

**OUR ENVIRONMENTAL CRISIS
and the
DOMESTIC VIOLENCE CLAUSE ***

A speech by Michael Diamond
at the Atlantic City Public Library
on October 29, 2007

You are encouraged to use, copy, distribute, and publish this talk,
attributing authorship to the speaker.

My thanks go to Sandy Davis-Neff of the reference department at the Atlantic City Public Library for inviting me to give this talk, "Our Environmental Crisis and the Domestic Violence Clause." And thank you all for coming.

Let me begin by making some promises. I will tell you of a crisis and pinpoint its cause. I will lay out an effective solution. You will leave here with an agenda for action.

You may be wondering about the word "crisis." How can this be a time of environmental crisis? Isn't a crisis supposed to be like a train wreck, immediately apparent to everyone?

The answer is no. A crisis can build incrementally and arrive quietly. Slowly worsening conditions can go unnoticed because humans, according to the noted microbiologist, Rene Dubos, adapt too well to changes.

So, the best way to determine whether a crisis has crept up on us is to compare present conditions with past conditions, like looking at two photographs marked before and after. For that, we need no experts, just an accurate memory and the courage to face facts.

* The domestic violence clause is found in Article IV, Section 4 of the United States Constitution. That clause says the following:

"On application of the [state] legislature or the executive [governor] when the legislature cannot be convened, the United States shall protect them [the people] against domestic violence."

The Crisis

I was born in Newark, New Jersey in the spring of 1939. I remember the late 1940s and the 1950s with sufficient accuracy. Let's compare that time with the present:

(1) I do not remember one single child who had cancer. Cancer was rare in children. Now, there are pediatric oncology wards in hospitals. Now, foundations have been created to fulfill the last wishes of dying youngsters.

(2) I do not remember in the 1950s, a single child with asthma. Now, the disease is so prevalent that school districts are gearing up to be first responders when a life-threatening asthma attack occurs during school hours.

(3) If kids in the 1950s didn't like the school lunch, there was always a table with peanut butter and jelly for them to make sandwiches. I don't remember a single case of an obvious allergic reaction to peanut butter. Now, teachers must be trained to deal with emergency measures when an allergic reaction to peanuts becomes a matter of life or death.

(4) I do not remember a single child with diabetes in the 1950s. Now, there's an epidemic of both childhood and adult diabetes.

(5) Autism was so rare back then that we never heard the word. Not so now. People who study the disease are saying that incidence went from one birth in every ten thousand to one birth in every two hundred and fifty, nationwide. And in New Jersey, one child in every ninety-four suffers from autism.

(6) Puberty began in the 1950s when we were about twelve years old. Not now. Children are beginning to experience it as early as five-years-of-age. Early onset of puberty interferes with the orderly processes of emotional and intellectual maturation.

(7) Cancer in adults, back in the 1950s, was relatively uncommon. Now, it's said that cancer will soon strike every third person in the United States.

(8) I do not recall a single individual suffering from Alzheimer's Disease in the 1950s. Nor do I remember conversations and jokes about it. Now, we are seeing a burgeoning of these cases, and they are affecting men and women in their forties and fifties.

The Cause

What could possibly have happened in our country to cause such drastic changes in public health? Having lived through that period of time and having an accurate memory of events going back to the 1950s, I understand how it happened. I remember what brought about our present crisis.

We decided that we were destined to live better through chemistry. We jettisoned all things natural and substituted chemical alternatives. That was an ill-conceived and dangerous idea. It was sold to us as progress by chemical industry media campaigns. Soon we would all be living lives of unprecedented leisure. Our automobiles would be powered by radioactive pellets. Energy would be too cheap to meter.

People who held advanced degrees in the natural sciences had misgivings but went along. Putting aside misgivings and going along with the majority is a very American trait. Alexis de Tocqueville wrote, "I know of no country, in which, speaking generally, there is less independence of mind and true freedom of discussion than in America." A person who goes against the majority, Tocqueville said, risks condemnation by those who "express their views loudly." Too often, he said, people who would express a truth retreat into silence, as if ashamed to be telling the truth.

That's how we plunged into the dangerous folly of trying to live better through chemistry.

One of the first acts we took while traveling that wrong road was to destroy our fine, rich topsoil by bombarding it with herbicides and pesticides. The herbicides and the pesticides were neurotoxins. They were especially harmful to our children in their early developmental phases. Exposures were massive and nationwide. They began in the late 1940s and became progressively more intense as the organisms we were killing became increasingly resistant.

