

# **ECO-IMPERIALISM**

**When policies kill**

**How misguided ideas, ideologies and policies  
kill millions of poor people every year in developing countries**

## **STATEMENT**

of

**Paul K. Driessen, APR, Esq.**

**Director,**

**Economic Human Rights Project**

before the

**House Subcommittee on Energy and Natural Resources**

## **HEARING**

on

**Science and Public Policy**

February 4, 2004

# CONTENTS

| <b>SECTION</b>  | <b>PAGE</b> |
|---|-------------|
| SUMMARY: Misguided policies can kill millions                 | 3           |
| ENERGY: Denying poor people electricity                       | 4           |
| MALNUTRITION: Denying poor people biotechnology               | 5           |
| MALARIA: Denying poor people life-saving pesticides           | 6           |
| NATURAL RESOURCES: Are we really exhausting them?             | 8           |
| NOTABLE QUOTABLES: The truth about Eco-Imperialism            | 9           |
| TABLES: Death tolls – and funding of eco-imperialism          | 10          |
| Table 1: Death and misery toll                                |             |
| Table 2: Foundation funding for environmental pressure groups |             |
| RECOMMENDATIONS: Three vital questions                        | 11          |
| PROFILES: CDFE, CORE, EHRP, Paul Driessen                     | 12          |

## SUMMARY: Misguided policies can kill millions

A number of prevalent environmental myths and misguided policies help perpetuate poverty, misery, disease and early death in developing countries. Three glaring examples fall within the subcommittee's jurisdiction, which includes "cooperative efforts to encourage, enhance and improve international programs for the protection of the environment and conservation of natural resources." Indeed, because the lives of so many people are directly affected by these examples, they may be among the most important issues the subcommittee faces.

**Electricity.** Two billion people in Africa, Asia and Latin America still do not have electricity – and must live without lights, refrigeration, hospitals, sanitation, safe water, or the hope of economic growth and better lives. Millions of mothers and daughters spend their days gathering wood or cow dung – and breathing polluted smoke from cooking and heating fires that leave brown clouds over their villages.

Four million infants, children and mothers die every year from lung infections – millions more from dysentery and other diseases caused by tainted water and spoiled food. Wildlife habitats slowly disappear, as people cut down trees, because they don't have electricity or other sources of income. And progress and economic development remain no more than dreams or mirages – because without energy and mineral production, there can be no wealth generation, no new investment in these destitute nations, no hope or opportunity for their impoverished people.

How can this happen? It is due in large part to strident opposition to hydroelectric, fossil fuel and nuclear energy projects by wealthy, powerful First World environmental pressure groups that insist that developing countries must rely on wind and solar power, or go without electricity. This is Eco-Imperialism – and it's harmful to people and their environment.

**Malnutrition.** Biotechnology could fortify plants with vitamins, to reduce malnutrition and blindness. It could increase crop yields, replace crops devastated by disease and drought, provide vaccinations, and reduce the need to cultivate so much wildlife habitat, and use so many pesticides and fertilizers.

But ideological environmentalists oppose this technology, too – on speculative environmental and specious ethical grounds. As Kenyan plant biologist Florence Wambugu says, "I appreciate ethical concerns, but anything that doesn't feed our children is unethical."

**Malaria.** Every year, 250 million Africans get so sick from malaria that they cannot work, go to school, care for their families or cultivate their fields, for weeks or months on end. Every year, 2 million Africans *die* from this dreaded disease – far more than from AIDS. More than half are infants and children. Millions more are so weakened from malaria that they succumb to AIDS, typhus, dysentery and other serial killers that stalk these desperate, impoverished lands.

How is this possible? It happens in part because environmental activists – along with the World Health Organization and our own USAID – tell these countries they must rely on bed nets and drug therapies, since the WHO and AID oppose and will not fund pesticides, especially DDT.

These people can *afford* to take this position. They live in wealthy, malaria-free societies – because *we* used DDT and other pesticides to eliminate malaria in the United States and Europe, and still use pesticides today to combat West Nile virus.

