

Citizens Electoral Council of Australia

Postal Address: PO Box 376, Coburg Vic 3058

Phone: 1800 636 432 Fax: 03 9354 0166

Home Page: www.cecaust.com.au Email: cec@cecaust.com.au

Authorised by R. Barwick, 595 Sydney Road, Coburg, Victoria 3058. Printed by Citizens Media Group Pty Ltd., 595 Sydney Road, Coburg, Victoria 3058.



Independent Political Party

The Plot to Shut Down the Murray-Darling Basin Food Bowl:

“Ecosystems” are a Genocidal Fraud!

All of modern environmentalism hangs upon a single concept: that of the “ecosystem”. The notion that all of Nature, and each of its components, is balanced in a delicate equilibrium, which mankind’s agriculture and industry throws out of whack, with disastrous consequences for both man and Nature.

Now, the Murray-Darling Basin food bowl, which feeds some 60 million human beings, is being systematically shut down and the lives of its residents who either produce that food or support those who do, are being shattered and destroyed. All this, ostensibly, to save the Basin’s delicate “ecosystem”.

There is only one problem with the “ecosystem” concept: it is a lie. There neither is, nor ever was any such thing. Two recent, authoritative exposés on the subject have proven that beyond any doubt: the first is part two of a three-part documentary entitled, “All Watched Over by Machines of Loving Grace,” by acclaimed filmmaker Adam Curtis, which aired on the BBC in May and June 2011; and the second source is two major speeches by Citizens Electoral Council national leader Craig Isherwood to the CEC’s July 2011 national conference, reprinted in the October/November 2011 issue of the CEC’s newspaper, the *New Citizen*. The BBC and CEC exposés were prepared independently, but have crucial points of overlap. In this presentation we will review part 2 of that BBC series, entitled “The Use and Abuse of Vegetational Concepts”, aired on 30 May, which opened:

“This is a story about the rise of the machines and our belief in the balance of nature. How the idea of the ecosystem was invented. How it inspired us. *And how it wasn’t even true.*”

The single individual which both the BBC and the CEC featured most prominently in their respective exposés was Sir Arthur Tansley (1871-1955), a University of Cambridge professor who is the acknowledged founder of the modern science of ecology.

Tansley founded the British Ecological Society in 1913, the first such society in the world. In 1935 he wrote a famous article in which he introduced the concept, and the name, “ecosystems”, and that became the cornerstone of the science of ecology. After World War II, Tansley served as the founding chairman of the British Nature Conservancy, one of four permanent research bodies under the Privy Council of the British Crown, the ruling body of the British Empire. His Nature Conservancy, in turn, spun off every major environmentalist/Green Fascist organisation in the world, including the International Union for Conservation of Nature, the World Wildlife

Fund, the Ramsar Convention on Wetlands, the Australian Conservation Foundation, and countless others.

Tansley was a devout British imperialist and an advocate of the racial pseudo-science known as eugenics, which derived from the “natural selection” theory of Charles Darwin. The so-called “science” of eugenics states that, just as in Nature some individuals and species are more fit to survive than others, so it is with mankind: some so-called “races” are superior to others, and a “master race” should carry out mass genocide as required to secure its rule over lesser races. Darwin himself was a devout eugenicist, and the term “eugenics”, as well as the formal theory was crafted by his first cousin and co-thinker, Sir Francis Galton. Eugenics provided the justification for British imperial rule, and for the British genocide in Ireland and India in the 19th century, as well as for Hitler’s genocide in the 20th. In 1909 King Edward VII knighted Galton for his efforts on behalf of the Empire.



Sir Arthur Tansley

Tansley was also a Fabian Socialist, as was his father before him. The Fabian Society was co-founded by novelist and science fiction writer H.G. Wells, bureaucrats Sidney and Beatrice Webb, and the aristocratic philosopher Lord Bertrand Russell. The Fabians were ardent British imperialists who intended to secure permanent world rule for the British Empire through a new world order based upon eugenics and “international socialism”, or “world government”. The chief funder of the Fabians was King Edward VII’s closest friend, the financier Sir Ernest Cassel. The Fabians disagreed with such *national* socialists as Hitler and Mussolini, only because their kind of “socialism”, i.e. *fascism*, was only national, and therefore too limited.

