

How NATO created environmentalism and the peace movement

by Laurent Murawiec, European Economics Editor

Most citizens believe that NATO, the North Atlantic Treaty Organization, is a military pact; that it commits more than a dozen Western nations to mutual defense in case of Soviet aggression; and that its prime functions are to deter such an attack, and failing that, to repel it.

Most citizens have been misled into believing this. In reality, neither is NATO chiefly a military organization, nor are its main functions military ones. NATO is certainly not the horrific militaristic tool of the military-industrial complex pictured in Moscow's propaganda and peacenik bogeymen galleries.

Looking at the evidence of NATO's true activities, one wishes that it were that. As demonstrated by the shocking evidence presented here (culled entirely from NATO's own published documentation), NATO's gigantic civilian bureaucracy has devoted most of its vast resources to creating the green environmentalist movement and the peace movement!

We will let prominent NATO speakers incriminate themselves and demonstrate, by their own uncensored words, that NATO—the supranational bureaucracy—is primarily concerned with the subversion of the sovereignty of its member states (and, since the NATO council of May 7, authorized deployments out of the North Atlantic area of the NATO charter, the subversion of other sovereign nation-states, as concretely demonstrated by the British gunboats' colonial expedition).

NATO's operational program today is the reduction of the world's population, the de-industrialization and de-urbanization of its leading nations. Hard to fathom as this might sound, the reader will now enter with us into some of NATO's highest deliberative councils.

NATO and the Club of Rome

“Perhaps we must work towards less energy-intensive patterns of activity having smaller environmental impacts. These patterns would have to be more oriented to individual participation and fulfillment, and be attuned to the problems of the wider world community. This also raises the vital question of the type of society that will adequately reflect the aspirations of our peoples and towards which our energies should be directed.

It also makes clear that we are in a position to choose our future, not simply to experience it.”

Who is this “Green” environmentalist spokesman? This dangerous anti-industrial social reformer is none other than Dutch aristocrat Jonkheer Joseph Luns, the Secretary-General of NATO, and a high-level member of the Order of Saint John of Jerusalem, the secret society of the old European “black nobility.”

Mr. Luns, with these words, is introducing a major, confidential strategy session of the elite that controls NATO. The scene is Brussels in April 1978. The NATO Science Committee, one of the innumerable “non-military” adjuncts of NATO, commemorates its 20th anniversary with a conference on the theme “Technological Challenges for Social Changes—Science and Future Choice.”

To whom has Joseph Luns's NATO addressed the answer to a question of such extraordinary importance? To the world's leading anti-growth, anti-industrial, anti-population, and anti-urban group, the Club of Rome. The Club of Rome's leaders are more than massively represented among the conference speakers; they and their ideology dominated the proceedings.

Former U.S. Ambassador to NATO Harlan Cleveland, formerly of the Aspen Institute, explains: “The central problem is clear enough: it is not limits to growth, it is limits to government. Let's not fudge the facts: in the industrial democracies, being developed has come to mean a chronic crisis of governance.”

Fortunately, Mr. Cleveland explains, “the yeast is rising. In every industrial nation a large number of people, often beginning with young people, have started to do some rethinking of growth patterns. In the United States, for example, the size of families has declined to about the population replacement level. The historic trek from rural to urban habitat has . . . gone into reverse. The ecological ethic in its many manifestations has started to make its influence felt in the market-place and in politics. A revolution has begun in the roles and status of ethnic minorities and the female half of the population. Local communities insist on gaining more control over their own growth.”

This is a desirable evolution, the NATO speaker stresses: "We are moving from an ethic of indiscriminate growth as the central organizing principle—growth unfairly distributed, growth wasteful of our resources and damaging to our surroundings . . . growth symbolized by a GNP that includes weapons, traffic jams, and drug abuse, but leaves out housework, week-end work or environmental improvement. [We need] some kind of selective growth, purposeful growth, growth 'as if people mattered.' I baptized this emerging ethic with a made-up name 'Humangrowth' . . . or 'Newgrowth.'"

This "new growth ethic," Cleveland continues—and no one among the several hundred attendants, diplomats, civil servants, and government ministers, apparently thought of booing him out of the room, and locking him away at the funny farm—starts with "a new scepticism of science and technology . . . A new emphasis on ecological causes and effects . . . new styles in governance for societies with less power at the 'top' and more kinds of people involved in planning and doing.

