



Settler's Advocate

Common Sense from New York and New England

October 5, 1994

Vol. 1, # 17

NFLC Recommendations

Good-bye Federal Greenline?

One need go no further than the inside of the front cover of Finding Common Ground: Conserving the Northern Forest to see how far the Northern Forest Lands Council has come since its inception. **GONE** is the finding of "**National Significance**" which was the justification for the Federal **Greenline** strategies in the Northern Forest Lands Study (though the finding appears in Appendix L as a sort of historic afterthought). **GONE** (though also appearing in Appendix L) is the finding of "**ever-increasing pressures**" which had been hyped to lend a sense of urgency to the implementation of **Greenlining**.

The Council went further, noting strong public support for continued dialog "**within** each of the four states" (emphasis added) and recommends four State Forest Roundtables to continue its work. The Council goes on to suggest that the Roundtables can meet collectively on occasion. While some may see this as a threat of renewed regionalism, such fears should not be carried too far. State sovereignty does not mean balkanization.

State Greenlines Persist

While the Council apparently heeded the public's concern over federal government intrusion into its local land use decisions, it failed even to note the resounding clamor over some existing state greenline programs (particularly in the Adirondacks and in Maine's unorganized territories). People living inside a greenline **always** end up with lesser rights than normal citizens, no matter what level of government appoints the administrator. Comments such as Governor Cuomo's that "That's the price they pay for living there" don't sit too well with those of us who take seriously our constitutional equal protection guarantees.

While the Council recommended that the State Roundtables include a wide variety of interests, such groups tend to become oligarchic over time, with the moneyed interests who can afford professional representation taking over. Unless the Roundtables are structured to be accountable to the people whose lives are most affected, they will drift inexorably towards domination by the same powerful environmentalist and industrial interests as dominated the early Northern Forest Lands process.

In the Northern Forests as elsewhere the environmental movement has pitted rural communities against an urban America which is ignorant of the fragile fabric of rural life. It is only proper that we give our own citizens the same sort of control

over their lives which we support for people around the globe.

Several mechanisms exist to insure that local people are given their fair say. Roundtable delegates can be elected at large from the Northern Forest constituents. Municipalities can be given authority to appoint delegates. Affected counties can be given appropriate authority. A Northern Forest state legislative caucus could make appropriate recommendations or appointments. Other possibilities may exist, but **they must serve to allow the people of the Northern Forests to control the process**. Without such a structure, further work on the problems facing our forests will degenerate into controversy.

Values, Values Everywhere

But Not a One Can Think

While many of the NFLC Recommendations move in the right direction, they are often peppered with the same sort of rhetoric which clouded the Northern Forest Lands Study. High on the list is the continued harping on an exhaustive rhapsody of **values**. We have natural values, economic values, private values, public values, ecological values, forest values, critical plant and wildlife habitat values, soil productivity values, scenic values, recreational values, exceptional values, cultural values, aesthetic values, personal renewal values, non-motorized recreation values, etc., etc. Conspicuous by its absence (and mercifully so) is any reference to family values.

Most disturbing is the continual comparison between **public values** and **private values**, implying some sort of values hierarchy. Such an attitude inevitably leads to bad, sometimes tragic public policy. A case in point is Oregon firefighter Levi Brinkley who lost his life (presumably a private value) in part because salmon protection regulations prohibited taking necessary water out of a nearby river (presumably a public value).

We humans can discern and act on only one values system: our own, **human** values. With over 5 billion of us on the planet our political systems have a hard enough time reconciling differences and formulating peaceful public policy without special interests cloaking their wants in seraphic, higher level values rhetoric.

This sort of thing can be seen in the Council's letter to the Governors and Members of Congress (page i) wherein it extols the benefits of our forests, "**rich in natural resources and natural values**". Unless our Northern Forest political leaders cast public policy in a more human context, they will sooner or later perpetrate our own version of the Levi Brinkley tragedy.



Settler's Advocate

September 7, 1995

Vol.2, # 4

Common Sense from New York and New England

Northern Forest Stewardship Act

Deja Vu All Over Again?

If you remember the tortuous Northern Forest Lands Council process, get ready to go through it all again. We originally got wind of the Northern Forest Stewardship Act last spring, but were assured by U.S. Senate staffers that it would be a reasonable bill to implement reasonable interpretations of the Northern Forest Lands Council Recommendations. We were assured that the process would be scrupulously fair and that environmentalist special interests would not be given an inside track.

On August 11, we heard that the bill had been formally introduced, but were again ensured that the process would be fair, with no interest being given any special advantage. The bill itself was described as "innocuous". The very next day these promises began to unravel.