Tansley always emphasised that the single most important influence on his life from his student days onwards, was Bertrand Russell. Russell was born into one of a handful of families which had ruled the British Empire since the so-called Glorious Revolution of 1688. He made no secret of the methods required to secure British imperial rule, against the “overpopulation” of lesser races. In his 1951 book, *The Impact of Science on Society*, Russell complained that because of the advance of modern science and technology, the population of the world was then increasing at 58,000 per day. He lamented that “War, so far, has had no very great effect on this increase, which continued throughout each of the world wars. ... War ... has hitherto been disappointing in this respect, but perhaps bacteriological war may prove more effective. If a Black Death could spread throughout the world once in every generation survivors could procreate freely without making the world too full. ... The state of affairs might be somewhat unpleasant, but what of that? Really high-minded people are indifferent to happiness, especially other people’s.”

Russell’s closest collaborator, H.G. Wells, was even more blunt about the pathway to world government, which he termed the “New Republic”. The men of the New Republic “will not be squeamish in killing”, wrote Wells, because “They will have an ideal that will make killing worth the while.” He asked rhetorically, “And how will the New Republic treat the inferior races? How will it deal with the black? how will it deal with the yellow man? how will it tackle that al-

THE NEW CITIZEN
Official Publication of the Citizens Electoral Council of Australia
No. 1000
CONTACT US
1800 636 432
03 9354 0166
www.cecaust.com.au

Defeat the British Crown's Green Fascist Dictatorship

LaRouche: Three Steps to Global Economic Recovery

Get concrete action	A 1
Colony/territory leads Green Fascism	A 2
The Green Fascist	A 3
The Green Fascist	A 4
The Green Fascist	A 5
The Green Fascist	A 6
The Green Fascist	A 7
The Green Fascist	A 8
The Green Fascist	A 9
The Green Fascist	A 10
The Green Fascist	A 11
The Green Fascist	A 12

Call: 1800 636 432, write to CEC, PO Box 376, Coburg Vic 3058, for your copy. \$5 posted.

leged termite in the civilized woodwork, the Jew?” And he answered himself, “Well, the world is a world not a charitable institution, and I take it they will have to go.”

Hippies and anti-war activists of the 1960s worshiped Russell as a great champion of world peace. Some peacenik: He helped convince U.S. President Harry Truman to drop nuclear bombs on Japan in 1945. The bombing was unnecessary, as Russell well knew: The Japanese were isolated, surrounded by Allied forces, and had already negotiated their surrender. But Russell wanted this display of the horror of nuclear weapons to help terrorise nations into submitting to a world government. The following year he advocated that the U.S. launch a pre-emptive nuclear attack on the Soviet Union, for the same reason.

Why is this relevant to ecosystems? Because the hard-core, anti-human, British imperial ideology which Tansley shared with his mentor Russell came first, and Tansley’s theories of “nature” only second. They were in fact an obvious product of that ideology.


So, after having discovered Arthur Tansley and his invention of “ecosystems”, and presenting this story at the CEC’s conference and in a special edition of our *New Citizen*, we in the CEC were very happy to find this new documentary from the BBC, of all places. It is not as far-reaching as Craig Isherwood’s case against Tansley, but it has certainly proven him to be a neurotic quack whose “science” is just pure kookery.

In his BBC documentary, Curtis recounts the story of how Tansley conceived of the idea of ecosystems:

After the subtitle, “London at the Height of the British Empire. Or so they thought.”, the story starts right in with Tansley, who shortly after World War I had a dream about murdering his wife. He wanted to find out what it meant, so in 1922 he went to Vienna to consult with Sigmund Freud. As the film recounted, Tansley devised the notion of “ecosystems” based on “an obscure part of Freud’s theory that said that the human brain was actually an electrical machine. That sense data that came in through the eyes and ears created bursts of energy that flowed around networks inside the brain, just like electrical circuits. Tansley was fascinated by this ... he decided that he could take this model of the mind and apply it to the whole of the natural world.” Then there are some excellent quotes on Tansley and ecosystems, how he invented the whole model. They interview ecological historian Peder Anker, who wrote a useful book called *Imperial Ecology. Environmental Order in the British Empire, 1895-1945*. In this BBC piece Anker quoted Tansley crowing about “The Great Universal Law of Equilibrium”, and how equilibrium was his assumption for *everything*, be it mechanical systems, ecosystems, or the human mind.

