

## COUNTERINTELLIGENCE

# Who are the environmentalists

On May 6, an estimated 70,000 environmentalists gathered in Washington, D.C. to demand the immediate shutdown of the U.S. nuclear industry and its replacement by a variety of exotic, marginal energy sources ranging from solar heat collectors to wood burning stoves to windmills. The demonstrators were for the most part young—high school and junior college-aged counterculturalists less interested in the pronouncements of speakers Ralph Nader, Barry Commoner, Jerry Brown, and Michael Harrington than in spending an all-expenses-paid day in the sun hearing rock music and taking drugs. Ominously interspersed in the “Woodstock” crowd was a vocal minority of antitechnology activists affiliated with the Mobilization for Survival, the Friends of the Earth, the Movement for a New Society, the Clamshell Alliance, and an alphabet soup of other “grass roots” groups predominantly from the East Coast.

In all, it was apparently an inauspicious beginning for what Barry Commoner proclaimed as the “Dawn of the Solar Age.” Astute observers nonetheless took serious note of the largest gathering of its kind since the height of the anti-Vietnam War movement of the 1960s and began asking such questions as:

- Who is the organizing force behind this “overnight” protest movement (all of the organizing for the event occurred over a period of less than three weeks)?
- What are the objectives of the sponsors of this movement?
- How does the environmentalist movement fit into the 1980 election picture?
- Will the environmentalist movement—like its predecessor, the antiwar movement of the 1960s—provide a breeding ground for a new terrorist gutter of the sort that has already blossomed in Western Europe and Japan?

Some “voices from the fringe,” typified by Georgia Congressman Larry McDonald and London *Daily Telegraph* columnist Robert Moss, have already indicated that they are hot on the trail of the “KGB” or “PLO” skeletons in the environmentalist closet; no doubt a number of Americans far more honest and

well-intending than the above two cited plug-ins to the London Heritage Foundation will succumb to those wild conspiracy

Nonetheless, the questions require immediate answers. There is a far-reaching and evil design behind the events in Washington, D.C.—one that originates not in Moscow or Damascus, but in the staid East 68th Street headquarters of the New York Council on Foreign Relations and its “mother” agency, the Royal Institute of International Affairs at London’s Chatham House.

### CFR’s ‘environmentalist world order’

It is no exaggeration to state that the institution most directly responsible for the May 6 event was the Council on Foreign Relations. Not since the early 1960s launching of the American branch of Lord Bertrand Russell’s “peace movement” have so many eastern establishment figures put themselves before the public at the head of a “Jacobin” crowd. Daniel Ellsberg, formerly a top aide to Henry Kissinger, formerly a research director at the Rand Corporation (where he launched the career of Energy Secretary James Schlesinger), and *still* a member in good standing of the CFR, is the active director of the Mobilization for Survival—one of the three principal organizing forces in the “May Sixth Movement.”

Professor Richard Falk of Princeton University, a member of the CFR and a policy board member of the CFR’s “Project 1980s,” heads the Institute for World Order in New York, which created the Mobilization for Survival as one of its action fronts for implementing an antitechnology “preferred world order.” In a recently published IWO paper, *Preferred Worlds for the 1990s*, Falk stated, “(we) hope to create, by 1980, a climate in which the preferred world order values will increasingly inform national and international decision-making....”

Falk’s deindustrialized and depopulated “preferred world order” is most succinctly defined by the fact that Falk was—by the public admission of CFR Project 1980s Director Dr. Richard Ullman—a prime mover

behind the recent coup that installed Ayatollah Khomeini in power in Iran and set off a civil war process that threatens to return the Persian Gulf region to the Dark Ages of the 12th century.

In fact, Falk's Institute for World Order (which lists itself as an affiliate of the CFR) emerges as the "mother" of all of the key groups that turned out the busloads in Washington. The Philadelphia-based Movement for a New Society, a nest of counterculture collective safehouses for unscrubbed back-to-nature freaks and black nationalist terrorists (like the MOVE countergang that last year staged an hour-long gun battle with Philadelphia police), regularly contributes to IWO White Papers.

Falk is affiliated with the Institute for Policy Studies and its recent spinoff, the Public Resource Center (the second principal participating group within the May 6 umbrella), a coordinating center and funding conduit for millions of dollars laundered into the environmentalists from the Stern Family Fund, the Ford Foundation, the Rockefeller Brothers Fund, and other CFR-connected tax exempt shelters.

#### **'Aggressive international environmentalism'**

What the CFR boys are out to accomplish with the unleashing of an overt mass-based antitechnology movement was succinctly spelled out last week by an aide to Council member Sen. Claiborne Pell (D-R.I.). The goal of the Anglo-American crowd is to deploy environmentalism as a weapon to halt the high-technology industrial development of the Third World, to delimit further industrial and technological development in the advanced sector to negative growth rates termed "controlled disintegration" and thereby to build a climate of containment around the Soviet Union such that the Warsaw Pact nations either capitulate to the environmentalist world order or go to war. A resolution proposing that environmentalism become the overriding foundation of international law, superseding national sovereignty, was presented last year before the NATO North Atlantic Assembly by Sen. Pell; and fellow CFR member Lucy Benson, Assistant Secretary of State, traveled last week to Nairobi, Kenya to deliver a similar ultimatum before a United Nations conference on the environment.

