

The Climate Change Dogma: Five Minutes Before Midnight?

Editor's Note: This paper was submitted for publication prior to the Copenhagen Climate Summit in late 2009. Nevertheless, it remains relevant as an historical discourse on the subject of Climate Change.

Dr John S Potter*

In a previous paper (Potter, 2009) I presented evidence that the scientific proclamations of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC) are fallacious. I further reported how this led me to look behind the IPCC rhetoric, to discover that the Climate Change Dogma has been contrived by an economic elitist group who hold to the ideological presumption that the current human population is unsustainable. In this paper I wish to look a little closer at the motivation behind the actions of this group and to consider some of the implications and predictable outcomes of their position.

ORIGINS

Giovanni Maria Ortes

It is always difficult to be dogmatic about origins in the case of ideas but there is general agreement that the population control concept began with the Venetian Giammaria Ortes (1713-1790)¹. This composer, mathematician, monk and philosopher is seen as 'one of the most influential ideologues of the Venetian oligarchy in its final phase' (Tarpley, 1994). His published works culminated with his "Reflections on the Population of Nations in Relation to the Natural Economy" published in 1790.

Ortes's views were controversial. Tarpley declares him 'a charlatan, a mountebank, a defrocked Camaldolese monk and libertine' (op cit). He was born in a time when the once powerful Republic of Venice was in a state of almost total impotence; a time when the remaining families of influence in Venice developed a paranoid determination to concentrate their operations and wealth into a single line – usually the last born son. Older sons were given free housing and moderate stipends as long as they remained celibate; they constituted an impoverished nobility, referred to collectively as the *barnabotti*. Most girls, having no prospect of marriage went into religious orders. In the 16th Century, 51% of the Venetian upper class remained unmarried, and this number grew to 66% in the late 18th Century. Venetians, including Ortes, became increasingly critical of Western civilization,

religion and foreign trade. Ortes never studied the impact of population empirically; his ideas reflected a moribund Venice establishment a few years before its end.

Ortes believed that 200 citizens per square mile was the ideal population in consideration of both human welfare and the environment. He noted that Italy, Holland, some German States and Switzerland had already reached this level in his time while Spain, France, the UK, Prussia, Austria and Poland with a mean population of 72 per square mile had some space to grow. His mathematical calculation was that the maximum number of people that could be sustained on planet Earth was 3 billion.

The British East India Company

The late 18th Century saw a crucial metastasis of Venetian power and thought from Venice to London. The United Kingdom had recently suffered a major set-back – defeat in the American War of Independence (1775-1783) and the loss of a major colony. Funds were urgently needed to promulgate a new British Empire so the time was right for Venetian money to spawn the British East India Company and for British philosophers like Thomas Malthus, Jeremy Bentham, James Mills and John Stuart Mills to begin 'slavishly plagiarizing their Venetian original', Giammaria Ortes. Malthus, an employee of the British East India Company's College in Hertfordshire, published his famous *Essay* soon after Ortes's death. Abraham Lincoln's economic adviser, Henry Carey, described the British East India Company as 'the greatest private monopoly in human history, inventing the lie of over-population to cover the devastating effects of its international system of free trade'².

To define the context a little further, it is worth remembering that the British East India Company made substantial profit by supporting the slave trade to the Americas. William Wilberforce began his opposition to the slave trade in 1797, one year before Malthus published his essay. He was successful in seeing the Slave Trade Act passed in 1807 but persistent opposition from the merchant class saw the passing of the Slavery Abolition Act in the English Parliament delayed until 1833.

A few years later, these same merchants were instrumental in turning an incidence of potato blight in Ireland into the *An Gorta Mór* (The Great Hunger) of 1845-1852. One million people died and one million only survived because they emigrated to the USA and Australia. Christine Kinealy (1995) assures us that these 'consequences were neither inevitable nor unavoidable'. She sees the fact that British merchants continued to export food from Ireland at the time of the famine as

evidence that the British were 'using (the famine) as an opportunity to facilitate long desired changes within Ireland, including population control'. Dennis Clark (1982) sees the Irish Famine as 'an epic of English cruelty' and Boyle (1996) sees the British government 'clearly pursuing a policy of mass starvation in Ireland'. Curtis in his book *Apes and Angels: The Irishman in Victorian Caricature* identifies the justification for such action as social Darwinism. For a colloquial account see the book *Brendan Behan's Ireland*.

