

THE NEW TIMES

Registered at the G.P.O., Melbourne, for transmission by post as a newspaper

\$7.00 per annum post-free. Box 1226L, G.P.O., Melbourne.

"Ye shall know the truth and the truth shall make you free"

Vol. 41, No. 7

JULY 1976

Keeping The Torch Alight In The Deepening Gloom

Nothing has so graphically demonstrated the Achilles heel of the non-Communist world than Australian Prime Minister Malcolm Fraser, generally considered to be a conservative, first making a foreign policy statement, warning about the Soviet's military expansion, and then stating that Moscow was not really concerned and would be extending a warm welcome to Deputy Prime Minister Doug Anthony. Apart from offering the Soviet more Australian food, Mr. Anthony is also prepared to discuss the sale of Australian uranium to the Soviet.

For over half a century Western politicians have been uttering all kinds of words of warning about the Communists. But at the same time, as has been so thoroughly documented by Dr. Anthony Sutton in *National Suicide*, the Western nations have been providing the vital economic aid without which there would be no Communist threat. Those financing this economic aid, the international masters of credit creation, clearly understand that there is no hope of driving a diverse mankind into the One World they seek unless there is deepening crisis, both national and international. The Communists are unable to create the crisis on their own, irrespective of how many of the sincere dupes believe that they are working with the "will of history". Those exercising power, national and international, the control of the creation and distribution of credit, are basically responsible for the crisis.

So far from contributing to a lessening of the crisis and growing social and economic convulsions everywhere, the Fraser approach to the Communist question must intensify crisis conditions. Like the despicable claim by the British "Conservatives" that the British people had to stay in the Common Market as a "barrier against Communism", Mr. Fraser can only create the impression that he is cynically exploiting and exaggerating the Soviet threat by blatantly contributing economic aid to help maintain the Soviet totalitarian system. Any politician who is genuine in his view that the Soviet Union is a growing threat to the non-Communist world, would be advocating and taking the firmest possible steps against the Soviet, including no further economic aid. But at this point the bleating of the mesmerised victims of "sound finance" is heard: "How can we possibly consider losing such a valuable export market? What about our favourable balance of trade? Our economy would collapse and this would be playing into the hands of the Communists." This attitude is, of course, an open surrender to the Marxist philosophy of economic determinism.

Another manifestation of the same philosophy is the acceptance of inflation as "inevitable". There was a time shortly after the Second World War when 3-4 percent inflation was warned against as disastrous. After a quarter

of a century of conditioning it is now hailed as a major achievement if inflation can be reduced to less than 10 per cent. This is described as "successfully controlling" inflation. The whole subject is confused by a type of double-talk, which even George Orwell would have found beyond belief. Before the last Canadian elections there was Prime Minister Trudeau assuring Canadians that he would "wrestle" with inflation, presumably right down to the ground. But inflation must have got up again in Canada, with the result that Mr. Trudeau is now showing out in his true Marxist colours. Rigid controls are now the answer—most of the controls being imposed on the unfortunate Canadians. Politicians in Australia generally also believe in "controlling" inflation, but they often go in for "fighting" it. Judging by the results of the contest, inflation must be the greatest fighter of all times. Perhaps Mohammed Ali should be used to take it on! Sometimes it is claimed that inflation is "imported". That could never happen in Australia because the waterside workers would refuse to unload it!

Now we read that following the recent conference of the major industrial nations to attempt to solve their problems,

THE BOOK OF THE MOMENT

Originally entitled "It's Time They Knew", by the late C. Barclay-Smith, "The Money Trick" might well be described as the book for the moment. It has a special value at present as the finance-economic crisis deepens and all constructive suggestions are met with the bleating cry, "But where will the money come from?" "The Money Trick" is the answer. It is a proven bestseller and eye-opener. Campaigners are urged to always have a small supply on hand, to hand to the Local Councillor, the hard-pressed businessman, and those desperate farmers so misled by their "leaders".

Let us saturate Australia. So that "The Money Trick" can go out in thousands we are offering a special discount rate: 4 copies for \$3, posted to anywhere in Australia.

the fear has been expressed that if another "world boom" takes place, a "new inflation epidemic" could "break out". The simple truth is that inflation is a deliberate policy, the result of which is as predictable as the sunrise. A new expansion of financial credit under present financial rules will certainly greatly stimulate economic activity—even if most of the activity is wasteful, or is designed to help still further the Communist nations. But the inflation rate will also be increased. Coming on top of what has been happening, increased inflation must accelerate the process of disintegration in all non-Communist communities. Is Civilisation, then, doomed?

