



Written by [William F. Jasper](#) on July 2, 2001

## Environmental Genocide

A brutal mass murderer is stalking the planet. Each year he kills millions and leaves millions more injured. Incredibly, while expressing concern over his carnage, the United Nations — with the help of the U.S. government — has given him a free pass to keep up his deadly rampage.

The killer's name is malaria, and the United Nations Convention on Persistent Organic Pollutants (known as the POP Convention) will give this murderous plague permanent protected status. The UN POP Convention, signed by representatives of more than 100 nations in Stockholm on May 23, is heralded by the radical eco-lobby and the media as a tremendous boon for humankind and the planet. Yet, the POP treaty is, in truth, a global death warrant for millions — and, potentially, hundreds of millions — of human beings.



“Malaria, which had been eliminated or effectively suppressed in many parts of the world, is undergoing a resurgence,” warned the Institute of Medicine of the National Academy of Sciences in 1996. “It is a public health problem today in more than 90 countries inhabited by some 2,400 million people — 40 percent of the world's population. Malaria is estimated to cause up to 500 million clinical cases and 2.7 million deaths each year. Every 30 seconds, a child somewhere dies of malaria. The global effects of the disease threaten public health and productivity on a broad scale and impede the progress of many countries toward democracy and prosperity.”

“The human dimensions of malaria are staggering. It is, by far, the most devastating and deadly parasitic disease in the world,” notes the Malaria Foundation International (MFI), one of the world's leading anti-malaria organizations. Or as Dr. Wenceslaus Kilama, chairman of MFI, has stated, the current malaria epidemic “is like loading up seven Boeing 747 airliners each day, then deliberately crashing them into Mt. Kilimanjaro.”

### Unnecessary Deaths

The most staggering aspect of malaria's horrendous death toll, however, is the fact that most of these deaths are unnecessary. Millions of lives could be saved and the suffering of hundreds of millions prevented for relatively small cost — and with “old” technology. That technology is DDT (dichlorodiphenyltrichlorethane), a pesticide that has proven to be a veritable godsend to mankind, even as it has been subjected to a campaign of vilification over the past four decades.

Dr. Roger Bate, a director of Africa Fighting Malaria, a South African non-governmental organization, reminds us that the heroic malaria-eradication program following World War II used DDT as its primary



Written by [William F. Jasper](#) on July 2, 2001

---

weapon. “This program succeeded in North America and southern Europe, and greatly reduced incidence in many other countries,” says Dr. Bate. “Spraying DDT in houses and on mosquito breeding grounds was the primary reason that rates of malaria around the world declined dramatically after the Second World War,” Dr. Bate notes in his study, *When Politics Kills: Malaria and the DDT Story*, published by the Competitive Enterprise Institute. “Nearly one million Indians died from malaria in 1945, but DDT spraying reduced this to a few thousand by 1960. However, concerns about the environmental harm of DDT led to a decline in spraying, and likewise, a resurgence of malaria. Today there are once again millions of cases of malaria in India, and over 300 million cases worldwide — most in sub-Saharan Africa. Cases of malaria in South Africa have risen by over 1,000 percent in the past five years. Only those countries that have continued to use DDT, such as Ecuador, have contained or reduced malaria.”

The MFI reports that, owing to Sri Lanka’s use of DDT in a mosquito abatement program, “in only 8 years, Sri Lanka went from a million cases of malaria a year to only seventeen.” When the DDT spraying was stopped, however, “malaria rebounded to nearly a million cases a year” within a decade.

Dr. Bate Records Similar Results in Africa:

Not long after DDT was removed from malaria control in South Africa in 1996, disease rates rocketed, particularly in northern KwaZulu Natal. A serious problem was that *Anopheles funestus* mosquitoes developed resistance to synthetic pyrethroids — the main alternative to DDT — making the switch an expensive and futile exercise. According to Rajendra Maharaj, head of vector control at the South African department of health, it is unlikely that [*Anopheles*] *funestus* would ever have returned had DDT remained in use.

One need only compare malaria rates in South Africa, Swaziland, and Mozambique to see the effect of banning DDT. Swaziland never halted DDT spraying and infection rates range between 2 and 4 per cent. A short distance over the border in South Africa, infection rates average about 40 per cent. In Mozambique, infection rates are over 80 per cent, owing in part to the collapse of the malaria control program during that country’s war ... DDT is now back in use in KwaZulu Natal and according to Jotham Mthembu, head of the malaria control program at Jozini in KZN, conditions have improved.