At the same time, we turned away from using natural fertilizers that had been the sources of vital energy in our foods. Instead, we made fertilizer out of petroleum. The new fruits, vegetables, and grains may have looked good, but were of insufficient nutrient density.

In the late 1940s and into the 1950s, people bought fresh fruits and vegetables from a grocery store. There, you could purchase grains measured out of barrels. Next to the grocery store was a butcher shop, and

next to that was a fish store. Supermarkets put them all out of business, but a huge array of chemicals became necessary to extend the shelf-life of foods. And those chemicals also became embedded in us, affecting the children most.

In business, time is money, and agriculture had become big business. Producers of milk, poultry, and meat began to increase production by feeding growth hormones to milk cows, chickens, and cattle. Children were most sorely affected. They experienced an early onset of puberty that tended to confound the orderly process of maturation and affect intellectual development.

Air and water pollution increased dramatically from the 1950s to the present. All of us were exposed to millions of new chemicals like PCBs and dioxins, chemicals that we were not designed to tolerate. Metals like lead, cadmium, and mercury reached us in quantities that brought harm to us. The chemicals and the metals impaired our health and diminished our mental acuity.

Perhaps the cruelest decisions were made in transportation. I remember the clean and silent-running electric buses that served the cities. They were put out of business, along with the old electric trolleys, through a criminal conspiracy engineered by automakers and oil companies. The clean-running electric buses and trolleys were replaced by diesel engines that left clouds of dangerous smoke and particles.

And those particles, along with lead, cadmium, and mercury, and PCBs, dioxins, pesticides, herbicides, and chemicals used to extend the shelf life of foods in supermarkets—to mention just a few—reached all of us, including children still in the womb. Living better through chemistry was a delusion and a public health nightmare.

The first unmistakable signs that chemicals were seriously impacting public health came in the 1970s. The number of children with birth defects doubled. Incidences of cancers, diabetes, asthma, and various autoimmune deficiencies began to rise, as did Alzheimer's Disease. Adults, in unusually high numbers, were showing signs of functional illiteracy. They could read, but thinking came hard. For example, many had difficulty interpreting bus schedules and dosing directions on prescribed medicines. Employers noted that workers could not readily learn new skills. In the schools, attention deficit disorders began to be more numerous. Autism started its sad rise.

Youngsters taking standardized academic tests were suddenly doing poorly, compared to years before. Those academic tests had to be made progressively easier. Boys and girls were experiencing puberty at earlier ages. Behaviorally, there was a steep rise of incivility. Beginning in the 1970s, arguments more often ended in murder. Road rage and going postal became part of the American vocabulary. Senseless murders at schools and on campuses became commonplace. And over time, those conditions, disorders, and diseases have grown worse. At present, well over half the population of the United States is suffering from one or more significant mental or physical diseases or disorders.

The Proof

Now, let's go over what I've said. I've told you that there is a health crisis in this country. That includes increases in diseases and physical disorders, behavioral declines and educational deficits. I've said that the crisis was caused by chemical exposures that started in the late 1940s. But you need proof that exposures, in fact, brought all that about. Fair enough. Let's go through the proofs, point by point.

Point one: In addition to metals of all sorts, we exposed ourselves to millions of kinds of chemical compounds, the great bulk of which were newly invented and never before experienced by humans. How many tons of toxic chemicals have been released into the environment through air and water pollution? A conservative estimate is eight million tons per year, year after year. And those toxins did not just go away. They remain in the soil, in the water sediments, and work their way up the food chain to our tables, year after year.

Point two: Those chemicals and metals have the clear capacity to cause diseases. Many are known, in fact, to cause cancer. Many more are capable of damaging DNA and thus bringing on genetic disorders.

Point three: Those chemicals and metals have the clear capacity to affect our intellectual functioning. They find their way into the brain and interfere with the complex interactions that allow for memory and cognition. Worse, many of the chemicals and metals find their way into the developing brains of babies, even in the womb, and disrupt the creation and orderly placement of neurons within the unborn child's brain.

Point four: Those chemicals and metals have the clear capacity to cause incivility and reduce human capacity for impulse control. They do this by

damaging the sensitive outer cortical structures of the brain. It's the outer cortical structures that act as governors over the primitive, limbic brain that sits atop the spinal column. Road rage and going postal results from the outer corticals being less capable of tamping down primitive behaviors by imposing reason, patience, and an understanding of duty in a complex modern world.

