



Written by [William F. Jasper](#) on October 4, 1993

Shackling Planet Earth: Clinton's Earth Day '93 Address

Ignoring the overwhelming, and steadily growing, body of scientific evidence that the global-warming "crisis" is nonexistent, President Clinton issued an environmental "clarion call" (his term) to the nation in his Earth Day '93 address. "I reaffirm, my personal, and announce our nation's commitment," he said, "to reducing our emissions of greenhouse gases to their 1990 levels by the year 2000."



The following month, on May 18 and May 26, former Senator Timothy Wirth, now counselor to the State Department and Clinton's designee for the new post of undersecretary for global affairs, presented the administration's position on the Framework Convention on Climate Change (more commonly known as the UN Global Warming Treaty) in congressional hearings. Testifying before the House Subcommittee on Energy and Power on May 26, Wirth warned that U.S. "domestic actions alone, even as large as we are, will not be enough to reverse the upward trend in global atmospheric concentrations of greenhouse gases. We must establish a partnership with other countries.... Therefore we must forge common cause around the world."

Incredibly, as we sat watching the proceedings on C-SPAN, nary a member of the subcommittee did we see, either Democrat or Republican, rise to challenge, object to, or even seriously question the alleged science undergirding Wirth's dire projections and sweeping proposals for global "partnership." Nor did anyone bother to ask him about an earlier statement of his, to wit: "We've got to ride the global warming issue.... Even if the theory is wrong, we'll be doing the right thing."

At What Cost?

Just where is that ride taking us and how much is the ticket price? And what is "the right thing" in this context? Considering the stakes involved and all of the recent heated debate over the deficit, jobs, taxes, and the economy, does it not seem that Congress is suffering an amazing lack of curiosity? The administration's "Action Plan" to implement the UN treaty was due out in August, but is still not ready as we write (in early September).

We have the President's promise that it will be "cost effective." Considering the meanings given to words in the *Slick Willie Lexicon* thus far — remember "managed competition" for socialized medicine, "investments" for new federal spending, and "deficit reduction" for massive new taxation — we had better get ready for an economic deathblow if he puts this one across.

The economic costs to American taxpayers and consumers to meet 1990 emissions targets will almost certainly run into the hundreds of billions of dollars. Politically, we can kiss the Constitution, local governance, and national sovereignty good-bye. Already the U.S. and UN eco-bureaucracies are spreading like "The Blob," with new agencies, committees, and task forces multiplying faster than devilish gremlins on a Spielberg movie set. And with much the same effect, we may soon learn. In the blockbuster, celluloid sci-fi fable, you may recall, what started out as irresistibly benign and cuddly little fur balls quickly transmogrified into hordes of hideous, destructive, and deadly beasts. Is it life imitating art or art imitating life? Either way, the burgeoning green leviathan spells disaster.



Written by [William F. Jasper](#) on October 4, 1993

At the federal level, Clinton has erected a whole new greenhouse labyrinth called the Interagency Climate Change Mitigation Group (ICCMG), composed of working groups from the federal departments of Energy, Transportation, Agriculture, Treasury, Commerce, State, the EPA, the National Security Council, OMB, the Domestic Security Council, and various other agencies and councils.

One of the new green global additions, the UN Commission on Sustainable Development, convened for the first time in February 1993 and again in June to stake out its territory: monitoring national compliance with the global-warming treaty, *Agenda 21*, the *Earth Charter*, the *Rio Declaration of Principles*, and other international agreements. As yet, the commission has no enforcement powers, but that may soon change. It is amassing a huge lobbying army to boost its suasive authority and to speed its assumption of genuine global enforcement muscle. To that end it is considering bringing as many as 1,400 NGOs (non-governmental organizations) into the commission as “participants.” Which means that Greenpeace, Friends of the Earth, the Sierra Club, Worldwatch, and every other assortment of green power-lusters will be strategically positioned to help draft and promote the UN’s eco-fascist edicts, and to keep upping the ante.

This NGO function of ratcheting the process ever leftward was demonstrated in May soon after the administration announced its climate initiative. A coalition of 16 environmental groups called on Clinton to go even further and offered 21 measures (additional regulations and taxes, of course) to speed our response to the global “crisis.”

