

Greenpeace founders: 'We created a monster'

by Rogelio A. Maduro

Greenpeace, the media's darling environmental organization, is not faring too well these days. In the past six months, several founders and former leaders of the group have denounced the extremism and the "anti-human" attitudes of its present leadership.

On Nov. 14, 1993, Denmark's TV-2 aired a documentary called "The Rainbow Man," a damning exposé of Greenpeace's financial misconduct and connections to international terrorism. The documentary was co-produced by internationally renowned Icelandic filmmaker Magnus Gudmundsson, who had previously made two film documentaries showing the unsavory money-making activities of Greenpeace. "The Rainbow Man" opened with an interview with Brian Metcalfe, founder of Greenpeace and its leader during the first decade of the organization's existence. (For more information on this film, see *EIR*, Jan. 21, 1994, "Greenpeace Accused of Bribery, Terrorism").

Metcalfe said, "When I think back over the years of the Greenpeace story, how it developed from the way we started it and the way it is today, I often see myself as a kind of Dr. Frankenstein, who created a monster that now has a life of its own."

Extremism and intolerance

Not long after that documentary aired, Patrick Moore, another co-founder of Greenpeace, penned a commentary in the Feb. 2 *Vancouver Sun*. He attacked the "anti-human" and "anti-civilization" bent which the organization has acquired. "More than 20 years ago," he wrote, "I was one of a dozen or so activists who founded Greenpeace in the basement of the United Church at 49th and Oak in Vancouver. The Vietnam War was raging, and nuclear holocaust seemed closer every day. We linked peace, ecology, and a talent for media communications, and went on to build the world's largest environmental activist organization. By 1986, Greenpeace was established in 26 countries and had an income of more than \$100 million per year."

After 15 years of leading Greenpeace, Moore decided to retire, believing that the environmental movement had achieved power, and that it was time to collaborate with governments and industry to solve the world's problems. Unfortunately, he said, "in the name of 'deep ecology' [some environmentalists] took a sharp turn to the ultra-left, ushering

in a mood of extremism and intolerance. As a clear signal of this new agenda, in 1990, Greenpeace called for a 'grassroots revolution against pragmatism and compromise.'

"The fall of the Berlin Wall contributed to this left turn," Moore continued. "Suddenly the international peace movement had a lot less to do. Pro-communist groups in the West were discredited. Many of their members moved into the environmental movement."

Moore wrote that "as an environmentalist in the political center, I now find myself branded a traitor and a sellout. My name appears in Greenpeace's 'Guide to Anti-Environmental Organizations.' Even fellow Greenpeace founder, Bob Hunter, refers to me as the 'eco-Judas.' Yes, I am trying to help the forest industry clean up its act so we might be proud of it again. Why shouldn't I make a contribution to environmental reform in the industry my grandfather and father have worked in for more than 90 years?"

The problem, according to Moore, is that "the new variant of the environmental movement is so extreme that many people, including myself, believe its agenda is a greater threat to the global environment than mainstream society."

An assault on science and reason

Some of the features of "eco-extremism" named by Moore include:

- It is anti-human. The human species is characterized by Greenpeace and other ecological extremists as a "cancer" on the face of the Earth. The extremists propagate the belief that all human activity is negative, whereas the rest of nature is good. This results in alienation from nature and subverts the most important lesson of ecology: that we are all part of nature and interdependent with it.

- It is anti-technology and anti-science. Eco-extremists dream of returning to some kind of technologically primitive society. Horse-logging is the only kind of forestry that these people can fully support. They see all large machines as inherently destructive.

- It is anti-democratic. This is perhaps the most dangerous aspect of radical environmentalism, in Moore's view. The very foundation of our society, liberal representative democracy, is rejected as being too "human-centered." In the name of "speaking for the trees and other species," we are faced with a movement that would usher in an era of eco-fascism. The "planetary police" would "answer to no one but Mother Earth herself."

- It is basically anti-civilization. Eco-extremism rejects virtually everything about modern society. We are told that nothing short of returning to primitive tribal society can save the Earth from ecological collapse. No more cities, no more airplanes, no more polyester suits. This is a naive vision of a return to the Garden of Eden.

Moore calls for "all environmentalists to resist the path of ever increasing extremism" and to "reject the anti-human, anarchistic approach."