

# ENVIRONMENT

## Doomsday And Dictatorship

Gary Allen, a graduate of Stanford University, is author of *Communist Revolution In The Streets*; Richard Nixon: *The Man Behind The Mask*; Nixon's *Palace Guard*; and, *None Dare Call It Conspiracy* — a sensational new best-seller with 6 million copies already in print. 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.

■ IF THERE is anything in America today which is sacred, it is ecology. Who dares to be against Mother Nature? Ecology has replaced Civil Rights, poverty, and the Vietnam War as the reigning cause célèbre of the underdone activists. Instead of picketing munitions manufacturers, the campus radicals are now waving their signs in front of detergent companies and real-estate developers. As if on cue, down came the Vietcong banners and up went the green and white flag of ecology, which now flaps just under Old Glory and the state flag at many of our nation's schools. The ecology fanatics have become the new abolitionists; gimlet-eyed, uncompromising, and often ruthless in their tactics, they are the new centurions of the Left.

How do you suppose such a vast, powerful, and increasingly successful movement sprang up virtually overnight?

Obviously the Establishment has the ability to turn on the money and publicity to build the movements that serve its purposes. And the Establishment's mass

media have pumped up the ecology balloon until it is now bigger than a Zeppelin. Two years ago the machines of mass misinformation began touting the ecology issue with propaganda like the following from *Time*: "The environment may well be the gut issue that can unify a polarized nation in the 1970's." The Hearst press saw it as a movement "that could unite the generations." The *New York Times* solemnly predicted that ecology "will replace Vietnam as the major issue with students."

Soon *Time* and *Newsweek* had added an environment department to their weekly hustle, and one could hardly pick up a general-interest magazine without coming across a doomsday article on ecology febrile enough to make Chicken Little blush. Television was a natural for maximizing this hysteria, depicting dead fish lining a polluted stream and eye-irritating smoke belching from the smokestacks of bloated capitalism.

The tactic was to take legitimate problems and inflate them into predictions of impending disaster, mixing a modicum of truth with gross exaggerations, false conclusions, and plain and fancy fright peddling. The average American was simply not equipped to separate truth from half-truth, to determine what is valid and what is hogwash, in the claims of the ecology crusaders. In short, the public was largely at the mercy of what Professor Ross McKinney of the University of Kansas has properly dubbed the "environmental con man."

Ever since time began, Dr. McKinney explains, man has been enchanted by magic; the prospect of something for



nothing. The name of the game at the moment is "ecology" and elimination of "pollution," for which, of course, business and industry are exclusively blamed. "Each day brings new stories," Professor McKinney notes, "of environmental horrors. Each new story must be worse than the last in order to get even a measure of attention."

The "environmental con men" have been promoted by the usual Establishment hustlers to form what has been called The Disaster Lobby, turning highly involved and complicated ecological problems into a mindless crusade. John Chamberlain writes of the anti-pollution movement that "its supporters for the most part are whim-ridden people who think the cure for everything is to conduct a march on the nearest state house. They rush off on crusades on the basis of insufficient knowledge, oblivious to the scientific proposition that any experiment in a new — and theoretically safer — direction demands its controls if we are not to substitute a cure that is worse than the disease."

As Dr. Samuel Aldrich points out in *The Freeman*: "We are experiencing an unusual phenomenon. A substantial number of people, especially young people, believe that we are on the verge of catastrophe unless we *immediately* stop many forms of pollution . . . Since a lot of people hold that view, it should not surprise us that some drastic measures to curb pollution are being suggested. Desperate persons are susceptible to radical ideas."

That is what The Disaster Lobby is all about: *Desperate persons are susceptible to radical ideas*. Once more the Establishment collectivists have been able to promote an issue which bridges generation, economic, social, and political gaps. Millions of Americans who regard themselves as moderately Conservative, and who oppose in general the philosophy of socialism, are now buying it step by step under the guise of protecting the environ-

ment. And the Establishment *Insiders* are well aware that in ecology they have a new political weapon made to order for their use. As columnist Anthony Harrigan puts it:

*Many of the self-styled consumer and environment advocates, I am convinced, aren't interested in specific remedies for product deficiencies or environmental problems. In my judgment, they want political power. They want a top-to-bottom takeover of industry by Big Government. They want nationalization, confiscation — call it what you will — indeed, full-scale, totalitarian control over private property.*

*As I see it, the radical liberals involved in consumer and environmental issues are hungry for power — power over people and companies.*

Having read the Harris poll, which reported that seventy percent of the American people are concerned about ecology, America's politicians have responded vigorously. The environment con men have been energetic and effective lobbyists for ecological "controls" at the federal, state, and local levels. And candidates casting the line of radical ecology were highly successful in last November's elections. Thomas L. Kimball, executive vice president of the National Wildlife Federation, one of the country's largest ecology groups, cited the voting results as "a clear mandate from the people."

The ecology bandwagon is now rolling downhill under a full head of steam, and it is well past time that we inquired as to who fired the boiler and where it is taking us.

