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Executive Summary

"Tom McDonnell of the sheep industry group confirmed that it was written by Rogelio Maduro...McDonnell said that when he distributed the article...he did not know that Maduro was associated with [Lyndon] LaRouche."

"Odd Trio Could Kill Nature Pact"
*Chicago Tribune*, page 1
September 30, 1994

When the 103rd session of Congress drew to a close, the Convention on Biological Diversity was not ratified by the U.S. Senate as it was widely expected to be. Supporters of the treaty, who had spent nearly a year shepherding it through the intricate treaty ratification process, are already planning how to gain ratification during the 104th Congress.

Treaty advocates are also struggling to understand where the vigorous opposition to the treaty, which ultimately killed it in this session, came from and what it was based upon. By better understanding the forces that killed this widely-supported and non-controversial treaty, advocates are hoping to strengthen their efforts during the coming 104th Congress.

The following facts are known:

- The International Convention on Biological Diversity has been signed by 160 countries, and ratified by over 90 nations, including Japan and all members of the European Union. The United States has signed the "Biodiversity Treaty," but ratification was killed in the Senate because of opposition from a few Republican Senators.

- Sudden and unexpected opposition in early August 1994 from "wise use" groups and farm organizations was the main factor that blocked Senate ratification of the International Convention on Biological Diversity. According to congressional staff, farm group representatives and Clinton Administration officials, the opposition arose primarily from farm constituents responding to a report that was published and widely circulated in July 1994 by the American...
Sheep Industry Association (known as ASI). A company called Ecological Strategies, Inc. was listed as an author, along with ASI, on the report's cover.

- Government officials first learned of the ASI report at an August 5, 1994 meeting convened by State Department and Agriculture Department officials and attended by staff members of the American Farm Bureau Federation and National Cattlemen's Association. A staffer for one of the agriculture groups read aloud from the ASI report, citing it as a source of farmer and rancher opposition, and provided a copy of the report to government officials.

- Within a month after the opposition sprang up from "wise use" groups, farm organizations and Senate Republicans, the September 2, 1994 issue of Executive Intelligence Review (EIR) featured a cover story entitled "Biodiversity: the new Malthusian religion." The article, written by Rogelio Maduro, presented nearly verbatim the anti-Biodiversity Treaty arguments contained in the ASI report. According to the magazine's masthead, the founder and contributing editor of Executive Intelligence Review is Lyndon LaRouche.

- In describing a "groundswell of opposition to the Biodiversity Treaty" in the September 2, EIR article, Maduro writes: "In a mobilization that had U.S. Senate staffers flabbergasted, State department officials screaming, and greenies weeping, Senate offices were flooded with hundreds of thousands of phone calls and faxes over Aug. 3-5 in a full-scale mobilization to defeat the Biodiversity Treaty. It was this steamroller that succeeded in waking up the Senate, moving 35 Republican senators to sign a letter requesting postponement of the vote on the treaty until September."

- In the same EIR article, Maduro describes a "massive grassroots campaign" by such "wise use" groups as the Alliance for America, the Environmental Conservation Organization, Putting People First, People for the West, the Blue Ribbon coalition, the National Federal Lands Conference, the American Land Rights Association, the National Wilderness Institute, the Maine Conservation Rights Institute, and the National Fishermen's Coalition. Leaders from some of these groups have written extensively for a sister publication to EIR, called 21st Century Science and Technology, another LaRouche backed publication.

- According to Maduro in the EIR article: "Trade associations were also involved. The American Farm Bureau and the National Cattlemen's Association lobbied in Washington to ensure that the American livestock and farm industries would not be destroyed by ratification of the treaty. They also mobilized their membership to put pressure on the Senate. An important factor was the distribution of a series of reports by the American Sheep Industry Association.
(ASI), detailing the true nature of the Biodiversity Treaty. For the first time, a highly respected trade association had the courage to put forward the actual dangers represented by a piece of radical environmental legislation." (Emphasis added.)

- In a front page, Sept. 30 story in the Chicago Tribune, the American Sheep Industry Association acknowledged that its scathing critique of the Biodiversity Convention was actually written by Rogelio Maduro, a long-time associate of political extremist Lyndon LaRouche. According to Virginia state officials, Maduro is one of two directors of Ecological Strategies, Inc., which is based in Leesburg, Virginia. Ecological Strategies, Inc. was incorporated on July 11, 1994, only two weeks before the ASI report was published.

- An ASI spokesman claimed in the Chicago Tribune story that they did not realize when they published the report that Maduro was an associate of LaRouche, who was released from federal prison in January, 1994, after serving time for mail fraud and tax evasion. Maduro, perhaps the main proponent of the theory that depletion of the ozone layer is a scientific hoax, is an associate editor of 21st Century magazine, the successor publication to LaRouche's Fusion magazine. Maduro's book, The Holes in the Ozone Scare, was published by 21st Century Science and Technology.

- Maduro has played a prominent role in major "wise use" conferences and political campaigns, most recently as a participant of the "Fly-In For Freedom" lobbying effort in Washington in September, 1994, organized by Alliance for America, a prominent "wise use" group based in Caroga Lake, NY, which claims to have 550 member organizations. In addition to Maduro's participation in the conference, LaRouche-related publications, including 21st Century and Executive Intelligence Review, were prominently displayed and distributed at the Fly-In's information and training sessions. According to an eyewitness account, Maduro seemed well acquainted with many of the "wise use" leaders present at the conference, greeting many by first name and talking at length about issues of mutual concern.