The answer is that it is not inevitable that disintegration continues to the point of complete collapse. The process can be reversed by starting to reverse the basic cause of disintegration. There is light in the gloom. The moves made

by the World Anti-Communist League to spotlight the real enemies of Civilisation, the international credit monopolists, and to arouse opposition to their policies, are of tremendous significance. One Western political leader, Premier J. Bjelke-Petersen of Queensland, has given a major constructive lead with his policy against inflation. "The Petersen Plan" is not only a major question in Australia, with the Treasury and Central Bank bureaucrats at Canberra attempting to head off growing support for the Queensland Premier's policy; it has been publicised right around the world. As disintegration grows worse, the pressure in favour of the "Petersen Plan" is going to mount.

The torch of Civilisation has been kept alight through the dedicated work of a minority. That minority is the only hope for Civilisation. It alone can provide the light necessary in the gloom.

Queensland Social Crediters Demolish Former Federal Labor Treasurer

The mounting campaign in favour of the anti-inflation "Petersen Plan" has badly nettled one of the hopes of the Australian Labor Party, former Federal Treasurer Mr. W. Hayden. Although Mr. Hayden likes to create the impression of being a cool and detached academic who examines finance-economic questions solely on their merits, he has let the mask slip, revealing the arrogance and viciousness of the Socialist planner by referring to a "right wing extremist political body (The League of Rights), which promulgates social credit economic nonsense". This charge, and attacks on the "Petersen Plan" in "The Times" Ipswich, resulted in Mr. Hayden receiving a heavy intellectual thrashing in his own electorate.

Excellent letters appeared in *The Times* of April 29, Mr. Victor Robb making the comment that "What Mr. Hayden completely fails to realise is that there are certain economic factors operating today about which he (Mr. Hayden) clearly knows absolutely nothing. This abysmal ignorance is due to a serious mental block caused by the socialist syndrome from which he, and so many others, suffer severely". On April 30 Mr. J. O'Donnell stressed that inflation was a deliberate policy, "not a problem," concluding with the information that "Molotov once confided that Social Credit was the only socio-economics system that the Communists feared."

Mr. L. Morton fired a major shot against Mr. Hayden with the following letter in *The Times* of May 4:

"SIR—As one of the defenders of the Petersen Plan) not angry) mentioned in Mr. Hayden's letter (QUEENSLAND TIMES, April 26) I intend to answer the question raised in his letter.

I have split the question into two parts so as not to confuse people. The first part was "How does Mr. Petersen propose to dramatically cut inflation?"

Answer: Mr. Petersen cannot because the Federal Government controls sales tax, etc. It would have to be done by the Federal Government.

The second part of the question: "How and where is the money going to come from?"

Answer: From the same source that it comes from now to finance inflation.

In the second paragraph of Mr. Hayden's letter he states,

"To reduce inflation, as measured by the consumer price index, by 1 percent either by sales tax cuts or consumer subsidies or a combination of both of these, would cost the Government about \$400 million."

It need not cost the Government any more than the cost of creation (free of debt of course).

Mr. Hayden put forward as the reason we cannot use the methods the Curtin Government used, was that he had "wartime controls and regulations etc." but omits to say Dr. Cairns used part of this plan to reduce the price of cars without wartime controls.

Since 1943, when Mr. Ben Chifley was Treasurer, every Treasurer since (Dr. Cairns not included—at least he tried) has made excuses for failure to halt inflation.

With reference to the last part of his letter Mr. Hayden makes mention of "a right wing extremist political body, which promulgates social credit economic nonsense."

Mr. Hayden does not enlighten us as to why Social Credit is nonsense. Perhaps I can do so to anyone interested who phones me on 281 5700 any evening, then let those interested decide for themselves."

In *The Times* of May 6, Mr. V. Bridger took Mr. Hayden to task as follows:

"Normally I do not correspond concerning such letters but am impelled to do so because of the illogical arguments and misleading statements which tend to confuse economics, ethics and politics.

Mr. Hayden commences his illogical argument by saying, "Whatever the Petersen Plan might be—and that seems to

be quite incomprehensible—it is no cure for inflation." Then he criticises three points of the Petersen Plan, which were suggested by Mr. Bjelke-Petersen at the 1974 Premiers' Conference as being "principles underlying the Petersen Plan, which represents a proven and painless method of pulling Australians out of the inflationary spiral."

I agree with Mr. Hayden that a freeze on income tax collections means a sharp reduction in the amount of money available for national Government. This is precisely what it is intended to do.

Secondly, I agree that it further reduces money available to the Government by proposing a substantial reduction in or the total elimination of sales tax. This is precisely what it is supposed to do.