Point five: So, if chemicals, new ones in the millions, and a host of metals like lead, cadmium, and mercury have the clear capacity of causing harm to humans—physical diseases, impairments of impulse control, and educational difficulties—must we not conclude that they did, in fact, cause that harm? To think otherwise is unrealistic.

Point six: Let's call point six, proof by confluence, the coming together of three separate streams of events. Increases in diseases is one stream. Educational decline is another. The third is impairment of impulse control. If one or two had happened without the others, then it would be hard to conclude that toxic exposures were the cause. But all three, in fact, occurred simultaneously. That confluence is proof that exposures were the cause of our present environmental crisis.

Point seven: For this point of proof, I bring the work of Rene Dubos to your attention. Dubos was considered preeminent in the field of microbiology. He set forth a warning in 1970 about the probable effects of continuing toxic exposures on humans. This is what he said: Our biological and mental natures were shaped by millions of years of genetic experience and are essentially unchangeable. In the short run, we can tolerate the stresses of environmental exposures for which we were not designed, but the price of that tolerance would be twofold. First, there would be increases in diseases. Second, and far more menacing for Dubos, there would be "distortions of mental and emotional attributes." Unless we limited those exposures, he cautioned, we would see the development of "a form of life that will retain little of true humanness."

Point eight: This point is a follow up to the last one. Many observers have corroborated Dubos' predictions. Here are just two:

Dr. Joseph Beasley, of Tulane and Harvard Universities, put it elegantly in his book, *The Betrayal of Health*: "The benefits and conveniences of today's technology, medicine, energy production, and agriculture have come at too high a price—birth defects, neurological disorders, cancer, and

degenerative ailments. Any inquiry into the biological roots of learning and behavioral disorders of the young, or this era's rapid rise in chronic conditions, cannot ignore this pervasive fact of twentieth-century life."

Gordon Durnil is a conservative Republican who was appointed to the International Joint Commission, a group that oversees the ecological health of the Great Lakes Basin. After carefully examining the evidence, Durnil says, in *The Making of a Conservative Environmentalist*, that persistent toxic substances in the environment are probably interfering with human development, beginning at the embryonic stage. In addition to being the cause of increases in diseases like cancer, there is more than enough evidence to conclude that toxins are bringing on neurological problems, learning deficiencies, behavioral abnormalities, reproductive failures, and suppressions of immune systems. The "future of the world," he concludes, "is in the hands of people willing to take a stand" on these matters.

Point nine: Further proof that our educational declines are the result of toxic exposures is the fact that other supposed causes were investigated and rejected. A 1987 report by the Congressional Budget Office, entitled *Educational Achievement: Explanation and Implications of Recent Trends*, concluded that changes in educational policy, quality of the schools, the number of minority students, television viewing, student use of alcohol and drugs, and the growing percentage of single parent households were not significant factors in educational declines.

Point ten: The Canadian experience with functional illiteracy proves that mental acuity has been diminished by toxic exposures. Pollution from as far away as Mexico and Louisiana reaches into Canada. As a result, the functional illiteracy rate in Canada is near thirty percent. Their educational policy and the quality of their schools had long been stable. Immigration had been orderly and well within limits. Family life in Canada tended to be more stable than in the United States. Television viewing and student use of alcohol and drugs has always been of lesser intensity there. As a result, no better laboratory test could have been devised to prove that exposure to toxins causes functional illiteracy.

Point eleven: The final point of proof is found in a field of medical research

that has recently surfaced. It's called developmental immunotoxicity, DIT, for short. DIT researchers have proven that exposure to toxins like pesticides and diesel exhaust during the in utero period can cripple the body's defenses to a host of illnesses, including cancer, and cause neurobehavioral problems. The federal Environmental Protection Agency, responding to the new DIT research, has acknowledged that, when making regulatory decisions, it failed to take into consideration harms done in the womb and during early child development.

I hope we can now all agree. We have an environmental crisis, and we brought it down upon ourselves. So, what do we do?

The Domestic Violence Clause

We must use the domestic violence clause in the United States Constitution. It's the crown jewel of all the provisions in that document. Let me put it this way, if the framers were standing here next to me, they would implore you to use that clause. "Put that powerful tool to work," I hear George Washington intoning. The scholarly James Madison says, "We created that clause for you and for this environmental crisis that will soon be your complete undoing." Benjamin Franklin was old and frail at the time of the Convention. He whispered and other men would rise and speak his words to the assembly. I hear him whispering to me. "Tell them. Tell them that the domestic violence clause is their best hope. Tell them more. Tell them it is their last hope. Did they seem to hear you? No? Tell them it is their only hope."