The Chartreuse Press

The morning saw the first of a continuous blizzard of press accounts, starting with an AP story warning of dire "threats" to the Northern Forests such as those which occurred in the past, "leaving regions worthless for decades." Neither the NFLC nor any other responsible institution ever said any such thing. This gross fabrication was printed for the sole purpose of whipping up a frenzy of crisis to replace the Diamond land sale hype of 1988. The actual bill makes no mention of any "threats".

A week later another AP article appeared, extolling the bill "that supporters hail as a national model." The only supporter they quote, however, other than Senator Leahy and environmental activists, is the state forester of **IOWA**. Once again the specifics of the bill are not mentioned - it is just discussed in vague, misleading terms.

As other stories contribute to this whole orgy of misrepresentations, fabrications and outright lies, an increasingly familiar pattern emerges. It is a combination of the standard old sensationalist yellow journalism with a green mega-bias which brooks no critique of the motives, methods or veracity of environmentalist institutions. We dub it Chartreuse Journalism

Saturation Bombast Campaign

The environmentalist complex has kicked off a massive direct action campaign as well. National Audubon Society sent a fund raising appeal throughout Massachusetts warning that our

Northern Forests were a "national treasure" which was "threatened and will be lost to future generations unless we take action." The letter goes on to describe how 200 Auduboners were present when Senator Leahy unveiled his plans to introduce the bill and gave him a standing ovation. It closes with the usual plea for financial and other support needed to force passage. Specifics of the bill were not mentioned.

The "Northern Forest Alliance" sent youth squads around various vacation spots in Maine gathering signatures in support of the bill. "This will save our forests" screamed one. "Our Senators will now be able to bring money in to help our communities" cried another. Slick literature was spread around featuring doomsday pronouncements like "The forests of Maine are being mined. I believe the raw materials the industry needs won't exist in a very few years." No specifics of the bill were provided, but that didn't stop the eager throngs of tourists from signing on. It wasn't their land the kids were talking about.

The Great Green Phantom

Such a campaign costs money - lots of money. Such money doesn't come from the people in the Northern Forests, and it doesn't come from membership fees. Unfortunately the Northern Forest Alliance is not registered in any of the Northern Forest States like a normal fly-by-day outfit would be, so there are no tax reports on file, no officers to hold accountable for the lies and fabrications.

Some of the money is likely diverted from the Appalachian Mountain Club hut system in violation of its Forest Service permit. Other funds most certainly come from wealthy foundations such as Boston's Jessie B. Cox Foundation which gave \$315,000 to promote greenlining in the Northern Forests. Environmental groups have refused to disclose detailed funding information, while enjoying huge tax-exempt privileges. Even requests from public officials have been stonewalled.

The Actual Bill

The actual bill can best be described as a vague pail of slush. Vague, however, is not innocuous. We live in an age where water 18 inches under the ground has been deemed legally navigable. We can be sure that the type of sweeping, feel good, principles contained in the bill will be manipulated by the legions of highly paid green Washington attorneys into Lord-only-knows-what. Our Senators should know better.

Our next issue will feature a detailed analysis of important aspects of the bill.

SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT COALITION



MAINE CONSERVATION RIGHTS INSTITUTE

Man and Nature Living in *PRODUCTIVE* Harmony

August 7, 1995

(207) 733-5593, Fax (207) 733-2932

Finally, the incredible magnitude of the environmental agenda is exposed in US and UN Documents! The agenda is clearly spelled out in the United Nations commissioned Global Biodiversity Assessment (GBA). Mandated by Article 25 of the Convention on Biological Diversity, the GBA is funded by the Global Environmental Facility (GEF). The treaty and its draft GBA are strongly supported by all the major US environmental groups and provide the underpinning justification for the Convention on Climate Change, the Montreal Protocol, and a host of treaties yet on the drawing board. According to Mohamed El-Ashry, Chief Executive Officer and Chairman of the GEF, "Biodiversity is at the centre of all the natural systems that support life on Earth." Everything mankind does negatively affects biodiversity. The twelve section, multi-thousand page GBA is truly stunning in its magnitude to transform the world into feudal-like governance by making nature the central organizing principle for our economy and society. Highlights of the GBA include:

- "Societies dominated by Islam, and especially Christianity have gone farthest in **setting humans apart from nature**.... In the process... *nature* [has] *lost its sacred qualities*." (Section 8.3.5)
- "Nature has an integral set of different *values* (cultural, spiritual, and material)" where "*humans* [are] *one strand in nature's web*" and "*all living creatures* [are] *considered equal*." Therefore "The natural way is right, and *human activities should be molded along nature's rhythms*." (§9.2.3.1.2)
- "[Human] population growth has exceeded the capacity of the biosphere...to sustain it.... An 'agricultural world' in which *most human beings are peasants*, should be able to support 5 to 7 billion people." OR "A reasonable, [population] estimate for an industrialized world society at the present North American material standard of living would *be 1 billion*" people! (§9.2.3.2)
- "Biodiversity in the large is very much a *public good* - part of the *global commons*." (§8.1.5) "One option for ensuring against excessive species depletion is the *allocation of property rights* in order to create markets." (§8.8.5) "In reality, access to every *public good* involves a political process, in the course of which users *cede rights to some decision-making regulatory authority*. However, this is most obviously a difficulty in the case of *ecological services that extend across a number of juridical boundaries*.... The importance of transfers as instruments of international environmental policy and this is in fact the **basis of the Global Environment Facility**." (§8.8.5)
- "To arrive at sustainable income...*environmental capital* (e.g., forests, soil, water, oil and minerals, etc) *is diminished as it is depleted by unsustainable* [use]. This **depreciation in value is deducted from national income accounts**, just as depreciation of human made capital assets...is deducted from national income in GDP estimates." By "**using green fees or taxes on socially and environmental undesirable activities**, governments can reduce market distortions and encourage more sustainable resource uses." (§10.5.2.2 & 10.5.2.3) Section 9.10.3 describes how agriculture, forestry, mining, fishing, tourism, and golf courses cause loss of biodiversity.
- "An idealized bioregional management programme will feature three components: Ecological...; Economic...; Social Cultural...; An idealized bioregion covers a reasonably *self-contained* ecological entity... *administered under a mixture of central or local government, private, community and community tenurial rights*." (§10.7.3.4)
- "Legal standing is necessary for conservation NGOs [Non Governmental Organizations such as the Sierra Club, Wilderness Society, etc.] to permit **participation in the decision-making process**." (§10.6.3.4) "Compliance with treaty obligations is enhanced by NGOs." (§10.6.4.3)

- “Representative areas of all major ecosystems in a [bio]-region need to be *reserved*. that [Reserved] **blocks should be as large as possible** (up to 25 million acres each), that *buffer zones* should be established around core areas, and that *corridors* should connect these areas. This basic design is central to the recently-proposed ‘WILDLANDS PROJECT’ in the United States.” (§10.4.2.2.3) The Wildlands Project to which the GBA cites recommends “that *at least half of the land area of the 48 conterminous states...be encompassed in core reserves and inner corridor zones... within the next few decades.*” “During the initial stages of park and reserve establishment, there may be a **transition phase while local inhabitants are provided with options for relocation outside of the area.**” (§10.5) (Italics added)

The UNITED STATES MAN AND THE BIOSPHERE PROGRAM, housed in the U.S. State Department, is to be the testing ground for these concepts in exactly the way described by the GBA and Wildlands Project. Likewise, the April 28, 1995 issue of *Inside EPA* outlines the PRESIDENTS COUNCIL ON SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT (PCSD) which includes almost every major point covered in the GBA. The *Inside EPA* article concludes that “many of the...recommendations are too radical to ever be implemented....” One member of the council was quoted as saying “*If I am a conservative Republican on Capitol Hill, this is red meat for me to say, ‘The Clinton administration is trying to practice social engineering.*”

IF YOU ARE INTERESTED IN WORKING TOGETHER TO STOP THIS WELL DOCUMENTED ECO-AGENDA, JOIN THE SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT COALITION SO THAT MAN AND NATURE CAN LIVE IN PRODUCTIVE HARMONY

The SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT COALITION is dedicated to the following principles inherent in the concept of sustainable development:

1. As defined by our Founding Fathers, human life is endowed by our creator with certain inalienable rights including life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness.
2. Respect for another’s freedom is a person’s first responsibility.
3. To accommodate individual freedom for all, people organize themselves into governments which should exist to promote and protect the value of human life and the pursuit of individual freedom.
4. Man and nature can live in productive harmony without a radical transformation and reorganization of Western Civilization — especially our economic, social and religious institutions. Current efforts to create a centrally controlled, planned society around nature is antithetical to principles 1 - 3.
5. Regulations should be based upon the historic premise of common law, and not subject to being applied in an arbitrary and capricious manner. Where science plays a deciding role, hard verifiable science must support the rule. Regulators must be ultimately accountable to the people they regulate.
6. International treaties recommended by United Nations Organizations should never be self-executing or enforceable by an international body, and must always require national legislation and national enforcement within the constraints established by the United States Constitution.
7. Financial and or political alliances must not be formed which result in the defacto subversion of these principles.