"It is now taken for granted, I would argue, that institutions should be built to contain, channel, and control new technologies, while they are being developed . . ." Cleveland adds. "In sum: a tidal wave of changes of values is well under way, and the main obstacle to converting these new values into policies and institutions is not the limits to physical resources but the limits to government . . . power is leaking out of national governments in three directions: to local communities . . . to non-government enterprises . . . and to international agencies."

Such is "The Third Phase of NATO" as presented—*as proposed*—by the NATO leadership.

What should NATO, then, do about this situation? Club of Rome head and co-founder Aurelio Peccei, a featured speaker, has an answer.

Peccei's NATO presentation of 1978 later became his book *100 Pages for the Future*. His target? "The freedom, independence, and unreined power inherent in modern science and technology [which] have permitted them to acquire a strategic position in government, the universities, and industry, as well as the military establishment. From their lofty, privileged niche, they are exercising an influence on society which dwarfs that of all other factors affecting society; and at the same time they raise unwarranted expectations and literally irradiate wave after wave of change before the attendant social and environmental costs, intermediate effects, and feedbacks can be appraised."

The enemy is clearly fingered. Quoting Club of Rome co-founder, Briton Alexander King (a man committed to the reduction of the numbers of "the yellow, brown, and black races,"), former Director-General of the OECD for Science, Technology, Industry, and Education, Peccei charges: "So far there have been

three main objectives, namely defense, economic growth, and national prestige, *for example, placing men on the Moon*. The social and services sectors of the economy" have been neglected, he laments.

"Blind human proliferation is the basic factor. . . . The impact of larger populations and more intensive human activities will certainly make things substantially worse . . . [what is urgent is] a thorough revision of the time-worn, if still apparently untouchable, principle of sovereignty and the concept of the nation-state. . . . The planet's land mass is suffering visible degradation owing to the combination of sheer demographic pressure, anarchical urbanization, and rapacious or improvident agricultural practices. . . ."

Peccei calls upon the NATO leaders he addressed *primus inter pares* of the Malthusian elite, to establish the "most stringent safeguards to preserve and positively restore a healthy state of the human habitat and what remains of the pristine wilderness all over the globe—which is the heart of nature." This program "must be given a high priority."

Compulsion will clearly be required, in the mind of the NATO theorist, since "the stubbornness of mankind in not perceiving what its real and permanent interest is [is] a bad omen."

So, from the rostrum of the 1978 NATO strategy session, Peccei calls for the establishment of a peace movement and the regroupment of the "green" movement under one NATO-controlled banner.

"In the present state of disarray, intolerance, frustration and fear, modern society is becoming an armed camp. . . . The nuclear arsenals have in store the equivalent of more than one million Hiroshima bombs packing a monstrous 'overkill' capacity, . . ."

Happily, Peccei reports to NATO, "There are encouraging signs" in the fight against the military establishment of nation-states and industrialists and growth-oriented labor. "[The signs] come mainly from the grass-roots of society—from the people themselves . . . an indication of the keen public consciousness that changes must be made, even at the cost of sacrifices, is the formation of spontaneous groupings of citizens, springing up all over the place, like antibodies in a sick organism."

Note well: inasmuch as science and the nation-state are defined by NATO as the disease, the "antibodies" which NATO wishes to deploy are now to be named.

"*The peace movement*" is the first named by Peccei. But, as the reader will certainly remember, *there was no peace movement at the time of Peccei's NATO speech!* The full horror of the conspiracy hits the reader of the 400-page official NATO reprint of all the conference speeches, in reading Peccei's list of "antibodies . . . The peace movement, the conservation and ecological groups, women's lib, the population policy associations, the de-

fenders of minorities, of human rights, and civil liberties, the apostles of amnesty, the peaceful protesters, the dissidents, the social workers, the consumer advocates, the conscientious objectors, etc. A fountainhead of fresh, innovative ideas, usually with a simple dialectic having the ring of a *vox populi*, they together form an incipient second-layer network, intent on watching and stimulating the official networks of government and inter-governmental agencies.”