Well, you may ask, if the domestic violence clause is so important, how come I've never heard of it before?

The answer is that it's buried in the back, among the miscellaneous provisions of Article IV, after Articles I, II, and III created the legislative, the executive, and the judicial branches of government. Not only is it in the back, but it's sandwiched between paragraphs that talk about how territories can become new states and how the Constitution can be amended.

How can something be buried in the back? Weren't the words always there to be seen?

Yes, but only recently have we known the thinking of the framers and how crucial the domestic violence clause was to the entire Constitutional

Convention in 1787. After the subject of domestic violence came up on the very first day of deliberations, the members voted that all their meetings were to be secret and were to be kept secret until after the last of them died. The only comprehensive note taker was James Madison, who was the last to die in the year 1839. The first printing of Madison's notes came in 1920. It wasn't until 1937 that there was scholarly acknowledgment of their accuracy. Hitler invaded Poland in 1939. Thereafter, the world's attention was on war. It was not until 1966 that Ohio University Press published the notes in an affordable and widely distributed edition. With that publication, historians went from trying to cull meaning from the dry bones of the words in the Constitution (quoting historian Jared Sparks), to a true understanding of what the framers meant.

You may ask, what was so important about the domestic violence concept that mere mention of it, on that first day, caused the framers to meet in strict secrecy for the next four months?

Here's what happened. Edmund Randolph, of the Virginia delegation, according to Madison's notes, rose to address the Convention. He apologized that he was not a man of "longer standing in life and political experience." His colleagues, he said, "imposed this task upon him," the task of opening "the great subject of their mission."

Their mission, he said, was to face, and I'm quoting, "the crisis and the necessity of preventing the fulfillment of the prophecies of the American downfall." "Crisis"? "Downfall"? What had happened in the ten years since independence?

The government of our nation, under the Articles of Confederation, said Randolph, was powerless to protect the people from threats of harm both internal and external. Internal harms were rebellions. The last one had occurred the year before. It was Shays' Rebellion in the State of Massachusetts.

The delegates called the internal threat "domestic violence." The external threat was called "invasion." They had been sent to Philadelphia by the states to merely amend the Articles of Confederation. It was soon apparent to them that, for purposes of security, they had to go well beyond their instructions. They were obligated to scrap the Articles of Confederation and create a new federal government, one that was powerful enough to deal with the crises that threatened survival, threats of invasion and of domestic violence.

As between the two threats, invasion or domestic violence, the internal threat was far more on their minds. Few delegates disagreed with Alexander Hamilton, who said "men are ambitious, vindictive, and rapacious." Domestic dangers were, therefore, considered "more alarming than the arms and arts of foreign nations."

So, the domestic violence clause, was, in fact, the fulcrum for the entire Constitution. Then, toward the end of their deliberations, on August 30th, 1787, an important motion was made that is critical to us more than two hundred and twenty years later. The motion was to strike out the words "domestic violence" and insert, instead, the term "insurrections." The motion was defeated. The framers did not know the form that internal violence might take in the centuries ahead so they stuck with the generic phrase, domestic violence.

They created a federal government that was empowered and obligated to protect us from domestic violence, the harm that they felt we were likely to do to one another.

Hamilton's description of us as ambitious, vindictive, and rapacious stays with me, as does the vision of Abraham Lincoln. Lincoln said: "All the armies of Europe, Asia, and Africa combined could not by force take a drink from the Ohio or make a track on the Blue Ridge, in a trial of a thousand years. At what point then is the approach of danger to be expected? I answer, if it ever reaches us, it must spring up amongst us. If destruction be our lot, we must ourselves be its author and finisher."

What is the domestic violence clause in the Constitution? It's the emergency cord, to be used in dire matters to assure survival. When racial tensions erupted in the 1960s and cities like Newark, Los Angeles, Detroit, Cincinnati, and Cleveland were scenes of looting, burning, and killing, the federal government moved in, under the authority of the domestic violence clause, with troops and tanks and imposed—by force—curfews and martial law.

And we are in no less an emergency now than occurred in Newark, Los Angeles, Detroit, and the other cities. In fact, ours is far worse. Most of us are now ill with diseases and disabilities. And we are watching the decline of our people toward, as Dubos predicted, "a form of humanity that will retain little of true humanness."

