

The Environment is on Everyone's Lips

Unnoticed by many non-Catholics, on June 18, 2015, Pope Francis presented a historical encyclical "Laudato Si': On Care for Our Common Home", in other words, caring for the environment. An encyclical is "a letter addressed to all the individuals of a group" (Merriam Webster) and normally the Pope would send it only to all the bishops around the world. But this time it was addressed to everyone, not just Catholic believers, and was presented at a press conference of the Vatican. The interested reader would notice that the Pope has some valid points and that his encyclical sounds a bit like the letters Billy sent to all the governments of the world in 1951 and 1958. To summarise, the main problems the Pope addressed are:

- Climate change, the most important challenge of the present
- Consumerism and waste which overextend the capacity of the planet
- The politicians bowing to the finance sector to the detriment of the environment
- Rapid growth at the expense of the poorest
- Decline in the quality of human life and the breakdown of society
- Suicidal behaviour of humanity

For the environmental problems Pope Francis blames the alienation of the human being from nature due to technical progress and economic growth. His solution is to overcome the alienation and to restore the original harmony of humans and nature. Ironically it could actually be the religious teachings that alienated us from nature in the first place, because some Christians believe that they do not have to care too much about nature as everything would be better in Heaven anyway.

Technological advancement is not bad in and of itself, and Pope Francis ignored one important point, namely overpopulation, even though one of his presenters at the press conference, Professor John Schellnhuber, had previously addressed it. Professor Schellnhuber, the Founding Director of the Potsdam Institute for Climate Impact Research, famously declared in 2009 that the "carrying capacity" of the Earth is less than one billion people, which is fairly close to the recommended number by FIGU (529 million). So without reducing overpopulation it is impossible for the harmony between human beings and nature to be restored, because of the need for resources for the ever growing population. And although the Pope told the citizens of the Philippines on a recent visit that they should not breed like rabbits, he still has not condoned contraception, and rather preaches abstinence to prevent pregnancies, which unfortunately does not give women control over how many children they have, especially in poor countries, or in societies where they are oppressed.

According to Mariann Uehlinger-Mondria (in FIGU-ZEITZEICHEN No. 6) the «Neue Zürcher Zeitung» (New Zurich Newspaper) from 24th June 2015, criticised the encyclical in an article titled, «Öko-Kritik des Papstes geht fehl» (Eco-criticism of the Pope Goes Awry), with the subtitle, «Die neue Enzyklika des Papstes ist in aller Munde. Ein überzeugendes Umweltprogramm kommt aber nicht aus dem Vatikan, sondern aus Kalifornien». (The new encyclical of the Pope is on everyone's lips. A convincing program for the environment however does not come from the Vatican but from California.)

The newspaper article is referring to the 'Ecomodernist Manifesto' that was published in April this year by the so-called 'Think Tank' of the Breakthrough Institute in California and some other 'authorities' from other countries. The eighteen authors of the manifesto have impressive titles behind their names, e.g. Associate Professor of Economics, Professor of Environmental Sustainability, Director of Conservation, Environmental Scientist, Senior Fellow, etc., and one could assume that they really know what needs to be done to reverse the damage this planet has suffered since the Industrial Revolution. But their suggestions are rather surprising. In their manifesto they "affirm one long-standing environmental ideal, that humanity must shrink its impacts on the

environment to make more room for nature”, but they reject another, “that human societies must harmonize with nature to avoid economic and ecological collapse”. (Page 6)

So we must shrink our impact on the environment, but not through harmonising with nature. But how is that possible? Do these authors not know that we are all one, that we depend on nature for our physical and psychological well-being and that we therefore need to look after it and live in harmony with it instead of exploiting and destroying it?

The authors of the manifesto further suggest, “Intensifying many human activities — particularly farming, energy extraction, forestry, and settlement — so that they use less land and interfere less with the natural world is the key to decoupling human development from environmental impacts.” (Page 7)

Is it not the intense agriculture that uses truckloads of chemicals in order to yield good harvests, thereby destroying ecosystems and endangering much needed helpers, e.g. the bees? And obviously the authors of the manifesto cannot see the cause and effect when it comes to energy extraction and an increase in earthquakes, or the destruction of wildlife habitats because of intense forestry, e.g. the deforestation for palm oil, etc. Have these authors stopped and thought about what intense human settlement does to the psyche of a human being?

