

ECOLOGY

Government Control Of The Environment

Gary Allen, a graduate of Stanford University and one of the nation's top authorities on civil turmoil and the New Left, is author of *Communist Revolution In The Streets* — a highly praised and definitive volume on revolutionary tactics and strategies, published by Western Islands. Mr. Allen, a former instructor of both history and English, is active in anti-Communist and other humanitarian causes. Now a film writer, author, and journalist, he is a Contributing Editor to AMERICAN OPINION. Gary Allen is also nationally celebrated as a lecturer.

■ WHEN the Establishment shifts into a new propaganda campaign it does so with the subtlety of an inebriate elephant trying to dance the Watusi in a china closet. First it was poverty, and every imaginable bureaucrat was out searching for government-certified poverts; then it was the "peace" movement, with its angry legions of Castroite pacifists; now the "in" thing is "conservation" or, as it is known among the usual "Liberal" press agents and phonies, "ecology." Check almost any recent issue of such Establishment slicks as *Life* or *Look* or *Time* or *Newsweek* and you will find at least one doomsday article about the grisly state of the American environment.

For those too hypnotized by the anesthetube to read, the federally licensed television networks are now devoting hours to promotion of the idea that man is poisoning his streams, polluting his atmosphere, brutalizing his environment, absorbing natural resources at a crippling rate, becoming engulfed in his own refuse, and at the same time

multiplying his numbers like over-sexed rats to further the destruction of his environment. On September 14, 1969, the National Council of Churches presented a series called "High Rise Living" on the N.B.C. network's *Frontiers Of Faith*. The first guest was identified Communist Pete Seeger, introduced in feigned innocence as a "conservationist and well-known folk singer." The frontiers of the Kremlin's favorite bard know no bounds. On March 20, 1969, the Xerox Corporation sponsored another nationwide television special on ecology, also featuring Comrade Seeger.

Meanwhile, wide-eyed youths in our nation's high schools and colleges are being enthralled with horripilant tales from such fearmongers of ecology as Stanford's Dr. Paul Ehrlich, author of *The Population Bomb*, probably the biggest bestseller on college campuses in a decade. "It is already too late to avoid famines that will kill millions, possibly by 1975," Dr. Ehrlich declares. He also predicts the total pollution and death of the world's oceans by 1979.

Oh, it's scary stuff.

Rudy Abramson of the *Los Angeles Times* and *Washington Post* proclaims that the ecology movement will be "our Sputnik for the 1970s." In referring to "America the Ugly," the Establishment's *Time* magazine croaks with its usual homogenized similes: "The environment may well be the gut issue that can unify a polarized nation in the 1970s." Even the pedagogous John Kenneth Galbraith has declared: "Pollution may well be the nation's most broadly based and democratic effort." And, of course, chief

Establishmentarian Richard Nixon agrees. The President announced in his State of the Union message:

The great question of the '70s is: Shall we surrender to our surroundings or shall we make our peace with nature and begin to make reparations for the damage we have done to our air, to our land and to our water?

In his 1971 Budget message the President delighted "Liberal" pundits by co-opting their ecology issue. Conservatives would, of course, applaud the President for cutting the ground from under "Liberal" issues if the Marxist solutions proposed by the "Liberals" were not adopted in the process. After all, the problems of our environment *are* genuine. But ecology is an issue on which the "Liberals" and radicals have, for the most part, seized the initiative.*

Through the use of highly emotional rhetoric, and by playing upon fears of impending social and environmental chaos, the Left is hoping to convert sincere and legitimate concern over the quality of our environment into acceptance of government control of that environment. The object is to make the "Green Revolution" part of the Red Revolution by using the Establishment media to stimulate the usual over-reaction among the American masses through exaggeration, magnification, and distortion of a genuine problem. The object is federal control of the environment in which we all must live.

While the problems of pollution have been with us for centuries, it is only in

recent months that the Establishment has begun to feed the issue through its propaganda machines. A few Americans with highly sensitive proboscides have already smelled a rodent. As Guy Wright of the *San Francisco Examiner* observed:

... there's something about the ecology kick that disturbs me. Most of this enthusiasm was artificially induced. And it is being deliberately manipulated. Like the teenie-boppers who squeal for a favorite singer, the people being manipulated don't know it and will swear it isn't true. But it's there.

Keith Lampe, an activist in Communist Jerry Rubin's radical Yippie Movement, released an article in August of 1969 which was widely reprinted in the radical underground press. He noted:

Almost certainly within six or eight months there will occur among most young activists a shift of consciousness emphatically away from campus-and-Vietnam issues and energetically into issues pertaining to the ecology emergency.

In early 1969 hardly anyone knew what ecology meant. Yet, by the end of the year, Lynn Sherr of Associated Press was writing: "American youth has found a new supercause.... The young are mobilizing with some of the same intensity that has gone into antiwar movements, against the pollution of air, land and sea." The radical *Berkeley Tribe* tipped off the objective in its issue for January 2, 1970:

The peace movement, which revived briefly this past fall, has sunk again into a lethargy that is more than seasonal. No one realizes this more than the Moratorium leaders, who have watched their constituency slip away as the

*Webster defines *ecology*, which comes from the Greek word meaning house, as (1) the branch of biology that deals with the relations between living organisms and their environment; (2) in sociology, the relationship between the distribution of human groups with reference to material resources, and the consequent social and cultural patterns.

months go by. In order to broaden their base in 1970, they extended their program to include environmental control... as well as immediate withdrawal.