Are we, as a people, not crossing the line into insanity right now? Historian, Barbara Tuchman, in a 1987 article entitled "A Nation in Decline," decried America's deteriorating ethics, poor performance, poor thinking, and lawlessness. Prophetically, she said and I quote: "It does seem that the knowledge of a difference between right and wrong [the basic definition of insanity] is absent from our society, as if it had floated away on a shadowy night after the last World War."

And you know that she was correct. We have lost our way because we committed violence upon ourselves. For over sixty years, we have assaulted ourselves with life-curtailling exposures. The assault must be stopped. The victims must be made whole.

Actions to Take

Now that you understand something about the domestic violence clause, you will want to know how to put it to work. Let's get right to that portion of this talk.

The first step is outreach. Go to your personal networks of family, friends, civic associations, churches, and places of employment. Working through and with your networks, find the families that are struggling with such things as cancer, asthma, allergies, learning disorders, attention deficits, autism, early onset of puberty, suicide, the birth defects of all sorts that are somehow less rare than they used to be, Alzheimer's Disease, chronic fatigue syndrome, fibromyalgia, lupus, diabetes, and a host of other growing autoimmune diseases and deficiencies.

Reach out as well to school boards, teachers associations, and parent groups in cities where education is in decline and won't come back, no matter how much money per pupil is spent.

Reach out to mayors and councils and civic organizations in the cities where violence won't go away and where disorder has replaced civility.

Tell them all that their plight is not a matter of bad luck. The diseases, disorders, and disabilities they suffer from need not have happened. Tell them how they are victims of a chemical age that was carelessly imposed upon this country sixty years ago.

Most important, tell them how to fight back. Tell them how to protect themselves, the children, and the generations on the way.

Tell them all to call, write to, and meet with their state government representatives. Here in New Jersey that would be members of the New Jersey Senate and Assembly. Why do this? Because the domestic violence clause specifically sets forth the procedure. The clause, in Article IV, Section 4, says: Upon application of the state legislatures, the United States shall protect them against domestic violence. The word them means us, the people. The U. S. Supreme Court in an 1868 case, Texas v. White, made that point loud and clear. It's the people, not the states, who are guaranteed protection by the United States if there is a condition of domestic violence.

How often should the state legislators be contacted? Every day, if necessary. Watching the suffering of loved ones should be a reminder to call their legislative offices that day. Watching the decline of education every day should be a reminder to call that day. Watching the violence and the rage and the incivility should be reminders to call each and every day.

The state legislators need to do one thing for us and one thing only. Make application to the federal government that we be protected. That's done with a simple joint resolution. They need not pass a law nor spend one penny out of the state treasury. The case we're making is obvious. Lengthy hearings will not be necessary. And making application for us does not require that they forward plans and recommendations on how the federal government might meet the challenge of dealing with the existing condition of domestic violence.

Essentially, all we need from them is that they fill out a form. Check the box marked "yes." A condition of domestic violence exists in this state, and we, the legislators, are hereby making application to the federal government, requiring that you protect the people.

If your state legislators won't do that for you, than elect others who will. And if the Democrats and Republicans, as parties, stand against you, replace them too. On that score, I recommend that you begin looking at state laws concerning how individuals and groups get on the ballot. Resistant Democrats and Republicans won't stand a chance of reelection in the face of an avalanche of voters who identify themselves as fighters for the protections they and their children require to ensure survival.

We'll need to step away from the amusements that surround us for a while. Let baseball, basketball, and football be just games and not passions.

Paying attention to the lives of celebrities at the cost of not paying attention to our own is a recipe for disaster. Shut off the news programs that have little content and less historical context.

Instead, let's have gatherings in each others homes at first, and then in classrooms, and auditoriums. In the course of discussions, I suggest that one question in particular be addressed: How did it happen that the federal government allowed a condition of domestic violence to proliferate to the point that our survival is now threatened?

My understanding of our history since 1945 is that government catered to business and corporate interests. Caring for us was a distant second.

The domestic violence clause requires that the federal government protect us. I read the word protect to mean care about, be considerate of, and yes, even to cherish and to love us. That message from spiritual antiquity was always considered quaint and optional. Abiding by that message is now a requirement for survival. We either learn to order our affairs such that we love and protect each other or we do not survive.

My hero is not Hank Aaron nor Franco Harris nor even Joe DiMaggio. My hero is Fyodor Dostoyevsky the Russian writer who lived and died under repressive Tzarist governments, a man who saw beyond capitalism and communism, a child of the both the Enlightenment and the purity of Russia's Greek Orthodox Church.