Before returning to the documentary and what nonliving machines, computers, have to do with ecosystems, let’s examine this idea of equilibrium, which is the kernel of the ecosystem idea: equilibrium, aka *the balance of nature*. Undoubtedly, you recognise this idea, perhaps you yourself have always accepted it. Tansley’s belief in the “great and universal law of equilibrium” is premised on what is claimed to be the cornerstone doctrine of modern science known as the 2nd Law of Thermodynamics. It was derived from a study of machines, and describes the ability of closed mechanical systems to perform work, such as heat-powered machines. Any such closed mechanical system, says the 2nd Law, will run down over time unless more energy is added to it from the outside, just like your car will finally stop unless you refill it with petrol. In technical terms, this is called the increase of entropy, or disorganisation of the system.

However British ideologues including Tansley claim that the 2nd Law holds for the entire Universe and everything in it, including life



Ecology pioneer Howard Odum, who simplified nature down to a system of electrical circuits with feedback loops—the definitive “ecosystem”.

and the human mind. But the history of life on Earth over the last 500 million years is precisely the opposite: Over time, a greater number of plant and animal species have emerged, and these species have become ever more powerful in their ability to do work—to act and to change the environment around them. Mankind is simply the latest phase of that lawful process. But mankind has unique creative powers of mind—which no other species possesses—and therefore exerts more power over Nature than any other species. The emergence of man is not some freak accident which is now running out of control, but reflects the very way the Universe is *designed*. It is not winding down towards a “heat death” in which all motion ceases—equilibrium—according to the 2nd Law and Tansley, but it is winding up.

We treat this matter at length in the *New Citizen*, but notice how Tansley’s own argument contradicts itself. First, he claims that all the processes of Nature—ecosystems—are in a delicate balance, and will always return to that balance if disturbed. But next, he says that all of Nature is *not* in equilibrium, but is inexorably running down towards a universal heat death—the grand and final equilibrium. As he wrote in a 1932 article about the process of life: “Its power of arresting entropy is a partial, local and temporary power that is perfectly intelligible physically, and that cannot arrest the process of equalisation in the distribution of energy throughout the Universe at large—a process that will ... ultimately bring about conditions under which the protoplasmic units cannot continue to exist.” i.e. “heat death” for the entire universe and everything in it.

Tansley had claimed that the human mind was a machine characterised by energy flows which tend towards equilibrium, and he applied that concept to nature to cook up ecosystems. The Curtis documentary shows that in the years immediately after Tansley first proposed his mechanistic ecosystem theory, another Bertrand Russell protégé, Norbert Wiener, promoted a new belief system called cybernetics, which was the notion that the mind was a mere machine—a computer. The cyberneticists also claim that all processes, whether of the mind, of human society, or of nature are also mechanistic systems, to which they add the idea of “feedback loops”. It was the rise of cybernetics that paved the way for Tansley’s ecosystem theory to become entrenched.

They then introduce computer pioneer Jay Forrester, as a leader in cybernetics and systems analysis, who defined the whole world as a machine-like ecosystem modelled on electrical circuit boards, saying, “We live in these networks of feedback loops...” Forrester babbles like a mad scientist about everything in the universe being feedback loops, etc. Curtis shows how the idea of cybernetics merged with Tansley’s ecosystems to become the modern science of ecology: “And cybernetics transformed the idea of the ecosystem. *It would lead ecology to rise up and become one of the dominant sciences of the 20th century.*”


The two key figures in this were the ecologist brothers Howard and Eugene Odum. Eugene Odum’s book, *Fundamentals of Ecology*, “became the Bible of the science.” He “portrayed the whole planet as a network of interlinked ecosystems. And Tansley’s machine hypothesis became a scientific certainty. But to make their theory work, the Odum brothers distorted the reality. They simplified the data to an extraordinary degree. They pared down the data to fit the circuits they had drawn. This fusion of cybernetics and ecology led to a new principle for organising human society as well. One of Howard Odum’s associates later wrote that what they were doing was creating a machine-like fantasy of stability...”