- In July, 1994, Maduro made a presentation at the "wise use" Leadership Conference, an annual planning meeting attended by the top organizers and ideologues of the "wise use" movement, concerning his work with ASI to generate opposition to the Biodiversity Treaty. Maduro promised those in attendance that they would receive a copy of his report upon its completion. Maduro also suggested that the "wise use" movement make opposition of the treaty their top concern.
For at least two years, prominent leaders of the "wise use" movement have published articles and advertised their groups and books in a LaRouche-related publication, 21st Century Science and Technology. Authors include: Rick Seiman, head of the Sahara Club (1992); Hugh W. Elsasser and William Hazeltine, both of whom are serve on the board of the Environmental Conservation Organization, a "wise use" network of hundreds of organizations (1994); Kathleen Marquardt, chair of the "wise use" group Putting People First (1993); and the late Dixy Lee Ray, a prominent author and spokesperson for the anti-environmental movement (1994, 1993, 1992).
How the Biodiversity Treaty Went Down

"With LaRouche in jail, his followers have sought out new areas in which to assert their influence. One of their most successful campaigns has been, through their magazines, books, and seminars and participation in various anti-enviro events, the promotion of anti-environmental counterculture."

David Helvarg
"The War Against the Greens"

On the back cover of the September 2, 1994 issue of Executive Intelligence Review (EIR) magazine is an advertisement for the EIR News Service. The ad features a menacing photograph of Adolf Hitler, shouting with his fist raised in the air. Beneath Hitler is a picture of U.N. Secretary General Boutros Boutros-Ghali. "What do these two men have in common?" the ad asks. And it answers: "They both push population control."

The advertisement offers a "special report" from the EIR News Service, entitled Stop the U.N. New World Order: Hitler in Blue Helmets (250 pages, $250). According to the ad, "The report, revised and expanded from the 1992 Special Report, 'The genocidal roots of Bush's 'New World Order,' is intended to help catalyze a fight for national sovereignty, the family, and human life in the face of the Malthusian onslaught of the United Nations and its one-world imperial supporters." In the same issue, EIR Editor Nora Hamerman expands on this point in her opening essay. The real purpose of the recent Cairo conference on global population, she writes, "is to diminish the population of the planet on a scale of which Adolf Hitler never dreamed, but following exactly the policies of the Nazi regime, which are also the policies of George Bush's family."

Comparing the head of the United Nations to Hitler, or attributing the genocidal policies of Hitler's Nazis to former President George Bush and his family, is standard fare for Executive Intelligence Review, and for its founder and contributing editor, Lyndon LaRouche. It is hardly surprising that news accounts of LaRouche's exploits over the years commonly refer to him as a "political extremist" or "conspiracy theorist." The cover story of LaRouche's EIR that month, however, is every
bit as extreme.

"Biodiversity: the new malthusian religion," written by long-time LaRouche follower Rogelio Maduro, is an irrational, factually incorrect assault on the international Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD) and on environmentalists. Maduro charges that the Convention, commonly called the Biodiversity Treaty, is really a "coup against man's sovereignty over the Earth." According to Maduro, "Biodiversity has nothing to do with science. Rather, it is a religious dogma, which promotes a belief in 'biocentrism'—the view that all species have equal rights, and that man has no rights higher than those of animals or insects."

Maduro says that "the Biodiversity Treaty mandates the adoption of the doctrine of 'sustainable use,' meaning that human activity must not affect the Earth in any way, but leave it untouched for posterity—a mandate even the troglodytes would have been hard-pressed to comply with." Maduro also contends that reports of species loss from forest loss and other disruptions of natural systems amount to "crude scientific fraud." He says that "the ratification of the Biodiversity Treaty will surrender national sovereignty over internal affairs." The article refers to Maurice Strong, Secretary General of the UN Conference on Environment and Development in Rio (where the Biodiversity Treaty was signed by 160 nations), as a "Canadian Oligarch" who harbors "hatred of humankind," seeks the "outlawing of technological progress," and promotes "scientific fraud."

Like much in EIR and related LaRouche publications, Maduro's treatment of the Biodiversity Treaty and the issue of conserving species and ecosystems is an exercise in conspiracy theory and political extremism. But unlike most LaRouche publications, Maduro's work on biological diversity has found a ready audience: anti-environmental "wise use" groups who adopted Maduro's views wholesale and launched a successful effort to defeat Senate ratification of the treaty.

Early Senate Action: A Love Fest for the Biodiversity Treaty

A few days before the April 12, 1994, hearing of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee on the Biodiversity Treaty, a "Greenwire" report (fatefully titled "Biodiversity: Barring 11th Hour Conflict, Treaty Good To Go") observed that "Environmentalists...are breathing a short, collective sign of relief because "wise use" forces do not appear to be fomenting opposition to the UN Biodiversity Treaty...." The same story reported that environmental advocates of the treaty felt that its non-controversial nature would spare it from the powerful, last minute "wise use" opposition to which both the National Biological Survey and the bill to elevate the Environmental Protection Agency to Cabinet-level status fell prey.¹

The article quoted Ron Arnold, a leading voice in the anti-environmental "wise use" movement, as saying: "As national policy, we certainly oppose [the treaty]. The private rights of the individual and the power of the market, we think, are more than adequate ways...to preserve resources," said Arnold, adding that his
organization, the Center For Defense of Free Enterprise, does not lobby and would not actively oppose Senate ratification of the CBD. Another “wise use” leader, Chuck Cushman of the American Land Rights Association, a privately held organization, indicated a passive objection to the treaty, saying it was “not one of our key, frontline issues...but it is something we pay attention to.”