But their inhumane policies mean hundreds of thousands of children and parents will *die* every year who would *live*, if their countries could also use DDT and other pesticides to repel, disorient and kill mosquitoes that carry the malaria virus.

This, too is Eco-Imperialism. It is immoral, irresponsible and lethal. It must stop, because the human misery and death toll – and the environmental impacts – are simply intolerable.

## **ENERGY: Denying poor people electricity**

Worldwide, nearly 3 billion people struggle desperately to survive on less than \$2.00 a day. Nearly 2 billion have no electrical power. They enjoy none of the conveniences and basic necessities we take for granted: indoor lighting, refrigerators, heating and air conditioning, radio, television, computers, safe running water – in their homes, schools, clinics or shops. Theirs is a life of poverty, misery, disease and premature death, devoid of opportunity or hope for the prosperity we expect as our rightful heritage.

These destitute people must rely on water carried in pails, often for miles, from lakes and rivers that are often tainted by disease-carrying parasites, and human and animal wastes. They live in fear every day that the water they drink and wash with will give them intestinal and other diseases that kill 1,000,000 adults and 3,000,000 children every year.

Instead of using electric or gas stoves, women and children spend hours each day collecting firewood – or squatting in mud laced with animal feces and urine, to collect, dry and store manure to burn in primitive stoves or open fires. Their hands and cookware are never clean or free of bacteria. Their primitive homes are filled with choking smoke, dust and bacteria.

The polluted air causes 4,000,000 infants and children to die every year from respiratory illnesses like pneumonia. Their mothers suffer from rampant asthma – and from lung cancer if they're "lucky" and live long enough to get cancer. These parents simply want better lives, a few basic technologies, a chance to see their children live past age five. They know that adequate supplies of affordable electricity are their only chance to determine their own destinies, build modern schools and industries, improve their health and environmental quality, and bring hope and progress to their communities.

Dependence on "biomass" fuel also harms the environment. "People cut down our trees, because they don't have electricity," Uganda's Gordon Mwesigye points out, "and our country loses its wildlife habitats and the health and economic benefits that abundant electricity brings."

But ideological environmentalists say these poor people will have to be content with "renewable" energy: wind and solar. They oppose hydroelectric, nuclear and fossil fuel facilities – the only way to provide sufficient, reliable, affordable electricity for modern societies. They ignore the real, immediate, life-and-death risks these poor people face every day. They ignore the thousands of acres of scenic habitat that giant wind turbines require ... the millions of birds they kill ... the far more expensive and unreliable electricity they generate. They ignore the lives and dreams they destroy.

(A single 555-megawatt gas-fired power plant in California generates more electricity in a year than do all 13,000 of the state's wind turbines. The gas-fired plant sits atop a mere 15 acres. The 300-foot-tall windmills directly impact over 100,000 acres, mar once-scenic vistas, and kill thousands of birds and bats every year – to provide expensive, intermittent, insufficient energy.)

Kenya's James Shikwati resents the activists' "arrogant" interference in Africans' lives. "What gives environmental activists and developed nations the right to make choices for the poor?" he wants to know. "We don't want to be encased like a museum," a woman in India's Gujarat province told a television news crew, in primitive lifestyles so romanticized by radical greens. Opposition to hydroelectric power projects is "a crime against humanity," a Gujarati man told the same crew.

We do need to protect the Earth. As we're often reminded, it's the only planet we've got. But we need to protect it from *real* risks – not exaggerated, imaginary or concocted threats. We need to understand the horrible negative consequences of alternatives promoted by eco-centric activists.

Most of all, we need to ensure that policies designed to safeguard the environment also safeguard the dreams, lives and human rights of our world's poorest citizens.

See *Eco-Imperialism: Green Power · Black Death*, Chapters 3 and 7, and [www.Eco-Imperialism.com](http://www.Eco-Imperialism.com)

## **MALNUTRITION: Denying poor people biotechnology**

Nearly 14 million people face starvation in southern Africa alone. Worldwide, 800 million are chronically undernourished, according to the World Health Organization. Over 230 million children suffer from Vitamin A Deficiency. At least 500,000 of them go blind from it every year – and 2 million a year die from malaria, dysentery and other diseases that they would survive, if they were not so malnourished and did not have so little vitamin A in their bodies.