NATO Supreme Commander Alexander Haig and NATO Secretary General Joseph Luns are "enthusiastic supporters" of this "aggressive international environmentalism" policy, the aide went on to state, "because it takes away a key Soviet weapon"—their ability to win friends in the developing sector by offering technological assistance.

Pell's aide went on to describe the series of draft treaties, which were authored under the auspices of the zero-growth Club of Rome, as a "foot in the door" for getting the environmentalist world order on line by the

mid-1980s. "We don't want to freak people out by saying what we eventually want to do.... We are doing some consciousness raising...."

The immediate form of that "consciousness raising" is the rapid escalation of a phony "left versus right" staged drama in which the surfacing of a "Greenie" movement behind the 1980 candidacy of Ted Kennedy is counterposed to a tough warrior candidacy of General Alexander Haig.

As the Pell remarks make very clear, the so-called "differences" between Messrs. Haig and Kennedy are pure theatrics. General Haig, whose personal collaboration with Kennedy dates to the Watergating of President Richard Nixon, is as rabid an advocate of the CFR environmentalist one world order as the Massachusetts Senator. Haig, not coincidentally, traces his family tree to the Scottish whiskey pushers and to the Astor family (thereby tracing the lineage of alliance with the Kennedy family back to the bootlegging era of the Prohibition, when Joe Kennedy ran the Haig & Haig concession, up through the prewar period, when "Papa Joe" frequented the pro-Nazi Clivedon Set of Lady Astor).

#### **A fascist movement unleashed**

For the student of history, an alarming feeling of *déjà vu* should be setting in at about this time. Earlier in this century, the same gang of lower Manhattan and London bankers, organized through conspiratorial clubs like the CFR and the Royal Institute, dipped into the counterculture gutters to bankroll a mass movement. Then, as now, the goal was to institute an antitechnology, fascist world order—with the option of a "modest" world war serving as a track toward that goal a considered possibility.

The gatherings in New York City and Washington, D.C. on May 5-6 represented the embryo of America's first outright fascist movement. What Bertrand Russell, the CFR, and others would have *liked* to have launched during the 1960s—a fully elaborated antiscience, antitechnology movement—has now reared its ugly head.

For the skeptical reader who may demand further "proof," *Executive Intelligence Review* presents the following eyewitness report of the two weekend events, with excerpts from several of the keynote speeches. Additionally, we include a "dossier" on the history, key personnel and funding of the principal organizations that make up the environmentalist movement. This latter section places years of investigative work in thumbnail form into the hands of our readership.

—Jeffrey Steinberg

# Deploying against science and reason

It is a public relations fraud to claim that the 2,000 people who turned out at the Riverside Church in New York City on May 5, and the 70,000 people who showed up in Washington, D.C. the following day were "mobilized" as the direct result of the disaster at the Three Mile Island nuclear facility. More appropriately, the Three Mile sabotage (documented in a special report available through NSIPS) is the "Reichstag fire" that provided the pretext for activating longstanding capabilities-in-place astride a movement built on fear, hysteria, and capitulation to rule by irrationality.

The keynote speakers and organizers of the weekend events were all well-known figures—long identified with campaigns of subversion against American labor and industry:

**Ralph Nader:** "consumer activist," well-financed protégé of Zionist lobby dirty tricks operative Arthur Goldberg. Nader's most recent areas of emphasis have been the creation of a terrorist "caucus" within the International Brotherhood of Teamsters and the building of campus-based feeder projects into the May 6 operation;

**Barry Commoner:** quack "scientist" from Washington University in St. Louis. Commoner has been active in both the U.S. and Western Europe fostering antinuclear and often proterrorist countergangs. Commoner's activities along these lines in Italy have been in the public view since 1977.

**Sam Lovejoy:** one of the principal organizers of last year's Sun Day and the Seabrook, N.H. demonstration that resulted in over 1,000 arrests, Lovejoy himself has been convicted of blowing up an electric power station. He is one of the most outspoken advocates of nuclear plant sabotage.

**Tom Hayden:** one of the original core of Russellite operatives to surface during the early 1960s, Hayden has been cleaned up since his Days of Rage riot act, but remains a leading advocate of the same policies of deindustrialization, community control, and the total shutdown of nuclear energy. His position in the environmentalist circuit is further enhanced by Columbia Pictures' elevating of his wife Jane Fonda into the position of "High Priestess" of the antinuclear movement.

**Michael Harrington:** another throwback to the earliest phases of the Russell deployments in the United

States. Harrington is the director of the Democratic Socialist Organizing Committee, a Willy Brandt-style radical social democratic fringe of the Democratic Party.

