident in Pennsylvania, the most serious ever to take place in the West, has had practically no consequences. The environmentalists' frenzies which put the nuclear reactor on the same footing as the atomic bomb are therefore utterly groundless, also because the nuclear fuel is quite different from the radioactive material used for warheads. Moreover a nuclear reactor can be supplied by a single cargo plane and needs no further fuel for ten years. On the contrary, a power station using coal, oil or gas, needs a steady inflow of supplies: the resupply of such a station allows therefore frequent bribes, while for a nuclear one the bribe can be got only once. This accounts quite well for the suspicious interest of politicians and high State official to demonize nuclear power and to favour other kinds of power production, more expensive for the tax-payers, but more lucrative for themselves. Besides, it is far from difficult to figure out what reactions are being stirred up by

the idea of a network of nuclear power stations such as to cut the use of oil down to size, at the archaic courts of sheiks and in the air-conditioned offices of the great oil companies, and what legal and illegal methods such power groups may put into the field to annihilate the nuclear option. There is therefore an extremely sturdy network of vested interests and superstitious hysteria seeking to bar the way to a rational solution of the energy problem.

Nevertheless, the hazard of traditional nuclear power stations, though remote, is a real one. It is therefore justified to do away, gradually, the extant nuclear reactors, but not to replace them with "clean" sources such as solar energy, wind or biomasses, which can be useful for integrative purposes but cannot replace fuels entirely. To supply a city with solar energy it would take a station as large as a city itself, without considering cloudy spells. Wind and biomasses are unreliable too if a steady energy production is sought. The solution, instead, can come from intrinsically secure nuclear reactors, sheltered from core melting hazards by the laws of physics. A new industrial revolution, based on intrinsically secure nuclear power, magnetic levitation, transgenic agriculture and the computer industry is possible, but against such an economic leap objections and obstacles of any kind are unleashed by powerful pressure groups linked to the oil and car industries. By producing cars upon cars, a crisis in the long run is inevitable. Mature technology and a largely stagnant market (at least in the developed world) are the two handicaps of the car industry, to which we could add urban air pollution and traffic congestion. New solutions must be found, so that a new constellation of highly innovative industries with wide market prospects may arise. But will environmentalist furies in the pay of oil tycoons allow it?

The need to defeat the reactionary interests of the enemies of innovation is therefore paramount, if we are to foster development and generate much needed jobs. This can only be achieved by means of a well organized information campaign. It must be made clear, once again, that while a rational protection of the environment is a healthy policy worth of support, people must be aware of the fact that the interested screams of extreme environmentalists are robbing them of their future prosperity.

References

- Campos Boralevi L. (ed.) (1980) *Jeremy Bentham, padre del femminismo*, Roma, Carucci.



- Engdahl E., Filipponi G., Gaspari A., Prinzi G., Rossi C., Schauerhammer R., Galliano Speri M. & Tennenbaum J. (1991) *Lo sviluppo dell'Europa ed il pericolo del movimento ambientalista*, Roma, Vita Nova.
- Farman J.C., Gardiner B.G. & Shanklin J.D. (1985) "Large losses of total ozone in Antarctica reveal seasonal ClO_x/NO_x interaction", *Nature*, 315: 207-210.
- Gaspari A., Rossi C. & Flocchi H.C. (1991) *L'imbroglio ecologico: non ci sono limiti allo sviluppo*, Roma, Vita Nova.
- Kanzawa H. & Kawaguchi S. (1990) "Large stratospheric sudden warming in Antarctic late winter and shallow ozone hole in 1988" *Geophysical Research Letter*, 17: 77.
- Khalil M.A.K. & Rasmussen R.A. (1989) "The potential of soils as a sink of chlorofluorocarbons and other man-made chlorocarbons" *Geophysical Research Letter*, 16: 679.
- Lenin V.I. (1916) *Imperializm, kak vyssaja stadija kapitalizma*, Petrograd, Parus.
- Lo Cascio E. (1991) "Forme dell'economia imperiale", in *Storia di Roma*, 2^o vol., "L'impero mediterraneo", 2^o tomo, "I principi e il mondo", ed. Momigliano A. & Schiavone A., Torino, Einaudi: 313-365.
- Lomborg B. (2001) *The skeptical environmentalist*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press.
- Malthus T.R. (1999) *Essay on population*, Oxford, Oxford University Press (orig. 1798).
- Sugden D.E. (1996) "The East Antarctic ice sheet: unstable ice or unstable ideas?", *Transactions of Institute of British Geographers*, 21, 3: 443-454.
- Tazieff H. (1991) *La Terre va-t-elle cesser de tourner?*, Paris, Presses Pocket.
- Tietze W. & Steinmann-Tietze M. (2001) "Tasks facing European transport policy in the 21st century", *Promet*, 2-3: 65-75.
- Tietze W. (ed.) (1998) *Transrapid-Verkehr in Europa*, Berlin - Stuttgart, Gebrüder Borntraeger.