Not one general, apparently, rose in anger to expel the dangerous subversive from a NATO conference. The NATO Secretary-General approved. The NATO speaker that commented, in the fashion of the conference, upon Peccei’s contribution praised “the role of the spontaneous movements for the ecology, disarmament, or human rights.” Nobody had a word of dissent. The conclusion is overwhelming: at NATO, it is not generals, nor defense imperatives that matter—it is this infuriating mish-mash of sociology, psychology, futurology, and nonsensology originally manufactured at the British Tavistock Institute, the center of the British psychological warfare department.

The rest of the proceedings of the NATO conference was no less dramatically monopolized by the Club of Rome: Alexander King, Eduard Pestel (a leader of the NATO Science Committee), Mihajlo Mesarovic, and André Danzin were among the Club of Rome members that contributed to the conference program. Many representatives of Club of Rome-associated organizations were also featured.

Leaving the NATO policy-making session where the peace movement was founded, we can ask ourselves in amazement: how, for the love of God, was the NATO first commanded by General Eisenhower turned into this kook factory?

A history of the NATO fraud

The elite supranational bureaucracy that controls NATO has relentlessly attempted, since the inception of the Atlantic alliance, to impose an expansion of its treaty-assigned area of deployment, its scope, and powers. Since the beginning, the European “black oligarchs” have tried to leverage the Atlantic pact and the network of NATO’s associate organizations into becoming the means of destroying the sovereignty of its member states.

It began on March 16, 1946 with the Fulton, Missouri speech of Lord Marlborough (also known as Sir Winston Churchill), with its shrill “Iron Curtain” rhetoric that buried Roosevelt’s wartime plans for postwar East-West cooperation for world economic development. The weakened imperial power, Britain, was still smart enough to lead “dumb giant” America by the nose. “American muscle and British brains,” as London said at the time.

As the two superpowers were being thrown into confrontation, a dense network of “Western” or “Atlantic” organizations of a supranational nature were created, and imposed upon national governments under the pretext of the danger of war. The emergency situation was used to justify this. Russian military and non-military threats were to be held in check.

The European Recovery Program (“Marshall Plan”) launched in June 1947, received an institutional form in April 1948 with the Organization for European Economic Cooperation (OEEC). An administrator of the agency that channeled Marshall Plan funds into Europe candidly explained what the policy was: “We rebuilt slowly under the Marshall Plan, because we did not want people to get the idea that prosperity was coming back,” said George Ball, Wall Street investment banker, and a junior executive working under President Truman’s special ambassador to the Marshall Plan’s European Cooperation Agency, East Coast blue-blood Averell Harriman, who soon became the head of the OEEC, and thus something of an economic dictator of war-torn Europe.

From Washington, the agency was ruled by banker William Draper, Undersecretary of the Army and the most fanatical advocate and practitioner of population reduction since Adolf Hitler.

While NATO, created by treaty in April 1949, incorporated the military components of pacts signed between European nations, the civilian components were amalgamated into the OEEC. Europe’s monetary and financial situation weakened by the shortage of convertible currencies, the OEEC established, in cooperation with the Basel-based Bank for International Settlements (BIS), the European Payments Union, which played the role of a clearinghouse for intra-European payments. Its small staff included Belgian-American economist Robert Triffin, and Italian whiz-kid Guido Carli. The EPU was designed by Harlan Cleveland.

The common policy of this alphabet soup of supranational organizations was expressed in a memorandum issued in October 1947 by the BIS: “The financial and monetary rehabilitation of European economies should be one of the main objectives” of policy, but “while the physical aspects of European reconstruction are undoubtedly important, they are *not* the only factor of which account has to be taken.” For the millions who starved in Europe at that time, it will be of interest to learn that the same Malthusian group that advocated a slowdown of U.S. economic and financial aid in the late 1940s for reasons of “monetary and financial orthodoxy,” is the same that tries today to usher in the “third phase of NATO.”

It must be emphasized that NATO itself, at that time, had no civilian bureaucracy whatsoever. It is only

in December 1950 that a Supreme Allied Commander in Europe was appointed, General Eisenhower, and NATO, in keeping with its charter, remained merely what it claimed to be—a military alliance.