Searching to discover who fuels such movements soon gets as repetitious as the lyrics of "Woodman Spare That Tree." Invariably one finds the same clique of Establishment *Insiders* operating through



tax-exempt foundations. Not surprisingly, the ubiquitous Ford Foundation is up to its red eyeballs in the environment movement through its Resources For The Future, Inc. Laurance Rockefeller established the Conservation Foundation, and is chairman of the Citizens Advisory Committee on Environmental Quality. He also runs the American Conservation Association. Brother Nelson Rockefeller has hired a friendly ghost to produce a book titled *Our Environment Can Be Saved* — a variation on the doom and gloom theory in which the New York Governor maintains that if the government is given enough power and money we can all be saved from environmental holocaust. Rockefeller cousin Robert Winthrop divides his time between the board of directors of the Rockefeller-controlled First National City Bank and the North American Wildlife Foundation.

Jon Margolis notes in the March 1970 issue of *Esquire* that this ecology business "is not a poor-man's movement." As Margolis says, "the conservationists... are not steel workers or assembly-line workers or small farmers or hotel clerks. They are Wall Street lawyers and junior faculty and editors and writers and corporate vice-presidents..."

Once again we have a movement in which the foot soldiers are radicalized students, hippies, starry-eyed idealists, and shallow, phony "Liberals" from the suburbs who had their minds laundered in Poly Sci One at Ping Pong State. But the generals — as in the peace, anti-poverty, and Civil Rights movements — are the penthouse plutocrats who are using it, as they used the others, to acquire more and more control over potential competitors as they acquire political power for themselves. Those who do not understand that socialism is not a "share the wealth" system, but a "control of the people" system, must find it ironic that the malefactors of great wealth are promoting a program said to be designed to destroy... the malefactors of great wealth.

The super-rich *Insiders* of the Establishment are, of course, in a position to hire energetic and talented environment con men to run their crusade for them. One of the most famous and powerful of these is Ralph Nader. Mr. Nader is best known for his efforts in the often closely related consumerism movement, but he is also a major power in environmentalism. Ralph Nader has had a better press than Mao Tse-tung. He was described by *Time* magazine in its cover story for December 12, 1969, as "an almost legendary crusader... the self-appointed and unpaid guardian of the interests of 204 million United States consumers... a folk hero, a symbol of constructive protest against the status quo." Thanks to this sort of buildup, says a member of the staff of Virginia Knauer, special assistant to the President for consumer affairs: "The credibility of that man is such that even if Jesus Christ said something was right and Ralph said it was wrong, the public would believe Ralph."

Ralph Nader now has 125 tax-free foundations through which he directs 4,000 radicals known as Nader's Raiders. Many ex-Raiders are turning up on government staffs, including that of Richard Nixon's domestic czar, Caspar W. Weinberger.

A reporter for *Hard Times*, a radical underground sheet that originally carried Nader's name on the masthead, assures us that Ralph and his legal assistants and associates are the big bureaucrats of the future, working "towards a new definition of a governmental system, in which 'lawyers' are a commanding elite. Nader's fundamental task is not so much to protect consumers as it is to organize his own constituency, the legal profession, for the assumption of power in a post-industrial society." In New Left radical jargon, the "post-industrial society" is a "people's participatory democracy" — Aesopian language for the Communist state.

Ralph Nader is a Marxist. There is no



other term which accurately describes his economic philosophy or his political goals. In September of 1970, Associated Press reported: "Consumer advocate Ralph Nader has proposed that corporations that abuse the public interest should be transferred to public trusteeship and their officers sent to jail." Nader would also require all corporations to operate under a federal license, subject to revocation by federal authority — which in turn would be controlled by the Rockefellers and other Establishment *Insiders*. If given Congressional approval, this would be a giant step towards government control of the means of production. Which is as concise a definition of fascism as you can find anywhere.

Nader's efforts have brought him the support of such organizations as the American Civil Liberties Union (cited by the State of California as "A transmission belt for the Communist Party") and the League for Industrial Democracy (the avowedly Marxist parent of the terrorist Students for a Democratic Society). Little wonder that Paul Rand Dixon, a former member of the Federal Trade Commission, has said of Ralph Nader: "He's preaching revolution, and I'm scared."

Yet, because of his carefully created power over public opinion, Nader has been dubbed a "fifth branch of government." *Fortune* magazine assures us: "He is chiefly responsible for the passage of at least six major laws." It was Nader who first promoted a Federal Office of Consumer Affairs — established by President Nixon on February 24, 1971, through Executive Order 11583. So powerful is he that Herbert Mitgang, a columnist for the *New York Times*, has described Mr. Nader as "the unofficial Inspector General of the United States."

Where does revolutionary Ralph Nader get the money for his activities? According to the *Indianapolis Star* of July 2, 1970, his financial angels include the Ford, Field, Carnegie, and Rockefeller

Brothers foundations. Other representatives of the downtrodden masses who bankroll Nader's Raiders include The Midas International Foundation, the New York Foundation, the New World Foundation, Chase Manhattan Bank, E.I. du Pont de Nemours, Ford Motor Company, General Electric, Mobil Oil and Refining Corporation, Standard Oil of Indiana, and David Rockefeller.