## What they said

This menagerie of experienced rabble rousers made not one attempt to present a coherent face forward to the crowd of counterculture types gathered under the antinuke banner. In between tirades against the mere possible existence of verifiable scientific knowledge and lying hysterical scare stories about the "invisible enemy" (radiation—ed.) a few actual points of tactical significance were noted:

1. The Price-Anderson Act (which limits the amount of liability of nuclear power companies in the event of accidents that claim lives or property) must be overturned. The effect of an overturning of this act would be to immediately bankrupt the entire nuclear industry.

2. Preliminary steps must be taken for constituting a "Green Party" in the United States in anticipation of the 1980 presidential elections.

3. Disaster evacuation plans must be tested on a regular basis in all areas within a 50 mile radius of a nuclear power plant. In the single case of the Indian Point facility in New York, this would mean the evacuation of an estimated 17 million people. Reports and detailed plans for such evacuations—in addition to mass "fire drills"—must be circulated on regular mandatory basis to all customers serviced by the power companies.

The May 5 teach-in at New York's Riverside Church was sponsored by Rupert Murdoch's *Village Voice* to build up to the next day's events in Washington, D.C. Both events featured some of the country's more notorious environmentalists and their remarks to their respective audiences suffice to explain precisely what the "movement" is all about.

At the teach-in, Ralph Nader detailed the scare tactics: "They of silent cumulative violence that it cannot sense, and therefore cannot individually defend against...a new form of industrial violence that strips millions of people of their natural physiological detection ability, making them rely on sophisticated scientific detection instru-

ments which are only in the hands of a few.”

Nader called for “practice drills so that a portion of the population radiating out from a nuclear power plant for some 50 miles would periodically have to engage in a practice evacuation in order to make sure that the evacuation plans are in tip-top shape, and are likely to work under real emergency conditions.” This is what Nader terms his plan for a “nuclear power plant holocaust.”

Helen Keldicott, a pediatrician and an author of antinuclear tracts, mixed tribal mythology and hysterical tales of death to back her hatred of science at the Washington demo: “Two weeks ago I was in Australia, (the source of) 70 percent of the world’s richest uranium. It is on Aboriginal sacred tribal land and there is a snake coming down the side of the mountain, a waterfall. ...It’s full of uranium, and the Aboriginal dream-time myth says, ‘if the rainbow snake is disturbed it will devour the world’.”

On Harrisburg, she added: “What would have happened if that had melted down, and by the grace of God it did not melt. It was nothing to do with men that it did not melt. ...Three thousand people would have died immediately, ten to one hundred thousand people right now would be going bald. They would be getting ulcers on their skins, severe vomiting and diarrhea, and as their blood cells died they would be dying of massive hemorrhage or infection. Thousands of men would be rendered sterile from the radiation on their testicles. Thousands of women would stop menstruating permanently. Thousands of babies would be born with small heads because the radiation attacks the developing brain...It would have killed approximately half a million Americans...”

Barry Commoner flatly asserted in Washington: “Today the solar age was born...the nuclear age died. ...We can close down these Harrisburgs waiting to happen, those ticking time bombs right now, and I believe we will. ...All over the country where anyone is dependent on a nuclear power plant, we can shut them down without any reduction in electric power. ...Make this the issue of the 1980 campaign.”

Jim Benson, consultant to the Council on Economic Priorities, raised the question of actually building a

third party for the presidential campaign: “We’ve got small think tanks all over the country. ...But we’ve got to start pulling it together, we’ve got to start pulling ourselves together, and we’ve got to lose this attitude of being on the defensive. ...I think ‘ecology party’ is perhaps not the best of terms, maybe something like a ‘values party’ is something that is more applicable. ...”

Michael Harrington elaborated: “We cannot allow this movement to be a movement of the college educated, and middle class, who will not suffer...the problem of the monopoly of knowledge in a technological society. That is to say that if knowledge is power, in such a society, the monopoly of knowledge is a kind of power. ...I suggest to you that we should not only have a Nuclear Regulatory Commission but an Antinuclear Regulatory Commission, which is funded by the federal government. ...We have to challenge this monopoly of knowledge.”

Then, there are the remarks made in an interview with WBAI radio by American Indian Chief Billy Tiak a participant in the events: “We feel that Technology is the enemy. It only goes so far. It’s against every natural law there is. ...”

Or, the ravings of Dr. John Gofman, the chairman of the Committee for Nuclear Responsibility: “Nuclear power is obviously unconstitutional. The Constitution of the United States provides nowhere that Congress shall issue murder licenses. Nuclear power plants licenses are nothing more or less than legalized murder permits.”

Sam Lovejoy, a terrorist by trade, outlined what is in store should the peaceful demonstrations fail to achieve their goal: “I would only say that if and when the grassroots groups go to Washington, and the United States energy policy is still headed in a nuclear direction, that it won’t be a nice rally and demonstration; you’re going to see most of the people showing up in Washington seizing the Nuclear Regulatory Commission headquarters, and the Department of Energy headquarters, and such other agencies as might be getting in the way. ...Any building, any office will do in my opinion, that’s trying to stick nuclear power down our throats.”