So the Odums, particularly Howard initially, drew up the ecosystems as actual electrical circuits, which the documentary shows examples of: “The ecosystems were drawn out as electrical circuits with feedback loops that showed how energy flowed around the systems, through the animals and the plants. Odum even built real electric circuits to represent Nature. He believed that you could monitor the feedbacks and decide when they weren’t sufficient, so you could intervene to bring them back to equilibrium.”

Curtis interviews a noted modern ecologist, Dr Daniel Botkin, who gives a firsthand account of how this purely mechanistic, “balance of nature” idea shaped the teaching of modern ecology.

Disputing this, ecologist Dr. Daniel Botkin, rubbished the Odum ecosystem model: “If you left nature alone, it would run like a perfectly-oiled piston engine”, he scorned the Odums’ “mathematics of machinery”.

Curtis then explains how this ecosystem concept inspired a utopian vision for how human society can be organised as an ecosystem in



Jay Forrester with his original schematic of a computer model of the whole world as one system.

equilibrium, as a bizarre fusion of nature and computers, but one entirely consistent with Tansley's teachings.

This utopian vision was epitomised by a poem written by Richard Brautigan, entitled "All Watched Over By Machines of Loving Grace":

I like to think (and
the sooner the better!)
of a cybernetic meadow
where mammals and computers
live together in mutually
programming harmony
like pure water
touching clear sky.

I like to think
(right now, please!)
of a cybernetic forest
filled with pines and electronics
where deer stroll peacefully
past computers
as if they were flowers
with spinning blossoms.

I like to think
(it has to be!)
of a cybernetic ecology
where we are free of our labors
and joined back to nature,
returned to our mammal
brothers and sisters,
and all watched over
by machines of loving grace.

All of this led directly to what we in the CEC have called Green Fascism. Curtis describes how by the 1970s there was a perceived global environmental crisis, which national politicians didn't understand how to solve. In truth, the so-called crisis was fabricated by the green organisations directly controlled by the British Crown, led by the International Union for Conservation of Nature, and the World Wildlife Fund. The fake emergency was manufactured to destroy national sovereignty, and reduce human population. We document all this in the *New Citizen*.

But before continuing with Curtis' account of the rise of environmentalism worldwide in the 1960s and 1970s, let us meet Max Nicholson (1904-2003) the single most important creator of that movement besides Prince Philip himself, and an architect of the plot to shut down the Murray-Darling Basin.

After Tansley died in 1955, Nicholson replaced him as the acknowledged new High Priest of this cult of ecology, of Green Fas-

cism. Following World War II, Nicholson held the extremely sensitive post of permanent private secretary to the Privy Council, the ruling body of the British Empire. Suddenly, he switched careers to follow Tansley as head of the British Nature Conservancy; he co-founded both the IUCN and WWF; and he was one of the leaders of the British eugenics movement from the 1930s until his death in 2003. In 1971, the IUCN-WWF alliance organised the world's very first global environmental treaty, the Ramsar Convention on Wetlands of International Importance. Nicholson keynoted Ramsar's founding meeting. That, of course, is the treaty that the *Water Act 2007* was passed to enforce, to shut down food production in the basin to save Ramsar wetlands i.e. ecosystems. A year earlier, in 1970, Nicholson had published a book entitled *The Environmental Revolution: A Guide for the New Masters of the World*. With an eye to the Ramsar process already under way to preserve wetlands supposedly for ducks and other waterfowl, he wrote that the rise of environmentalism spelled the end of national sovereignty: "Ducks Unlimited Means Sovereignty Superseded", he crowed.


The Tansley/Nicholson British Nature Conservancy has dug its claws deeply into Australia: Nicholson helped set up Prince Philip's Australian Conservation Foundation, while two top Nature Conservancy officials, Derek Ovington and Peter Bridgewater, were deployed to Australia to become the first and second heads of our newly-created national parks and wildlife ministry. Parks head Bridgewater, who was also Ramsar's point man in Australia, played a decisive role in devising the Murray-Darling Basin Authority's plot to shut down our food bowl. That under way, he moved to Switzerland to head up Ramsar itself.

