

Soviet Union endorses new eco-fascist world order

by Carol White

The official journal of the Soviet Foreign Ministry, *International Affairs*, published an article in its English-language April issue by Mikhail Kaloshin, entitled "The global dimensions of ecology," which could as well have been written by Britain's Prince Philip. The article is a landmark in the Soviet campaign for an ecological fascist world order—a campaign which Mikhail Gorbachov launched in a Dec. 7, 1988 speech to the United Nations General Assembly.

International Affairs goes beyond previous Soviet press treatment of international ecological issues, to develop a systematic conception of a world order that will be neither Christian nor Marxist, but characterized by a gnosticism of flamboyantly Dostoevskian coloration. The new One World regime will police the citizens of what were once nation-states, to enforce the dictates of those who believe that man, technology, and industry are cancers that pollute the pristine face of Mother Nature.

The article comments upon a six-day international meeting which was held in Moscow in January of this year, and was addressed by Mikhail Gorbachov himself. Kaloshin describes the conference as keynoting this decade, "The Decade of Ecology." That meeting, and the North American Conference on Religion and Ecology held in Washington, D.C. in May, constitute an open attack upon the Western Judeo-Christian tradition. The argument of the article, and the theme of the Moscow conference, is encapsulated in the following quotation:

"The paradox is that the main, the only destructive force in nature is man, *homo sapiens*, who hardly comports himself as a thinking man. No animal, not the simplest organism in nature, destroys its habitat as ruthlessly, as senselessly, as consistently and extensively as man does. Even the simplest germ is programmed for ecological self-sufficiency, self-regulation, and restoration of the habitat. Only man engages in self-destruction. Man has never been so merciless towards the environment and himself. He has become similar to a cancerous tumor which appears in the body and feeds on it and grows, gradually destroying the body and, as a result, itself."

Such a view of mankind suggests that the kind of radical population reduction now being advocated by these same ecologists is not only justified, but mandated by a moral imperative. After all, how do we treat cancers!

We have traveled a long way down the path of fascism, when an official Soviet publication will openly endorse these views, or when the Duke of Edinburgh, husband of the head of the Anglican Church, openly espouses paganism. In both cases, we are dealing with the evil oligarchical world view.

An oligarchy's primary aim is to establish or maintain the oligarchical system. Such a world system is not a utopia, but a set of rules of the game, with certain game objectives built into the rules, and nothing is supposed to interfere with the operation of the rules. The ruling elites may change the rules, but they reserve such an option as their own prerogative. As long as the potential of war exists, they cannot do away with their reliance upon technology; therefore, they wish to eliminate the nation-state and the conflicts or potential conflicts which arise with the nation-state, and jeopardize their own control. They do not accept the idea that human beings, as human beings, have certain inherent rights under natural law.

The development of Soviet-style fascism

While Kaloshin's article is shockingly explicit, the material covered in it is not really new. As early as 1982-83, Lyndon LaRouche had identified the increasing hegemony in the Soviet Union of a fascist tendency, which was dedicated to making Moscow a "Third Rome," according to the dogma of the Russian Orthodox Church.

In the spring of 1982, at a conference of the Russian Orthodox Church held in Moscow, Patriarch Pimen attacked the strategic ballistic missile defense policy that Lyndon LaRouche was vigorously advocating. He threatened that were the United States to pursue this policy—as President Reagan did a year later, calling it the Strategic Defense Initiative (SDI)—this would be a destabilizing factor which could lead to war. At the same time, the Orthodox Church vigorously supported the ecologist movement.

At this time, it was LaRouche and his associates who were vigorously campaigning for a strategic ballistic missile defense, based on new physical principles, throughout the United States and the Western Alliance. Thus Pimen was directly answering LaRouche's proposal. LaRouche had received a similar answer in back-channel discussions, on behalf of the Reagan administration, which he was conducting with representatives of the Soviet government at the begin-

ning of 1983. The Soviet representatives recognized the validity of LaRouche's contention that his conception of the SDI would lead to enormous productivity gains in the economies of the West. They also recognized that, while this was so for the West, Soviet culture would not be able to assimilate such a technology burst.