He then goes on to state that a generous outlay of Government expenditures as subsidies for certain consumer food items would add to deficit problems and aggravate any inflation.

This statement is a combination of *petitio principii* and *non sequitur*, and is rather naive coming from a man who has presented this country with the greatest deficit budget in history.

His final comment about the Petersen Plan was—as Mr. Hayden said "whatever that may be"—is a pastiche of woolly thinking and silly fantasies from the Social Credit Movement.

This is total rubbish and I suggest that the comments emanate from total ignorance, or a political desire to refuse consumers the increasing benefits that society has created.

Finally, it would appear that Mr. Hayden has a hot line to Sir Gordon Chalk when he says that Sir Gordon "refuses to touch it with a barge pole." His electors should consider these comments and this unusual relationship.

Then came what could be described as a massive and devastating assault on Mr. Hayden in *The Times* of May 17 with two letters, the first from Mr. J. Harding of the Rockhampton Anti-inflation Group and the second by Mr. Jeremy Lee.

Mr. Harding's letter read:

"SIR—Mr. Bill Hayden, M.H.R. says the "Petersen Plan" is no cure for inflation (QUEENSLAND TIMES, April 14) because it reduces Government income by reducing taxes, and needs more money to pay the consumer credits (subsidies) to reduce the price of food etc.

Mr. Hayden has not told the full story.

Because of inflation and "indexed" wages and salaries, the banking system is creating huge sums of new ledger-cheque money, as overdrafts to employers, to pay the increase in wages and keep the workers and pensioners income level with inflation. And a further sum has to be added each quarter.

To pay an "indexed" increase of \$4.50 per week for 5 million workers needs \$1170 million per year of new money. As all wages are costed into prices, prices will be inflated by

that amount plus interest.

If that amount of money—\$1170 million—is used to pay consumer credits to reduce the prices of bread, meat and milk, it will reduce the cost of living by about \$6 per week for every family of four persons in Australia.

The relevant fact is the money is being created now to pay "indexed" wages, and it is increasing inflation.

Use that money instead to pay consumer credits and it reduces prices—it ends inflation.

The Government does not need income from taxes to pay the consumer credits, as Mr. Hayden infers.

Labor Prime Minister John Curtin did end inflation from 1943 to 1945 by the use of consumer credits. This fact is recorded in Commonwealth Year Book No. 37 page 460 and Book 65 page 251.

The Premier, Mr. Bjelke-Petersen, stated in Parliament on April 1 he prepared what has become known as the "Petersen Plan" after studying how John Curtin ended inflation.

The use of consumer credits will certainly end inflation now, and it could well be called the 'Curtin-Petersen Plan'."

Previous Labor Support For Subsidies.

Mr. Jeremy Lee dealt a final blow:

"SIR—Bill Hayden's intemperate attack on Mr. Bjelke-Petersen's proposals to cut inflation is misleading.

He asks how tax cuts and consumer subsidies could be effectively introduced at one and the same time.

The answer is to divert some of the increase in the money supply from the sort of destructive empire-building indulged in by the A.L.P. during its three year term of office, to price reductions.

When Mr. Whitlam's Government gained power in 1972, total taxation revenue, (direct and indirect) amounted to \$8453 million. Three years later, Mr. Hayden himself as Treasurer budgeted for a total tax of \$17,608 million.

Every cent of that staggering increase was taken—without asking—from the pockets of ordinary Australian consumers, the very people the A.L.P. claimed to be helping.

Mr. Bjelke-Petersen proposes to put that money back into the pockets of Australians by reducing taxes, and has earned the criticism of Mr. Hayden.

At the same time that these massive tax increases were being imposed, the policies of the Whitlam Government resulted in an average annual increase in the volume of money of approximately 20 percent.

Not only was this too big an increase, but it was spent in a way that forced prices upwards.

Why could not this increase in the money supply be used instead to reduce prices? Price subsidisation would be the logical way to do it.

Just before Mr. Whitlam gained office, the Queensland Graingrowers' Association approached all political parties
Continued on page 7

THE EIGHT SURPRISES

By John J. McKetta

The E.P. Schoch Professor, Department of Chemical Engineering, University of Texas

We have often observed that perversion is one of the great evils with which man has to contend. Regular readers of this journal are aware that over the years we have dealt with many forms of pollution, built-in obsolescence in industry, and the poisoning of our soils. But clearly the pollution question, like organic farming and gardening, has been perverted. The following article contains much food for thought and demonstrates the necessity for a balanced approach to the whole question of pollution and nutrition.