As mentioned previously, we note that Charles Darwin drew his notion of the survival of the fittest from Malthus (Potter, op cit). He published his book *On the Origin of Species by Means of Natural Selection, or the Preservation of Favoured Races in the Struggle for Life* in 1859 (Darwin, 1859). In arguing that it was a principle of nature that only the fittest would survive, he opened the door for the human population to be considered 'a herd to be controlled by an elite, who would cull its ranks or just plain kill entire races, including the lower orders of white society' in order to advance the cause of human development (Anon, *The New Citizen*, 2009). That this led to the indiscriminate slaughter of dark skinned people around the world over the next 100 years is evident. It also led to Nietzsche's Superman and his *Beyond Good and Evil* (Nietzsche, 1886), which in turn encouraged Hitler to argue with pure Malthusian zeal that:

"Providence has endowed living creatures with a limitless fecundity; but she has not put in their reach, without the need for effort on their part, all the food they need. All that is right and proper, for it is the struggle for existence that produces the selection of the fittest" (Trevor-Roper, 2000).

Sad to say in our time, despite that fact that Hitler's principle of Aryan supremacy is supposed to have been put behind us, there are still scientists comparing the thickness of human skulls, hoping to make the point that white skinned people are superior to their dark skinned cousins.

In arguing for natural selection, Darwin and his cohorts Thomas Huxley and Francis Galton effectively introduced the science of eugenics. The notion was widely embraced by the British establishment in the late 19th Century and led to the rapid spread of the British Empire, the reasoning being that providence had ordained the British, with their superior intellectual power, to rule over the world and bring it into order. In fact, the British Empire was just a continuance of Ortes's free-trade option. The callous imposition of British influence in South Africa is a case in point. In 1806 the British took over the Cape Colony without so much

as a please and thank you; and in 1899-1901 they took over the gold fields of the Transvaal, arguing that the Dutch settlers were not managing the mines correctly!

Thanks to Hitler, the term eugenics was unpopular after World War II so Julian Huxley, one time president of the British Eugenics Society, repackaged it as 'environmentalism'. In his books *Man in the Modern World*, Huxley demonstrated that the Malthusian project was alive and well in Britain:

"The lowest classes are reproducing too fast. Therefore they must not have easy access to relief or hospital treatment lest the removal of the last check on natural selection should make it too easy for children to be produced or to survive; long unemployment should be the ground for sterilisation' (Huxley, 1947).

Huxley was the co-founder of the World Wild Life Fund (WWF) along with Britain's Prince Philip and Prince Bernhard of the Netherland. Backed by the resources of Royal Dutch Shell, BP, RTZ and Unilever the WWF 'spawned a whole panoply of green organizations world wide, including the Australian Conservation Foundation of which Prince Philip was president from 1971-1976' (Anon, *The New Citizen*, 2009). Prince Philip has made his intentions clear: 'In the event that I am reincarnated, I would like to return as a deadly virus, in order to contribute something to solve over-population' (*Deutsche Presse-Agentur*, August 1988). Along with St Augustine, we may only marvel at the power of an idea!

In the light of the above, we see that the Climate Change Dogma is just the latest extension of the Malthusian position. And this is confirmed by the fact that it was Huxley's associate, Crispin Tickell, who as British Ambassador to the UN (1987-1990) was responsible for the establishment of the IPCC in 1989. An immensely influential person with two knighthoods and 24 honorary doctoral degrees³, Tickell presented his groundbreaking *Climatic Change and World Affairs* at Harvard in 1977; it was published by Pergamon Press in 1978. From 1990, Tickell headed the Washington DC Climate Institute, working with Al Gore to get the US Government to adopt the global warming scam. Britain's latest 'high priest' of climate change, Lord Nicholas Stern is Tickell's protégé. A one time advisor to Margaret Thatcher, it was Tickell who coined the phrase "Mankind is a disease". He was joined in this belief by people like Lord Bertrand Russell, Prince Philip, the Club of Rome, Maurice Strong, Jacques Cousteau and the radical Australian environmentalist, Dr John Reid. These facts leave

no doubt that to be a climate change dogmatist is to be a genocidalist. As Jaques Cousteau said in 1977:

'In order to stabilise world population, we must eliminate 350 000 people per day. That is a terrible thing to say but it is just as bad not to say it'⁴.

