

U.S.C.
Von KleinSmid
Library

GREEN BACKLASH

*Global Subversion of
the Environmental
Movement*

ANDREW ROWELL

1996



LONDON AND NEW YORK

First published 1996
by Routledge
11 New Fetter Lane, London EC4P 4EE
Simultaneously published in the USA and Canada
by Routledge
29 West 35th Street, New York, NY 10001

© 1996 Andrew Rowell

Typeset in Perpetua by Keystroke
Printed and bound in Great Britain by Biddles Ltd, Guildford and King's Lynn

All rights reserved. No part of this book may be reprinted or reproduced or utilized in any form or by any electronic, mechanical, or other means, now known or hereafter invented, including photocopying and recording, or in any information storage or retrieval system, without permission in writing from the publishers.

British Library Cataloguing in Publication Data
A catalogue record for this book is available from the British Library

Library of Congress Cataloguing in Publication Data
Rowell, Andrew.

Green backlash: global subversion of the environmental movement/ Andrew Rowell.

p. cm.
Includes bibliographical references and index.

(cloth: alk. paper).

(paper: alk. paper)

1. Anti-environmentalism. I. Title.

GE195.R68 1996

363.7-dc20

95-53941

CIP

ISBN 0-415-12827-7 (hbk)

0-415-12828-5 (pbk)

To Ken Saro-Wiwa

early 1980s.²⁹ This was due, in part, to the realisation that much of the land might be privatised and sold to the highest bidder, if it was given over to state control. This would not suit the average rancher who had originally backed the Rebellion.³⁰ Resentment over federal land ownership and regulatory control issues that had constituted part of the melting pot of the Rebellion would boil over later in the decade.³¹

Watt was becoming unpopular and in 1982 the Free Congress Foundation (FCF), commissioned an unknown writer, Ron Arnold, to write a biography on him. The FCF is headed by the New Right guru Paul Weyrich, a leading archconservative and ideological and business associate of Joe Coors. It was Weyrich's idea to produce a glowing biography of the controversial Secretary of the Interior.³² Not only did the book exonerate Jim Watt to near sainthood, but Arnold, like Watt, launched a broadside attack against the environmental movement. 'The implicit goals of environmentalism to drastically reduce or dismantle industrial civilisation and to impose a fundamentally coercive form of government on America are real, even though they tend to be hidden in the complex structure of the movement,' wrote Arnold in his book, *Eye of the Storm*.³³

Arnold, a self-professed former environmentalist and member of the Sierra Club, claimed that environmentalism stood for a new religion, which was anti-humanity, anti-civilisation, anti-technology as well as pro-alarmism and terrorism, in his 'coherent critic' of the environmental movement.³⁴ *Eye of the Storm* gave Arnold the political break he had been seeking. However, he later conceded that the book was more ideological than objective and written from a conservative viewpoint.³⁵ Gaylord Nelson, the Chairman of the Wilderness Society, was unimpressed. 'People like Watt and Mr Arnold really don't see that there is much value to anything unless you can put a dollar sign on it,' he said. 'They'll deny it and say they want "balance". But if you look at that "balance", it's all in favour of unrestrained exploitation of natural resources.'³⁶

Arnold and Watt were not the only people talking in divine undertones. 'It's a holy war between fundamentally different religions,' Charles Cushman of the National Inholders Association was raging.³⁷ 'Environmentalism is a new paganism. It worships trees and sacrifices people' is a favourite Cushman saying.³⁸ Charles 'Chuck' Cushman, calls himself the 'tank commander' of the green backlash and has spent much of the last fifteen years warning rural audiences about the US National Parks service and the environmental movement, or preservationists, as he calls them. Cushman, who had originally formed the National Inholders Association to represent 'inholders' or people

who live inside National Parks, received national notoriety when he was appointed to the National Park System Advisory Board by Jim Watt. Already a friend of Ron Arnold's and a highly controversial figure, Cushman enthusiastically defended Jim Watt, rallying support for the ailing Secretary of the Interior. 'The Secretary is doing a hell of a job,' said Cushman.³⁹

Neither Arnold's book nor Cushman's support could prevent Watt's early demise from office. Watt, who had become renowned for public gaffes, described the make-up of a newly formed commission: 'We have every kind of mixture you can have. I have a black, I have a woman, two Jews and a cripple.' One mistake too many, Watt resigned as Secretary of the Interior in the autumn of 1983.⁴⁰

However, much of the rhetoric that is used against the environmental movement now, labelling activists as 'extremists', 'preservationists', 'religious fanatics' and 'communists' began in earnest in the Reagan era with people such as Watt, Arnold and Cushman. In turn they seem to have drawn much of their terminology from political extremist and perennial presidential candidate, Lyndon LaRouche. The process of the marginalisation of the environmental movement had begun.

GUNNING OVER THE MOON

The same year as Watt resigned and headed back west, another archconservative was heading south, jetsetting off to an all-expenses paid conference in Jamaica. Alan Gottlieb, one of the foremost right-wing fundraisers in the USA, who describes himself as the 'premier anti-communist, free-enterprise, *laissez-faire* capitalist',⁴¹ was attending a conference arranged by an organisation called CAUSA – the Confederation of Associations for the Unification of the Societies of America. This mouthful is a front group for the Reverend Sun Myung Moon. The Reverend Moon, whose popular image is one of the head of a religious cult, in fact heads a vast smokescreen multinational political and business empire whose tentacles span the globe. He owns 280 corporations in America alone. Moon's stated goal is a global automatic theocracy. 'I will conquer and subjugate the world,' says Moon, who sees himself as the son of God.⁴²

CAUSA, the organisers of the conference in Jamaica, was set up in 1980, as Moon's transnational political front. 'The primary mission of CAUSA,' recalls leading Moon watcher, Dan Junas, 'was to support the Reagan foreign policy

This said, Ramos concludes that, 'Were the corporate sponsorship, or the right-wing activists, to wither and blow away, the movement, as a movement, could not persist.'¹³¹

'You do not have movement against movement, you have the corporate sector against the environmental movement and I think this is a very important point,'¹³² says leading political expert Sara Diamond. The political analyst Dan Junas adds:

I think in some respects it is an artificial creation. However, at the same time the people who are involved in the Wise Use movement at the grass-roots, they have, in some cases, legitimate concerns, although I don't necessarily agree with their view-point. It is not just that they are being manipulated, but I do see it as being an artificial creation.¹³³

The Wise Use movement has had a major political success, and with the Republicans in Congress, other anti-environmental measures will seriously undermine many of the environmental gains of the last twenty years. This may be the Wise Use movement's greatest legacy, that, through its grassroots organising it helped one of the most vehement anti-green Republican administrations in the history of American politics into power.