Given monetary muscle from those he is supposedly out to destroy, Nader has to know whom he is fronting for — even if many of his Raiders think they are out seeking the Holy Grail.

Given the sources of his money, the game is obvious. Nader's job is to create public "pressure from below" to be exploited by that other friend of the Rockefeller Clan, Richard Nixon, through "pressure from above," to massively increase federal control. When competitors are squeezed out, the national monopoly will be in the hands of super-rich *Insiders* like the Rockefellers, Fords, and other powers of the Establishment who will operate the dictatorship for their own purposes.

Mr. Nixon has been in on the game from the beginning. Columnist Guy Wright of the *San Francisco Examiner* observed on February 15, 1970, that President Nixon's man Robert Finch, then top bird at H.E.W., provided \$50,000 to transport campus radicals to Washington for a conference on November 11, 1969, that launched the nationwide ecology push. It was at this meeting that the original Earth Day was established. If you ascribe any meaning to the fact that these budding Bolsheviks chose Lenin's birthday for their Earth Day celebrations you are probably, like me, an ultra-paranoid.

It was at about this time that President Nixon began talking like Nature Boy, swinging from tree to tree on the clichés of the ecologists and preparing to use the federal government to control every phase of our environment through huge new regulatory powers. As is usual with

The ecology con men forecast doomsday as part of a campaign to grab control of every feature of our environment. Backed by the Establishment foundations and mass media, they have committed us to a monstrous program estimated by *U.S. News* to cost \$287 billion — about four times the total after-tax profits of all U.S. business in a year. On March 12, 1972, the federal government admitted that in but eleven industries it had surveyed so far the new ecology controls will mean the closing of hundreds of industrial plants, directly eliminating 125,000 jobs. A study by the "Liberal" consulting firm of Arthur D. Little cites the cost to the pulp and paper industry alone at \$3.3 billion, noting that controls are likely to close 329 of the 752 mills.





such moves by Mr. Nixon, the power of the Presidency was to be greatly increased. This vast increase in power was described by the Associated Press on October 14, 1970, as follows:

*A new federal structure of environment and resource programs is taking shape as a four-sided pyramid with an all-seeing eye at the top. One corner of the environment-resource pyramid has existed for over a century — the Interior Department, a grab-bag of land, water, minerals, and incongruously, the American Indian. The other three corners existed only as building blocks scattered through the government landscape until the Nixon administration began stacking them up this year.*

*The first new structure was the President's Council on Environmental Quality, established by 1969 legislation which President Nixon signed into law as his first official act of 1970. The second, is NOAA — the National Oceanographic and Atmospheric Administration created October 3, by executive reorganization. The third will be EPA, the Environmental Protection Agency to come into being next December 2 under a companion reorganization.*

*The all-seeing eye at the top is the president, of course, who remains the single executive overseeing the entire structure.*

Yes, Mr. Nixon is the all-seeing eye at the top! And his eyelids in the environment field are Russell Train, who heads the Council on Environmental Quality (C.E.Q.), and William Ruckelshaus of the Environmental Protection Agency (E.P.A.). The former is a member of the President's staff and the latter operates under the Department of Health, Education and Welfare.

Russell Train is a Rockefeller protégé, having been president of the Rockefeller's Conservation Foundation prior to being named to boss C.E.Q. Ruckelshaus previously served the Nixon Administration in the Justice Department, where Joseph Alsop referred to him as the "house liberal." According to *Time* of January 3, 1972, wags in Washington see William Ruckelshaus as "the greatest friend of American industry since Karl Marx."

Few businessmen are laughing. One reason they are not is that the type of individual who seeks employment with the E.P.A. and its state equivalents often brings to his job an anti-capitalist bias. Many have been active with the Sierra Club, The Friends of the Earth, or other agitation organizations run by the Far Left. They generally have no knowledge of the realities of economics and despise businessmen as exploiters of nature who must be brought to heel by the representatives of "the people." These zealots choose to ignore the fact that government, through ineffective sewage and trash disposal, is the nation's number one polluter.

The ecology zealot is the modern-day equivalent of Jean Jacques Rousseau, calling for a return to nature for revolutionary purposes. In the past, "Liberals" have fancied themselves humanitarians, but the environment crusader puts "nature" before people. To him, G.N.P. means gross national pollution. Anyone who advocates increased production or construction is immediately assailed as a "growth maniac" or an "abominable growthman."

"It's physically impossible for the gross national product per capita to continue rising forever," declares Ronald Ridker of the Ford Foundation's "Resources For The Future, Inc." Mr. Ruckelshaus of the E.P.A. maintains: "The idea that unlimited, uncontrolled growth is good is no longer an unquestioned dogma. States are considering rules which a few years ago would have been denounced as un-American." States are not



only considering such laws, they are passing them — and so is the federal government.