When their rejection of LaRouche's proposal occurred in April, LaRouche came to the conclusion that the response of the Kremlin leadership, under General Secretary Yuri Andropov, was based precisely upon the commitment to an imperial "Third Rome" strategy. Soviet endorsement of the ecology movement *for the West* must be understood in this context. They recognized that the greatest danger to their imperial aspirations, was the demonstrated ability of the United States during World War II, and then again after the Kennedy-era Apollo program to land a man on the Moon, to rebound into technological optimism and a corresponding surge in productivity.

Rather than embark upon the kind of cultural transformation proposed by LaRouche, which would have allowed them to benefit from a program such as the SDI, they embarked upon an attempt to subvert the United States and Western Europe. Their vehicle was the environmentalist movement, which fanned every current of irrationalism in populations already demoralized by two decades of the rock-drug-sex counterculture.

It is thus not surprising that Kaloshin's article begins by drawing attention to the connection between Soviet endorsement of the ecology movement and military questions—i.e., a strategy to disarm the West. He writes: "The Global Forum on Environment and Development for Survival, which was held in Moscow this past January and gathered 1,400 delegates from 83 countries—political, religious, and public figures, scientists, diplomats, and journalists—demonstrated once again that ecology, being closely linked with the task of eliminating the military menace, above all the nuclear danger, is a sphere in which the fundamental and vital interests of the whole of humanity are concentrated."

Kaloshin abuses the Bible

Kaloshin represents the Russian Orthodox view, which rejects the Christian belief that man was created in the living image of God, with God-given responsibility to further the moral purposes of the Creation, as outlined in Genesis: that mankind should be fruitful and multiply, and subdue the Earth. Therefore, unlike Prince Philip, who is forced to reveal himself as a pagan in opposition to the Bible, Kaloshin pretends to take the message of radical ecologism from the Bible as a source.

Thus he deceitfully cites the Bible, writing: "Will the prophetic words of the great book, the Bible, which has been warning humanity for several millennia of the inevitability of retribution for violation of the principles of the harmony of the universe and for transgression of the threshold of man's

incursion into the environment, really come to pass? . . .

"The reasons for this behavior by man lie above all in his base moral and spiritual qualities, which lag far behind the requirements of the modern level of the technological development of civilization. The formation and development of man and his consciousness, spirit, and morality are evolving. Revolutionary spurts, bypassing certain stages, are impossible here. At the same time, humanity is advancing, especially in the 20th century, at a cosmic pace in science and technology. Here one revolution is following another. Today we have learned to orbit huge chunks of metal, which just recently seemed fantastic, and relay information over any distance. Yet man has remained what he was 2,000, 4,000, and more years ago in his spiritual and moral development.

"This has led to a situation where we have violated the warnings contained in Holy Scriptures, for example, not to cross a certain line, not to touch technologies and discoveries which man has not yet matured morally enough to utilize.

"The more serious consequence of the lag of man's spiritual and moral development has been the fact that he has placed himself in the center of the environment as its master and directed efforts at altering, adapting, and subordinating it to fit his needs. Man has concentrated not on himself, not on the goal of his evolutionary development in nature, but on acquiring machines and gadgetry designed to replace man, perform physical and mental work for him, and even think for him. On the one hand, the results of such an approach have been the separation of man from nature, a split of internal biological links with it, a gradual undermining of the foundations of evolutionary development for it, and the ultimate transition to degradation as a biological species; on the other hand, uncontrolled exploitation by man of the environment and its wealth, which is fraught with catastrophic, destructive consequences, has begun. The overlapping of these processes, which have been developing increasingly rapidly, is especially manifest at the close of the 20th century. The urgent task today is to save both the environment and man; the ecology of nature has become indivisible from the ecology of the spirit."

Not only does Kaloshin pretend to be a Christian, but he claims that atheistic communism is really a type of Christianity, writing: "For the purpose, all of us, in the East and West alike, need to depart quickly from the ideologies that disunited humanity, and turn to the teaching of the great spiritual prophets of humanity who for centuries called for unity among people on the basis of universal values and joint creation for the sake of the future. In the West this is Christian teaching with its lofty humanistic precepts; so far, no one has come up with anything better. It should be admitted that our code of the builder of communism which we tried to introduce is in effect suffused with the spirit of many Christian precepts. . . . It is not fortuitous that the Moscow ecology forum was attended by representatives of virtually all the main religions and religious teachings of the world.