The *Brothers Karamazov* was published in 1880, the year before Dostoyevsky's death. Father Zosima, a dying priest, is a character in that novel who speaks for the author.

Through Zosima, Dostoyevsky begs us to love the Earth and every grain of sand in it. Love the plants and the animals. Love every man and especially the children, for they are sinless and in our care.

The ability to love so well, says the old priest, and so universally is not won in a day, but slowly and by long labor. And we are not to love occasionally. Even the wicked can love occasionally. We are to love forever and always.

He concludes, find your joy in deeds of light and mercy. There is no freedom in living to satisfy your desires because they multiply. And in that cruel mathematics comes, not happiness, but isolation and death of the

spirit. In the end, there is not a carriage fine enough to take one to a meal sumptuous enough and back, at the end, to a house great enough.

I know people who love like that, and so do you. They've waited their turn to shape this world. Their turn has come and just in time.

Using love and responsibility as the yardsticks by which to measure appropriate federal activities under the domestic violence clause, we can do so many things surely and quickly. We will stop the exposures that are causing us to be both ill and incapable. Through massive training and reorganizing, our medical and insurance systems will be transformed from reactive to pro-active and preventative endeavors. Our food supply will again be made safe and nutritious. Cleanups of hazardous wastes will be completed. Educational deficits will be made whole by a full-out campaign to restore children and adults to complete functioning. Safe alternative energy sources can be a reality in three years, the time it took the Manhattan Project to create the first atomic bomb. The current fleet of polluting engines can be taken off the road in the same time and replaced by engines that already exist that do not pollute and sicken us.

The domestic violence clause contains wartime powers that are to be used to meet the domestic threat. As in a time of war, business and financial interests will need to conform to efforts that will assure survival. There is a time and a place for allowing complete freedom in the marketplace. The middle of a public health crisis—where survival is in doubt—is not one of those occasions.

Shouldering the massive job ahead can be, as Winston Churchill said, our finest hour. It can also be the beginning of the finest era this planet has ever experienced. Earth's history has been dominated by war. War is no longer affordable. Chemical violence has been a worldwide phenomenon. The children in Mexico City, in the Amazon Basin, and in Central Africa are ours to love as well. By treaties that grow stronger every year, countries of the world are creating an international justice system and methods that will allow the sovereignty of all nations to be respected. The United States will have to become part of that movement.

You can expect an outcry against the proposed use of the domestic violence clause. Un-American, some will say. None of our liberties should ever be curtailed. The response is that we have sorely abused our liberties. That abuse has been constant and unrelenting for the last sixty years. We chose

a foolish path that has led to us to illness. Now, there is no other course than to order our affairs—both public and private—in a manner such as to bring about health and life.

Others will rail against big government. My response is that we got ourselves into this mess because we didn't have enough government. We did not have a government of, by, and for the people. Now, we are deep into this emergency. Now, government must do what the people acting alone cannot possibly do to get us through to health and sanity.

Some critics will say that there is no "scientific proof" that chemical exposures have caused declines in health, behavior, and educability. The argument will be that the "scientific method" can only accept proof of causality when all other possible causes are studied and eliminated. And I ask, where were these scientists when we poured millions of chemicals into the world? Because of the complexities of chemistry, the pollutants, in fact, have long interacted with one another to create an infinite number of combinations of poisons. And that infinite number of poisons have interacted within the complexities of both human biology and our vibrant and changing society. In this mess, use of the phrase, "scientific method," is an absurdity. The time to have used that pristine, laboratory concept was sixty years ago, before our public health was undermined.

Another outcry against use of the domestic violence clause will be that we can't afford the cost. I say we can no longer afford the cost of rampant illnesses and the slide toward "a form of life that will retain little of true humanness," to quote yet again the words of Rene Dubos.

It's Up To You

Only you can bring all of this about. The domestic violence clause is yours to use or not. The Supreme Court has long held that you, not the lawyers and the courts of this land, are to determine what is and what is not a condition of domestic violence. You and not the lawyers and the courts of this land are to determine what measures must be taken to assure survival.

Start with reaching out to all those who are sorely affected by environmental insults. Take the matter to your state representatives. Then follow through with visions of peace, brotherhood, and love to all your countrymen and to all the peoples of the world. And do it, as Father Zosima says, especially for the children, for they are sinless and in our care.

Thank you for inviting me to address you. It's been my honor to do so.

For additional information go to www.DomesticViolenceClause.org
or google "Michael Diamond" along with "domestic violence clause."

To contact Michael Diamond, please email him at:
michaeldiamond@comcast.net