STRATEGY

In my previous paper (Potter, op cit) I outlined the Malthus recipe for reducing the population. He saw nature providing positive agencies like drought/famine, pestilence and disasters (cyclones, tornadoes and psunamis); war he saw as another 'positive influence'. Then there were preventative measures that could be promoted, e.g. delaying marriage, abortion, contraception, prostitution and celibacy. In our day we can add homosexuality and euthanasia, although the latter remains controversial. It is easy to see that the promotion of preventative measures by the neo-Malthusians since 1971 has been extremely effective in Western countries; less so amongst primal cultures although there have been rumours of deliberate attempts to introduce disease and to supply unsuitable pharmaceuticals to populations in the developing world. The latter reports have been difficult to substantiate but the rhetoric of the climate change dogmatists suggests that they are not beyond taking such actions.

In recent times the one-child per family policy in China stands out as the most deliberate attempt to control population. It has been unsuccessful in even holding the Chinese population level let alone reducing it, and it has precipitated some serious problems – see below.

The Climate Change Strategy is a superior strategy to all of the above in that it holds universal hope that the population can be reduced by significantly reducing food supplies. It also has the potential to radically change the way we do things, asking us to: (1) relinquish our prerogative to manage the world's resources; (2) recognize that we have no superior right to those resources than other creatures; and (3) to realize that our best hope for survival is to abandon development in favour of a return to pristine dependence on what nature provides.

Step 1 – Vilification of Carbon Dioxide

The first step in the Climate Change Strategy is to vilify the plant food carbon dioxide (CO₂). The Earth's atmosphere consists of nitrogen (78%), oxygen (21%) and a 1% of other gases including argon and carbon dioxide (Chang, 1984). Air is subject to gravity and is densest on the Earth's

surface; 50% of the atmosphere lies within 6km of the Earth's surface, 90% within 16km and 99% within 32km.

Atmospheric nitrogen is mainly inactive although in electrical storms some of it may be converted to nitrate (NO₃) and contribute to soil nitrogen levels when it is dissolved in rain. Oxygen is essential for life; it is breathed in by practically every living creature and breathed out by plants as a product of photo-synthesis.

Carbon dioxide levels in the atmosphere are presently about 385 ppm by volume, i.e. about 0.04%. CO₂ is a product of respiration; it is breathed out by most living creatures and taken in by plants to be used, along with water, to synthesize glucose – the main source of energy in living creatures. Plants cease producing glucose when the level of CO₂ in the atmosphere drops below 200ppm (Plimer 2009). Vegetable growers find that concentrations of CO₂ around 1000 ppm are ideal for the production of vegetables grown in glasshouses, the same level that submariners find best for their health (Plimer, op cit).

The atmosphere not only provides the oxygen we need to survive⁵ but has a moderating effect on air temperatures at the Earth's surface. Some of the energy that we derive from the Sun is reflected back into the atmosphere as heat; we are aware of this because every night the atmosphere cools. The size of the drop in temperature depends on the modifying effect of some gases in the air which absorb the reflected heat and prevent it escaping into the outer atmosphere. The chief of these is water vapour⁶, the concentration of which in the atmosphere varies considerably from day to day. The amount of water vapour in the air is expressed as the relative humidity (RH), i.e. the amount of water vapour present expressed as a percentage of the maximum amount of the water vapour that the atmosphere can hold⁷. When the RH is high heat absorption is high; when the atmosphere is dry there is greater cooling. This is confirmed in winter; frosts are common on nights when there is no cloud cover and night temperatures remain higher when there is ample cloud cover. This effect has been termed the 'Greenhouse Effect', although the operation is quite different from how a green house operates. To be a genuine green-house effect there would have to be a layer in the atmosphere that reflected energy downwards. Satellite temperature measurements indicate that no such layer exists⁸.