An April 13 Greenwire article entitled “Biodiversity Treaty: Senate Hearing a Huge Love Fest”, reported that everyone who testified did so favorably. Several committee members did raise objections. Senators Helms (R-NC), Brown (R-CO) and Craig (R-ID) submitted statements expressing concerns over the vagueness of the treaty language with respect to its funding, its voting structures and its effect on domestic regulations.

Despite the opposition of those senators, however, the Foreign Relations Committee, on June 29 in one of the rare displays of bipartisanship in the 103rd Congress, approved the measure 16-3. Based on events to that stage proponents of the treaty and senate aides anticipated little difficulty in attaining the two-thirds margin necessary for ratification. The vote was expected in the full Senate prior to the August recess.

“Wise Use” Groups and the Sheep Industry Association Attack Treaty

Despite early indications from “wise use” leaders that there would be little opposition to the treaty, opposition to the CBD began to escalate in the period between the June 29 Senate Foreign Relations Committee vote on the CBD and the August 25 Congressional recess. In mid-July, several “wise use” groups and agricultural trade organizations launched an attack against the CBD, sending out fax alerts, distributing letters and reports opposing the treaty to key decision makers in the Senate and the Administration.

In a July 15, 1994, letter to Senator John Chafee (R-RI), Ruth Kaiser, Executive Director of the National Federal Lands Conference (NFLC), a “wise use” group based in Bountiful, Utah, outlined a vague set of concerns about the treaty and requested that the ratification process be halted and hearings convened to address her concerns. Her letter opens, “Yesterday we learned that the Biodiversity Treaty has been voted out of committee on July 5 and that it is now on the fast-track...for ratification by the full Senate...” She continues, “There are strong concerns concerning the affects [sic] of this treaty on our national sovereignty as well as our unalienable constitutionally protected rights.” Ms. Kaiser closed her letter by indicating that the NFLC maintains a list of 7,700 people who share the same concerns, and is part of a network with over 100 other grassroots organizations representing 6,000,000 members.

On July 28, a document bearing a cover memo from Tom McDonnell of the American Sheep Industry Association (ASI) was distributed to ASI affiliates, ASI Legislative and Resource Management Councils and interested parties, including Senate
offices. In his memo, Mr. McDonnell outlines concerns about the CBD which were treated at length in the attached 100-page document. The memo starts;

Attached is one of the most important documents ever compiled [emphasis in original]. While organizations, industries, private property owners and this nation's citizens have been fighting battles in the arenas of range reform, mining reform, clean water, wetlands, endangered species, private property rights, etc., federal agencies have been quietly implementing an all-encompassing agenda that is meant to transform the economic, social, moral and philosophical ideology of America.

On May 5th and June 1st, ASI circulated the Environmental Protection Agency's (EPA) National Performance Review and Department of Interior internal working documents on ecosystem management. Within these documents it became evident that the federal government intends to take control of this nation's legislative, judicial and administrative powers, along with the nation's natural resources—private, state and federal. These two documents, however, did not make it clear that the federal government has, in fact, been implementing the United Nation's Agenda 21 and the Convention on Biological Diversity (Biodiversity Treaty). The attached document outlines the purpose of the Biodiversity Treaty, its relationship to ecosystem management, and how the ratification of this treaty will assign the sovereignty of the U.S. to the United Nations. [emphasis added] 6

Mr. McDonnell's memo goes on to summarize the chief objections to the CBD detailed in the attached document, stating that "[after review of the testimony given before the Senate Committee, it is clear that the ramifications of the treaty's ratification are not understood. This document is critical to providing that information."

The August edition of Federal Lands Update, the monthly newsletter of the National Federal Lands Council (NFLC), a prominent "wise use" group, carried the headline "THE DEATH OF OUR SOVEREIGN RIGHTS. Clinton/Gore Eco Plan Equals Treason. How Could This Ever Happen In America?!" The mailing panel included the warning "URGENT!! OPEN IMMEDIATELY! ACT NOW!! Your Freedom & Rights are on the brink of destruction if the UN takes charge of America!!"

This eight-page newsletter was written as "a team effort by Tom McDonnell, American Sheep Industry...Howard Hutchinson, Media Liaison Arizona/New Mexico Coalition of Counties...and Jim Faulkner, NFLC Staff Writer...." Readers were invited to contact the ASI for copies of the documents discussed in the article.

In the NFLC newsletter, the authors make arguments virtually identical to those put forth in the ASI report. They describe purported federal plans to centralize
government, the dissolving of state and private rights, the adoption of ecosystem protections as equal to or superior to human health protections, green activism as social ideology, and the sinister and anti-people green religion (pantheism). The article concludes that totalitarian, centralized government, not the protection of species, is the real goal of the Biodiversity Treaty. These arguments mirror those in the ASI report. A sidebar in the newsletter also announces that "a call for hearings based on the fact that the treaty violates our Constitution and national sovereignty is underway at this writing."

The next document opposing the CBD was an alert sent out over the Alliance for America network on August 4, 1994. The Alliance for America, a central "wise use" group established as a result of a brainstorming session following a recent "Fly In For Freedom" lobbying effort, acts as a networking organization for many other "wise use" groups.

In the Alliance fax alert, readers were urged to contact Senator Dole (R-KS) immediately to demand that he kill the treaty. Several points were made:

- The treaty is an unfinished document that provides only the framework in which radical environmentalists will fill in the specific language.
- The treaty is not based on science, but rather on a new age ideology.
- The treaty equates humans with animals and prioritizes environmental protection above the protection of human rights.
- The treaty would force the U.S. to surrender sovereignty on issues related to ecosystem management.
- The treaty will reduce the standard of living in the U.S.