Also up and running is the UN Global Environment Facility (GEF), the entity charged with dispersing billions of dollars (from the poor and the middle class in the developed countries to the rich in the developing countries) for environmental protection and development. Then there is the Intergovernmental Negotiating Committee (INC) on climate change, which has been receiving “scientific” input from the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC). The list goes on.

Totalitarian Master Plan

We mentioned the UN treaty *Agenda 21*; it is surely deserving of a moment or two of our attention. An intimidating 700-plus pages of complex legalese, understandably, very few Americans and few members of Congress have read this monstrous document. We have. Prepare yourselves. The UN Earth saviors have launched into their task with a zeal and hubris that would do credit to our own Hillary and her healthcare crusade. In *Agenda 21* they have set forth a truly frightening master plan for global population growth, healthcare, land-use planning, hazardous waste, pesticides, ozone depletion, food production and distribution, energy production, transportation, homeless shelters, drought relief, species protection, biotechnology, and regulations to “protect” forests, mountains, deserts, wetlands, oceans, rivers, streams, lakes, coastal waters, etc., ad nauseam.

The treaty is not easy to obtain. The most accessible version of the document is an abbreviated 300-page edition entitled, *AGENDA 21: The Earth Summit Strategy to Save Our Planet*, (Earthpress, 1993), edited by environmental-activist attorney Daniel Sitarz and enthusiastically endorsed by Earth Summit chief Maurice Strong. If ever there were a case of unintentionally damning with fulsome praise, this is it. “AGENDA 21 is not a static document,” enthuses Sitarz. “It is a plan of action. It is meant to be a hands-on instrument to guide the development of the Earth in a sustainable manner.” (Emphasis added.) Some may take comfort in the thought that there are mere mortals with the omniscience, confidence, and virtue to “guide” all planetary development; others may be pardoned for measured skepticism. And skepticism will surely increase and graduate to outrage as the true totalitarian nature of this plan unfolds to public view. Consider this chilling excerpt from UN cheerleader Sitarz:



Written by [William F. Jasper](#) on October 4, 1993

AGENDA 21 proposes an array of actions which are intended to be implemented by every person on Earth.... It calls for specific changes in the activities of all people....

Effective execution of AGENDA 21 will require a profound reorientation of all human society, unlike anything the world has ever experienced — a major shift in the priorities of both governments and individuals and an unprecedented redeployment of human and financial resources. This shift will demand that a concern for the environmental consequences of every human action be integrated into individual and collective decision-making at every level.

Look again: “all human society,” “every person on Earth,” “every human action,” “every level,” “demand,” “require.” The totalitarian power grab is so transparent that it should automatically be scorned and rejected by all civilized nations. But, as Sitarz points out, it was adopted at the Earth Summit “by nations representing over 98% of the Earth’s population.”

The goal is as plain as day. In her new book, *Environmental Overkill*, former Washington Governor Dixy Lee Ray notes: “The objective, clearly enunciated by the leaders of UNCED [the Earth Summit], is to bring about change in the present system of nations. The future is to be world government, with central planning by the UN.... If force is needed, it will be provided by a UN green-helmeted police force.”

Is Dr. Ray — noted author, scientist, and “unofficial” participant at the Earth Summit — exaggerating the coercive intent of the UNCED folks? Hardly. The documents and official proceedings speak for themselves. So too, more and more, do environmentalist leaders. Take, for instance, Jacques Cousteau, eco-socialist demigod of the ocean seas. Just prior to the Earth Summit, the revered gray one wrote in his bimonthly journal, *Calypso Log*: “Here I am referring to the necessity of creating an international environmental police, ‘green helmets,’ who would be under the direction of the United Nations. Our planet needs guardians, independent organizations, free of the constraints of profit or national sovereignty, and responsible for making up an almost daily bill of health of our common habitat, our Earth.”

Another coercive utopian, William Ophuls, has this to say in his recent opus, *Ecology and the Politics of Scarcity Revisited*:

The need for a world government with enough coercive power over fractious nation states to achieve what reasonable people would regard as the planetary common interest has become overwhelming.