That state of affairs came to an early end with the commissioning by the Atlantic Council (the ministers' meeting) of a Temporary Council Committee (TCC) set up "to reconcile the requirements of collective security with the political and economic capabilities of the member countries." This TCC, which held its first session in Paris in October 1951, was directed by the ubiquitous Averell Harriman (best defined by his lifelong commitment to the Nazi doctrines of eugenics), Frenchman Jean Monnet (whose career led him from opium money banking in Shanghai to attempted destruction of Europe's nation-states with his federalist version of the European Community, torpedoed by President de Gaulle) and Britain's Sir Edwin (later Lord) Plowden, a veteran from the U.K. Ministry of Economic Warfare and the Ministry of Aircraft Production.

In keeping with the extreme supranationalist views held by such leaders, the TCC final report filed a strong recommendation to "strengthen non-military cooperation. . . . The North Atlantic Treaty must become a permanent body . . . [and] be enabled to function continuously," they wrote, "with effective powers of decision, irrespective of the presence of ministers. . . ." The TCC report, in addition, recommended the creation of a Secretary-General of NATO. By 1952, Britain's General Lord Ismay had become NATO's first. That was the foot in the door.

The door was to be shoved open just a few years later. In 1956, the North Atlantic Council appointed a committee of three foreign ministers to explore "non-military cooperation in NATO," clearly an obsessive concern on the part of the organization's leaders. The three were Italy's Gaetano Martino, Norway's Halvard Lange, and Canada's Lester Pearson (who a few years later directed a U.N.-sponsored Commission on Third World Development Affairs, the conclusions of which were no less Malthusian than those of Pearson's successor Willy Brandt).

Their report boldly stated that "the fundamental historical fact underlying developments is that the nation-state . . . is inadequate for progress or even survival in the nuclear age. . . . This basic fact underlies our report and the recommendations contained therein." The report had been drafted by Jean Monnet's protégé, Guido Carli, who lamented in the body of the report that "NATO has not yet fully recognized the essential interrelationship between these two aspects of security—civilian and military." Further, the report stated that "NATO should not forget that the influence and interest of its members are not confined by the area covered by

the treaty. . . . [NATO] has not done enough to bring about that close and continuous contact between its civil and military sides," supranationalist Carli wrote.

The recommendations of the "Three," which were unanimously endorsed by the NATO Ministerial Council in December 1956, created NATO as a supranational bureaucracy. The specific recommendations included:

- The establishment of a NATO Science Committee;
- The establishment of a committee of NATO economic advisers (today the NATO Economics Directorate);
- An extraordinary development of the role, functions, status, and staff of the NATO Secretary-General.

More than anything else, this proved to be the feature that finally transformed NATO into the bizarre conglomerate of Malthusian fanatics described above. Little time was lost after the report of the Committee of Three had been approved. The ineffective Lord Ismay was replaced by the tough Belgian politician Paul-Henri Spaak, a former leading figure in the Belgian Trotskyist movement, whose career had skyrocketed when the Royal Family took him under their personal protection in the late 1930s.

To complete the (by then) impressive array of Atlantic agencies thus created, the Atlantic Congress of NATO Countries' Parliamentarians was induced to propose the establishment of a NATO think tank, the Atlantic Institute, which came into being in Paris in 1961, under East Coast blueblood Henry Cabot Lodge, one of the planners of the U.S. Vietnam disaster. One of the chief officers of the Institute was former Fiat executive Aurelio Peccei.

By then, the OEEC had grown into the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development, the supranational economic-policy-making equivalent of NATO. And Paul-Henri Spaak had been replaced by another dignitary of the Sovereign Military Hospitaller Order of Malta, Italian diplomat Manlio Brosio. It seems that a title, membership in the Order of Malta, or its Protestant form, the Order of Saint John of Jerusalem, and a solid pedigree in eugenics and Malthusianism are *sine qua non* preconditions for holding high-level office in the NATO bureaucracy.

The cancerous apparatus of NATO

The Malthusian commitment of the NATO controllers, exhibited so shamefully in their late 1940s promotion of "turnip winter" quasi-starvation conditions for the European population, and the fanatical hatred of nation-states they demonstrated in their attempts at building a federalist Europe, reached a turning point with the extraordinary success of the U.S. and Soviet space programs, which threatened to overturn their every plan and dream. Something urgent had to be done.

In 1968, NATO think-tanker Aurelio Peccei, and the OECD (the “civilian NATO”) Director-General Dr. Alexander King were brought together by top Soviet KGB talent-scout Dzhermen Gvishiani, the late Premier Kosygin’s son-in-law, and a leading official in the Soviet science and technology establishment. Together, the three men founded the Club of Rome, very much a NATO undertaking from the start.

