

British Greens welcome shutdown of Middle East oil

by Mark Burdman

During June, *EIR* contributing editor Lyndon H. LaRouche issued an alert that the Mideast was rapidly heading toward war. LaRouche warned that the responsibility for planning a Mideast war lay with the British and the controllers of the environmental movement, based especially out of Britain's Cambridge and Oxford Universities. Such individuals want to shut down a good deal of the world's oil supply to bring about their new order of ecological paganism and Gaia-Mother Earth worship. In LaRouche's view, a series of controlled wars, highlighted by an Arab-Israeli war, together with planned devastation in the Third World, would also deal with what these elites see as "the population problem."

As the crisis erupts, Britain's ecologists are gleeful over the prospect that the Gulf crisis will bring about a new era of "conservation" and "sustainability." Senior British elites are equally excited that the crisis initiates a new era of North versus South conflicts, over demographic and "environmental" crises.

The former view was explicitly stated in a London *Guardian* feature Aug. 17, which began: "Do the war clouds over the Middle East have a green lining? Has Saddam Hussein done the planet a good turn by rolling his tanks into the heart of the world's premier oil-exporting region, by pushing up oil prices?" Writer Fred Pearce said British Greens had best play down their enthusiasm or else a headline in the British press could read, "Greenpeace backs butcher of Baghdad." The ecologists have to be publicly diplomatic, he asserted, but privately, "they know that any rise in the price of oil should be good for many of the Greens' dearest desires, including energy conservation and the development of cleaner sources of energy that could stave off the greenhouse effect."

Stewart Boyle, formerly of Friends of the Earth and now with the Association for the Conservation of Energy, told Pearce: "Oil does not pay its way. It produces carbon dioxide and the greenhouse effect, urban smog, benzene pollution and many other hazards. None of this is reflected in prices, so alternative cleaner fuels such as wind, wave and solar power are at a disadvantage. *Anything that can even out the playing field must be a good thing*" (emphasis added). Another ecologist, Michael Oppenheimer of Environmental Defense Fund in New York and author of a book called *Dead Heat*, told Pearce that the Iraq crisis would "jolt" the world toward a "new era" in which oil use is phased out. In Pearce's

view, such factors outweigh arguments that environmental restrictions on oil exploration and drilling be ended.

Walter Schwarz, in an Aug. 17 *Guardian* commentary, also argued that the Gulf crisis might create an opportunity for British Prime Minister Margaret Thatcher to lead the world into a "new civilization based on sustainability, freed from the myth of endless growth in a finite world." Schwarz advised Thatcher to use World War II-style "Dig for Victory" propaganda to get people to change their habits and support such things as organic farming. "The British like doing their bit, and Mrs. Thatcher is good at appealing to the patriotic instinct. She is also concerned about the threats to the climate, the environment and the ozone layer—among which cars and power stations are prominent. She knows the power of symbols and gestures," he wrote.

On June 29, a Cambridge University environmentalist had prefigured such reactions to a Mideast crisis when he told a journalist that "an oil shutdown would have a beneficial effect, since people could then get away from their unnecessary dependency on using oil. . . . I don't worry about an oil shutdown, it could be a good thing." Cambridge was then advertising itself as the best site for a new "European Environmental Agency," claiming that it had an "unrivaled network of world-class environmental institutions" centered around its new Inter-Disciplinary Environment Center.

On Aug. 19, the London *Observer* leaked a report prepared by the Inter-Governmental Panel on Climate Change. One recommendation is for an *immediate* 60-80% reduction in the use of fossil fuels in order to combat the "greenhouse effect" and the danger of "global warming." (*Observer* owner "Tiny" Rowland played a key role in fomenting the Iraq crisis, as *EIR* has documented.)

On Aug. 20, Boyle told the London *Times* that the Gulf crisis might "get the Americans off the fence" in their support for the IPCC recommendations and in implementing energy-conservation measures and reduction of use of fossil fuels in the United States.

The IPCC, which operates under the auspices of the U.N., is largely British controlled. Until now, there has been resistance in the U.S. to implementing the drastic IPCC recommendations. But now, the British think, the U.S. will have been greatly softened up.

Here enters Thatcher and links between the Gulf crisis

and the "climate change" issue. Thatcher visited a major "climate change" research institute while she was in Aspen, Colorado, over the Aug. 2-5 period when she was otherwise busy "stiffening George Bush's resolve" against Iraq, as the British press has been phrasing it. Before the Gulf crisis erupted, her agenda had reportedly included weakening U.S. opposition to the IPCC program.