A Planetary Religion

Apparently so, and the corollary to this eco-dogma is that it must reach down and permeate every aspect of our lives. As Donald Snow of the Conservation Fund wrote in an important 1992 study conducted for the leadership of the environmental movement, “The new mandate for leadership demands that virtually every institutional sector of American life — education, government, business, public communications, and the not-for-profit sector — become deeply engaged in solving environmental problems.” Yes, in the new order we must eat, drink, sleep, work, and play environment, environment, environment! In short, say the eco-babblers, environmentalism must become the new planetary religion.

We kid you not. Consider the *Declaration of the Sacred Earth*, which was part of the Earth Summit opening ceremonies. In his keynote address to the Summit’s plenary session, Maurice Strong directed the world’s attention to the *Declaration* and proclaimed, “The changes in behavior and direction called for here must be rooted in our deepest spiritual, moral, and ethical values.” According to the



Written by [William F. Jasper](#) on October 4, 1993

declaration, “The [ecological] crisis transcends all national, religious, cultural, social, political, and economic boundaries.” Moreover, “The responsibility of each human being today is to choose between the force of darkness and the force of light” — with the light being a politically correct green light, naturally. And, it continues, “We must therefore transform our attitudes and values, and adopt a renewed respect for the superior laws of Divine Nature.”

Normal, rational people at this point must find themselves asking: Where is all this leading us? Has the entire world gone mad? Why this headlong, gadarene rush into dictatorship? Why the continued media trumpeting of imminent ecological doom when science and common sense say otherwise? Why the sudden fervent embrace of, and proselytizing zeal for, environmental paganism by those elites who have relentlessly opposed Christianity and traditional moral values? How do we explain the enormous push for statist “solutions” to nonexistent ecological “crises,” when the evidence from the communist and socialist countries demonstrates overwhelmingly that collectivism and central planning have wrought unparalleled environmental destruction? How do we account for the intimate and long-standing symbiosis in the environmental movement between super-wealthy corporate elitists and their supposed arch-enemies, interventionists, socialists, and communists of all stripes? And, finally, *cui bono* — who benefits — from all of this “madness”?

Hidden Agenda

For anyone who has delved even slightly into the science, politics, finance, and ideology of environmentalism, these questions scream to be answered. For those who delve deeper the answers are as compelling as they are disturbing. What becomes clear is that the modern-day environmental “movement” and all of its phony “crises” have been created, promoted, and sustained by the same elitist organizations that have generated many other movements throughout this century for the purpose of destroying our constitutional firewalls and public disposition against a centralized, all-powerful federal government, and for creating a sympathy and a constituency for the ultimate objective: an omnipotent world government.

Which isn’t to say that all, or even most, of the myriad environmental groups are conspiratorial cats-paws. But some of the most influential of these organizations most definitely are. It is certain that there would be no well-oiled, professionally staffed and directed, billion-dollar mass *movement* without some extraordinary string-pulling and palm-creasing behind the scenes by powerful establishment groups and individuals promoting a hidden agenda.

It is just as certain that there would not be a hope of stirring mass hysteria over global warming, ozone depletion, acid rain, deforestation, endangered species, and a host of similar eco-scams, without massive deception and intervention by the same sub-rosa forces. Without question, environmentalism is being used to advance a covert cause that has nothing to do with protecting dolphins, the ozone layer, or the spotted owl. To borrow from Lord Tennyson (with apologies to the poet for liberties taken): “Yet I doubt not through the outrages one increasing purpose runs.” And that purpose is decidedly evil.

The conspiratorial movement for a totalitarian, collectivist world government, often euphemistically referred to as a “new world order,” has been carefully dissected and documented in many articles in *The New American* and in many books. * The prominent institutional players in this one-world cabal have been the Rockefeller, Carnegie, and Ford Foundations, the Council on Foreign Relations, the Atlantic Council, the Committee for Economic Development, the Business Advisory Council, Chase Manhattan and other New York banks of the Morgan-Rockefeller axis, the United World Federalists, the Trilateral Commission, and others. The Council on Foreign Relations (CFR) is widely recognized as the



general staff of this insider coterie.