In addition to daily warming and cooling there are seasonal effects. When the sun is overhead in summer the temperature tends to be warmer than when the sun's rays are oblique in winter. But beyond that, temperature records show that there

are trends in mean temperatures the cause of which has opened the door for controversy. Most cosmic scientists agree that these variations in temperature are concomitant with Sun spot activity but since the late 19th Century there have been those who have argued that CO₂ may be a main cause of temperature variation, especially the CO₂ that is emitted by the burning fossil fuels – what in recent times has been called anthropogenic (man-made) CO₂.

The Swedish scientist Svante Arrhenius, drawing on the work of Joseph Fourier (1768-1830) was the first to publish such an account (Arrhenius, 1896). He drew on the Stefan-Boltzmann Law⁹ to propose a Greenhouse Law which can be stated thus: *If the quantity of carbonic acid increases in geometric progression, the augmentation of the temperature will increase nearly in arithmetic progression.* It is of interest that Arrhenius actually proposed this law to explain ice ages; unlike his modern counterparts, he saw warming as a positive change leading to better health and increased food production. However, it is also of interest that Arrhenius became a member of The Swedish Society for Racial Hygiene (Eugenics) in 1909 and was actively involved in the development in 1922 of The State Institute of Racial Biology in Uppsala, Sweden, the Institute responsible for providing a scientific basis for Compulsory Sterilization programs in such countries as Canada, the Czech Republic, Germany, Sweden and 27 States in the USA (commencing 1934). [Compulsory sterilization is not something we talk about these days but President Fujimori of Peru sterilized 200 000 mainly Indians in his time in office (1990-2000)¹⁰ and there are many countries in the world that still have compulsory sterilization statutes on their books]. The connection between the vilification of CO₂ and eugenics is well established in Arrhenius's work as is his connection with the Nobel Foundation. Arrhenius was a member of the Nobel Committees for Physics and Chemistry and himself received the Nobel Prize in 1903. On this account it is not surprisingly that Al Gore and the IPCC received the Nobel Prize jointly a century or so later for their success in promoting the Climate Change Dogma.

Al Gore in his Nobel Prize acceptance speech gave credit to Roger Revelle the oceanographer who with Hans Suess published a paper in 1957 claiming that the oceans were incapable of absorbing CO₂ quickly enough to prevent it becoming an influence on global warming - the *Revelle resistance* factor. In his later years, Revelle was head of the Harvard Centre for Population Studies (!); it was here that he influenced Al Gore. Revelle was not a rabid promoter of population reduction; he promoted the idea that education

would lead to better fed communities and a natural trend to fewer children. Al Gore has not pushed the population reduction concept publicly either; his interests seem to be more in line with making money. He is chairman of Generation Investment Management, a financial management group managing funds from pension groups, foundations, endowments and 'high net worth individuals' and a partner in Kleiner Perkins Caufield and Byers, a venture capital company in which Gore heads up the climate change solutions group. Needless to say Gore's involvements in these companies have made him extremely wealthy.

In the United Kingdom, as mentioned above, Crispin Tickell has been a main proponent of the climate change population reduction lobby. It was he who wrote Margaret Thatcher's 1988 speech on climate change and encouraged her to give funds to the British Council for environmental research. Baroness Thatcher was open to the global warming position because in 1984 she was involved in a massive battle with the National Union of (Coal) Miners and in 1988 she was keen to find a way of reducing the UK dependence on the oil rich nations. Crispin Tickell is currently Director of the James Martin 21st Century School at Oxford (formerly the Green College Centre for Environmental Policy and Understanding) despite the fact that he has no academic qualifications in environmentalism.