Biotechnology could fortify plants with vitamins, to reduce malnutrition and blindness, and even produce vaccinations against diseases. Genetically engineered Golden Rice is rich in beta-carotene, which humans can convert to vitamin A, to prevent blindness and save lives. Just 1.5 ounces a day will do – not the 4 (or more) pounds that anti-biotech activists disingenuously claim they'd need.

Precise genetic engineering techniques could also produce plants that can grow better in saline and nutrient-poor soils; withstand insects and viruses; replace crops devastated by disease and drought; and reduce the need to cultivate so much wildlife habitat, and use so many fertilizers and pesticides. Biotech crops would also reduce the need for starving people to hunt and cook virtually anything that swims, runs, crawls or flies. By increasing crop yields, these crops could also help developing countries compete with European and American farmers, who get over \$300 billion a year in subsidies.

Modern biotech methods are precise, predictable and safe for people and the environment. But radical greens oppose this technology – and claim they are ethical and socially responsible.

“I appreciate ethical concerns,” comments Kenyan plant biologist Florence Wambugu. “But anything that doesn't feed our children is unethical.” We wouldn't stop using penicillin just because it causes allergic reactions in a few people, she notes, and we shouldn't ban genetically engineered crops, just because noisy activists raise speculative safety concerns.

Nor should we allow them to foment fear about food aid, on the ground that some of the grain might be genetically modified. They did exactly that in 2002, when the United States sent Zambia 26,000 tons of corn – the same delicious corn that millions of Americans have been eating safely for years. The corn got locked up in warehouses, while children and adults starved – until some broke into the warehouses.

Activists claim the rampant malnutrition, disease and death isn't their intent. However, it is the *result* – and the result is certainly predictable. The likely consequences are simply ignored, and the radicals have done nothing to alter their anti-biotech campaigns. In fact, they intend to spend *\$175 million* battling biotech foods over the next 5 years – on top of the *\$500 million* they spent between 1995 and 2003, courtesy of “socially responsible” foundations and organic food companies. As Greenpeace co-founder Dr. Patrick Moore says, they all put “unfounded fear-mongering ahead of the world's poor.”

Greenpeace and allied organizations frequently use scare tactics, threats, lies and even violence to keep people from planting or eating genetically modified crops. Even when malnourished Africans want to plant disease-resistant GM crops only to feed themselves, anti-biotech zealots shriek “Frankenfoods” and “genetic pollution.” And well-fed Europeans threaten to ban the import of grains, other crops and even fish from any nation that dares to defy their anti-biotech or anti-DDT phobias.

The director of Uganda's banana research program has been blunt in his outrage. “The Europeans have the luxury to delay,” he said. “They have enough to eat. But we Africans don't.” Dr. Norman Borlaug, father of the first Green Revolution, says: “There are 6.6 billion people on the planet today. With organic farming we could only feed 4 billion of them. Which 2 billion would volunteer to die?”

America is a biotechnology leader, precisely because we want these people to live and prosper. The challenge now is to confront and defeat the misguided policies that threaten their future.

See *Eco-Imperialism: Green Power · Black Death*, Chapter 4, and [www.Eco-Imperialism.com](http://www.Eco-Imperialism.com)

## **MALARIA: Denying poor people life-saving pesticides**

“I have suffered high fevers for days, vomited until I thought I had no stomach left,” Ugandan farmer and businesswoman Fifi Kobusingye says softly. “It has left me dehydrated, thirsty and weak, and sometimes I could not tell day from night.” Malaria has killed her son, two sisters and two nephews, one of them as she and her mother were hospitalized with the disease.

“My friend’s four-year-old child hasn’t been able to walk for months because of malaria,” Ms. Kobusingye continues. “She crawls around on the floor. Her eyes bulge out like a chameleon, her hair is dried up, and her stomach is all swollen because the parasites have taken over her liver. Her family doesn’t have the money to help her, and neither does the Ugandan government. All they can do is take care of her the best they can, and wait for her to die.”

