
Elections

Voters reject 'Big Green' eco-fascism

by James Duree, Jr.

The Nov. 6 election was certainly not a banner day for environmentalists in California: Citizens "voted their pocket-books" by rejecting both key environmental initiative measures, Propositions 128 and 130. Proposition 128, the so-called "Big Green" initiative co-sponsored by Assemblyman Tom Hayden (D-Santa Monica), was defeated by a nearly 2-1 margin; Proposition 130, dubbed "Forests Forever" by its supporters, the timber lock-up swindle first proposed by the eco-terrorist Earth First! group and bankrolled by Rockefeller-connected investor Harold Arbit, was defeated by a smaller margin. The two industry-backed alternative initiatives, Propositions 135 and 138, put on the ballot by agriculture and timber interests to counter 128 and 130 but advertised as "environmental" measures, were defeated by even larger margins.

Proposition 128, the "Environmental Protection Act of 1990," touted by supporters as the "most comprehensive package of environmental legislation ever presented to voters," was conceived as part of outgoing California Attorney General John Van de Kamp's unsuccessful bid for the Democratic gubernatorial nomination. Big Green (now known as "Big Loser") brought together the entire environmentalist movement.

In its 39 pages and 16,000 words of fine print, Proposition 128 proposed, among other things, to 1) ban as many as 200 pesticides; 2) cut carbon dioxide emissions by 40% by the year 2010; 3) phase out all refrigerants and other chemicals using chlorofluorocarbons (CFCs); 4) float \$300 million in state bonds to buy up certain stands of old-growth coastal redwoods on private timberland; 5) prohibit all oil and natural gas production in state waters; 6) set up an ecology führer (the act called it the "Environmental Advocate") to enforce the proposition, and create environmentalist attorney bounty-hunters to intervene on their own to help carry out the enforcement.

The pro-128 campaign, bankrolled primarily by entertainment industry types like Ted Turner and Jane Fonda, used a "hit parade" of actors such as Michael Landon and

Bruce Willis in TV ads with an emotional, anti-scientific appeal on pollution, pesticides, and cancer in children.

The opposition to 128 and 130 spanned the political spectrum, from the loggers, foresters, and family farmers whose jobs and livelihood were threatened by the measures, to pesticide manufacturers, oil companies, and agricultural cartel firms. The business-backed opposition committee, known as "No on 128, the Hayden Initiative," spent over \$10 million, much of it on dull-as-dishwater radio and TV ads, with lines like: "Everyone is for protecting the environment, but the Hayden Initiative costs too much, tries to do too much, and may cause more problems than it solves." Toward the end of the campaign, the industry committee began airing a one-minute spot featuring former U.S. Surgeon General C. Everett Koop, correctly arguing that Proposition 128 would do nothing to protect the health of Californians.

Effective opposition: LaRouche's associates

Having recognized early on the inadequacy of the campaign planned by the industry-sponsored committee against 128, political associates of then U.S. congressional candidate and political prisoner Lyndon LaRouche set up a statewide political committee, known as "Stop Eco-Fascism—No on 128 and 130," to expose the malthusian, anti-growth, anti-population policy behind both ballot measures. The "Stop Eco-Fascism" committee produced its own half-hour television documentary on Big Green, which exposed the austerity program the measure would implement, demolished the scientific frauds underlying every key section of the measure, documented the neo-pagan, anti-Judeo-Christian outlook of the "Green" movements in the West, and laid out the positive alternative—the economic recovery program of LaRouche, modeled on the successful programs of President Franklin Roosevelt in the 1940s and President John Kennedy in the early 1960s.

When the committee unveiled the documentary at a press conference by committee vice president Dave Kilber in Sacramento, the media mobbed the event and reported on it statewide. The Hayden crowd was so worried that they deployed two people to the press conference to monitor the program.

The committee then circulated the television program throughout the state, first through press tours in timber and agricultural areas, and later on cable TV in all the major metropolitan areas. Several hundred copies of the program were also produced on VHS videocassette and circulated to political supporters in timber, farming, labor, industry, and religious and community groups. The cable TV broadcasts, which made the show accessible to 2 million households, included the cities of San Francisco, Oakland, San Jose, Los Angeles, Long Beach and many nearby cities, and part of San Diego.

