

## DEFINITION OF A GREEN

There is a misconception in our community that environmentalists and the Greens are the same, and the terms are often used interchangeably. Nothing could be further from the truth. Environmentalists are not Greens, and Greens are not Environmentalists. I admire environmentalists, but I distrust the Greens.

Environmentalists are people who have chosen to study and learn about the environment. Over time, they gain more experience, eventually becoming the experts in this field of study.

Their environmental discipline is investigated using scientific methods, and their findings are based on facts. They are engaged with the community providing it with expert information when required and elevate problems about our environment when they believe the community might want to solve them. They have empathy with the community and realise that at times other community problems may be more important than the problems involving the environment.

Most of us support and admire environmentalists, and consequently are happy to be seen as supporters of environmentalists.

In contrast, the Greens are followers of an ideology that they wish to impose on our society. This sometimes put them in conflict with environmentalists and they will not hesitate to sacrifice environmental goals if these threaten their ideological goals. Their focus is more about changing society than protecting the environment. An example might explain the difference I see.

Environmentalists became concerned with the health of trees and investigated this environmental problem. At the end of the investigation, they reported that there were 27 different ways that the health of trees was adversely affected. Because the environmentalists were primarily concerned with the health of trees, the 27 problems were ranked in order of the seriousness they had on the health of trees. Follow-on work could then concentrate on, say the top five problems, hoping to resolve the major problems affecting the health of trees.

Environmentalists probably noted that the seventeenth ranked problem was acid rain.

The Greens are not primarily concerned with trees at all, but with social engineering. To reach the Green's ideal lifestyle, society has to be returned back through both the information and industrial age stopping about two thirds the way into the agricultural age, where life will be based on a self-sufficient village economic model.

To achieve movement in this direction, the vestiges of the industrial age have to be vilified and, if possible, reversed. Their measure of success is the impact they have on society driving them back towards their ideal world. Consequently, the

Greens would have looked at the 27 problems affecting the health of trees and chosen one of the problems that could be tied to industrialisation, and with the help of a fear campaign have its priority elevated in the community and acted upon eventually achieving the Green's own covert goals. "This is a wacky idea" you might say!

About a decade ago, I was intrigued to see the high regard that the Greens still held for both Rachel Carson and Paul Ehrlich, yet their work could not be considered as anything else but a gigantic flop. Carson has nearly been deified and is considered the founder of the Green Movement. I could not imagine a physicist who predicted that apples would not fall to the ground but fly up into the sky being treated the same way once his prediction turned out to be laughably wrong.

Why is Carson, and many other Greens, held in such high esteem when their predictions failed so miserably?

I found I was using an environmentalist's, not a Green's, measure of success. I was measuring success as a measure of the number of birds or trees saved by the applicable Green initiative. That was never the goal of the Greens, and their measure of success was how much influence or impact they had on our society. How much did they move our society down the Green's path towards their ideal world?

Looked at in this light, these foundation members of the Green movement were the first to influence governments and society, resulting in movement towards the Green's goal. Some would say not much movement, but it was the first step, and is still recognised by the Greens as a wonderful success, not a miserable flop.

Patrick Moore was one of a handful of people who created the "Greenpeace" organisation. Later, he helped it to go global and served for six years as a Director of "Greenpeace International". The words of Patrick Moore in the Wall Street Journal Article, 4 Aug 08, explaining why he left Greenpeace International epitomises why I now differentiate between "Greens" and "environmentalists".

*"At first, many of the causes we championed, such as opposition to nuclear testing and protection of whales, stemmed from our scientific knowledge of nuclear physics and marine biology. But after six years as one of five directors of Greenpeace International, I observed that none of my fellow directors had any formal science education. They were either political activists or environmental entrepreneurs. Ultimately, a trend towards abandoning scientific objectivity in favour of political agendas forced me to leave Greenpeace in 1986.*

*The breaking point was a Greenpeace decision to support a worldwide ban on chlorine. Science shows that adding chlorine to drinking water was the biggest advance in the history of public health, virtually eradicating water-borne diseases such as cholera. Despite science concluding no known health risks and ample benefits from*

*chlorine in drinking water, Greenpeace and other environmental groups have opposed its use for more than 20 years.*

*Sadly, Greenpeace has evolved into an organisation of extremism and politically motivated agendas. Its anti-chlorination campaign failed, only to be followed by a campaign against polyvinyl chloride”*

I believe Moore is an environmentalist, whereas the remaining directors of Greenpeace appear to be Greens.

## **THE STING IN THE ARMAGEDDON TALE**

The Greens achieve their goals by ‘selling’ us Armageddon tales. The people who spread any Armageddon tale have an agenda that is often hidden. There is always a mild form of blackmail attached to each tale.