Here are some more quotes from the manifesto with which the ‘Think Tank’ is trying to convince us that our environmental problems are not as bad as we may think:

“Despite frequent assertions starting in the 1970s of fundamental ‘limits to growth’, there is still remarkably little evidence that human population and economic expansion will outstrip the capacity to grow food or procure critical material resources in the foreseeable future.” (Page 9)

Logic tells me that an increase in population and an economic expansion will put more pressure on the environment because of the chemicals, carbon dioxide, etc., which will increase the damage to eco systems and increase the likelihood of extreme weather events, which in turn will destroy more and more food that the farmers try to grow.

“...cities both drive and symbolize the decoupling of humanity from nature, performing far better than rural economies in providing efficiently for material needs while reducing environmental impacts.” (Page 12)

The manifesto gives no details about how the cities provide ‘efficiently for material needs while reducing environmental impacts’, e.g. where all the waste of the city dwellers goes and where their electricity comes from, etc., so it is up to the reader to guess.

“...: rising harvest yields have for millennia reduced the amount of land required to feed the average person. The average per-capita use of land today is vastly lower than it was 5,000 years ago, despite the fact that modern people enjoy a far richer diet. Thanks to technological improvements in agriculture, during the half-century starting in the mid-1960s, the amount of land required for growing crops and animal feed for the average person declined by one-half.” (Page 13)

With ‘technological improvement’ are they referring to caged hens and other domestic animals held in small enclosures which are not appropriate to the species? And if the people living in developing countries wanted to enjoy a ‘richer diet’ like us ‘modern people’, does that mean even more chickens and other domestic animals having to live under inhumane conditions?

“Urbanization, agricultural intensification, nuclear power, aquaculture, and desalination are all processes with a demonstrated potential to reduce human demands on the environment, allowing more room for non-human species.” (Page 18)

Have those scientists not learned anything from the disaster in Fukushima, the effects of which will harm generations to come? And because of global warming, more severe weather events are to be

expected, as has been pointed out in the article 'Arctic Death Spiral: Sea Ice Extent Hits Record Winter Low As Thickness Collapses' (<http://thinkprogress.org/>), which means we can expect more disasters that can destroy vital technology and create environmental catastrophes.

In the Ecomodernist Manifesto the interested reader will find some great slogans that could make one think that things are not as bad as some environmentalists want us to believe, and this is the closing statement: "We hope that this statement advances the dialogue about how best to achieve universal human dignity on a biodiverse and thriving planet." (Page 31)

Have I missed something? Where is this biodiverse and thriving planet on which we can achieve human dignity? As far as I can tell, this planet is struggling because it has a 'cancer' called 'irrational human beings', which is growing uncontrolledly and has made mother Earth very sick. And if this 'cancer' is allowed to grow it has the potential to 'kill' the planet, or at least destroy the foundation of life that is needed by the human beings to live in dignity on this planet.

And what I have observed over the last forty years, Billy and the Plejaren have discussed many times. In the above mentioned article in the FIGU publication 'Zeitzeichen', Mariann gives one example from Contact Conversation 589 from June 16, 2014, which was published in FIGU-Bulletin No. 85, September 2014, and in which Billy mentions that the sky does not look as blue as it did seventy years ago, because the increase in population has led to an increase in air pollution and thus damaged the atmosphere. He also observed that a similar damage has occurred on the ground, where heavy use of chemicals (needed for the intensified farming) and urban sprawl have destroyed wildlife habitats and killed animals that we depend on, e.g. the bees. As Billy points out, chemicals kill small insects and bees and without them plants will become extinct, which in turn causes insects and other animals to become extinct. But Billy thinks there is still hope:

Billy

"...Dazu denke ich, dass besonders diese Übel vom Menschen noch behoben werden könnten, wenn sie sämtliche Chemie aller Art, die auf die Natur und deren Flora und damit auch auf die Bäume, Büsche, Gräser, Sträucher usw. sowie auf alles Gemüse, Korn und alle Samen ausgebracht wird, umgehend strikte verbieten würden. Chemie vergiftet im Laufe der Zeit nicht nur alles pflanzliche Leben, sondern auch die Insekten-, Tier-, Fisch-, Vogel-, Reptilien- und Getierwelt und letztendlich auch den Menschen."