The vilification of CO₂ has proceeded despite the fact that there is *no empirical evidence* to support the claim¹¹. Firstly, the most accurate temperature readings taken from balloons and satellites show that the Earth is not warming; and there is no grounds for predicting that it will do so in the future. Secondly, the atmosphere does not behave as a greenhouse or even an insulating blanket; the energy balance in the atmosphere is the result of competing forces – evaporation, convection, precipitation and radiation. Arguments that CO₂ in the atmosphere acts as a greenhouse gas and results in global warming are sheer fantasy, promulgated in the first instance by people who have no scientific background and, in the second instance, by scientists who have prostituted their scientific integrity in order to keep their laboratories open. According to Plimer (op cit), the atmosphere contains a miniscule amount of carbon; 0.001% of the total carbon in the Earth's crust. In the light of the clear connection between the Climate Change Dogma and projects aimed at reducing the world's human population, it is clear that the vilification of CO₂ is nothing more than a frenetic scaremongering tactic of a group of people who have bypassed empirical reality to embrace an ideology that suits their agenda.

Step 2 - Emission Trading Schemes

Gaining the acceptance of the populace that some thing must be done to reduce global warming (or address Climate Change as it is now called seeing that the Earth's temperature has fallen since 2003) provides an opportunity for the State to take oversight and control over a whole gambit of activities that make up 21st Century life. The Kyoto Protocol, enacted in 1997, calls for nations to take action to reduce their 'greenhouse' gas emissions from the year 2005 and to work towards imposing emission limits on all industries for the period 2008-2011 via a mechanism, that has come to be called Cap-and-Trade (CAT). So far, the UK, the European Union (EU), Canada, Japan and Australia (in that order) are the only nations that have made a serious move towards implementing an emissions trading scheme (ETS). The results have been mixed.

In 2003 the EU announced its intention to implement an experimental CAT scheme in the period 2005-2007. The first step was to ask participating nations to establish National Allocation Plans (NAPs). To test the system, only heavy polluters (12 000 companies) were engaged in the first period; these contributed 45% of the total EU emissions in the year 2003. An emissions target was set for each individual company's operation and 'allowances', i.e. carbon credit certificates (CCs), were issued by each government to each company for the period under test. That is to say, an overall environmental cap on emissions was set and a set number of permits issued. The idea behind this was that companies had a choice: (1) reduce their emissions below the cap and sell-off excess allowances; or (2) buy CCs and continue to emit emissions at a level above the cap. The purpose behind this extra-ordinary arrangement was that it *put a price on carbon and opened the door for Carbon Trading*. One metric tonne of carbon was chosen as the unit of trading; it was anticipated that the unit trading price would be €20-€25/tonne of CO₂.

The EU scheme began with 15 participating nations. The prior existence of a UK scheme meant that the market traders were ready to trade Carbon Credits; in the first year, 362 million tonnes of CO₂ were traded for a sum of €7.2 billion. Futures and option trading were quickly built into the market and by April 2006 the unit price had reached €30. But some countries let it be known that they were likely to give their industries such generous caps that there was no need to take emission reduction seriously. The trading price fell to €10/unit in May 2006, €1.2/unit by May 2007, €0.10 in September 2007 and €0.03 by December of that year¹²! Further, when the results came in at the end of the

period (June 2007) it was shown that, of the 24 EU nations, only 11 had reduced their emissions and most of them by small amounts. Of the rest, emissions had risen by between 0.2% (Italy) to 28.5% (Finland). UK emissions rose by 5.8%. Overall, emissions in the EU rose by 2%. Thus, while the participating nations had lowered their emissions marginally, the trading of allowances had failed dismally after the first year's rake-off by the more experienced operators. Al Gore's Generation Investment Management Group did quite well we understand!

The second country to take action was Canada. The Canadian government gave a Notice of Intent in 2005. But a Canadian CAT scheme failed to materialize because by 2008 the Provinces had imposed their own carbon taxes and were threatening to join a CAT scheme being developed in some states of the USA. In the 3 years 2005-2008 Canadian emissions rose 25% with prospects of a further rise of 24% by 2011. Clearly CAT schemes are not as easy to manage as their designers have supposed. In Canada there is now a move on the part of the National Government to allow the Provinces to run CAT schemes and to introduce an *emissions intensity* system at Federal level whereby emission cuts will be measured against units of output. It seems that each level of government is going to work hard to ensure that they have access to the 'cash cow'!