Early Attempts

The first try at “world order” came in the form of the League of Nations at the end of World War I. If only the nations of the world would come together in unity and begin the process of surrendering national sovereignty to a world body, went the siren song, the scourge of war would be vanquished. This “peace” propaganda almost produced its desired effect — but not quite. The United States was protected from armed invasion by ocean moats which made armed invasion unlikely. Moreover, the spirit of nationalism and independence still ran strong in American blood. In spite of an intense insider-led campaign for the League, the U.S. Senate decided to reject American membership in the organization. Our nation’s refusal to go along doomed the League of Nations from the start.

The second try at world order followed World War II, and culminated in the creation of the United Nations. The arrival of the atomic bomb and long-range delivery systems (bombers, missiles, etc.), together with CFR dominance of the White House and growing CFR influence in the media and the Senate, provided the insiders with the combination they needed to get the UN Charter ratified. But a UN with no real authority was still just half, or even less than half, a loaf. Significant vestiges of national sovereignty still presented real barriers to full-blown world government.

For 40 years, the insiders relied on fear of “the bomb” to keep America tied to the United Nations. If we dared quit the world body, went their argument, there would surely be nuclear war with the communists and global annihilation. Coexistence was our best available option, at least until such time as the UN became powerful enough to guarantee its version of peace. But even while “the bomb” was serving its purpose well, long-range planning was underway to employ the threat of environmental cataclysm in future campaigns to build the world organization into a world government.

Birth of a Movement

The environmental “movement” phenomenon is a casebook par excellence of the insiders’ conspiratorial machinations. There is an abundance of documents showing:

- The one-worlders conducting feasibility studies on creating apocalyptic environmentalism as a credible impetus for world government years before the environmental movement materialized.
- The insider bankrolling of the predominant environmentalist forces for decades.
- Key insiders running and directing many of the leading eco-forces.
- The insider-controlled major media working in concert with radical environmentalists to contrive fraudulent, frightful scenarios of ecological doom.
- The same forces conspiring to prevent the responsible voices of science from gaining media access to refute the Chicken Littles.
- Admissions by insiders that the green movement is one of their major avenues to the new world order.

A World Effectively Controlled by the United Nations is an incredible study prepared in 1961 by Professor Lincoln P. Bloomfield (CFR) of MIT under a contract (No. SCC 28270) with the State Department, which was then under Secretary of State Dean Rusk (CFR). The global regime contemplated by the study, said Bloomfield, would “be referred to unblushingly as a ‘world government.’” The problem, he reported, was that it could take a couple hundred years or more for this global governance to evolve naturally and consensually. However, he had a plan to “bypass the main path of history, short-circuiting the organic stages of consensus.” The Bloomfield scheme involved “a



Written by [William F. Jasper](#) on October 4, 1993

crisis, a war, or a brink-of-war situation so grave or commonly menacing that deeply rooted attitudes and practices are sufficiently shaken to open the possibility of a revolution in world political arrangements.” “According to this version,” he said, “the order we examine may be brought into existence as a result of a series of sudden, nasty, and traumatic shocks.”

Iron Mountain Meeting

But what crisis “so grave or commonly menacing” could be devised for the purpose? To solve that dilemma, insiders in the Kennedy administration convened a Special Study Group of 15 men at a secret facility at Iron Mountain, New York, during the summer of 1963. Their mission: Come up with alternatives to war that would provide the same social and political “stabilizing” function.

Two and a half years later the group produced its findings. The secret report was not intended for public consumption. One member of the group, however, felt it should be made available for the American people. So in 1967 it was published anonymously under the title, *Report From Iron Mountain on the Possibility and Desirability of Peace*. Harvard economics professor John Kenneth Galbraith (former CFR) later admitted he was “a member of the conspiracy” (the words are his) that produced the book.

