

The Greening

by Larry H. Abraham

Table of Contents

- [Introduction](#)
- [Forward](#)
- [Chapter 1](#) - The Greening is Born
- [Chapter 2](#) - Tell Them What They Want to Hear
- [Chapter 3](#) - Perception vs. Reality
- [Chapter 4](#) - The Great Land Grab
- [Chapter 5](#) - "Necessittie" the Tyrant's Plea
- [Chapter 6](#) - A Legal End Run
- [Chapter 7](#) - The Most Endangered Species
- [Chapter 8](#) - The Greening's New Religion
- [Chapter 9](#) - The Green Investment Bonanza
- [Epilogue](#)

Introduction

Dr. Gary North calls it "the most stupendous, unified, worldwide propaganda campaign I've seen in my lifetime."

He is not exaggerating. In fact, this astute analyst of current events and trends is probably understating the case.

Earth Day 1990 dominated the media like no event since the Japanese bombing of Pearl Harbor. It seems likely that more Hollywood stars and MTV celebrities joined the "save the earth" crusade than opposed the Nazis in World War II.

When Larry Abraham began warning the readers of his monthly newsletter, Insider

Report, about the growing power -- and peril -- of "The Greening" revolution, he was virtually alone.

This wasn't the first time Larry was on the cutting edge of national and international developments. Far from it. His pre-eminence as a geopolitical analyst began more than two decades ago, when he and Gary Allen co-authored *None Dare Call It Conspiracy*. This small paperbound book became a national sensation, selling more than five million copies.

Since then, Larry Abraham has traveled throughout the world (including low-profile trips behind the Iron and Bamboo Curtains). He has lectured extensively, and he has written scores of articles and another book, *Call It Conspiracy*, exposing the power, the ploys, and the grand design of the real rulers of the Establishment...in both the East and the West.

The material you are about to read may be Larry's most important expose yet of the people we call "Insiders." Senator Steve Symms describes "The Greening" as "stimulating...thought-provoking...must reading." And he concludes, "The power grab is on."

Indeed it is. After reading the report that follows, you will have no doubt that "The Greening" revolution is an essential part of Insider plans. Their goal is not to green the earth...but to rule it.

Here is how they plan to do it.

W.W. "Chip" Wood
Publisher

[Table of Contents](#)

Forward

Over the past 30 years I have observed, chronicled, and variously opposed numerous onslaughts which would reduce the sovereignty of the individual and add to or increase government's power.

Without exception, every one of the projects and programs subjected to this scrutiny was presented to the public as "necessary" or "vital." Some were even presented as "life-saving" or "life-threatening." And to be sure, equally present in each "crusade" were two constant elements: (1) a grain of truth about the concern: and (2) a well-

organized minority which helped create "the appearance of popular support."

As Edmund Burke said, "The people never give up their liberties but under some delusion." What was true in 1784 is even more applicable today, given the impact of instantaneous and worldwide multimedia coverage. As it was in Burke's time, so it is now. The delusions for the "give-up" of liberties always produce the same result: bigger and more powerful government.

However reluctant some are to acknowledge it, another fact applies as well. The late George Washington University Professor of Law, Arthur S. Miller, observed, "Those who formally rule take their signals and commands not from the electorate as a body, but from a small group of men (plus a few women). This group will be called the Establishment. It exists even though that existence is stoutly denied. It is one of the secrets of the American social order." Professor Miller also added, "A second secret is the fact that the existence of the Establishment -- the ruling class -- is not supposed to be discussed."

In this report I have set out to document, and I believe prove, that in the name of "preserving the environment" or "stopping pollution," the greatest surrender of liberty in all human history is well under way. It will transfer power and natural resources heretofore undreamed of not to "the people" or "the electorate as a body," but rather to a "small group of men" or elite Establishment. The implications of this transfer are almost beyond calculation.

I must also point out and emphasize that my quarrel is not with those millions of people who are legitimately concerned about the earth's environmental well-being or the various elements of these concerns, real or contrived, i.e., "ozone depletion," the "greenhouse effect," "acid rain," "endangered species," plus countless other causes of varying focus. Nor is this the time or place to evaluate the validity of these arguments, pro or con. Each of the components has promoters as well as antagonists, and considering what's at stake here, that's as it should be.

No, my concern is how "The Greening" juggernaut is steamrolling all opposition, silencing its critics by a feigned moral and intellectual superiority and, in the process, transferring global wealth and power on an unprecedented scale.

It is also my sincere hope that even the most fervid and dedicated among "the green" movement will pause to consider how their dedication is being directed, used and misused in ways which are as varied and sinister as they are subtle.

On the more practical side of what's contained here, let's not be coy. Billions and billions of dollars have already been spent, tens if not hundreds of billions will be spent, and tremendous fortunes will be made, all in the name of "preserving the environment." While I may not be able to stop or even slow down "The Greening," I can, and do, show any objective person how to invest in order to capitalize on this mega-trend. Then let's hope and pray that people of goodwill everywhere will use

their wealth and influence to preserve what is mankind's most precious, precarious, and endangered environmental condition --liberty.

Larry H. Abraham
Wauna, Washington
April 1990

[Table of Contents](#)

Chapter 1 - The Greening is Born

Over the next 15 years, the federal budget for environmentally related expenditures will replace and surpass defense spending in both size and economic impact. I use 15 years only as an arbitrary number, electing to be overly conservative. In all probability, it will take far less time than that for this dramatic change in priorities to occur.

In the process of this "greening of the world," incredible sums of money are going to be spent, whole new industries will emerge, and vast new fortunes will be made. In the last chapter of this report I will reveal the Number One Insider-favored investment in all of this, the investment that in the '90s will be what gold was in the '70s.

As I've written numerous times over the years, unless we are able to cut through illusions and false perceptions, thus grasping reality, we will fail to understand world events and the threats to our freedoms. A lessor, but applicable, consequence will be our failure as investors.

With that axiom in mind, I wish to share with you some forgotten history of 20-plus years ago. You will be astounded as you see how it relates to the environmental movement today, and specifically, our enthusiastic comments about the prime Insider investment of the '90s.

What If Peace Breaks out?

In 1967, a little book of just over 100 pages was published by Dial Press. The thoroughly innocuous title was Report From Iron Mountain on the Possibility and Desirability of Peace. Leonard C. Lewin, who wrote the introduction, describes the circumstances of the book's publication as follows:

""John Doe". as I will call him in this book for reasons that will be

made clear, is a professor at a large university in the Middle West. His field is one of the social sciences, but I will not identify him beyond this. He telephoned me one evening last winter, quite unexpectedly; we had not been in touch for several years. He was in New York for a few days, he said, and there was something important he wanted to discuss with me. He wouldn't say what it was. We met for lunch the next day at a midtown restaurant."

"He was obviously disturbed. He made small talk for half an hour, which was quite out of character, and I didn't press him. Then, apropos of nothing, he mentioned a dispute between a writer and a prominent political family that had been in the headlines. What, he wanted to know, were my views on 'freedom of information?' How would I qualify them? And so on. My answers were not memorable, but they seemed to satisfy him. Then quite abruptly, he began to tell me the following story:

"Early in August of 1963, he said, he found a message on his desk that a 'Mrs. Potts' had called him from Washington. When he returned the call, a man answered immediately, and told Doe, among other things, that he had been selected to serve on a commission 'of the highest importance.' Its objective was to determine, accurately and realistically, the nature of the problems that would confront The United States if and when a condition of 'permanent peace' should arrive, and to draft a program for dealing with this contingency. The man described the unique procedures that were to govern the commission's work and that were expected to extend its scope far beyond that of any previous examination of these problems."

"Considering that the caller did not precisely identify either himself or his agency, his persuasiveness must have been of a truly remarkable order. Doe entertained no serious doubts of the bona fides of the project, however, chiefly because of his previous experience with the excessive secrecy that often surrounds quasi-governmental activities. In addition, the man at the other end of the line demonstrated an impressively complete and surprisingly detailed knowledge of Doe's work and personal life. He also mentioned the names of others who were to serve with the group; most of them were known to Doe by reputation. Doe agreed to take the assignment -- he felt he had no real choice in the matter -- and to appear the second Saturday

following at Iron Mountain, New York. An airline ticket arrived in his mail the next morning."

"The cloak-and-dagger tone of this convocation was further enhanced by the meeting place itself. Iron Mountain, located near the town of Hudson, is like something out of Ian Fleming or E. Phillips Oppenheim. It is an underground nuclear hide-out for hundreds of large American corporations. Most of them use it as an emergency storage vault for important documents. But a number of them maintain substitute corporate headquarters as well, where essential personnel could presumably survive and continue to work after an attack. This latter group includes such firms as Standard Oil of New Jersey, Manufacturers Hanover Trust, and Shell."

"I will leave most of the story of the operations of the Special Study Group, as the commission was formally called, for Doe to tell in his own words. At this point it is necessary to say only that it met and worked regularly for over two and a half years, after which it produced a Report. It was this document, and what to do about it, that Doe wanted to talk to me about."

"The Report, he said, had been suppressed -- both by the Special Study Group itself and by the government inter-agency committee to which it had been submitted. After months of agonizing, Doe had decided that he would no longer be party to keeping it secret. What he wanted from me was advice and assistance in having it published. He gave me his copy to read, with the express understanding that if for any reason I were unwilling to become involved, I would say nothing about it to anyone else."

Why Insiders Love War

Lewin then goes on to describe how he came to understand fully why Doe's associates didn't want their work product publicized and why the real author of the Report had to use the trite but necessary nom de plume of John Doe. Lewin writes that the Special Study Group concluded:

"Lasting peace, while not theoretically impossible, is probably unattainable; even if it could be achieved it would almost certainly not be in the best interests of a stable society to achieve it."

"That is the gist of what they say. Behind their qualified academic language runs this general argument: War fills certain functions essential to the stability of our society; until other ways of filling them are developed, the war system must be maintained -- and improved in effectiveness."

Lewin concludes his introductory comments:

"I should state, for the record, that I do not share the attitudes toward war and peace, life and death, and survival of the species manifested in the Report. Few readers will. In human terms, it is an outrageous document. But it does represent a serious and challenging effort to define an enormous problem. And it explains, or certainly appears to explain, aspects of American policy otherwise incomprehensible by the ordinary standards of common sense. What we may think of these explanations is something else, but it seems to me that we are entitled to know not only what they are but whose they are."

A short time after the book was published, a popular guessing game of "Who is Doe?" sprang up amid the governmental and academic literati. By 1969 John Kenneth Galbraith, the Harvard economist and Insider par excellence, admitted his involvement and authorship, but never would, to this very day, disclose the other members of the research team.

With this background, let's now extract just a few of the most startling revelations as they pertain to our current hysteria on the "environment" and the "end of the Cold War." As we do, remember we are quoting verbatim from a document published in 1967 which was the result of a project started in 1963. The Special Study Group said:

"Our work has been predicated on the belief that some kind of general peace may soon be negotiable. The de facto admission of Communist China into the United Nations now appears to be only a few years away at most. [It was four years, to be exact. -- LA] It has become increasingly manifest that conflicts of American national interest with those of China and the Soviet Union are susceptible of political solution...It is not necessary, for the purposes of our study, to assume that a general detente of this sort will come about...but only that it may."

In Section 5, entitled "The Functions of War," the Report states, "As we have indicated, the pre-eminence of the concept of war as the principal organizing force in most societies has been insufficiently appreciated."

The Special Study Group then goes on to show how war, or the threat of war, is very "positive" from government's perspective because it allows for major expenditures, national solidarity, and a "stable internal political structure." They state, "Without it [war], no government has ever been able to obtain acquiescence in its 'legitimacy,' or right to rule its society." They further state, "Obviously, if the war system were to be

discarded, new political machinery would be needed at once to serve this vital sub-function. Until it is developed, the continuance of the war system must be assured, if for no other reason, among others, than to preserve whatever quality and degree of poverty a society requires as an incentive, as well as to maintain the stability of its internal organization of power."

Before moving into a discussion of what could possibly serve as a substitute for the positive aspects of war, Doe writes, "Whether the substitute is ritual in nature or functionally substantive, unless it provides a believable life-and-death threat it will not serve the socially organizing function of war." [Emphasis added] I urge you to reread and keep that statement etched deeply in your mind as we go forward.

A Substitute For War

Then in Section 6, "Substitutes for the Functions of War," Doe, writing for the Special Study Group, goes on to outline the economic necessities which must be applied:

"Economic surrogates for war must meet two principal criteria. They must be 'wasteful,' in the common sense of the word, and they must operate outside the normal supply-demand system. A corollary that should be obvious is that the magnitude of the waste must be sufficient to meet the needs of a particular society. An economy as advanced and complex as our own requires the planned average destruction of not less than 10% of gross national product..."

Please read this incredible revelation a second, and maybe even a third, time. For this admission will help you understand Lewin's following comment and 40-plus years of history." ...[It explains, or certainly appears to explain, aspects of American policy otherwise incomprehensible by the ordinary standards of common sense.]

After exploring a whole range of "substitute" possibilities, such as a war on poverty, space research, even "the credibility of an out-of- our-world invasion threat," the Special Study Group reports and Doe recites." It may be, for instance, that gross pollution of the environment can eventually replace the possibility of mass destruction by nuclear weapons as the principal apparent threat to the survival of the species. Poisoning of the air, and of the principal sources of food and water supply, is already well advanced, and at first glance would seem promising in this respect; it constitutes a threat that can be dealt with only through social organization and political power. But from present indications it will be a generation to a generation-and-a-half before environmental pollution, however severe, will be sufficiently menacing, on a global scale, to offer a possible basis for a solution."

I hope you didn't skim over the preceding paragraph. It explains, with almost unbelievable boldness, that environmental concerns were an almost perfect replacement for war. but it would take a generation or a generation-and-a-half (that

is, 20 to 30 years) to bring this about. Remember, we are talking about a report circa 1967.

The time frame is now complete, as evidenced by an article in the March 20, 1990, Seattle Post-Intelligencer. The front-page headline says, "Pollution a 'ticking time bomb,' conference warned." Datelined Vancouver, B.C., the lead paragraph read, "Environmental destruction is a 'ticking time bomb' that poses a 'more absolute' threat to human survival than nuclear annihilation during the Cold War, former Norwegian Prime Minister Gro Harlem Brundtland told an international environment conference here."

The article goes on, "The conference, Globe '90, was launched yesterday amid warnings that pollution and overpopulation are threats that require resources previously committed to the arms race."

I'll have more to say about Globe '90 and other such conferences later. Now let's continue with Report From Iron Mountain and its revelations.

In the section, "Substitutes for the Functions of War," they conclude:

"However unlikely some of the possible alternate enemies we have mentioned may seem, we must emphasize that one must be found, of credible quality and magnitude, if a transition to peace is ever to come about without social disintegration."

Then they say, "It is more probable, in our judgment, that **such a threat will have to be invented**, rather than developed from unknown conditions." [The emphasis is definitely mine.]

Doe, a.k.a. J.K. Galbraith, then summarizes, "What is involved here, in a sense, is the quest for William James' 'moral equivalent of war.'"

All I can say is, "equivalent of war" it is and has become, but "moral," never!

It is also worth noting that in his section entitled, "Background Information," Doe says, "The general idea...for this kind of study dates back at least to 1961. It started with some of the new people who came in with the Kennedy Administration, mostly, I think, with McNamara, Bundy, and Rusk."

The very same McGeorge Bundy who served as Kennedy's National Security Advisor has a feature article in Foreign Affairs, Vol. 69, No.1. Bundy's piece is entitled, "From Cold War Toward Trusting Peace." You must give these devils their due -- they are very patient.

Earth Day -- 1970-1990

Now let's shift the scene to April 22, 1970. On that day, with the approval of the Congress, President Richard M. Nixon declared the first Earth Day and simultaneously in the same year established the Environmental Protection Agency. (A few more cynical types, familiar with how the Marxist-Leninists and their Insider buddies like to link dates, have pointed out that most biographers also cite April 22 as V.I. Lenin's birthday. Not wanting to be Ultra-conspiratorial, I'll use April 23 for Lenin's birthday, as some others do, and not try to draw any ominous conclusions. Just thought you might be interested.)

It is finally "a generation- and-a-half" later, and the whole world is gearing up for Earth Day 1990. As I write, it is amidst the rising cacophony of what is to come. April 22 is going to be a very big day. My latest tally shows that 107 countries worldwide will be involved in a planet-wide recognition of this Green Gala.

In a front-page feature in the Sunday, January 28, 1990 Seattle Times, reporter Bill Dietrich said, "Environmentalists are hoping history is about to top itself with a[n]...Earth Day celebration...involving more than 100 countries and 100 million people. The goal is to make the '90s the 'Decade of the Environment.'"

How does this fit with the Report From Iron Mountain? Just two citations from the same Seattle Times piece make the point:

"Government, business, and consumers have spent up to a trillion dollars, by Department of Commerce count, to clean the environment...the U.S. seems to find three new environmental hazards for each one it conquers."

That's the reporter's observation, not mine. The item continues, "Twenty years after Earth Day, those of us who set out to change the world are poised on the threshold of utter failure...How could we have fought so hard, and won so many battles, only to find ourselves now on the verge of losing the war?" That particular lament was uttered by none other than Denis Hayes, the founder of the original Earth Day.

In a moment of surprising candor, Ken Weiner, Jimmy Carter's Deputy Director of the Council for Environmental Quality and now a Seattle attorney, admitted Hayes is more than half right: "The environmental movement is recognizing its issue is being taken away by the Establishment. It has been said war is too important to be left to the generals. Some are wondering if environment quality is too important to be left to the environmentalists."

As the jubilant contestants on Family Feud would say, while clapping hands and jumping up and down, "Good answer, good answer!"

So let's quickly do a recap on the environment and see if it fits the "Substitute for the Function of War" so desperately sought by the Special Study Group in the Report From Iron Mountain:

1. We have a "war"
2. It involves "everyone -- everywhere"
3. It's "urgent"
4. It's already required the spending of "a trillion dollars"
5. It's "international;" and most frightening of all,
6. "You ain't seen nothin' yet."

Yes, I think we can say there is a fit here. One that is planned to bridge East and West, communist and capitalist, into a single clean, pure, breathable New World Order.