You will notice that while the student radicals have shifted gears in unison with the Establishment against which they think they are revolting, the radical student leadership remains constant. Ecology is to be the great umbrella of the Seventies, with every radical issue from the governing of private property to population control tied to environment. *Newsweek* of December 20, 1969, informs us:

While front pages still report that the major student protests are centered on the war and the draft, concerned college students are enlisting increasingly in the fight for a cleaner, purer, less ravished environment....

Joined by former antiwar activists, young Democrats, crew-cut fraternity members and so-called hippies, the environment movement on campus is a response to alarms as varied as pesticides, oil slicks, ... and car-exhaust pollution....

Still, the tone of the antiwar movement has influenced the fight against pollution. "Many students," says Wayne Miyao, a social-science major, "view environment problems and Vietnam as manifestations of the same political and economic situation."

Elsewhere as well, the movement cuts across political lines. Half the members of the month-old Ecology Action organization at Columbia are former members of SDS. But the other half, said a radical, "are un-political freaks...."

Lynn Sherr of Associated Press comments on the similarities between the Vietnik and ecology movements:

In many ways, ecology activity is largely an outgrowth of The Movement [the New Left] — antiwar, antighetto, antiEstablishment [sic].

In their own terms, both groups see the status quo which they define as war or pollution as threatening to end life on this planet. Both see "the system" which they consider government or giant corporations as the adversary. Both reject old values, old politics, piecemeal solutions. Both talk of revolution. And both blame the profit system.

Ecology radicals have donned gas masks to invade auto shows, picketed campus recruiters for oil companies and manufacturers of pesticides, and developed a rhetoric for ecology of which Lenin would have been proud. Harvard's underground *Old Mole* recommends:

In order to localize and focus the environmental crisis, ecological radicals can engage in exemplary actions: plug up a belching smokestack with cement. Radical students can make radical ecological demands on universities — the laboratories of death technology, the ivory towers of technocratic ideology....

Sporadic eco-guerrilla actions and local piecemeal demonstrations can be effective and revolutionary.... Ecology by definition cannot be reformist. Ensuring an inhabitable earth requires an international revolution in order to establish a worldwide planet of human life which conforms to the organic requirements of the planet.

The new ecology game provides the radicals with a whole new audience of potential recruits. After all, the "peace" movement had its limitations. No American with any knowledge of Communism,

or any sense of patriotism, would participate in a demonstration led by school-boy Lenins carrying the Vietcong flag. But concern about the quality of our environment bridges social, political, and religious lines. It presents an opportunity for the greatest con since W.C. Fields passed himself off as a temperance leader and the happy father of ten.

When a "scientist" carrying the prestige of a Ph.D. starts throwing "facts" and "figures" at students, how can they assess their validity? On most issues it takes another scientist to refute the fearful projections made by the radical professors shouting of ecology. But, of course, it is only the radicals who are invited to address student assemblies.

Following in the wake of the Leftist intellectuals are the Leftist politicians, as usual pitching their con to youth. Typical of the ecology bunk being aimed at students is an article by Senator Gaylord Nelson in the Marxist *Progressive* magazine of November 1969:

The real loser in man's greedy drive is the youth of this country and the world. Because of the stupidity of their elders, the children of today face an ugly world in the near future, with dangerously and deadly polluted air and water; overcrowded development; festering mounds of debris; and an insufficient amount of open space to get away from it all.

Since youth is again the great loser, perhaps the only hope for saving the environment and putting quality back into life may well depend on our being able to tap the energy, idealism, and drive of the oncoming generation that, otherwise, will inherit the poisonous air and deadly waters of the earth.

Senator Nelson is a founder of "The First National Environmental Teach-In." Denis Hayes, the national coordinator of

this effort, says that on April 22, 1970, ecology teach-ins will be held at nine hundred colleges and four thousand high schools across the country. The program, employing the same techniques as those used to promote the cause of the Vietcong among American students, was evolved from a meeting of student ecology radicals financed and sponsored by the Department of Health, Education and Welfare.* According to Guy Wright in the *San Francisco Examiner*:

Last October 100 student leaders, mostly activist types, were invited to Washington for a four-day conference on environmental pollution. All their expenses were paid from a \$50,000 fund Bob Finch put up as Secretary of Health, Education and Welfare.

On the second day Senator Gaylord Nelson (D.-Wis.) made an unscheduled appearance. He just happened to hear about the conference, he said, and decided to drop in. For a casual visitor he came curiously prepared with a concrete

*Typical of the types Secretary Finch brought to Washington is the tyke quoted by Wright as proclaiming: "America is malignant.... We must take the power away from the elite and redistribute it!"

David Rubin described Secretary Robert Finch's ecology meeting in *Cross Currents* of December 20, 1969: "The strictly political dimensions of the pollution and environmental deterioration problem were hammered home to over one hundred graduate students, including the author, who gathered at Airlie House outside Washington, D.C., a few weeks ago for an environmental conference at the expense of HEW. The way in which these students — most of them straight [non-hippie, non-radical] and from moderate to conservative universities — reacted to the speakers and conducted themselves during the four days of meetings and talk sessions should be cause for alarm among industrial and government polluters. In a word, the students were radicalized, determined to force the polluters and their political henchmen into contrition — perhaps in a manner that will parallel protests against the Vietnam War."

proposal. He promised the student leaders \$25,000 and office space if they would try to close down their schools one day next spring for a nationwide teach-in on environmental pollution.