On March 27, 1973, I heard Garner Ted Armstrong say over the television: "There is no way you can have any optimism for the continuation of life on this earth because of the pollution, over-population, and results of technological advances."

It disturbs me that there are so many purveyors of gloom talking about the hopelessness of our future.

There is an entire spectrum, from zero to infinity, of views and actions on almost any problem. Let's take the pollution problem, for example. We all know there are still some companies and cities that put toxic gases and liquids into our air and streams. It's almost unbelievable that many of our large cities still discharge raw sewage, or only partially treated sewage, into our streams. Both industry and the cities should immediately be forced to stop these flagrant violations.

On the other extreme we have those people who wish to have distilled water in the streams and zero particulates in the atmosphere. These are impossible concentrations and could not be attained even if we had no people on earth. The answer, obviously, is a situation somewhere between these two extremes.

Just like most of you, I am a family man. My lovely wife and I have four wonderful children. It is my wish that they (and I) have clean air to breathe and clean water to drink—not distilled water or absolutely pure air. But I do want them to have odourless, non-toxic, clean air, and clean water. I believe we still have a great deal of environmental work to do in the U.S.A. I believe, however, that extremism is bad on either end of the spectrum.

We're all deeply concerned about reports of the destruction of our environment as a result of technological recklessness, over-population, and the lack of consideration to the preservation of nature. As Chairman of the National Air Quality Commission, I have to read great volumes of technical literature on this subject. I've turned make starches and cellulose, and give off oxygen. In this way the whole chain of plant and animal life is sustained by energy from the sun.

When the vegetable or animal materials thus produced are eaten, burned, or decay, they combine with oxygen and return to the carbon dioxide and water from whence they came. We all know this. So—what is the big surprise?

Surprise Number One is that most of the oxygen in the atmosphere **doesn't** come from photosynthesis. The

evidence is now overwhelming that photosynthesis is clearly inadequate to have produced the amount of oxygen that is present in our atmosphere. The reason is that the amount of oxygen produced by photosynthesis is just exactly enough to convert the plant tissue back to the carbon dioxide and water from which it came. In other words, the net gain in oxygen due to photosynthesis is extremely small.

The oxygen in the atmosphere had to come from another source. The most likely possibility involves the photo dissociation of water vapour in the upper atmosphere by high-energy rays from the sun and by cosmic rays. This process alone could have produced (over the history of the earth, 4.5×10^9 years) about seven times the present mass of oxygen in the atmosphere.^{2, 11}

The significance of this scientific information is that the supply of oxygen in the atmosphere is virtually unlimited. It is not threatened by man's activities in any significant way. If all the organic material on earth were oxidized, it would reduce the atmospheric concentration of oxygen by less than 1 percent. We can forget the depletion of oxygen in the atmosphere and get on with the solution of more serious problems.⁷

SURPRISE ONE

Is the oxygen disappearing?

My first surprise concerns the air we breathe. You may have read that we are seriously depleting the oxygen in the atmosphere and replacing it with toxic gas, like carbon monoxide.

Throughout my formal education I was taught that the oxygen in our atmosphere is supplied by green plants using the process of photosynthesis. It is known that plants take in carbon dioxide and through activation by sunlight, combine CO₂ with water to up a lot of evidence that I'd like to share with you.

Some of the people (who are filled with gloom and believe we have no future) blame our apparent demise on the Judeo-Christian ethic that it is God's will that man exploit nature for his proper ends. They believe we have overdone our exploitation. Others recommend that we turn the clock back 2500 years and revert to the life style of druidism. Many, many people express a disdain for science and mistrust in technology in general.

The same people say our automobiles are no longer a wondrous method of freeing man from his immobility, but

instead cars have become terrible polluters and ultimately piles of junk to desecrate the landscape. Electricity, which has been the most convenient form of energy ever available, has fallen into disrepute. The utility that produces electricity is viewed as an evil organization of the Establishment whose objective is to create new radiation hazards with nuclear power plants, cut down trees, stick poles into the ground, and pump smoke into the air to poison all of us.

It's a gloomy picture indeed. But I've found out this outlook is not justified. That is what I'd like to talk to you about. I hope you'll understand that I'm speaking as one who understands elementary science and engineering and not as an emotional supporter of any particular "side" of ecology. Some of the facts I will mention may surprise many of you. I can assure you that my conclusions are supported by evidence that is difficult to interpret in any other way. They may be verified by anyone who wishes to do so. A bibliography follows.

SURPRISE TWO

Carbon monoxide will kill us all!

As you know, the most toxic component of automobile exhaust is carbon monoxide. Each year man adds 270 million tons of carbon monoxide to the atmosphere. Most of this comes from automobiles. The scientists are concerned about the accumulation of this toxic material because they know that it has a life in dry air of about three years.