Theoretical physicist John Maddox expressed his concern about this environment con game in *Saturday Review* of October 21, 1972:

*The doomsday cause would be more telling if it were more securely grounded in facts, as well as better informed by a sense of history and an awareness of economics . . . .*

[Concern over the environment in the U.S.] is an honorable tradition going back to the end of the nineteenth century, when Gifford Pinchot, head of the U.S. Forest Service, wrung his hands over the prospect that timber in this country would be used up in roughly thirty years, that anthracite coal would last for only fifty years, and that other raw materials such as iron ore and natural gas were being rapidly depleted. Seventy years later the same complaints are heard. The environmentalists have coined the phrase "our plundered planet" to express their anxiety about the probability that petroleum will be much less plentiful a century from now and that the time will soon come when high-grade copper ores are worked out . . . .

... Indeed, despite what the environmentalists say, the present time appears to be one in which forecasts of scarcity are less valid than ever . . . . And, however strange it may seem, the real economic cost of extracting such metals as lead and copper from the ground is still decreasing as exploration and the techniques of mining and metallurgy become more efficient. In terms of their availability, at least, the earth's resources are becoming more and more plentiful.

Dr. Maddox observes that The Disaster Lobby neither knows nor cares about such trivia as supply and demand:

*In general, economics is not the strong suit of the environmentalists. And, unfortunately for their case, most of the issues they tend to present as questions of life or death for the human race are essentially questions of economics . . . .*

*The extremists have created the false impression that prosperity itself is the enemy . . . .*

Naturally, Mr. Nixon is far too wise and pragmatic a man to take to the stump championing the "no growth" movement. Rather, the President urges: "The answer is not to abandon growth but to redirect it." Guess who is going to do the redirecting? Not the owners of business and property. The economy is to be managed by Mr. Nixon's impartial experts.

President Nixon requested twenty-three separate pieces of environmental legislation from Congress in 1972, most of which were buried in Committee. Mr. Nixon got around the Congress with a skulk of Executive Orders giving the E.P.A. the muscle to lean on anyone its bureaucrats decide is a polluter.

Meanwhile, "Quality of Life" has become the ecology cliché of the year. What the environment con men ignore is that to most people the quality of life depends first upon having a job. Businessmen are now being joined by union leaders concerned about environmentalist excesses. As a steel union official puts it: "Hysteria is no substitute for bread and butter." A Maine labor representative, arguing for a new oil refinery along the state's coast, maintains: "We can't trade off the welfare of human beings for the sake of scenery." Even A.F. Grospiron, president of the Oil, Chemical and Atomic Workers, which has taken a tougher anti-pollution stand than most unions, warns: "We will oppose those theoretical environmental-



ists who would make air and water pure without regard to whether or not people have food on their tables."

In a recent letter to President Nixon, Joseph Tonelli, national head of the pulp and paper union, urged the government to avoid imposing "do-it-now demands" on the paper industry because "the cost will be too heavy a burden for management to bear." If mills have to close, he added, "I predict there will be poverty, sick men and women, mentally and physically. Sir, this must be avoided! This is not good for America!"

The ecology zealots expect you to sit on your front porch enjoying the clean air as you sip a mint julep purchased from your welfare check. Many jobs have already bitten the ecological dust.

A growing number of small communities across the nation face economic death because newly imposed environment-protection controls threaten to close down their single, sustaining industry. In Saltville, Virginia, enforcement of environment regulations shut down a major portion of the town's prime industry, the manufacture of soda ash. The result was five hundred persons unemployed. In San Juan Bautista, California, environment regulations are hastening the closing of the town's biggest business, a cement plant. The jobs of 150 people hang in the balance. There are hundreds of other examples.

In Pittsburgh, P.P.G. Industries announced last May twenty-first that it would suspend some production operations at its Barberton, Ohio, chemical complex by the end of 1972, because it couldn't operate them economically within environment-control requirements. This had to be done despite recent expenditures of ten million dollars to meet those standards. One thousand jobs were involved.

On January 12, 1972, Weyerhaeuser announced it was closing down its sulfite pulp plant in Everett, Washington, because it was not economically feasible to

make it comply with pollution requirements. Some 330 jobs were on the line. Simpson Lee Paper Company also blamed the high cost of satisfying new environment requirements for its shutdown of an eighty-year-old pulp and paper mill in Everett. It employed about 750 people.

Olin Corporation closed down a soda-ash operation in Virginia because of pollution problems after spending eight million dollars to comply. From 414 to 747 employees were involved.

Kennecott Copper Corporation, the nation's largest copper producer, will spend more than \$100 million to meet federal air quality standards, according to its president, Frank R. Milliken. He said the government and the public are fooling themselves if they believe these costs can be passed along to the consumers. Properties that can't produce at a profit within prevailing prices, said Milliken, have no alternative but to close. Kennecott operates smelters in Arizona, Nevada, New Mexico, and Utah.

More than one-third of the nation's pulp and paper mills face possible closure in the face of pollution controls which will cost the industry about \$3.3 billion by 1976, reports the consultant firm of Arthur D. Little. Its study revealed that of the existing 752 mills, 329 are currently operating at margins that probably would not survive the costs of control. "Price increases were not expected to cover their increased costs. This will reduce already low profit margins and create some difficulty in raising the capital required for pollution control equipment," the study said.

