

## Why the Russians Conceived the Global Warming Scam

By Cliff Kincaid

One of my duties at Accuracy in Media (AIM) has been to expose left-wingers in the media and Congress who were soft on the old Soviet Union and are now acting like hard-liners on Vladimir Putin's Russia. It is a fascinating topic that exposes the duplicity of the left-wing obsession with Russia.

These people, who were soft on the Soviet Union and now hard on Russia, are the worst kind of hypocrites. Their hypocrisy is further demonstrated by the abundant evidence that the global warming or climate change theory, which they now embrace, was conceived by Soviet communists as a means by which to destroy the industrial base in the United States. This disinformation theme has been embraced by the liberals now claiming to be tough on Russia.

Don't take my word for it. When Natalie Grant Wraga died in 2002 at the age of 101, *The Washington Post* recognized her expertise as a Soviet expert, noting that she was "born in czarist Russia, saw great upheaval in her native land and became an expert in unmasking Soviet deception methods for the State Department..."

But the *Post* would not admit that fact in today's political climate.

The liberal *Economist* magazine wrote, "She was perhaps the only person alive in the West who could claim such an intimate knowledge of Russian political thinking, from tsarist times to the collapse of the Soviet Union." She commented, "Many people are studying the past, but very few are studying the present. Keep your eyes open and your ears open."

This is good advice. One of the great Soviet/Russian deceptions, Wraga wrote, was the idea that humans were changing the climate and that humans could save the earth through socialism. She said, "Protection of the environment has become the principal tool for attack against the West."

### Communism and the environmental movement

In her 1998 article, "Green Cross: Gorbachev and Enviro-Communism," Wraga, who dropped her last name and wrote under the byline Natalie Grant, explains in detail how the Soviet deception campaign, using the climate as an organizing tool, was developed. It was launched after the so-called collapse of the Soviet state, when Mikhail Gorbachev, the last Soviet president, embarked on an environmental crusade, using the United Nations and other international organizations.

The veteran journalist Wes Vernon wrote about Grant's research in this area, in an article entitled "[The Marxist Roots of the Global Warming Scare.](#)"

**Published on** June 12th, 2017 | *by Wes Vernon*

## **The Marxist Roots of the Global Warming Scare**

The late Natalie Grant Wraga once wrote, "Protection of the environment has become the principal tool for attack against the West and all it stands for. Protection of the environment may be used as a pretext to adopt a series of measures designed to undermine the industrial base of developed nations. It may also serve to introduce malaise by lowering their standard of living and implanting communist values."

And who was this person?

Natalie Grant Wraga (who died in 2002 at age 101) was an internationally-recognized expert on the art of disinformation. In her Washington Post obituary, Herbert Romerstein — veteran intelligence expert in the legislative and executive branches of government — described Grant/Wraga as "one of our leading authorities" on Soviet deceit

In a 1998 article appearing in Investors Business Daily (IBD), reporter John Berlau wrote that some of the most respected scholars on Soviet Intelligence have credited this woman with teaching them how to penetrate desinformatzia, Moscow's term for its ongoing operation to deceive foreign governments.

John Dziak — onetime senior intelligence officer at the Defense Intelligence Agency (DIA) — is quoted by IBD as saying were it not "for someone like Natalie, we would have had more failures, and the Soviets would have had more successes."

Which leads us where?

In many of her writings, she dropped her last name and wrote under the byline Natalie Grant. That takes us to the spring 1998 issue of The Register. Therein, Grant identified Green Cross International (GCI) as a Non-Government Organization (NGO) founded by Mikhail Gorbachev, the last communist dictator of the Soviet Union. The aim of GCI was worldwide enforcement of a rigid environmental agenda.

Concurrent with the advancement of GCI, there was the birth of yet another NGO called the Earth Council, chaired by Maurice Strong, a key environmentalist mover and shaker at the United Nations. According to Wikipedia, Strong — a Canadian — describes himself as "a socialist in ideology and a capitalist in methodology." The bio also notes that "some consider Strong a frightening power seeker." And then this: "He shares the views of the most radical environmentalist street protester, but instead of shouting

himself hoarse at a police barricade at a global conference, he's the secretary general inside, wielding the gavel."