The third nation to indicate that they were about to take action was Japan. A formal statement of intent was made in May 2008 but no action has been reported to date.

Finally, the Australian Government has taken action by calling for a report from Professor Ross Garnaut, a Nicholas Stern disciple. This led to the issuing of a Green Paper, a White Paper and the submission of a Carbon Pollution Reduction (CPRB) Bill to the Parliament in May 2009, together with 10 related Bills. The Bills were passed by the House of Representatives in May but defeated by the Senate in August 2009. The objectives of the CPRB are stated as follows¹³:

Object 1: To give effect to Australia's obligation to the Climate Change Convention and the Kyoto Protocols.

Object 2: To support the development of a Global response to Climate Change

Object 3: To reduce greenhouse gas emissions by 5-15% by the year 2020 and by 60% by 2050.

President Obama has indicated recently that the USA agrees with the implementation of a CAT

scheme in principle but the rest of the world is silent. CAT schemes are seen to be a means whereby the State can take greater control of economic affairs and provide market investors with another way to make money out of money.

The architects of CAT schemes are playing a cautious game at present. The first object is to get the basic Act in place. In particular, the question of whether rural food producers should be included in the scheme is being judiciously avoided by politicians, although cattle are being vilified every day on Australian TV because they emit methane (another so-called greenhouse gas) from both ends of their anatomy. The passing of the Act will allow the Malthusians to introduce all kinds of regulations that can be put in place without the Government having to face the Parliament. Clearly, if members of the general public knew what effect a CAT scheme is likely to have on the price of food, they might not be so keen to see the scheme implemented. Conversations with a cross section of the Australian community suggest that the older generation has a strong conviction that the whole business is a scientific non-event and a money-making scam. But this view is being challenged by members of a younger generation that have been indoctrinated with Climate Change mis-information throughout their school life; they have accepted the Climate Change Dogma with the same naivety as previous generations accepted the Darwin's theory of evolution. In between, are the hard working economically active people who are too busy making ends meet to ask questions about a subject over which they see they have no control.

But to ignore the threat may be a mistake. Professor Bob Carter¹⁴ has estimated that the cost of carbon sequestration, based on a price of \$30/tonne of CO₂ could be around \$3054 per annum for the average family. Ross Garnaut, on the other hand, has said that it will cost \$250/tonne to remove carbon dioxide for re-cycling or permanent sequestration; at that rate the expected cost per family would be \$22 455 per annum, all for a *possible* reduction in temperature of 0.0001°C! In addition, there would be hidden costs: (1) unemployment caused by replacing coal-fired power plants with wind power; (2) transitional costs, estimated to be 1% of GDP; (3) contributions to off-set losses experienced by developing countries, a further 1% of GDP (see below); and (4) the economic growth foregone – estimated by the Australian treasury to be 1.8% of GDP.

The most regrettable fact associated with the Australian Government's approach is their designation of CO₂, along with water the most important plant food on the planet, as a pollutant. This choice seems to have the potential to lead

human thought into a bizarre make believe world, an insanity from which we might not recover. The eugenic architects of the Climate Change Dogma have done their homework well.

The challenge for the developing world is that the Climate Change Dogma will exclude them from developing electricity services based on coal power. Further, all fossil fuel prices are set to rise and most developing countries are already paying more than Westerners for petrol and diesel. The attack on fossil fuels also necessarily impacts on international trade; I have mentioned previously how Kenyan vegetable growers have been disadvantaged by the global warming hype (Potter, op cit). Some nations in the Pacific see talk of rising sea levels opening up possibilities for more aid but they may be disappointed in this. There has been some excitement in Africa re the possibility that they may participate in Carbon Credit Payments but the collapse of the market in the EU suggests that they may be overly optimistic. It is hard to see any advantage for the developing world arising from a Greener world. As Bob Carter has said, we should be more concerned with seeing that the populace in the developing world has clean water and electricity than making sure that speculators have yet another way of making money without work.