One meeting between Thatcher and Bush on the Gulf crisis occurred at the ranch of Henry Catto, U.S. ambassador to Great Britain and a longtime friend of Bush. Catto's wife, Jessica Hobby Catto, one of the wealthiest women in the U.S., is one of the biggest patrons of the U.S. Environmental Defense Fund.

Sir Crispin Tickell and the global agenda

Britain's ambassador to the U.N., Sir Crispin Tickell, has played a pivotal role in the Iraq crisis and "climate change" diplomacy. Tickell is one of the chief architects of the U.N. Security Council resolutions and in the coordination of diplomacy among the five permanent members of the U.N. Security Council—the U.S., Soviet Union, Britain, France, and China. According to the Aug. 8 London *Times*, Tickell has hosted "historic meetings" at his residence in New York since 1987, of the five permanent-member ambassadors. Beyond this, the *Times* reported, he is a "dedicated environmentalist," having written a book in the late 1970s entitled *Climatic Change and World Affairs*. He stressed to the *Times* the importance of "the arrival of what I call the Global Agenda, the big issues such as the environment, that cannot be dealt with in any other way. In my judgment, the U.N. now has a reasonable chance of going back to what was originally planned for it."

Tickell is not only the chief diplomatic figure in pushing the "climate change" hoax, but has also been key in spreading the analysis that the threat to the northern countries in the coming years will arise from the migration across borders of tens of millions of so-called "environmental refugees."

Tickell is one of Thatcher's closest advisers on environmental matters along with James Lovelock, the author of the pagan Gaia hypothesis and recipient of the Order of the British Empire, and Sir James Goldsmith, the disreputable international financier and business associate of Lord Jacob Rothschild, whose brother "Teddy" is the *éminence grise* behind the British and continental European environmental movements. Sir Jimmy has reportedly sold Thatcher on the virtues of the neocolonialist idea of "debt-for-nature" swaps with Third World countries.

An invasion of Brazil?

Sir Crispin was one of the select participants at a June 21-24 meeting of predominantly British and American policymakers held at the Ditchley Estate near Oxford, on the theme, "Elements of Change in International Relations: A Foreign Policy Agenda for the 1990s." *Financial Times* of

London correspondent Edward Mortimer on June 26 likened that meeting to the post-World War I Versailles Conference and to the post-World War II Yalta, Dumbarton Oaks, and Bretton Woods conferences. In retrospect, it might be surmised that that meeting was the inception in Anglo-American planning for a war in the Mideast and for an era of North-South conflicts. One participant said that the key future problems facing NATO would include "the environment and population migration from the South to the North." As Mortimer commented on the Ditchley meeting: "What worried the Europeans most was the prospect of large-scale population movements, heading toward Western Europe from East and South." This had replaced the Russian threat as "our main preoccupation," he said.

One of Sir Crispin's British co-thinkers on the Ditchley Park-Trilateral Commission circuit stated privately Aug. 22, that "there was quite a lot of plausibility" in the view that future global conflicts would be "North versus South." He said he did not rule out such future contingencies as an attack by Northern countries on Brazil over an "environmental" conflict, and stressed that the Persian Gulf crisis was important to "highlight" the emerging strategic reality.

Sir Crispin's co-thinker, who had been in the 1960s Harold Wilson Labour Party government, said that a key problem was "rapid population growth in the Third World—more and more of *them* every year. The pressure on the North from the South over control of resources contains the seeds of conflict. The South has us over a barrel, they have to be made to stop doing things which are destructive to our quality of life. They have to be heavily bribed, and this could engender a real conflict.

"I've always thought that North-South conflicts were more important than the East-West conflicts. I've never believed there was really an East-West conflict in the first place. But now we have the obvious disappearance of the East-West conflict, as the Russians become more and more preoccupied with their internal problems, which might indeed be insoluble. So we can deal now with the more important conflicts, of rich and poor. And, of course, the military dimension of this problem has now been highlighted for us by Saddam Hussein," he said.

He said that Iraq was one of 10-12 Southern countries that either had, or would have within 10 years, a nuclear capability. "Look, India and Pakistan may start dropping nuclear bombs on each other." He stressed that "as the environmental crisis grows, and becomes more widely appreciated, there will be more strident demands for the South to do things they won't like. They will have to be bribed, and that involves very large potential resources. Looking some way down the road, I could see an intervention into the South. It's not too fanciful in my mind, that there could be a military act against a future government of Brazil, if that country keeps destroying another 1 million hectares of rain forest in the Amazon."