For the past several years, monitoring stations on land and sea have been measuring the carbon monoxide content of the atmosphere. Since the ratio of automobiles in the northern and southern hemisphere is 9:1 respectively, it was expected that the northern hemisphere measurements would show a much higher concentration of atmospheric carbon monoxide. The true measurements show, however, that there is no difference in CO amounts between the hemispheres and that the overall concentration of CO in the air is not increasing at all. In fact, they've found higher concentrations of CO over the Atlantic and Pacific oceans than over land, where the cars are!

Early in 1971 scientists at the Stanford Research Institute in Palo Alto disclosed that they had done some experiments in smog chambers containing soil. They reported that carbon monoxide rapidly disappeared from the chamber. Next, they sterilized the soil and then found that now the carbon monoxide did not disappear. They quickly identified the organisms responsible for CO removal to be fungi of the aspergillus (bread mold and penicillin types). These organisms, on a worldwide basis, are using all of the 270 million tons of the CO made by man for their own metabolism, thus enriching the soils of the forest and the fields.¹

This does not make the carbon monoxide any less toxic. But the fact is that, in spite of man's activities, carbon monoxide will never build up in the atmosphere to a dangerous level except on a localised basis. To put things in perspective, let me point out that the average concentra-

tion of CO in Austin, Texas, is about 1.5 parts/million. In downtown Houston, in heavy traffic, it sometimes builds up to 15 or 20 ppm. In Los Angeles it gets to be as high as 35 ppm. In parking garages and tunnels it is sometimes 50 ppm.⁶

Here is surprise Number Two—do you know that the CO content of cigarette smoke is 42,000 ppm. The CO concentration in practically any smoke-filled room grossly exceeds the safety standards allowed in our laboratories. I don't mean to imply that 35 to 50 ppm CO should be ignored. I do mean that there are so many of us who subject ourselves to CO concentrations voluntarily (and involuntarily) that are greater than those of our worst polluted cities, including the Holland Tunnel in New York, without any catastrophic effects. It is not at all unusual for CO concentrations to reach the 100-200 ppm range in poorly ventilated, smoke-filled rooms. Incidentally, if a heavy smoker spends several hours without smoking in a highly polluted city air containing 35 ppb of CO concentration, the concentration of CO in his blood will actually decrease!¹⁰ In the broad expanse of our natural air, CO levels are totally safe for human beings. Incidentally, 93 percent of the CO comes from trees and other greenery (3.5 billion tons/yr). Only 7 percent comes from man (270 million tons/yr).

SURPRISE THREE

Oxides of nitrogen will choke us!

I have been extremely impressed by the various research efforts on the part of petroleum, automotive, and chemical companies to remove oxides of nitrogen from the products of combustion in our automobiles. I've read about the brilliant work of Dr. Haagen-Smit who showed that the oxides of nitrogen play a critical role in the chain reaction of photochemical smog formation in Los Angeles.⁸ Oxides of nitrogen are definitely problems in places where temperature inversions trap polluted air.

But we've all known for many years that Nature, in addition to man, also produces oxides of nitrogen. The Number Three surprise (and shock) is that most atmospheric oxides of nitrogen come from Nature. If we consider only nitric oxide and nitrogen dioxide, the best estimates are that 97 percent are natural and only 3 percent are man-made. If we include nitrous oxide and amines, it turns out that 99+ percent is natural and less than 1 percent is man-made.^{6,9}

Nature makes oxides of nitrogen in several ways. Biological action and organic decomposition produce most of the N₂O and NO. In fact, the great saltpeter deposits of South America are a result of perpetual thunderstorms over the Andes. Oxides of nitrogen in rainwater react with minerals of the soil and end up as saltpeter when the water evaporates.

The great abundance of marine life between Antarctica and the tip of South America is also attributed to the nitrate run-off from the Andes, which generates plankton growth, thus setting off a whole chain of fishes, which eat each other, ending on the top with the blue whale.

The significance of this is that even if we are 100 percent successful in eliminating the oxides of nitrogen from combustion gases, we will still have more than 99 percent left in the atmosphere (which is produced by Nature). **Sometimes I think that Nature laughs at us.**

SURPRISE FOUR

The death of Lake Erie

We've all read for some time that Lake Erie is dead. It's true that the beaches are no longer swimmable in the Cleveland area and that oxygen content at the bottom of the lake is decreasing. This is called eutrophication. The blame has been placed on phosphates as the cause. Housewives were urged to curb the use of phosphate detergents. In fact, for several years, phosphate detergents were taken off the market. There's been a change in the law since scientific evidence proved that the phosphate detergents were not the culprits and never should have been removed from the market in the first place.