KILLING THE BIODIVERSITY TREATY

To date, maybe Wise Users' biggest victory happened in 1994. During the 103rd Session of Congress, the United States Senate did not ratify the United Nations Framework Convention on Biological Diversity, which had originally been agreed at the Earth Summit in Rio de Janeiro in June 1992 to protect the world's flora and fauna. Although it had been expected to be ratified, it was blocked by the Republican Summit. The Senate opposition only materialised after a campaign by Wise Use activists, who in turn had been misleadingly primed by a colleague of the political extremist, Lyndon LaRouche.¹³⁴

Roger Maduro (also known as Rogelio), an associate editor for *21st Century Science and Technology*, a magazine associated with LaRouche, wrote a scathing conspiratorial attack on the treaty for the American Sheep Industry Association, which later was widely circulated and used as evidence to kill the treaty. Maduro, who has been active in LaRouche's political movement since the late

1970s, had also urged Wise Use activists at the 1994 Reno Conference to oppose the Treaty, saying that otherwise, people would be governed by the United Nations.¹³⁵ Activists from Reno as well as from the Alliance from America were to take Maduro's conspiratorial rhetoric and spin it into an unstoppable barrage of faxes, phone-ins and letters that inundated Congress in July, asking for the Treaty to be buried. The Cattlemen's Association and American Farm Bureau were soon to follow suit.¹³⁶

John Doggett, the director of governmental relations for the American Farm Bureau, which opposed the Bill, conceded that 'unfortunately, what we've seen is that certain groups tried to create a crisis where one doesn't exist'.¹³⁷ Moreover, Doggett was to concede that Maduro's campaign was the 'key to triggering the masses'. A former Chief Counsel to the Senate Agriculture Committee also agreed that the campaign had had a serious effect, 'slowing the treaty down and eventually stopping it'.¹³⁸

The stopping of the Biodiversity Treaty could pale into insignificance compared to other items on the anti-green agenda being promoted by the Wise Use movement and now the Republican administration in Congress. 'The most prevalent theme running throughout all the speeches was anti-federal government with private property rights a close second,' said Sheila O'Donnell, of the Reno conference in 1994. 'Cost benefit analysis, risk assessment and unfunded mandates were also discussed.'¹³⁹

THE 'CONTRACT WITH AMERICA'

The issues of property rights/takings, cost benefit analysis/risk assessment and mandates have become the three-pronged trident that has been struck in the heart of the environmental debate, which has left the green movement staggering from the potentially fatal wound. Dubbed by environmentalists the 'unholy trinity', it is easy to see why these three critically important issues are the Wise Use devil's advocate. More worrying, the 'unholy trinity' is also at the heart of Gingrich's 'Contract With America', and the new Republican revolution.

The emphatic return to Republican control of House and Senate after a forty-year absence, with the election victories in November 1994, signalled a turning point in the political fortunes of the Wise Use movement. Not since the days of Reagan and Watt did the advocates of the green backlash have such

I've never seen anything pay out as quickly as this whole Wise Use thing has done. What's really good about it is it touches the same kind of anger as the gun stuff, and not only generates a higher rate of return but also a higher average dollar donation. My gun stuff runs about \$18. The Wise Use stuff breaks \$40.⁶⁰

As a fund-raising concept, Wise Use works. For as long as it does, both Gottlieb and Arnold will push anti-environmentalism to make a profit. 'Wise Use is a profit-making enterprise for those in control of the various organisations,' remarks Paul de Armond, who along with Jim Halpin interviewed Gottlieb at length.⁶¹ De Armond continues:

He mails out twenty-five million direct-response letters every year. Recipients mail back \$24 million. His costs, at 27 cents per letter, are \$6.75 million, which means his mailers net \$17.25 million. Put another way, \$2.25 comes back for every dollar invested in direct-response letters.⁶²

Of this, some \$2 million goes to various anti-environmental clients.⁶³ Gottlieb also regularly holds fund-raising sessions at Wise Use conferences, and has held fund-raising seminars for key activists Chuck Cushman, William Perry Pendley and Clark Collins, so they can then fund-raise against the green threat.⁶⁴

There are other exploitative forces around on the fringes of American politics, that of the conspiracy. The most frightening part is that it is on the increase.

LYNDON LAROCHE: THE CONSPIRACY BEGINS

'Greenpeace: shock troops for a New Dark Age' ran the headline of *Executive Intelligence Review* (EIR) in April 1989. The article alluded that 'Greenpeace, indeed, is the ecological version of the Nazi SA, or what today might be called "eco-spetsnaz commandos."' This was just one of a number of startling accusations made in the article.⁶⁵ EIR is a magazine associated with extreme political chameleon, Lyndon LaRouche, someone renowned for his anti-semitic and racist views as well as his wild conspiracy theories such as the British royal family being behind the global drug trade and the environmental movement.

LaRouche, a former Marxist, did a severe political backflip in the early 1970s to the Right, where he has remained ever since. Dennis King, who has written an exposé on LaRouche, outlines what happened next.

Organisers for his [LaRouche's] National Caucus of Labor Committees (NCLC) began contacting everyone they and their fellow radicals of the anti-Vietnam War movement had reviled – the CIA, and FBI, the Pentagon, local police red squads, wealthy conservatives, GOP [Republican] strategists, and even the Ku Klux Klan. Their announced objective was to build a grand coalition to rid American politics of the Enemy Within – the evil leftists, liberals, environmentalists and Zionists.⁶⁶

Funding for his operations has been partly derived by pressuring supporters into taking out huge personal loans which are never paid back, credit card fraud and through a private political intelligence-gathering service.⁶⁷ Sometimes LaRouche goes too far, even in the eyes of the law. In December 1988, Larouche and six top aides were convicted on fraud and conspiracy charges and were sent to jail.⁶⁸ Finally released from prison on 26 January 1994, his global empire was kept running by his wife Helga Zepp LaRouche, whilst he was inside.

Although the LaRouche organisation is headquartered in the USA, mainly run as the National Caucus of Labor Committees (NCLC), it basically spans most of the world, run either through the International Caucus of Labor Committees (ICLC), the European Labor Party, the Schiller Institute or a LaRouche publication.⁶⁹ LaRouche publications are sold all over the world, and apart from pushing conspiracy theories, concentrate on two things. First they advocate a 'new world economic order', as the world is heading for economic collapse. 'Only we have the knowledge and methods for teaching a new elite the necessary historical, scientific and above all, economic knowledge the world needs for its survival,' says LaRouche.⁷⁰ Second, Larouche's followers vehemently promote nuclear power and high-tech industry, peddling fusion and fission power as the panaceas to the world's problems, whilst at the same time castigating anti-nuclear critics. 'Vote for me and I'll build 2,500 nuclear power plants,' LaRouche told voters in his 1980 presidential bid.⁷¹

More often than not Larouche articles mix fiction with conspiracy theories. The *Executive Intelligence Review* article alleged that Greenpeace could cause a major environmental disaster by sabotage to 'bring into operation a global "crisis management apparatus", that will be the *de facto* interim government of a "green fascist" new world order'.⁷² The article also exaggerated the accusations from a 1989 film, *Survival in the High North*, by the Icelandic film-maker, and arch-Greenpeace critic, Magnus Gudmundsson.⁷³ Lyndon LaRouche, and publications associated with him have publicised Gudmundsson's work all over the world. Gudmundsson's relationship with the LaRouche people is examined more closely in chapter 13.

The EIR article also alleged that it is the British royal family and the Soviets that are Greenpeace's backers.⁷⁴ This is entirely consistent with LaRouche's beliefs. An editorial in *21st Century Science and Technology*, another LaRouche publication, claimed at the same time as the EIR article that 'In the Federal Republic of Germany, the Soviets have also used the Greens as a cover for covert military manoeuvres, involving their own *spetsnaz* special-forces troops in acts of sabotage and even, on occasion, assassinations.'⁷⁵

Carrying on the conspiracy conundrum, the EIR article contended that Greenpeace is one of the 'officially patronised groups of the Lucis Trust, the umbrella organisation for the New Age movement, which was originally known as the Lucifer Trust'.⁷⁶ The Lucis Trust, according to LaRouche, 'is the leading, putatively respectable Britain-based Satan cult (it worships Lucifer)'.⁷⁷ Furthermore, the Trust opposes 'the materialism of science and every form of dogmatic theology, especially the Christian religion . . . and promotes a pagan form of Theosophical religion'. Other prominent front organisations for the Lucis Trust, apart from Greenpeace, are the following: the United Nations Association, the World Wildlife Fund UK, the Findhorn Foundation, Amnesty International, the Rudolf Steiner School, UNESCO, and UNICEF.⁷⁸ Feeling confused? What is the connection with Greenpeace, Soviets, paganism and wildly rampant conspiracy theories?