Nobody is willing to admit who selected the date of April twenty-second for the "Earth Day" teach-ins. That is, after all, the one-hundredth anniversary of Lenin's birth. A coincidence you think? The student activists just picked a convenient weekend? Hardly. April twenty-second falls on a Wednesday. For months the radical and Communist Press has been detailing plans to celebrate Lenin's centennial birthday with worldwide demonstrations. April twenty-second is as familiar a date to these people as Washington's Birthday is to real Americans. The selection of this date as "Earth Day" provides an excellent indication of who is running the campus ecology movement.

I telephoned the Teach-In's national coordinator, Denis Hayes, to ask him how April twenty-second happened to be selected for the ecology festivities. Mr. Hayes, late of Harvard's Graduate School of Government, had obviously memorized his answer: "It also happens to be William Shakespeare's birthday, Queen Elizabeth's birthday, Maryanna Kaufman's birthday and her Aunt Ann's birthday, but I am sure that none of those entered into Gaylord Nelson's thoughts when he and the steering committee or whoever it was chose that date."

Mr. Hayes should avoid lying about matters so easily checked. The date settled upon as the natal day of William Shakespeare is April 23, 1564; Queen Elizabeth was born on April 21, 1926. Which leads one to suspect that even Hayes' friends Maryanna Kaufman and her aunt (if they exist) might well have been born on some Friday the thirteenth for all he knows. What else do you suppose Mr. Hayes lies about?

The sponsors of Earth Day have already prepared a 367-page manifesto, published by Ballentine, called *The Environmental Handbook*. The sponsoring steering committee, according to Hayes, includes Gaylord Nelson, Far Left Republican Pete McCloskey of California, Sidney Howe of the Conservation Foundation, Paul Ehrlich of Stanford, Harold Jordoff of the University of Wisconsin, and three students. *The Environmental Handbook* is totally Marxist in orientation and contains excerpts from the writings of all the key environment radicals. According to columnist Paul Scott, Earth Day already has the backing of Walter Reuther's United Auto Workers and "several of the big tax-free liberal foundations."

This ecology business has a particular attraction for hippies, who live in filth but claim to love the beauties of nature. According to Professor Paul Ehrlich, a good deal of the success of the ecology revolution is to be attributed to the "much despised 'hippie' movement . . . a movement wrapped up in Zen Buddhism, physical love and a disdain for material wealth. It is small wonder that our society is horrified at hippies' behavior — it goes against our most cherished religious and ethical ideas."

The pseudo-philosophy which attracts hippies to champion the "Green Revolution" is projected in their anthem *This Is The Age Of Aquarius*, from the hip-tease show, *Hair*. The hippie subculture is very big on astrology, and the astrologers tell us that we have left the 2,000-year "Age of Pisces" and have entered the "Age of Aquarius." The hippies interpret this as an end to the tiresome "work ethic" of the age of Christianity and the beginning of the age of collectivism. As Vera Reed declares in *Towards Aquarius*:

Up to now the most valuable factor to evolve in world states is the immense fusion of peoples created by the United States of

America and the United States [sic] of Soviet Russia . . . The contribution of the U.S.S.R. . . is more immediately progressive and valuable. In face of strenuous opposition from the rest of the world [sic] Russia has had the vision to create a new order more in line with the symbolism of Aquarius than any so far attempted . . . From Russia the Aquarian note of hope rings crystal clear and from her may come a yet finer expression of human progress.

Rod Chase of Liberation News Service (the underground equivalent of Associated Press) tells us:

The Aquarius is humanity in distribution. Aquarians want everybody to do his own thing. Aquarians can be so commune minded that they sometimes believe that the home and the family should be abandoned and the children should be reared by the state.

Chase also says that "Orwell's 1984, an Aquarian prophecy, is likely to be fulfilled. Privacy and individuality will vanish. [*How this squares with "do your own thing" Chase doesn't explain*] . . . Aquarians often see the whole world as a commune. Boundaries to them are arbitrary and archaic. Wendell Willkie's One World is characteristically Aquarian. And then they say we are likely to have another revolution in late 1970 — I would say by summer 1970 or in 1971 when . . . Uranus will be on America's Saturn and Libra. The Uranus-Saturn conjunction is an aspect of tremendous upheaval."

Ah yes, astrology, ecology, and Communism. The antipathy to Christianity, capitalism, and patriotism is written in the stars. This is *some* con game!

What particularly bugs these self-worshipping Humanists is Genesis 1:28,

which states: "And God said unto them, Be fruitful and multiply, and replenish the earth, and subdue it; and have dominion over the fish of the sea, and over the fowl of the air, and over every thing that moveth upon the earth." In "The Historical Roots Of Our Ecologic Crisis," Professor Lynn White of U.C.L.A. maintains:

What we do about ecology depends on our ideas of the man-nature relationship. More science and more technology are not going to get us out of the present ecologic crisis until we find a new religion, or rethink our old one. The beatniks who are the basic revolutionaries of our time, show a sound instinct in their affinity for Zen Buddhism . . .

Hence we shall continue to have a worsening ecologic crisis until we reject the Christian axiom that nature has no reason for existence save to serve man. (The Environmental Handbook, Pp. 24-25.)

Stanford's Professor Ehrlich, a favorite of the slick Establishment magazines, contends that in order to survive in the coming years:

. . . somehow we've got to change from a growth-oriented exploitive system to one focused on stability and conservation. Our entire system of orienting to nature must undergo a revolution. And that revolution is going to be extremely difficult to pull off, since the attitudes of Western Culture towards nature are deeply rooted in Judeo-Christian tradition . . .