The closing of these paper mills will result in the loss of 32,300 jobs within the paper and support industries. Remaining mills can then be anticipated to increase prices between 3.5 and 10 percent to meet pollution-control costs.

Pollution regulations are causing shut-downs indirectly, too. The Esperanza copper-molybdenum mines of Duval Corporation near Tucson, Arizona, provide



The \$287 billion ecology con is run by former Rockefeller operative Russell Train (below at left), who heads Mr. Nixon's Council of Environmental Control, and "house liberal" William Ruckelshaus of the Environmental Protection Agency (below at right). Ruckelshaus told *Science News* in December that the objective is government control of all land use. The Secretary of Commerce admitted early last year that the ecology fanatics were holding up five to ten billion dollars in construction. And ecology con men have even been used to promote an "energy crisis" to justify U.S. development of Soviet oil and gas fields. They did this by arranging to outlaw new offshore drilling in California and restricting production on the Atlantic shelf (two trillion barrels), allegedly because of three crude-oil spills — of fourteen thousand offshore wells drilled. Ecologists have also stopped efforts to deliver 100 billion barrels of oil under Alaska. The game is one that would have delighted John D. Rockefeller Sr.



Offshore Magazine — Houston

U.P.I.



U.P.I.



an example. Company officials said new air-pollution standards restrict the operations of smelters around the country and thus reduce demand for ore. So they have sealed the mines, laying off 480 employees.

A study released by the E.P.A. on March 12, 1972, admitted that federal ecology policies would force hundreds of plants to close during the next four years, eliminating 125,000 jobs. This is not the total damage as only eleven industries were covered in the survey. Nonetheless, we can't just measure jobs lost. To determine the total impact we must also measure the jobs not created. As *U.S. News & World Report* of August 23, 1971, explains:

*The crusade to clean up the U.S. environment appears to be having this surprisingly strong side effect: a definite slowing of the nation's economic growth.... While Government and business struggle to spark an economic resurgence, billions of dollars' worth of public and private projects are being delayed or canceled outright on the ground that they will worsen pollution.*

Claims of potential ecological damage played a major role when Congress killed the supersonic-transport program in March after about \$865 million in federal funds had been already paid out. In January of 1971, after advice from his Council on Environmental Quality, President Nixon stopped work on the \$210 million Cross-Florida Barge Canal "to prevent a past mistake from causing permanent damage." Critics said the 107-mile canal, on which more than fifty million dollars had been spent, would destroy wildlife and plants along the Oklawaha River as well as endanger underground water supplies.

Government agencies are also re-examining the proposed Tocks Island Dam on the Delaware River, a project

authorized by Congress nine years ago and for which \$25 million has been spent. Authorities are now worried that the dam — designed to create a lake that would provide water, flood control, and recreation for 25 million persons — might pollute the river and kill some fish.

A \$100 million improvement for the Chesapeake and Delaware Canal was supposed to be completed by the middle of 1973, and has been called a vital move to bring big modern ships into Baltimore harbor. But new studies indicate the project could be delayed several years and cost up to forty million dollars more if experts conclude the present plan would disrupt marine life in Chesapeake Bay.

Industry spokesmen note, also, that at the same time anti-pollution forces are pressing for "clean" fuels such as natural gas and low sulphur coal, they often are blocking drilling of new wells, opening of new mines, and the building of refineries and pipelines. Secretary of Commerce Maurice Stans admitted in the January 1972 issue of *Reader's Digest*: "It is estimated that from \$5 billion to \$10 billion worth of public and private construction projects are now being held up by environmental actions." Five to ten billion! And that was a year ago. Since that time numerous other states have passed even more restrictive laws. For example, in June the State of Delaware passed a law which bans new industry along the state's entire coastline. According to the *Wall Street Journal* the law will block thousands of new jobs and \$750 million in planned developments.

Due to increased government intervention and some incredible court decisions won by the pantheists during the past year, the figures cited by Stans may be low. The California Supreme Court is responsible for one of the more outrageous landmark decisions, described by *Time* of January 1, 1973:

*Now the ground rules are changing — and radically. The first*



shock to developers came last September, when the state supreme court ruled on a case called *Friends of Mammoth Mountain v. Mono County*. The issue was whether the "spirit" of California's Environmental Quality Act of 1970, which requires state agencies to publish detailed reports on the environmental "impact" of their projects, also applied to private developers. The court, which has often acted as a trail blazer for other states, answered unequivocally: "To limit the operation of the E.Q.A. solely to what are essentially public works projects would frustrate the effectiveness of the act." Then the judges went on to excoriate "those who are oblivious to the ecological well-being of society." In other words, the slipshod developers.

This decision means that every new private development must be submitted to the bureaucrats for approval. Environment studies can cost up to one thousand dollars per acre of land to be developed and can take up to two years to complete. As *Business Week* for September 16, 1972, notes:

*The cost of these studies will depend on the specific job. Donald E. Nelson, the Dames and Moore partner in charge of land planning and development, says an impact statement for a new gasoline station could cost anywhere from \$5,000 to \$10,000....*

Meanwhile, of course, the developer may lose his option money... and many have already gone broke as a result. A typical example of the chaos created by *Friends of Mammoth Mountain v. Mono County* is described by *Business Week*:

*At Laguna Niguel, an 8,000-acre new town being built by Avco*

*Corp. in southern Orange County, 43 projects worth \$300-million have been stalled, says Raymond A. Peloso, general manager. "We've got \$400,000 of front-end money tied up in one project alone," he complains, "and the bills come in daily."*

We could fill the rest of this magazine with such examples. But who cares? Not the environmentalists. It's not their money and it's not their jobs.