'LaRouchians accuse "dark forces" of being behind whatever happens in the world,' writes journalist Jerry Sommer, who has spent time studying LaRouche's activities in Germany. He continues:

The conspirators are not always the same, and the conspiracy theories are not always logical, but conspirators are none the less almost always at work. The conspiracy theories are often so abstruse that it is simply incredible how people can cling to them. But they are often cleverly intermingled with facts and half truths, or legitimate political positions, to form an apparently inextricable tangle.⁷⁹

According to LaRouche, everything can be traced to Babylonian times, and the forces of order – epitomised by Plato – and the forces of chaos – symbolised by Aristotle and the evil oligarchists. 'LaRouche claims that his followers represent a 3,000-year-old faction of "Neoplatonic humanists" locked in mortal struggle with an equally ancient "oligarchy",' says Dennis King.⁸⁰ Political analyst Chip Berlet adds:

For the LaRouche people, if you accept the idea that there is a secret cabal that has been operating since the fall of the temple of Babylon, that was behind the Aristotelian thinking,

if you really believe that that is true, of course when you look at the environmental movement you see in it this conspiracy.⁸¹

Along with environmentalists and the Rockefellers, LaRouche often singles out Jews, especially Jewish bankers, as being behind the global conspiracy. Henry Kissinger is a particular LaRouche favourite, too, often being referred to as a 'Soviet Agent'. So too are the British bankers and the British royal family. In LaRouche's mind, Britain can be blamed for about anything, even Hitler was a British agent, according to LaRouche.⁸² According to the LaRouchians, the British monarchy are also behind the international drug trade, as was outlined in his book *Dope Inc: Britain's Opium War Against the US*, published in 1978.⁸³

Delving deeper into LaRouche's world we find that he considers many of the key conspirators part of a Malthusian plot to take over the world. Before the UN Conference on Population in Cairo, in 1994, the LaRouche organisation was rampant in its opposition. The 29 April edition of *Executive Intelligence Review* ran a headline 'Hitler in Blue Helmets: The Case for Halting Cairo 94', in which the conference is described as the 'direct heir to the 1932 New York eugenics conference which set Nazi policy'. The *New Federalist*, another LaRouche publication, quoted LaRouche as saying, 'There is no difference between those in the UN who are convening and supporting this population conference, and Adolf Hitler.' The article alleged that UN Secretary Boutros-Ghali was 'Britain's Brown-Skinned Hitler' who was installed by the British in 1992, because the British consider it easier to kill hundreds of millions of Africans and Asians under the direction of a 'brown-skinned' agent, rather than in their own name.⁸⁴

The UN is, according to LaRouche, attempting to conquer the world with a police state or a UN-controlled 'New World Order'. *Executive Intelligence Review* called the Earth Summit in 1992, 'the Mother Earth cult festival in Rio de Janeiro, which is intended to spread mass psychosis and institutionalise a global police state in the name of saving the environment'. There was, according to EIR, 'fascism being promoted in Rio: the most evil threat, in sheer scale, which has ever faced humanity. For that, we need a herculean effort to educate people to overcome the brainwashing of the environmentalist media.'⁸⁵

Asked just how significant a player LaRouche was in propagating the international anti-environmental message, Chip Berlet responds:

He has always been important [on both the national and international level], because he is like a deranged bee, cross-pollinating various flowers. His people are relentless in their

pursuit of networking and even though people in the anti-environmental movement will swear up and down that he is crazy and that they do not work with him, in fact many of their staff do.⁸⁶

One such busy bee is Roger Maduro, an Associate Editor of *21st Century Science and Technology* and rising anti-environmentalist. He is a visible bridge between the LaRouche organisation and the Wise Use movement, and the LaRouche magazine *21st Century Science and Technology* is increasingly becoming the mouth-piece for anti-greens too. 'Even a limited review of LaRouche-related publications makes clear that his organisation has found fertile ground among "wise use" and "property rights",' wrote Dan Barry and Ken Cook from the Environmental Working Group in 1994.⁸⁷

Maduro is also a leading anti-environmental scientist, who co-authored the book *The Holes in the Ozone Scare*. *21st Century* is peppered with articles claiming the fraudulence of environmental science and promoting Dixy Lee Ray, another leading science sceptic, up until her death in 1994. The process of debunking environmental science is discussed in chapter 5. But there are other links between the Wise Use movement and *21st Century*. Hugh Elsaesser is on the board of both the Environmental Conservation Organisation (ECO), a Wise Use network of over 400 groups and the Scientific Advisory board of *21st Century*. An article by Dr William Hazeltine, another ECO board member appeared in the Summer 1994 edition of *21st Century*.⁸⁸ Other prominent Wise Use activists have also had articles published in *21st Century*, such as William Perry Pendley, Kathleen Marquardt, and Michael Coffman.⁸⁹ An article by the hardline anti-environmental group, the Sahara Club, appeared in the Summer 1991 edition.⁹⁰ Teresa Platt from the Fishermen's Coalition, one of the 'Wise Use Heroes,' was interviewed by the EIR. Barry Clausen, a private investigator who infiltrated Earth First!, also has an article published and book advert in the Spring 1994 edition of *21st Century*. He has also teamed up with Roger Maduro to write a publication *Eco-Terrorism Watch* (see chapter 5).

What is frightening about LaRouche is his organisation's ability to collect and trade intelligence information all around the world. In the early 1980s, LaRouche and Helga met with the serving CIA deputy director to discuss Germany's environmental and peace movements.⁹¹ Admiral Booby Ray Inman is said to have received 'enticing information' from LaRouche on the German Green Party. 'At the time, nobody in intelligence was covering them at all,' said Inman.⁹² But there are other LaRouche attacks on the environmental

movement in Germany. Also in the early 1980s the European Labor Party (ELP) attacked leading green activist Petra Kelly, who was leader of the German Greens until her death. Due to the harassment, Kelly sued for libel. According to her attorney, the 'LaRouchians had engaged in a "vicious campaign that made it difficult for her to appear in public".'⁹³

The ELP had claimed that Greens were both fascists and were communist-controlled, a slight contradiction in terms. For example the party had, on the one hand distributed leaflets against the 'green environmental fascists',⁹⁴ whilst on the other, Helga Zepp LaRouche called for the German Green Party to be banned in the 1980s because it was run by the KGB.⁹⁵ Other magazines associated with LaRouche have also targeted Greenpeace. *Fusion* magazine in Germany has remarked that 'Greenpeace suggests using organic fertilisers to help save dying forests. Question: how many "Greens" do you need to fertilise a tree? Answer: Five. Actually one is enough, but you need four to persuade him to get into the bone crusher.'⁹⁶

Because of his pro-nuclear stance, LaRouche has links to the nuclear industry, in particular the nuclear establishment, who although they must know he is an extremist are prepared to support him because of his pro-nuclear views. LaRouche's '1980 presidential campaign committee solicited donations from executives of nuclear power and aerospace corporations,' according to Dennis King.⁹⁷ Dozens of scientists and engineers signed a full-page *Fusion* advertisement backing LaRouche for President.