The Iron Mountain group reported that a war substitute “would require ‘alternate enemies,’ some of which might seem ... farfetched in the context of the current war system.” The participants considered a number of general social welfare programs as possible substitutes: health, transportation, education, housing, poverty, etc., but were not satisfied with any of them. “It is more probable, in our judgement,” they opined, “that such a threat will have to be invented.”

“Like its political function,” said the diabolical brain trust, “the motivational function of war requires the existence of a genuinely menacing social enemy.” The “alternate enemy,” they contended in the report, “must imply a more immediate, tangible, and directly felt threat of destruction. It must justify the need for taking and paying a ‘blood price’ in wide areas of human concern.” With this in mind, the group felt, the possible substitute enemies they were considering were woefully inadequate.

According to the report, however, “One exception might be the environmental-pollution model, if the danger to society it posed was genuinely imminent. The fictive models would have to carry the weight of extraordinary conviction, underscored with a not inconsiderable actual sacrifice of life.” If these conditions could be met, the study concluded hopefully, “It may be ... that gross pollution of the environment can eventually replace the possibility of mass destruction by nuclear weapons as the principal apparent threat to the survival of the species.”

In 1970, the environmental era was kicked off with Earth Day, a green confabulation made significant by the incredibly lavish and sympathetic coverage provided by the insider media. It was accompanied by an orgy of funding for the eco-activists by the establishment tax-exempt foundations. One of the insiders’ noteworthy early calls for launching global governance under the green label appeared in an advertisement sponsored by the World Association of World Federalists (WAWF) in the January-February 1972 issue of *The Humanist*, published by the American Humanist Association. It read:

World Federalists believe that the environmental crisis facing planet earth is a global problem and therefore calls for a “global” solution — a worldwide United Nations Environmental Agency with the power to make its decisions stick. WAWF has submitted a proposal for just such an agency to be considered at the 1972 U.N. Environmental Conference to be held in Stockholm.

A New Leader



Written by [William F. Jasper](#) on October 4, 1993

That first UN Environmental Conference, held in Stockholm, Sweden June 5-16, 1972, proved to be the launching pad for the worldwide campaign to establish a UN planetary environmental authority. One result of the conference was the establishment of a United Nations Environment Program (UNEP) intended as the overseer of a future monitoring system of the world's environment. The man selected to be the first executive director of the new agency was Maurice Strong, a Canadian, who had served as secretary-general of the Stockholm event and was at the time a trustee of the Rockefeller Foundation.

This same Maurice Strong was named 20 years later to serve as secretary-general of the United Nations Conference on Environment and Development (UNCED), the official name of the 1992 Earth Summit. A millionaire businessman with a passion for socialist, one-world causes, Strong is a radical environmentalist and New Age devotee. He is also a major player in such insider circles as the Club of Rome, the Aspen Institute for Humanistic Studies, the World Economic Forum, the World Federation of United Nations Associations, Planetary Citizens, and the Business Council for Sustainable Development.

In the months leading up to the major event in Rio, Strong grabbed headlines on several occasions with outlandish rantings against the United States and the middle class of the industrialized countries. For example, he declared that "the United States is clearly the greatest risk" to the world's ecological health. This was so, he said, because, "In effect, the United States is committing environmental aggression against the rest of the world."

In a UNCED report issued in August 1991, Strong wrote: "It is clear that current lifestyles and consumption patterns of the affluent middle-class ... involving high meat intake, consumption of large amounts of frozen and 'convenience' foods, ownership of motor-vehicles, numerous electric household appliances, home and workplace airconditioning ... expansive suburban housing ... are not sustainable."

He also wrote the introduction to the revealing 1991 Trilateral Commission book, *Beyond Interdependence: The Meshing of the World's Economy and the Earth's Ecology*, by Jim MacNeill, Pieter Winsemius, and Taizo Yakushiji. His good friend David Rockefeller wrote the foreword.

According to UNCED Secretary Strong, Trilateralist author Jim MacNeill "is now advising me on the road to Rio." *Beyond Interdependence* served as the CFR-Trilateral game plan for Rio, and it had Strong's full endorsement. To stress its importance, Strong said the study would help guide "decisions that will literally determine the fate of the earth." That was significant, since MacNeill and his co-authors advocated "a new global partnership expressed in a revitalized international system in which an Earth Council, perhaps the Security Council with a broader mandate, maintains the interlocked environmental and economic security of the planet."