Now let's look at the scientific evidence that I've been able to find on the subject. The study shows that the cause of the eutrophication of Lake Erie has not been properly defined. This evidence suggests that if we totally stopped using phosphate detergents it would have no effect whatever on the eutrophication of Lake Erie. Many experiments have now been carried out that bring surprise Number Four. It is the organic carbon content **from sewage** that is using up the oxygen in the lake and not the phosphates in the detergents.^{4,5}

The real reason that the Cleveland area beaches are not swimmable is that the coliform bacterial count is too high.

Enlarged and improved sewage treatment facilities by Detroit, Toledo, Sandusky, and Cleveland will be required to correct this situation. Garbage disposal units do far more to pollute Lake Erie than do the phosphate detergents. If cities put in the proper sewage treatment facilities, the lake will sparkle blue again in a very few years.

Incidentally, we've all heard that Lake Superior is so much larger, cleaner, and nicer than Lake Erie. It's kind of strange then to learn that in 1973 more tons of commercial fish were taken from Lake Erie than were taken from Lake Superior.

Thermal pollution

Governor Gilligan of Ohio declared war on pollution in general and on thermal pollution in particular. Investigation of the thermal pollution problem reveals that, beyond any question of doubt, the sun is by far the greatest thermal polluter of Lake Erie. Governor Gilligan announced that he would "back legislation making it unlawful to increase the temperature of the water by more than one degree over the natural temperature." I don't know what he will do with the sun breaking the law since, as we all know, the natural temperature of Lake Erie is changed by the sun more than 40°F every year between winter (33°F) and summer (75°F+). The natural life in the lake accommodates this change in great fashion, as it has for many thousands of years. According to my calculations, if we could store up all the electricity produced in Ohio in a whole year and use it exclusively for heating

Lake Erie all at one time, it would raise the overall temperature of the lake less than 3/10ths of 1°F.

In terms of localized heating we must remember that we already have hundreds of power plants pouring warm water into streams and lakes. Forty of these are nuclear power plants. Evaluation of the effects of these from an ecological point of view is that "thermal pollution" is a less descriptive and less appropriate term than is "thermal enrichment". There are no species disappearing. No ecological catastrophes or problems have appeared. Some of the best fishing locations in the country are near the warm-water outlets of these power plants.

SURPRISE FIVE

Is DDT killing us?

DDT and other chlorinated compounds are supposedly endangering the lives of mankind and eliminating some bird species by the thinning of the eggshells of birds. There is a big question as to whether or not this is true. From the reading that I have done, the experiments were conducted in such a manner that positive conclusions could not be drawn from them. Even if it is true, it's quite possible that the desirable properties of DDT so greatly outnumber the undesirable ones that it might prove to be a serious mistake to ban entirely this remarkable chemical.

Many of you have heard of Dr. Norman E. Borlaug, the Nobel Peace Prize winner. He is opposed to the banning of DDT. Obviously he is a competent scientist. He won the Nobel Prize because he was able to develop a new strain of wheat that can double the food production per acre wherever in the world it can be grown.

Dr. Borlaug said: "If DDT is banned by the United States I have wasted my life's work. I have dedicated myself to finding better methods of feeding the world's starving population. Without DDT and other important agricultural chemicals, our goals are simply unattainable."

As I read into this matter I find that DDT has had a miraculous impact on arresting insect-borne diseases and increasing grain production from fields once ravaged by insects. According to the World Health Organisation, malaria fatalities alone dropped from four million a year in the 1930s to less than one million per year in 1968. Other insect-borne diseases, such as encephalitis, yellow fever, and typhus showed similar declines. Surprise Number Five is that it has been estimated that 100 million human beings who would have died of these afflictions are alive today because of DDT. Incidentally, recent tests indicate that the thinning of bird eggshells may have been caused by mercury compounds rather than DDT!

SURPRISE SIX

We're killing off species!

Many people feel that mankind is responsible for the disappearance of the animal species. It is possible that in some instances man **may** hasten the disappearance of certain species. However, the abundance of that evidence indicates that he has very little to do with it. About 50 species are expected to disappear during this century. It is also true that 50 species became extinct last century and

50 species the century before that, and so on.

Dr. T. H. Jukes of the University of California points out that about 100 million species of animal life have become extinct since life began on this planet, about three billion years ago. Animals come and animals disappear . . . Surprise Number Six is that man has had nothing to do with the disappearance of millions of species that preceded him.

In fact, one of man's failures is that he has not been successful in eliminating a single insect species—in spite of his all-out war on pests.

