

Global eco-fascist deals increase danger of war

by Mark Burdman

From the time of Mikhail Gorbachov's Dec. 7, 1988 speech to the United Nations General Assembly to the Malta summit of Dec. 2-3, 1989, the establishment of an ecological fascist world order has moved to the center of the world political and economic agenda.

Gorbachov had called for the creation of a "new world order" dedicated to the proposition that industrial and scientific progress on the traditional Western model would be rejected. He attacked the "old patterns of industrialization," and called for "restructuring the world economy" to protect the environment. In large part, the speech was an overture to the transatlantic liberal establishments. It was made soon after the U.S. presidential elections, in the transition period to the Bush administration, which rapidly proved itself to be an "environmentalist" administration and embraced the Gorbachov perspective enthusiastically.

U.S. Secretary of State James Baker III has pointed to U.S.-Soviet talks on "environmentalism" as the core of the so-called "Fifth Basket" of issues between the superpowers. From the very first moments of the new administration, when the State Department hosted Soviet spokesmen in Washington for confidential talks on "cooperation on environmental matters" in late January, to the announcement at Malta that the U.S. would sponsor a conference on "global warming" in autumn 1990, the global-ecological orientation has been clear. In mid-October, U.S. Attorney General Richard Thornburgh traveled to Moscow, and worked out accords for, among other things, cooperation on "environmental protection."

The Anglo-American Establishment emphatically went "green" during 1989. On the American side, this is seen in such developments as the strengthening of the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency. Under former World Wildlife Fund President William Reilly, the EPA has emerged as the

second institutional pillar of the rapidly developing police-state apparatus in the United States, together with Richard Thornburgh's Justice Department. Also, many leading corporations and banks financed a week-long "Globescope" conference in California, on Oct. 31-Nov. 5, where the designated keynote speaker was George Bush.

As for the "Anglos," 1989 witnessed an open embrace of paganism, ecologism, and green issues by leading British institutions, ranging from the monarchy to the vaulted vaults of the City of London. The British and Dutch monarchies spent much of the first half of 1989 competing for the honor of whose Queen could be the "greenest," as both countries' monarchs sponsored major international initiatives on "global ecologist" themes.

Perhaps the seminal policy statement on ecologism during 1989 from the Western liberal establishments, was an item published by the influential Prudential-Bache investment bank in June, unabashedly in favor of a global dictatorship to enforce "environmentalism." Its content was echoed by the influential London *Economist*. In the June 28 issue of Prudential-Bache's newsletter *Strategic Weekly*, author Mark Melcher forecast that "environmental efforts will dominate global economic and political thought and actions in the next century." A centerpiece of the emerging "sea change" in attitudes toward energy and material wealth, he forecast, would be an end to the former respect for "sovereignty of nations." The superpowers would become co-guarantors of a world order based on "heavy-handed action on the part of the international community, an undertaking virtually impossible under the conditions of Cold War rivalry that exist in the world today." Melcher also forecast a significant growth in influence of "green groups in the developed nations."

Soon thereafter, the London *Economist* expressed this "establishment consensus" in a most candid way: "What de-

fense has been to the world's leaders for the past 40 years, the environment will be for the next 40."

LaRouche warns: Eco-fascism leads to war

Complementing such propaganda, has been an increasing acceptance among Western people, largely due to the propaganda operations of the liberal media and the Soviet KGB and the widespread "Gorbymania" brainwashing, that "ecology" and "peace" are somehow inextricably linked, and that ecologists are kind, peace-loving people. The enormous positive international publicity given to the Greenpeace group has reinforced this image. But reality is completely different from the publicity image.

The immediate danger, is that the ecological-fascist movement, through the rapid growth in membership and activity of groups like Greenpeace, was able increasingly during 1989 to coopt and subvert legitimate and normal human concerns about pollution, clean air, natural parks, etc. All of this has been hijacked by a movement committed to a new feudalism, a new Dark Age, the implementation of which necessarily requires fascist measures on a global scale. Beyond this, as Lyndon LaRouche pointed out in a seminal document written in January, the eco-fascist agenda is locking the world inextricably into a pattern toward *world war*. We may be moving, rapidly, from the "Cold War" to a "Hot War."

LaRouche wrote on Jan. 9, "Soviet pseudo-science could cause World War III," which was published in *EIR* on Jan. 27, 1989, warning: "If Moscow chooses the neo-malthusian globalism featured in Gorbachov's December UNO address, the early physical breakdown of the Soviet economy is now preassured. In that variant, a general world war, or something equally awful, is virtually assured for some time in the 1990s, perhaps on the early side of the coming decade. . . . If neo-malthusian globalism is institutionalized through aid of supragovernmental powers entrusted to the U.N. Security Council . . . that globalist malthusianism will be institutionalized to the degree that it becomes impossible to shift world economic policy in ways needed to arrest the ongoing internal collapse of the Soviet economy. In that case, a spectrum of conditions and issues exists worldwide, intersecting the growing desperation inside the Soviet empire, thus making World War III or something like it inevitable at some point during the 1990s, perhaps early during the 1990s."