Recurring Connections

The same globalist-socialist vision was presented in *Global Economics and the Environment: Toward Sustainable Rural Development in the Third World*, another Earth Summit guide published just prior to the UNCED palaver by the Council on Foreign Relations. The common apocalyptic theme has been repeated innumerable times in environmental jeremiads coming from a bevy of one-worlders ranging from David Rockefeller, Henry Kissinger, and Helmut Kohl to socialists Francois Mitterrand, Willy Brandt, and "former" communist Mikhail Gorbachev, and even to Ted Turner, Jane Fonda, and Tom Hayden. It is not possible to study the environmental movement in any depth without repeatedly tripping over the recurring connection between the socialist/communist Left and the corporate/banking elite personified by David Rockefeller and the organizations he has led.

Consider, for example, Lester R. Brown (CFR), the supposed anti-establishment ecofanatic who heads



Written by [William F. Jasper](#) on October 4, 1993

the very influential Worldwatch Institute, one of the driving forces behind UNCED. His best-selling 1972 book, *World Without Borders*, proposed a “world environmental agency” because, “Arresting the deterioration of the environment does not seem possible within the existing framework of independent nation-states.”

His books and statist solutions are hyped by the CFR-dominated media and CFR academics, while the big CFR-controlled foundations shower his think tank with millions of dollars.

“Building an environmentally sustainable future,” Brown later said of the Earth Summit’s mission, “requires nothing short of a revolution.” This would involve “restructuring the global economy, dramatically changing human reproductive behavior and altering values and lifestyles.”

In *State of the World 1991*, the annual doomsday report issued by the Worldwatch Institute, Brown predicted that “the battle to save the planet will replace the battle over ideology as the organizing theme of the new world order.” This same globalist theme was delivered by Ronald I. Spiers (CFR) in the March 13, 1992 *New York Times*. “The [United Nations] Trusteeship Council,” he declared, “should be changed from a body dealing with the vestiges of colonialism to one dealing with the environment, becoming in effect the trustee of the health of the planet.”

And since CFR hacks like Lester Brown and Richard N. Gardner were very much involved in directing the Earth Summit process, it is not surprising that similar dire warnings of eco-destruction were everywhere apparent. The UNCED booklet, *In Our Hands: Earth Summit '92*, for example, asserted in its closing paragraph: “The world community now faces together greater risks to our common security through our impacts on the environment than from traditional military conflicts with one another.” And, it proclaimed, “We must now forge a new ‘Earth Ethic’ which will inspire all peoples and nations to join in a new global partnership of North, South, East and West.”

An earlier purveyor of this line, CFR “wise man” George F. Kennan, the author of the Cold War phony policy of “containment” against communism, explained in a 1989 *Washington Post* column that we now live “in an age where the great enemy is not the Soviet Union but the rapid deterioration of our planet as a supporting structure for civilized life.”

In an opinion column in the *New York Times* of March 27, 1990, Michael Oppenheimer (CFR) warned darkly: “Global warming, ozone depletion, deforestation and overpopulation are the four horsemen of a looming 21st century apocalypse.” He assured readers: “As the cold war recedes, the environment is becoming the No. 1 international security concern.”

The *New York Times* senior columnist Flora Lewis (CFR), has praised Mikhail Gorbachev — Mr. Green Cross International — for going “beyond accepted notions of the limits of national sovereignty and rules of behavior” with his green proposals. She was thrilled by his “plan for a global code of environmental conduct,” which “would have an aspect of *world government*, because it would provide for the World Court to judge states.” (Emphasis added.) This, she gushed with obvious delight, “is a breathtaking idea, beyond the current dreams of ecology militants.... And it is fitting that the environment be the topic for what amounts to *global policing*.... Even starting the effort would be a giant step for *international law*.” (Emphasis added.)