Meanwhile, about a dozen people participated in the organizing meeting of Gorbachev's GCI, including then-U.S. Rep. James Scheuer (D-N.Y.). The congressman had publicly stated that regardless of whether the allegation of man-made "global warming" was valid or exaggerated, the U.S. should proceed to take the steps required to fight it because those steps supposedly would benefit the planet. (As explained in last week's column, the Cap and Trade — "Tax and Rob" — legislation aimed at carrying out the radical enviro agenda at a steep cost to American consumers and taxpayers was dropped like a hot potato in the U.S. Senate June 6, lest the great unwashed arise in anger and deliver an unwelcome verdict at the polls. It will be back in 2009. Connecting these dots is relevant. But I digress.)

The main organizing events

Other GCI meetings were to follow, including what Grant called "The Big Event — the Moscow Conference," in January 1990. Then-Senator Al Gore was among the speakers. Only two years before, he had conducted hearings on Capitol Hill where the "global warming" theory was showcased.

As the Moscow conference got underway, the Soviet Union was then was on its last legs — down, but not yet out, you might say. Gorbachev, still the Soviet leader, voiced his government's demand that the nations push for a nuclear test ban, an international environmental monitoring system, a covenant to protect "unique environmental zones" (a mindset that has since led to an international fight over UN efforts to disallow snowmobiles in Yellowstone Park on American soil), support for United Nations environmental programs, and a follow-up conference in June 1992 in Brazil.

Grant writes that while Gorbachev was expressing the "views" and "suggestions" of the Soviet Communist Party, those suggestions did not fall on deaf ears. "Before long, the activities of the movement began to reflect the communist 'recommendations.'"

Update: 2008

Now, why all this background?

On May 28, here in Washington, the featured speaker at the annual dinner of the Competitive Enterprise Institute (CEI) was The Honorable Vaclav Klaus, President of the Czech Republic.

Klaus's book *Blue Planet in Green Shackles* had just been released. As the Czech head of state put it at the dinner, the purpose of the book was to outline his firm belief that

much of organized environmentalism is "an ideology I consider the most dangerous threat to freedom and prosperity in the current era."

Was Schumpeter right?

Klaus believes that the United States — for all its problems — is "the most free country in the world and the inspiration for all of us. I emphasize it here and now mainly because of my growing frustration with the developments on the other side of the Atlantic where I've just come from."

President Klaus then referred to the philosopher Joseph Alois Schumpeter, whose knowledge of tyranny came from such events in his life as having to flee Nazi Germany. Klaus noted that "[Schumpeter's] evolutionary theory of the demise of capitalism [would be] based on its very success."

Here's how that theory plays out: Innovations would become a matter of routine, progress would be mechanized, problems would be "simply solved" by reason and science, entrepreneurship would be replaced by mere calculation, individual motivation would subside, collectivistic mentality would prevail and the growing teamwork in large corporations would lead to the gradual obsolescence and at the end the disappearance of the crucial player (or perhaps mover) of capitalism — the entrepreneur.

This column would interject here that in the post-Watergate, post-Vietnam years of the late seventies, there were early signs the Schumpeter theory might eventually become reality. The optimism and humming economy of the eighties got America (and much of the world) back on track.

However, Klaus believes Schumpeter's theory "seems to be too pessimistic." The world simply has not followed that script. "As one who in my country actively participated in the dismantling of communism and the building of a free society," he says, "the collapse of [the Soviet empire] and the explicit acceptance of capitalism almost all over the world [is something which] with all due respect is clearly incompatible with Schumpeter's hypothesis."

Then what is the problem?

As Klaus told his CEI audience, there are other factors "by which capitalism could be brought to an end, [such as in] the enormously expanding and growing disbelief in the ingenuity of man and in the advantages of the market process."

In the past, the Czech chief executive noted, socialist arguments were laced with slogans about "the immiseration of the masses" (workers of the world, unite, etc.). Now

instead, there is "a more dangerous slogan: the immiseration (or perhaps destruction) of the Planet."