Banks and savings and loan associations quite naturally are not going to lend money to sustain a development which may be killed because it displaces some gophers. In commenting on the decision, California Lieutenant Governor Ed Reinecke observed that "Hundreds of millions of dollars of construction are being stopped." The *Wall Street Journal* reports:

*... Conservationists are hailing the case as the most significant yet in their battle to halt what they consider the rape of the California environment. The decision means that citizens can sue to halt any "significant" private construction that doesn't have an environmental-impact study....*

The housing and construction industries are in a state of shock — as are many leaders in construction unions and lending institutions. Indeed, in what one environmental-law expert has called "a hysterical over-reaction," such cities as San Francisco and Santa Barbara have stopped issuing building permits for fear they'd violate the new law....

"I think they want to put the builders out of business," charges Gene Meyers, executive vice president of Levitt United Construction.

This incredible decision was followed by another unbelievable ruling in San



Francisco where, reports the *Los Angeles Times* of October 23, 1972, a federal judge "ordered the state Highway Department to pay lawyer's fees and witness costs of . . . environmental organizations that successfully sued the department to stop construction of a \$100 million freeway. Private citizens should not be discouraged from bringing such actions by burdensome legal costs," said the judge. In other words, every little local Committee to Save the Groundhog can bring suit to stop development of any kind, and the State of California will have to pay their attorneys' fees and court costs. "Can you imagine what that is going to do to the judicial calendar?" asked a disgusted court reporter. Can you imagine what it will do to growth and development?

These two decisions set a dangerous precedent. Doubtless, they will wind up on appeal in the U.S. Supreme Court. And those who believe that Mr. Nixon's Court will refuse to validate such outrages have not been paying attention. In fact, William Ruckelshaus, Mr. Nixon's man at E.P.A., may push them to the High Court if Mr. Nixon doesn't first establish them as a matter of law by Executive Order. For political reasons, the President would probably rather have the onus put on the Supreme Court just as he has done with busing, but Mr. Ruckelshaus has made no bones about where he stands. As *Science News* of December 2, 1972 notes: "William D. Ruckelshaus, chief of the Environmental Protection Agency, anticipates Federal legislation encouraging states to adopt acts similar to California's EQA . . ." *Science News* then quotes Ruckelshaus as having told the California League of Cities:

*... There is no way to avoid integral planning of land use with transportation, housing, utilities, farm policy and so on . . . The only question now is whether it will be rational and well-thought-out or*

*impulsive and highly charged with emotion, whether it will leave a major role for states and local communities or take a more drastic national form.*

What this means is that we are going to have national or regional "land use" laws in which bureaucrats are going to tell you what you can or cannot do with your own property. California has already passed such a "land use" law to control its coastline. *Time* of January 1, 1973, describes it:

*While the Mammoth decision was creating these mammoth problems, the state's voters approved an initiative to control all development within 1,000 ft. of California's entire coastline. To continue any project started after last March 31, or to build any new project, developers would first have to get a permit from one of six new regional commissions. This slows [or stops] the rush to build on the shore line — and theoretically prevents any environmentally harmful projects.*

In the past, local zoning laws have been arbitrarily enforced, but since zoning was done by members of the local community, at least there was a chance to remove unreasonable overseers from positions of authority at the next election. Now, under the new California law, zoning decisions will be made by distant commissioners who are, for all practical purposes, immune to retribution from the people of a community whose property values they destroy. Rudolph Esau, a partner in a Santa Barbara chrysanthemum-growing firm, is challenging the new law in court. He maintains, "if we cannot develop our property, then our property is not worth anything to us." Mr. Esau catches on fast.

The situation in California is only a foot in the door. Guidelines requiring



environmental impact studies for all federal projects are set down in the Urban Growth, New Community Development Act of 1970, the National Land Use Policy Act of 1971, and an Executive Order published in the *Federal Register* on April 23, 1971. All that is needed now is to extend the authority for federal land planning from government projects to private projects as the California Supreme Court has already done at the state level. Big Brother is coming in dressed as the Jolly Green Giant.