[Table of Contents](#)

Chapter 2 - Tell Them What They Want to Hear

In order to place "The Greening" in perspective, we must examine in part the "end of the Cold War." For just as the Secret Study Group was planning the protracted future in the U.S., other "generation-or- generation-and-a-half" plans were being discussed half a world away. Any thorough retrospective demands an examination of a possible fit. What Doe (Galbraith) didn't say in the Report From Iron Mountain was that if the "Cold War" were to come to an end and if "peace breaks out," surely the adversary, i.e., the Soviet Union, might have something to say about it.

What you have been watching on TV, reading in your newspapers, and digesting in the weekly news magazines over the past year may well be the most massive deception in the entire history of mankind. It is certainly the greatest (and most dangerous) charade of my lifetime. I have previously called this metamorphosis "The Greening of the Reds."

I'm referring to the short-lived "democratic" revolution in China; the power-sharing and elections in the Soviet Union; the elections in Poland, Hungary and throughout Eastern Europe; the rebellion in the Eastern Bloc; the disunity in NATO; the merging of East and West Germany; and the "conversion" to anti-Communism by the radical and establishment Left in this country. I am now convinced that they are all part of the same elaborate ruse. We are living through a dialectic that has been brilliantly and patiently designed to mislead the world, and more specifically, the American people.

If I am right, what you are witnessing is nothing less than the beginning of the final stages of the drive toward a New World Order. It's clever; it's powerful; it's believable; and most dangerous of all, it's working.

The Hidden Picture

Now, having said all that right up front, please hear me out. I do not always look behind every silver lining for the dark cloud I'm convinced must be there. In the age-old struggle between freedom and slavery, I welcome "good news" as much as the next person.

It is just that I have spent too many years and plowed through too many thousands of volumes not to recognize a carefully arranged deceit when one is being presented. Those of you who read *None Dare Call It Conspiracy*, or my sequel, *Call It Conspiracy*, will recall the following metaphor:

"Most of us have had the experience, either as parents or youngsters, of trying to discover the 'hidden picture' within another picture in a children's magazine. Usually you are shown a landscape with trees, bushes, flowers, and other bits of nature. The caption reads something like this: 'Concealed somewhere in this picture is a donkey pulling a cart with a boy in it. Can you find them?' Try as you might, usually you could not find the hidden picture until you turned to the page further back in the magazine which revealed how cleverly the artist had hidden it from us. If we study the landscape we realize that the whole picture was painted in such a way as to conceal the real picture, and once we see the 'real picture,' it stands out like the proverbial painful digit.

"We believe the picture painters of the mass media are artfully creating landscapes for us which deliberately hide the real picture. In this book, we will show you how to discover the 'hidden picture' in the landscapes presented to us daily through newspapers, radio and television. Once you see through the camouflage, you will see the donkey, the cart and the boy who have been there all along."

Those paragraphs were first written back in 1971. They were the result of my trying to find a way to explain to people then just how confusing world events can be -- until you see the real picture. I first developed that metaphor in 1969 in the course of giving a three-hour lecture, which ultimately became the basis for *None Dare Call It Conspiracy*. How that lecture evolved into Gary Allen's and my runaway best-seller is an interesting story, but one that is better left for another time and place.

My point today is (and was then) that in the real world of mega-power politics, we are being deceived on a scale so massive it is almost beyond human comprehension. I must grudgingly admit that my use of a "green" and natural landscape as part of the deception was totally coincidental, but its current application is better than ever.

Some Ancient Stratagems

This whole strategy really isn't anything new, except to the extent that television and other sophisticated communications techniques make it more compelling. As long-time readers of my newsletter, *Insider Report* know, I have for years encouraged

serious students of politics to become familiar with Sun Tsu and his classic work, *The Art of War*. This treatise, which was written nearly 2500 years ago, around 500 B.C., contains the blueprint for all that is being done to us today, as the Insiders pursue their age-old dream of a New World Order.

Quoted below are just a few examples of Sun Tsu's stratagems. As you read them, reflect on what you have been exposed to in the recent media blitz.

- All warfare is based on deception.
- When the enemy is divided, he is destroyed.
- When he is united, divide him.
- To subdue the enemy without fighting is the acme of skill.
- Those skilled in war subdue the enemy without battle.
- When able to attack seem unable; when active, seem inactive.
- When near make the enemy believe you are far; when far away make him believe you are near.
- If weak pretend to be strong and so cause the enemy to avoid you; when strong pretend to be weak so that the enemy may grow arrogant.

Sun Tsu knew, as do his more modern practitioners, that painting false pictures for the purpose of deception is an integral part of the "ultimate weapon." Believe me, our enemies know all about the strategies of deception. An important new book on this subject has just been released by the brilliant investigative reporter, Edward Jay Epstein. He has even called his book *Deception*, and it is one that I highly recommend to you. In it he says:

"First, the victim's leadership has to be in a state of mind to want to accept and act on the disinformation it receives from its own intelligence. This might not happen unless the disinformation fits in with the adversary's prevailing preconceptions or interest -- which is, at least in the case of the United States, not difficult to determine. Angleton [former CIA head of counter-espionage] suggested that Lenin showed he understood this principle when in 1921 he instructed his intelligence chief in crafting disinformation, to 'Tell them what they want to hear.'

Second, the victim has to be in the state of mind in which he is so confident of his own intelligence that he is unwilling to entertain evidence, or even theories, that he is or can be duped. This kind of blanket denial amounts to a conceit, which Angleton claimed could be cultivated in an adversary...[to leave] a nation defenseless against deception."

The CIA's late superspy, James Jesus Angleton, was fond of saying, " Deception is a state of mind -- and the mind of the state." [Emphasis added]

For another example of this strategy at work -- but one that is far removed from the world of international geopolitics -- rent a video of that classic Paul Newman/Robert Redford movie, "The Sting." They were indeed masters of deception.

And in fact, "The Sting" wasn't all that different from the international machinations we've been discussing. If you'll remember, essential to the success of that con game was what James Angleton called the "feedback channel" -- a way to successfully disseminate false but believable information back to the "mark," or in this case the person who was to be stung.

A Series Of "Glasnosts"

Describing all of the ramifications of what's going on right before our eyes would take a volume of no small proportion. There is a desperate need today for such a study. But in the meantime, consider just a few facts and juxtapose them with the principles of deception and the "art of war" that we've been describing:

Mikhail Gorbachev is the central figure in a massive "PR" campaign, the results of which have framed the official policy of our government and others into "preserving his leadership role" and "helping him to succeed."

Gorbachev's "glasnost" is actually the sixth one that we've experienced since Lenin's day. As Epstein points out and my own studies confirm, they were:

1. The New Economic Policy (NEP), Spring 1921-1929. At that time, Lenin said, "Glasnost is a sword which heals the wound it inflicts."
2. The Soviet Constitution, 1936-1937. This was the time of what Stalin called "reconstructions," or "perestroika."
3. The Wartime Ally, 1941-1945. Stalin was known as "Uncle Joe." After Yalta, FDR's advisor Harry Hopkins wrote of the Soviets, "...there wasn't any doubt that we could live and get along with them peacefully for as far into the future as any of us could imagine." The British Foreign office concluded, "The old idea of world revolution is dead."
4. DeStalinization under Khrushchev, 1956-1959. Remember when Khrushchev pounded his shoe on the podium at the UN -- and later declared, "We spit in your face and you call it dew"?
5. Detente, 1970-1975. As Epstein writes, "The central theme was that the Soviet government...had no interest in adhering to the Leninist Doctrine of class warfare..." And finally, there is:
6. The Deception Occurring Right Now.

In each period of "glasnost," the Corporate Marxists have fallen over each other in their rush to bail out the Soviets with money, technology transfers, and credit -- all guaranteed by the U.S. taxpayers, of course.

Nor is this "deception by glasnost" limited to Russia. To the above list could be _____

added Tito of Yugoslavia, Dubcek of Czechoslovakia, Mao of China, Ceaucescu of Rumania, plus a list of lesser-lights like Nasser and Ortega. At one time or another, each had his own "glasnost" -- and his own sponsors among the Insiders of Corporate Marxism. Who will be next? My bet is on Cuba's Castro or his replacement.

In every case, the methodology of deception was the same. A brutal tyrant was portrayed as something else. The "art of war" was applied to the West's "state of mind" and became "the mind of the state."

Masters Of Deceit

Here are some further points to keep in mind as we attempt to untangle the deceptions being foisted upon us:

- Dissidents such as the late Andrei Sakharov and Lech Walesa are not really anti-socialist or exponents of competitive capitalism at all. They seek to preserve the current power structure, call it "non- communist," declare a so-called "market socialism," and provide a new face. These men are carbon copies of a ploy that was used many years ago, during Lenin's first glasnost, the New Economic Policy. Then, the so-called opposition was called "The Trust," and it was later proved to be created and directed by the Party itself.
- The "student revolution" in China started while Gorbachev was visiting Beijing and it was encouraged by the Communist Party leaders themselves. In the process, it identified all the real anti- communists who were promptly marked for extinction.
- All the TV news and newspaper commentaries are using anti-communist rhetoric of the type they would have scorned only a few months earlier. But at no time do they call for breaking diplomatic relations or imposing South African-style economic sanctions on China. Why?
- Did you notice, by the way, that not once in all those thousands of hours ground out by ABC, NBC, CBS and CNN was a truly anti-communist analyst the subject of those in-depth interviews? Nor were any representatives or diplomats from Taiwan interviewed.
- Without a single exception I can think of, every expert interviewed (and sometimes doing the interviewing) was a familiar CFR Trilateral type, such as Henry Kissinger, William Hyland, John Chancellor, Dan Rather, Ted Koppel, Orville Schell, Flora Lewis, and Betty Bao Lord (wife of elite Insider Winston Lord, our immediate past ambassador to China).
- In almost every instance, from China to Poland and all stops in between, the news coverage has been written and arranged for Western and especially U.S. audiences, not for domestic consumption.
- Simultaneous to all of the above, the "Green Movement" has taken over the role of radical socialism from Euro-communism and is being pushed by everyone from David Rockefeller to the Red Brigade.

In the case of China, here's where I believe it's all headed. Just as was the case of Sakharov in Russia and Lech Walesa in Poland, very shortly a much-publicized but untouchable "dissident" will emerge in Mainland China. The "brutal fascistic tyranny" of Li Peng and Deng Xiaoping will be replaced by a "reasonable moderate" such as Fang Lizhi or the "out of sight" Zhao Ziyang. Suddenly, China will have its own carbon copy of Mikhail Gorbachev.

This will be followed by even greater press and publicity for China's "green movement." These new "defenders of the environment" will be promoted by the very same leaders and pundits, including Gorbachev himself. The message is increasingly clear: The "preservation of the environment" is a basis for "worldwide cooperation" - - regardless of ideology. (Note that President Bush is now referring to himself as "The Environmental President.")

Placing all of these seemingly disconnected events and developments in context, it could be that while the world focuses on the "breakup" of communism, the stage is being set for the program I describe at length in my special report, WIPEOUT. (If you have not already seen it, I strongly suggest buying it and reading it very carefully. Readers of this report can get a copy for half-price -- only \$ 19 -- by writing: Insider Report, P.O. Box 84903, Phoenix, Arizona 85071.)

Or could it be what Mr. Gorbachev referred to in his "inaugural speech" on March 17, 1990, "...major decisions are being prepared that will spell not only a new step in improving Soviet-American relations, but also an important contribution to our two countries consolidating positive tendencies in the entire world politics." He made that statement referring to the upcoming "meeting with President Bush in Washington" scheduled for summer 1990.

While the world is singing funeral dirges over the grave of communism, the reality is that we are witnessing "The Greening of the Reds." It's one of the most brilliant and diabolically cunning gambits of this century.

If it succeeds, you can be sure that the "great merger" will roll merrily along and that we will have taken a giant step towards the ultimate formation of the New World Order.

[Table of Contents](#)

Chapter 3 - Perception vs. Reality

Niccolo Machiavelli observed almost 500 years ago. "Men in general make

judgments more by appearances than by reality, for sight alone belongs to everyone, but understanding to a few." This keen theoretician of State power understood then what every smart political operative both before and since has recognized and applied. Machiavelli's 20th-Century counterpart, Henry Kissinger, put it this way: "Perceptions become reality."

As we observe the world around us, our constant struggle is to make the distinction between what the author of *The Prince* called "appearances" and what events mandate as reality. This is no easy task under the best of circumstances. In modern times it has become almost impossible. When we pit our common sense against the tidal waves of misinformation flooding out of the major media, too often we capitulate to what appears to be an overwhelming consensus. Time and time again, on issue after issue, this mental surrender occurs.

The "creation of the appearance of popular support" is at the center of all contemporary political activity. This technique is so all- pervasive as to lead even the most rational among us to conclude even in the face of the most outlandish proposals, "I must be the only one who feels this way." Our opposition to some preposterous scheme seems to be unique, with the result that we shrug our shoulders and accept what we are told is "the wisdom of the majority" or the all- conclusive, argument-ending "world opinion."

Adding impetus to this emerging mindset is the innate desire to believe the best. We have been nurtured on happy endings and the vision of the "good guy" riding off into the sunset, having righted all wrongs. It goes against our nature to believe the worst, to assume we are being deceived, or to be always on guard against such deception. And every power seeker from Sun Tsu to Gorbachev knows this implicitly. "Tell them what they want to hear," Lenin admonished Dzierzhinski.

Clear And Present Danger

In more contemporary times, say the past eight or nine years, the soothing voice of the Great Communicator worked its magic on the unspoken concerns of the West, and the American people specifically. The ritual of keeping alive the Reagan rhetoric has become for Conservatives something akin to the custom of the Bunyoro tribesmen of Uganda. When the king died and his heir emerged, he would return to his father's corpse and remove the jawbone. The new king would then bury the jawbone with full ceremonies. Later, a house would be built over the spot for the dead king's regalia -- with the rest of his body being unceremoniously discarded. The tomb housing the royal jawbone would long be venerated.

Now don't judge me or Mr. Reagan too harshly by this amusing comparison. He did much to deserve our gratitude, just as, I am certain, did the late lamented Bunyoro king for his constituents. But the fact remains that venerated jawbones do little to cast the light of reality on our clear and present danger.

And just what is that clear and present danger? It has been decades in the planning it has been built on the corpses of millions of innocents. The ultimate goal has been described by the Insiders themselves as the creation of a New World Order. As I pointed out in the last chapter, the most important current strategy in that design can be summarized as "The Greening of the Reds." Let me cite a few recent news items and articles to illustrate my point.

- The New York Times, December 8, 1989, text of Gorbachev's speech at the United Nations. "International economic security is inconceivable unless related not only to the world's environment but also to the elimination of the threat to the world's environment...Let us also think about setting up within the framework of the United Nations a center for emergency environmental assistance."
- Facts on File, March 24, 1989, "Greens Emerge -- the Ecologists Party or Greens Won Over 1,800 City Council Seats Across France."
- The New York Times, June 18, 1989, Flora Lewis's column, headline: "Red-Green Tide in Germany."
- Seattle Post-Intelligencer News Service, June 20, 1989, headline: "The Green Parties Post Big Gains in Euro-Parliament."
- Reuters, June 23, 1989, dateline: Stockholm, Sweden. "Socialists indicated yesterday that their red flag of the future will have broad bands of green as left-wing parties embrace environmental politics. 'Issues such as safeguarding our environment, international resource management and protection...are going to dominate our common future,' Austrian Chancellor Franz Vranitzky told the triennial meeting of Socialist International. The threat to the environment was the top theme at the three-day meeting of 81 socialist and Social Democratic parties. 'This is our new mission,' said Swedish Environment Minister Birgetta Dahl. Speaker after speaker stressed that left-wing parties had to adapt to the new reality [emphasis added] if socialism was to keep step with the times [I will have more to say about the "new reality" shortly --Larry]. They also indicated that traditional concerns such as security and global disarmament were less compelling in an atmosphere of East-West rapprochement. 'Conventional conflicts were no longer the main threat to humanity,' said Hans-Jochen Vogel, Chairman of the West German Social Democratic Party."
- Seattle Post-Intelligencer, July 12, 1989, editorial headline: "Greening of the Soviets." "Bowling to environmentalists, the Soviet Parliament this week fired the timber minister Mikhail Busygin. It is seen as evidence of the governmental lobbies' growing strength in this new era of Soviet reform."
- ABC News Special Report, July 13, 1989, Paris. Headline: "... Environment takes Center Stage at Economic Summit Meeting."

Since I outlined these specific citations in the July 1989 issue of Insider Report, not a single day passes without some dispatch or news items carrying the same theme. An Op-Ed piece in The New York Times of March 27, 1990, is typical of this barrage. It was headlined. "From Red Menace to Green Threat." The writer. Michael

Oppenheimer, co-author of *Dead Heat: The Race Against The Greenhouse Effect*, writes, "Global warming, ozone depletion, deforestation and overpopulation are the four horsemen of a looming 21st century apocalypse." He continues, "As the cold war recedes, the environment is becoming the No. 1 international security concern." My files are bulging with variations of this same theme and it is coming from every point on the compass.

The "New Reality"

Are you getting the impression that there may be a trend here? And just what is this "new reality" to which the Reds themselves refer? This phrase keeps popping up in some very interesting and diverse places. In the Summer 1988 edition of *Foreign Affairs*, the quarterly publication of the Council on Foreign Relations (the senior Insider organization in the United States), Henry Kissinger and Cyrus Vance Co-authored a lengthy piece for the incoming and yet-to-be-determined president. It was called, "Bipartisan Objectives for American Foreign Policy."

Within this presumptuous 22-page epistle, Messrs. Kissinger and Vance used the phrase "new realities" three times -- without once defining what they mean. Mr. Gorbachev, in the aforementioned UN speech six months after the Kissinger-Vance article, used the phrase "newly emerging realities" -- again, without explanation. Now the same phrase appears in the June 1989 meetings of the Socialist International in Stockholm, Sweden.

Since these "wise men" don't reveal what their "new reality" is based on, let me tell you what it encompasses.

- It means the abandonment of the old face of communism, and the embracing of the Corporate State.
- It means the merging of State Socialism and Corporate Marxism which, in turn, will build a New World Order [their phrase, not mine] of monetary and political establishments.
- It means the transfer of the major world resources to massive eco- holding companies (the working reality of what the architects of the policy call the World Conservation Bank).

All around the world the move is on to transfer the rain forests, the deserts, the jungles, the plains, and even private property to a consortium of foundations, international agencies and councils, all of which are interlocked through directorships and agenda.