Conclusions

Climate Change is a strategy developed by people who wish to depopulate the planet. We should resist the imposition of CAT schemes politically and at the same time make plans for off-setting the impact of inevitable food shortages that will result if the Malthusians have their way. The difficulties experienced by the EU and the Canadians in setting up CAT schemes are encouraging. Maybe our combined ingenuity at the individual level will be sufficient to win the day after all.

As this paper is being written, news comes of an extension to the carbon footprint – the introduction of a water footprint, i.e. a measure of how much water is needed to produce a unit of product. Early Dutch attempts to quantify water footprints show that agricultural products are very inefficient in water use, e.g. by their account it requires 3 500 litres of water to grow 1kg of beef. Some CSIRO scientists in Australia are re-calculating the figures using a less biased approach. It is to be hoped that their figures present a better picture, otherwise the Climate Change protagonists will have another strategy to cause us all to become vegetarians.

THE IMPACT OF REDUCING POPULATION

Returning to the real objective of the Climate Change mongers, population reduction, it is

interesting to review progress of the one child policy in China. China had a population of 565 million and a growth rate of 6.2% when they introduced a one child per family policy in 1979; the current population is 1.33 billion and the growth rate is 1.7%. So, while the rate of growth has fallen, the population of China is not getting less because life expectancy has lifted from 40 years in 1950 to 81 years in 2009¹⁵. We get a picture of this trend by looking at the ratio of 0-14 year olds to 60+ year olds:

HUMAN AGE GROUPS IN CHINA

	0-14 years	60+ years
1950:	36%	16%
2008:	7%	27%

These figures are overall figures; various ethnic groupings vary somewhat in their growth patterns. Since 1979, the predominant Han people have grown by 21%, Tibetans by 40% and the Manchu by 148%. By 2050 China is expected to have 1.45 billion people.

These statistics hide three important social problems being faced in China as a direct result of the one child policy. Firstly, because families prefer to have a son than a daughter and because abortion and infanticide continue to be practiced, there are now many more young men than young women of marriageable age in China. By some estimates the discrepancy is 32 million but a figure of 60 million has been quoted. The Population Reference Bureau¹⁵ sees the disparity varying with the ethnic grouping; the overall figure for China (male babies versus female babies) in 2008 was 120:100 but in Tibet it was 135:100 and in Xinjiang 138:100. The result is that many men cannot find a mate in their home territory. What the full consequences of this may be we can only guess at but one consequence has been an increased use of prostitutes with a resultant spread of AIDS. Currently 4 million people in China have AIDS and the number is expected to rise to 10 million by 2010. The Malthusians will no doubt be happy to hear that!

A second problem is that children are regularly being abducted. One estimate suggests that more than 200 children are stolen on any given day; and the sadness and sense of loss felt by parents is not helped by a police force rendered indifferent by the incredible difficulty of finding a child in the massive Chinese population.

A third, perhaps the major problem is the challenge of caring for the aging population. Traditionally,

the aged were cared for by family members; now family members are faced with an almost impossible task because under a one child per couple policy each person aged 35-40 must care for his or her parents aged 55-60 and four grandparents aged 75-80. A recent Australian Broadcast Commission report revealed that Shanghai Province has some 22 million people over 60 years and only 33 000 places in geriatric hospitals. And, from the visual evidence presented, it is certain that no Westerner would tolerate the conditions provided in the hospitals that are available. As indicated previously (Potter, op cit), a main reason that people have children is to ensure that they are cared for in old age. This is no longer a reasonable expectation in modern China.