(FIGU-Bulletin Nr. 85, Seite 13)

Billy

"...Thereto I think that especially these disastrous things could still be remedied by the human being if all chemicals of all kinds – which are applied to nature and its flora and thus also to the trees, bushes, grasses, shrubs, etc., as well as to all vegetables, corn and all seeds – would be strictly forbidden immediately. In the course of time chemicals poison not only all plant life but also the world of insects, animals, fish, birds, reptiles and other creatures and finally also the human being." (FIGU bulletin no. 85, page 13)

Ptaah

Das Ganze des Chemieeinsatzes, zu dem nebst Pestiziden, Herbiziden, Neonicotinoide auch Antibiotika und Kunstdünger aller Art gehören, ist absolut wider allen Verstand und alle Vernunft des Erdenmenschen, wie aber grundsätzlich wider die Gesetze der Natur, folglich sie, wie du sagst, rundweg verboten werden müssten. Nur dann, wenn der Chemieeinsatz beendet und auch die Explosions-motorenabgase und alle sonstigen in die Atmos-phäre und in die Natur und deren Fauna und Flora gelangenden gefährlichen Emissionen aller Art vollständig unterbunden werden, kann sich die Natur sowie die

Ptaah

The entire application of chemicals, to which belong pesticides, herbicides and neonicotinoids together with antibiotics and all kinds of fertiliser, is absolutely contrary to all intellect and all rationality of the Earth human being, and also fundamentally contrary to the laws of nature, consequently, as you say, they ought to be forbidden outright. Only then, when the application of chemicals is ended and also the internal combustion engine emissions and all other dangerous emissions of all kinds – which get into the atmosphere and into the nature and its fauna and flora – are completely prohibited, can the nature and the atmosphere recover

Atmosphäre im Laufe von schätzungsweise 70–100 Jahren wieder erholen. Weiter bedingt das Ganze aber, dass die Überbevölkerung durch einen weltweiten, rigorosen und kontrollierten Gebur-tenstopp vermindert und alle weitgehend aus der Überbevölkerung hervorgehenden schädlichen Auswirkungen eingedämmt, doch leider nicht endgültig behoben werden. Der ganze Prozess der Wiedergutmachung kann nur einen gewissen Teil betreffen, denn all das, was bereits zerstört und vernichtet wurde, kann nicht rückgängig gemacht werden, denn all die Zerstörungen und Vernich-tungen, die als direkte und indirekte Ausartungen der unvernünftigen Überbevölkerung in Erscheinung getreten sind und auch weiter als Langzeitwirkungen noch ihren Tribut fordern werden, sind absolut irreparabel.

Billy

Irrwitzigerweise werden viele Dinge beschlossen und getan, um den Bedürfnissen der Überbevölkerung Herr zu werden. So werden immer mehr Chemikalien ausgebracht, um das Wachstum von Beeren, Früchten, Gemüse, Kräutern und Obst zu fördern und um diese Nahrungsmittel vor Schädlingen zu schützen, wodurch natürlich alles vergiftet wird und die Gifte dann auch vom Menschen aufgenommen werden, weil sich diese ja in allen diesen Naturlebensmitteln ablagern, was natürlich von den Chemikern und den Nahrungsproduzenten bestritten wird. Selbst die chemischen Gifte, die auf die Sämereien aufgebracht werden, um sie vor Schädlingen zu schützen, gelangen in die Pflanzen und damit auch wieder in den Nahrungskreislauf, und zwar auch hinsichtlich auf den Menschen gesehen. Gleiches geschieht auch in bezug auf die Antibiotika, womit die Tiere, das Federvieh und allerlei Getier traktiert werden und die Menschen dann das mit Antibiotika kontaminierte Fleisch essen, wodurch sie infolge einer Antibiotika-Über-Medikamentierung antibiotikaresistent werden. Es wird nichts unternommen, um natürliche Wachstumsmittel oder Schädlingsbekämpfungsmittel zu erforschen und anzuwenden, sondern es wird nur alles getan, um weiterhin die Chemie zu fördern und alles damit zu vergiften und ins Siechtum zu treiben, eben auch den Menschen.