The *New Citizen* recounts how the British Crown systematically created the modern cult of Green Fascism, and the notion that the world is in a dire "environmental crisis" as a pretext to destroy modern agro-industrial society and national sovereignty, and to slash the human population. Jay Forrester and his machine models of nature and society played a crucial role in that, as did the genocidal Club of Rome, co-founded by Alexander King, a high-level official of British Intelligence.

Under the subtitle, "The Doomsday Machine", the documentary continues, "It was clear that there was a serious global environmental crisis by the early 1970s. Jay Forrester knew how to solve the problem. He became involved with the Club of Rome." And for the Club of Rome, he "built a model of the whole world as one system", with the different variables of population growth, resources, investment in agriculture, pollution, etc. Forrester set up a team of cyberneticists who created a model which predicted imminent total global collapse. The BBC team asked Forrester, "When you ran that model, what did it show?" Forrester: "It showed in all likelihood that the population would overshoot the carrying capacity of the world and then you would have a collapse of the population back to lower levels and the standard of living would constantly decline."

The Club of Rome then held a press conference predicting global disaster, and the documentary runs clips of Alexander King predicting total doom. The Club of Rome "published *Limits to Growth*. It became a bestseller and transformed our way of thinking of nature." Based on this the UN held its first ever conference on the "world population crisis". The documentary showed footage of a snobbish British woman addressing the conference blasting national sovereignty, and demanding that "world governments must give up on promoting growth and instead create a new, steady state for the world." Their job was to hold the world's system in *equilibrium* to avoid the collapse. Forrester: "The idea of growth is in contrast to the idea of equilibrium ... maintaining a constant level of population ... a man-made equilibrium of our own." (i.e. like Tansley's equilibrium of nature.)

Notice that Forrester singled out human population growth as



The Club of Rome's *Limits to Growth* book forecast doom.

the major problem. In his computer model, human beings disturbed the equilibrium of the system. Therefore, politicians and people all over the world became conditioned to accept measures targeting the very existence of human beings, because they accepted a model of society they were told by scientists was based on nature. Except it was all lies.

At the time, the U.S. physical economist Lyndon LaRouche in his book entitled, *There Are No Limits to Growth*, refuted Forrester and the Club of Rome. LaRouche's unique discovery in economics was that a healthy economy, like nature, was characterised by constant growth and constant development. This development, LaRouche showed, is driven by human creativity—the ability of human beings to discover universal principles, and apply those discoveries through science and technology. LaRouche demonstrated that human population growth, far from being a threat, is the singular metric of a healthy economy. He also proved that a so-called zero growth, or steady-state economy—an economy supposedly in equilibrium—would necessarily *collapse*. The proponents of a steady state economy claim that resources are finite and therefore unlimited growth is impossible. All of human history, however, has proven that to be a lie because mankind's advances in science and technology continually create entire new ranges of resources which never before existed. What was iron ore, for instance, to a cave man, but a lump of rock? Any attempt to create an artificial "closed system" in order to supposedly conserve resources and to stay "in balance" with nature, on the other hand, would necessarily result in mass death. And that is precisely why the British Crown and the Club of Rome and their co-thinkers cooked up the idea of a steady state economy or "sustainability" in the first place—to dupe the population into accepting genocide.

Concocting supposedly unchallengeable "science" to further the aims of British imperial rule is an old trick. To illustrate the point, Curtis chose not to emphasise the case of Tansley, but one of Tansley's rivals in ecological theory, General Smuts. Their systems amount to the same thing in the end. Smuts invented a theory of nature known as "holism", that nature—and also human society—is one gigantic, interrelated whole, and each of its parts is itself a whole within the larger one. Smuts' holism was inspired by, and a justification for, the British Empire itself, which functioned as a whole, so long as every part stayed in its place. To Smuts, the place of the white colonial masters was to be in charge, and the black natives was to be subservient.