In almost every state of America -- I can think of no exception -- local environmental groups are pushing ahead with their plans to seize ownership of some of the most productive and beautiful areas of our planet. The same thing is happening in other parts of the globe: Africa, South and Central America, Europe, Australia, New Zealand, Canada, and even Asia. And always and everywhere, there is some local

crisis or pending catastrophe to justify their move. In my home state of Washington in the Pacific Northwest, the beneficiary of this concern is the spotted owl. In Montana it is the timber wolf. In Nebraska the whooping crane. In Africa the elephant takes center stage. (In the case of the spotted owl, the leader of the Sierra Club was quoted as saying, "If the spotted owl did not exist, we would find it necessary to genetically engineer one.")

Add to this the so-called threat to the ozone, the greenhouse effect, and countless other real or ersatz environmental concerns, and you have the prescription for a worldwide control mechanism which is awesome in its scope and power.

The Plan Behind It All

Standing astride this environmental juggernaut like a colossus is the same group of Insiders who have been playing God with people's lives since before World War I. Thanks to their "internationalism" and "balance of power" schemes, the 20th Century has proved to be the bloodiest in all human history. Yet these so-called "wise men" finance tyranny, replace governments, elect presidents and prime ministers, and, in general, act as the un-elected rulers for a world gone crazy.

Let me be specific. I am talking about the economic and political cartel represented in Britain by membership in the Royal Institute for International Affairs, in the United States within the Council on Foreign Relations, and internationally in such groups as The Bilderbergers, The Club of Rome, and most recently, The Trilateral Commission. "

Now I know that to single out these organizations and the men or women who lead them is not viewed as "responsible" in some circles. But where will an examination of reality take us if not there? Are we to believe that all of this "greening" is the result of some overnight worldwide consensus?

As we examine such foundations as the World Wildlife Fund, the Heritage Trust, the Nature Conservancy, the National Wildlife Federation, the Sierra Club, the World WildernessCongress, Conservation International, the Center for Earth Resource Analysis, to name but a few, what do we find? Not so strangely, key members of the Insider institutions cited above are leading or directing every one of them. This doesn't take into consideration the UN organizations which are, at the very least, co-directed by representatives of Communist members.

Why is it that so many radical leftists, mega-bankers and Corporate Marxists are suddenly concerned about our environment? Could it be that there is another agenda afoot --a "new reality?"

Allow me to quote briefly from a letter I received in the mail June 1989. It starts:

"Dear Investor,

"I'd like you to prepare yourself for a mild shock of a most rare and welcome kind. "There is indeed a group that has quietly 'bought up' acres and acres of wild land in your state. "But not for condominiums or shopping centers, golf courses or industrial parks, not for strip mining or highways or parking lots. "Not for profit or private gain at all. "For love, for life, for the preservation of this exquisitely beautiful planet of ours for the benefit of future generations of all its inhabitants."

This letter goes on for four more pages, bragging about the various activities of the organization whose letterhead it bears, "The Nature Conservancy." They boast, "We own and manage a national system of more than 1,000 sanctuaries." This is the very same group that, along with Citicorp, Chase Manhattan, and Bank of America, is up to its ears in debt-for-nature swaps in Costa Rica, Ecuador, Guatemala, and the state of California. (And let me add parenthetically, it is only one of the eco-groups involved in these debt-for-nature swaps which are now being played out throughout South and Central America.)

Not long ago in Insider Report I cited two such deals that deserve a mention. One was a \$9-million Ecuador foreign-debt exchange for such priority targets as part of the Ecuadorian Andes and Galapagos National Park. The World Wildlife Fund and Nature Conservancy bought this debt for twelve cents on the dollar. Earlier that same month, the ubiquitous Nature Conservancy announced a debt-swap deal with the Bank of America for a foreclosed property in California called the Dye Creek Ranch/Preserve. It includes 40,000 acres of redwoods and an option on another 2,900 acres.

In April of 1989 I reported that Brazilian president Jose Sarney was up in arms over what was being planned for his country and the 1.9 million square miles of the Amazon Basin. An A.P. dispatch from Rio earlier that same month said that Sarney's speech was "...marked by a strongly nationalist tone [as] Sarney raised Brazil's century-old battle cry, 'A Amazonia e nossa [the Amazon is ours].'" The article went on to report that, concerned about "...national sovereignty, Sarney ruled out debt-for-nature swaps, financial arrangements under which Brazil would retire discounted dollar debt in return for contributing in local currency to Brazilian environmental projects."

Then comes the punch line, revealing who all joined the big banks in putting pressure on Sarney to do the deal. The article states, "Last Friday as Sarney presided over a meeting of Latin American environmentalists in Brasilia, Mostafa Tolba, an Egyptian diplomat representing the United Nations Commission on Environment and Development, chided him for opposing the debt-for-nature swaps."

This is really getting hit by traffic going both ways. Here's a Brazilian president getting a dressing down from a Third World leader because he won't give up sovereignty within his own country to the big banks and their greenie front groups.

Do you get the idea that maybe, just maybe, somebody in the United Nations also understands how this scam -- or should I say, "new reality" -- works and expects to participate in the payoff downstream? This same Mostafa Tolba is now the Executive Director for the United Nations Environment Program (UNEP) and was a featured speaker at Globe '90, the aforementioned conference held in Vancouver, B.C., in March of this year.

In his speech Tolba said, "The Cold War is dwindling...Environment has rocketed to the top of the world political agenda...We need a global partnership -- dynamic, innovative and highly interconnected...We have no choice but to curb the wasteful consumption by the rich and lift the status of the poor...More bilateral and multilateral assistance is needed. Much more. We are talking hundreds of billions."

And then get a load of this as part of his conclusions. "We need shifting of resources from destruction to building -- from arms to protecting our environment. We need to think of new sources. I am advocating The Users Fee a fee for using the environmental resources like air." [Emphasis added] Who says you can't raise big money out of thin air?

Back In The U.S.A.

As I write this, House Resolution 876, titled the "American Heritage Trust Act," is being gently guided through Congress. This bill would appropriate in its first year alone a minimum of \$1 billion to be used in the purchase of private tax-paying property and lock it away under the guise of preserving our heritage. Utilization of these funds would not so coincidentally be available to "private non-profit organizations...qualified for exemption from income taxes under Section 501(c)(3) of the Internal Revenue Code..." The Nature Conservancy, perhaps? These moneys will be extended as matching funds to the various states which are rushing to take advantage of such a windfall.

I could continue for pages on this scheme alone. But before we move on, consider these few statistics. In just the 11 western states of the U.S., wilderness areas now account for 86,474,870 acres. Federal] agencies have recommended another 20,256,780 acres for wilderness designation. And further "studies" for possible inclusion would add up to 133,653,459 more acres. In countries like Brazil and Australia, the lockup numbers are not measured in acres, but in square miles.

To help put it all in perspective and grasp this "new reality," let me recall for you what occurred in Denver, Colorado, in September 1987. When the Fourth World Wilderness Congress gathered there, many delegates were surprised to find that something called the "Denver Declaration for Worldwide Conservation" had already been written for them. World Wilderness Congress founder Dr. Ian Player said at the time, "The declaration is the most important in the history of conservation. It's our new Magna Carta." Whatever happened to the genteel custom of understatement?

Point Four of the Declaration reads, "Because new sources of funding must be mobilized to augment the expansion of conservation activities, a new international conservation banking program should be created to integrate international aid for environmental management into coherent common programs for recipient countries based on objective assessments of each country's resources and needs."

Bailing Out The Banks

Such flowery language notwithstanding, there is a big payoff to all this. Up to 30 percent of the world's wilderness land mass is proposed to be set aside into wilderness areas. That's over 12 billion acres, with who knows what kind of natural resources underneath. Title to this land would be vested in a "World Wilderness Trust."

This plan was unveiled to the more than 1,500 people from 60 countries who attended the World Wilderness Congress. And lest you think this was just a group of ineffectual whale lovers and fern fanciers, let me disabuse you of that notion right now. Hosting and attending were such well-known "greenies" as David Rockefeller of Chase Manhattan, Baron Edmund de Rothschild of the 200 year old international banking family, and then U.S. Treasury Secretary James Baker. With that kind of clout, who says it's not easy being green?

Here's how the World Conservation Bank fact sheet explained the group's plan. The World Conservation Bank would finance, directly and through syndicated and co-financing arrangements:

1. "The preparation, development and implementation of national conservation strategies by developing country governments;
2. The acquisition/lease of environmentally important land for preservation of biological diversity and watersheds;
3. The management and conservation of selected areas."

And, "Plans for the World Conservation Bank (WCB) propose that it act as intermediary between certain developing countries and multilateral or private banks to transfer a specific debt to the World Conservation Bank, thus substituting an existing doubtful debt on the bank's books for a new loan to the WCB [the debt-for-nature swaps -- LA]. In return for having been relieved of its debt obligation, the debtor country would transfer to the WCB natural resource assets of 'equivalent value.' Or, developing country debts under foreign assistance programs, which have little hope of repayment, could be retained in-country and applied toward conservation, reforestation, or rural agricultural programs through WCB."

In other words, the mega-banks' bad loans which are not now collateralized, would be sold at full monetary value to the World Conservation Bank, instead of their presently discounted value on the open market for as low as six to 25 cents on the dollar. The WCB would "buy" the loan from the existing holder and the debtor

country would have to collateralize the loan with wilderness areas. If the debtor failed to pay, the WCB, or whoever its stockholders happen to be, would end up with vast tracts of land and everything below it.

Now you see why I've been saying and warning for years that the very big bank failures were just not going to happen. The fix is in. What was proposed in Denver almost three years ago has now become, in part, a reality -- and with the momentum of events as cited above, the whole world is now turning "green," led, of course, by the "wise men" of the New World Order.

Let me be among the first to acknowledge the need for sensible conservation programs and environmental preservation. But let me also add that private enterprise has had a vested interest in conservation long before Yale professor Charles Reich wrote his *Greening of America* in 1970. In my own state of Washington, Weyerhaeuser Timber Company has for years prided itself with the slogan, "The tree-growing company," and then backed up its claim by reforesting millions of acres.

This is a far cry from what we are witnessing today. Now the name of the game is the creation of world banks, regional currencies, multinational trusts, giant foundations, land expropriations, and massive transfers of natural resources which will ultimately translate into transfers of natural sovereignty. And while the world focuses on the "breakup of Communism" and sings funeral dirges over the grave of the Soviet Empire, the reality is that we are witnessing one of the most brilliant Hegelian gambits of this or any other century -- "The Greening of the Reds."

Let me conclude my remarks for this chapter with two further quotations. The first is again from Machiavelli, who said: "Men in general make judgments more by appearances than by reality." The second is from that most profound American, Ralph Waldo Emerson, who observed: "Every mind must make its choice between truth and repose. It cannot have both." If you are willing to have your repose disturbed by the truth, read on.

[Table of Contents](#)

Chapter 4 - The Great Land Grab

Throughout this report I have chronicled the environmental onslaught we are now facing. It is sweeping across us like a gigantic tidal wave, and like a tidal wave, it was created and launched by forces we cannot see but whose existence we can track and whose pernicious intent we can definitely document.

The whole panoply shows conclusively how every facet of the Left (along with many movements considered mainstream) is now cooperating in the promotion of a worldwide program whose ultimate objective is to gain control of most of the world's resources.

This amalgam of groups and organizations includes the United Nations, the Soviet Presidium, the multinational banks, scores of tax-exempt foundations, the Socialist International, most of the governments in the world, the Green Parties of Europe, Congress, the Bush Administration, and radical street revolutionaries in every country. The last time so many groups and forces united on one issue was more than four decades ago, when the enemy was Nazi Germany.

Solving The Debt Crisis

What I didn't emphasize in the previous chapters is how this whole movement is bound together with the subject of "debt." In Gorbachev's UN speech, immediately prior to his remarks about the "world's environment," he said this: "The Soviet Union favors a substantive discussion of ways to settle the debt crisis at multilateral forums, including consultations under the auspices of the United Nations among heads of government of debtor and creditor countries."

In virtually every instance where international efforts to protect the environment are discussed, juxtaposed with it you'll find the subject of debt. Tolba and Brundtland both linked debt to the environment in their globe '90 speeches.

Not wishing to miss the opportunity of having his country's debt "forgiven," Costa Rican president and Nobel Peace Laureate Oscar Arias added his plea. In a column entitled "For the Globe's Sake, Debt Relief," which appeared in the Op-Ed section of The New York Times, July 1989, this architect of Latin American policy first decried the "destruction of tropical forests" and the loss of "animal and plant species." He then went on to proffer the following solution to this worldwide crisis:

"Debt for nature swaps should be encouraged by both developed countries and multilateral development banks [emphasis added]. These swaps should be expanded from commercial to bilateral obligations so that old loans requiring foreign exchange could be earmarked in local currency for environmentally sound projects."

Sound familiar? Arias then concluded by calling for a massive surrender of national sovereignty:

"Efforts to negotiate global treaties that recognize as common resources our shared elements -- such as the atmosphere, the oceans and bio-diversity -- should be encouraged and expedited. Actions to mitigate global environment problems cannot wait for a new international economic order."

Did you get that? Mr. Arias is in such a hurry to have the debt and environment problems solved he says we can't wait for the "new international economic order" to be established. It has to be done now!

And You Pay For It

You will also recall that I brought to your attention a mischievous piece of legislation that had been introduced in Congress. HR 876, the "American Heritage Trust Act," would provide federal matching funds to states for the purchase of "environmentally threatened areas" in the United States.

Well, the ink wasn't even dry when two self-appointed champions of the eco-system held a press conference in Seattle. Former Senator Daniel J. Evans, a Republican, and former Congressman Mike Lowry, a Democrat, joined together to announce the formation of something called the "Washington Wildlife and Recreation Coalition."

And what is the first order of business of this new coalition? To win approval for a \$500 million bond offering -- the money to be used, along with federal matching funds provided under HR 876, to push the eco-land grab.

All of this is no idle "Liberal" dream, either. The coalition's member organizations include some 20 different groups, not the least of which are the Nature Conservancy and the SierraClub. (Evans' long- time directorship in the debt-for-nature swap mothership, the Nature Conservancy, was not mentioned at the press conference.)

Residents of the state of Washington should remember all too well the facts when it comes to the politics of Messrs, Evans and Lowry. Dan Evans has been a political lackey for Rockefeller interests for over 25 years. He was such a faithful lapdog of the Establishment, in fact, that he was invited to the founding meeting of the Trilateral Commission in 1973.

Mike Lowry's politics are so far to the Left that his senatorial aspirations were rejected by the voters of Washington State -- at the very same time 53% of them voted for another left-wing Democrat named Mike who was running for president. The voters may have been fooled by Dukakis, because they didn't know him as well. But they knew all they needed to about Mike Lowry.

Two weeks after the Evans/Lowry announcement, Elliot Marks, vice president of the Nature Conservancy and its Washington State director, announced that he was assuming the presidency of the coalition. Marks said the Washington group "was following the lead of California and other states that recently approved bond issues for wildlife...California to the tune of \$976 million." Some of the other states he mentioned were Minnesota, Maine, Rhode Island and New Mexico.

I would venture to say that some form of this scam is being launched in virtually every state in the Union. Not long ago, I received a call from a reader worried

because in her state of Missouri the Sierra Club was pushing a land lockup called the Natural Streams Act.

It's happening in my backyard, too. On April 4, 1990, the spotted owl was given "imperiled" status by the U.S. Forest Service, the Parks Service, the Bureau of Land Management, and the Fish and Wildlife Department. What this means is that 2.5 million acres of forest land in Washington, Oregon and Northern California will no longer be available to selective logging. Estimates of what this will cost in the way of jobs to the independent timber industry range from 9,000 to 60,000. The costs are almost incalculable in that this action has a domino effect. Not only will jobs be lost, but now the senators and congressmen in the affected areas are rushing to the federal government with so-called "job retraining" legislation, plus special packages of aid to the cities and counties losing tax revenues due to these actions.

What or how real is the danger to the spotted owl? Nobody really knows. "Independent surveys" by the environmentalists, especially the Sierra Club, have determined that there are 1,460 pairs of spotted owls residing in the old growth forests of the Pacific Northwest. They also "estimate" that over the next 100 years this population of owls will stabilize and then increase to the whopping number of 1,760 pairs. That's a net increase of 600 owls over the next 100 years.

Considering the lost revenue on production and the related job losses, Ted La Doux, Director of Forestry Affairs for the Northwest Independent Forest Manufacturers Association, estimates the cost at \$95 million per pair of owls. The bottom line is: Tens of thousands of jobs are lost, countless families are tossed into turmoil, millions of taxpayers' money is questionably spent, and each spotted owl is given a calculated worth of \$47.5 million.

If this weren't bad enough, just remember that the spotted owl is only one of the so-called "imperiled" or "endangered" species which "require" a special habitat. In the Catskill Mountains of upstate New York, the battle is raging over the bald eagle. Last year the New York legislature authorized the Environmental Conservation Department to spend \$15 million of taxpayers' money to buy the "most critical eagle habitats on 13,000 acres of property." As The New York Times reported on July 4, 1989, one opponent of this land grab said, "The eagle has no awareness of who owns the title to the land under his branch." Well, sir, the eagle may not care any more than - -3,000 miles to the west -- the spotted owl cares whose branch or whose land he's sitting on, but the architects of the New World Order care...and that's what counts.

As I said above, almost every state has a similar crusade looming in its environmental future. Knowing and having grown up in the Olympic Peninsula, I can tell you firsthand about the area most impacted by the spotted owl business; it's devastating. The local economy will be hit with a shock of historic proportions, turning these once- thriving communities into ghost towns. But as I also pointed out previously, the spotted owl is simply an excuse for the transfer of natural resources.

The beneficiary of this particularly preposterous act will once again be the corporate giants like Weyerhaeuser, which owns its own timber. While going through the required "tut, tut" and "tsk, tsk," the chief financial officer will be crossing his fingers and mentally calculating what this reduction of supply will do to drive the Weyerhaeuser timber prices to historic heights. "Hypocrisy," thy face is green.

