

showed that Greenpeace U.S.A. received nearly \$24 million in contributions and donations during 1987, over \$1 million in merchandise sales, and nearly \$2 million from grants, royalties, investment earnings, and other revenues. At year's end, Greenpeace U.S.A. still had over \$6.8 million on deposit after all expenses, and listed over \$8 million in overall assets.

In addition to a continuous outpouring of direct mail solicitations, petitions, action bulletins, etc., Greenpeace U.S.A. publishes a bimonthly 24-page glossy color magazine focusing on such issues as toxic waste, nuclear proliferation, and endangered species.

The Green model

In an October-December 1986 special issue of *Greenpeace* commemorating the 15th anniversary of the group, two Greenpeace activists, Fritjof Capra of the Elmwood Institute and Randy Hayes of the Rainforest Action Network, published a revealing treatise on the Greenpeace philosophy titled "Green and Peace: A Visionary Link."

That article stated in part:

"We see the rise of ecological awareness as part of a fundamental change of worldview that is now transforming our society. We call it the paradigm shift. . . . Our starting point is the recognition that most of us, especially our large social institutions, are still tied to an outdated world view that is responsible for the global crisis we face. . . . The old paradigm is guided and supported by a set of ideas which include: the conception of our natural environment as a mechanical system consisting of separate parts to be exploited by different interest groups and of life as a competitive struggle for existence; the belief in unlimited material progress to be achieved through economic and technological growth. . . . The new paradigm that is now emerging may be called an ecological world view.

"The many diverse movements that make up the progressive elements of modern Western nations—the feminist movement, holistic health movement, spiritual and Third World movements, for example—are finding themselves, like Greenpeace, aligned with the new paradigm. They are now beginning to coalesce, recognizing that they represent merely different facets of the same new vision of reality and a powerful force of societal transformation is emerging. The most impressive example of this coalition is the movement of green politics which began in Germany five years ago."

While flaunting the Soviet bloc's most successful irregular warfare foray into Western Europe—the Green Party—as the model for their worldwide operations, Greenpeace U.S.A. and Greenpeace Action were curiously remiss in their otherwise flawless public relations assault against the American public. In every published document obtained by *EIR* in the course of preparing this special report, nowhere did the American Greenpeace groups make any mention of their Soviet operations or their newly established Moscow offices.

Russian sub disaster triggers Greenpeace

by William Engdahl

On 7 April, at 09:41 hours, the first indication of trouble was picked up when radio SOS signals from a Soviet submarine 118 miles southwest of Bear Island in the remote Arctic waters of the Norwegian Sea, between the northern Cap of Norway and Spitzbergen, reported a fire aboard. By 15:15 hours that day, according to the official chronology of the Norwegian Ministry of Defense, the Soviet submarine started to sink in 4,500 feet of water. By 15:30, Johan Jorgen Holst, the Norwegian defense minister, was informed that "something has occurred" in the area. One hour later, a Norwegian Orion reconnaissance airplane arrived at the reported site of the event. The Orion reportedly spotted what appeared to be an oil slick and a nearby life raft with several people aboard and two apparently dead bodies floating in the icy waters.

By 22:00 Norwegian time, the U.S. television company Cable News Network was the first to broadcast a story, citing a "Pentagon source," of a "Soviet submarine accident" in the Arctic waters.

By that weekend, the world's press carried banner headlines on the event, speculating as to what kind of nuclear power reactor drove the craft, and whether nuclear missiles were on board. The most sensational coverage was in the London *Sunday Telegraph* of April 9, which warned its readers of an imminent "threat of a major environmental disaster, as it emerged that it was powered by suspect liquid metal nuclear reactors." The paper, whose editor-in-chief, Andrew Knight, is a member of the Anglo-Soviet Roundtable, warned of the "biggest potential environmental threat of its kind that the world has faced at sea." It speculated that the sub was of an advanced, compact but unstable Mike Class design, extremely quiet, but whose nuclear reactors would be cooled by liquid metal, most likely sodium, which could corrode the pipes underwater and come into an explosive contact with the ocean water, releasing untold volumes of radioactive discharge.

With remarkable haste, the Greenpeace international "environmental" organization went into high gear. In Scan-

dinavia, Greenpeace issued a press statement calling the incident a "ticking environmental time bomb" under the sea. Hans Moeller Christensen, Copenhagen-based coordinator of the Nuclear Free Seas campaign of Greenpeace, told journalists on April 10, "The main point is that there is uranium fuel with a fission reactor and plutonium at the bottom of the sea. Sooner or later that will come out into the sea. We can't say when. This is a rich fishing area. This could have profound implications for fish stock, for the fishing industry and for the international view about fish caught in Nordic waters generally. Already we have heard rumors that a Japanese trading company has cancelled further purchases of Norwegian fish until it is clear what the danger is."