The fax alert warns that passage of the treaty will provide a framework for establishing "a New World Order," and that agencies within the federal government have already put regulations in place that will enforce the treaty even though it has yet to be ratified. Again, many of these objections mirror those in the ASI report.

**The Farm Bureau and Cattlemen Weigh In. Republican Senators Follow.**

On August 5, 1994, letters from the National Cattlemen's Association (NCA) and the American Farm Bureau Federation (AFBF) were sent to Senator Dole outlining concerns about the treaty and requesting a delay in the ratification vote. Neither group had previously expressed reservations about the treaty to the Administration or to the Senate Foreign Relations Committee.

In the NCA letter, President Dan Koons describes the CBD as "broad and ambiguous in nature," providing a list of 18 bulleted passages of concern. Mr. Koons called the ambiguities listed a "dire threat to all landowners," and demanded specific answers to several questions, among them: how would private property rights be protected under the treaty; does the treaty presuppose the creation of a federal
agency to collect information on biodiversity; would federal agencies be mandated to protect biological diversity at all costs; and would the environmental protection laws of the U.S. become subject to higher international standards?

In the letter from the Farm Bureau, Washington Office Executive Director Richard Newpher states that "Several groups have issued position papers condemning the treaty based on speculation that the treaty will impose an extreme environmental agenda on the United States." Mr. Newpher remarks that the AFBF considers such fears to be "alarmist," but suggests that there are legitimate concerns about the treaty's impact on productive agriculture that need to be addressed. Claiming there is insufficient time, Mr. Newpher does not list these concerns in his letter. However, he does say that if the vote on the CBD is not delayed, the AFBF will be forced to oppose it.

Also on August 5, a letter (signed by 35 Republican Senators) was sent to Senate Majority Leader George Mitchell, outlining a set of concerns with the treaty, again calling for a delay in its consideration and delivering the veiled threat of a filibuster. The letter, written on Senate Foreign Relations Committee letterhead, where Senator Helms is the ranking minority member, was passed around the Senate floor by Senate Minority Leader Bob Dole for signatures.

The Helms/Dole letter called the CBD vague and contradictory. Specifically, it questioned the "no reservations" clause, dispute resolution procedures, the level of financial obligations connected to the treaty, the possibility that the alien species provision would include livestock, the ability of the Senate to advise and consent to a treaty whose provisions have not yet been decided, the effect on domestic environmental protections, U.S. access to genetic resources under the treaty, technology transfer issues, and the possibility of a biological safety protocol mandating licensing for transfers of biologically modified organisms.

Then on August 7, 1994, an editorial entitled "Attack of the Alien Cows" appeared in The Washington Times blasting the CBD. The editorial raised specific alarms regarding the ratification of a treaty for which the legal obligations have yet to be determined, the lack of influence the U.S. would have (even given its size and wealth) in determining the legal obligations of the treaty, the possibility that farm animals will be classified as "alien species" and will be eliminated, bringing about the destruction of agriculture, the lack of scientific proof regarding how many species are actually becoming extinct, and the possible limits the treaty would impose on U.S. technology and business development. Also raised as a concern was the threat to our national sovereignty.

Given the rapid succession of these letters and articles, and the opposition they inspired, it would appear that a coordinated effort to oppose the CBD, as announced in the NFLC newsletter, was indeed underway.

Just as clearly, much of the opposition centered around a common set of arguments that were most elaborately spelled out in the ASI report. What was not clear, until recently, was that the arguments advanced in the ASI report were writ-
Comparison of Main Objections Raised to the Treaty

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sovereignty</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constitutionality</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Violates Civil Rights</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Treaty Not Defined</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anti-Property Rights</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Scientific</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equates Humans with Animals</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Based on Eco-religion</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inhibits Technology Transfer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harms Intellectual Property Rights</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Voting Structure Unfair to US</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Object to Funding of Foreign Nations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Will Restrict Biotechnology</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Will Empower UN</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Empowers Non-elected Officials</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Treaty Supporters Caught by Surprise

What caught industry, environmental and Administration supporters of the Convention by surprise was not just the abruptness and ferocity of the opposition, but its source. It was understandable that “wise use” groups might weigh in at the last minute. But neither the Farm Bureau nor the Cattlemen had previously taken positions on the Convention. In fact, other major agricultural and agribusiness organizations—including Archer Daniels Midland and the American Corn Growers Association—had become prominent Convention proponents. Also supportive was the Biotechnology Industries Organization, that industry’s main trade association, which had opposed the treaty as signed in Rio. However, once they were satisfied that the Clinton Administration’s “interpretive statements” committed the U.S. government to safeguarding intellectual property rights and other industry concerns, agricultural companies involved with biotech (as well as pharmaceutical and other firms) realized that Senate ratification of the Convention would be in their self interest.

With Senate ratification, the United States would have a powerful role as a voting party to the Convention at the first, crucial meeting of the parties, set to begin November 28, 1994, in Nassau, the Bahamas. Without Senate ratification, the United States would be relegated to non-voting “observer” status, hardly a position from which to press for international acceptance of the government’s interpretive statements or otherwise protect U.S. corporate interests. Opposition from the 35 Republican Senators on the Helms/Dole letter meant the Biodiversity Treaty lacked the necessary two-thirds margin for ratification.