Few American can begin to comprehend the horror and scope of this tragedy. Malaria infects 300,000,000 people a year – and kills 2,000,000. Most are in sub-Saharan Africa. Over half are children. Malaria control costs Africa, India, Latin America and other affected areas billions of dollars annually, depleting other health and environmental programs.

The disease leaves victims so weak that they cannot work, go to school, care for their families or cultivate their fields, for weeks or months on end. It is no wonder that central Africa, where malaria is most prevalent, is also the most destitute region on this impoverished continent.

A major reason for this epidemic and its devastating consequences is a near-global restriction on the production, export and use of DDT. The restrictions result from intense pressure by ideological environmentalists and threats by the United Nations, European Union, foundations and aid agencies to cut foreign aid or curtail trade with any nation that uses the insecticide.

Of course, none of these activists, bureaucrats or politicians have to worry about malaria killing them or their families. They can *afford* to have purist, utopian viewpoints about malaria and pesticides. Their nations eliminated malaria – and yellow, dengue and typhoid fever – decades ago, using the same pesticides (including DDT) that they now deny to Africa, Asia and Latin America.

Nothing works better than DDT. It’s affordable (other pesticides cost 4 to 6 times more), and that’s important for impoverished nations. It’s long lasting. A single spraying retains its potency for at least six months, meaning more dangerous pesticides do not have to be applied more often.

Sprayed in tiny amounts on walls of traditional African homes, it repels mosquitoes for six months or more. It kills any that land on the walls, and disorients those it does not kill or repel. Where DDT is used, malaria cases and deaths plummet by as much as 80 percent. Where it is not used, they skyrocket.

DDT is not carcinogenic or harmful to humans. Used properly, it is safe for the environment, and malaria-carrying mosquitoes are far less likely to build immunities to DDT than to other pesticides, which are still used heavily in agriculture.

During World War II, DDT was sprayed on Allied troops, protecting them from malaria and typhus, and saving thousands of lives. After the war, concentration camp survivors and Italian and German citizens were also sprayed with the pesticide. In the 1950s, DDT helped eradicate malaria and typhus in the United States, Europe, Canada, Australia and other countries. No ill effects were ever demonstrated.

Rachel Carson launched modern environmentalism and the anti-pesticide crusade with her book, *Silent Spring*. At the time, DDT was used in near-massive quantities to control agricultural pests and exterminate disease-carrying flies and mosquitoes. Ms. Carson postulated that these chemicals would kill off America’s raptors and songbirds, leaving us with only a silent spring. However, even as her book was being published, robin and other songbird populations were actually increasing, and subsequent studies failed to substantiate her alarmist predictions.

Nevertheless, Greenpeace, the Pesticide Action Network, NRDC, World Wildlife Fund, Physicians for Social Responsibility and other pressure groups still insist that pesticides in general, and DDT in particular, are terribly toxic to wildlife – and do all they can to prevent their use. Hollywood elites and big donors like the Ford, Pew, MacArthur and Schumann foundations support these groups with tens of millions of dollars a year. As though bowing to their demands, the World Health Organization refuses to prescribe, recommend or fund the use of any pesticide, and is particularly opposed to DDT.

Instead, they all promote drugs and insecticide-treated bed nets. These methods do help reduce malaria rates. However, they are expensive, hard to get and only partially effective. In fact, for some 20 years or more, the malaria virus has been so immune to two of the cheapest and most-prescribed anti-malarial drugs, chloroquine and SP, as to render them virtually worthless. As to bed nets, while they certainly do help at night, if maintained and used properly, they are of no value during prime mosquito hours for people who are still working or moving about their homes and villages.

And still the WHO, supposedly the developing world's primary healthcare provider, refuses to alter its stance – and the US Agency for International Development claims it can't support or fund DDT use, because the WHO opposes it, and the United States no longer permits its use. The fact is, however, that the Environmental Protection Agency banned the pesticide in 1972 primarily for political reasons, bowing to NRDC-generated pressure and in the face of extensive scientific evidence that DDT was not responsible for bird deaths, thin eggshells or harm to humans.