One thing is certain though about LaRouche, and that is that his conspiratorial rhetoric is currying favour with many people in the USA, not just in the nuclear industry, but on the extreme Right.

THE MILITIA: CONSPIRING OUT OF CONTROL

The most violent manifestation of the culture war and a reflection of the feeling of the despair, distrust and anger that are now endemic in many sections of the Right, is the rapid growth of the militia movement in the USA. The expedient growth of the militia, coupled with the depth of anti-government feeling, had caught many people and politicians totally off-guard.

A mass movement the size of the militias could not have grown as fast as it has without there being a very large pre-existing group of people willing to be organised around some extremely real grievances, argues Chip Berlet:

Dick Carver, a Nye County Commissioner has attended and spoken at both Wise Use events as well as Christian Identity functions.¹⁵³ 'White supremacist elements add a degree of militancy and experience in conflict with the Federal government that folks in the Wise Use movement and militias appreciate,' argues Jonathan Mozzochi, from the Coalition for Human Dignity.¹⁵⁴ In fact, members of the Aryan Nations had started a recruitment drive in 1991 in the resource-dependent communities of the Northwest, aimed at people who were threatened by economic downturn and seemingly hostile environmental legislation, according to the Coalition for Human Dignity. 'The coming warfare will literally be a war for survival not just of the logging industry or a way of life, but the very survival of the white race,' said one letter to the editor in *Log Trucker*.¹⁵⁵

In a final ironic conspiratorial twist to the tale, only capable by a magazine associated with Lyndon LaRouche, *21st Century Science and Technology* reported that Nye County officials, like Carver were actually funded by the same people who were behind the environmental movement. It was also, according to Marjorie Hecht, the author of the article, Lord William Rees-Mogg and British Intelligence who were attempting to incite 'local militias to violence'.¹⁵⁶ Hecht also alleged that the British Crown and 'its wealthy friends and agents including top-level British intelligence figures like Rees-Mogg, is also manipulating anti-environmentalists'.¹⁵⁷ So the British monarchy are behind both the environmental and anti-environmental movement, and even the militia. The reason, according to Hecht, was to 'finish off what is known as the American system, so that an industrial American giant can never again threaten the British colonial system'.¹⁵⁸

Another article in *21st Century* also alleged that 'the other British-party designers of the "Wise Use" movement, would destroy the United States faster than the Greens could do, by breaking up the Government and the union'.¹⁵⁹ You see everything is possible in the conspiracy. For further details, computer kids can scan talk.politics.guns, alt.conspiracy and misc.activism.militia on the Internet. But watch out for the black helicopters.

THE DEATH OF DEMOCRACY

The Twentieth Century has been characterised by three developments of great political importance; the growth of democracy, the growth of corporate power, and the growth of corporate propaganda as a means of protecting corporate power against democracy.¹

The intensity of the corporate counter-attack against a burgeoning environmental and consumer rights opposition has been so powerful that in countries like America, it has, at best, derailed, at worst, destroyed, democracy itself. If democracy is meant to signify a representative government for all the people, in which everyone has an equal chance of being heard, of being able to influence their local politician, then democracy is dead, killed by the monoliths of the modern age – transnational corporations.

Overtly and covertly, by stealth and by design, big business has perverted the democratic process by buying politicians, by bribing them, by funding 'independent' think-tanks, by forming 'corporate front groups', by bullying citizens, by lobbying and by lying – all in the name of profit. At the same time, they have told us how much they care. The way companies have co-opted the environmental message and colonised the debate is examined in the next chapter.

CORPORATIONS AND POLITICS

REGULATORY POLITICS

Much of the focus for business activity has been around corporate opposition to regulation. As companies have expanded overseas, this anti-regulatory dogma

**DOWNPLAY THREATS TO THE ENVIRONMENT, BY
DEBUNKING SCIENTISTS**

Grant Gerber: environmentalists are 'anti-scientific'.⁴⁵ Alliance for America: Fred Singer 'has done a lot to demythologise crackpot scientific theory'.⁴⁶ 'There isn't such a thing,' says Ron Arnold, about the ozone hole. If CFCs cause ozone depletion, why are there not ozone holes above CFC manufacturing plants? contends Arnold. Acid rain is exaggerated.⁴⁷ Global warming, Alar, and species depletion are pure scare tactics, says Arnold, 'to create the illusion of crisis'.⁴⁸ Barbara Keating-Edh, Consumer Alert, 1994 Wise Use conference, 'Panic peddlers'.⁴⁹ Michael Coffman, Alliance for America Conference 1994: acid rain, global warming are issues of the 'extreme imagination' of environmentalists. Bud Houston, Wise Use activist: 'Mankind has not caused ozone depletion or global warming or acid lakes. They are natural conditions.'⁵⁰

ENVIRONMENTALISTS ARE VIOLENT TERRORISTS

Lyndon LaRouche was one of the first people to brand anyone involved in any progressive protest as a 'terrorist'.⁵¹ Following his lead many sections of society are now labelling environmentalists as terrorists. William Perry Pendley calls greens terrorists. MSLF has held conferences on eco-terrorism, and has been instrumental in having Earth First! labelled as a terrorist organisation.⁵² In 1990, MSLF filed suit against the US Forest Service seeking to stop them giving a permit to the 'environmental terrorist organisation'.⁵³ Grant Gerber too has held workshops for companies such as Georgia-Pacific and Exxon on eco-terrorism.⁵⁴ 'Ecoterrorism: The Dangerous Fringe of the Environmental Movement', was the title of the briefing paper that the Heritage Foundation published to celebrate Earth Day 1990.

These last two issues, that of debunking environmental science and attempting to demonise environmentalists as violent are key parts of the paradigm process and warrant further analysis.

COUNTER-SCIENCE

The paradigm shift is coming from all sections of society who have reason to oppose environmentalists: industry, PR companies, the Wise Use movement, the government, the Right and increasingly the media. Furthermore, Lyndon LaRouche and publications associated with him have long defamed environmentalists and attacked environmental science and much of the paradigm shift process can be traced directly back to him. Wise Use activists are picking up on LaRouche counter-science and crackpot conspiracy theories. So too are the militia. More importantly, through Wise Use activists, right-wing groups and radio hosts, this vehement rhetoric is reaching the mainstream media.

LaRouche himself sounds very similar to the Wise Use movement, calling ozone depletion a fraud, and groups like Greenpeace and the Sierra Club 'nut groups, which are determined . . . to destroy industrial society for what they deem a post-industrial, depopulated planet'.⁵⁵ The LaRouchians are spreading their message and it is not just confined to the magazines *21st Century Science and Technology* and *Executive Intelligence Review*, now it is reaching into the heart of Washington. In 1994, the Biodiversity Treaty was not signed because of a campaign by LaRouche associates and Wise Use activists. At both major anti-environmental conferences that year, people reiterated bizarre conspiracy theories that the ultimate agenda of the environmental movement is the destruction of mankind. LaRouche's associate Roger Maduro warned that 'population is the enemy of the environmentalist. . . . The actual agenda is to rid us of human beings.'⁵⁶ Because of this so-called anti-human bias, Maduro recommended to the participants at Reno that they should join forces with the anti-abortion movement.⁵⁷