A Hard Road, Indeed

Of course, the CFR’s own journal, *Foreign Affairs* (according to *Time* magazine the “most influential journal in print”), has been host to many influential green pieces. One such was Richard N. Gardner’s notable article, “The Hard Road to World Order,” in the April 1974 issue. One of the boldest calls for



Written by [William F. Jasper](#) on October 4, 1993

world government ever to appear in *Foreign Affairs*, it called for building the “house of world order” through “an end run around national sovereignty, eroding it piece by piece.” Moreover, it set out the CFR insider plans for exploiting fears about environmental calamity as a vehicle for expanding the UN’s power. In this 1974 article, Gardner wrote:

The next few years should see a continued strengthening of the new global and regional agencies charged with protecting the world’s environment. In addition to comprehensive monitoring of the earth’s air, water and soil and of the effects of pollutants on human health, we can look forward to new procedures to implement the principle of state responsibility for national actions that have transnational environmental consequences, probably including some kind of “international environmental impact statement.”

To any farmer, rancher, logger, miner, developer, businessman, or property owner who has had to wrestle with the ordeal of attempting to comply with local, state, or federal environmental impact statements, the idea of a planetary EPA demanding similar compliance must be a nightmare too horrible to contemplate. But to the one-world corporate statist who plan on ruling, it makes wonderful sense.

Much more also begins to make sense. Like the long-standing symbiotic relationship between the Rockefeller Brothers Fund, Ford Foundation, Council on Foreign Relations, Exxon, IBM, Procter & Gamble, et al. on one hand, and Friends of the Earth, Nature Conservancy, Planned Parenthood, Sierra Club, Greenpeace, Environmental Defense Fund, et al. on the other. Pressure from above and pressure from below: The American people are caught in a pincer attack.

Thus we see the ubiquitous establishmentarian Lester Brown (CFR), making common cause with the Socialist International in calling for more socialist wealth redistribution programs. In an interview in the June 3 issue of *Terraviva*, a special daily newspaper distributed to participants during the Earth Summit, Brown predicted that “ecological sustainability will become the new organizing principle, the foundation of the ‘new world order,’ if you will.” And what that really means, said Brown, is that “we can no longer separate the future habitability of the planet from the distribution’ of wealth.” Which means more foreign aid prescribed and directed, naturally, by Brown and his elitist, eco-socialist confreres.

Surrender Process

“But,” suggested the *Terraviva* interviewer, “the current climate here in the U.S. seems very hostile to foreign aid.” Acknowledging the dilemma, Brown responded: “It might take a few more scares to get this country energized.” Or, as his fellow one-world aspirant, Bloomfield, would say, “a series of sudden, nasty and traumatic shocks.” No doubt these establishment eco-terrorists have plenty of scares and nasty shocks up their sleeves to “energize” the masses into surrendering their freedoms and national sovereignty to the UN’s rapidly evolving global green regime.

This surrender process is well underway and escalating, says Worldwatch associate Hilary F. French, through the passage of international treaties, such as those concerning global warming, ozone depletion, biodiversity, etc. In the Institute’s study, *After the Earth Summit: The Future of Environmental Governance*, French says: “National sovereignty — the power of a country to control events within its territory — has lost much of its meaning in today’s world, where borders are routinely breached by pollution, international trade, financial flows and refugees.... Nations are [through treaties] in effect ceding portions of their sovereignty to the international community, and beginning to create a



Written by [William F. Jasper](#) on October 4, 1993

new system of international environmental governance as a means of solving otherwise-unmanageable problems." These "unmanageable problems" are, of course, colossal frauds, mere "fictive models" (in *Iron Mountain* nomenclature) given credibility by enormous and sustained propaganda campaigns in the CFR insider-dominated media.

Every call to action, every solution offered by the green globalists, always leads to a loss of freedom and more power in government. It is becoming ever more obvious that the plans of the self-proclaimed planet guardians have virtually nothing to do with ecological stewardship or whatever other noble-sounding cause they are using as cover for their real goal. Instead, their plans have everything to do with forging the chains for a UN-dominated world dictatorship.

If you have detected a stepped-up campaign in recent months to reignite the over-population scare of the 1970s, you're not just imagining things. You can expect the onslaught to intensify as we approach the United Nations Conference on Population and Development, scheduled for 1994.