India poses a problem for the Malthusians in that it is reproducing at the rate of 2.8% and is expected to reach 1.5 billion by 2050. Another group that is continuing to reproduce unchecked is the Islamic population; they are currently averaging 6.2 children per couple (8.1%). Some commentators see this posing a threat to the indigenous populations of Europe, Australia and the USA where white groups are reproducing at rates well under 2%: France 1.8%; UK 1.6%; Greece 1.3%; Germany 1.3%; Spain 1.1%. These figures suggest that most of Europe could become Islamic States in 30-40 years time. The disparity in population growth in the USA is 8% for Muslims compared with 1.6% for other races. In Canada, where there are now 1.6 million Muslims, the rate for whites is 1.6%.

FINAL THOUGHT

The overwhelming success of the Malthusian project in our time and the imminence of CAT schemes suggests that the human population is about to be plunged into a nightmare world of contrived unreality. Are we five minutes to midnight?

There appears to be some light at the end of the tunnel. The EU and Canadian CAT schemes are not working too well. Perhaps we should not be discouraged by superficial success but press on with an empowered individual agency to ensure that a Cornucopian vision of a better world remains intact.

NOTES

¹See www.wikipedia.org/wiki/Giammaria_Ortes.

²See www.wikipedia.org/wiki/Henry_Carey

³See Tickell's CV on www.crispintickell.com

⁴Costeau received the International Environmental Prize jointly with WWF co-founder, Sir Peter Scott in 1977. The quote is from the *UNESCO Courier*, November 1991.

⁵The human brain will not survive more than five or so minutes without oxygen (Brand & Yancy, 1982).

⁶ The average concentration of water vapour at the Earth's surface is around 30 000 ppm or 3% by volume, some 78 times that of CO₂ (Chang, 1984).

⁷More particularly, relative humidity is the ratio of the partial pressure of the water vapour at a point in time relative to the saturated vapour pressure at the prescribed temperature expressed as a percentage.

⁸See article by Dr David Evans, *The Australian*, January 31st, 2009 www.theaustralian.news.com.au

⁹Stefan proposed a Law of Heat Irradiation in 1879 based on empirical research; Boltzman came to the same conclusion in 1884 on theoretical grounds.

¹⁰See www.wikipedia.org/wiki/Compulsory_sterilization.

¹¹The information in this paragraph is mainly taken from Plimer, 2009.

¹²See www.treehugger.com/files/.../europe-cap-and-trade-works.

¹³See www.climatechange.gov.au/emissionstrading.

¹⁴Bob Carter is Professor of Earth Sciences at the James Cook and Adelaide Universities; see his views on www.iinet.net.au and www.csiro.au/news

¹⁵See Population Reference Bureau, Bulletin 59, No.2. www.prb.org./Source/China

REFERENCES

Anon (2009): 'Carbon Trading is Hitler Style Genocide', The New Citizen, Coburg, Victoria

Arrhenius, S.(1896): On the Influence of Carbonic Acid in the Air upon the temperature of the Ground, *Philosophical Magazine & Journal of Science*, London.

Brand, P & Yancy P. (1982): *In His Image*, Hodder & Stoughton, London

Chang, R (1984): *Chemistry*, McGraw Hill, New York.

Darwin, C. (1859): *On the Origin of Species by Means of Natural Selection, or the Preservation of Favoured Races in the Struggle for Life*, John Murray, London.

Huxley, J. (1947): *Man in the Modern World*, Chatto & Windus, London.

Nietzsche, F. (1886): *Jenseits von Gut und Böse(Beyond Good and Evil)*, Leipzig.

Plimer, I. (2009): *Heaven+Earth*, Connor Court, Ballan, Victoria

Potter, J. (2009): 'The Climate Change Dogma – the Gospel according to Thomas Malthus', *Veritas*, Vol.1 No.1

Roper T. (2000): *Hitler's Table Talk 1941-1944*, Enigma, New York.

Tarpley, W. (1994): Giammaria Ortes: The Decadent Venetian Kook Who Originated The Myth of "Carrying Capacity", *The American Almanac*, June.

Tickell, C. (1978): *Climatic Change and World Affairs*, Pergamon Press, Oxford.

*Dr John Potter holds degrees in Agricultural Science, Education Management, Education Philosophy and Theology. He has worked as a soil conservationist, a rural sociologist, an educator and management consultant in Australia and Africa for the past 53 years.