Specific Challenges for the SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT COALITION include:

1. Prevent implementation of Agenda 21 by: a) stopping the ratification of the Convention on biological Diversity; b) withdrawing from the Convention on Climate Change; c) terminating the consideration of the Convention on Desertification, and Convention on Sustainable Development; and d) stopping implementation of the policies advocated by the *Global Biodiversity Assessment*, the Man and the Biosphere Program, and the President’s Council on Sustainable Development.
2. Redefine “Sustainable Development” to maximize human achievement in resource stewardship and environmental protection by promoting the development and application of sound science.
3. Fully inform the American people of the true eco-social agenda of environmental leadership.

The SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT COALITION is designed to be an information exchange and a strategy building organization between groups and individuals committed to stopping the anti-human environmental social engineering agenda in America. It will be part of the National Action Plan being initiated and implemented by the Maine Conservation Rights Institute (MECRI), the Environmental Conservation Organization (ECO), and Environmental Perspectives, Inc. (EPI). It is coordinated by a five person executive committee. The SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT COALITION will function in three ways.

1. Monthly phone teleconferences with participants initiated and managed by the Natural Resources and Policy Group, a division of MECRI. The purpose is to solicit and exchange critical information and build national grassroots strategies to address existing and emerging issues.
2. Conduit for factual information on each of the above five goals being developed through the National Action Plan. This factual information can be used by coalition members to inform their individual grassroots constituents, other publics, the media, state legislatures, and Congress of the true environmental agenda behind specific legislation and treaties.
3. A catalyst to help candidates in the 1996 campaign by providing them accurate information to combat the intense disinformation campaign now being developed by environmental leadership.

The Sustainable Development Coalition is designed to complement, not to compete with other critically important coalitions.

JOIN THE SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT COALITION NOW!
FAXBACK THE COMPLETED FORM BELOW

COMPLETE THIS FORM AND FAXBACK TO # (207) 733-2932 or (207) 733-2014

- YES! I WOULD LIKE TO JOIN THE SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT COALITION. I WILL RECEIVE A COPY OF THE NATIONAL ACTION PLAN.
- I WILL PARTICIPATE IN THE MONTHLY TELECONFERENCES.
- I WOULD ALSO LIKE TO HELP BY DONATING PLEDGING \$ _____ TO HELP DEFRAY COSTS.

NAME OF ORGANIZATION _____

ADDRESS _____ CITY, STATE, ZIP _____

PHONE _____ FAX _____

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CALL BOB VOIGHT (MECRI) AT (207) 733-5593. MIKE COFFMAN (EPI) AT (207) 945-9878. HENRY LAMB (ECO) AT (901) 986-0099.



September 11, 1995

Alert

Alert

Alert

NORTHERN FOREST STEWARDSHIP ACT

The Northern Forest Stewardship Act was introduced last month as a vehicle to implement some recommendations of the Northern Forest Lands Council. Cosponsors included both Senators Cohen and Snowe.

The Act is so vague that it is fraught with some very troubling implications. The Pacific Legal Foundation has warned that hazy declarations "serve the purpose of giving carte blanche to regulators and the courts to steer implementation of the Act in any direction they may wish." Perhaps the most troubling of these declarations is the following:

"people must appreciate that the Northern Forest has values that are beyond the boundaries of the forest;"

This is essentially equal to the Congressional declaration of "**National Significance**" which the Ninth Circuit Court found was sufficient to justify imposition of federal land use regulations in the Northwest.

The Act purports to "**respect**" private property rights. The problem is that it does not **acknowledge** any specific rights, leaving regulators free to declare cavalierly that "No rights are disrespected". A section limiting government acquisitions to "willing sellers" is likewise worthless as it puts no restriction on officials to use their full coercive bag of tricks to force sellers to be "willing".

Perhaps the most troubling aspect of the bill is a **very broad authorization to acquire private lands** as the government sees fit. Those restrictions enumerated in the bill could be circumvented by a first year law school student.

The Act suggests formation of an appointed "**Citizens Advisory Committee**" as part of an "**Interstate Coordination Strategy**". This would likely be the basis for a new Northern Forest Lands Council the minute some new manufactured "crisis" like the 1988 Diamond sale came along.

Both Senator Cohen and Snowe have assured us that they want to hear how the people feel about this bill before they pursue it. You may have read or seen some of the well funded campaigns environmentalists are waging to promote passage. We urge you to express your views. Addresses and phone numbers are:

Senator William Cohen
322 Hart Senate Office Building
Washington, DC 20510
202-224-2523

Senator Olympia Snowe
495 Russell Senate Office Building
Washington, DC 20510
202-224-5344