But of course, our country had already eradicated malaria, yellow and dengue fever, and typhus – and could *afford* to do without DDT. Yellow fever had claimed 19,000 lives in Memphis alone in 1878. Malaria outbreaks in states as far apart as Alaska, Louisiana, Virginia and Wisconsin had claimed thousands of lives in recurrent epidemics over our history. And typhus had also been a big killer. But all had been eliminated from our nation, and our consciousness, by 1972 – thanks in large part to DDT.

Perhaps even worse, as the British medical journal *Lancet* forcefully pointed out in January 2004, both of these “aid” agencies have *continued* to recommend, fund and provide supposedly anti-malarial drugs that they have known for years are no longer effective in preventing or treating this disease. No one knows how many people have died believing the drugs were effective, because WHO or USAID had provided them – but the number is doubtless in the thousands.

The consequence is horrible, totally foreseeable and unconscionable. Hundreds of thousands of children and parents are dying every year who would *live*, if their countries could also use DDT – spraying it in tiny quantities, just once or twice a year, under carefully conducted “indoor residual spraying” programs. No wonder Niger Innis, national spokesman for the Congress of Racial Equality, and others have condemned the anti-DDT policies as reckless medical malpractice – and eco-manslaughter.

No wonder *Jurassic Park* author (and PhD molecular biologist) Michael Crichton says: “Banning DDT is one of the most disgraceful episodes in the twentieth century history of America. We knew better, and we did it anyway, and we let people around the world die, and we didn't give a damn.”

No wonder *New York Times* editors said in 2002: the developed world “has been unconscionably stingy in financing the fight against malaria or research into alternatives to DDT. Until one is found, wealthy nations should be helping poor countries with all available means – including DDT.”

No wonder *20/20* news reporter John Stossel recently said: “Because of America's hysteria about chemicals, much of the world won't use DDT. And by the time this TV show is over, malaria will have killed another hundred children.” And Greenpeace co-founder Patrick Moore says “the environmental movement has lost its objectivity, morality and humanity.” The world's malaria victims will not be saved by bed nets and promises. They need DDT, and they need it now. Millions of lives are at stake.

See *Eco-Imperialism: Green Power · Black Death*, Chapter 5, and [www.Eco-Imperialism.com](http://www.Eco-Imperialism.com)

## NATURAL RESOURCES: Are we really exhausting them?

In a word, No. The day the world runs out of oil is much farther in the future than green activists care to admit. That is clear from data compiled by Dr. Robert Bradley, Jr. at the Institute for Energy Research.

- In 1947, the world's proven reserves of crude oil totaled only 68 billion barrels. Over the next 50 years, we *consumed* 783 billion barrels – and at the end of 1998 still had proven reserves of 1,050 billion barrels! Back in 1966, world proven natural gas reserves were just 1,040 trillion cubic feet (tcf). By the end of 1998, we had used up 1,880 tcf – and still had untapped reserves of 5,145 tcf!
- At 1998 consumption rates, today's proven reserves are equal to 43 years of oil and 62 years of natural gas – and crews are still discovering new deposits all over the world.

The notion that we are running out of energy (and metal) resources also reflects an abysmal grasp of basic mineral economics. “Proven reserves” is not a static number. It reflects what we can expect to extract from known deposits at a particular commodity price and with existing technology. As more deposits are discovered, prices increase, and technologies improve – proven reserve numbers rise.

Moreover, societal needs and scientific breakthroughs constantly change the kinds and amounts of energy, metallic and non-metallic resources we need. Because of incremental improvements in extrusion technology, aluminum beverage cans are now 30 percent lighter than they were in the 1960s, dramatically reducing the amount of metal needed to make a billion cans.

Improvements in tensile strength and architectural design mean modern high-rise buildings require 35 percent less steel than did their counterparts a mere 20 years ago. And today, a single fiber-optic cable made from 60 pounds of silica sand (the most abundant element on earth) carries hundreds of times more information than did an “old-fashioned” cable made from 2,000 pounds of copper.