Before the Christian era trees, springs, hills, streams and other objects of nature had guardian spirits. These spirits had to be approached and placated before one could safely invade their ter-

ritory. As [Lynn] White says, "By destroying pagan animism, Christianity made it possible to exploit nature in a mood of indifference to the feelings of natural objects."*

Another theme which pervades the ecology movement is the idea that "capitalism is the cause of all our pollution problems." Ignoring the fact that much of our pollution is the fault of ineffective government sewage and trash disposal, the Lenin Day *Environmental Handbook* declares boldly: "Pollution is somebody's profit." Lynn Sherr of Associated Press observes:

Indeed, to the young ecologists, capitalism is Ecology Enemy No. 1. They criticize the growth motive — America's annual attempt to push the Gross National Product higher and higher.

Writing in Harvard's radical *Old Mole*, ecology activist Tom Gallagher claims:

One of the functions of the left in the United States is to show how environmental destruction is based upon a system of human exploitation and how only the abolition of capitalism will provide the probability for the preservation of the earth as an inhabitable place....

Ecological destruction on a global scale is a direct product of American imperialism....

Not until imperialism is defeated in the third world and is replaced by socialism at home can we begin to deal with the problem of the environment in a rational way. At this point in history the ecologists' best friends are the Viet Cong.

The idea that radical socialism is the cure for environmental problems is absolutely absurd. The United States of Russia [sic], the Aquarian ideal, has

pollution problems as extensive as any in America. Victor Zorza reports in the *Los Angeles Times* of February 15, 1970, that even *Pravda* has confessed: "we are turning the atmosphere of our major industrial regions and large cities into a dump for poisonous industrial wastes." Despite the fact that the U.S.S.R. has only five percent as many motor vehicles as the United States, that Aquarian Paradise has a severe air pollution problem both because its technology is so far behind ours and because of Communist indifference to the quality of the environment. Victor Zorza notes of the Soviet Union:

... new factories are still being built without any purification plant, for water or smoke. Indeed where smoke filters are provided, they often [says Pravda] "work badly, or not at all." More than half of the Soviet towns discharge their sewage, untreated, directly into nearby waters.

Clearly the efforts of the "new environmentalists" to create ecology propaganda for the purpose of shoving more socialism down the throat of America are ludicrous. But, while the radical ecologists sow Marxist propaganda below, the politicians above are preparing to reap the socialist crop. There is no secret about all

*Part of this anti-Christian attitude of the leading ecologists is reflected by U.C. Berkeley instructor Clifford Humphrey in an attack on Christmas trees. Honest! Humphrey, who has worked closely in anti-American activities with Communists like Bettina Aptheker and Peter Camejo, emphasizes in *Politics Of Ecology*: "I want to mention one specific consumer habit that has outlived whatever usefulness it may have had — Christmas trees." In December, Berkeley radicals actually held ceremonial burial services for Christmas trees. It is interesting to recall that one of the first moves after the Communists' November Revolution in Russia was the banning of Christmas trees (*100 Things You Should Know About Communism And Religion*, Report of the House Committee on Un-American Activities, Page 8.)

of this. It's right out in the open. Stuart Loory of the *Los Angeles Times* notes:

Mr. Nixon talked in his State of the Union message last month about developing a "national growth policy" to make certain that new progress is not overwhelmed by new problems. This implies the kind of centralized planning that has long been anathema to the American Way and which has proved economically destructive in the Soviet Union.

But perhaps — with all the beer cans and soda bottles and waste paper and smog piling up in the environment — the time for such planning has come.

The doomsday environmentalists are even using ecology as a ploy to propagandize Americans about the need for world government. "Nations are such an artificial construct from an ecological point of view," says *The Environmental Handbook*, "that any further energies poured into them are almost certain to do more long-term harm than good. Nations . . . must be phased out as quickly as possible and replaced with tribal or regional autonomous economies . . ." In its issue of February 5, 1970, the San Francisco underground newspaper *Good Times* assures us: "Ecology is the issue by which we unite all Americans, and probably Russians too." Not surprisingly, the United Nations has developed a sudden interest in environmental problems.

Not only has the ecology movement been perverted into a collectivist One World movement, but many of its most prestigious spokesmen are total regressivists. Rudy Abramson writes in the *Los Angeles Times* of February 15, 1970:

Some of the environmental activism undoubtedly results from a revulsion to technology, the military, even science. It is a way of

crying out against the domination of computers, automobiles, telephones and credit cards. It is a search for the past.

What the radical ecologists are calling for is an abandonment of our high standards of living and a return to the primitive drudgery from which our ancestors worked so hard to escape. In a chapter in *The Environmental Handbook* entitled "Suggestions Toward An Ecological Platform," Keith Murray declares:

The runaway U.S. growth economy must be stabilized to halt the destruction of the world resource base before we choke in the waste products of our affluence. There should be a thorough re-assessment and reversal of unlimited economic growth as a national goal. The first and most crucial step is a guaranteed income, to break the compulsory link between jobs and income that has been a principal stimulus to growth-manship.

Ways must be found to curb the U.S. appetite for goods . . . (Pp. 318-319.)

The poverty-stricken, over whom these same Leftists have spilled buckets of crocodile tears, may not be entirely overjoyed if these people are able to put an end to the only real hope of escaping poverty. Naturally the hippies and revolutionaries would love to be supported by a guaranteed annual income while they work to overthrow civilization.