Incidentally, doesn't it strike you as a little strange that in underdeveloped countries the name of the game is the elimination of debt, by swapping lands and resources, while here in the good ol' U.S. of A., the game plan requires the exact opposite. Here, we're supposed to jump with joy over the prospect of increasing debt and levying new taxes to pursue the very same agenda! And if you are wondering who is going to supply the "hundreds of billions" and pay the "user fees" for the air, remember Mr. Tolba's comments about the "wasteful consumption by the rich." You, gentle reader, are the fatted calf and it's your slaughter that will supply the lucre for these plans and programs.

Worldwide Orchestration

All across this country and all around the globe, the people who are being most directly affected either have no say in what is being done, or are made to feel that they are the "greedy," "uncaring" and "despoiling holdouts" in an ecologically conscious world. As the woman from Missouri told me on the phone, "Mr. Abraham, the people up in St. Louis don't seem to care about what's being done to us here in the Ozarks." No, ma'am, I'm afraid they don't, but you are going to pay for it just the same -- as will the people in Seattle, Los Angeles, New York or Minneapolis.

How many people in Madagascar (yes, I said Madagascar) had any say while their government queued up at the World Wildlife Fund to swap \$2,111,111.12 of its bad paper and untold thousands of its acreage to Banker's Trust and others in a debt-for-nature exchange?

As I said earlier, this whole environmental power play has been a PR masterpiece. It seems like everywhere you turn, you find another angle being promoted. For example, in the July 1989 issue of their customer newsletter, Bank of America ran a column headlined "Thanks for All Your Support." In it they boasted that "Sales of B of A's cause-related series of special checks -- featuring whales, pets and endangered species -- have raised more than \$157,000 for five non-profit organizations. This success is due to the continued interest and support of our customers...for each 26 order of checks and/or matching leather checkbook cover ordered, we make a 50-cent donation to the corresponding organization."

Isn't that sweet? While B of A customers get a warm and fuzzy feeling, as they pen in checks over the face of a little red fox or the torso of a blue whale, they also helped raise \$63,000 for the Nature Conservancy, whose 1989 budget grossed \$168 million.

So there you have it, gentle reader. "The Greening" is now in full swing. As David Letterman would say, "We're having fun now." Just think of all the debt we're eliminating and all the snail darters we're saving,

From Europe to Australia, from Madagascar to California, and from Maine to Brazil, the most massive transfer of natural resources in the history of the world rolls merrily along. And unless we are willing to drag this incredible situation into the spotlight of public scrutiny, we're going to sit back and watch while one area after another falls into the waiting arms of the men who would "be as gods."

Unless the farmers, miners, loggers and property owners can join with concerned people everywhere, each will be picked off one by one in the name of "conservation." Unless the leadership of anti-communist conservatives worldwide comes together to fight in unison, this unholy alliance of Marxists, mega-bankers and fern fanciers will roll over the isolated opposition like a Sherman tank.

The Master Plan

In all my years of chronicling the moves and measures of the Insiders, nothing compares to what I have described here. The "New World Order" isn't something that is going to happen; rather, it is something that is happening now -- while you read these very words.

Never before in my lifetime have the Insiders and their allies moved so boldly (or so successfully) on a worldwide scale to begin implementing this part of the Communist Manifesto. Let me remind you that the abolition of private property, and the application of all rents of land to public purposes, comprise Plank One of the Marxist blueprint.

Add to the above the following initiatives and the picture becomes complete:

1. The monetary and ultimate political unification of Europe.
2. The de-communization of the Soviet Union and its satellites into federal corporate states.
3. The sellout and abandonment of anti-communist resistance groups everywhere (e.g. Angola, Nicaragua, Mozambique).
4. The purposeful surfacing and subsequent elimination of internal resistance, such as in China.
5. The building of new Trilateral governance groups; and finally,
6. The destruction of the will to resist both here and abroad among all who should oppose such moves and measures.

Our condition today is not unlike what Edmund Burke described two centuries ago. In his masterful work, *Thoughts on the Cause of Our Present Discontent*, Burke said, "When bad men combine, the good must associate, else they will fall one by one, an unpitied sacrifice in a contemptible struggle."

Time will tell whether good men (and women) will associate to combat the Insiders on this one, or whether we will fall "one by one."

[Table of Contents](#)

Chapter 5 - "Necessittie" the Tyrant's Plea

In Milton's Paradise Lost, the first time Satan spies Adam and Eve in the Garden he muses that he is forced by circumstances to plot their fall from grace. Milton comments, "So spake the Fiend, and with necessittie, the Tyrant's plea, excus'd his devilish deeds."

Tyrants haven't changed much since Milton's day -- or since Adam's. "Necessittie" is still their plea, and the eco-hype daily pumped out in the media is just another example. The "crisis," the "emergency," the "necessittie" is needed to justify the "moral equivalent of war," and it's being created in advance of the war. Let me share a quotation with you from the Insiders' favorite pop-intellectual, Bill Moyers. This comes from the November 15, 1989, program of his PBS television series, "The Public Mind."

"The basic text of our political system, The Federalist Papers, anticipated a government of reflection and choice. Forget it. Fifty years ago, Dale Carnegie wrote a new bible for American politics and called it How to Win Friends and Influence People. In it he said,

"When dealing with people, we are dealing with creatures of emotions, creatures bristling with prejudice and motivated by pride and vanity.' This famous evangelist of persuasion went on to say that the Art of Human Engineering, as he called it, requires an ongoing appeal to the emotions. The opinion industry lives by the gospel that it's easier to motivate the heart than the mind, easier to stir up our feelings than our thoughts. Vanity, love, anxiety, hope --these sell cake mix and tooth-paste...and foreign policy, too." [Emphasis added]

Much as we may wish it otherwise, Mr. Moyers is absolutely correct. As we must constantly repeat, even to the point of tedium, for most people "perception becomes reality." And for the decade of the nineties, creating perceptions is going to be not just an art form, but a way of life.

Here is one more significant quotation by Mr. Moyers from that same PBS television program: "Symbols and slogans. Slogans and symbols. The monologue of televisual

values becomes the conversation of democracy."

As we move into 1990 and beyond, our task is to sort out the reality and not be seduced by the "symbols," "slogans," and "the art of human engineering."

In the case of the environment, the media fear-mongering knows no limit. Even the words are carefully chosen for maximum emotional effect: "Brink of Destruction is Here, Scientists Warn;" "Destruction of our planet's resources;" "Warnings of a nightmare world;" "No serious scientist questions the catastrophe theories;" "Changes in the atmosphere may be irreversible, with consequences second only to nuclear war;" "Breathing: Latest hazard to nation's health;" "Pesticides, toxic chemicals take to the airways;" "Acid rain destroys thousands of inland lakes;" "Earth's chemistry upset as rain forests vanish;" "Some of the smallest nations may be doomed;" "Thinner ozone layer paves way for more cases of skin cancer;" "The sky above: A fragile shield under attack;" "Pollution, a 'ticking time bomb.'" "Even the staid and stodgy Wall Street Journal headlined a book review of two recent eco-Jeremiads with "Kissing nature goodbye."

Of course, editors write headlines to sell newspapers, but how many of you read this one: "CFCs 'not a threat to the ozone Layer'" when 30 leading U.S. environmental scientists disputed the correlation between ozone depletion and the use of CFCs. Or this one: "Greenhouse effect a fraud, Senate told" when an environmental science professor refuted every claim that there is a global warming resulting from man-made emissions of "greenhouse gasses."

One side of the eco-discussion claims that disaster is just around the corner or has already arrived; the other, hardly ever heard or quoted, says there is no scientific basis for these catastrophe claims. Doesn't it seem that a fair-minded press, in the interests of ascertaining the truth in public discussions, might report both sides of the story? Sure, and the check is in the mail, too.

The threats to the environment, we are told, transcend all other interests: economic, racial, national, ideological, every other consideration pales before the great eco-threat. "Humanity must re-integrate itself into nature and ignore national, religious, and racial boundaries to cooperate in restoring the planet," says a declaration of international scientists and scholars assembled by UNESCO in Vancouver in September, 1989. Remember this when we discuss a bit later our predicted legal basis for a worldwide eco-tyranny.

In case you aren't convinced by headlines, there are emotional spurs, too: guilt manipulation, self-hatred, and misanthropy. "The destruction of our planet's resources touches every one of us," writes Tom Wicker in the August 23, 1989, Seattle Post-Intelligencer, "and each of us is in some way responsible."

Guy Dauncey, a British Green, writes that our "ruthless exploitation of nature," our "commitment to materialism and personal gain" and the West's "disproportionate

consumption of the world's resources" have proven to be our undoing. Twenty percent of the world's population in the West are accused of consuming 80 percent of the world's resources.

For those not easily buffaloed by such crude guilt manipulation, the next question might be, "Well, so what?" Would everybody be more comfortable if we left the 30 minerals in the ground, and hovered naked around peat fires like our ancestors? Apparently, the Greenies' answer is yes.

For others, a little guilt -- just enough to take the edge off a sleepy conscience but not enough to make you really writhe -- will not suffice. They want guilt deep enough for wallowing: "The quest for material wealth has brought humanity to the brink of destruction, a group of international scientists and scholars says," reports the Canadian Press on August 25, 1989. "We see man as the destroyer and upsetter of our whole world," said Digby McLaren, President of the Royal Society of Canada, at a conference sponsored by the United Nations Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organization (UNESCO) [emphasis added]. It seems that every vegetable, animal, and protozoan has a right to exist on earth -- except man.

But folks may not be as gullible as the press believes. The Polling Report of June 19, 1989, reports that "according to a new Gallup Poll, three-fourths of Americans now think of themselves as environmentalists and there are signs the environmental movement may have broadened its base during the last few years...Large majorities say they worry about pollution of rivers, lakes, and reservoirs (72%), contamination of soil and water by toxic wastes (69%), air pollution (63%), and ocean and beach pollution (60%). Majorities also express great concern about the loss of natural habitat for wildlife (58%)...and contamination of soil and water by radioactive wastes from nuclear facilities (54%)."

Sounds like The Greening of America, right? Then at least half of Americans must consider the environment as the greatest problem facing the country, right? Wrong. "Asked to name the most important problems facing the nation, 4 percent [emphasis added] now cite environmental issues; 34 percent, various economic problems; 27 percent, the drug crisis; and 10 percent, poverty and homelessness." In other words, although three-fourths of the people polled consider themselves "environmentalists," only one American in 25 thinks that environmental issues are the most important problem facing the country.

Notoriously and necessarily, wars depend on a steady supply of ready youth. The American educational establishment is rising to the environmental challenge. "Educators and environmentalists say that schools across the country are reporting an increase in classroom demand for environmental education as teachers struggle to explain complex and often frightening issues in the news, from global warming and acid rain to leaking landfills and endangered species," says a November 21, 1989, New York Times article.

Government officials and other spokesmen, sometimes dressed like magicians or superheroes, go to schools with messages of garbage awareness. Utilities, which spend millions of dollars a year on educational programs, have expanded their efforts.

In one of the most ambitious programs, administrators at the Porter School [in Columbia, Connecticut] have declared global awareness and environmentalism the themes for the school year. Assemblies, songs, and posters reinforce the message that pupils must conserve, recycle, and save the earth by saving their own back yards: Several teachers describe the campaign as brainwashing for a good cause." [Emphasis added]

The piece concludes, "Teachers also walk a delicate path between inspiring students and scaring them...Asked about the need for cleaning up the environment, Elizabeth Smith, a fifth-grader, began, 'We have to, or soon our whole lifespan is going to go,' and ended with a sputtering noise and a slicing motion of her hand."

Nobody goes to war, not even the "moral equivalent of war," when there isn't one. So the drums must beat to the throb of the presses, and the weapons must be forged on the anvil of "60 Minutes" and the nightly news.

When they are finished they will have forged "Necessitie, the Tyrant"s plea."

[Table of Contents](#)

Chapter 6 - A Legal End Run

We've seen that both governments and radical environmentalists want power over vast areas of the earth, but what legal basis can they use? After all, in the West at least (and most of the rest of the world), the victims won't give up their property and their rights without a whimper.

The answer lies in treaty law. Article VI of the U.S. Constitution reads, "This constitution, and the Laws of the United States which shall be made in Pursuance thereof; and all Treaties made, or which shall be made, under the Authority of the United States, shall be the supreme Law of the Land ..."

Although one could rightly argue that no treaty can abrogate the rights guaranteed by the Constitution, nevertheless governments' past approach, both here and abroad, have been to introduce under treaties laws which would never be approved by the national legislatures. Thus, we can look for international treaties, especially United

Nations' treaties, to be put forth as the basis for the legal attack on private property rights and the building of the ecological super- state.

It's a classic end run -- around the Constitution.

The Politicians Turn "Green"

Already we noted that the "threat to the environment" has been billed by the media as a disaster so potent that it transcends all national and ideological interests. It is a global problem above politics, we are repeatedly told. Suddenly, at the July 1989 Group of Seven economic summit in Paris, we witnessed the "greening of the politicians." The economic summit became the "eco-summit."

As the Fresno Bee asked and reported in an August 20, 1989, article,

"What is curious, however, is why -- during the past 12 months -- environmental politics has gone from virtual international obscurity to center stage... One possibility, of course, is that environmental consciousness has finally trickled up into the high political reaches. Margaret Thatcher's conversion to environmentalism is by now almost legend...One might also say (cynically, perhaps) that the success of environmental parties in the recent elections to the EEC Parliament put fear into the hearts of Western Europe's leaders...

"[T]he Pressures on European leaders to respond are very strong, and most seem to recognize that the world is entering a period of great change and fluidity in international politics. This is where environmental issues come in. Protection of the environment is, almost literally, a 'motherhood' issue (as in 'motherhood and apple pie')...This then is the gist of how the agenda is pushed forward.

"While one might quibble over the costs of protecting the environment, almost no one is overly in favor of destroying it...
Hence, the environment provides an almost perfect arena for East-West cooperation." [Emphasis added]

Nor is the Bush Administration slow to pick up the environmental bone. "The world's deteriorating environment has become a top economic policy concern of the United States and other industrial nations...William A. Nitze, a top environmental policy official at the State Department, said, "This is now an issue of consequence that has risen to the top of the international agenda." (New York Times, May 15, 1989)

In the very near future, expect the Environmental Protection Agency to have been elevated to Cabinet status. The only debate as of March 29, 1990, is just how sweeping the powers of the office will be and whether Congress will be able to exert

some micro-management over the new department.

The U.N. Is Ready

But how will the actual constitutional abrogation be done? The answer, or one of them, appeared in The New York Times, November 9, 1989: "Warning that global warming could cause devastating floods and food shortages in wide areas, Prime Minister Margaret Thatcher of Britain called on the United Nations today to complete by 1992 a treaty that would require action toward stabilizing the world's climate. Mrs. Thatcher told the United Nations General Assembly that the treaty should be supplemented by specific, binding agreements regulating the production of gasses that trap heat in the atmosphere...Mrs. Thatcher said the restrictions would have to be obligatory and their application carefully monitored." [Emphasis added]

Continuing, "This year's United Nations General Assembly is expected to approve a resolution next month setting up a negotiating body to draft a climate-stabilization treaty for approval by the second World Environment Conference, which is to meet in Brazil in 1992."

A ready institutional framework already exists at the UN in the form of a horde of agencies and treaties. One prototypical forerunner is the 1972 United Nations Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organization (UNESCO) "Convention concerning the protection of the world cultural and natural heritage," or World Heritage Treaty.

The Treaty set up a World Heritage Committee within UNESCO, allocated funding, and established procedures for listing cultural and national "heritage" sites worldwide. And doesn't this pique your interest: The convention calls for cooperation with "international and national governmental and non-governmental organizations (NGOs)." [Emphasis added] The structure is very similar to that called for in the American Heritage Trust Act -- not accidentally, since it is the UNESCO World Heritage Treaty that prescribes such national heritage trusts.

Under the World Heritage Organization, signatory nations have listed official "heritage" areas around the globe. In New Zealand almost half the South Island is slated for World Heritage listing. In Australia the result of World Heritage listing has been to run farmers, loggers and ranchers off land they have used for generations. Looking at what has actually taken place, and what has been planned in Australia, it appears that UNESCO may eventually assume governmental sovereignty over the area, i.e., that the assignment of "heritage" status could be construed as a cession of National sovereignty over the areas in question.

How close does this come to home? Not long ago I took an automobile trip up the Olympic Peninsula of northwestern Washington. Since I had lived there for seven years as a young boy, I was anxious to show my youngest children (Lauren, age 10, and Josh, age 7), "where Daddy lived when he was your age."

Off we went with great weather and some of the most beautiful country on the face of the earth as targets for the excursion. Arriving at Lake Crescent in the Olympic National Forest, we were disappointed because there was no room at the inn. I really didn't expect there would be, but hoping for a last-minute cancellation can occasionally pay off.

I was a little miffed, as I explained to everyone within earshot what a shame it was to have only one overnight facility on a 15-mile-long lake. And that in the name of "protecting the environment," we were fast approaching the point where anyone who didn't want to backpack or hug a tree would ultimately be locked out of the area. In the process of grousing my way out the door, I picked up the brochure for the Lake Crescent Lodge -- which incorporated information on another National Park facility in the Olympic Mountains, Hurricane Ridge Lodge.

Casually leafing through the four-color foldout, I darn near choked. There, prominently displayed on the front and back of the brochure, was an emblem about the size of a nickel. Within the center of the emblem was a surrealistic rendition of mountains and trees and very small lettering reading, "Olympic National Park." And in clearly readable type, arching the top and bottom of the outside ring, it stated, United Nations World Heritage Site .

Can you believe it? I go searching for my roots, and end up with a shock tantamount to a root canal. Looking back on it, I feel sorry for my young companions. While doing their level best to cool my rage, they also had to endure my indignant babblings for several hours. It's bad enough to write about these things when it's Amazon basins or Third World hinterlands, but when it hits you right between the eyes in your own backyard, it stops being an intellectual pursuit and quickly becomes an emotional battleground.

Olympic National Park is only one of the World Heritage Sites in the U.S. As of December, 1987 seventeen U.S. national parks and historic sites were listed, including the Everglades, Great Smokey Mountains, Mammoth Cave, Yellowstone, the Grand Canyon, Yosemite, and most appalling, the Statue of Liberty and Independence Hall.'