DDT was developed by Dr. Paul Hermann Müller, a Swiss chemist who received the Nobel Prize in Medicine in 1948 in recognition of the enormous medical importance of this remarkable chemical substance. Though widely used for only three decades, DDT has been justifiably credited with preventing more human deaths by disease than any chemical ever concocted.

Yet, the government of the United States has joined forces with environmental organizations and the United Nations to deny this important life-saving tool to those who most desperately need it. The UN POP Convention has targeted 12 chemicals that it has dubbed “The Dirty Dozen” for elimination or severe restriction. While not scheduled for outright elimination (at least not yet), the POP restrictions on DDT will render it too costly and inaccessible to those countries in most serious need.

### **Backing From Bush**

If a Clinton or Gore administration had announced its intent to sign the POP Convention, one could be sure of an avalanche of furious denunciations from the loyal opposition. GOP congressmen and conservative commentators would have scorched the Oval Office for “green extremism” and environmental genocide. Al Gore’s embarrassingly ridiculous 1992 ecological manifesto, *Earth in the*



Written by [William F. Jasper](#) on July 2, 2001

---

*Balance*, would have been dredged up once more for rhetorical target practice.

Nevertheless, while the presidential remarks emanating from the White House Rose Garden on April 19 sounded like a rip-and-read from Gore's infamous book, the words were coming out of the mouth of George W. Bush. Flanked by Secretary of State Colin Powell and EPA Administrator Christine Todd Whitman, to underscore the importance of his announcement, President Bush proclaimed:

"Negotiations were begun by the previous administration, and this treaty achieves a goal shared by this administration. I am pleased to announce my support for the [POP] treaty and the intention of our government to sign and submit it for approval by the United States Senate."

Adopting the vernacular of the radical environmentalists at Greenpeace and the Environmental Defense Fund, President Bush declared that "this international agreement would restrict the use of 12 dangerous chemicals — POPs, as they are known, or the Dirty Dozen."

The Republican president went on to proclaim that "concerns over the hazards of PCBs, DDT, and the other toxic chemicals covered by the agreement are based on solid scientific information. These pollutants are linked to developmental defects, cancer, and other grave problems in humans and animals. The risks are great, and the need for action is clear. We must work to eliminate, or at least to severely restrict the release of these toxins without delay."

Citing the POP treaty as a wondrous "bipartisan" victory, Bush announced that "now a Republican administration will continue and complete the work of a Democratic administration. This is the way environmental policy should work."

Unfortunately, this is the way environmental policy does work amongst our bipartisan globalists in Washington. This seeming Republican reversal on the POP treaty should not have surprised anyone. As James M. Lindsay of the Brookings Institution pointed out last fall during the closing weeks of the Bush-Gore election race, "both Al Gore and George W. Bush are internationalists by inclination." Lindsay made that significant observation in the September/October 2000 issue of *Foreign Affairs*, which *Time* magazine has called "the most influential periodical in print." This influence derives from the fact that *Foreign Affairs* is the flagship journal of the Council on Foreign Relations (CFR), the central brain trust of the organized one-world internationalists.

In the globalspeak well understood by *Foreign Affairs* readers, Lindsay was assuring Council members that, rhetoric notwithstanding, George W. could be counted on reliably to continue the same one-world agenda of empowering the United Nations that they would expect of Al Gore. For those internationalists who had any doubts, all concerns surely melted away when they saw the Bush administration take form; dozens of Cabinet members and top-level appointees were drawn from the usual CFR stable.

The POP Convention also bears the CFR's fingerprints. Contrary to popular lore, this UN treaty was not conceived, developed, and nurtured to fruition by the UN; that world body's pampered diplomats and bureaucrats merely served as midwives in the final delivery. The real progenitors of the deadly POP scheme include a sizable contingent of the CFR intelligentsia operating, over the last four decades, in a coordinated fashion, in such power centers as the State Department, the Environmental Protection Agency, Brookings, the Carnegie Endowment, the Trilateral Commission, the World Resources Institute, the Worldwatch Institute, the Environmental Defense Fund, the Sierra Club, Planned Parenthood, the Gorbachev Foundation, the Club of Rome, etc.