The man with the sign around his neck saying the “The World will end on Tuesday” is not providing a community service by telling us:

*“Go home pat your spouse on the head, kiss your dog, beat your children for the last time, pay your bills and wait for the lights to go out on Tuesday”.*

No, he was about to start controlling our lives.

*“Join us and you will be saved. However, you must do what our leader tells you, you must follow our lifestyle etc. etc.”*

So, what is the Green agenda attached to the global warming tale. In short it has nothing to do with the environment. Some examples, from dozens, explains this.

### **Sir John Houghton**

Houghton and Bolin were the co-chair of the newly created UN’s Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC) in 1988. On winding up a meeting celebrating the creation of the IPCC, Houghton made the following comments:

*“We have just created a UN body that will monopolise all the information about global warming given to every country in the World. With the new global warming campaign backed by the UN’s IPCC, we now have our best chance of redistributing wealth from the rich countries to the poor countries.”*

### **Canada’s Environment Minister – Christine Stewart**

Believing she was talking to newspaper reporters and their editors “off the record” stated:

*“No matter that the science of global warming is all phony ....climate change [provides] the greatest opportunity to bring about justice and equality in the world”*

Reported by Terence Corcoran, "Global Warming: The Real Agenda", *Financial Post*, 26 December 1

## Al Gore

When Al Gore was told that there were some geo-engineers who believed they could cool the planet and save the human race, Al Gore was appalled.

*"No, we don't want a technical fix, we need global warming so we can force people to live a lifestyle that we believe in."*

## Green Candidate 2007 Federal Election

Professor Clive Hamilton was a Green candidate in the 2007 Australian Federal election. Not realising that as a politician you should avoid telling the truth, this candidate gave voters the following advice.

*"You should realise that if the Greens gain power, they will get rid of our present democracy and set up a one-party state. In addition, you should prepare yourself to lose 85% of your personal freedoms."*

He then went off script and railed against women shopping – promising he would stop them shopping once he was elected.

## Executive Secretary of the UN Framework Convention on Climate Change of (UNFCCC)

On two visits to Sydney, Christiana Figueres head of UNFCCC being interviewed by the press, stated:

*"We can no longer afford to have democracies. We must set up one party (authoritarian) governments that are based on the Chinese style of government."*

## IPCC Report

When you read some excerpts from the IPCC reports you gain an understanding that global warming is being used to justify the acceptance of the Green's ideal lifestyle, rather than one of solving the problems caused by global warming. The IPCC

*"finds" we should reorient our individual lifestyles away from consumption. We should focus on sharing assets, choose free time rather than working on for wealth, choose quality rather than quantity, and increase freedom while containing consumption. Reduce our dependence on transport by setting up regional economies, replacing international air travel and heavy road transport with sailing ships and bicycles."*

Lomborg, Bjorn, *Cool It*, Alfred A. Knopf, New York, 2007, pp.140-141, Quoting IPCC's report 2001.

Most might be confused by such a **"finding"** by a committee investigating problems caused by the weather. However, you still might smile when we are told

that we should “give up work and increase freedom” and this will defeat climate Armageddon.

The IPCC acknowledge (ibid) that the *“conditions of public acceptance of such options are not often present at the requisite large scale”*. They suggest that we don’t **yet** accept this lifestyle solely because we have been indoctrinated by the media.

You guessed it, they then suggest the media ***should be used to reindoctrinate us so we accept their vision for our lives*** (these are my words in bold italics that have come to mind when reading the IPCC words ; **“raising awareness amongst media professionals... to encourage a wider cultural shift”**).

Here we have an unelected UN Panel, not only deciding how we should live in the future, but one already planning how to use the media to reindoctrinate us - thank you very much. Remember man is “wicked” – their words - and redemption can only be achieved by adopting this new lifestyle. Talk about Orwell’s book “1984”! This is all being carried out under the guise of “global warming”. You may now understand why I refer to the UN IPCC as a Green dominated panel.

## CONCLUSION

Think about what you have just read in the last section. Did you hear lots about “Some of the greatest environmental problems we face today”, for instance:

- The planet is doomed - save the planet,
- The human race will become extinct by the year 2000,
- Our children will see lakes boil and forest self-combust, and
- Catastrophic sea level rises and weather events

No. We didn’t hear anything about environmental issues – what we heard was social engineering goals from people who want to control our lives. They achieve these ends by hiding behind the ‘skirts’ of environmentalism and science, giving both nothing more than ‘lip service’, while running scare campaigns.

Take care it is easy to be deceived and misled by the people who “sell” us Armageddon stories. Remember in the past 4,000 years no Armageddon story has ever come true.