LaRouche publications offer a forum for much anti-green theory whilst vehemently supporting the use of pesticides and nuclear power. Numerous anti-environmental scientists have had their work published in *21st Century*, mixing a strange concoction of conspiracy and counter-science. The only problem for the reader is distinguishing what is reality and what is fantasy. 'Save the planet's humans: lift the ban on DDT!' ran the headline of the *Executive Intelligence Review* in 1992.⁵⁸ Inside Marjorie Mazel Hecht, Managing Editor of *21st Century*, wrote that 'DDT was the "mother" of all the environmental hoaxes to follow, from saving the lousewort, to the ozone hole.'⁵⁹ According to Hecht, there were 'millions of lives lost as a result of the environmentalists' victory in banning DDT . . . DDT does not have harmful effects alleged by the

Dirty techniques were used by the Sahara Club at the time of 'Redwood Summer' in 1990, where violence would be used against Earth First! and Judi Bari. Moreover, the Sahara Club routinely publish vehicle number plates and phone numbers and addresses of Earth First! activists, in order to intimidate them. Intimidation is left up to the Sahara Clubbers, whose message to EF! is simple: 'Our special division of Sahara Clubbers was simply gonna . . . do justice that the authorities wouldn't do.'¹⁶⁶

The Sahara Club are receiving information on the environmental movement from both the John Birch Society and magazines associated with Lyndon LaRouche.¹⁶⁷ 'Fantastic source of information! It's called *21st Century Science and Technology*,' report the Sahara Club, 'Since we have been trading information and news with these folks they offered a special deal to Sahara Club members.'¹⁶⁸ They also repeat the accusation that environmentalists are terrorists.¹⁶⁹

MONKEY-WRENCHING AND TREE-SPIKING

The advocacy of monkey-wrenching and tree-spiking was the reasoning and rationale behind labelling environmentalists as terrorists. 'Monkey-wrenching', the sabotage or 'ecotage' of property to stop ecological destruction, was originally born in the mind of Edward Abbey who wrote a fictional novel entitled *The Monkey Wrench Gang* published in 1975. The novel, which became a cult book, is about four characters who roam the west carrying out covert actions of ecotage. Dave Forman, a former lobbyist for the Wilderness Society and the founder of Earth First!, was to immortalise Abbey's writing in his book *Ecodefense: A Field Guide to Monkeywrenching*, which described various ways of monkey-wrenching. Whilst these tactics are considered sabotage by some, to others it is called terrorism. 'Sabotage is violence against inanimate objects: machinery and property. Terrorism is violence against human beings,' argued Edward Abbey.¹⁷⁰ Earth First! has always maintained a policy of non-violence towards people, although sabotage against property was advocated. But there is one tactic which was to prove contentious both inside and outside the direct action movement.

Earth First!'s most controversial tactic was its advocacy of tree-spiking, a practice that has now been stopped and denounced by the more progressive groups. If Earth First! had ever wanted to give a public relations coup to its opposition, tree-spiking was it. The theory behind tree-spiking was simple. If

you wanted to protect old-growth forest from being logged, you banged a large spike or nail into a tree, which had the potential to damage either a blade or a saw when the tree was either being cut down or sawn in the mill. Because of the danger to equipment and personnel, it was believed that either the Forest Service or timber companies, once told a region had been spiked, would leave the trees alone. Of course they did not and felling continued.

Despite press reports to the contrary, only one injury has ever been attributed to tree-spiking, that of timberman George Alexander near Elk, California. In 1987, Alexander suffered facial injuries when a nail embedded in wood caused a massive saw blade to break.¹⁷¹ As a result of the accident, Alexander's jaw was broken in five places and he suffered huge blood loss. He is lucky to be alive. Although it was the nail that caused the blade to break, it seems safety issues were coming to a head at the plant. Fresh saw blades had been delayed and the situation with his own saw had become so bad that Alexander had nearly not gone to work that day.¹⁷²

The press quickly condemned the incident as 'Tree-spiking terrorism', and the company labelled it 'terrorism in the name of environmental goals'. Before he had fully recovered, Alexander was asked to go on a tour by a pro-industry group denouncing Earth First! and tree-spiking. He refused and returned to work. The company put forward a \$20,000 for information leading to the conviction of whoever was responsible, although Alexander had to file a private lawsuit for personal injury damage. He received just \$9,000 and was moved on to night shift. When L-P closed the mill down, he was laid off.¹⁷³ No proof has ever been offered that anyone from Earth First! was responsible for the incident, although the indifference of some EF! members in response to Alexander's injury angered Judi Bari and other activists. As a result, progressive EF! groups denounced tree-spiking and have signed a declaration of non-violence.

'ECO-TERRORISM WATCH'

Despite this change, groups like Earth First! and Greenpeace, who have a policy of non-violence, are still being labelled as 'terrorists'. In a move that singles the further merger between Wise Use activists and the LaRouche network, Barry Clausen, a Wise Use activist and private investigator, teamed up with Roger Maduro to produce a subscription journal entitled *Eco-Terrorism Watch*. The product is vintage LaRouche. *Eco-Terrorism Watch* has become another outlet for

LaRouche, with articles quoting from the *Executive Intelligence Review* and *21st Century Science and Technology* but also Ron Arnold and Alan Gottlieb, as well as Clausen's own book *Walking on the Edge: How I Infiltrated Earth First!*. Clausen's book is publicised on the Sahara Club Borderline Bulletin Board and promoted by *21st Century Science and Technology* as well as by the American Land Rights Association, Chuck Cushman's organisation. Alan Gottlieb's Merril Press distributed the book, although the Washington Contract Loggers Association published it. Ron Arnold designed the cover.¹⁷⁴

Barry Clausen teamed up with Maduro because he is 'one of the best known environmental writers today. Maduro has done an excellent job debunking major environmental frauds such as ozone depletion and global warming.'¹⁷⁵ Clausen claims to have worked undercover in Earth First!, paid to infiltrate the group by timber, mining and ranching interests.¹⁷⁶ He is active in spreading a climate of fear in timber communities across the west and has appeared at meetings with former army officers and security agents, warning of a 'terrorist threat' from Earth First!. One such meeting in Potlatch, Idaho, was designed to induce fear and hatred towards Earth First!, according to people who attended.¹⁷⁷ Taylor has worked with Ron Arnold, too, appearing at 'anti-terrorism' workshops for the timber industry with him.

When once asked to classify his working definition of terrorism, Clausen responded that, 'I'd just as soon not answer that question.' When pushed by the interviewer, he responded, 'I bet that if you look it up in the dictionary, it would be spelled EARTH FIRST.' Clausen also admitted that, from his experience, only a very small proportion of people in Earth First! engage in these 'terrorist' activities.¹⁷⁸ He has also conceded that he had never seen any illegal activity being undertaken by EF!.¹⁷⁹ Still Clausen attempts to label the whole environmental community as terrorists.

Clausen's attempts to tar the environmental movement as terrorists capable of mass homicide took an ugly turn after the Oklahoma bombing, when he appeared on Vancouver television. 'Former Vancouver resident Barry Clausen warns the tragedy in Oklahoma could happen closer to home, and he says it may not be the work of radical right-wingers, but radical eco-terrorists,' warned BCTV Lynn Colliar. 'Many of these people are advocating eliminating people. They want the planet left for the trees and the animals. And they want us out of it,' said Clausen in scaremongering rhetoric.¹⁸⁰

Despite there being no proof, the private investigator has attempted to link the notorious Unabomber to the environmental movement. The Unabomber had waged an 18-year periodic bombing spree that killed three people and

injured twenty-three, before Theodore Kaczynski, a 53-year-old former Berkeley Maths teacher was arrested in April 1996, on suspicion of being the bomber.