The main attack on DDT was launched by the Environmental Defense Fund (EDF) with massive promotion courtesy of the CFR media cartel and funding from the CFR-dominated tax-exempt



Written by [William F. Jasper](#) on July 2, 2001

---

foundations. The Sierra Club boasts on its website that the POP treaty triumphed “thanks to the Sierra Club and over 300 other environmental and social justice organizations from around the world working in coordination under the umbrella International POPs Elimination Network (IPEN).” Like the EDF and Sierra Club, virtually all of these groups are beholden to the same media and foundation insiders for funding and promotion.

The same Sierra Club webpage notes that the POP treaty grew out of several earlier agreements spawned at the 1992 UN Earth Summit in Rio de Janeiro, particularly the UN’s eco-manifesto for total regimentation of the entire planet, known as Agenda 21. The secretary-general of the Earth Summit was Maurice Strong, who said, prior to that event, that the global agenda in Rio would be guided by a report of the Trilateral Commission entitled “Beyond Interdependence: The Meshing of the World’s Economy and the Earth’s Ecology.” “I have been privileged to work closely with the principal author, Jim MacNeill, for over two decades,” Strong wrote in the introduction to that report, noting that MacNeill “is now advising me on the road to Rio” concerning “decisions that will literally determine the fate of the earth.” Writing the foreword to that same study was none other than David Rockefeller, longtime chairman and guiding light of both the CFR and Trilateral Commission.

Thus, the sudden embrace of the POP treaty by the CFR-laden Bush administration should not have surprised any readers of *The New American*. As William Norman Grigg noted in a joint profile of George W. Bush and Al Gore prior to last November’s election outcome (see “Tweedledee or Tweedledum?” in our December 4, 2000 issue), in the controlled Republican-Democrat dialectical scheme, “the general division of labor is this: Democrats initiate, Republicans consolidate.” The POP flip-flop is but one of many actions that have vindicated Grigg’s analysis. In the environmental field alone, Bush has ratified radical and destructive Clinton programs on wetlands, timber, roadless areas, and water use; all of which point darkly to an eventual Bush reversal on “global warming” and an embrace of the UN’s dangerous Kyoto Protocol.

### **The Drive for Depopulation**

Given the life-and-death stakes involved in the DDT-malaria conflict, questions naturally arise: Don’t the POP champions realize the deadly consequences of their actions? Don’t they know that millions of people will die as a result of enforcement of the POP restrictions? Obviously, many of the pedestrian-level “environmentalists” do not; many of these well-meaning do-gooders would be shocked if the real nature and effects of this treaty were explained to them. However, the CFR insiders who spawn and promote these global enviro-schemes know full well the lethal measure of their proposals. These organized globalists have been fully apprised by eminent scientists and learned societies of the terrible cost in lives, suffering, and dollars that will result from their policies, and they have proceeded apace nonetheless. They know that President Bush’s claim that the POP agreement is “based on solid scientific information” is ludicrous; they know it is based on junk science and deadly deception.

What’s more, we can logically surmise that many of these one-world elitists are culpable of actually intending the terrible outcome that enforcement of the POP treaty will surely bring: the condemnation of fellow human beings to death by depriving them of the readily available means of protecting themselves. We can make this surmise because they have told us so in their own self-indicting speeches and writings.

During the debates over DDT in the late 1960s, Dr. Charles Wurster, chief scientist for the radical Environmental Defense Fund (EDF), responded to a reporter’s question about DDT’s life-saving potential by saying there are too many people on the planet already. Banning DDT, he said, “is as good



Written by [William F. Jasper](#) on July 2, 2001

---

a way to get rid of them as any.” “Them” refers to all of the millions of hapless victims — primarily in developing countries — whom people like Wurster view as excess baggage. “Them” includes “all those little brown people in poor countries,” as fellow depopulationist Dr. Van den Bosch of the University of California so indelicately phrased it.

But it’s not only Third World “brown people” who are targeted for elimination. During a 1971 House Committee on Agriculture hearing on DDT, Representative John Rarick revealed this quote by Dr. Wurster, whose EDF has been lavishly funded for decades by the CFR-dominated tax exempt foundations: “It really doesn’t make a lot of difference because the organophosphate [pesticide] acts locally and only kills farm workers, and most of them are Mexicans and Negroes.”