According to a September 30, 1994, Chicago Tribune account of the events of the treaty controversy in early August: “In an effort to discover the reasons for the op-
position, government officials met with representatives of agriculture groups August 5 at the Washington offices of the Farm Bureau. According to two government officials, one participant held up and read part of an article that had been distributed by the American Sheep Industry Association. According to the Tribune, one participant in the meeting described the report as "non-trivial...but I'm not sure that it was pivotal. One of the guys from the cattlemen's association held it up to explain the kind of response they were getting from their people." The Tribune said that "According to this participant, the Washington lobbyists knew that the article was irrational, 'but even if they didn't think these objections had any substance, how far ahead of their constituents could they get.'"

According to congressional sources, as early as mid-August officials of the ASI were disavowing their Biodiversity Treaty report as "unofficial" freelancing on the part of association staff member Tom McDonnell. But by then the damage was done. As John Doggett, the Farm Bureau's director of governmental relations would later tell the Chicago Tribune, "Unfortunately, what we've seen is that certain groups tried to create a crisis where one doesn't exist."

The Maduro-LaRouche Link

It is not clear how or when ASI officials or other farm groups realized that the ASI report's author was associated with the LaRouche organization. Nor is it clear what the "wise use" groups that parroted Maduro's work may know about him or his connections to LaRouche. According to the Chicago Tribune, "McDonnell said that when he distributed the article, which he intended only for other members of his organization, he did not know that Maduro was associated with LaRouche. He also said that the Sheep Industry Association is not taking any position on ratification of the treaty. But he did defend the substance of Maduro's work," reported the Tribune. For outside observers of the treaty battle, the first clue to a LaRouche link was the cover of the ASI report itself.
According to Virginia state officials, Ecological Strategies, Inc. of Leesburg, Virginia, is owned by Rogelio Maduro. The shallowest verification of Maduro's background, particularly the identity of the publisher of many of his works (21st Century magazine and 21st Century Science Associates), would have made it clear that he has long been prominently and publicly associated with the views and organizations of Lyndon LaRouche.

The second clue landed like a sledge hammer. Maduro's cover story for LaRouche's Executive Intelligence Review was freely displayed and distributed at the Alliance for America's "Fly In for Freedom" in mid-September. Maduro himself participated actively in Fly In gatherings. We do not know if ASI, Farm Bureau or National Cattlemen representatives participated.

More importantly, Maduro's article, in addition to reproducing much of the ASI report's rhetoric, also contained a sidebar in which Maduro described the "Groundswell of opposition to Biodiversity Treaty."

"In a mobilization that had U.S. Senate staffers flabbergasted, State department officials screaming, and greenies weeping," Maduro said, "Senate offices were flooded with hundreds of thousands of phone calls and faxes over Aug. 3-5 in a full-scale mobilization to defeat the Biodiversity Treaty. It was this steamroller that succeeded in waking up the Senate, moving 35 Republican senators to sign a letter requesting postponement of the vote on the treaty until September."

According to Maduro's EIR account, the situation for treaty opponents "seemed hopeless" as late as August 3. "But meanwhile, the 'wise use' and 'property rights' movement had been cranking up a massive grassroots campaign. The Alliance for America went onto red alert. Using their extensive national network of facsimile machines, the alliance—an umbrella group of nearly 600 property rights organizations—alerted all of their member organizations of breaking developments. Fax alerts went out to more than 4,000 organizations and individuals, and many fax recipients re-transmitted them so that within 25-48 hours, between 1 and 5 million citizens were alerted," Maduro writes.

"The same was done by the Environmental Conservation Organization, an umbrella group for over 500 organizations," Maduro continues. "They cranked-up their fax network, and also mobilized a network of city councils across the country which is fighting unfunded federal mandates. On top of this, many other leading wise use and property rights organizations deployed their grassroots networks. These included Putting People First, People for the West!, the BlueRibbon coalition, the National Federal Lands Conference, the American Land Rights Association, the National Wilderness Institute, the Maine Conservation Rights Institute, and the National Fishermen's Coalition."

Maduro's account suggests that he is extremely well informed about "wise use" and "property rights" groups, their capabilities and their methods. Maduro's account
also suggests, if it can be believed, that those capabilities are enormous. Any effort that can reach thousands of people by fax, let alone “between 1 and 5 million” citizens in 24-48 hours, would require a very substantial investment of money. It raises the question of how the supposedly small, “grassroots” groups said to comprise the “wise use” movement could have paid for such a swift and massive campaign.

According to Maduro in the EIR article: “Trade associations were also involved. The American Farm Bureau and the National Cattlemen’s Association lobbied in Washington to ensure that the American livestock and farm industries would not be destroyed by ratification of the treaty. They also mobilized their membership to put pressure on the Senate. An important factor was the distribution of a series of reports by the American Sheep Industry Association (ASI), detailing the true nature of the Biodiversity Treaty. For the first time, a highly respected trade association had the courage to put forward the actual dangers represented by a piece of radical environmental legislation.” (Emphasis added.)

Maduro failed to note in the EIR article what ASI’s Tom McDonnell admitted to the Chicago Tribune, namely that Maduro himself was the author of the ASI report that was such an “important factor” in inciting farm groups to oppose the treaty.

Beyond The Biodiversity Treaty: The Interweaving Worlds of Wise Use & LaRouche

For some years now, publications produced by the LaRouche organization have attacked environmental organizations and environmental science with the same stridency that marked their past attacks on “Zionists,” the mental health of Michael Dukakis, the Queen of England’s drug trade and “KGB Agent” Henry Kissinger. But even a limited review of LaRouche-related publications makes clear that his organization has found fertile ground among “wise use” and “property rights” groups, much as in the past it has successfully linked up with disaffected farmers, blue-collar workers, and ultraconservative business interests.