The summer before Kaczynski's arrest Clausen had attempted to link EF! and the Unabomber via a publication called *Live Wild or Die* and the *Eco-fucker Hit List*, despite the fact that EF! had not even issued the publication. 'I think this list is where he drew some of his victims,' said Clausen, singling out two people on the list from the California Forest Association and Exxon.¹⁸¹ Even though no-one from Exxon had ever been targeted by the Unabomber, ABC News, using information supplied to them by Clausen, reported that the 'Unabomber claimed responsibility for the death of a New Jersey advertising executive who worked for Exxon', and linked the bomber to EF!.¹⁸²

In the immediate aftermath of Kaczynski's capture ABC repeated their story on their *World News Tonight* programme, again interviewing Clausen.¹⁸³ The right-wing press also linked the Unabomber to the environmental movement and Greenpeace.¹⁸⁴

In what is obviously a concerted effort, Clausen and Wise Use activists are now attempting to label the whole environmental movement one big terrorist organisation, capable of perpetrating an Oklahoma outrage. Essentially, the campaign hopes to manipulate public opinion regarding the increase in political violence about resource issues. Clausen's message has been now taken up by *EnviroScan*, a newsletter produced by Public Relations Management Ltd, a Canadian PR outfit with close ties to the Wise Use movement. 'This [violence] is the darkness of the environmental movement. It's never far from the surface. And, no critic or opponent is immune,' warned *Enviroscan*.¹⁸⁵ Arnold and Gottlieb's CDFE has also established the 'Ecoterror Response Network' to 'compile the first comprehensive list of attacks against Wise Users – and to expose the environmentalist smear campaign to stigmatise the victims'.¹⁸⁶

While no-one can condone violence, what is unjustifiable is when those who do counsel violence also accuse the victims of violence of being terrorists, which is what happened to Judi Bari and Darryl Cherney of Earth First! who were blown up by a car bomb (see next chapter). Furthermore, an often repeated allegation by LaRouche and Ron Arnold is that the Greenpeace activist Fernando Pereira who was killed when the French Secret Service blew up the *Rainbow Warrior* in Auckland Harbour in 1985 was a member of the violent terrorist organisation, the 2nd June Movement.¹⁸⁷ These allegations have been repeated in the mainstream press, such as in a *Forbes* article on 11 November 1991.

THE RESULTS OF THE PARADIGM PROCESS

The ultimate paradigm shift is that the non-violent people who are being labelled as violent are having violence used against them. Violence is not a by-product of the paradigm shift, it is the end result of a process designed to dehumanise. If people continue to scapegoat environmentalists as terrorists there is only one result – violence against the environmentalists.

Reframing the environmental movement as criminal subversives and terrorists has other effects. It tars them with the same brush as the extremists who planted the bomb in Oklahoma, killing 168 people. This outrage gave America a benchmark with which to define the meaning of 'terrorism'. After the bombing President Clinton talked about the 'climate of violence' being bred on right-wing radio stations. 'They leave the impression, by their very words, that violence is acceptable,' said Clinton.¹⁸⁸

This said, Wise Use leaders have dismissed inflammatory rhetoric as potentially leading to violence. 'We don't believe that rhetoric is violence,' maintains Arnold.¹⁸⁹ Others disagree. 'Ultimately, some people persuaded by these scapegoating arguments conclude that the swiftest solution is to eliminate the scapegoat,' concludes Chip Berlet.¹⁹⁰ In the aftermath of the Oklahoma tragedy, the former President of the American Academy of Psychotherapists, Howard Halpern, wrote about language and violence:¹⁹¹

Social psychologists and demagogues have long known that if ordinary citizens are to be provoked to violent actions against individuals or groups of fellow citizens, it is necessary to sever the emphatic bond with those to be attacked by painting them as different and despicable.

We are unlikely to harm a friendly neighbour because she has strong views about equal rights for women, but if we call her a 'femi-Nazi' she becomes 'the other' – evil, dangerous, hated. We are unlikely to harm the couple down the block who are active on behalf of protecting endangered species, but if we call them 'environmentalist wackos' they become 'the other' – weirdos who must be vilified and suppressed as enemies to 'normal' Americans. When our shared humanity with those with whom we disagree is stripped away, it becomes acceptable to blow them up.¹⁹²

This is exactly what is happening.

THE PRICE OF SILENCE

Surveillance, suppression,
SLAPPs and violence

I used to love the silence. Now it haunts me.

Pat Costner, victim of arson¹

THE BARI BOMBING

Judi Bari was one of the leaders of the new breed of Earth First! activists and a key organiser of 'Redwood Summer', an event planned to highlight the destruction of the redwoods in Northern California in 1990. A former union activist, Bari posed some serious problems both to the timber companies and to the federal authorities.

This charismatic mother of two was a mobiliser who could inspire people to undertake high-profile, non-violent direct action. This differed from tree-spiking which was predominantly low-profile and potentially violent. In April 1990, Bari led the renouncement of tree-spiking, saying that 'the real conflict is not between us and the timber workers, it is between the timber corporations and our entire community'.² By denouncing tree-spiking, and declaring their commitment to non-violence, EF! activists were potentially scuttling any effective counter-PR campaign. It would now be much harder to label these activists as mindless eco-terrorists.

Bari was concerned about worker rights and safety. She was organising a timber workers' coalition with both union members and Earth First! and had represented five Georgia Pacific employees who were contaminated by PCBs at work, after the company and union colluded in a cover-up.³ At Bari's behest, Earth First! dropped its advocacy of tree-spiking fearing injury to loggers and

Lindzen was to visit again three years later, in the run-up to the 1995 Berlin Climate Conference, when he was invited by the CIS and the New Zealand Business Round Table. During his visit Lindzen declined to debate climate change with Kirsty Hamilton from Greenpeace, stating that Greenpeace was an organisation that 'acts like Goebbels'.⁵³ The Science and Research Minister for the New Zealand Government, Simon Upton, wrote to the Business Round Table 'frankly surprised that you have chosen to sponsor a tour by a scientist who has to date failed to convince his peers in normal scholarly exchanges'.⁵⁴ Lindzen's highly sceptical line has been adopted by such organisations as the Business Council for Australia who highlight the uncertainty of the science of global warming, claiming that no proof has yet been furnished concerning the link between greenhouse gases and climate change.⁵⁵

Furthermore, articles in the CIS's magazine *Policy* have reiterated the old right-wing rhetoric about the threat of environmental 'zealots' and the 'environmental priesthood'. 'Environmental extremism has become the principal means by which many collectivists hope to achieve their dream of a thoroughly regulated, controlled and planned economy,' writes one author warning that, 'The Red Star is burned out, but the Green Star is rising.'⁵⁶ The IPA also warns readers of 'green hysteria', 'the greens and beliefs in sorcery and witchcraft' and the 'religion of environmentalism'.⁵⁷

One person who has long regarded the environmental movement as religious fanatics is political extremist Lyndon LaRouche, whose followers have been busy in Australia. They have flown key activists over, such as the Citizens Electoral Councils (CEC), paying for one of LaRouche's chief spokespeople, James Bevel, to visit in 1994.⁵⁸ They have also forged links with at least two politicians, set up intelligence networks and tapped into Australia's growing gun lobby. One of LaRouche's supporters in the country has called on people to start forming armed militia, just as is happening in the USA. Moreover, the LaRouchians have also established a substantial funding network.⁵⁹ Their agenda is simple. Uwe Friesecke, from the Schiller Institute, outlined the LaRouche blueprint for a nationalistic recovery in Australia in 1993: pro-development, pro-technology, pro-nuclear power and anti-environmental.⁶⁰

Another anti-green group called the New South Wales Public Land Users Alliance, started in September 1993. Its spokesperson, National Party MP Peter Cochrane, has scapegoated environmentalists for causing the bush fires which raged through the region in 1994 and for supposed acts of 'ecoterrorism'. Following the fires, R. J. Smith from the American Competitive Enterprise Institute, gave the Alliance and other groups a speech entitled 'Endangered Rats,

Fire and the Federal Bureaucracy'.⁶¹ In 1996, the Public Land Users Alliance, announced that it would be organising a national Wise Use rally 'in conjunction with our friends from the mining, forestry and agricultural industries', to which Ron Arnold would be invited.⁶²

In the near future, it is in all likelihood that the direct links between individuals and groups propagating the anti-environmental message will not only continue but widen.