LaRouche proposed: "The alternative for Moscow is a switch, away from neo-malthusianism, to what used to be called 'American methods' until the U.S.'s neo-malthusian 'cultural paradigm-shift' of 20-odd years ago. Unless Moscow makes that switch, general war becomes the likely variant of the 1990s. If it switches away from neo-malthusian 'globalism,' Moscow's preferred discussion-partners in the West are Washington, Paris-Bonn, and Tokyo."

From the standpoint of adequate formulation of global policy, he stressed, "what is wanted, to make solutions politi-



Ecological fascist William K. Reilly

Ecological fascist M.S. Gorbachov

cally possible, is to scrap malthusian impulses, and to do more than merely return to the emphasis on capital-intensive modes of scientific and technological progress of 20-odd years ago. We must generalize the efficient realization of such progress on a planetary scale. . . . We must turn to the direct opposite of what the malthusians propose."

The 1989-90 "winter crises" of the economies of the Soviet Union and Eastern Europe recall LaRouche's warning. In its Dec. 4 edition, *Time* reported a threat by Soviet thinktanker Andranik Migranyan, of Moscow's IMEMO, that the U.S.S.R. was facing the choice of either "food or force." The fact that around the same time, the No. 11, 1989 edition of the U.S.S.R.'s *International Affairs* magazine was featuring a call by leading Soviet policymakers for "ecologizing" the Soviet economy, and that the Soviets are sponsoring new "global ecological" initiatives for 1990, under the banner of the state-run International Foundation for the Survival and Development of Humanity, only underscores the problem. The influence in the U.S.S.R. of "ecologizers" will make it inevitable that food can, indeed, be obtained only by force.

This points to the irony of the indicated LaRouche document. It was written only 18 days before the former presidential candidate was put in jail, following a frameup conviction in Alexandria, Virginia. The *EIR* issue in which the article appeared is dated Jan. 27, the day he entered prison. The Gorbachov speech itself was made nine days before LaRouche was convicted, and during the time the Alexandria trial was going on. Whether or not Gorbachov personally intervened to secure this conviction—and it is likely he did—the fact is, the Soviets are locking themselves into a war

AIDS in 1989

The 1980s was the decade of AIDS. The first cases were recognized in the 1979-80 period, and we now mark the tenth year of our experience with what may be mankind's terminal illness. It is singularly appropriate that AIDS is a disease of poverty, perversion, and drug addiction, since these are the hallmarks of the dawning "New Age."

It is difficult to avoid feeling like Cassandra, the Greek prophetess condemned to accurately predict the future and be ignored. In 1989 more and more of the predictions we made in the early 1980s are coming true. Policies which Lyndon LaRouche and his associates advocated four to five years ago are now being advocated by those who vehemently opposed the same policies. More and more evidence is accumulating that HIV infection can be spread by means other than sex or needles. Authorities, such as Dr. Jonathan Mann of the World Health Organization, now acknowledge that the most catastrophic predictions are the most accurate.

Certainly some incremental progress has been made. New drugs have been demonstrated to be effective against some of the infections associated with AIDS. New tests enable us to detect infection even before the development of antibodies. There is good evidence that early treatment

with AZT and other antiviral drugs can suppress the infection and probably delay the onset of disease.

Yet the overall impression of 1989 is that we are suffering from "AIDS of AIDS," as one prominent scientist put it. In spite of the apocalyptic warnings of Dr. Mann, the official line is that HIV infection is still only spread by sex and needles. The First International Conference on Oral AIDS this summer, which presented hard scientific evidence of oral transmission of HIV infection, was totally blacked out of the mainstream press. Harassment of the organizer of the conference continues to this day.

Looking at the spread of HIV infection and AIDS, we see that the epidemic appears to have peaked in the homosexual populations of New York and California. No longer a homosexual disease, AIDS is now a "heterosexual disease of poor people."

The response to this spreading plague among the minority poor is condoms and more condoms. This, in spite of more and more evidence that condoms do not stop the transmission of infection.

After ten years of AIDS and AIDS policy, it is increasingly evident that the disease, and the policies advocated to control it, are serving the end of drastic reduction of selected populations. Let's hope that the recent conference on HIV-AIDS and Global Population, held in Philadelphia on Nov. 27-29, will serve to launch an effective counterattack against this malthusian genocide.—*John Grauerholz, M.D.*

course, to the extent they ignore LaRouche's solutions for the economic crisis, and pressure the U.S. authorities to keep him in jail.

The jailing of LaRouche is otherwise directly related to the global "eco-fascist" deals. Over the past two decades, he has emerged as the most outspoken opponent in the world of "eco-fascism." A suit initiated in autumn by the Greenpeace organization in West Germany against publications associated with Lyndon and Helga LaRouche only underscores this fact.