“Yes, the ecology of the spirit is very important and necessary, and work needs to be stepped up in this direction. It should be admitted, however, that the evolution of the consciousness of man and his spirit and morality will not be able to make up for the destructive consequences of technological advance. The onslaught on nature is proceeding so rapidly that it would be unforgivable to pin one’s hopes solely on the moral facet of man and not take urgent practical measures to protect the environment.”

“We need to create a mechanism of world monitoring and control of the state of the environment. We should think about instituting an international ecological court or tribunal. . . . Today, we cannot do without legislative measures.”

—Mikhail Kaloshin

Kaloshin exposes his own cynicism in citing the Bible—and the gnostic character of his thinking—in the following passage where he invokes the satanic mystic Fyodor Dostoevsky: “Religions and religious teachings provide their own empirical interpretation of the question. However, their explanations are not quite convincing for people, as they lie outside human experience and cannot be tried in a lifetime. A universal search for a universal answer to the question is needed. As Fyodor Dostoevsky put it, ‘the mystery of human life is not in living but in the purpose of living.’”

“When every person understands and realizes deep in his mind the answer to the question, then within the Earth’s every denizen there shall be a switch on the natural and universal mechanism of co-evolution of Man and Nature as the decisive factor of the civilization’s survival. Then the Universal compass and universal clock shall be started which are to determine the direction, purpose, and tempo of the mankind’s development.”

Call for a ‘new development model’

Kaloshin picks up the theme of Mikhail Gorbachov’s December 1988 U.N. speech, in which the Soviet leader called for the formation of a global ecological police force which would be able to override the governments of sovereign nations. Here, Kaloshin expands on the theme of a world federalist fascist alternative to industrial capitalism. Of course, he tries to present the package in a more attractive wrapping:

“The record of world development has clearly shown that, regrettably, there is no political system or development

model that would guarantee in and of itself ecological prosperity and harmony between man and society, on the one hand, and the habitat on the other. Although it has proven its high effectiveness in providing the population with material boons and services and comfortable living conditions and although it has created a society of constantly growing consumption, the Western model has not been able to blend in with the environment and ensure preservation of nature; it has proven to be destructive for it. Western and Eastern ecologists, religious leaders, and representatives of developing countries are becoming more critical of the Western model in its present form as being anti-ecological and not ensuring the survival of civilization.

“Our Soviet model, which we have followed up to now and from which we are trying to depart during the course of perestroika, is also anti-ecological and inadequate to meet the needs of the normal development of the individual and society. For one thing, most importantly, this model has proven incapable of providing the population with the requisite level of material goods and services at any stage in its 70-year existence; it has functioned with constant intensiveness of all its structures and also manpower and material resources and, having been brought to other countries, has not proven itself in any of them, which is why it has not become firmly entrenched on Earth. For another, the structures of this Soviet model not only have not blended into the environment; they have proved more destructive for it than the Western ones.

“Obviously, the question is arising of the need to develop a new and all-purpose development model that would ensure countries and peoples rapid attainment of an adequate level of well-being with harmonious relations with the environment being maintained, and would guarantee preservation and reproduction of nature and the survival of civilization. What with the absence of such a model in the East European countries and in our country, too, for that matter, we are observing a tendency toward copying the Western model. It appears that in advancing along this path we will not catch up to the West, for it will also be making progress. While we are catching up it will shoot far ahead. Therefore, we indeed need other development models that would lead to the rapid self-sufficiency of the country and the creation of the optimal standard of living and of self-regulating ties with the environment.

“It is quite obvious from the ecological standpoint and for the sake of civilization’s survival that neither we nor the rest of the world can afford to blindly copy the specifics of production and consumption typical of advanced Western societies. The world simply does not have the resources and the space where the wastes of such a civilization could be sent.”