A partial cataloguing of the LaRouche publication 21st Century Science and Technology in recent years reveals publication of numerous articles written by known “wise-use” leaders, and advertisements selling “wise use” books or soliciting membership in at least one “wise use” group. Stridently anti-environmental articles are appearing with increasing frequency. 21st Century emerged from a previous LaRouche publication, Fusion, following LaRouche’s conviction on tax and mail fraud, and is widely considered part of a family of publications heavily influenced, if not controlled by, Mr. LaRouche.

21st Century Science and Technology

Summer 1994
Hugh W. Ellsaesser, Ph. D. Listed as a member of 21st Century’s Scientific Ad-
ABOUT LYNDON LAROUCHE

Convicted in December, 1988, in Alexandria, Virginia, on charges of conspiracy, mail fraud and tax evasion, LaRouche was released from federal prison term in January of this year. As writer David Helvarg notes in his new book, *The War Against the Greens*, “most Americans who've heard of Lyndon LaRouche remember him as the peculiar third-party presidential candidate who bought network airtime to expostulate his economic theories during the 1984 and 1988 presidential primaries.” During LaRouche’s time in jail, Helvarg notes, his multimillion-dollar business and intelligence network continues to function, turning out *Executive Intelligence Review*, *The New Federalist*, *21st Century Science and Technology*, and reams of other publications, all asserting that the world is dominated by a secret cabal led by the British oligarchy and its Jewish backers, including ‘Soviet Agent’ Henry Kissinger. They claim that Queen Elizabeth controls the world’s drug cartels, that Prince Philip and Prince Bernhard of the Netherlands pull the strings on the environmental movement, and that drugs and environmentalism are key tools in a plan to bring on a New Dark Age, a descent into madness that only Lyndon LaRouche has the political genius to prevent.”

Helvarg concludes his overview of LaRouche’s “wise use” involvement: “With LaRouche in jail, his followers have sought out new areas in which to assert their influence. One of their most successful campaigns has been, through their magazines, books, and seminars and participation in various anti-enviro events, the promotion of anti-environmental counterculture.”


visory Board. Also on the board of Environmental Conservation Organization (ECO), a wise use network of over 400 groups.


In the “News Brief” section, an item mentions the efforts of Dr. S. Fred Singer, Director of Science and Environmental Policy Project, and Dr. Patrick Michaels, who publishes “World Climate Review,” a coal industry-funded magazine which opposes global climate change theories, and serves on the board of the American Policy Center, to debunk the greenhouse effect theory.

A. Alan Moghissi, Ph. D. Wrote an article entitled “The Cost of Safety and Environmental Protection.” Mr. Moghissi serves on the boards of the American Policy Center and the National Wilderness Institute, two prominent “wise use” groups.

Dr. Dixy Lee Ray. A feature article entitled “Plutonium As A Resource, Now
and in the Future." Dr. Ray published a book before her death entitled "Trashing the Planet," which was based in part on the writings of Rogelio Maduro. She also served on the boards of the "wise use" American Policy Center and Environmental Conservation Association.

Rogelio Maduro. An article entitled "EPA, Greenpeace Plan Chlorine Ban." The article concludes, "The greens are confident that they can get away with this gross deception, as they have with all the others. This time, however, there is an aggressive backlash from grass-roots groups, scientists, and municipal governments across the country. The chlorine scare may be the proverbial straw that breaks the camel's back."

An item entitled "Fighting Environmental Blackmail," advertising Dr. Dixy Lee Ray's book "Environmental Overkill."

Spring 1994

A "News Brief" mentioning Rogelio Maduro's appearance on ABC's Nightline, February 22, in a piece discussing the connections between industry, LaRouche and the Reverend Sun Yung Moon and the anti-environmental movement.

A "News Brief" item mentioning a report by the industry-funded Council for Agricultural Science and Technology that asserted that the planet could provide food for 10 billion people if agricultural technologies are properly utilized.

Dr. Dixy Lee Ray. An article entitled "Environmental Overkill." A note indicates that this is the final chapter of her book by the same name, which she had selected (before her death) to be reprinted in 21st Century.

The index of articles published in 1993 indicates that Kathleen Marquardt, Chair of the "property rights," "wise use" group, Putting People First, published an article in the Spring, 1993, issue, entitled "Extremists Attack Norway For Resumption of Whaling." Also, William Perry Pendley, President of the Mountain States Legal Foundation, published an article in the Fall, 1993, issue entitled "Do Grizzlies Have the Same Rights as Humans?"

Barry Clausen. An article entitled "Inside Earth First! A True Story About Terrorism." Clausen has written a book which is purported to be his first hand account of the internal workings of Earth First! Ron Arnold and Alan Gottlieb's book "Trash- ing the Economy" is listed as a reference for this article. Clausen's book is advertised in a side bar.
**Summer 1993**

A one-third page advertisement soliciting membership for Putting People First!, a well-known "wise use" group. This ad appears next to a "Viewpoint" article by Walter Howard, entitled "Rights! Animals' Or Ours?"

Hugh W. Ellsaesser. An article entitled "Did the H-Bomb Tests of 1961-1962 Affect Stratospheric Ozone?" Ellsaesser is a member of the board of the "wise use" group Environmental Conservation Organization and is on the Scientific Advisory Board of *21st Century*.

An article by Dr. J. Gordon Edwards entitled "Malaria: The Killer That Could Have Been Conquered," which calls DDT "Mankind's Most Life-Saving Chemical." The article claims that Rachel Carson's acclaimed book, *Silent Spring* (1962), was part of a plot to discredit pesticides in order to increase disease levels in third world nations, thereby increasing the death rate in those countries as part of a grand Malthusian scheme to limit population. Edwards' publications are distributed by The National Council for Environmental Balance.