The ecology movement portends many other threats to our liberties and to the economy. One of the most important concerns oil and natural gas. The newspapers and magazines are ablot with frightening articles about the impending "energy crisis." We are told, for example, that America is rapidly running out of oil and natural gas and that we must begin relying on overseas imports to avoid a crisis. What is happening is that the alleged energy crisis is being used as a rationale for beginning the "great merger" of the American and Soviet economies. Secretary of Commerce Peter Peterson, the Cabinet officer President Nixon put in charge of trade and credit negotiations with Moscow, has announced:

*The developing U.S. energy shortage and the Soviet Union's compelling need to import Western technology to modernize its economy, have been major factors in promoting the Washington-Moscow detentes.*

A deal is cooking to bring liquified natural gas to the U.S. from Siberia; a

deal which columnist Paul Scott reports "will swallow billions of dollars of U.S. investments amounting to as much as \$20 billion by 1980."\* We are going to finance and provide the technology for the Soviets to develop their Siberian oil and gas fields, thereby greatly increasing their war-making capacity. Doubtless the American people would be queasy about these arrangements except that they have been sold on the idea that getting oil and gas from the Soviets is a *necessity*. The truth is that our energy crisis is a hoax created by federal controls and ecology propaganda.

What has happened is that following the unfortunate Union Oil leak off Santa Barbara in 1969, the federal government put severe restrictions on drilling for offshore oil and California outlawed it — all in the name of ecology. The petroleum industry has pointed out that in drilling approximately fourteen thousand offshore wells, there has been a grand total of *three* accidents which resulted in crude oil spilling into the ocean! None of them did any permanent damage to the environment. Yet, in the name of "preserving the environment" we have allowed vast gas and oil supplies to go untapped† while at the same time preparing to develop those of the U.S.S.R. in order to meet "crisis" needs. As United Press International reported on December 18, 1972: "Oil deposits second in size only to Alaska's in the United States and worth an estimated \$2 trillion at current market prices lie untouched along the Atlantic continental shelf..." They are untouched because the ecology boys have stopped the show.

Ahh, and that brings up Alaska, where millions of dollars' worth of pipe and building equipment lie rusting. According to *Time* there may be as many as one hundred billion barrels of oil underground in Alaska, as compared with five billion barrels under oil-rich East Texas. It is that big. But, a pipeline right-of-way 200 feet wide and 773 miles long is

\*Peterson has also revealed that the United States is negotiating with Red China to develop oil and gas deposits off her shores.

†The *Los Angeles Herald-Examiner* for July 20, 1970, reports: "The untouched Los Angeles basin... holds an oil and gas potential in excess of 75 billion barrels. That is an educated guess of petroleum geologists today."



required to get the oil to a warm-water port where it can be transported to the continental United States. And that pipeline is not being built because a court has decided that it might upset the ecology of Alaska. The court required an "environmental impact study." Now there are *conflicting* impact studies! The one submitted by Mathematical Sciences Northwest concluded that the construction of the pipeline would be "a potential major perturbation on the economy and life style" of Alaska.

Sooner or later that pipeline will be built, but it will require three years from the date construction begins before any oil flows. In the meantime we will be developing the oil and gas resources of the Soviet Union. We don't develop our own resources because it might upset the polar bears or the gulls, but we develop those of our declared enemies. It's right out of Alice in Conspiracyland.

You doubt it? Then you are not aware that the natural gas shortage in this country has been created by the Federal Power Commission's artificial underpricing of gas. This has proved beneficial to Communists of every stripe. The *Wall Street Journal* of August 17, 1972, reports:

*Now, although there's gas aplenty under the U.S.A., the shortage the FPC has largely created has forced it into the preposterous position of agreeing to allow purchase of foreign gas at twice the domestic price. The FPC six weeks ago cited the national shortage, without even blushing, and gave El Paso Natural Gas Co. permission to import liquefied natural gas (LNG) from [Communist] Algeria. A 25-year, \$8 billion deal. The Algerians chill the gas to 260 degrees below zero, sell it to El Paso for 30.5 cents a cubic foot. It's loaded on special tankers, which will cost El Paso more than \$740 million, and it's delivered on*

*the East Coast at no more than 77 cents or 83 cents, depending on delivery point.*

*U.S. News & World Report* of August 21, 1972, reveals that government and business will spend \$287 billion during the balance of the decade to scratch the itches of our environment fanatics while helping the Reds to develop their military resources.

Professor Peter Drucker writes that there is "a dangerous delusion abroad today [that] the cost of cleaning the environment can be paid for out of 'business profits.' After taxes, the profits of all American businesses in a good year come to sixty or seventy billion dollars. And mining and manufacturing — the most polluting industries — account for less than half of this. But at the lowest estimate, the cleanup bill, even for just the most urgent jobs, will be three or four times as large as all business profits."

In other words, you are going to pay for the costs of the ecology maniacs through higher taxes and increased costs of *everything* that you buy. All of which is going to make foreign imports more attractive, worsening our dangerously high balance of payments deficits and triggering even more unemployment. The end result of these falling dominoes could be a very nasty depression.