Why NATO should bother to create an organization committed to ruining NATO nations’ industrial, technological, and scientific capacities, and the type of education that fosters such science-oriented growth, shows once more that the name of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization covers two entirely distinct realities: a secondary, minor factor—a wide number of military agencies—and a dominant, fast-developing, non-military bureaucracy. Professional military officers of NATO countries have seen the first NATO gradually become the prey of the proliferating futurologist and supranational bureaucrats—and increasingly losing thereby any efficient reality as a military power.

A first, major Club of Rome undertaking was the 1969 founding of an environmentalist agency within the NATO bureaucracy. That Committee on the Challenges of Modern Society (CCMS) was initiated by Henry Kissinger, then the U.S. National Security Adviser, and Daniel Patrick Moynihan, then special presidential assistant. These two greenies sold President Nixon the idea that “a new, social dimension had to be added to NATO.” Impressed by this “vision,” Nixon campaigned heavily with the allies for the establishment of this green NATO. What the new agency was is explained by NATO itself in the following terms:

“The alliance, much more than just a military organization, has a charter and a history that fit it for a wide variety of tasks. . . . There exists with the nations of the alliance a powerful, if still somewhat latent, concern with the deterioration, indeed, the degradation of national environments under the impact of technologically based industrialization. . . . [What is needed instead is] a significantly more fulfilling and meaningful environment.”

The aims of the new agency were set out in unambiguous terms: “The survival of human society as we know it—perhaps the survival of man as a species—is threatened now by a new factor: the rapid deterioration of the globe itself as an ecological system. . . . The world-wide ecological crisis (for crisis it is) has three main components: urbanization, now a universal phenomenon; the population explosion; and the damaging encroachment of man’s technologies on his physical and socio-cultural environments.”

Could it have been made clearer? NATO named the names of its three main enemies: *cities, people, and technology*.

And to stress the point once more, when the reluctant allies yielded to intense pressure from the White House, and accepted the establishment of the “green NATO,” the Committee on the Challenges of Modern Society, there were few greenies, and no mass environmentalist movement! That movement was created, to a large extent, by NATO directly.

How this was done was described by the CCMS itself, and published in a no more secretive location than the *NATO Review*. From its inception, CCMS was conceived as an organizing tool in charge of creating a movement:

“The CCMS program has created an international network of high-level specialists. . . . It uses diplomatic facilities, means of communication, and protocols, and those of NATO for its administrative and logistical activities. . . . [It] helps men to remain in harmony with a rapidly evolving world, [it] strengthens the national institutions which are concerned with environmental affairs. . . . It is the existence of [informal] networks and their role in the formation of a consensus. . . . CCMS has been particularly useful in the early stages of new key domains [of environmentalism]. . . . The interaction of the CCMS ‘communities’ is the real medium . . . of institutional change, and the greatest achievement of CCMS has been the facilitation of the process. . . . The committee has been able to make a significant impact because most [CCMS] experts are in key positions to serve as catalysts for change. . . .”

The Club of Rome had found its “conveyor belt,” which would train a cadre-force. The stage of the mass movement only came later. At that time, the Malthusians were still compelled to keep a relatively unobtrusive profile.

The OECD published in 1971 the report of its Ad Hoc Committee on the New Concepts of Science Policy, led by Harvey Brooks—whom we find among the leading speakers of the April 1978 Brussels conference reported above. The Committee wrote: “Science is in disarray because society itself is in disarray, partly for the very reason that the power of science has enabled society to reach goals that were formerly only vague aspirations, but whose achievement has revealed their shallowness and created expectations which outrun even the possibilities of modern technology. . . . Policies concerned with science and technology in the next decade will have to take into account, much more explicitly than in the past, the benefits and disbenefits, actual and potential, that may result from the application of science or the deployment of technology.” Aurelio Peccei’s comment of 1978 on this piece is revealing: “Nowadays, one can be blunter.”

This astonishing piece of new left ideology printed without a hiccup by the “respectable” and dignified OECD, the sister institution of NATO, typifies the great

strides already made then by the Malthusian ideas that had led to the establishment of the whole network of supranational institutions of the postwar period. By then also, the NATO central apparatus was in full bloom, under the supervision of Joseph Luns.