Professor Paul Ehrlich says in his best-selling *Population Bomb*:

Working people should insist on a reduction in working hours People would then have more time to repair their own appliances, grow some of their own food, and mend

their own clothes, rather than having to pay others . . .

*But in the long run, it is questionable whether large factories can be scaled down and decentralized without dismantling the corporate investment and profit system. (Reprinted in *The Environmental Handbook*, Pp. 245-246.)*

One wonders how many hours Dr. Ehrlich has spent lately mending a dollar T-shirt, or whether the average worker would not prefer to work another twenty minutes on the job to buy a new one rather than spend an hour with thread and needle repairing his tattered underwear. And how would you like to repair your color TV set?

Much of this regressivism is simply a pretext for an attack on free enterprise. Gary Snyder is a self-professed Communist who was recently featured in a laudatory article in *Look* magazine. The author of this little screed, who failed to mention Comrade Snyder's advocacy of Communism, explains the game:

If everyone in this country refused to buy a new car in 1969, the American economy would collapse. That would be enough to do it all in. That's sort of like an unimaginable utopian kind of revolution, but it's absolutely true. By consumers refusing to consume, you destroy the whole roots of the capitalist economy overnight.

The automobile is a particular target of the environment radicals, many of whom drive to their demonstrations in new sports cars paid for by their capitalist parents. Students at San Jose State College collected \$2,500 earlier this year to buy a new Ford Maverick for burial. Two radical clergymen read funeral eulogies, concluding with "ashes to ashes and rust to rust." Kenneth Cantor maintains in *The Environmental Handbook*:

The automobile and the American public are locked in a life and death struggle. The car is robbing the American people of their land, air, minds, and their very lives . . . Programs aimed at reduction of automobile usage to one-tenth of the present levels must receive high priority.

Paul Ehrlich recommends on Page 249 of the *Lenin Day Handbook* that, "to solve the smog problem, we should immediately pass a law that no one own a car bigger than a Volkswagen . . . New cars are bad ecology . . ."

Air pollution caused by the internal combustion engine is a genuine problem of great magnitude, but the environment radicals do not want technological solutions to that problem. "The automobile industry's recent announcement of pollution control programs for the private automobile merely prolongs the agony of the private transportation system," argues Professor Ehrlich. You see, these boys want to take away your car so *government* can own our transportation system.

Another facet of the ecology movement closely inter-woven with the anti-capitalist mentality is its anti-urbanism. In his widely reprinted article "The Four Changes," Peace and Freedom Party radical Clifford Humphrey predicts:

Some communities can establish themselves in backwater rural areas and flourish . . . Ultimately cities will exist only as joyous tribal gatherings and fairs, to dissolve after a few weeks.

While preparing to dismantle urban areas, the radical ecologists intend to manipulate the cities politically. Ehrlich says, "We must now begin to integrate ecological reasoning into all community and political organizing for social change." He further advocates forming tenants' unions and "Community Devel-

opment Corporations" — which amount to nothing less than soviets — to confront local businesses and city hall. Then the author of *The Population Bomb* declares:

The most effective mechanism for obtaining community control of the environment is to organize around specific issues in neighborhoods, getting media coverage of newsworthy events and building energy to the point of an implicit threat of the possibility of direct action and confrontation in order to negotiate for community control. The community development corporation [soviets] through its self-governing capability will be able to ritualize and maintain whatever control is taken from downtown. (The Environmental Handbook, Page 251.)

Dr. Ehrlich has some quaint ideas for these soviets he wants to impose on the cities. He wants them to "freeze downtown highrise development. There is no need for any new highrise structures . . . We don't need more shelter, rather we must learn to use our existing buildings more efficiently, to justly redistribute our shelter resources. No more new suburbs should be built until we are prepared to build semi-rural self-sufficient communities from re-claimed, rather than virgin building materials . . ."

Also, says the learned Professor from Stanford, we must:

Close off streets for orchards, vegetable gardens, parks, market places. Close the city center to private automobiles . . . Groups [soviets] should organize to take down fences separating yards to make truck gardens and neighborhood sheds for storing shared [property of the collective farm] tools . . . Experimental living groups should construct their shel-

ters from used building materials (church windows [sic], old car parts — hoods and trunks make beautiful domes) . . . (The Environmental Handbook, Page 243.)

The radical ecologists are arguing for replacement of modern urban civilization with rural communes. *Anarchos Magazine* maintains in an article called "Ecology And Revolutionary Thought" that "the factory floor must yield to horticulture and gardening." *The Environmental Handbook* insists we must accept "the inherent aptness of communal life." And, it continues: "It is hard to even begin to gauge how much a complication of possessions, the notions of 'my and mine,' stand between us and a true, clear, liberated way of seeing the world."

Clifford Humphrey comments in "The Four Changes" on the natural allies of the ecological commune movement:

It seems evident that there are throughout the world certain social and religious forces which have worked through history toward an ecologically and culturally enlightened state of affairs. Let these be encouraged: Gnostics, hip Marxists, Teilhard, de' Chardin Catholics, Druids, Taoists, Biologists, Witches, Yogins, Bhikkus, Quakers, Sufis, Tibetans, Zens, Shamans, Bushmen, American Indians, Polynesians, Anarchists, Alchemists . . . the list is long. All primitive cultures, all communal and ashram movements.

