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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 Larrv Abraham beean warnine the readers of his monthlv 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 rulersof 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
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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: CI) a erain 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

meea-trend. Then let's hooe and orav that r)eoDle of goodwill evervwhere 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
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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 "greeningof 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 Ive 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 1 967, a little book of just over 1 00 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 where 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 aooear 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 Reming 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'snowextractjust afew 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

rieht to rule its societv." Thev further state. "Obviouslv. if the war svstem 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

reolacement for war. but it would take a generation or a generation- and-a-half Cthat

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, 1 990,

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."

ni 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.l . 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, 1 990 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 loosing 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.

Chapter 2 - TeU 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."

Im 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 1 97 1 . 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 1 969 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 mv newsletter. Insider Reoort know. I have for vears encouraeed

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 SunTsu'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 modem 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. Atthat 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 "deceotion bv elasnost" 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 oranother,

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, Rora 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 $ 1 9 ~ 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 anew 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 ofthe 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 ofthe New World

Order.

Chapter 3 - Perception vs. Reality

Niccolo Machiavelli observed almost 500 vears aeo. "Men in eeneral 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 modem

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 whatwe 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 jaw-

bone 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 embraceenvironmental 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." "Bowing 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 Heal: 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 Cirus 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 alwavs and evervwhere. there is some local

crisis orpendingcalaslrophelojuslify their move. In my home stale 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 spottedowl, 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

WildemessCongress, 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,

'Td 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 Eiica, 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 1 989 1 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 Samey'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 representingthe 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

sovereiantv within his own countrv to the bie banks and their ereenie front erouos.

Do you gel 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...Weneeda 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 1 987. 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 "buv" 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,

Weyeriiaeuser 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.

Tabic of Conicnis

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 thiswhole 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 gel 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 Lsland and New Mexico.

I would venture to say that some form of this scam is being launched in virtually

everv state in the Union. Not lone aeo. I received a call from a reader worried

because in her stale 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,

1 989, 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

oreviouslv. the spotted owl is simolv 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 of 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 1 989 budget grossed $1 68

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."
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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 necessitie, the Tyrant's plea, excus'd his

devilish deeds."

Tyrants haven't changed much since Milton's day ~ or since Adam's. "Necessitie" is

still their plea, and the eco-hype daily pumped out in the media is just another

example. The "crisis," the "emergency," the "necessitie" 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 Carnage 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

oroeram: "Svmbols and slogans. Sloeans and svmbols. 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 comer 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 inthe 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 r)ersonal eain" and the West's "disorooortionate

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, 1 989. "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. ThePollingReport 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 likeTheGreeningof 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 , 1 989,

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."

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 leeislatures. Thus, we can look for international treaties. esr)eciallv 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 "(ireen"

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, 1 989, 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

sweeoine the oowers 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, 1 989: "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 1 972 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,

itappears 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, 1 dam 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 341 753,

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 1 988 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, 1 989, the next step is a treaty to

limit carbon dioxide (CO 2 ) 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 C02 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 CO 2

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 lighter, you should know that right after Secretary of

State Baker and Soviet Foreign Minister Shevardnadze met in Jackson Hole,

Wyoming, in thesummer of 1 989, 1 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; "Worid 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- Worid War 1

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 ofthe 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 ofthe 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 amone its manv 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 onoutboard 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 modem 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 1 988

as the 'World Wilderness Inventory', prepared by the Sierra Club at

thebehestofthe 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 1 990 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 Worid 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 21 st 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

rephes. 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 modem 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 1 993, in Tobago, a small island in

the West Indies. 'Regional centers' are to be established in Berlin, Malta, Beijing and

Southern India. The olan even includes a orison for criminals convicted bv 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 worid. And out of there, I maneuver and cajole and pressure and

what not, to get a greater worid 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, 1 984,

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.

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 buildine of the ereat one-worid olan. the future holds the corporate state:

Corporate Fascism. And fascism, as anycareful 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

Novembers, 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

arbitrarv assignment of non- Quantifiable "costs" to the orice of evervthine. 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 developaltematives. 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 steward^ip 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 been 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 thoselands 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-

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

orivate forest lands, former U.S. Senator. Dan Evans told the Washineton 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: 31.9percent of allU.S. territory!

According to National Cattlemen's Association president Dale Humphrey,

commenting on the first defeat of the Act in 1 989, " [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 oroiects that will involve buvine

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 or 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 secretively 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.

Chapter 8 - The Greening's New Religion

We agree with the Australian Financial Review, which wrote in June 1989, "[litis

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 itis growing rapidly worldwide, forcing itself into

everv Dolitical and economic discussion, with a zeal and fanaticism that can onlv 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 isjust 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

theclergy 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 environment-

alists.. .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

communitv to which we all belong.' Berrv writes.. .'We bear the universe in our beine

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 holel. 'That's not reallv Lovelock's view at all. The human being is an

irrelevance as far as Lovelock is concerned. If Gala 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 Hearald 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 comer, 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 Rosseau.

On February 5lh 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 toencourage 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 Kuftaro, 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 Khomeni, 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 Jehad 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 s Newsweek report of February 2, 1 990:

"[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 erouDS of radical environmentalists, which claims 15.0{X)

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 environ- mental 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

warwith 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 bio-

centrism. 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 soley 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- rots

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 theNAACP 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 ofthe 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 over-

stating the facts, that every one of the 13 areas of human activity is now inundated

with the eco-on si aught.

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

giveyou 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 lOpercent 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. Im 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 $ 1 1 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 "ereen") taoe bv the Federal Enerev

Regulatory Commission gelling in ihe way. In all, 1 8 projecls have received

preliminary approval from ihe FERC wilhoul so much as a burp of prolesl from ihe

greenies.

George H. Lawrence, presidenl of ihe American Gas Associalion, has predicted ihal

gas consumplion nalionwide will "rise by one-lhird over ihe nexl 20 years." I think

he is being far loo conservative. I'll bel ihe rise will be much closer lo 50 percent,

and in a lot less than 20 years, loo.

As 10 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, 1 990, 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 memakemy 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.

Ofthe 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 madeitthroueh the camaee of 1982-1988 obviouslv 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., Enex (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 1 989, 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 youll 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- 377-881 1

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 cantell 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 planed 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. militarv- industrial complex in the aftermath of World War

n...

Qearly, it may lake 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

reoresents more than 4.8% of the funds in the trust.) These shares will be held for

income and appreciation until October 31,1 994. 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 1 994, 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, lake 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 Ive 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 alwaysthat 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

Durooses behind surface events. Plavine in this eame 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.
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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 1 990 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, th 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," "wanna-be's," and "never-were's" trying to jump on the bandwagon for

a ride to eco-imortality.

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- 1 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 pre-

schoolers' 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 Osboume will sew a head back onto a live bat."

Even Superman (Christopher Reeve) fell 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 1 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 Studv. which totally destroys "the warmine of the earth"

hypothesis, gels, at best, only minimal coverage. Typical of our "fair- minded"

media, the Seattle Post- Intelligencer relegated the story to page 1 3. "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 ofthe future he would create.

Every petty-fogging demagogue and Big Brother promoter I can think of has gotten

into the Earth Day act. JesseJackson 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 1 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.
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