OTHER ANTI-GREEN ORGANISATIONS

The Forest Protection Society has also worked with other anti-green organisations in Australia, such as the Tasmanian Traditional Recreational Land Users Federation (TTRLUF) on issues such as the proposed closure of the Raglan Range four-wheel drive track in the Western Tasmania World Heritage Area.⁶³ The TTRLUF was formed in 1990 to oppose the designation of parts of Tasmania as World Heritage Sites. TTRLUF are the only community organisation to get front-page treatment on the Chamber of Mines newsletter advertising their meetings and have consistently refused to oppose mining in National Parks.⁶⁴ In a tone similar to his North American counterparts, TTRLUF's spokesperson Simon Cubit, who is also a senior Forestry Commission employee, warns people against Tasmanian environmentalists who are 'dangerous fanatics intent on locking up public land'.⁶⁵

Other anti-green and animal rights groups exist too in Australia but some have misleading names which just confuse: the Conserve Our Residential Environment (CORE), which is a pro-freeway organisation that opposed Greenpeace on the building of the M2 freeway.⁶⁶ The Australian Federation for the Welfare of Animals 'is the largest national association representing people who are associated with animals in work and leisure and wish to put common sense back in animal welfare'. The group, which seems very similar to the Wise Use group, Putting People First, lists the advantages of animals for medical research.⁶⁷

MOTHERS AGAINST POLLUTION

Another area of topical environmental debate that has sprouted industry groups is the packaging industry, especially over drinks cartons. Much like the B-M-

suffered from the image of meddling imperialistic city dwellers who know nothing about traditional ways of life in the Arctic, and who care more about animals than the continuance of rural traditions, and a way of life that has remained constant for generations.

Since 1989, Magnus Gudmundsson has made three films with the purpose of attacking animal rights and environmental groups, *Survival In the High North*, *Reclaiming Paradise?* and *The Man in the Rainbow*. The first, *Survival in the High North*, made in 1989, was an attempt to highlight the devastating effect that certain environmental policies have had on the communities of the high Arctic such as Greenland and Northern Canada. He also accused Greenpeace of using false footage in their anti-sealing campaigns of the 1970s and in their campaigns against the kangaroo hunts of the 1980s. Gudmundsson's allegations about Greenpeace using false footage in their kangaroo campaign are based on the accusations of the Danish journalist Leif Blaedel, who has been attacking Greenpeace since the early 1980s, and who appeared in the film. Blaedel's accusations were later refuted by a Swedish court of arbitration as false.³

It seems others wanted the film made and wanted Greenpeace attacked. A proportion of the money for research for the film, as well as some footage which was donated free, were provided by the Icelandic Ministry of Fisheries, a fact that Gudmundsson has refused to acknowledge.⁴ Money also came from the Vestnorden Fund, which promotes regional cooperation from the Faeroe Islands, Greenland and Iceland. Money towards Gudmundsson's second film *Reclaiming Paradise?* came from the Icelandic Film Fund.⁵ On 8 June 1989, Magnus Gudmundsson gave a press conference at the National Press Club in Washington, where *Survival in the High North* was shown. The conference was paid for by *21st Century Science and Technology*, the magazine that is affiliated with political extremist Lyndon LaRouche.⁶ *21st Century* and other magazines associated with LaRouche, particularly the *Executive Intelligence Review* have also widely publicised Gudmundsson's other films and his work around the world, more of which is expanded on later.

So outraged were Greenpeace about allegations in *Survival in the High North* that they had faked film footage of a seal culling and used 'terrorist' tactics, that they sued Gudmundsson in Norway. It would be the start of several legal battles that have ensued between Greenpeace and Gudmundsson as the filmmaker persists in making unsubstantiated allegations against the environmental organisation. The court ordered various parts of the film to be cut and ordered Gudmundsson to pay Greenpeace 30,000 Norwegian kroner in damages.⁷ Although Magnus Gudmundsson appealed against the court's decision, this was

refused.⁸ Gudmundsson, whose court costs were paid by the Norwegian Fisheries Association, or Fiskarlaget, an organisation that itself receives funding from the Norwegian government, took four years to pay the damages.⁹

Despite knowing that Greenpeace had successfully sued Gudmundsson, the American Wise Use group Putting People First distributed a revised version of the film to all members of the House of Representatives in 1993, saying this is the 'video Greenpeace doesn't want you to see'. In their attached letter, although PPF mentioned the Norwegian court case, they falsely stated that Magnus Gudmundsson 'was acquitted of all libel charges and compensation demands'.¹⁰ Given its pro-whaling policy, it is not surprising that PPF, which professes to have members in Canada, Norway and Japan and outside of the United States, should support Gudmundsson's work and that of other pro-whaling individuals. It has also distributed Gudmundsson's two other films *Reclaiming Paradise?* and *The Man in the Rainbow*, as well as actively promoting funding for Gudmundsson, and supporting a boycott of Greenpeace. Wise Use groups see support for Norwegian whalers and Arctic coastal communities as a further strategy with which to attack the environmental movement.

THE HIGH NORTH ALLIANCE

PPF has made other links with key anti-environmentalists in Scandinavia. The High North Alliance (HNA), headed by Georg Blichfeldt, is a pro-whaling and anti-environmental organisation that lobbies for such as the International Whaling Commission to lift the moratorium on commercial whaling and which also promotes Magnus Gudmundsson's films. It has an association with PPF and disseminates PPF literature to the Norwegian media.¹¹ Georg Blichfeldt publishes his pro-whaling views in his aptly named newsletter, the *International Harpoon: The Paper with a Point*. The relationship between PPF and the HNA goes further. In 1993, the HNA announced that it had commissioned American Attorney William Wewer, Kathleen Marquardt's husband and a key Wise Use activist, to research the maritime environmental group, the Sea Shepherd Conservation Society, and whether its anti-whaling actions were considered an act of piracy under US law.¹²

The HNA originally took its name from Gudmundsson's first film, *Survival in the High North*, and only subsequently changed it to the High North Alliance. The HNA is just one of many organisations that have sprung up in whaling,

Gudmundsson had been invited to 'balance the environmental debate'.²⁷ Gudmundsson repeated the *Survival in the High North* allegations during his New Zealand tour at a speech to the Fishing Industry Association, as well as on television.²⁸ TV NZ, when told of the facts by Greenpeace, offered an apology, whereas Gudmundsson refused to retract his allegations.²⁹ Once again he was sued by Greenpeace.