Not one person alive at the dawn of the twentieth century could have envisioned the amazing technological feats of that era, its changing raw material needs, or its increasing ability to control pollution. In 1900, coal and wood provided heat. Air pollution and disease killed millions. Telephones, cars and electricity were novelties for the rich. Common folk and freight alike were hauled by horses, which left behind 900,000 tons of manure a year in New York City alone. The Wright brothers still made bicycles. Air conditioners, radios, televisions, plastics, antibiotics, organ transplants, computers and space shuttles could not even be imagined.

Today, the pace of change is exponentially faster than 100 or even 50 years ago. To define sustainability under these conditions is impossible. To suppose that anyone could predict what technologies will exist, what pollutants will be a problem, what fuels and minerals we will need – in what quantities – is to engage in sheer science fiction. Or in the most deceitful public policy scam.

Had environmental activists and their “precautionary principle” governed scientific and technological progress in past centuries, numerous historic achievements would have been limited or prevented. In fact, in 2003, 40 internationally renowned scientists listed modern marvels from A to Z that the precautionary principle would have stopped dead in their tracks: airplanes, antibiotics and automobiles; blood transfusions, CAT scans and contraceptives; electricity, microwaves, open heart surgery and organ transplants; refrigeration, telephones, televisions and water purification – to name but a few.

Had today's technophobic zealots been in charge in previous centuries, we would have to roll human progress back to the Middle Ages – and beyond, since even fire, the wheel and organic farming pose risks, and none would have passed the “absolute safety” test the zealots demand. Putting them in charge now would mean an end to progress, and perpetual deprivation for inhabitants of developing nations.

See *Eco-Imperialism: Green Power · Black Death*, Chapter 7, and [www.Eco-Imperialism.com](http://www.Eco-Imperialism.com)



## NOTABLE QUOTABLES: The truth about Eco-Imperialism

“We must put humanity back into the environmental debate. We all want to protect our planet. But we must stop trying to protect it from bogus or illusory threats – and on the backs, and the graves, of the world’s most powerless and impoverished people.” Niger Innis, national spokesman, Congress of Racial Equality

“When I helped create Greenpeace in 1971, I had no idea it would oppose genetic engineering and other programs that could benefit mankind – and adopt zero-tolerance policies that so clearly expose its intellectual and moral bankruptcy.” Dr. Patrick Moore, Greenpeace co-founder

“Telling destitute people in my country, and in countries with even greater destitution, that they must never aspire to living standards much better than they have now – because it wouldn’t be ‘sustainable’ – is just one example of the hypocrisy we have had thrust in our faces, in an era when we can and should grow fast enough to become fully developed in a single generation. We’re fed up with it.” Leon Louw, South Africa

“A developing country does not need First World ideological oppression. It needs to develop towards its own goals by means of its own self-respect.” Dr. Kelvin Kemm, South Africa

“Cute, indigenous customs – the kind activists say they are trying to safeguard – mean indigenous poverty, indigenous malnutrition, indigenous disease and childhood death. I don’t wish this on my worst enemy, and I wish our so-called friends would stop imposing it on us.” Akinyi Arunga, Kenya

“Why do Europe's developed countries impose their environmental ethics on poor countries that are simply trying to pass through a stage they themselves went through? After taking numerous risks to reach their current economic and technological status, why do they tell poor countries to use no energy, agricultural or pest-control technologies that might pose some conceivable risk of environmental harm? Why do they tell poor countries to follow sustainable development doctrines that really mean little or no energy or economic development?” James Shikwati, Kenya

“Our family and community are suffering and dying from malaria, and too many Europeans and environmentalists only talk about protecting the environment. But what about the people? The mosquitoes are everywhere. You think you’re safe, and you’re not. Europeans and Americans can afford to deceive themselves about malaria and pesticides. But we can’t.” Fiona Kobusingye, Uganda

“Donor agencies like the WHO and USAID need to decide whether they are in Africa to save lives, or to be politically correct and please the Greens at home.” Richard Tren, South Africa