The "back to nature" tribal communes are no joke to these people. The movement has historical parallels with the teachings of Rousseau and Weishaupt, and with the pre-revolutionary Nihilists in Russia. The head guru of this movement is Gary Snyder, whose book *The Earth Household* has been referred to by the Communist S.D.S.'s Tod Gitlin as a "green arsenal." Snyder is an admitted

Communist who maintains that "political repression" by the "fascist police," combined with ecological disaster, will make living in rural communes necessary for revolutionaries. According to Snyder:

The country is revolutionary territory. . . . What Castro and Che later had to say about the Cuban experience was that you can't trust the city comrades or rely on the city comrades for anything and you just give up depending on them for anything because they'll never understand the situation of the guerrilla camp in the mountains. . . . Also Castro and Che felt that the guerrilla camp provides real training in being a communist.

In pointing out the military implications of the ecology commune movement, Comrade Snyder notes:

*What if the Pentagon had to deal with thousands of small tribes scattered across the American landscape? Tribes interiorally gentle but exteriorally capable of good offense and defense. Knowing Indians' techniques and capable of Indian mobility. The suburban whites thus find themselves surrounded — in fact opposed simultaneously from front and rear. The strategic situation changes so much that possibly few shots will have to be fired.**

During the past year a large number of these radical communes have been estab-

lished in the Western States. Many are comprised of hippies (and nothing polutes an area like flooding it with hippies) who want to get into the country where they can grow marijuana. Others are guerrilla bands preparing for revolution. A group in Northern California calling itself L.A.R.G.O. (Liberation Army Revolutionary Group Organizations of the National Liberation Front) notified the Mendocino County Board of Supervisors on March 11, 1970, that as of March 15, 1970, a state of war would exist and The Revolution will have begun. On March 13, 1970, Charles W. Bates of the Federal Bureau of Investigation in San Francisco sent the following message to law enforcement authorities throughout all of Northern California:

Request for information re black commune [sic]. Information has been developed from an informant of unknown reliability that there is a black commune located a few hundred miles north of San Francisco consisting of thirty to fifty male Negroes with no children allowed. This commune is allegedly located in a mountain area near a swift moving river in a densely wooded area inaccessible by helicopter and can be reached only by road and any vehicle traveling the road would be under observation by members of the commune for some distance prior to the arrival at the site [sic]. Members except for a chosen few are transported in and out of the site blindfolded in either trucks or vans. Informant indicated there was a small town where food was purchased for the commune. The members of the commune according to the informant possess and maintain a quantity of firearms and dynamite and they carry out paramilitary exercises on a daily basis. Another commune consisting of both Negroes and whites is sup-

*Chicago Seed, August 1969. On August 30, 1969, a "People's Conference — A Gathering of the Tribes" was held in Berkeley featuring a tape-recorded address by Eldridge Cleaver, who brags that he is part of "the world Communist movement." Tribes attending included: the Marxist Peace and Freedom Party's Ecology Action, Red Mountain Tribe, Radical Student Union, Black Panther Party, Third World Liberation Front, and the American Committee for Solidarity with the Vietnamese People.

posed to exist a short distance from the above commune and several members are believed to be federal and local fugitives

The ecology movement is not only deeply involved in revolution, it is up to its neck in efforts to control population. The leader of the over-population hysteria is Paul Ehrlich, author of *The Population Bomb*, president of a group calling itself Zero Population Growth, and recently appointed as an associate at the radical Marxist Center for the Study of Democratic Institutions. According to Ehrlich, civilization will during the next decade collapse in famine as millions of people starve to death. Ehrlich is not especially concerned about the population growth of Asia, Africa, or South America. What bothers him is the growth of families in the United States. "Each American child," he says, "is 50 times more of a burden on the environment than each Indian child." He claims this is because the wicked United States, with only 5.7 percent of the world's population, consumes forty percent of the world's production of natural resources. The answer, he argues, is to stabilize our population and level our standard of living down to that of the rest of the world.

Joining Ehrlich in this push is the entire ecology crowd, including such Establishmentarians as Robert S. McNamara, President of the World Bank, who has proclaimed: "The threat of unmanageable population pressure is very much like the threat of nuclear war." President Nixon has even announced: "One of the most serious challenges to human destiny in the last third of this century will be growth of the population." Dr. Lee DuBridge, the President's science advisor, recently told U.N.E.S.C.O.: "Every human institution, school, university, church, family, government — and international agencies such as U.N.E.S.C.O. — should set [population control] as its prime task. Our spacecraft called the

earth is reaching its capacity. Can we not invent a way to reduce our population growth rate to zero?"

The "people regulators" have devised some ideas for population control that would make Big Brother blanch. The same "Liberals" who a year ago were defending the "rights" of Welfare recipients to breed themselves weary at the taxpayer's expense are now demanding federal controls over the right of the middle-class to reproduce. Hippies are crying "Freedom for drugs but not for babies." Scientists like Ehrlich are ridiculing the idea that American families have a right to decide how many children they should have.

Oliver Finnigan, Professor Ehrlich's cohort in Zero Population Growth, recently told an audience: "Legislation can affect birth rates." The *Berkeley Gazette* reports that he actually "used as an example, Eastern [Communist] Europe, where nations have been able to slow population growth through strong government controls." What is good enough for the slaves in the Aquarian Paradise is good enough for the American middle-class.

Professor H. Bentley Glass of Johns Hopkins University has a plan for all of this, described in the *Los Angeles Times* of June 4, 1964, as follows:

A man and woman who planned to marry would visit a "genetic clinic" where chemical tests would be given to show if they were likely to have defective children If they passed they would be issued a marriage license. The right to the first child would be automatic, and the family would even get a tax exemption.