again over the course of approximately 70-100 years. However, furthermore the whole thing requires that the overpopulation is reduced by means of a world-wide, rigorous and controlled birth-stop, and that all harmful effects, which have largely arisen from the overpopulation, are stemmed, unfortunately however they would not be completely remedied. The complete process of reparation can only concern a certain part, because everything that has already been destroyed and eliminated cannot be reversed, because all the destruction and elimination – which has appeared as the direct or indirect Ausartung¹ of the irrational overpopulation and which will continue to take its toll as a long term effect – is absolutely irreparable.

Billy

Absurdly enough many things are decided and done in order to handle the needs of the overpopulation. Thus more and more chemicals are applied in order to promote the growth of berries, crops, vegetables, herbs and fruit and to protect these food products from pests, whereby naturally everything is poisoned and the poisons are then also ingested by the human being, because they accumulate in all these natural food products, which of course is denied by the chemists and food producers. Even the chemical poisons that are applied to seeds, in order to protect them from pests, get into the plants and thereby also into the food chain again, and indeed also as far as the human being is concerned.

The same also happens in regard to antibiotics, with which the animals, poultry and all sorts of creatures are abused, and the human beings then eat the meat which is contaminated with antibiotics, whereby they become resistant to antibiotics due to over-medicating with antibiotics. Nothing is done to research and apply natural means for growing or for pest control, rather only everything is done to further chemistry and to thereby poison everything and drive it to lingering illness, and indeed also the human being.

¹ Explanation of the Plejaren language scientists, given to Billy August 27, 2010: Ausartung = a very bad get-out of the control of the good human nature

Ptaah

Das ist tatsächlich in jeder Beziehung so, wie du sagst, wobei es nur um den schnellen und grossen Profit geht, der durch die Chemie erwirtschaftet werden kann, während durch das ganze Gebaren verantwortungslos die Zerstörung der Fauna und Flora und die vielen Gesundheitsschäden der Erdenmenschen in Kauf genommen werden.

Dies, während das Ganze eine der ausgearteten Folgen der Überbevölkerung ist, die immer mehr Nahrungsmittel fordert, die nur noch dadurch geschaffen werden können, indem sie durch giftige chemische Substanzen zu schnellem und grossem Wachstum getrieben werden. Dass dabei jedoch diese in der Natur wachsenden Nahrungsmittel viel an Geschmack- und Nährstoffen einbüßen und für den Erdenmenschen eben mehr oder weniger gefährliche toxische Substanzen enthalten, das kümmert weder die Chemiekonzerne noch die Züchter der Nahrungsmittel, die bedenkenlos die Chemie zur Anwendung bringen. Grundsätzlich kümmert es aber auch die Erdenmenschen als Endverbraucher dieser Nahrungsmittel nicht. Tatsache ist aber, dass gesamthaft alle toxischen Stoffe, die auf Blüten, Früchte, Knospen, Kräuter, Sämereien sowie auf Getreide, Beeren, Gemüse und auf Obst ausgebracht werden, sich ebenso nicht verflüchtigen, wie wenn Tieren, Federvieh und Getier Antibiotika verabreicht werden, denn alles wird mit den toxischen Substanzen kontaminiert, folglich der Erdenmensch diese Stoffe dann beim Verzehr der Nahrungsmittel in sich aufnimmt. Natürlich sind die toxischen Stoffe in dieser Form dann nur gering und können von den irdischen Chemikern manchmal nicht einmal festgestellt werden, doch trotzdem sind sie gesundheitsschädlich und fördern bei vielen Menschen Krebs, sonstige Leiden oder schleichendes Siechtum.