SURPRISE SEVEN

Man is the real polluter!

Here's the Seventh Surprise! The late Dr. William Pecora calculated that all of man's air pollution during his thousands of years of life on earth does not equal the amount of particulate and noxious gases from just three volcano eruptions: Krakatoa, Java, 1883; Mt. Katmai, Alaska, 1912; Hekla, Iceland, 1947.

Dr. Pecora also pointed out that Nature's "pure water" is not so pure after all. Here are a few of his examples:

1. The natural springs feeding the Arkansas and Red Rivers carry approximately 17 tons of salt per minute.

2 The Lemonade Springs in New Mexico carry approximately 900 lbs of H²SO₄ per million pounds of water. This is more than 10 times the acid concentration in coalmine effluents.

The Mississippi River carries over two million tons of natural sediment into the Gulf of Mexico each day.

4. The Paria River of Arizona makes the Mississippi look like a trout stream. It carries 500 times more natural sediment per unit volume than the Mississippi River. Back to the good old days

Don't believe the tall tales about the happy lives that people once lived before all this "nasty" industrialisation came along. Things really weren't so happy. One of my 19-year-old students once asked me, "What have all these 200 years of development of industry and civilisation done for us? Wouldn't we have been happier in 100 B.C.?" I said, "No, chances are 97 out of 100 that, if you were not a poor slave, you'd be a poor farmer, living at a bare subsistence level."

When people think of living in ancient times, they think of themselves as members of the aristocracy. They imagine they are sitting in the Agora in Athens listening to Socrates; in the Senate House in Rome debating with Cicero; riding on horses as knights of Charlemagne's time. They are never slaves, never peasants, but that's what most of them would be.

My wife once said to me, "If we had lived a hundred years ago we'd have no trouble getting servants." I said, "If we'd lived 150 years ago, we'd be the servants."

Let's consider what life was really like in America just 150 years ago. For one thing, we didn't have to worry about pollution very long—because life was very brief. Life expectancy of males was about 38 years of age. It was a grueling 38 years. The workweek was 72 hours.

The women's lot was even worse. They worked 98

hours a week, scrubbing floors, making clothes by hand, bringing in firewood, cooking in heavy iron pots, fighting off insects without pesticides. Most of the clothes were rags by present-day standards. There were no fresh vegetables in winter. Vitamin deficiency diseases were prevalent. Homes were cold in winter and sweltering in the summer.

Epidemics were expected yearly and chances were high that they would carry off some members of the immediate family. If you think the water pollution is bad now, it was deadly then. In 1793 one person in every five in the city of Philadelphia died in a single epidemic of typhoid as a result of polluted water. Many people of that time never heard a symphony orchestra, or travelled more than 20 miles from their birthplace during their entire lifetime. Many informed people do not want to return to the "paradise" of 150 years ago. Perhaps the simple life was not so simple. Practicing witchcraft

In every age people practice witchcraft in one form or another. I used to think that the people of New England were irrational in accusing certain women of being witches without evidence to prove it. Suppose someone accused you of being a witch? How could you prove you were not? It is impossible to prove unless you can give evidence.

It is precisely this same witchcraft psychology that is being used to deter the construction of nuclear power plants. The opponents are saying that these nuclear plants

BOOK NOW FOR NATIONAL WEEKEND

The 1976 National Weekend will be from Friday, September 17 until Sunday 19. The "New Times" Annual Dinner will be held on the Friday. Donations this year will be \$7 a person, another result of inflation. But private hospitality can be arranged for country and interstate visitors. The League's National Seminar will deal with all aspects of Australia's defence—including moral and psychological defence.

Queensland Social Crediters

to explain how they intended tackling the problem of inflation.

Included in the reply of the A.L.P. (reproduced in the Queensland Graingrower of November 29, 1972) were the following remarks: "The number of consumer subsidies first introduced by the Chifley Labor Government to stabilise basic commodity prices, whilst giving the producer a just return, is undoubtedly a good economic tool in the battle against spiralling costs and inflation."

Was the A.L.P. spokesman who provided this reply also a "racist, right-wing extremist promulgating social credit economic nonsense," or was he a bit closer to the truth than the lofty Mr. Hayden."

are witches and it is up to the builders and owners to prove that they are not.

The scientific evidence is that the nuclear power plants, constructed to date, are the cleanest and least polluting devices for generating electricity so far developed by man. We need electricity to maintain the standard of living we have reached. But in the eyes of the extreme environmentalists we are the witches. We should be burned at the stake.