But as I pointed out earlier in this report, the World Heritage Organization isn't the only existing UN environmental agency or treaty. In 1982 the UN created the UN Commission on Environment and Development, chaired by none other than the Globe '90 star speaker, Norwegian socialist Gro Harlem Brundtland. The Commission published a report, "Our Common Future," which is the typical "humanity is running out of resources and ruining the globe" fare. As Franklin Sanders of The Moneychanger argued, "The Brundtland Report is nothing less than a scheme for a socialist world order, managed world economy, and massive redistribution of the world's wealth." (The Moneychanger, P.O. Box 341753, Memphis, Tennessee 38184-1753, December 1988.) I agree, totally!

Then there is also the previously cited United Nations Environmental Program (UNEP), whose executive director, Mostafa Tolba, oversees a worldwide staff of 600 with an annual budget of \$50 million. "He played a pivotal role in negotiating the world's first international agreement to protect the ozone layer. He persuaded 100 nations to agree to stop dumping toxic wastes in the Third World. Now he is laying groundwork for a treaty to stave off potentially disastrous climate changes." (Atlanta Journal, July 14, 1989) And if that were not enough, there is the United Nations Tropical Forest Action Plan - - and the UN-sponsored Inter-Governmental Panel on Climate Change.

Already existing UN environmental treaties include the 1985 Helsinki Protocol to the UN Convention on Long-Range Trans-boundary Air Pollution, the 1988 Sofia Protocol to the UN Convention on Long-Range Trans-boundary Air-Pollution, and the 1989 Montreal Protocol on Substances that Deplete the Ozone Layer.

As reported in The New York Times, October 27, 1989, the next step is a treaty to limit carbon dioxide (CO₂) emissions. "The Bush Administration is facing increasing pressure from other nations, Congress, and environmental groups to take more aggressive action on the problem of global warming...On one side is the EPA which favors bolder steps by the U.S., including stabilizing the CO₂ emissions known [sic] to cause global warming...

"The State Department official responsible for coordinating government policy on global warming, William Nitze, said this week that because of growing international pressure, the United States will probably have to accept a goal of stabilizing CO₂ emissions...White House officials favor a worldwide agreement that would initially acknowledge the problem of global warming and later work out specific steps to deal with it." This particular UN "world conference" is scheduled for Brazil in 1992 under the auspices of Tolba's UNEP. In keeping with the class warfare aspects of UN policy, the so-called Third World members are "...Arguing that poverty itself promotes environmental degradation by encouraging deforestation or over- grazing, they are pressing the industrialized countries to make debt relief and higher prices for their exports part of the final package." (New York Times, January 3, 1990) [Emphasis added] Notice the "debt to environment" link is ever-present.

Eco-Courts And Eco-Cops

Recalling Mrs. Thatcher's visit to the UN General Assembly in November 1989, she spoke of " binding agreements," and " obligatory restrictions" with " carefully monitored application." Binding agreements are bound down and monitored in courts. But what court exists to take cognizance of these existing and projected treaties?

Re-enter Mrs. Gro Harlem Brundtland of Norway. Brundtland is now in the forefront of a worldwide campaign to establish a World Court for settling "international environmental conflicts."

To clench the nails down a bit tighter, you should know that right after Secretary of State Baker and Soviet Foreign Minister Shevardnadze met in Jackson Hole, Wyoming, in the summer of 1989, I caught a small news item on the agenda for their discussions.

While the mass media predictably focused on the so-called "arms limitations" discussions, one completely ignored phrase said that they had also held talks about the role of the World Court. "Arms control talks" -- that's so Dan Rather can entertain the masses; "World Court developments" -- that's for the Insiders.

I called Senator Steve Symms' office about this and asked his assistant, Andy Jaswick, to contact the State Department and find out what Baker and Shevardnadze discussed about the World Court. Andy called me back the next day and told me that the material on the World Court discussion was "not available."

I suggested he take it a step further and encourage Senator Helms (the ranking Republican on the Senate Foreign Relations Committee) to make the same request. Back came the same response.

In the glow of glasnost, why should this one subject be so confidential? Let me tell you what I think. Very soon, probably within a year, the U.S. and the U.S.S.R. will make some sort of joint declaration, expressing their eagerness to strengthen the pillars of "international law." To prove their sincerity, the two superpowers will agree to subordinate their "narrow national interests" to the World Court -- thus demonstrating their joint leadership in "making the world safe for democracy," or the environment, or something.

If all of this has a familiar ring, it should, for as far back as the post-World War I period and the debates surrounding U.S. participation in the League of Nations, the Insiders, led by then-chairman of the Establishment Elihu Root, nixed the League and championed the World Court.

Watch for the drumbeats to increase on the whole subject of international law. The debate surrounding the adjudication of the Noriega case and future drug wars is just the overture. The real orchestration is yet to come.

When all of this bears its rotten fruit, American citizens will wake up to realize that many of their Constitutional protections have been transferred to an international body and in the process, we will all become "citizens of the world."

But what good is a court without cops? The People's Republic of Massachusetts has already led the way with its own "special strike force to prosecute polluters." (Atlanta Journal, July 10, 1989) Will the "war on drugs" furnish the model for a future "war on polluters," with a special federal government Pollution Enforcement Agency (PEA)? The bill passed by the House on March 28, 1990, would indicate same. It includes among its many provisions an office of international environmental

affairs, an office of pollution prevention, and an office of enforcement.

Proposed pollution controls for Los Angeles are so picayune, so draconian that we have to ponder what sort of petty but terrifying tyranny might be established in the name of "saving the environment." The Atlanta Journal for July 10, 1989 reported that the "South Coast Air Quality Management District has developed a sweeping 3-stage plan to bring the region's air up to federal standards by 2007." Stage One, to be implemented by 1994, calls for pollution reduction gear on outboard and inboard motor boats, requiring the use of radial rather than bias-ply tires, ethanol emission controls for bakeries, more efficient exhaust hoods in restaurants, limitations on vehicle registrations, elimination of deodorants using certain propellants, higher parking lot fees, forced installation of perchloroethylene recovery devices at dry cleaners, staggering of work hours, a ban on gasoline lawn mowers, and -- no, I am not making this up -- banning barbecues that use starter fluid.

While all this might sound ridiculous, it is very serious when combined with the surveillance capability of modern technology. The December 1988 Moneychanger reported that

"United Nations agencies, multilateral aid agencies, and private non-governmental environmental organizations (NGOs) have already put together a massive worldwide surveillance database. This was unveiled at the Fourth World Wilderness Congress in September 1988 as the 'World Wilderness Inventory', prepared by the Sierra Club at the behest of the Fourth World Wilderness Congress. 'Only areas of at least 400 square kilometers (1 million acres) were inventoried, because the constraints of this particular study did not allow identification of smaller wilderness areas, **though they, too, are of interest.**'" [Emphasis added]

It isn't just an unjustified paranoia which makes this vast information-gathering project stink of dictatorial ambitions. The architect of this Wilderness Inventory, Sierra Club researcher J. Michael McCloskey, was quoted in the same Moneychanger piece: "It is from this inventory that reservations of major new protected areas can be made. This Land will no longer be anonymous back country and bush which is nibbled away with impunity."

Editor Franklin Sanders asks, "Impunity? Impunity means unpunished. Who is planning the punishing here, and what is the crime? Is it a crime to use your own property as you see fit? This statement well displays the frightening totalitarian implications of satellite/computer technology surveillance such as this GRID (Global Resources Information Database) system. It also reveals an unhealthy coercive bent in Mr. McCloskey." As I reported in the March 1990 Insider Report, Mr. McCloskey isn't the only one looking to provide a method for "environmental crimes." Professor Robert Woetzel brags that he has a "done deal" for a new World Court system which will transcend national laws. (More about that in a moment.)

The already snowballing problem of maintaining personal privacy in an age of massive commercial and governmental databases becomes even more threatening when one considers that present satellite technology allows the identification and viewing of areas as small as ten square feet! It is bad enough to have a bureaucratic Peeping Tom peering over your shoulder at every credit application you fill out. But what if the bureaucrat, like Mr. McCloskey, possesses an "unhealthy coercive bent?"

A comic nightmare vision of the future looms before us. The guests are assembled in the back yard, relaxing with cool drinks. It's a sultry summer afternoon. The host comes out of the patio door with a plate full of raw hamburgers. He reaches the barbecue grill, puts down the burgers, pulls out his starter fluid, douses the charcoa], and lights it.

Hundreds of miles out in space, a red light blinks in the Environmental Strike Force Satellite of the Pollution Enforcement Agency. Alarms sound in the local PEA office, and the eco-cops jump on their non-polluting ten-speed bicycles, turn on their flashing lights and sirens, and pedal over to Mr. Suburban's back yard. With machine guns and fire hoses at the ready, they break down the backyard gate, douse the offending fire, and haul our host off to an environmental re-education camp for 30 years of planting crocuses.

A Stronger World Court

As I hinted above, I fully expect to see a treaty proposed which will, in effect, elevate the role of the World Court and put the U.S. and the U.S.S.R. in bed together as world cops. Further evidence of this dynamic is coming thick and fast.

In a letter to The New York Times in January, Eric Cox, Executive Director of the Campaign for United Nations Reform, said: "Since the United States is conducting an alleged war on drugs, why doesn't the Bush Administration support the creation of an international criminal court to deal with those who violate international conventions against traffic in narcotics?"

Mr. Cox goes on to argue, "Since the United States claims to support international law, why doesn't the Bush Administration demonstrate such backing by favoring an international criminal court to allow the reach of world law to gain jurisdiction exactly where it is needed -- directly over individuals who commit internationally recognized crimes..."

In this same vein, an incredible article appeared in the Santa Barbara News on April 9, 1989. It shows how far the planning has already gone to eliminate our constitutional protections and grant frightening new powers to an international tribunal. The article is based on an extensive interview with Robert Woetzel, whom the reporter describes as "an Oxford-trained scholar, a lecturer at UCLA and director of the University of Santa Barbara's International Studies Program."

The article describes Woetzel's efforts thusly: "For 25 years he has taken the lead in bringing to life an idealistic pet project that finally appears to be a done deal: The establishment of an international criminal court." [Emphasis mine - LA]

I am going to quote almost all of this article, for if it is indeed a "done deal", then you need to know what sort of "major decisions are being prepared" in the name of glasnost and perestroika.

"Robert Woetzel calls it 'the golden rule of the 21st century.'

"A simple idea, really. "Individuals always have been and always will be expendable if they do wrong,' he says. 'The basic concept, which I think every holy book from the Bible to the Koran preaches, is that we have to be accountable -- under God, if you wish, but certainly under the consensus of nations.'

"There is already a World Court at The Hague, but that forum is designed only to resolve disputes pitting nation against nation. The final judgments in the World Court often are made by those with national, and thus partisan, interests. Many countries -- including the United States -- have objected, rightly or wrongly, to such one- on-one scrutiny.'

"There's a kind of collective guilt if you lose, and that's totally unacceptable to some sovereign nation-states,' Woetzel said of the World Court. 'The states don't want to be taken to court.'

"An international criminal court, on the other hand, would be less sectarian, he believes. It would be set up, he says, as an impartial, 'depoliticized' body, composed of an international panel of judges selected for their lack of 'extreme' national partisanship, thus allowing, in concept, a more objective system of justice. Cases would be directed against groups, corporations and individuals, including individuals within governments who have carried out criminal acts of international proportions.

"The basic concept is that world peace must be based on justice,' Woetzel said during a recent interview from his home/office on Tunnel Road, perched high in the foothills above the Mission. 'Justice is larger than just the law. There must be a relationship of responsibility to rights.'

"Based on the Nuremberg principles applied against Nazi war criminals, the international criminal court would prosecute persons or other responsible entities for crimes that, Woetzel says, are generally viewed as an affront to every civilized person, crimes that know no geographic boundaries. People could be tried in absentia, and the death penalty can be meted out in some cases.

"What kinds of offenses would be prosecutable?"

"International drug trafficking, terrorism, hijacking, hostage-taking,' Woetzel replies. But that's not all. Ecological crimes like the illegal dumping of ocean wastes, and economic crimes like insider stock manipulation that might threaten the stability of various nations, also are included on the roster of offenses.

"We make sure,' he says, 'that individuals, groups, corporations, states and governments can be held accountable for their actions.'

"We have drafted something we call the code of offenses against the peace and security of mankind, which is like a development - from Cain and Able to our modern times -- of a global code of justice, which all parties recognize, and which is based on consensus among peoples, nations and states.

"It's very important for us to assert that accountability. We've tried other approaches. The United States tried to pressure Noriega (in Panama); it tried to pressure Mexico, and to pressure the Turks and the Colombians on the question of drug traffic. It didn't work.'

"Woetzel has won congressional support for his project, in addition to an endorsement from about 80 percent of member countries at the United Nations. Ironically, the United States is so far among the minority U.N. members that has withheld its full endorsement. The American government might feel a bit threatened by the notion of its officials being brought to justice by such a broad-based court, Woetzel says. But the government appears to be reluctantly heading toward future support, he added.

"In terms of the U.S. record, we have nothing to fear except fear itself,' he says. 'The idea is to let the chips fall wherethey may. Any government has a few rotten apples in the barrel, and there are not any rotten apples (in the United States) who have ever been condemned.'

"Despite the legalistic and diplomatic hurdles it still must surmount, the international criminal court is heading toward the bricks-and-mortar phase. Woetzel is embarked upon a \$50 million fund-raising project to finance the court system --most of it through private donations. To avoid the threat of political patronage, governments are prohibited from making monetary donations.

"But at the same time, it is governments that, by endorsing and participating in the international court, will give it legal and moral legitimacy.

Woetzel said the court will be headquartered, by 1993, in Tobago, a small island in the West Indies. 'Regional centers' are to be established in Berlin, Malta, Beijing and Southern India. The plan even includes a prison for criminals convicted by the court.

They could end up being housed under lock and key at St. Helena in the South Atlantic. This is a highly appropriate locale; Napoleon spent his time in exile there.

"It's interesting if you think how small the world has become,'
Woetzel said, 'and how effective you can be. Out of that little office
where I work, overlooking the tranquil Pacific, from a hillside above
the Old Mission, I'm in touch daily with the leaders of governments in
the world. And out of there, I maneuver and cajole and pressure and
what not, to get a greater world order.'

Listen to what this man is saying. People "could be tried in absentia," and "the death penalty can be meted out in some cases." Frightening, isn't it? I think you'll agree that the piece deserved such a lengthy citation. I was sorely tempted to make numerous comments about "Malta," "ecological crimes," and "economic crimes," but will resist in the interest of space. Besides, readers of this report don't need my help at this point figuring out where people like Woetzel are coming from --or where they want us to go.

In George Orwell's nightmare novel of the totalitarian world of the future, 1984, Winston Smith is arrested and tortured by Inner Party man O'Brien. In the process of Smith's "re-education" O'Brien calmly explains:

"Power is not a means; it is an end. One does not establish a dictatorship in order to safeguard a revolution; one makes the revolution in order to establish the dictatorship. The object of persecution is persecution. The object of torture is torture. The object of power is power. Now do you begin to understand me?"

Yes, we are beginning to understand just what it is that the eco-maniacs have planned for us.

[Table of Contents](#)

Chapter 7 - The Most Endangered Species

We live in an age of illusion. For a hundred years, in politics and advertising, manipulators of every stripe have honed "the art of human engineering." Goebbels or Ivy Lee, Pennsylvania Avenue or Madison Avenue, they've all learned the art of illusion.

In the building of the great one-world plan, the future holds the corporate state:

Corporate Fascism. And fascism, as any careful reader knows, is nothing but corporate socialism. But if socialism is a discredited economic disaster, how is it to be made palatable? Simple. Call it something else. While socialism supposedly wheezes out its last outdated breath in Eastern Europe, Greenies worldwide are preparing the way for a new, improved, and more potent version under the name of "environmental consciousness."

Invariably, the "solutions" offered to the various environmental threats are only more socialism: centralized planning; price controls; fascist "partnership" between industry, government and environmental elitists; and an end to private property. "Global environmentalism requires global planning, global regulation, and, inevitably, jobs for global bureaucrats," observed the Wall Street Journal on November 8, 1989.

For suffering mankind, the worst is the anti-development mentality that colors all these proposals, As pitifully inefficient as it is, at least socialism claims the goal of production. The new radical environmental socialist readily opposes production and development, for the sake of opposing it alone.

The nerve center of a capitalist economy is the price system. Through the price system, consumers "vote" on the plans and output of producers. Those producers who obey the voice of consumers continue to produce; those who don't, don't.

It has been the refusal to bow to the delicate mechanism of free prices in free markets which, more than any other technical mistake, has left the Soviet Union incapable of rational industrial production or even self-sufficient agricultural production.

Now enter the Greens with a new proposition to make pricing impossible and to divorce prices from the realities of the marketplace and consumer wishes: the Green GNP. The "Green GNP" proposes to assemble a Gross National Product figure which takes into account environmental costs in the national economic statistics, to show the costs of using, or misusing, the environment. Because such costs can at best be only educated guesses and at worst pure imagination, this is a statistician's nightmare and a bureaucrat's fantasy come true.

The questions posed by formulating a Green GNP are almost unanswerable. According to the July 4, 1989, International Herald Tribune, German "officials say that the already daunting task of assigning a monetary value to existing resources and to steps taken to protect them is relatively easy compared to the greater challenge of assessing how much it would cost to restore the environment or compensate those who suffer in the meantime."

This search has already led some West German researchers into such areas as noise pollution, aesthetic pollution [sic], and even smell pollution." The result will be the arbitrary assignment of non-quantifiable "costs" to the price of everything, in order

to account for a supposed, presumed, or imagined "cost" of its production to the environment.

GNP statistics are questionable at best, since the vast economic activity of even a small nation can hardly be accounted for totally. But at least this is an objective quest that seeks to deal with facts. The Green GNP would interpose subjective factors at arbitrary "costs" chosen out of thin air, to result in numbers completely useless from a scientific standpoint. Further, this elitist undertaking presupposes that consumers are incapable of making such choices themselves and have not already figured in all the costs in the prices they are willing to pay.

But the purpose is not scientific or objective -- the purpose is to shoehorn the economy into the environmentalists' pipedream of the eco- millennium. The International Herald Tribune article further notes, "The [German] Greens...are especially anxious to have such calculations for use in steering resource and taxation policies." In other words, down the road after the perfection of the Green GNP, special taxes will be levied to make sure prices reflect their "true" environmental costs.