The Greenpeace organization immediately volunteered figures to Danish and Swedish media that an "estimated 4-5,000 people could die" from the "food chain contamination" arising from the nuclear sub's discharge, as a result of fishing those waters. They renewed their call for "nuclear-free seas."

NATO maneuvers targeted

Leftist Danish journalist Jørgen Dragsdahl, writing a lead editorial in the daily *Information* of April 12, picked up the Greenpeace cudgels. Dragsdahl, who often writes anti-NATO pieces and has longstanding ties to left-wing groups such as Washington's Institute for Policy Studies, used the Soviet sub incident to demand support for Greenpeace's Nuclear Free Seas campaign. Noting the recent U.S. announcement that the battleship *USS Iowa*, equipped with nuclear-tipped cruise missiles, will join the June NATO naval maneuvers in the Baltic, Dragsdahl calls on Greenpeace to organize operations against the ship. Several days before the Soviet submarine incident, *Information* had co-sponsored a meeting in Copenhagen of various leftist and "peace" groups. West German "maverick" Admiral Schmaeling attended and denounced the planned presence of the *USS Iowa* in Danish waters.

The Soviets, from their side, have hardly helped restore calm. Official Norwegian requests for information on the type of nuclear power unit aboard the vessel have so far been met with stony silence. Earlier Norwegian offers of humanitarian rescue aid to the sailors aboard, in the approximately six hours between the original distress signal of fire and the sinking, which the Norwegian government believes could have saved a number of lives of those frozen to death at sea, were also refused by the Russians. The only official Russian statements have been to tell Western officials that there is "no danger" of leakage and that there were two nuclear-armed warheads aboard. Nothing has been said about the reactors aboard, leading to extensive Western speculation.

While no Western source can yet confirm exact details of what happened and what the reactor type is under the Norwegian Sea, certain things can be stated. First, according to the official Norwegian State Institute for Radiological Hygiene in Oslo, the designated agency making sophisticated

on-site deep water tests, the initial samples of deep water taken from the site reveal "less radioactivity background than normal readings from the coastline of Norway. There is, at present, no indication of any unusual radioactivity." The monitoring tests will be continued, officials tell *EIR*, but to date, there seems little cause for alarm.

Why, then, is Greenpeace jumping in with this all-out offensive? Are they simply an overzealous group of young "eco-nuts" who want to find new campaigns after their "save-the-whales" effort seems discredited as a publicity stunt? The Greenpeace offensive around the Soviet sub incident suspiciously fits the framework of a several-years-long campaign by the group, which apparently enjoys intimate ties to certain Western liberal Establishment circles tied to the secretive Trilateral Commission, including Henry Kissinger and former Carter White House counsel Lloyd Cutler.

The Soviet strategy

Greenpeace has an established geographical strategy which just happens to overlay a map of current Soviet demands for a Nordic nuclear-free zone. In a timely article in the March 11 issue of the Soviet official military publication, *Krasnaya Zvezda*, Col. V. Pavlov wrote a piece titled, "The Arctic Variant and Its Alternative." He points to the recent NATO discussions of a "possible shift of the basic planned theater of military actions from Central Europe to the Arctic." Pavlov describes the region surrounding the Arctic Ocean encompassing Norway, Iceland, Greenland, and Canada as the new "central front" for future NATO-Warsaw Pact military engagements. The Soviets accuse NATO of wanting to exploit new U.S. naval strategic plans to deploy sea-launched cruise missiles close to the Soviet borders. Significantly, Pavlov ends with a renewal of the 1987 Murmansk call by Mikhail Gorbachov for "mutual steps to reduce military activity in the Arctic."

According to one West European NATO naval expert, the Russian propaganda offensive in recent years has increasingly called for "denuclearizing the seas," precisely at the same time that Greenpeace has created its propaganda campaign for Nuclear Free Seas. According to this NATO strategist, "We can expect Gorbachov to use the recent Soviet submarine incident to relaunch his campaign to demilitarize the North Nordic region. If he were to succeed, it would give the Soviet Navy a massive strategic benefit." Soviet demands in recent years have been for a mutual "withdrawal" of NATO nuclear vessels to seas south of the strategic Greenland-Iceland-United Kingdom (GIUK) Gap, leaving the vital seas north of that line free for Soviet naval deployment.

Interesting in this light is the fact that the Danish Greenpeace coordinator, Michael Gylling Nielsen, arrived in Moscow some days prior to the April 7 submarine incident. He will reportedly be there for six months to coordinate establishment of the Greenpeace Moscow offices which are being financed by the Russian recording firm, Melodiya.