Curtis concludes by featuring ecologists who have demonstrated that nature is highly dynamic, that equilibrium is a myth: "In the middle 1970s the fatal flaw in the idea of self-regulating ecosystems was exposed. A new generation of ecologists showed that nature was always in a state of dynamic change." The documentary then quotes an ecologist saying that many ecologists became almost hysterical because the cardinal belief of their entire outlook was being disproved. They report on an American named George Van Dyne, who did a computer model of the grasslands of Colorado, the Grasslands Project, with zillions and zillions of variables plugged into giant computers. "But the more data Van Dyne put in, the more it showed wild instability." He died at age 48, the documentary implies because he was such an obsessed lunatic. "Van Dyne's death marked the end of the systems theory, the 'balance of nature'."



George Van Dyne (left) and his students in the Grasslands Project. Searching for equilibrium in his model, Van Dyne added more and more data which resulted in wild instability—"balanced" nature was a myth.

Conclusion

The idea of "ecosystems" is an obvious British imperial fraud. But that raises the question: Is there a real science of ecology, one which shows nature to be always evolving upwards to greater organisation and greater complexity? The answer to that is a resounding "yes". It was developed to its highest degree by the great Russian scientist, Vladimir Vernadsky, the founder of the modern science of biogeochemistry among his other extraordinary achievements, who is the subject of Craig Isherwood's speech printed in our *New Citizen*, entitled "The Noösphere of Vernadsky and LaRouche". Because the truth is that Vernadsky refuted Tansley's fraud of ecosystems even before Tansley cooked it up. In fact, when Vernadsky's ideas began to circulate throughout Europe for the first time in French-language translations in the mid-1920s, the British imperialists went ape, and assigned Tansley and the biologist Julian Huxley to invent an opposing, 2nd Law of Thermodynamics-centred so-called "science of ecology". Huxley was a leader of the British Eugenics Society from the 1920s onwards, and was Tansley's collaborator and co-founder of the Nature Conservancy, the IUCN, and the WWF. To combat Vernadsky, and to popularise Tansley's fraud, the British commissioned H.G. Wells—the best-selling author in the world at the time—to co-author a book with Huxley called "The Science of Life", which became *the* definitive early text on ecology.

Vernadsky demonstrated empirically that the Earth was first of all not some closed, isolated system, but was constantly subject to all sorts of powerful cosmic radiation from the far reaches of our galaxy and even beyond, radiation from the Sun being only the most obvious of these forces. Secondly, defined by these cosmic processes, he proved that the Earth is constituted of a hierarchy of three distinct physical phase-spaces: the non-living matter of rocks, known as the lithosphere; the living matter of plants and creatures, the biosphere; and the cognitive matter of human creativity, which he called the noösphere. Vernadsky ranked these three phase-spaces by their power: life on earth, although comprised of individually weak organisms, over the course of geological time has completely transformed the planet, proving it has a far-greater material-energetic power than the non-living matter of rocks. Likewise, Vernadsky examined the geologic impact of mankind in the period of human existence, and demonstrated that human beings, by virtue of their creativity, in a much shorter span of time have exercised an even greater material-energetic power over the planet than life. Thus, said Vernadsky, the earth is no longer simply the biosphere, defined by life, but is now the noösphere, noös meaning "idea". Lawfully, the greatest physical power on earth is now human cognition. And it is human cognition—creativity—which terrifies the British imperialists.

The crucial difference between Vernadsky and Tansley, is that Vernadsky didn't start from the British imperial standpoint of how to keep the masses of the people stupid and their numbers in check, and therefore under imperial control. Rather, his discoveries embody profound breakthroughs in science, in man's fundamental understanding of the highly dynamic processes of Nature, and of man's role in the universe in general. Tansley's ecosystem fraud, on the other hand, is simply an excuse for genocide, one might say for "sustainable" genocide.

Get your Free DVD

"Ecosystems" a Genocidal Fraud!

The Plot to Shut Down the Murray-Darling Basin Food Bowl.

For a free copy call toll-free **1800 636 432** or send in this coupon to CEC PO Box 376 Coburg Vic 3058, and leave ALL your details below.

Name: _____

Address: _____

Phone: _____

Email: _____