Nor are the German Greens the only environmentalists calling for inclusion of environmental "costs" in the economic calculation. In his book *After the Crash: The Emergence of the Rainbow Economy*, British "Green" Guy Dauncey predicts that "instead of justifying their operations solely in terms of profit, businesses will have to become 'holistic' -- responsible to their employees and customers for personal, social, environmental, and planetary goals." (Vancouver Sun, September 16, 1989)

The Atlanta Journal of July 14, 1989, reports that "growing numbers of corporate planners and financial analysts are trying to forecast the business climate in a world transformed by global warming, rising seas, and shifting rainfall...Global climate is starting to figure into investment decisions."

Two recent items in the financial pages of The New York Times announced that Disney and G.E. had just created Departments of Environmental Policy and appointed men to the positions of vice president of same. Other major companies are quickly jumping on this bandwagon.

Environmentalist Steven Schneider in an Australian TV interview asserted, "Right now the current price of coal, oil, and gas doesn't include the disruption it does to the environment...If we're going to ever have the right market incentives [sic] to solve the problem...we are going to have to have the right prices on energy. We've got to include environmental costs." (Quoted in *Greenhouse Hokum*, R.J. Long, Dominion Data, GPO Box 1467, Brisbane, Queensland, Australia 4001.) Let me assure you that when Mr. Schneider talks about "market incentives," he is not talking about privatization of the power industry or removal of subsidies and government-controlled energy prices.

What does all this mean to us? The international Herald Tribune article gives a clue. "Mr. Schultz [of the German Federal Environment office in West Berlin] noted that gasoline is available at roughly one Deutsche Mark (50 cents) per liter (0.26 gallon) in West Germany, but he said that some studies show it should be as much as 5 DM [Five times the present price! - LA] to pay for the effects of noise and air pollution, and the cost of accidents."

The costs won't stop there. Chlorofluorocarbons (CFCs) not only power aerosol sprays, they are also the most effective refrigerant known. Chlorine produced from CFCs is the much-touted culprit behind the "ozone-hole" at the South Pole. Yet volcanoes emit 36 million tons of chlorine gas a year, while approximately only 750,000 tons per year are attributed to CFCs, or about 2 percent of the total. For their 2 percent, CFC producers are being forced to develop alternatives. Du Pont, the largest producer, "estimates that retrofitting and shifting all the world's processes to alternative compounds will cost the world between \$50 billion and \$100 billion by the year 2000." Alternatives will cost three to five times CFCs presently used, according to Forbes magazine for October 30, 1989.

Environmental safety won't come cheap, and you must pay.

Partners In Crime

The chief distinction of fascism is the "partnership" between business and government. In practice this amounts to a government-sanctioned price-fixing scheme, with a side benefit of locking out competition forever.

As evidenced by the 600 corporate exhibitors at Globe '90 in Vancouver, the environmental movement thrives on "partnerships." Within the corporate socialist state of the future will be added a new partner: NGOs, or non-governmental organizations. These NGOs are private, un-elected environmental groups. While many people with a sincere and well-founded concern for stewardship of the environment may be connected with these organizations, they are also the major supplier of radical environmentalists. From the UNESCO Heritage Treaty to the Fourth World Wilderness Congress, environmentalist declarations and official documents call for the participation of these un-elected NGO's in the planning and administration of national environmental policies. This is a bit like giving a kleptomaniac the keys to Macy's.

Fascism is, by its very nature and practice, elitism and this tendency is reinforced by the appointment of these un-elected radical environmentalists to positions of great power over the destiny of national economies. Of course, this is sold under the guise of "scientific or professional expertise," but the threatening result is a world governed by persons unaccountable to the public.

It's not the spotted owl or elephant which is the endangered species: it's man and his liberty.

Goodbye Small Business

Socialist central planners like to plan and nothing throws a wrench in the planning like an entrepreneurial small businessman. Every time the bureaucrats look around, there they are, mucking up the Five Year Plan, building factories and businesses, making jobs for people, and using up precious resources that had better be left "natural."

Increased regulation for the economy means increased overhead for business, and it is small business that can least absorb increased costs, whether in buying capital equipment for regulation compliance or just in the cost of complex record-keeping. But there is another front that threatens small businessmen farmers, ranchers and developers alike: the legal axis and the eco-land grab.

The Eco-land Grab

Armed with a new federal court of appeals ruling, environmental groups in the Pacific Northwest now have standing to sue the Bureau of Land Management because of their "recreational interest" in these lands. This means that environmental groups without any economic interest in government lands can block development, mining, or even logging on those lands in long, costly legal battles.

The lumber industry in Washington and Oregon is a perfect example of the disproportionate effect of these legal actions on the small businessman. Well-funded environmental groups are trying to block the harvesting of "old growth" timber on federal government lands, ostensibly to save the northern spotted owl. Neither the small timber mills nor their employees have the financing to fight, so in the past 15 months, according to the Northwest Independent Forest Manufacturers Association, 33 mills have shut down in Washington and Oregon (46 since 1987), obliterating more than 2,500 jobs. As logging reductions "to protect the owl" are fully implemented, timber industry officials contend thousands more will be out of work and the small independent mills, which have dotted the Northwest for a century, will be virtually wiped out. Of course, the giant forestry corporations, Weyerhaeuser and others, have their own timber lands and are not as closely dependent on government timber. But for the small mill owners and workers, the future is bleak or non-existent.

The small mills contend that the spotted owl is just a red herring. "If there was no such thing as the owl, you might not have this crisis to the current extent, but you'd have it eventually, because you're up against a group of people who don't like logging and who at the very minimum don't want any logging of old growth," says Washington's Senator. Slade Gorton.

For the lumber industry this is only the beginning. "A powerful, reinvigorated environmental movement is going to revolutionize the management of public and private forest lands. former U.S. Senator. Dan Evans told the Washington Forest

Protection Association...Curt Smitch, director of the Washington Department of Wildlife, said that overwhelming public pressure is growing to manage forest and other lands for the protection of all wildlife, not just for the propagation of game animals. `And that means private lands,' according to Smitch.' **The difference between public and private land is slowly dissolving in the name of "environmental protection."** [Emphasis added]

To the south in Nevada, the desert tortoise is the cause celebre. Since a federal listing of the tortoise as an endangered species, disruption of the animal's habitat is prohibited. That threatens not only off-road races and some cattle grazing on federal land, but also land development.

"If you have un-graded land that has tortoises on it, it basically stops you dead," said Jim Ley, a Clark County administrator. "There won't be any impact for 6 to 9 months because of the projects already under construction, but after that, you'll see a definite lull."

But it's not only public land that hangs in the balance, it's private land as well. Current U.S. legislation threatens not only the control of private property by the rightful owners, it even threatens title. You already know the American Heritage Trust Act of 1989 (HR 876) was reintroduced in the 1990 session of the U.S. Congress. Among other things, the Act creates a gigantic land trust independent of Congress and provides for funding states and private organizations in the acquisition and management of wilderness areas. (Remember the NGOs and "partnership" mentioned above?) This is in a country where already 740,885,157.6 acres are being administered by federal agencies: 31.9 percent of all U.S. territory!

According to National Cattlemen's Association president Dale Humphrey, commenting on the first defeat of the Act in 1989, "[This Act] would have given federal and state agencies and local land trusts hundreds of millions of dollars every year to buy up private land, and could have led to restrictions on livestock grazing and other multiple uses on surrounding federal lands."

There is no satisfying the appetite of the environmentalist land grab. In a plaintive letter to the editor of Agri View, a threatened Wisconsin farmer pleads his case:

"For three years, myself and others have been trying to get the Department of Natural Resources (DNR) and the legislature to listen to our concerns as landowners and to treat us as the Constitution guarantees. Sadly, we are finding out that because our numbers are small in comparison to the environmentalists and others with great political pull, we have few, if any, rights. With the proposed legislation now being pushed, people...will lose local control...Did you know that 5,300,000 acres of our state is now owned by the DNR, U.S. government, and county and local governments? Did you know that DNR is working on 137 more projects that will involve buying

land?

"Think about what's been happening to our rights as Americans and then ask yourself: Am I really free? The free landowner is becoming an endangered species."

But no farm is so humble, no ranch so huge that the environmentalists are willing to leave its owners in peace. In fact, Deborah and Frank Popper, professors at Rutgers University in New Jersey, are environmentalists who can really think big. Their plan is to return most of Montana, Wyoming, Colorado, New Mexico, North Dakota, South Dakota, Nebraska, Kansas, and half of Oklahoma to -- not the Indians -- the buffalo!! According to the Poppers, "The only way to keep the Plains from turning into an utter wasteland, an American Empty Quarter, will be for the federal government to step in and buy the land -- in short, to deprivatize it." A few years ago the Poppers and their proposal would be the subject of deserved ridicule, but nothing, and I mean nothing, seems beyond possibility anymore.

There is a real partnership between government and NGOs in the eco- land grab. "The National Park Service has secretly surveyed the entire U.S., territories and possessions, sorting through millions of properties, public and private, without the knowledge or consent of private owners."

This is from a frightening expose in the highly reliable Daily News Digest on January 4, 1990: "The program is called the National Natural Landmark Program. It has no organic basis in legislation. For a private landowner, being singled out by the Program is the property-rights equivalent of being Jewish and having your name, address, photo, and fingerprints on a list safely in the hands of the Nazi Party. Secrecy is a necessary part of the process, to wit:

"The question of secrecy and of publicity is a hot topic which will undoubtedly come back to haunt us over the years if this document ever becomes generally available to the public.' (Potential Ecological and Geological Natural Landmarks of the New England Adirondack Region, Thomas G. Sicama Ph.D., Yale School of Forestry and Environmental Studies; for Department of Interior, Division of National Natural Landmarks, 1982 (A Theme Study, a survey)."

Daily News Digest editorializes, "What it amounts to is the National Park Service has been caught dead to rights in a corrupt process of swindling private owners out of property rights...presented as innocuous, the National Landmark Program is tied into every conceivable form of land use regulation. It is the foundation of de facto federal zoning, but not exclusively, enforced by other jurisdictions (state, county, municipal). If your property appears in a Theme Study survey (33 regions; 6 volumes, each the size of a metropolitan phone directory), then the Environmental Mafia (federal, state, and local agencies, the Nature Conservancy, the National Parks and Conservation Association, ect) feel entitled to develop plans for your property which you know nothing about...

"If your property is geologically, ecologically, or scenically remarkable, this Program, working in tandem with the environmental consortium, is out to stick it to you...Theft of rights by bureaucratic means is a well-oiled process, and the Environmental Mafia owns the system like a lynch mob owns the courthouse...Functionally, their maxim is that if you cannot hold onto your property rights, you deserve to lose them."

What we are witnessing on an international level threatens the end of private ownership of property with control and title in private hands, and the beginning of a new feudalism under government and corporate landlords.

And why do so many environmentalists hate and fear mineral and logging development? One suspects the genuine reasons differ vastly from those proffered, obscure perhaps even to the conservationists themselves.

The wealth of the world consists in the things men dig from the ground or nurture out of it. If natural resource exploitation can be prevented and controlled, potential and private wealth will not be generated and whole populations can be kept dependent. When new mineral wealth is suppressed, existing developments become more valuable, and the status quo of wealth distribution and power is preserved and strengthened. The key to the survival of monopolistic economic power is the ability to keep out the competition. Or, as John D. Rockefeller expressed it with characteristic cogency, "Competition is a sin." The "partnership" will know who is "suitable" and who isn't.

Mussolini would be proud.

[Table of Contents](#)

Chapter 8 - The Greening's New Religion

We agree with the Australian Financial Review, which wrote in June 1989, "[I]t is difficult to generate a balanced discussion about the greenhouse effect, indeed about almost any other environmental issue. It has been removed from the rational sphere into the religious dimension. The environmental movement has developed a thoroughgoing theology, with its own demons and deities and, most significantly, its intense sense of guilt." [Emphasis added]

If the eco-movement were localized or small, we might dismiss out of hand its transformation into a religion. But it is growing rapidly worldwide, forcing itself into every political and economic discussion. with a zeal and fanaticism that can only be

described as religious. Whatever your religion -- or lack of religion -- the metaphysical undertones to environmentalism, more than any other trend, should concern you. It threatens the very roots of Western civilization. The eco-cult has a theology of sin and salvation, apocalypse and millennium, god and man -- or perhaps more aptly, god(dess) and (wo)man -- some new, but most very ancient and very dark.

From the aging hippies at its ratty fringes to the limousine liberals at its Gucci'ed center, all the shades of the radical environmental spectrum share an outlook fundamentally hostile to the teachings of Judaism, Islam, and even Christianity. The Western religions (in which Islam must be included because of its Biblical roots) all presuppose the transcendence of God -- God is the Creator, personal, above and outside His creation, although also active in that creation.

Immanence Versus Transcendence

Against this teaching of transcendence, the environmental movement poses the immanence of God -- God is not personal, but dwells everywhere and in everything. God is not the Creator in the creation, He/She is the creation. This is pantheism -- the ancient pagan religion which identifies the Deity with the various forces and workings of nature.

Nor is this paganizing view confined to the followers of occult mysticism; it has its voices within the Christian churches. As The Moneychanger charged in October 1989: "If you think this is just a Protestant problem, think again. Ever since Teilhard de Chardin, the Jesuit paleontologist and mystic, this conscious repaganization has surfaced over and over in Roman Catholic Circles."

Editor Franklin Sanders reported, "A New Story of Creation: It's the season for a theology of ecology...Now, amid signs and warnings of impending ecological crisis, religious scholars are searching their Scriptures for a theology of ecology that can guide and inspire the burgeoning environmental movement. [In March 1989 there was a World Council of Churches seminar on the environment in Basel, an then another WCC conference in San Antonio] and next weekend the United Nations Environmental Program [UNEP] is sponsoring an Environmental Sabbath, which all the clergy of North America...have been urged to celebrate with appropriate prayers and sermons on the soil, water, and air.

The most provocative figure among this new breed of eco-theologians is Father Thomas Berry, a solitary American monk whose essays have aroused environmentalists...If religious leaders want to know what God thinks about nature, he says, books like the Bible and the Koran are the wrong places to look. The universe itself is God's 'primary revelation,' Berry declares and the story it tells of its own evolution from cosmic dust to human consciousness provides the sacred text and context for understanding man's place in God's creation. 'The natural world is the larger sacred community to which we all belong.' Berry writes...'We bear the universe in our being

even as the universe bears us in its being.

"The same atoms that formed the galaxies," Berry likes to remind audiences, "are in me..." In short, God may be our father but earth is truly our mother."

Sanders concluded, "In these sweepstakes, not surprisingly, Taoism and the religions of the American Indians surpass all other rivals...Where the Bible enjoins man to live in covenant with a transcendent God, Berry emphasizes a new covenant with his creation. Moreover, unlike the book of Genesis, which is designed to desacralize nature [i.e., to remove the animism and pantheism], Berry's new cosmology imposes certain values on its human offspring."

In the Bible-based Western religions, Earth was created for man's dominion and use to God's glory. In the eco-cult, the Earth and its beings are divine, but man is the intruder and destroyer. This helps to explain the religious zeal the environmentalists display in their opposition to development of any kind. Nature is not to be used but worshipped -- it's not nice to use Mother Nature.

The Goddess Comes

In the emerging eco-cult, "Mother Earth" is more than just a comic reference to nature: she is the divinity on which we live. This also accounts for the identification of the eco-cult not only with radical environmentalism, but also with radical feminism.

The impulse toward worship of Mother Earth was given a "scientific" push by the work of Dr. James E. Lovelock with his "Gaia pronounced GUY-uh] hypothesis."

"Mother Earth is alive," quoted the Atlanta Constitution on July 12, 1989. The item reports, "For James E. Lovelock, maverick scientist, inventor, and philosopher, that is the only explanation...When Dr. Lovelock proposed his hypothesis a decade ago, he called it 'Gaia', after the Greek earth goddess...Despite the new-found respectability, Gaia still makes many scientists uneasy. They say it smacks more of religion than science. Most scientists are uncomfortable with the idea of Earth as a self-conscious creature..."

Dr. Lovelock believes the scientists have it backward. He says the Earth maintains its chemical balance by marshaling its living matter, from whales to viruses, to manipulate the environment. To him, Gaia is a 'complex entity involving the Earth's biosphere, atmosphere, oceans, and soil... which seeks an optimal physical and chemical environment for life on this planet.' Without it, Dr. Lovelock says, Earth's climate would be out of control and Earth itself would be an inert chemical ball.

"People think there is a force out there that will take care of these problems for them," says [Joseph C.] Farman [the British researcher who discovered the Antarctic ozone hole]. "That's not really Lovelock's view at all. **The human being is an**

irrelevance as far as Lovelock is concerned. If Gaia needs to kill man off, it will. That's his view.' [Emphasis added]

Australian legislator Richard Jones on the religious program Compass was much more blunt: "Gaia is nature, is God; God is nature, is Gaia." Get the point?

Of course, this Gaia hypothesis fits right into pagan concepts of the mother earth goddess. For the "ratty fringes" seeking to extend their "spiritual knowledge," the next logical step moves toward the oldest nature religion, witchcraft. In a June 8, 1988, New Zealand Herald interview with several New Zealand witches we read:

The New Zealand Herald spoke to women belonging to two other [witchcraft] groups with a more formal approach -- Cone and Aurora. The same thread ran through the conversations. They were older women who had once been part of orthodox religion but who found their churches lagging behind the fast pace of social change in the '70s and '80s. The growth of feminism, the upsurge of interest in environmental and racial issues left many of the churches, more than other institutions, grasping unsuccessfully for relevancy. As the awareness of the women grew they became increasingly dissatisfied with the way the churches were catering for their spiritual needs."

'The [witchcraft] rituals affirm that we are all part of the Earth and cosmos and that we must each be caretakers of our bodies and environment,' says [witch Audrey] Sharp. 'Rather than relying on a God or supreme being to solve our problems, it's our responsibility and within our power. I am the goddess and you are the goddess.' [Emphases added]

Apocalypse And Millennium

Any religion worth its incense has an eschatology -- a vision of the way the world will end -- nor is the eco-cult lacking here. In the eco-apocalypse, the final battle between man and the environment lies just around the corner, the grand ecological disaster in which either global warming, a new Ice Age, acid rain, overpopulation, the death of the ozone layer, rising sea levels, or some combination of all of them will sweep most of mankind away to start all over again.