While many NATO documents lay thick layers of decorative veneer on reality, and stress with great effort and little credibility that “NATO is not a supranational organization,” the fact that its permanent apparatus is supranational is more difficult to conceal. Since the 1956 reforms, and in successive stages, the office of the Secretary-General has acquired formidable powers. The Secretary-General is the chairman of:

- The North Atlantic Council (inter-government level);
- Defense Planning Committee;
- The Nuclear Planning Group;
- The Committee on the Challenges of Modern Society.

The Secretary-General heads a number of other senior committees, and the international staff of NATO at Brussels headquarters. He controls the “private office” and the Office of the Secretary-General, and that of the legal adviser. Additionally, the NATO Office of Security—a mysterious outfit—reports to the Secretary-General directly, and its known functions are “to coordinate, monitor, and implement NATO security policy. The director of security is the Secretary-General’s principal security adviser, the chairman of the NATO Security Committee, and [he] directs the NATO headquarters security service.”

Given the extraordinary interpenetration of Europe’s environmentalist, pacifist, and terrorist movements, and the role played by NATO in fostering the green and peacenik components, questions are inexorably raised concerning the exact role played by the “independent” NATO intelligence services in European terrorism. Italian experiences with the Verona southern flank NATO center for psychological warfare, which coordinated several attempted coups d’état in the 1960s and 1970s, as well as Red Brigade operations, and quite recently operations at the Sigonella, Sicily NATO base, only strengthen these suspicions.

Among the innumerable other bodies that pullulate within the NATO structure, attention should be concentrated on an agency placed under the authority of the Assistant Secretary-General for Defense Planning and Policy, the Senior Civil Emergency Planning Committee (SCEPC). The Committee is in charge of drawing up the plans for the “coordination of plans for use of civil resources in support of the alliance defense efforts; the rapid transition of peacetime economies to an emergency footing. . . .” Under this respectable façade, we find formidable powers, and an extremely wide scope for such “civil emergency planning.” It embraces:

- The continuity of the machinery of government;
- The maintenance of law and order;
- The mobilization and use to the best advantage of natural resources (energy, manpower, transport systems, production capacities, food and agriculture, raw materials, telecommunications);
- Civil defense: warning, rescue service, and health care.

The Committee, enabled to “provide for a range of contingencies,” represents, in other and more brutally realistic words, the alternative machinery of a supranational dictatorship. In case of “emergency,” the powers of these NATO civil wartime agencies could be invoked. SCEPC, which was tested during the 1975 Hilex maneuvers, comprises eight planning boards and committees which are the nuclei of the wartime emergency agencies, and cover the control of population movements (“population control”) as well as a central supply agency centralizing food, agricultural goods, and industrial commodities, the pooling of all merchant ships and agencies for the control of inland surface transport in central Europe, and transport in the Mediterranean, as well as civil defense.

The NATO Assistant Secretary-General for Infrastructure, Logistics, and Council Operations has oversight of (undisclosed) crisis management plans and arrangements. In both cases, the example of the dictatorial government apparatus constructed in the United States under the cover of the Federal Emergency Management Administration (FEMA) is the immediately relevant reference.

Worst of all, given the nature of the apparatus that controls NATO lock, stock, and barrel, there cannot be the slightest doubt that such emergency powers, as soon as invoked—under the impact of a crisis in petroleum supplies, for example, after or during a conflict in the Persian Gulf—would be used by the thoroughly evil Malthusian conspiracy of oligarchs, and their weird employees, to sweep away the prerogatives of the sovereign nation-states.

It is very unfortunate that Charles de Gaulle’s courageous attempt, when he inflicted a severe strategic setback to that apparatus by pulling France out of NATO and thereby destroying the aura of invulnerability and total power of the NATO bureaucracy, could not succeed in finishing off the beast. For this reason, *EIR* founder Lyndon LaRouche has recently proposed that “the fruit-cake side of the NATO organization must be closed down, and the lunatics sent back to the Tavistock Institute and other cookie factories. . . . The remaining, legitimate aspects of our military alliance organizations must then be reorganized simply as a military general-staff function.” NATO countries’ military would certainly be in better shape—not to speak of their civilian society.