A second child would be licensed too, although there would not be a second exemption. Instead of gaining an exemption for a third child, even if licensed, a couple would have \$600 added to their taxable income.

Dr. Glass said penalties for producing an unlicensed baby would be severe. He suggested sterilization as a punishment to fit the crime.

The Associated Press carried the following on September 4, 1969:

A Washington psychologist and sex therapist advocated Wednesday that the world's nations remove "the right to reproduce" from their people as the only solution to the global population explosion.

Dr. Robert H. Harper, addressing the 77th annual convention of the American Psychological Association said practical maneuvers to assure compliance might be available within a few years by such means as placing temporary sterilizing chemicals in food and water supplies. Under such a compulsory system, he said, "The privilege to reproduce could then be granted and the rules governing such privilege could be worked out in whatever wholly democratic ways people would want."

*"But," he added, "the original removal of the right to reproduce would have to be done whether or not it was with the individual's approval and consent."**

Numerous other environmentalists have proposed variations on, and combinations of, the above themes. The one thing they all have in common is government control of human reproduction. Ehrlich advocates free distribution by government of the pill, voluntary legal abortion, a tax on children in excess of two per family, heavy taxes on cribs, diapers, toys, etc., and bonuses or tax exemptions for delayed marriages, childless marriages, and sterilization. He calls for a "responsibility prize" for men and women who allow themselves to be sterilized.

Many of the ecology groups have actually called for a major reduction in population. The Lenin Day *Environmental Handbook* declares: "The goal would be half of the present world population, or less." Just what form such genocide should take is not suggested. Perhaps President Nixon has some ideas on this score. Holmes Alexander writes in a column titled "Nixon All Gung-Ho For Birth Control, Asks Legislation":

President Nixon is the first chief executive to send a message to Congress on the undisguised subject of Population, meaning that the birth rate is a national burden and not an asset

As the Nixon programs for the decade continue to unfold, it's very evident that he is trying to shape the whole ball of wax. He is the first President in history with a deliberate plan to decrease, to decelerate, to deflate, to depopulate, and to decontaminate — all at once

In his programs . . . the President seems to be trying to induce an approach toward zero-increase in births†

Yet, of all the aspects of the environmentalist programs there is no bigger fraud than the idea that America is threatened with destruction through over-population. Dr. Donald Bogue, a respected

*Conservatives are concerned at the fact that the two most prominent organizations working in the field of population control are the Ford and Rockefeller Foundations. See *Congressional Record*, December 29, 1969, Page 11017. John D. Rockefeller III has already recommended that the U.N. establish a "population commissioner." (U.P.I., May 25, 1969.)

†One indication that the population propaganda is a Leftist ploy is that none of these concerned ecologists has suggested ending the monetary incentives given to women on Welfare to produce illegitimate children. Indeed, President Nixon's expanded Welfare programs would further stimulate subsidized bastardy.

demographer at the University of Chicago, notes that population in the United States is leveling off and predicts it will settle at about 220 million. As Professor Ansley Coale of Princeton observes:

More than half of the counties in the United States have lost population in each of the last two intercensal decades. The density of population is 4.5 times greater in France, 10 times greater in the United Kingdom and 30 times greater in the Netherlands than in the United States; yet pollution, traffic jams, and delinquency are no worse in those countries than here. Even if our population rose to a billion, its average density would not be very high by European standards. (Congressional Record, October 20, 1969, Page S12806.)

The fact is that we are *not* overpopulated. Professor Karl Brandt of Stanford has spoken of our serious underpopulation "by any standards we can reasonably apply. This country will not be overpopulated with 350,000,000 or many more people and will have a much higher standard of living."* Dr. James H. Ford commented in the *Los Angeles Times* of April 2, 1969:

Some "over-population" pundits talk, in their usual hysterical manner, about "standing room only" somewhere in the future. This term might represent some sort of absolute — even though a rather unrealistic and improbable one. Even if the present world population were 4 billion persons, simple arithmetic will show that we could give each person a two-foot square plot for "standing" and we could put the whole of the earth's population within a plot 30 miles square.

The relation between population and poverty is equally absurd. As Diana Sheets, an outstanding young researcher, has noted: "Overpopulation is commonly accepted as the cause for the great poverty of the people of India. However, India has five hundred people per square mile while Japan has seven hundred, Holland eight hundred, and Monaco forty-six thousand. This means Monaco has ninety-two times as many people per square mile as India. Yet, one never hears of these countries being overpopulated or starving."

Virtually every ecology "expert" is now predicting massive famines for America within only a few years. This prediction is totally debunked by the facts. Professor Karl Brandt (who you may be sure does not get one one-hundredth the opportunities to speak on college campuses as does his Stanford colleague, the radical Dr. Ehrlich), comments:

... I reject as illegitimate and invalid the argument that the accelerating pace of population growth is over-taking the rate of growth of food production and that therefore disastrous famine of abhorrent proportions is almost inevitable unless population growth is throttled.

As I shall prove, the famine projections are neither a sound nor a legitimate argument for population control because the world's existing agricultural capacity gives abundant leeway to produce adequate food supplies for the growing population. Therefore, using famine alarm to justify support of government action toward birth control can only weaken the initiative to promote recognition of the importance of responsible parenthood.

*From the *National Observer*, July 15, 1963, as quoted by the Reverend Rushdoony in his authoritative *The Myth Of Over-Population*, Craig Press, 1969.