But the Apocalypse will be followed by a millennium -- a golden age which the environmentalists, by good eco-works and clean living, can help to bring about here attracted not merely to alternatives to present energy sources and land uses but to a wholesale retreat to what they see in their millennial terms as 'the simple life,' said the Australian Financial Review.

This is part and parcel of the "small is beautiful" theories and the "earth is running out of resources" mentality that cropped up in the '70s. It is a Green border on the writings of Jean Jacques Rousseau.

On February 5th of this year, Christian News ran a lengthy two-column article on a Moscow gathering. The lofty title for this get-together was "Global Forum of Spiritual and Parliamentary Leaders on Human Survival." I also have in my files a lengthy 7-page promotion letter and brochure signed by the Executive Coordinator Akio Matsunura which extols the virtues of what took place "in Moscow."

A few quotes will give you an idea of the spiritual overtones which dominated the discussion. "Environmental destruction has deep roots in the spiritual unfulfillment of people and the decay of social relations as well as in economic, legal and technical relations...our approach is to reconstitute the political, spiritual and scientific in an attempt to address the whole issue. It is unlikely that such an event could have taken place at any previous time in history. Equally amazing is the fact that a group as diverse as this one actually could collaborate to produce a comprehensive document on reversing the global destruction of our natural environment."

The letter then issues a call to action: "Now that the success of such a gathering has been proven, we would like to encourage similar meetings and discussions in a many places as possible...Spiritual people, politicians, students, scientists and others need to join hands in every community, on every college campus and in every town hall in order to help speed the changes in attitude and in awareness that are sweeping the world."

This was no gathering of also-rans. Speakers included Gorbachev (yes, he is spiritual -- just ask him), UN Secretary-General Javier Perez de Cuellar, Gro Harlem Brundtland (of course), Episcopal Bishop James Parks Morton, the Grand Mufti, Sheikh Ahmed Kufaro, Franz Cardinal Koenig, plus representatives from Buddhism, Jainism, Sikhism, Shinto and the much-revered Native American Indian.

Whether by Robespierre, Hitler, Stalin, or the Ayatollah Khomeini, the millennial dream has often been used to justify lawlessness and in humanity -- always in the name of some "greater good." In fact, as one listens to some of these "religious" leaders, we are struck by the fever of their rhetoric. It is taking on the characteristics of an Islamic Jihad or "Holy War." As it develops, the new eco-cult will drive its devotees to greater and greater zeal, perhaps even to violent means "justified" by the great good of their "ends." As the true believers become more and more impatient for the golden age, saving the whales vicariously with a check may no longer suffice. This turn to violence can already be seen in a Newsweek report of February 2, 1990:

"[E]co-guerrillas, radical environmentalists...have turned to outrageous -- and sometimes illegal tactics in their war against 'greedheads' and 'eco-thugs.' Militants vow not just to end pollution but to take back and 'rewild' one-third of the United States.

'They call us the Kaddafis of the movement, but we feel like cornered animals,' says Jamie Sayen, a member of Earth First!, one of the best-known groups of radical environmentalists. which claims 15,000

members. 'We feel like there are insane people who are consciously destroying our environment and we are compelled to fight back.'

"In practicing what Earth First! co-founder Dave Foreman calls 'a form of worship toward the Earth,' eco-guerrillas pour sand in the fuel tanks of logging equipment and drive spikes into the trees of old-growth forests, potentially ruining expensive lumber-mill saws. They tear down power lines and pull up survey stakes; they sink whaling ships and destroy oil-exploration gear. Even the upcoming trial of Foreman and three others on conspiracy charges hasn't dampened the militants' fervor. In just the last six months, radicals have conducted blockades on the big island of Hawaii to stall development of a geothermal plant on the flanks of the Kilauea volcano, and chained themselves to the tops of cranes on a China-bound freighter to protest the export of timber.

"The militant faction of America's environmental movement is growing rapidly. Many mainstream environmentalists, impatient with their own leadership, are defecting to the radical ranks. A large contingent of environmental scientists, some of them involved in the very government agencies that militants despise, are also aligning themselves with groups like Earth First! 'The more you study ecology, the more radical you become,' explains environmental biologist Jeff Elliot. 'You develop for all living organisms the affection that you have for your relatives, and you don't have any choice but to be as effective as you can against people who are at war with your family.'...The FBI alleges that [Earth First!] with financial help from Foreman, planned ultimately to cut lines to three nuclear power plants...

"What unifies radical environmentalists is their adherence to a philosophy of biocentrism. Earth First!, the Wolf Action Network, the Rain Forest Action Network, Virginians for Wilderness, Preserve Appalachian Wilderness -- scores of small groups across the country endorse the belief that every species has equal, intrinsic value and that the planet cannot be viewed solely as a resource for humans. Though still considered an eccentric and impractical theory by some mainstream environmentalists, the concept of 'deep ecology' is finding increasing grass-roots support...

'It's like the early days of the civil-rights movements,' says Denis Hayes, coordinator of Earth Day 1990 [and its founder]. 'People didn't send money to the NAACP to see if they could get a new law passed. They got up, walked to the front of the bus, and sat down.'

Mike Roselle, a founder of Earth First! and supporter of Greenpeace, spends much of his time organizing new militants around the country. 'I think we've got so many more people out there who are willing to do things,' he says, 'and yet there are fewer groups that are actually asking anything of these people other than to send a check.' But, he adds, 'with groups like us nipping at their heels, mainstream groups are going to take stronger positions.' [Emphasis added]

Totemism

Totemism, the worship of animals, accompanies pantheistic paganism, and not surprisingly, crops up in the new eco-cult. We've already read that biologist Jeff Elliot says that "you develop for all living organisms the affections that you have for your relatives." Also, radical environmentalists are unified by their adherence to a "Philosophy" of bio-centrism and "endorse the belief that every species has equal intrinsic value."

Those eco-cultists who have bridged the whole gap between science and religion, progressing all the way to Mother Earth worship, say, "By reclaiming the ancient wisdom, the animals again may become sacred. As the goddess is respected and honored, her animals too become respected, for the two are inseparable." In fact, according to many radical environmentalists, the only creature who is not sacred is: "the destroyer," "the upsetter" -- man. All of this cultish nonsense is part of what C.S. Lewis prophesied in a book by the same title, The Abolition of Man.

This strange self-hatred and misanthropy, wound about tightly with an unfocused and unattainable guilt for all the eco-sins of the world ("we're all responsible"), runs like a blood-red thread through environmentalist pronouncements. It's a categorical rejection of the Western Biblical concept of man as the crowning glory of creation, made in the image of God and for that reason worthy of respect, dignity, and human rights. Eco-cultists grudge a profound suspicion and sour distrust toward any man who appears to be enjoying himself by using God's creation -- the obvious evidence of his immoral refusal to accept the collective guilt. These eco-killjoys make the much-maligned Puritans look like Falstaff on a spree. Under their assumed mantle of "tolerance" they allow any belief -- as long as it agrees with theirs.

There is a diseased loss of balance in this view of man that can only be explained as religious fanaticism run wild. How far will it run? In an interview on the Australian religious program, Compass, Richard Jones, said, "I think an ant is as much a part of God, as a polar bear, or a koala, or you and me or a priest. I think they're all spiritually equal. So if I save an ant from drowning, that's as equal [sic] as saving anything else from drowning. And I think we can be taken seriously. When people get this connection, when they finally get the connection that we are all interconnected." [Emphasis added]

A very long time ago the Apostle Paul explained this sickness: "Professing themselves to be wise, they became fools, and changed the glory of the uncorruptible God into an image made like to corruptible man, and to birds, and four-footed beasts, and creeping things." (Romans 1:22-23)

Chapter 9 - The Green Investment Bonanza

In the preceding chapters I have given you just a basic or ground- floor examination of "The Greening." In the interest of space, I didn't even touch on what is being pounded into young minds starting in kindergarten. Nor did I examine the role of Hollywood, television or the music industry. It can be said without any fear of overstating the facts, that every one of the 13 areas of human activity is now inundated with the eco-onslaught.

As much as I am tempted to end this report with my own appeal to reason and a Revere-like call to alarm, which would present a counterattack in defense of liberty, I cannot -- at least not now. In spite of the concern on the part of a growing number, especially those who are directly in the crosshairs of environmental targets, most people are not ready to see the real face of "The Greening."

As The New York Times said when it reported on the House vote for the EPA Cabinet-level bill, "Politicians generally acknowledge that the American public has grown so concerned about environmental problems that it is risky to vote against environmental legislation." Even freedom groups and conservative organizations are hesitant to attack "The Greening."

So until the time comes, if it does in time, I'll keep reporting the facts in the hope that more and more people will finally come to see the real face behind the Green Mask. In the meantime, there is going to be incredible money made by investors who see what's happening and act accordingly. Let's now examine the opportunities.

At the beginning of this special report I wrote, "In the process of this 'greening of the world,' incredible sums of money are going to be spent, whole new industries will emerge, and vast new fortunes will be made. In the last chapter of this report I will reveal the Number One Insider-favored investment in all of this, the investment that in the '90s will be what gold was in the '70s...If you miss this investment play, it will be equal to passing on gold in 1972, when you could have bought it for \$42 an ounce."

But I'm not going to tell you what it is just yet. Unless I set the stage, you can't fully appreciate exactly why this investment is going to be such a gangbuster. So let me give you a proper introduction before I lift the curtain for you.

Putting everything together, let's bring the global overview into micro-focus, starting with an exercise in environmentalist logic:

- **Major premise:** The growing industrialization of the world economies will require ever-increasing amounts of energy.

- **Minor Premise:** The development and use of many energy sources are harmful to the environment.
- **Conclusion:** The least environmentally damaging energy source is the one which should be most widely used.

Now, that's the sort of syllogism which would have received an "F" in Father Conner's class, but since logic isn't being taught anymore, who's to grade my paper? And besides, we're talking about "environmentalist logic" here. That's an oxymoron by every definition.

What's at stake here has nothing to do with logic, common sense, or even responsible conservation. The name of this game is "Money and Power." To that end, we are talking about sums of money which are beyond human comprehension -- and the power to match it at all levels of government.

Regarding money: If it is a "must" to purposefully destroy 10 percent of the national GNP (see Chapter 1), and if this "global reach" means 10 percent of the world's GNP, then you tell me how much money that is. My calculator doesn't go that high.

Regarding power: The EPA is going to be elevated to Cabinet rank. Every state has its own EPA look-alike, and every county, every city, every Middlesex village and farm will come under scrutiny if it wants to dig a ditch or move a mallard. Again, you tell me how much power is involved.

As to which form of energy will prevail, let's quickly go through a process of elimination to find the "environmentally acceptable sources."

- **Wood.** Get serious. We have spotted owls to worry about, to say nothing of the "greenhouse" effect. Wood and plants, in fact, now have groups to defend their own "Civil rights." In Arizona recently, 21 people were charged with felonies for cactus poaching.
- **Cow dung.** I'm not kidding. No less an "authority" than Stanford's Paul Ehrlich has warned about the atmospheric emissions of cow dung used as an energy source in feed lots within Third World countries. (This is the same guy who wrote *The Population Bomb* and a whole list of eco-books calling for population control.) I even have in my files a completely serious article entitled, "How Now You Gassy Cow," warning of the dangers of too much methane being released into the air by flatulent cows.
- **Coal.** Scar the earth! Acid rain! No way!
- **Hydroelectric.** Would you want to invest in a Grand Coulee Dam environmental impact statement? As to the TVA we have the "snail darter syndrome" which is infinitely more costly than the China one.
- **Nuclear.** Too clean, too safe, too cheap -- whoops! Ormake that WPPSS, as in WPPSS bonds. Need I say more?
- **Miscellaneous.** Solar, windmills, methane, tidal, fusion...not a chance. There's not enough money in any of them.

So what's left? Only two choices, really: abandon all hope of industrializing the world, or use the hydrocarbons -- oil and gas. Up till now, these two have been synonymous. But not anymore. Black gold has been given a black hat. I could take an entire year of Insider Report to chronicle all of the attacks on oil. Drilling, transportation, refining, burning, you name it and a study exists -- along with a "green" group to promote it -- attacking oil.

Why, you ask? Well, the answer is simple. Oil reserves are being depleted, and the Insiders have decided that much of what remains will be needed for the non-energy component. Just the oil needed in the plastics and new composites industries will keep demand at ever-increasing levels, to say nothing of the automobile.

In America the automobile has almost reached maximum consumption levels and is now in a replacement category. But in Eastern Europe, China, the Third World, and almost everywhere else, it is still part of the dream of the "good life." While oil's use in the automobile certainly qualifies as "energy consumption," and as such will continue to receive more than its share of bad PR, this, too, has its limits. Even the greenies like to go places without riding in the front (or back) of a broken-down, smelly old bus.

So what's left? What's the "last resort" ...the one energy source that hasn't been lambasted as "bad for Mother Earth" ...the industry the Insiders are setting up to inherit the lion's share? Not surprisingly, it's the number one Insider-favored investment in all of this. Are you ready?

It's natural gas.

Gas Is The One

The environmentalists are already describing natural gas as "the miracle energy source for the future." An article in the January 8, 1990, New York Times sounded like a PR summary for the industry when it said:

"At a time when American oil production is declining, dependence on imported oil is growing and worries about the environment are pervasive, many analysts point to the advantage of natural gas.

It is, they say, a fuel that is clean and easier to find in North America than oil. They predict that despite a complex, cumbersome procedure for building new pipelines, gas will substitute for oil and coal in generating power, heating homes and firing industrial plants."

Everywhere you look, gas pipeline systems are being planned or expanded. There's the \$ 11 billion Korean-Alaskan joint venture to pipe gas from Prudhoe Bay to Valdez. Throughout the Northeast, pipeline projects are being rushed to approval, without a lot of red (or should that read "green") tape by the Federal Energy

Regulatory Commission getting in the way. In all, 18 projects have received preliminary approval from the FERC without so much as a burp of protest from the greenies.

George H. Lawrence, president of the American Gas Association, has predicted that gas consumption nationwide will "rise by one-third over the next 20 years." I think he is being far too conservative. I'll bet the rise will be much closer to 50 percent, and in a lot less than 20 years, too.

As to the huge capital cost needed to make these conversions and transmission conduits possible, don't worry about it. The Insiders won't. We're talking chump change, compared to the profit potential. Besides, the costs will be passed through to the consumer anyway.

Until now the oil and gas industry has always been viewed as unitary. But not anymore. On April 3, 1990, the New York Mercantile Exchange started trading in a natural gas commodity contract. By the time anyone reads this special report, the natural gas contract will be in place and this will separate the sheep (gas) from the goats (oil). As I write this, major investment banks and brokerage firms are separating their research departments, giving natural gas its own priority separate from oil.

Investment Recommendations

Have I convinced you of the case for natural] gas? I hope so. Let me make my own conviction clear. Gas is going to be for the 1990s what gold was for the 1970s, with one major difference: the "gas game" will last much longer -- well into the next millennium.

Take it from an old gold bug who was there as gold moved from \$35 per ounce to \$850. Today, if you asked me the one place where you could put your money now, never touch it for ten years, and be confident of doing well, natural gas would be my hands-down choice,

So how do we go about structuring a portfolio for the natural gas investment play? Here is what I would recommend:

- 40 percent in the major producers,
- 40 percent in pipeline and transmission companies,
- 20 percent in small-to medium-sized exploration and development companies.

Of the 20 percent in the latter category, at least half should be in Canadian companies. Canada has far more natural gas opportunities than the U.S. The only exceptions are the Gulf Coast states, and the smaller companies there should not be overlooked. Those which made it through the carnage of 1982-1988 obviously have

prudent management and a good asset base.

There are many senior companies that represent both sides of the industry. Burlington Resources (BR-NYSE), for example, is a natural gas producer and transmitter. It's buying and drilling natural gas at a record pace, as well as expanding its El Paso gas pipeline system. Consolidated Natural Gas (CNG-NYSE) is in the same category, as is Columbia Gas Systems (CG-NYSE). These three are among the largest of those companies which are fully integrated, pure gas plays.

Others which are extremely well-placed for growth are Ensearch (ENS- NYSE), Enron (ENE-NYSE), Sonat (SNT-NYSE), Tenneco (TGT-NYSE), the Williams Companies (WMB-NYSE), and Coastal Corporation (CGP-NYSE). My early favorites, Adobe (ADB-NYSE) and British Gas (BRG-NYSE), are still good buys. In fact, they are my first choices, along with Columbia and Consolidated.

As to the smaller companies, I have already urged the purchase of POCO Petroleum Ltd. and Northstar Resources, two of Jerry Pogue's Canadian favorites. Now I have added two smaller companies in the U.S., Enx (ENEX) and Whiting (WPCO), both on NASDAQ. Both companies are well- managed and can be bought at attractive discount-to-asset values.

In the recommendations listed above, I have purposely left out price entry points. My reason for doing so is simple: we are talking about taking a fundamental position for the long haul. When I first recommended Adobe in the spring of 1989, and called attention then to the emerging natural gas play, I wrote, "The play won't happen fast. In fact, I will add that you shouldn't even think about selling for 24 to 36 months or until the stock has at least doubled." That was good advice then and it is good advice now. Buy these stocks at the market now and put them away for a few years, confident that you'll be handsomely rewarded.

If you want more action, then the natural gas commodity contract on the New York Mercantile Exchange is the place to be. But don't use full leverage, as these markets will go through the fluctuations natural to any commodity. Or simply buy the low-cap stocks which Jerry Pogue or Sam Parks can recommend.

I'll continue to look for other "sleeping beauties," but in the meantime, I urge you to review your stock portfolios and make natural gas the cornerstone for the "new realities" which are shaping the future.

The brokers who are doing their homework on the emerging natural gas play and will handle your stock business with the prudence it demands are:

- Don Samples, Remington Securities, Los Angeles, California, 800- 377-8811 or 213-477-3377;
- Guy Asadorian, Jr., Smith-Barney, Providence, Rhode Island, 800- 556-7757 or 401-276-5945;

- Jerry Pogue, National Securities, Seattle, Washington, 800-426-9993 (for Canadian stocks only);
- Kip Reid, First Eagle, Inc., Colorado Springs, Colorado, 800-888- 6446 or 719-531-5300; and
- Sam Parks, Neidinger/Tucker/Bruner, Denver, Colorado, 800-825-6148 or 303-825-6148.