Fascist controls, ‘legislative measures’

Following this preamble, Kaloshin moves directly to the imposition of international fascist controls over production:

“Development of an international strategy of survival is the overriding task facing the world community. Radical reorientation of the economic development of individual countries and human civilization as a whole and of the world’s material resources and means, and self-limitation and a rational approach to natural resources should be the focal point of this strategy. It should ensure economic development, which used to be tackled by the method of trial and error over a lengthy historical period, over a very short span with minimal damage to the environment. It cannot but be admitted that this task is unprecedented in its complexity, so the entire world’s intellectual potential should be mobilized to tackle it.

“The point at issue is the elaboration of a strategy of the ecological survival of humanity. The main prerequisite for the solution of this problem is support by the world public at large, governments and international organizations, the involvement of the media, and the creation of an international network.”

This includes a program for brainwashing children, with international controls on education: “It is high time to work out an international ecological code of behavior that would be studied from the first grade in all the schools across the planet.

“We need to create a mechanism of world monitoring and control of the state of the environment. We should think about instituting an international ecological court or tribunal. Of course, a spiritual leader can impel industrialists to concern themselves, the losses notwithstanding, with the purity of the air and rivers and instill in people a careful attitude to nature by appealing to their moral instincts. It should be admitted, however, that today we cannot do without legislative measures.

“The formation of a global mechanism to protect the biosphere requires the creation of ramified organizational and technological structures, which in turn demands enormous expenditures. The military organizations of countries possess good possibilities for taking immediate and effective measures in the ecological field, and a special role could be played by the Warsaw Treaty and NATO, especially in emergencies (accidents, natural disasters, etc.). The two military alliances and the military organizations of the biggest countries possess a well-organized structure of transport and all types of communication, including space communication, and dispose of top-class specialists in many fields. Why not use this enormous potential in the ecological sphere and carry out conversion along these lines? Special subdivisions could be set up even now within the framework of both military alliances, or international forces formed to render rapid assistance in the event of different disasters or catastrophes on any point on the globe. The participation of Soviet chemical defense troops in dealing with the Chernobyl disaster proved very effective.”

Global Forum vs. human civilization

by Mark Burdman

During the week of Jan. 14-20, as Moscow’s Mikhail Kaloshin points out in *International Affairs*, an important international gathering took place in Moscow, the Global Forum on Environment and Development. The conference attracted little attention in the media, because the Soviet Union was in the midst of spilling blood in the streets of Baku, Azerbaijan at the time. Indeed, there is a relation between the two events: Soon after the massacres in Azerbaijan, one individual close to the Global Forum exulted in a private discussion, that the Soviet leadership was contributing wonderfully to reducing world population by what it was doing in the Transcaucasus and Soviet Central Asia.

The meeting was sponsored by the Global Forum of Spiritual and Parliamentary Leaders on Human Survival. This is, in significant part, a joint venture of Anglo-American and Russian elites. It held its first meeting in Oxford, England, in April 1988. The Oxford gathering was one of many that have occurred in recent years, under the auspices of this or that world federalist group, which presumes to be rallying to the defense of “our endangered planet,” and which uses that slogan to propose ideas and policies that would cause genocide vastly worse than that committed by the Nazis.

An official account of the Oxford meeting, written by Sri Lankan psychologist Anuradha Vittachi, emphasized that it was filled with attacks on “technological wizardry,” “the human ego,” and “free will.” “At times during the conference,” she wrote, “it sounded like technology was our real enemy.” Presaging Kaloshin, Vittachi stated that “only humans, with our free will, are disorderly.” She reported that a central concept shared by many participants was belief in the “Gaia [Mother Earth goddess] Hypothesis,” whose inventor, James Lovelock, was a featured speaker. Vittachi insisted that humans are “umbilically tied to Gaia,” and warned that Gaia will “eliminate us with no pity” if we don’t stop “exploiting the Earth in the name of technological efficiency and progress” (see *EIR*, Jan. 12, 1990, “Green fascists plot against humanity”).

The Global Forum of Spiritual and Parliamentary Leaders on Human Survival is the inspiration of a Japanese named Akio Matsumora. Matsumora is a former employee of various United Nations agencies, including the United Nations Fund for Population Activities. In recent days, the UNFPA