Dr. Brandt goes on to say that in recent years some of the most densely populated areas of the world have increased food production beyond all expectations and against the worst odds. He notes that since the end of World War II the world's technical, and economically feasible, potential for food production has expanded at *more* than a geometrical rate. Even the United Nation's Food and Agriculture Organization (F.A.O.) has been forced to confirm the position of Dr. Brandt. In an announcement appearing in the *Los Angeles Times* of February 12, 1970, that U.N. organization revealed: "The food problem facing the world in the near future is more likely to be surpluses than starvation."

Technological advancements have put the lie to neo-Malthusian claims. "The underdeveloped areas of the world, where the danger had been foreseen, increased their agricultural production by 5% in 1967 and 2% in 1968, with estimates for the year just ended showing a continuation of the trend," admits the U.N.'s F.A.O. Food production even in "underdeveloped" areas was growing faster than population. As Stanford's Professor Brandt concludes:

If famine should occur, neither scarcity of natural nor man-made resources nor the rate of population growth offer valid excuses. Even natural calamities like drought, floods, or pests do not necessarily cause famine in any properly organized society.

*If famine should occur in some countries — as it well may — it will be primarily "government made" by policies similar to those that initially resulted in the starvation of 5 million people and have prevented for nearly 40 years any proper expansion of food production in Soviet Russia and have cost uncounted millions of lives in Red China.**

Actually, American politicians have done everything possible during the past thirty years to limit our *over-supply* of food. If we ever do have a famine in America it will be because of socialism and government controls. As the Reverend Rushdoony writes in *The Myth Of Over-Population*:

... socialism always creates ultimately an imbalance between the number of people living and their food supply which results in hunger or famine. There is in this sense therefore always a problem of over-population under socialism. Hunger is chronic and endemic to socialism.

Who has to be reminded that Russia, which before the Revolution *exported* a vast surplus of grain, must now import wheat?

Of course, the professional sowers of environmental despair disdain the free market and capitalist technology as providers of solutions to our problems because they are promoting socialism as the only answer. Actually, our technology is the best hope for ending pollution and continuing to expand the food supply. Great strides are already being made toward solving these problems.

Innovations in the field of agriculture have been enormous. Such advances allow milk, fowl, and egg production in indoor conditions on a scale unimaginable only a few years ago. Development of improved fertilizers has allowed much more food production on far less land. Vastly improved seed grains have multiplied yields tremendously.

Our free technology can easily meet the demands of population growth! As the *Los Angeles Times* recently reported: "Within a short time, you'll be able to buy for five dollars all the protein you'll

**The Freeman*, January 1967. For information on how our government may be creating a massive famine, see Dan P. Van Gorder, III *Fares The Land*, Western Islands, 1966.

need for a year." (That breakthrough is with a protein that comes from a fish-powder concentrate.) Plans are already being made to grow fish in underwater "factories" like chickens. Scotland is even now using the warm water produced by power plants to stimulate the growth of fish and shell fish.

The automobile is, of course, the chief polluter of the air; but technical breakthroughs have already been made in the production of less toxic gasolines and auto pollution-control devices. Because of this, the *Los Angeles Times* was able to report on March 16, 1970:

Southlanders may be breathing clean air — at least air free of auto emissions — as much as three years earlier than originally anticipated.

Meanwhile, scientists are hard at work to develop electric, turbine, or steam-driven cars. Corporations are at work developing techniques for recovering pollutants (which are, after all, lost resources) now being pumped into the air by factory chimneys. Literally dozens of top business concerns are at work on processes to remove pollutants from the water and turn them into profits.

The radical ecologists claim the profit motive is responsible for the pollution of America. It is true that some businesses have polluted air and water in their search for the cheapest way to dispose of wastes, but the answer to this problem is to use our technology to turn those wastes into profits. The fact is that much of our pollution is caused by city-operated trash and sewage disposals, which have usurped the field and precluded the opportunity for private initiative to find a way to re-use

trash and garbage. A *Japanese* concern has discovered a way to turn trash into building blocks, and a unit is even now being built in Muskegon, Michigan, to turn sewage into valuable fertilizer.* These problems *can* be solved without Police State methods. According to the *Chicago Tribune*, "On a percentage basis, business is already spending 10 times more money [to stop pollution] than the really big polluters of our environment — the municipal governments."

Sanity and balance are needed to solve our environmental problems. Ecology isn't a moral crusade, it is a science — a science which is being perverted by an organized campaign to propagandize Americans into accepting government land grabs, bureaucratic population control, and a further proliferation of government bureaus to manage every conceivable phase of our environment. The legitimate purpose of government is the protection of life and property. Since pollution is an attack on another man's life and property, conservatives will support private law suits and local legislation to put an end to it. Only in this way can these problems be dealt with in anywhere near a simple and efficient manner. But this is *not* the way it is going to be handled unless Americans wake up to the fact that they are being propagandized and used by a well organized army of phony environmentalists, self-seeking bureaucrats, and radical politicians.

America has major problems, but the solutions are not the ones the environmental ideologues are talking about. These people are part of the problem, not part of the solution. Many of them don't give a farthing about the problems of pollution, but are using this issue as a pretense to advance Marxist political schemes. The biggest pollution problem we face is the pollution by the collectivist Establishment and Marxist revolutionaries of the minds of a once thoroughly independent and free people. ■ ■

*For numerous examples of how elimination of wastes and pollution can be turned into profits see "Use Pollution To Benefit Mankind," by J. Leon Potter, *Congressional Record*, June 16, 1969, Page E4962.