Dr. Dixy Lee Ray. A review of her book *Environmental Overkill*, which concludes with the line "Now, at 78, she is waging a political fight to save this country and to save humanity from the grasp of ecocafism. Her book gives us the ammunition to get the job done."

Ron Arnold and Alan Gottlieb's anti-environmental tome *Trashing the Economy* is advertised for sale.

**Winter 1992**

A one-third page advertisement for publications by the National Council for Environmental Balance, including several papers on the benefits of pesticides by Dr. J. Gordon Edwards.

Hugh W. Ellsaesser, board member of Environmental Conservation Organization and scientific advisor to *21st Century*, published an article entitled "Is Stratospheric Ozone Really Under Chemical Attack?"

An advertisement soliciting membership for Putting People First.

In a review of the book, *The DDT Story*, 21st Century managing editor Marjorie Mazel Hecht states that the author, Kenneth Mellanby, "...is not perfect, however. In particular, he naively embraces Rachel Carson and her book...as over enthusiastic for her cause.... It is more accurate to say to say that Rachel Carson lied about DDT for political reasons."
Spring 1992

An exchange of letters from an official with the Department of Interior, Rick Seiman, head of the radical anti-environmental group Sahara Club, and William Perry Pendley, President of the Mountain States Legal Foundation (former professional home of James Watt), regarding a case against members of Sahara Club.

A news item concerning a press conference by the American Council on Science and Health held on the third anniversary of “the alar scare” warning that the U.S. faces food shortages in the future if “hoaxes” such as this continue to occur.

A news item about a presentation by Rogelio Maduro before “representatives from Earth Summit delegations and from the United Nations missions of several nations” about “climate hoaxes.” The presentation, held in New York, was sponsored by the Schiller Institute, a LaRouche organization.

Dr. Dixy Lee Ray. An article entitled “Global Warming, Ozone Depletion—Where’s the Evidence?”


“Fossil Bill” Kramer, a writer who claims to have been an environmentalist until he saw through the “fairy tales.” An article entitled “How We Escaped the Web of Eco-Propaganda.” Kramer writes a weekly column called “The Angry Environmentalist” which appears in several wise-use newsletters.

Winter 1991

A news item, “People Need A Lobby, Says American Council on Science and Health,” describing Dr. Elizabeth Whelan’s press conference called to “unmask the danger that animal rights advocates present.”

Hugh W. Elsasser, board member of the Environmental Conservation Organization and 21st Century scientific advisor. An article entitled “Setting the 10,000-Year Climate Record Straight”, which demonstrates that “the global warming doomsday phenomenon is not real.”
Sources and Experts on Lyndon LaRouche

Dennis King, author of *Lyndon LaRouche and the New American Facism*. King is regarded as the nation’s leading expert on Lyndon LaRouche—his history and the nature of his political organization. Mr. King can be reached at (212) 838-9829.

Sheila O’Donnell, Ace Investigations. As a private investigator researching violence and intimidation aimed at environmental advocates, O’Donnell has come to know the anti-environmental operations of the LaRouche organization well. Ms. O’Donnell can be reached at (415) 381-0734.

David Helvarg. Author of the recently-released *The War Against The Greens: The Wise Use Movement, the New Right, and Anti-Environmental Violence*, a book which chronicles the backlash against environmental politics and activists. Mr. Helvarg has developed a special understanding of the intricacies of the wise use movement, including its connections with the LaRouche organization. Mr. Helvarg can be reached at (415) 331-3717.

Chip Berlet, Political Research Associates. Mr. Berlet has spent a considerable portion of his career as an investigator looking into the strange world of the “radical right”, and has recently dedicated a great deal of time to understanding the world view of Lyndon LaRouche and the political power of his international network. Mr. Berlet can be reached at (617) 661-9313.

Major LaRouche Publications and Organizations


The Schiller Institute, Inc. P.O. Box 66082, Washington, DC, 20035-6082. 202-544-7018. Publications: *The New Federalist* and *Fidelio*.


Ecological Strategies, Inc. Rogelio Maduro, Director. 117 Davis Avenue, SW, Leesburg, VA, 22075. 703-777-4958. Also, P.O. Box 214, Leesburg, VA, 22075.
End Notes

1 Greenwire, Friday, April 8, 1994. “Biodiversity: Barring 11th Hour Conflict, Treaty Good To Go”.
2 Ibid.
3 Ibid.
4 In his written remarks, Senator Helms raised several main reservations to the treaty. First, he raised the possibility that “many of the clauses and statements in this treaty reflect a rather common view among so-called developing nations that this treaty is some sort of international cash cow to transfer wealth and technology from developed nations while promoting the economic growth of developing nations without interfering in any way with their sovereignty. In particular, I find the convention’s treatment of intellectual property rights, finances, voting procedures, technology transfer and biotechnology dangerously muddled, vague and disturbing.” Helms goes on to say that the United States is being asked to “buy a pig in a poke” because many of the obligations and procedures in the treaty will not be spelled out until the initial “Conference of Parties” meets to establish the institutional structure of the treaty. Because the treaty has no “reservation clause,” Helms continued, the treaty would take away the Senate’s constitutional right to advise and consent. Arguing that the CBD was more a preamble than a treaty, with the actual treaty to be determined at the initial Conference of Parties, Helms urged that the Senate not move to ratify the treaty. In his written remarks, Senator Brown raised concerns about the protection of intellectual property rights, as well as “open-ended financial commitments,” writing that “Developing countries must not be placed in a position to impose financial obligations upon developed, major donor nations, including the United States.”
5 The following senators voted in support of the Convention in committee. Democrats: Republicans: Voting in opposition were three Republican senators, Helms (R-NC), Pressler (R-SD) and Coverdell (R-GA).
Odd trio could kill nature pact

Biodiversity treaty imperiled

By Jon Margolis
Tribune Staff Writer

It was negotiated by Republicans and signed by a Democrat.