If you do not fit that racial profile, don’t imagine that you have been neglected by the one-world eugenicists. Friends of the Earth founder David Brower, another radical environmentalist long favored by the CFR establishment, has targeted you too. In his *Earth Day — The Beginning*, a “survival guide” published in 1970, Brower declared: “That’s the first thing to do — start controlling the population in affluent white America, where a child born to a white American will use about fifty times the resources of a child born in the black ghetto.” Brower also proclaimed: “Childbearing [should be] a punishable crime against society, unless the parents hold a government license.... All potential parents [should be] required to use contraceptive chemicals, the government issuing antidotes to citizens chosen for childbearing.”

One of the most chilling admissions of deadly intent came from the lips of the late Jacques Cousteau, the sainted environmental icon. In an interview with the *UNESCO Courier* for November 1991 the famed oceanographer said:

The damage people cause to the planet is a function of demographics — it is equal to the degree of development. One American burdens the earth much more than twenty Bangladeshes. The damage is directly linked to consumption. Our society is turning toward more and needless consumption. It is a vicious circle that I compare to cancer....

This is a terrible thing to say. In order to stabilize world population, we must eliminate 350,000 people per day. It is a horrible thing to say, but it’s just as bad not to say it.

Later, just before the Earth Summit, Cousteau told Jean Daniel, senior editor of the French weekly *Nouvelle Observateur*: “More and more people are willing to use the atomic bomb if the situation arises that one billion people are migrating toward the West.” Cousteau didn’t explicitly say that he would be willing to use the bomb, but the inference was that such drastic measures may be not only justified, but possibly essential, to attain “sustainable” world population levels.

Unfortunately, the extremist views of Brower, Wurster, Cousteau, and company are completely at one with the internationalist elite who fund them and populate the upper echelons of the CFR network of power. Consider Maurice Strong, for instance, billionaire honcho at the World Economic Forum and the Club of Rome and secretary-general of the UN Earth Summit. It was Strong who welcomed Cousteau, Gorbachev, and Castro to Rio and elevated them to demigod status in the UN’s green pantheon. At the Earth Summit, Strong deplored the world’s “explosive increase in population,” and warned, “We have been the most successful species ever; we are now a species out of control.” He thundered: “Population must be stabilized, and rapidly.”

Just prior to the UN Earth Summit, the Club of Rome, in which Strong has been a prime mover, had issued its startling report, *The First Global Revolution*. That report declared: “In searching for a new



Written by [William F. Jasper](#) on July 2, 2001

---

enemy to unite us, we came up with the idea that pollution, the threat of global warming, water shortages, famine and the like would fit the bill.... All these dangers are caused by human intervention.... The real enemy, then, is humanity itself.”

This was the same theme espoused by Cornell University Professor David Pimentel in his 1994 address to the American Association for the Advancement of Science, in which he posited that the number of human beings on our planet is nearly triple what it should be. According to Pimentel’s calculations, world population should be reduced to somewhere between one billion to two billion people.

Philosopher/author Sam Keen has gone even further. Addressing Mikhail Gorbachev’s 1995 State of the World Forum (a top nongovernmental organization at the UN), Keen decried the “population explosion” and said: “We must speak far more clearly about sexuality, about contraception, about abortion, about the values that control the population, because the ecological crisis, in short, is the population crisis. Cut the [world’s] population by 90 percent and there aren’t enough people left to do a great deal of ecological damage.”

Not to be outdone, Ted Turner, the CNN-Time-Warner mogul, would like to get rid of an even larger chunk of humanity “Right now, there are just way too many people on the planet,” Turner said, in an *Audubon* magazine interview. What did this great humanitarian think might be the optimal population level for the entire planet? Not more than “250 million to 350 million people,” said Ted.

The POP Convention is merely an opening round in the UN’s war against that great “enemy,” humanity. Even malaria will not be sufficiently lethal to satisfy the depopulation goals of the globalists. More murderous measures will surely follow, unless we act first to “Get US out! — of the United Nations.”



## Subscribe to the New American

Get exclusive digital access to the most informative, non-partisan truthful news source for patriotic Americans!

Discover a refreshing blend of time-honored values, principles and insightful perspectives within the pages of "The New American" magazine. Delve into a world where tradition is the foundation, and exploration knows no bounds.

From politics and finance to foreign affairs, environment, culture, and technology, we bring you an unparalleled array of topics that matter most.



[Subscribe](#)

### What's Included?

- 24 Issues Per Year
- Optional Print Edition
- Digital Edition Access
- Exclusive Subscriber Content
- Audio provided for all articles
- Unlimited access to past issues
- Coming Soon! Ad FREE
- 60-Day money back guarantee!
- Cancel anytime.