

Tree Hugging from a Revolutionary Perspective

In his great work, *Fires in the Minds of Men*, James Billington, remarks upon the attraction of revolutionaries to 'Nature'. At a time when nature, as opposed to God, has become one of the principal driving forces of political life, when politicians must obtain 'Green' credentials to attract the voters, when anthropogenic climate change has become the new bogeyman attested to by a vast array of climatologically-correct scientists and politicians, when denial of such climate change is akin to holocaust denial, it is worth reminding ourselves of some of Billington's observations and perhaps, thereby, recognising the origin of some of the forces which lie behind modern society's obsession with matters 'Green' and other revolutionary phenomena of our age.

Greens are positively obsessed by carbon capture, carbon sinks and footprints, and also in the belief that they can save the planet – akin to what Billington described as: *'the general modern belief that science would lead men out of darkness into light'*¹ - a belief, he said, which resembled *'The Promethean faith of revolutionaries.'* Another group obsessed with carbon as their name suggests, were the *Carbonari*, who, Billington advises us: *'combined all three beliefs that we have seen to be crucial to the revolutionary tradition: belief in an uncompleted revolution, in the authority of Nature against tradition, and in secret hierarchical organisation.'*² He reminds us too that in the French Revolution: *'Revolutionary authority juxtaposed the simple and natural to the complex and traditional.'* Indeed, he relates, how *'The site of the Bastille itself became a cleared space [perhaps a portent for the revolutionary population control exercised in the Vendée etc.] a tabula rasa. Many proposals*

¹ Perhaps even "utopia" – see quotation below from Professor Chris Rapley.

² The sort of 'directing nucleus' which lies behind the green phenomenon?

were made to fill it with symbols of a new order, but the first to be realised was the enormous sphinx-like statue of Nature erected there after the overthrow of the Monarchy. Designed by the brother-in-law of David, the statue was to be the rallying point for a pre-dawn gathering to sing a "Hymn to Nature" by Gossec, to hear the poet Herault de Sechelles read an invocation to nature, and then to join in a ritual that was nothing less than a secular fusion of baptism and communion rites beneath a "fountain of regeneration representing Nature".'

This might explain the quasi-religious obsession with the 'Planet' which 'Green' man has come to save. Science, particularly 'Green' science, has become salvific. But at whose expense? The salvific action of Christ involved the sacrificial offering of the Lamb of God Himself. What sacrifice, if any, will be offered by the high priests of the Green revolution? Although their voices are generally muted, those who take the implications of anthropogenic climate change to its logical conclusion are already beginning to break their silence. To them man's carbon footprint is the greatest threat to the planet and reduction in population the real answer to the problem. Professor Chris Rapley³ Director of the British Antarctic Survey, based in Cambridge, UK expressed the solution thus in an article on a BBC website on 6th January 2006:

*'Although reducing human emissions to the atmosphere is undoubtedly of critical importance, as are any and all measures to reduce the human environmental "footprint", the truth is that the contribution of each individual cannot be reduced to zero. **Only the lack of the individual can bring it down to nothing.** [Our emphasis]*

³ Professor Rapley is a Patron of the Optimum Population Trust
<http://www.optimumpopulation.org/opt.aboutus.html>

So if we believe that the size of the human "footprint" is a serious problem (and there is much evidence for this) then a rational view would be that along with a raft of measures to reduce the footprint per person, the issue of population management must be addressed.' He continues thus: Let us assume (reasonably) that an optimum human population level exists, which would provide the physical and intellectual capacity to ensure a rich and fulfilling life for all, but would represent a call upon the services of the planet which would be benign and hence sustainable over the long term.

A scientific analysis can tell us what that optimum number is (perhaps 2-3 billion).⁴

With that number and a timescale as targets, a path to reach "Utopia" from where we are now is, in principle, a straightforward matter of identifying options, choosing the approach and then planning and navigating the route from source to destination.

In practice, of course, it is a bombshell of a topic, with profound and emotive issues of ethics, morality, equity and practicability. As found in China, practicability and acceptability can be particularly elusive.

So controversial is the subject that it has become the "Cinderella" of the great sustainability debate - rarely visible in public, or even in private.

As we have seen elsewhere modern secular society recognises no moral or ethical absolutes and therefore to invoke morality or ethics as if these might present an obstacle is a moot point. Indeed if one were to paraphrase Lenin, morality and ethics in

⁴ The current population is around 6.7 billion and estimated to rise to about 9 billion.

a secular humanist/ Freemasonic society are simply those which serve to advance the revolution of whatever hue. As Arnaud de Lassus reminds us:

'Masonic rationalism ...maintains that:...

*- man makes himself through the power of his will and that he creates his own morality.'*⁵

In revolutionary France it was the 'Sainte Guillotine' which fertilised the 'tree of liberty'. What device will be used to save the Planet – will the aborttoir fertilise the arboretum planted to save the Planet from global warming - 'all the fault, of what David Attenborough describes as, 'that featherless biped, Man.'⁶ Nesta Webster, if my memory serves me right, advised us that 18th century nature-loving revolutionaries were prepared to decimate the population of France to progress their aims, why should we think that their 21st century cousins would be any less ruthless? If the Communist Chinese can devour children in the maw of the abortion mill to secure their goals with little protest from the West; if most Western democratic governments are complicit in the daily murder of their own unborn by chemical and surgical terminations of pregnancies for what are essentially reasons of social convenience; what makes us think that Green reasons cannot be harnessed to secure an even greater bloody harvest when a global government takes upon itself to save the planet and create the "utopia" sought by the likes of the Optimum Population Trust? And who will there be to defend the victims required to bring about a 'lack of individuals' to the extent of the 3-6 billion souls necessary to secure the Green utopia.

ASF.

⁵ See Apropos 22, *The Fundamentals of Freemasonry* p.

⁶ Saga, January 2007 – as always man being de-personalised into some evolutionary by-product.