In the older times, it was easy to prove in relatively short order whether people (i.e., workers) were better off. "Now it will take centuries to come up with convincing proof that the Planet has been destroyed or does not find itself on the brink of destruction."

In other words, "The free riding [of] this horse is therefore much easier. The ambitious politicians who try to mastermind the world and their fellow citizens have been dreaming for decades to find such a marvelous, from reality-immunized doctrine. Years or decades of cold weather will not disprove it — to my great regret. It is almost religious. My certainty that this ideology becomes the main vehicle for the destruction of the free market was my main reason for writing the book."

And just to pinpoint the problem, Klaus adds: "Schumpeter was hopefully wrong in his predictions. And in addition to it, he has been dead now for almost six decades. Al Gore, however, is very much alive."

The Marxists' new propaganda weapon

Or — again — as the late Natalie Grant put it, "Protection of the environment may be used as a pretext to adopt a series of measures designed to undermine the industrial base of developed nations. It may also serve to introduce malaise by lowering their standard of living and implanting communist values."

When she died, Natalie Grant Wraga's obituary quoted her as saying, "One must give the Soviets their due. No other country is capable as are the Soviets of manipulating public opinion in the West."

Just delete the word "Soviets" and replace it with "environmental Marxists," and you get a pretty clear picture of what faces us today.

The big event, as Grant called it, was a Moscow conference in January, 1990. As *Time* magazine described it, "At a meeting of the Global Forum in Moscow in 1990, when he was still Soviet President, Gorbachev proposed an organization roughly analogous to the International Red Cross to contend with environmental problems that cross national boundaries." Among the guests and speakers was then-U.S. senator and future vice president Al Gore.

Talk about "collusion" with the Russians! Where was the FBI investigation?

The collusion took place through the Global Forum and various United Nations conferences, including the Earth Summit of 1992, giving rise to the concept of "sustainable development," another way to describe socialism.

Grant wrote, "Protection of the environment may be used as a pretext to adopt a series of measures designed to undermine the industrial base of developed nations. It may also serve to introduce malaise by lowering their standard of living and implanting communist values."

Grant predicted how this campaign would proceed, using "nightmarish" pictures of floods, scorched earth, disease and death, unless drastic action was taken at the international level to curb industrial activity in the capitalist West.

She said the campaign would be driven by Moscow's sympathizers or dupes in "science," academia, "and the slavishly obedient Establishment media," all for the purpose of forcing the United States and other Western countries "to accept measures and regulations harmful to the Western world."

In short, for communism to succeed, capitalism would have to be portrayed as based on exploitation—but not of man, as the old Marxist theory held. Rather, capitalism was now exploiting the earth! The whole purpose of this dogma has been to inhibit global capitalism, the only system that has proven capable of meeting the growing needs of expanding populations. But this time the claim was that human economic progress threatened the environment because of the capitalist model on which it was based.

Hence, President Obama's Paris climate change agreement was designed to curtail U.S. industrial expansion while sending foreign aid to the rest of the world. It was a Marxist plan that benefited Russia, a major oil and gas producer.

### **Persistent propaganda campaign**

On June 1, when he announced pulling out of the climate change agreement, President Donald Trump put his finger on the key problem, which was deliberately part of the plan. He attacked "the draconian financial and economic burdens the agreement imposes on our country" while creating a so-called Green Climate Fund which would cost the United States "a vast fortune" to be sent to the other nations of the world.

In other words, Trump's pull-out from the agreement works AGAINST Russian interests and those of the global socialists.

Nevertheless, the propaganda campaign continues. In July, Netflix releases the film "Chasing Coral," which attempts to blame man for "dramatically changing" and losing coral reefs in the world's oceans on a global scale. With carbon emissions said to be "warming the seas," the audience will be told of the "catastrophe" that is "silently raging underwater" unless we wake up and dramatically restrict our lifestyles.

Meanwhile, Ohio State University has released a "study" in the Journal of Peace Research suggesting that climate change could lead to "food violence." One of the

authors is quoted in an Ohio State University press release as saying, “Development aid is important now and it is likely to be even more important in the future as we look for ways to increase climate resilience.”

This article was published in Accuracy in Media on June 20, 2017