We hear the same accusations about anti-knock lead compounds from the gasoline engine. Our Environmental Protection Agency has no evidence that there has ever been a single case of death, or even illness, from lead in the air coming from the burning of gasoline. But the environment freaks still insist that we must remove the lead from the gasoline.

To the E.P.A. we are witches—they have no evidence—no proof—we are pronounced guilty! And yet everybody knows that gasoline needs some additives to prevent engine knocks. If we don't use tetraethyl-lead we'll have to use aromatic compounds. Some aromatics are carcinogenic. We know that! The use of unleaded gasoline also uses up to 20 percent more crude oil. (Incidentally, the real reason for removing lead from gasoline was because it was suspected that lead poisoned the catalyst in the emission control unit. Now we have good evidence that it isn't the lead at all, but ethylene bromide which is the poisoner.)^{1,2}

From what we read and hear, it would seem that we are on the edge of impending doom. A scientific evaluation of the evidence does not support this conclusion. Of course, there are some effluent problems attributed to technological activities. The solution of these problems will require a technical understanding of their nature, and their solution will not come through emotion. They cannot be solved unless they are properly identified, which will require more technically trained people—not less.

I agree, as Thomas Jefferson did, that if the public is properly informed, the people would make wise decisions. The public has not been getting all the facts on matters relating to ecology. This is the reason why I am speaking out on this subject today—as a technical man and as a citizen. Some of the things you have seen here are contrary to your beliefs, but I'm willing to support my conclusions on evidence good enough for me to stake my reputation on it.

SURPRISE EIGHT

We're going to live!

In summary, let me state that civilisation is not on the brink of an ecological disaster. Our O² is not disappearing. There will be no build-up or poisonous CO. The waters can be made pure again by adequate sewage treatment plants. The disappearance of species is natural. A large percentage of pollution is natural pollution and would be here whether or not man was on this earth. We cannot solve our real problems unless we attack them on the basis of what we know rather than what we don't know. Let us use our knowledge and **not our fears** to solve the real

problems of our environment.

There is an old axiom, the gist of which is that those who misrepresent facts are not believed when they speak the truth. We've heard many cries of "wolf" with respect to our oxygen supply, the build-up of CO, the disappearance of species, DDT, the oxides of nitrogen, phosphates in the lakes, thermal pollution, radiation effects from nuclear power plants, lead in gasoline, mercury in fish, filth in our streams, to name a few. For the most part, these cries of "wolf" have not been malicious, but have been based largely on fear, ignorance, or misinformation. The people have listened to these cries and have come running to the rescue, but when they got there they didn't find the wolves.

Let's not cry "wolf" until we are reasonably certain that we have done enough homework to know what a wolf looks like. Otherwise we may undermine our credibility and not be believed by the people when we warn them that the real wolves threaten.

The author presented this lecture at the 44th Convention of The Wire Association at Kansas City, Missouri, October 30, 1974.

Acknowledgement

Many of the concepts in this lecture are drawn from talks given by my friends, Drs. A. Letcher Jones, I. W. Tucker, and the late William Pecora.

References

1. Anonymous, *Chemical and Engineering News*, Page 24, May 10, 1971.
2. Broecker, W.S., "Man's Oxygen Reserves", *Science*, 168, Page 1537, June 26, 1970.
3. Inman, R. F. and Ingersoll, R. B. "Uptake Of Carbon Monoxide By Soil Fungi", *Journal Air Pollution Control Association*, 21, Number 10, Page 646, October 1971.
4. Merriman, D., "The Calcification Of A River", *Scientific American*, Page 42-52, May 1970.
5. Mitchell, D., "Eutrophication Of Lake Water Microcosms, Phosphate vs. Non-Phosphate Detergents", *Science*, 174, Page 827, November 19, 1971.
6. Niesler, R. A., "Industrial Emissions: An Analysis Of Some Key Factors", *Journal of the Institute of Petroleum*, 56, Number 552, Page 344, 1970.
7. Ochsner, A., "Hazards Of Air Pollution—Fact Or Fiction?" *Proceedings, American Power Conference*, 31, 23, 1969.
8. Peters, M. S., *Chemical Engineering Progress*, 67, Page 115, 1971.
9. *Stanford Research Institute Journal*, 23, 4-8, December 1968.
10. U.S. Department of Health, H.E.W., "Smoke And Health", Number 1103, Chapter 6, Page 49-65, 1964.
11. van Allen, L., "The History And Stability Of Atmospheric Oxygen", *Science*, 171, Page 439, February 5, 1971.
12. B. Maxwell Teague. Chief Research Scientist, Chrysler Corporation 1974. See *Chemical and Engineering News*, May 13, 1974.