“For all their avowed concerns for the poor, the World Social Forum and other environmental groups hold the poor in utter contempt. They do not recognize the right of the poor to decide for themselves.” Barun Mitra, India

“The only thing organic farming sustains is poverty and malnutrition.” Dr. CS Prakash, Tuskegee University and Bangalore, India

“Do you want two or three million children a year to go blind and one million to die of vitamin A deficiency, just because you object to the way Golden Rice was created?” Ismail Serageldin, director of the UN-sponsored Consultative Group on International Agricultural Research

“Ideological environmentalists are all too often helped every step of the way by people who ought to know better, and ought to be the first to challenge their assumptions, claims and demands: corporate executives, human rights groups, U.S. civil rights leaders, journalists, college professors and even clergy. By their silence, they accept and encourage the human rights violations, and the brutalizing of entire nations and continents.” Niger Innis, CORE

# TABLES: Death tolls – and funding of eco-imperialism

**TABLE 1. Developing country deaths due in part to ideological environmental standards**

Source: World Health Organization and others

| <b>CAUSES</b>                             | <b>DEATHS per year</b>   |
|---|--|
| Dysentery and diarrhea                    | 3,000,000 children<br>1,000,000 adults                           |
| Malaria                                   | 900,000 infants and children<br>1,000,000 adults                 |
| Malnutrition                              | 3,000,000 infants, children and adults                           |
| Measles, diphtheria and tetanus           | 3,000,000 infants and children                                   |
| Pneumonia and other respiratory diseases  | 4,000,000 infants and children<br>1,000,000 adults, mainly women |
| Typhus (typhoid fever)                    | 500,000 infants, children and adults                             |
| Vitamin A Deficiency-related diseases     | 2,000,000 children   |
| Babies in developing nations (all causes) | 5,000,000 dead in their first month                              |
| <b>TOTAL annual deaths</b>                | <b>24,000,000 infants, children and adults</b>                   |

**TABLE 2: Foundation funding for anti-biotechnology pressure groups (partial list)**

Sources: CDFE, Capital Research Center, V-Fluence and other watchdogs

| <b>Foundations making grants</b>                        | <b>Amounts awarded, 1995-2001</b>        |
|---|--|
| Pew Charitable Trusts                                   | \$130,996,900                            |
| Ford Foundation   | \$ 39,978,020                            |
| Joyce Foundation  | \$ 14,583,000                            |
| John D. & Catherine T. MacArthur Foundation             | \$ 11,906,500                            |
| Charles S. Mott Foundation                              | \$ 10,173,040                            |
| David & Lucile Packard Foundation                       | \$ 8,579,397                             |
| Turner Foundation                                       | \$ 8,282,000                             |
| Florence & John Schumann Foundation                     | \$ 6,782,500                             |
| Richard & Rhoda Goldman Fund                            | \$ 7,485,000                             |
| Rockefeller Brothers Fund                               | \$ 7,321,000                             |
| Foundation for Deep Ecology                             | \$ 4,158,800                             |
|   | <b>TOTAL: \$248 million</b>              |
| <b>Selected major anti-biotech recipients</b>           | <b>Sample amounts received 1995-2001</b> |
| Consumers Union U.S.                                    | \$155,640,358                            |
| Environmental Defense                                   | \$ 38,794,150                            |
| Natural Resources Defense Council                       | \$ 41,625,882                            |
| Sierra Club Foundation                                  | \$ 31,356,866                            |
| Greenpeace USA  | \$ 23,748,737                            |
| American Humane Association                             | \$ 11,660,717                            |
| Ralph Nader Public Citizen                              | \$ 6,701,554                             |
| Ralph Nader USPIRG                                      | \$ 3,598,705                             |
| Environmental Media Services                            | \$ 1,325,495                             |
| Interfaith Center on Corporate Responsibility           | \$ 1,209,309                             |
|   | <b>TOTAL: \$3187 million</b>             |
| <b>2001 expenditures of leading anti-biotech groups</b> | <b>\$341,400,000</b>                     |

## RECOMMENDATIONS

The following suggestions are not a solution. But they will lay the necessary *foundation* for a solution. I recommend that the subcommittee commission a careful, brutally honest study to explore three critical questions:

1. Will biotechnology and non-renewable electrical generation be better – or worse – for plant and animal species, habitats, scenic values, air and water quality, and *people* in developing countries?
2. Will greater prosperity in developing nations place greater stress on the Earth and its natural resources – or will it free people from poverty, starvation and killer diseases ... unleash their creative energy ... and generate the wealth, human spirit and technological progress that can help *conserve* energy, mineral and environmental resources?
3. Will the use of pesticides to control malaria, under careful, modern guidelines, harm – or improve – the environment of developing countries? In other words, should hypothetical risks of pesticides, or ideological opposition to them, override the clear health and economic benefits of using them? Does banning these pesticides violate the most basic human rights of people in these countries – including their right to live?

I think I know the answers to these questions – as do members of the Subcommittee on Energy and Natural Resources. Our country is living proof.

If the subcommittee accepts our Project's challenge, investigates these issues, and develops sound legislative and public policy approaches to address them – millions of parents, children and animals will be alive to thank it.

# PROFILES

## **Center for the Defense of Free Enterprise**

CDFE is a non-partisan 501(c)(3) education and research organization devoted to studies, public policy research, book publishing, conferences, white papers and media outreach on free enterprise, private property rights, environmental protection and wise use of natural resources. In the past, it has supported and helped coordinate such important works as *The Federalist Papers: In Modern Language: Indexed for Today's Political Issues*, by Mary Webster, and *Ecology Wars: Environmentalism as if people mattered*, by Ron Arnold. The Center is headquartered in Bellevue, Washington. For more information, visit [www.CDFE.org](http://www.CDFE.org)

## **Congress of Racial Equality**

CORE was founded in 1942 and is the third oldest of the "Big Four" civil rights groups in the United States. It promotes "harmony and healing in all aspects of society" and challenges people, politicians and organizations that sow racial discord – while also encouraging the adoption of policies that enable people to capitalize on their own initiative and creativity. The Congress of Racial Equality's national headquarters are located in New York City; supporting local affiliates and chapters are found across the U.S. and parts of Africa, Central America and the Caribbean. Its 2003 Martin Luther King awards dinner featured doctor and Senator William Frist, who spoke of his experiences ministering to African patients. The 2004 MLK program included a 4-hour "teach-in" on the impacts of eco-imperialism on developing countries. For more information, visit [www.CORE-online.org](http://www.CORE-online.org)

## **Economic Human Rights Project**

The Economic Human Rights Project is an initiative of the Center for the Defense of Free Enterprise, in cooperation with the Congress of Racial Equality. Reflecting its belief that "Economic rights *are* human rights" the growing coalition is dedicated to correcting prevalent environmental myths and misguided policies that help perpetuate poverty, misery, disease and early death in developing countries.

## **Paul Driessen**

Paul Driessen is director of the Economic Human Rights Project and a senior fellow with several nonprofit public policy institutes that focus on energy, the environment and economic development (the Atlas Economic Research Foundation, Center for the Defense of Free Enterprise and Committee For A Constructive Tomorrow). The author of *Eco-Imperialism: Green Power · Black Death* ([www.Eco-Imperialism.com](http://www.Eco-Imperialism.com)), he speaks and writes frequently on energy and environmental policy, climate change and corporate social responsibility. He works closely with a number of economic development and public policy institutes in the United States, Canada, Africa, Asia, Europe and Latin America.

Driessen received his BA in environmental sciences from Lawrence University, a law degree from the University of Denver, and an Accreditation in Public Relations from the Public Relations Society of America. His 28-year career also includes tenures with a governor's office, an energy trade association, the U.S. Senate, the U.S. Department of the Interior and several public relations firms.

A former member of the Sierra Club and Zero Population Growth, he rejected their policy prescriptions when he recognized that they too often misrepresent the facts – and have become intolerant in their views, inflexible in their demands, unwilling to recognize our tremendous strides in protecting the environment, and insensitive to the needs of people who lack the nutrition, electricity, safe water, healthcare and other basic necessities that we take for granted.