Its language was non-binding and its subject matter—the beauty of nature, the web of life and the love of learning—hardly seemed controversial. Environmental groups and big corporations all thought it was great.

So even in today's contentious political setting, few expected much trouble for the Convention on Biological Diversity, more commonly known as the biodiversity treaty.

But that was before it ran into a bizarre political trio: the internal dynamics of the Republican Party, the anti-environmental "Wise Use" movement and political extremist Lyndon LaRouche.

Arising with unexpected fury, this opposition has stalled Senate ratification of the treaty and imperils it in the remaining days of the 103rd Congress.

Although there is little doubt the treaty would be approved if it got to the Senate floor, the opposition of some Republicans
In fact, the treaty, which states that "states have sovereign rights over their own biological resources," was approved by negotiators appointed by President George Bush. Pressured by some in his own party, Bush did refuse to sign the treaty, but the U.S. scientists and diplomats who negotiated it have continued to support it. It was signed last year by President Clinton.

Although the article was not signed, Tom McDonnell of the sheep industry group confirmed that it was written by Rogelio (sometimes called Roger) Maduro. Maduro is an associate of LaRouche, the conspiracy theorist who was released in January from federal prison, where he was serving a sentence for fraud and conspiracy.

Maduro is associate editor of 21st Century, one of LaRouche's magazines, and he writes for another, Executive Intelligence Review. A version of his attack on the biodiversity treaty appears in the Sept. 2 edition of that journal.

McDonnell said that when he distributed the article, which he intended only for other members of his organization, he did not know that Maduro was associated with LaRouche. He also said the Sheep Industry Association is not taking any position on ratification of the treaty.

But he did defend the substance of Maduro's work. "What I have found is that his work very closely follows what is in the Global Biodiversity Assessment," according to McDonnell, the Global Biodiversity Assessment is the UN document which is "the model for the treaty."

There is no such document, said a member of the staff of the UN Environmental Program. "We have a biodiversity treaty and a secretariat," she said.

The Global Biodiversity Assessment is a process, just beginning, in which scientists from all over the world will monitor the world's biological diversity.

Neither the Farm Bureau's Doggett nor the other participants in the Aug. 5 meeting said that Maduro's article was the only cause, or even the main cause, of opposition to the treaty. "It was non-trivial," said one participant, "but I'm not sure that it was pivotal. One of the guys from the cattlemen's association held it up to explain the kind of response they were getting from their people."

According to this participant, the Washington lobbyists knew that the article was irrational, "but even if they didn't think these objections had any substance, how far ahead of their own constituents can they get?"

One government scientist familiar with the situation said that farmers and ranchers, especially in the West, are a receptive audience for conspiracy theories.

"They're all bent out of shape about the Endangered Species Act, property rights and environmental regulations," he said. "Some of their objections do have legitimate roots, but it makes them receptive to these statements that are paranoid and irrational."

One of the objections to the treaty, for instance, is that it defines cattle and sheep as "alien species" in the natural ecosystem. This might seem credible because in academic zoology livestock are so defined. "But not!"

Doggett nor the other participants in the Aug. 5 meeting said that the article was irrational, "but even if they didn't think these objections had any substance, how far ahead of their own constituents can they get?"

One government scientist familiar with the situation said that farmers and ranchers, especially in the West, are a receptive audience for conspiracy theories.

"They're all bent out of shape about the Endangered Species Act, property rights and environmental regulations," he said. "Some of their objections do have legitimate roots, but it makes them receptive to these statements that are paranoid and irrational."

One of the objections to the treaty, for instance, is that it defines cattle and sheep as "alien species" in the natural ecosystem. This might seem credible because in academic zoology livestock are so defined. "But not!"

"Unfortunately, what we've seen is that certain groups tried to create a crisis where one doesn't exist," said John Doggett, the Farm Bureau's director of governmental relations. Doggett remains unhappy about some elements of the treaty, but he said his organization is no longer opposing ratification.

But it was opposing the treaty early in August, which is when the serious opposition first came to the attention of the government officials responsible for the treaty. "I was surprised," said a State Department official. "It really had not shown up on my radar screen."

In an effort to discover the reasons for the opposition, government officials met with representatives of agriculture groups Aug. 5 at the Washington offices of the Farm Bureau.

According to two government officials, one participant held up and read part of an article that had been distributed by the American Sheep Industry Association.

The article claims that the treaty, which has been ratified by 78 nations, was written by "extremists" who believe that farming, jogging, fishing and mining violate the concept of "sustainable use" and who want to impose the "religious philosophy" of "biocentrism," defined as "the view that all species have equal rights." It also contends that the treaty establishes a "supranational body" that will override national sovereignty.

The article claims that the treaty, which has been ratified by 78 nations, was written by "extremists" who believe that farming, jogging, fishing and mining violate the concept of "sustainable use" and who want to impose the "religious philosophy" of "biocentrism," defined as "the view that all species have equal rights." It also contends that the treaty establishes a "supranational body" that will override national sovereignty.
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