Ptaah

In every respect it is actually as you say, whereby it is only about the quick and large profit that can be generated by means of chemistry, while, through the entire behaviour, irresponsibly the destruction of fauna and flora and the many forms of health- damage of the Earth human beings are accepted.

This happens, while the whole thing is one of the consequences – which has gotten very badly out of the control of the good human nature – of overpopulation, which demands more and more food products that can only be created by driving them to quick and large growth by means of chemical substances. However, neither the chemical corporations nor the growers of the food, who unscrupulously apply chemicals, are concerned that thereby these naturally grown food products lose much in regard to taste and nourishment and even contain toxic substances that are more or less dangerous for the Earth human being. However, basically the Earth human beings as the ultimate consumers of these food products do not care either. The fact however is that completely all toxic substances, which are applied to flowers, crops, buds, herbs, seeds and to grain, berries, vegetables and fruit do not volatilise, just as when antibiotics have been administered to animals, poultry and creatures, because everything is contaminated with toxic substances, consequently the Earth human being assimilates these substances during the consumption of the food products. Of course in this form the toxic substances are only slight and sometimes cannot even be detected by terrestrial chemists, but nevertheless they are damaging to health and further cancer, other afflictions or lingering illness in many human beings.

This makes it clear to me, that the intensifying of agriculture, aquaculture and human settlement, as proposed by the authors of the 'Ecomodernist Manifesto', would only lead to bigger problems, because they are not considering the effects of using chemicals on plants, penning up animals and human beings (in high rise apartments in the city) and other measures that would have to be applied if their pipe dreams were to become reality.

In conclusion I disagree with the statement of the New Zurich Newspaper, that Pope Francis' eco criticism is wrong and that the so-called 'Think Tank' has the answers to our environmental woes. Pope Francis may be heading in the right direction, but unfortunately his solution does not contain measures to reduce the overpopulation. The authors of the manifesto however, would do well studying the laws of cause and effect and coming back down to earth. As Mariann suggests, one would have to question the ulterior motive of the authors of the manifesto. Who is paying their

wages, and who would benefit if their pipe dreams came to fruition? With Billy Meier and the Plejaren it is clear that they do not have any such advantage from explaining the laws of Creation to us and from urging us to curb overpopulation in order to improve living conditions on this planet.

Vibka Wallder, 8 September 2015



Photo: Mads Nissen. Retrieved 15 September 2015, from <http://www.madsnissen.com/overpopulation-in-manila-the-philippines/>

Bibliography

- Vatican 2015, *Encyclical Laudato Si*. Retrieved 12 July 2015, from http://w2.vatican.va/content/francesco/en/encyclicals/documents/papa-francesco_20150524_enciclica-laudato-si.html
- FIGU-Zeitzeichen No. 6, 2015, *Wirtschaft vor Verstand, Vernunft und Logik – or is a «Think-Tank» a bunch of ... lowly intelligent scientists?* (By Mariann Uehlinger-Mondria). Retrieved 12 July 2015, from <http://www.figu.org/ch/verein/periodika/zeitzeichen/2015/nr-06>
- Ecomodernism.org 2015, *An Ecomodernist Manifesto*. Retrieved 17 July 2015, from <http://static1.squarespace.com/static/5515d9f9e4b04d5c3198b7bb/t/552d37bbe4b07a7dd69fcd6bb/1429026747046/An+Ecomodernist+Manifesto.pdf>
- Romm, J. 2015, *Arctic Death Spiral: Sea Ice Extent Hits Record Winter Low As Thickness Collapses*. Retrieved from <http://thinkprogress.org/climate/2015/03/26/3633019/arctic-death-spiral-sea-ice/>
- FIGU 2014, *FIGU-Bulletin Nr. 85*. Retrieved from http://www.figu.org/ch/files/downloads/figu_bulletin_85.pdf