

# Leading Environmentalists Detail Plot To Bankrupt Nuclear Industry

Presented here are three interviews with well-known spokesmen for the so-called environmentalist movement, men who are central in packaging and selling global energy policy for the Carter Administration and lower Manhattan financial interests, those of the Rockefeller family foremost among them. These are the men who have created the "belief structure" of environmentalism — around which the superstition and fear of "youth culture" victims in particular and the population in general is mobilized against scientific and technological progress.

Their own words are sufficient to prove that these leaders of the environmentalist movement have no legitimate concern about the safety of this or that nuclear power plant construction or technology. Environmentalist-sponsored court suits, demonstrations, terrorist acts are being coordinated with a high-pressure diplomatic campaign run through the U.S. State Department and private intelligence agencies like Friends of the Earth, as part of one integrated economic warfare operation whose goal is the total destruction of the entire nuclear industry. The tactic is to stop the nuclear industry in the USA and Western Europe in its tracks by stalling completion of nuclear power projects and harassing existing facilities until the entire industry becomes "economically unfeasible." Should this prove too slow, a staged nuclear terrorist catastrophe is openly voiced as a primary fall-back option.

Recent developments in West Germany document the nature and scope of the campaign. While nuclear reactor construction has been held up by courts in Gronde, Wyhl, Kalkar and elsewhere, based on the testimony of U.S. nuclear "safety experts" shipped in at the expense of Laurance Rockefeller's Natural Resources Defense Council, nuclear waste disposal — a major "safety issue" raised by environmentalists — has been sabotaged by the same Rockefeller operation. A nuclear waste disposal site under construction in the state of Lower Saxony was vetoed last week by state prime minister Albrecht, who reported he had "changed his mind" about having the site located in his jurisdiction — based on the advice of Albrecht's science minister Pestel, a member of John D. Rockefeller III's zero-growth planning body, the Club of Rome.

The recent assassination of banker Jürgen Ponto, widely known as a major architect of the West Germany-Brazil nuclear technology agreement, illustrates the open terrorist component of the operation.

## Denis Hayes: 'Virtual Nuclear Moratorium In USA Now'

*DENIS HAYES, WORLDWATCH INSTITUTE:* Hayes is an energy specialist and self-styled expert on nuclear terrorism at the Washington, D.C.-based Worldwatch Institute. He is the author of the Worldwatch pamphlet: "Nuclear Energy: The Fifth Horseman," detailing nuclear terrorism and nuclear disaster scenarios.

The Worldwatch Institute is a leading economic warfare and terrorist control research unit which brings together specialists from the Brookings Institution, Aspen Institute and Rockefeller Brothers Fund. Lester Brown, its director, is well-known as a proponent of labor-intensive agriculture and "food control" schemes for the developing sector nations, and was a participant in the Rockefeller Brothers Fund's Environmental Agenda project mentioned below. The Rockefeller Brothers Fund; Robert O. Anderson, chairman of Atlantic Richfield Corp. and president of the Aspen Institute; and the Federal Energy Administration have all funded Worldwatch.

*Q.* Where does the nuclear energy debate stand at this point? How is the Carter Administration's energy policy going?

*A.* In general the popular opposition to nuclear energy is mounting, and governments are going ahead with nuclear development despite this. The French-West German agreement to develop nuclear power and the fast breeder is a major setback to the Carter Administration. Jointly they will be able to go beyond the present French fast breeder technology and this will be bad . . .

*Q.* What kind of effect are the anti-nuclear protests having?

*A.* The opposition is having a local effect in gaining recognition of the dangers of nuclear power. What looks hopeful is the statements by the West German Minister of Technology (Matthöfer) who wants a five year nuclear moratorium beginning this year. That's pretty surprising from a technology minister. . . The Brokdorf and other demonstrations have had the same effect as hitting the proverbial mule over the head with a big stick to get his attention. Now people are waking up to realize that

nuclear energy will result in terrorism or a repressive autarchy to protect against terrorism. There is still the safety problem and a problem with acts of god.

The nuclear issue boils down to weapons proliferation versus a finite resource base. Weapons proliferation is inevitable if fast breeder technology is developed, but if it isn't then we are dealing with a finite amount of resources for our present reactors . . .

*Q* What is the most effective way to stop nuclear proliferation?

*A:* First of all there is a virtual nuclear moratorium in the U.S. now. Only one reactor contract for export has been closed this year and there were only two last year. This nuclear moratorium is the most effective. If a country such as the U.S. makes a decision against nuclear power then others will begin to think twice about their development plans . . . Sooner or later the escalating

safety requirements and the cost of those requirements will make nuclear energy economically unfeasible.

Of course nuclear power development would be stopped overnight if there were a disaster or disastrous calculated event; and with the vehemence of some of the anti-nuclear groups running around this is to be expected. There have already been bombings and terrorist attacks against nuclear plants in the past . . .

*Q:* So you see nuclear terrorism as inevitable if nuclear energy development continues?

*A.* Well it is still a credible scenario. But don't get me wrong. I think it would be much better if we could get a nuclear moratorium. If we could get a moratorium in several of the advanced countries for just a few years, then we could keep nuclear power from ever being economically feasible again.

---

## Gerald Barney: 'Vietnam War Resistance' To Nuclear Power

*GERALD O. BARNEY, ROCKEFELLER BROTHERS FUND:* Barney is a staff member of the Rockefeller Brothers Fund and functioned as chairman of its Environmental Agenda Task Force, a collection of representatives from virtually every significant environmental organization brought together by the Fund to produce a "consensus report" on environmental issues. This report has been published under the title "The Unfinished Agenda," and is the basis of the Carter Administration's energy program.

*Q.* As head of the Environmental Agenda Task Force what do you think of the present situation...?

*A.* I think we are progressing very well. For details call Gus Speth at the Council on Environmental Quality and Dan Ford at the Union of Concerned Scientists. On all the nuclear parts of the Unfinished Agenda I turned things over to them... The Carter plan is through the House and I think it will go through the Senate though there will be more problems. What is important is that there is more awareness of the dangers of nuclear energy than ever

before. I saw a poll taken several months ago which showed that 65 percent of the population *still* is not concerned about the danger of nuclear energy.

*Q.* Some people are saying that Carter is supporting nuclear energy too much and has gone against his campaign promises.

*A.* Well, there is more emphasis on nuclear power than I would have given, but this is I think because there is no concrete alternative. It is the responsibility of the environmentalists to develop this alternative. Amory Lovins has gone a long way toward this in a new book, *Soft Energy Paths*. Also the recent series in *Science* magazine on the solar energy program was very important.

We have reached a point where any government that thinks a quick and easy decision for nuclear development is possible is going to be surprised. The resistance to the continued use of nuclear energy is like the Vietnam war. There are also a lot of people with very strong feelings against nuclear energy and they are not going to live with it. They will go a long way to conserve and sacrifice to get away from a nuclear economy. But let's be clear, ultimately the decision on nuclear energy is going to be a political decision.