The insider-orchestrated campaign is surfacing everywhere. "Counselor" Timothy Wirth (CFR), in an address at the Paul H. Nitze School of Advanced International Studies on May 12, 1993, warned of the dreadful threat to humanity and Mother Earth from the "forces of global environmental decline": soil loss, rainforest destruction, global warming, etc. "Last, and central to all others," though, said Wirth, "is the spiral of population growth." Moreover, "Population must be at the top of our agenda for global cooperation — it dwarfs all others in terms of its importance and its difficulty."

Attack of the People Haters

In a winter 1992/93 *Foreign Affairs* article with the foreboding title, "The Population Threat," Michael S. Teitelbaum (CFR) warned, "The Clinton administration can ill-afford to ignore international population trends." He urged renewed U.S. funding for the UN's Fund for Population Activities (UNFPA) and the International Planned Parenthood Federation (IPPF).

At UNCED, Maurice Strong deplored the world's "explosive increase in population," and warned, "We have been the most successful species ever; we are now a species out of control." "Population," he declared, "must be stabilized, and rapidly."

Jacques Cousteau, one of the most venerated attractions at the summit, issued a fearful warning that "the fuse connected to a demographic explosion is already burning." At most, he said, humanity has ten years to put it out. Parroting the new Paul Ehrlich population bomb scare stories, the famed oceanographer urged "drastic, unconventional decisions" if the world is to avoid reaching the "unacceptable" and "absurd figure of 16 billion human beings" by the year 2070.

But the true depth of Captain Jacques' misanthropic zeal was revealed a few months earlier in an amazing interview that appeared in the November 1991 *UNESCO Courier*. Cousteau told his French interviewers:

Our society is turning toward more and more needless consumption. It is a vicious circle that I compare to cancer.... Should we eliminate suffering, diseases? The idea is beautiful, but perhaps not a benefit for the long term. We should not allow our dread of diseases to endanger the future of our species.

This is a terrible thing to say. *In order to stabilize world population, we must eliminate 350,000 people per day.* It is a horrible thing to say, but it's just as bad not to say it. [Emphasis added.]

Billions for Murder



Written by [William F. Jasper](#) on October 4, 1993

Agenda 21 calls for some \$7 billion per year for population control measures. What this means, in plain English, is that the UN wants a lot more money to dramatically expand its sterilization and abortion programs, as well as universal access to contraceptives and sex education. It will surely expand the coercive “one child” policies of Red China and may even help institute the kinds of “elimination” efforts Cousteau hinted at in his UNESCO interview.

The alarming thing is that Cousteau is not alone. Far from it. Consider the Club of Rome, another insider enclave in which Maurice Strong is a prime mover. In the Club’s 1991 book, *The First Global Revolution*, the one-worlders show their true colors. They declare: “In searching for a new enemy to unite us, we came up with the idea that pollution, the threat of global warming, water shortages, famine and the like would fit the bill.... All these dangers are caused by human intervention.... The real enemy, then, is humanity itself.”

If you are a member of humanity, a human being, you are the enemy of the globalist insiders, and they are your enemies. They are involved in a conspiracy against humanity — a conspiracy against God and man. Unless we recognize that fact and fight them with all of the honorable means at our disposal, we are doomed to be their victims in their tyrannical new world order.



Subscribe to the New American

Get exclusive digital access to the most informative, non-partisan truthful news source for patriotic Americans!

Discover a refreshing blend of time-honored values, principles and insightful perspectives within the pages of "The New American" magazine. Delve into a world where tradition is the foundation, and exploration knows no bounds.

From politics and finance to foreign affairs, environment, culture, and technology, we bring you an unparalleled array of topics that matter most.



[Subscribe](#)

What's Included?

- 24 Issues Per Year
- Optional Print Edition
- Digital Edition Access
- Exclusive Subscriber Content
- Audio provided for all articles
- Unlimited access to past issues
- Coming Soon! Ad FREE
- 60-Day money back guarantee!
- Cancel anytime.