Indeed, rivers of blood separate the LaRouche conception of political-economy and of the development of the human species from that of the "global ecologists," whether East or West. The issue: Is man made in the image of God, or not? Is man the crown of creation, or not? Does one believe in the injunction of the Book of Genesis to "multiply and subdue the earth," or not? The fact is, that the hard-core leaders of "global ecologism" are against the existence of the human race as such. They see those qualities associated with *human existence* as evil, and seek to reduce man to the level of the animal and plant kingdom. This is most clearly seen in the

emergence during 1989 of a movement called "deep ecology," which has been dubbed "eco-Nazi" by the Italian press. Its main mouthpiece, a magazine called *Earth First!* has welcomed AIDS as a population-reduction measure, chastised international agencies for stopping the spread of cholera in Africa, and expressed the hope that biological warfare could be unleashed against the human race more generally, to reduce population. "Deep ecology" *Earth First!* activists have committed numerous terrorist actions against loggers, livestock breeders, and other "oppressors of nature."

Since the LaRouche movement has taken on the eco-fascists directly, it has become a rallying point in many countries for those committed to scientific progress and technological development. Organizations associated with LaRouche have catalyzed or encouraged such anti-ecologist resistance tendencies in the United States, Brazil, Italy, Scandinavia, Australia, and among others.

From the Socialist International to Tiananmen

What will determine the battle in Eastern Europe, Ibero-America, and other parts of the world in the coming months,

Environmentalism kills

As a polite rationalization for massive food reduction and depopulation, the issue of “protecting the environment” has come to the forefront in 1989, for official USDA policy, and much of that in the European Community and elsewhere. William K. Reilly, named by George Bush to head the Environmental Protection Agency, and Agriculture Secretary Clayton Yeutter have set such issues as groundwater “purity” and wilderness protection as the leading issues of Washington policy, and the concept is promoted that “agriculture pollutes” the environment, with its runoff of manures and chemicals and their odors.

There has been a barrage of deliberate media misinformation in an attempt to eliminate or heavily regulate the use of agricultural pesticides, insecticides, growth-promoting hormones, feed additives, or medications for milk, beef, pork, and poultry production, and other food-preserving or growth-promoting technologies. The net effect will reduce food production.

Beginning in early 1989, LISA—Low-Input Sustainable Agriculture—was pushed by Washington with a vengeance. In September, the National Research Council of the National Academy of Sciences put out the book *Alternative Agriculture*, making the argument that low-input farming methods are just as productive as high-input methods, and that somehow, they are more sustainable.

But scientifically supervised multi-year studies at Iowa State University and South Dakota State University indicate that both profits and production decrease with low-input methods. Even though the LISA movement has no scientific studies that substantiate its claims, the movement is on the fast track.

The largest institutional funder of sustainable agriculture projects in the United States, the Jesse Smith Noyes Foundation, is also one of the largest funders of world population control programs. Similarly, the big funders of the *Alternative Agriculture* book project were the Rockefeller Brothers Fund and the Mellon Fund, all of whom have funded the Conservation Foundation and the major population reduction movements of this century. What better way to reduce population than by cutting off the food supply?

The sustainable agriculture philosophy replaces science with pagan superstition. The Noyes Foundation has funded such “New Age” sustainable agriculture farm groups as the Center for Rural Affairs in Walthill, Nebraska and the Land Stewardship Project in Marine, Minnesota. Literature published by the Land Stewardship Project states, “traditional Indian thinking . . . we believe will prove central to the survival of world populations. . . . It starts with the basic definition of human beings as spiritual participants in the eternal life of the Earth. It assumes the validity of the planet as our Mother Earth, our nurturer to love as we do our human mothers.” This pagan, Satanic philosophy is yet another way to manipulate farmers into voluntarily reducing food production.—Robert L. Baker

will be whether the LaRouche movement and like-minded forces prevail over the agents of the Socialist International. In June of 1989, the Socialist International met in Stockholm, to celebrate its 100th anniversary. Largely under the direction of the Swedish branch of the SI, the delegates vowed to make “environmentalism” into the “new mission” of the Socialist International in the coming historical period. A policy document prepared for the meeting fully endorsed the “international ecological security” perspective put forward by the Gorbachov team in Moscow. In October 1989, Socialist International head Willy Brandt traveled to Moscow, and concluded a deal for full-scale Soviet Communist Party-SI cooperation around the world.

The Stockholm 100th anniversary meeting occurred only days after the mid-June elections to the European Parliament in Western Europe, the so-called “Euro-elections,” in which “Green” parties did extraordinarily well, achieving, for example, 20% in Britain even though the U.K. Green Party had never run in a major election before.

One agency of the SI and the world federalists whose deleterious influence became widespread during 1989, is the World Commission on Environment and Development, better known as the Brundtland Commission, headed by the former Prime Minister of Norway, Gro Harlem Brundtland (who was voted out of office by a disgusted Norwegian electorate in October). The headquarters of the commission is now in Geneva, Switzerland, at the Center for Our Common Future. This center has become a clearinghouse and “networking” institution for ecological and environmentalist groups worldwide. On June 3, the center and the commission sponsored an extravaganza television special broadcast simultaneously around the world via satellite, showing world leaders from various countries praising the content of the Brundtland Report. One videotaped speech was made by Chinese Prime Minister Li Peng, attacking the overabundance of “polluters” in his country. At that very moment, his government was finding a final solution for many such “polluters” in Tiananmen Square.