There is no question that the "Stop Eco-Fascism" committee played a critical, catalytic role in mobilizing opposi-

tion to 128 among the public and key policymakers, since only the committee made clear that Propositions 128 and 130 were, in fact, *eco-fascism*—fascism with an ecological face—that would “shut down our farms and factories, and cut your family’s standard of living.”

The critical role of LaRouche’s associates in communicating this message was underlined perhaps best by Tom Hayden himself. When confronted by a “Stop Eco-Fascism” representative at a debate on the initiative and asked if he weren’t in fact trying to set up “an eco-fascist police state, with you [Hayden] as the eco-Führer,” Hayden could only blurt out: “At least it won’t be with Lyndon LaRouche!”

Vote against taxes, depression

Virtually every California ballot proposition which had a substantial price tag attached to it went down to defeat, including bond measures for prison construction, public schools, and the “war on drugs.” Despite the shallowness of the campaign waged by the industry-sponsored “No on 128, the Hayden Initiative,” their campaign did stress that there would be massive costs associated with Proposition 128. The developing Mideast war crisis also appears to have played a role in the defeat of Proposition 128, as well as the fear of higher gas prices due to so-called global warming and the carbon dioxide reduction sections of the measure. The *Sacramento Bee* published an analysis piece on the proposal several weeks before the election which noted that the crisis in the Gulf meant “rough going” for Big Green.

While it would be an exaggeration to argue that the overwhelming defeat of Proposition 128 indicates a complete repudiation by voters of radical environmentalism and malthusianism, it is clear that the election outcome does mean that voters are increasingly associating environmental measures with job loss and cuts in their standards of living. And as even California sinks into the depths of the onrushing depression, this is the beginning of the kind of political awakening necessary to reverse the past 25 years of environmentalist sabotage of productive agriculture and industry.

But eco-fascists never learn

Far from abandoning its anti-growth, malthusian, “environmental protection” program, the environmentalist movement plans to continue pushing the same garbage contained in Proposition 128, although in a piecemeal, issue-by-issue fashion, through the legislature and with the signature of the new Republican governor, Pete Wilson. The tip-off to this orientation was an editorial in the Oct. 29 *Los Angeles Times* opposing 128 as “bad environmental science.” The *Times* argued that the machinery was already in place, *without* 128, to impose the environmental agenda, and referenced the Clean Air Act, the South Coast Air Quality Management District’s draconian air pollution control program, and recent actions by the state’s Air Resources Board.

The process by which the zero-growth environmental

agenda is already being imposed in California is exemplified by the ongoing takeover of key public and private utilities by hard-core malthusians. The Los Angeles Department of Water and Power, the nation’s largest public utility and historically one of the bastions of pro-nuclear, pro-water, and pro-development outlooks, has been taken over from the top by environmentalists. Over the past several months, Los Angeles Mayor Tom Bradley has orchestrated a coup at DWP, by appointing several environmentalists to the board of directors of the utility; the environmentalist faction now controls a majority of the board. One key appointee is Mary Nichols, formerly a staff attorney with the Natural Resources Defense Council. At the same time, the new chief executive officer of Southern California Edison, the largest private utility company in the nation, is John E. Bryson, an attorney who co-founded the NRDC. Albert Meyerhoff, another attorney for the NRDC, was one of the authors of Hayden’s Proposition 128.

Depression shows no incumbent is safe

by Webster G. Tarpley

The Nov. 6 midterm elections were a serious defeat for George Bush, and at the same time a barometer of the rising mass-strike mood of large sectors of the U.S. population as war approaches and depression deepens. But while voters humiliated Bush, they did not inflict such massive damage on Republican candidates as to paralyze Bush and reduce him to undeniable lame-duck status: That would have required far more than the GOP’s net loss of one Senate seat, nine House seats, and one governorship.

The clearest repudiation of incumbents came in the governors’ races, where 14 of 36 state executive posts changed hands from one party to another. Governors were targeted by anti-establishment, anti-incumbency voters because it was they who, during most of this year, have personified the budget crisis of government in the depression. Not one governorship was uncontested. The majority of the population became aware of de facto national bankruptcy on the federal level only in October.

The biggest concentration of these gubernatorial turn-overs came in the Northeast, where the economic depression is the deepest, and where state budget crises had already forced a number of governors to give up their plans for reelection last spring. In Rhode Island, Democrat Bruce Sundlun