In Japan in 1992, he said of animal rights 'this movement seems to have adopted, either coincidentally or on purpose, some of the ideas Herr Hitler publicised in his *Mein Kampf*'.³⁰ During a lecture at the Greater Japan Fisheries Conference in February 1994, Gudmundsson openly accused Greenpeace and WWF of using 'more than five million dollars to bribe and buy support of delegates at the IWC'.³¹

In 1993 Magnus Gudmundsson and Steinar Bastesen again made a trip to another anti-environmental conference in the US, this time to the Wise Use conference at Reno organised by Alan Gottlieb's and Ron Arnold's Center for the Defense of Free Enterprise. The conference passed a resolution supporting Norwegian whaling.³² Bastesen has had a close relationship with the Wise Use conference for years, attending in 1990, 1991, 1993 and 1994.³³ Arnold sees Gudmundsson and Bastesen as his two key contact people in Scandinavia. 'We pay for their travels and they attend our conferences,' Arnold told the Norwegian *Verdens Gang* newspaper in 1994.³⁴ Bastesen, in turn, reiterates Arnold's rhetoric and quotes him as the source of the fact that the environmental movement is a 'front' organisation for the communists. 'Arnold', Bastesen believes, is 'foresighted'.³⁵

OUT TO SINK THE RAINBOW

It is no coincidence that Arnold, given his history of vehement anti-environmental rhetoric, would appear as a character witness against Greenpeace in Gudmundsson's third film, entitled *The Man in the Rainbow* in Danish or *The Rainbow Man* in English. Made by the Danish company Nordisk with Gudmundsson as a consultant for the Danish TV channel TV2, the film was originally shown in Denmark on 14 November 1993. It would later be shown in Denmark, Sweden, Finland, Malaysia and Iceland. The accusations made in the film, however, circumnavigated the world.

Magnus Gudmundsson tells different stories in different places, as to whose

idea the film was. At meetings in the USA and Mexico, such as at the International Whaling Commission (IWC) and Convention on International Trade in Endangered Species (CITES), Gudmundsson recalls that he was persuaded to make a film about Greenpeace after having been approached by Nordisk, although he did not particularly want to. However, during a lecture at the Greater Japan Fisheries Conference in February 1994, Gudmundsson stated that the film was entirely his idea and he approached the film company.³⁶

The film was an attack on Greenpeace and, in particular, its Honorary Chairman, David McTaggart, based mainly on old allegations that had appeared in press reports and some new exaggerated and unsubstantiated research. Appearing alongside Ron Arnold, who appeared as 'a writer', was the private investigator and Wise Use activist Barry Clausen, who works closely with *21st Century Science and Technology's* associate editor Roger Maduro to produce *Ecoterrorism Watch*. Maduro himself has met Gudmundsson on numerous occasions and professes to have the same beliefs on the environmental movement as his Icelandic counterpart.³⁷

Within twenty-four hours of *The Rainbow Man* being shown, *21st Century Science and Technology* was distributing a press release, which was also posted on the Internet. Information that could have only been known by the producers was contained in the release, which suggested some degree of cooperation between *21st Century* and the film-makers.³⁸ A week after the film was shown, members from the LaRouche group, Patriots for Germany, including LaRouche's wife Helga, interrupted a Greenpeace meeting in Dusseldorf by shouting allegations from the film.³⁹ *21st Century Science and Technology* also carried a four-page article on the film in its Winter edition, written by a Dane called Poul Rasmussen, who is Chairman of LaRouche's Schiller Institute in Copenhagen. The magazine also published a fax number where one could order the film.⁴⁰

The film accused Greenpeace of bribing the IWC, of having secret bank accounts and of working in collaboration with the 'terrorist organisation' Earth First!. Arnold also accused Greenpeace of bribing politicians. It was a cleverly put together piece of questionable journalism. However, in their desire to discredit Greenpeace, the film-makers were prepared to go to some pretty disreputable lengths themselves. After the German TV channel NDR had bought the film, it was due to be shown in Germany. However, having been warned by Greenpeace, one of their reporters, Christoph Luetgert was told to examine the way it had been made. Luetgert found out, among other things, 'that statements made in interviews with the marine biologist Francisco Palacio

capitalism, and 'cheap and abundant energy'. [Other Wise Use favourites – Greenpeace has been promoting alternative technologies such as the Greenfreeze refrigerator and solar power, but Gudmundsson's last comment was a plug for the nuclear industry.] Most federal agencies had been infiltrated by Greenpeace, said Gudmundsson.⁸²

Magnus Gudmundsson has been actively associated with the Icelandic and Norwegian governments, whalers, sealers, fishermen, the nuclear industry, the Wise Use movement, associates of Lyndon LaRouche, the IWMC, and various right-wing think-tanks such as the Heritage Foundation. Icelandic environmentalists believe that Gudmundsson's association with the US anti-greens puts him in a difficult position. On the one hand, his credibility with the Wise Use movement stems from the fact that he is Icelandic. Indeed, Gudmundsson and his associates represent an effort by the Wise Use movement to internationalise its campaign against regulation of resource utilisation. On the other, Gudmundsson's increasing reliance on anti-environmentalists damages his credibility in Iceland, where Wise Use policy on ozone depletion, global warming and other topical ecological issues, meets no sympathy at all.

This said, it seems the networking between key resource-dependent industries, anti-environmentalists, right-wing commentators and the Wise Use movement is becoming more coordinated. For example, in December 1995, following the International Conference on the Sustainable Contribution of Fisheries to Food Security in Kyoto, the Norwegian Whalers Union signed a 'joint declaration of non-governmental organizations interested in responsible aquatic resource utilization', along with fishing and whaling groups from Canada, Russia, Japan, Korea, Latin America, Switzerland, Zimbabwe and the United States. Over eighty American Wise Use groups signed, including the Alliance for America, BlueRibbon Coalition, People for the West! and Putting People First. The organising group was the Fishermen's Coalition, which had been set up after a demonstration against Greenpeace's tuna campaign in 1992.⁸³

Two months later, in February 1996, Teresa Platt from the Fishermen's Coalition and Bruce Vincent from the Alliance for America wrote to President Bill Clinton arguing that:

With the completion of the revised management procedure, the IWC should finally allow, recognise and support the humane and sustainable use of abundant cetaceans as practised for thousands of years by citizens of Norway, Iceland, Canada, the Faeroe Islands, Japan, the Caribbean nations, South America, the United States and many other countries.⁸⁴

In June, further international networking was reflected in a panel discussion at the Alliance for America's Fly-in for Freedom, entitled 'Going Global: Making a Difference in the International Arena', chaired by Teresa Platt. Attending a Wise Use conference for the first time was Georg Blichfeldt from the High North Alliance, speaking on the 'Conflict Between US Preservationists Values and the People of the High North'. Other speakers on the panel included Judy Mashinya, from the Africa Resources Trust, talking about 'Elephants and Africans: Is Coexistence Possible?' and Ike Sugg, from the Competitive Enterprise Institute, speaking on 'Economic Value and Wildlife: Impossibility or Necessity'. Gudmundsson also held a workshop on Icelandic films.

There is no doubt that the IWMC and their Wise Use allies will have an increasing influence on debates at the IWC and at CITES, and very likely at other conventions such as those on biodiversity. The whales that the world thought had been saved in the 1980s by the moratorium on commercial whaling are far from safe, and their future looks increasingly bleak, as anti-environmental forces coalesce across the globe. The international battle over the whales, and increasingly now over the rapidly dwindling fish stocks, looks set to become one of the most controversial resource conflicts of the coming decade. In parallel with America, many people embroiled in restarting commercial whaling are out to gut the Endangered Species Act, the domestic protection for American wildlife.

There will be strenuous efforts to focus the agenda on to 'sustainable utilisation', and 'balance' which will be no more than privatisation of wildlife in disguise. Or extinction by another name.