Also, a few excellent private limited partnerships are available which are perfect for cash flow-conscious investors and pension and profit-sharing plans. SEC rules prohibit my discussing them here, but if you have an interest, call my son Kye Abraham at (206) 851-7486. He has his own brokerage business, Abraham and Co. I don't receive any compensation from his firm, or from any of the other recommended brokers.

Some Other Recommendations

Natural gas is not the only investment for the 1990s. I can tell you right now that most of our future stock buying recommendations are going to be in three industry groups: Natural gas, of course, but also environmental and telecommunications. These are the industry segments most favored by the Insiders, which means they are going to be the major beneficiaries of government policy and spending.

Believe me, the Insiders know and have planned what's now underway and are prepared to reap humongous profits on the billions of dollars that will be marshaled in this "battle." The amounts to be spent will be matched or surpassed only by the foolishness of the spending.

The companies which will benefit the most from this spending spree are those which offer water treatment, waste-to-energy conversions, recycling, hazardous and solid waste disposal, and, of course, the equipment and instrument manufacturing for all of the above. But let me emphasize once more that natural gas will be the central element to everything concerning energy and its use.

As this concern grows and the money spills forth, a whole financial industry segment will develop, complete with mutual funds, analysts, and stock watchers. In fact, it's already started. One major firm has already launched a new closed-end mutual fund called the Freedom Environmental Fund. Isn't that name incredible? Freedom -- Environmental -- Fund. Give me a break.

Let me quote for you from the brochure I received describing the Freedom Environmental Fund and its objectives:

"The World's Next Great Growth Industry? Because of the scope of the problem, the coming environmental mobilization could create the greatest growth industry the world has seen since the ascendancy of the U.S. military-industrial complex in the aftermath of World War

II...

Clearly, it may take hundreds of billions of dollars of new capital, perhaps trillions, over the next several decades to marshal the talent and resources to produce, deliver and implement these new methods and technologies.

For mankind, this new industrial revolution represents a critical challenge...and for investors, a major opportunity."

The brochure also quotes a year-ago issue of Time magazine, which had this to say:

"From South America to Canada -- from Finland to Japan -- world leaders and multinational conferences are pledging to undertake new initiatives to save the environment. According to an expert on environmental issues in the Soviet Union, even that country's leadership has concluded that after disarmament, environmental protection is the number-one world issue."

You've already guessed what I'm going to say. I think we should follow the lead of the Insiders and start our own environmental portfolios. My current favorites are Tyco Labs (TYC) and Safety Kleen (SK) on the New York Stock Exchange, plus Laidlaw Transportation (LDMFB) and Calgon Carbon (CRBN) on NASDAQ. All of these companies have gone up significantly over the past year, but never mind. Our job isn't to pick bottoms, it is to pick Insider favorites.

I will not take the space now to go into each of the "whys" and "wherefores" of each of these picks. For now, let me just note that these are also the favorites of the Freedom Environmental Fund. Their "due diligence" is good enough for me.

A Natural Gas Winner

Some of the letters and comments I have received from readers ask, "As a small investor, how can I take advantage of your recommendations without buying into a mutual fund?" Well, to this problem I believe we've found the answer -- at least for natural gas. The EIF Natural Gas Unit Investment Trust will do the job perfectly.

The trust has a portfolio holding shares in 28 different natural gas companies. Within the portfolio are the common stocks of companies engaged in exploration, production, transmission, and distribution of natural gas, and even in natural gas drilling services. Professionally selected, these stocks are the "pick of the litter." The trust includes almost all of my own personal favorites.

The trust works as follows. On August 23, 1989, 10300 shares of common stock representing the 28 different companies were purchased. (No one company represents more than 4.8% of the funds in the trust.) These shares will be held for

income and appreciation until October 31, 1994. At that time, the trust will start to be liquidated, with a termination date no later than December 1 of that year. Once all the shares are sold, the moneys in the trust will be distributed to those holding the units at that time.

This is a very sound approach and one which I highly endorse. It is also an excellent vehicle for IRAs and pension plans. The shares in the trust are valued each day after the market closes; that determines the price of the unit for the next day, much like an open-ended mutual fund. The units currently sell for \$10.05; they came out at \$10.00. They were co-underwritten by Smith-Barney, Prudential- Bache, Shearson, Dean Witter, and Merrill Lynch, all of which make a secondary market in them, The minimum investment is about \$1,500, give or take \$40 or \$50. Each unit is given a \$10 value and 150 units represent the minimum purchase. Plus, there is a one-time 4% sales charge.

You need to understand that the trust is not managed. Nobody is buying and selling shares in the trust; that's one of the key benefits of investing in a unit investment trust. You know the make-up of your investment, because "what you see is what you get."

Most of the companies in the trust do pay dividends, and there are quarterly distribution of net dividend income to unit holders. Although dividend income is taxable, it should qualify for the 70% federal "dividend-received" deduction for corporations. For those of you who like the idea of this approach and want to invest at least the minimum of \$1,500, let me suggest you contact Guy Asadorian at Smith-Barney's office in Rhode Island. His number is 1-800-556-7757 or 401-276-5945.

Should you choose to sell any or all of your units before December 1994, you may do so simply by calling the broker who bought them for you. The profit or loss will be reflected in what happened to the price of the shares in the portfolio during your holding period. Oh, one quick note of caution. If you purchase the units from a broker other than one of the underwriters, you will have to pay an additional commission. On this one, stick with the old saying and "Dance with the girl who brung ya."

Some Basic Rules

In conclusion, let me say that this is just a beginning -- just a taste of the many investments that will magically appear as the direct result of the "green" movement. Companies that aren't even a twinkle in somebody's eye today will become household words within months or years. This is prime profit-making time here.

So do we ignore what the Insiders are doing? Do we just sit back and watch them walk off with the store? Or do we invest -- and profit -- along with them? I say let's get started. Get into these investments and wait to (I can't resist) clean up.

Before you make a single phone call to a broker, though, take a moment to review a couple of investment basics to which I firmly adhere. My fundamental question before I buy any stock is, How do the Insiders view it? With the exception of a few penny stock flyers from time to time, I make my recommendations based more on the "who" than on the "what."

When we see the insiders of world finance move into an industry group or company, we do, too. Or if, as in the case of American Barrick, Horsham Corporation and Archer Communications, we see smart operators with deep pockets make a move, we do, too. It all goes back to the old saying, "It isn't what you know, but who you know." If I have any claim to fame at all, it is that I know who's who and how the real world works.

When it comes to selling (which is every bit as important as buying), I recommend a very simple formula. If the stock doubles, sell half of your original position. If it doubles again, sell half of the rest. Then let the balance ride and hope for a home run. This strategy is especially applicable to low-cap stocks.

If a large capitalization stock falls 30 percent from where you bought it, sell all of it. If a penny stock falls 50 percent, sell all of it. These general rules work, so please don't forget them.

Looking Beyond The Obvious

Let me share one last insight as to how we should hone our focus. A very experienced stockbroker told me years ago that the price of any particular stock is determined 50 percent by which way the market is going generally, 30 percent by the industry group it's in, and 20 percent by the individual company's uniqueness.

Time and time again I've seen this observation confirmed. This is one of the reasons I don't recommend investing in open-end mutual funds. I know we can do far better by putting together our own diversified portfolios, paying special attention to Insider objectives and the who's who of the industry group in question.

As the confusion grows during the coming months and years, and as one crisis after another convulses the markets and rivets the attention of the public at large, remember always that much of what is occurring has been designed and staged for effect.

With the industry groups identified in this report, coupled with the due diligence that will identify the best management of the specific companies, we have a decided edge. The stock markets will ebb and flow, and at times convulse and quake, but the game goes on and profits are made.

It's up to us to look beyond the obvious. Our challenge is to understand the plans and purposes behind surface events. Playing in this game will take nerves of steel and the

confidence of a poker player holding four-of-a-kind. If you can do it, I promise you, the results will be spectacular.

[Table of Contents](#)

Epilogue

Earth Day has finally come and gone. But don't think for a minute that you are going to get a reprieve from the eco-onslaught. You won't. Earth Day 1990 was only "the end of the beginning." From now until as far into the future as anyone can see, the din of exo-threat is going to be with us. Even as I write, the choreographers of "The Greening" are lining up the acts for the next grand spectacle, so all I can do is try to anticipate what will happen next in the Green Gala.

If advance billing, or as they say in show biz, "pre-opening publicity," means anything, you could tell Earth Day was going to be an extravaganza quite unlike anything we'd ever seen or been subjected to in the past. Naturally, the cast was star-studded, with every "big name" that could possibly shoehorn his or her mug before some camera somewhere. In addition to the biggies, there was a plethora of "might-have-beens," "wannabe's," and "never-were's" trying to jump on the bandwagon for a ride to eco-immortality.

Having witnessed and been subjected to these types of H.Y.P.E.S. (Hollywood Yuppies Promoting Extreme Socialism) many times through the years, I have developed a few rules for evaluating the "causes." For example, here are two of Abraham's Laws on Hollywood H.Y.P.E.S.

- **Law No. 1:** The permanent value of any cause diminishes in direct proportion to the number of movie stars involved in its promotion.
- **Law No. 2:** The permanent harm done to Western Civilization by any cause will increase in direct proportion to the number of TV specials aired on its behalf.

There are also some addendums to these precepts. Consider, for example, The Fairchild Factor: The stupidity of any cause is enhanced by the prominence of Morgan Fairchild in its patronage.

Then there is The Streisand Supposition: The importance of any left-wing cause is increased by the number of public appearances featuring Barbara Streisand in its advancement.

And let's not overlook The Denver Declaration: As long as you say the right things for public consumption, you can do all the wrong things and get away with it.

Finally, there is The Kristofferson Connection: You can be confident that any cause featuring Kris Kristofferson has been declared "approved" in Moscow.

Along with Abraham's Laws there is P.J. O'Rourke's rating system: "Silly, very silly, and Shirley MacLaine."

With TV Behind Them...

As a headline article in the April 12, 1990, Seattle Post-Intelligencer said, "TV is awash in environmental shows for Earth Day." The reporter, P-I television critic John Engstrom, wrote, "Television tries to atone for all its 'Bay Watches' and 'My Mother the Cars' by taking a frenzied leap next week into the parade leading up to Earth Day's 20th anniversary."

Engstrom continues, "Never shy about pirating a bandwagon and claiming it as their own, the networks and local stations are training their talent to blather 'Earth' or 'environment' at least once every third sentence."

Not wishing to be drummed out of the corps of "concerned journalists," Engstrom then hastens to add, "But for once it's tough to fault the overkill, because if we don't get over our bad environmental habits, they're going to kill us." Nice recovery, John.

A cursory count of shows aired on or about Earth Day in the Seattle area numbered 37. That's no typo -- 37. And that's not counting those which went at it for five straight days, such as "Today," "Good Morning America," the "CBS Morning Show," and of course each of the major networks' evening newscasts. "Mister Rogers' Neighborhood" was at it all week long, pounding the "eco-cult" into the preschoolers' and toddlers' consciousness.

Add to all of this the various local TV news shows, special features, talk shows, etc., and you truly have a scenario that became ad nauseam.

In its commitment to Earth Day, Hollywood and TV Land rolled out the big guns. Everyone from Meryl Streep and Kevin Costner to Bugs Bunny, Tweety Bird, and Porky Pig got into the act. E.T. even rolled back into town for a special appearance. All the Tinsel Town "intellectuals" showed up as well, as Doogie Howser, M.D. (Neil Patrick Harris) and Doc Brown (Christopher Lloyd of "Back to the Future" fame) stamped the event with their monumental IQs.

There was the obligatory rock music contribution, "Save the Planet: A CBS/Hard Rock Cafe Special." As "Entertainment Weekly" said, "Who knows, maybe as a gesture of ecological goodwill, Ozzy Osbourne will sew a head back onto a live bat."

Even Superman (Christopher Reeve) felt compelled to help out by lending his voice to an HBO animated special starring the Zwibbles Dibbles, a group of socially responsible baby dinosaurs. The Discovery Channel offered another Earth Day fantasy; unfortunately, their show "Earth" -- narrated by Stanford professor and Population Bomber Paul Ehrlich -- was presented as fact.

Not wanting to be left out, The Weather Channel felt compelled to push back the clouds with an offering, "Within Our Power," a 30-minute documentary on renewable energy resources.

And finally, never one to overlook that perennial TV staple --sex -- CBS offered "Dolphins, Whales and Us," featuring theSports Illustrated swimsuit model Elle MacPherson in her underdressed best. All too aware of the flap caused by Andy Rooney's comments about homosexuals, the CBS bigwigs made "sure" they wouldn't be hit with "sexist" charges and wrote in a part for Olympic swimming hunk Matt Biondi.

But Seriously...

Like I said at the top, Earth Day was a real extravaganza. And if you think this review of Earth Day 1990 is a bit flippant, please excuse me. This is without doubt the most frightening expose I have ever done. If I didn't take this opportunity to lighten the load a bit, I probably would have crawled off to a corner somewhere and, like Linus, sat holding a blanket and sucking my thumb.

I am frequently asked by Insider Report readers, "How do you keep your sanity with all that you see and write about?" Sometimes it ain't easy! The answer is, occasionally I do what I've done here in this chapter -- I rip and snort a bit. Believe me, it can be a great catharsis. And besides, some of this stuff is really funny -- or at least some of the self-important posturing of the promoters borders on the ridiculous.

All of the activities outlined above only represent the broadcast industry's contribution to the Earth Day promotion. The print media even surpassed the airwaves. I was more than a little amused by the obvious contradiction of how many trees gave up their lives to supply newsprint for the millions and millions of words extolling the virtues of not cutting down trees. But this "war" is no different than most -- "some are expendable."

Ignore All Unpleasant Facts

Slowly, very slowly, some voices of reason are starting to be heard. Some of the truth is fighting its way into the debate. "Debate" is actually a misnomer. The eco-maniacs don't debate. Any contrary evidence, no matter how well it's supported by fact and documentation, is ignored and treated as if it didn't exist.

Even the NASA TIROS-N Study, which totally destroys "the warming of the earth"

hypothesis, gets, at best, only minimal coverage. Typical of our "fair-minded" media, the Seattle Post-Intelligencer relegated the story to page 13. "Experts whose previous cries of alarm proved totally without merit are never taken to task for their erroneous and apocalyptic projections. Such charlatans as the aforementioned Stanford professor Paul Ehrlich are classic examples of this expertise-come-a-cropper.

An entire volume could be written proving the falsity within Ehrlich's late '60s whopper, *The Population Bomb*, yet here he is twenty-plus years later, still regurgitating the same old nonsense and still getting top billing on "The Tonight Show" to tout his dishonest bombast. Ehrlich's only real interest is in depopulating the planet, especially America. He doesn't care one wit how many falsehoods must be disseminated in order to make it happen. The problem (and this is a very significant problem) is that too many people accept his alleged "expertise" without any knowledge of his past -- or the consequences of the future he would create.

Every petty-fogging demagogue and Big Brother promoter I can think of has gotten into the Earth Day act. Jesse Jackson trumpets "Pollution, Now A Bigger Threat Than Red Army." Senator Al Gore calls for SEI - Strategic Environment Initiative -- as a counterpart to SDI, and says, "The need is urgent; no longer is the threat of nuclear war at the top of the world agenda...it is imperative that we approach environmental protection...as we approached SDI and with comparable or greater funding."

Please make no mistake about it: what is being proposed and promulgated, in the name of "protecting our environment," is nothing less than the most comprehensive assault on liberty, private property, and limited government in all human history.

And before you rush to the conclusion that Abraham is indulging in the same rhetorical overkill he's criticizing, then all I ask is for you to do what the eco-maniacs will not -- please, check the evidence.

A New Information Source

While this lengthy report doesn't cover every aspect of the subject I've discussed on these pages, it certainly gives a comprehensive macro-view of the eco-agenda and where it's going. Unless people like us come to understand what's really going on, we are going to sit idly by and watch our world and the values we hold dear completely destroyed -- all in the name of "saving earth."

In keeping with the importance of this subject, I launched a whole new information source to examine it...and to profit from it. It is called *The G.E.O. Report*, and it is devoted exclusively to the investment opportunities of "The Greening."

The G.E.O. Report is a twice-monthly analysis of gas, environmental/energy, and oil opportunities. It is edited by yours truly and has as contributing editors the best people we know who can bring their expertise to bear.

In order to bring the scientific expertise necessary to the whole range of "environmentalism," we have made a special arrangement with Dr. Petr Beckmann, editor of Access to Energy. This excellent monthly, published and written by Dr. Beckmann since 1973, will be included with The G.E.O. Report every month as part of your basic subscription. As Professor Emeritus of Electrical Engineering, University of Colorado, this brilliant scientist brings to his work a lifelong scholarship in the natural sciences and applied physics. As such, he is uniquely qualified to speak out on the various "hoaxes" and "scams" which play such a large part in contemporary environmentalism. Equally important are his sensible alternatives to the most extreme proposals.

Some Final Thoughts

How the media and their Establishment bosses treat the publicity on their various causes, including this one, is very revealing. They will bring the issue, like environmentalism or nuclear threat, into a crescendo of worldwide exposure. Then just as certainly as it started, it stops -- and the quiet meetings, conferences, and conventions go about the drafting of various treaties, laws, and protocols to effect its permanence. I have watched this happen twice with "The Greening," and it will happen again. That's why continuing coverage on our part is absolutely essential.

In the months and years ahead, hundreds of billions of dollars are going to be spent in the cause of environmentalism. Companies which don't even exist today are going to become household words tomorrow, and your own pocketbook is going to be dramatically affected, whether you like it or not -- or even whether you are aware of it or not.

A relative handful of people are going to make fortunes, while the majority quietly go about paying their hard-earned money to support it all. Through The G.E.O. Report, both I and our skilled and knowledgeable contributing editors do our best to help you become one of the profitable few.

If you haven't subscribed yet, call our business office for a free issue. They'll also give you information on subscribing. The numbers are 800-528-0559, or in Arizona, 602-252-4477.

--End

This file was originally posted to the ACT (Against Constitutional Terrorism) email reflector. You may subscribe by sending email to listproc@efn.org with the text: "subscribe act" in the message body.

*(Isaiah 33:22) For the Lord is our judge, the Lord is our lawgiver, the Lord is our king;
he will save us.*