Is our only alternative rising unemployment, depression, and dictatorship on one hand, and a poisoned, increasingly unlivable environment on the other? Of course not. First, we must realize that much of the propaganda of The Disaster Lobby is simply fright peddling. As Professor Ross McKinney, a professional ecologist of twenty-years standing, has noted:

*The public is being conned into believing that things are getting worse and worse. Actually, just the opposite is true. The situation is actually getting better and better.*



*This progress is not being made by the environmental con men but by the plodding professional who does the work and is never recognized.*

The world of the good, pure old days that the ecological Carrie Nations romanticize never existed. In the good old days people heated their houses with smokey soft coal instead of clean gas or electricity. Transportation was by horse (definitely a polluter) or by coal-burning trains. The rivers were clear, but their waters often contained typhoid and other unfriendly bacteria. Since then the American businessman, so despised by the environmental night riders, has changed our lives immensely — and for the better. As Thomas Shepard puts it:

*For in the past 20 years — an eyeblink in history — an America geared to private industry has conquered communicable diseases, abolished starvation, brought literacy to the masses, transported men to another planet and expanded the horizons of its citizens to an almost incredible degree by giving them wheels and wings and electronic extensions of their eyes, their ears, their hands, even their brains. It has made available to the average American luxuries that a short time ago were beyond the reach of the wealthiest plutocrat.*

*And by developing quick-cook meals and labor-saving appliances, it has cut kitchen chores in most homes from five hours a day to an hour and a half — and as a result has done more to liberate women than all of the bra-burning Betty Friedans, Gloria Steinems and Kate Milletts combined . . . .*

*. . . American industry is spending over \$3 billion a year to clean up the environment and additional billions to develop products that will keep it clean, and . . . the real*

*danger today is not from the free enterprise establishment that has made ours the most prosperous, most powerful and most charitable nation on earth.*

There are tremendous strides being made, privately, towards further improvements in the environment. Many are extremely exciting, and if space allowed we could fill the rest of this magazine detailing them. There are spectacular breakthroughs in converting trash and garbage into profitable products, in new sources of clean energy and power and fast-growing forests. A fish is even being imported from Malaya whose favorite delicacy is the algae which is a prime polluter of our waterways. But you don't see announcements of these promising private developments in your newspaper or on your television screens. The Establishment "people movers" give the headlines to The Disaster Lobby and the environment con men. You have to search the back pages for the rebuttals — and you will be lucky to find them even there.

As a letter in *Chemical & Engineering News* explained it, there are three kinds of pollution: "actual, political and hysterical." Our pollution problems should be handled with balance and discrimination. They should be handled sensibly by state and local government, and by the courts, *when there is actual damage*. Businesses could be encouraged to adopt the most up to date anti-pollution procedures by making their use tax deductible. But, of course, that would not require billions of dollars of wasteful government spending or the establishment of a Big Brother Bureaucracy.

And building a Big Brother Bureaucracy is exactly what the Nixonites and their Establishment friends are doing. Every solution to the pollution problem proposed by the President increases his own power. If an all-powerful government could prevent ecological problems,



the Soviet Union would be an ecologist's paradise. Instead, Russia has worse pollution problems than we do... simply because her technology is decades behind ours. As it is, we may be regulated out of existence in the Seventies. The June 26, 1970, issue of *Life* reported:

*In Washington today men who nurse such dreams believe that some day this ultimate National Center for Environmental Control will be larger than the Pentagon. The Pentagon protects America from foreign enemies: Environment Control must protect America from Americans, which is more difficult....*

*Now, American politics must entertain Richard Nixon's first major original approach to government in an adventure that must combine both emergency action and long-range housekeeping. Promising to decentralize Washington and return power to local government, he will now propose a system that will enlarge the authority of the Federal Government even more than did Roosevelt's New Deal. Over the long run, if this new system is to be effective, it must control not only General Motors, but the local garagemen who spill crankcase oil in sewers. It must control not only ocean-going tankers and offshore drilling, but beach buggies that ravage sand dunes and pleasure boats that flush toilets in lakes.*

Dr. Henry D. Jacoby, a Harvard economist, has observed that such an all-encompassing agency would be "a dollar-devouring regulatory dinosaur." Professor Jacoby says: "It would be a monster consigned to collapse and die from its own massive, inefficient weight."

Maybe the dictatorship will collapse — in a few hundred years or so. But what will we have to endure in the meantime?

What we could be facing is ably described in the March 1970 issue of *Esquire*:

*... for the nation as a whole, for the economy, the conservationist's dichotomy remains, and he has not faced up to it: if we do not stop expanding, we ruin the environment; if we do, we condemn the lower-middle classes to their present fate.*

*Unless. Unless of course we did redistribute the profits of affluence by legislative fiat. Unless we planned where industries could locate and how much they could produce and where people ought to live in what numbers, and where, ecologically, no one ought to live, or drive, or even walk. Unless we instituted such extensive public regulation over use of the land, water, air, and people, that hundreds of enterprises, perhaps most of them, could not operate profitably, especially if they couldn't grow, so that perhaps they would have to be operated on a basis other than profit. There is a name for such a system. And can you see Laurance Rockefeller financing a feasibility study on that, and can you see all those \$40,000 executives endorsing it?*

*Well, maybe. Huey Long supposedly said that if fascism came to America it would come from the working class. Now we may have come to the point where if socialism comes to America, it will come from Wall Street lawyers concerned less about the welfare of people than the survival of spoonbills....*

I only wish it were that simple. What those Wall Street *Insiders* are really concerned about is not spoonbills but the creation of a vast federal monopoly over everybody and everything... which they intend to control. ■ ■