



Written by on February 1, 2011

## **The Reality of a Green World: [3 Wolves and a Sheep] Voting on What to Have For Lunch**

After fighting the radical environmental movement for more than 20 years, I have come to one basic conclusion: the people who understand and care for the environment the least are environmentalists. My experience has shown that the leaders of this once-popular and still powerful force simply use the environment as an excuse to impose a radical, socialist agenda. Meanwhile, the faithful rank and file of the movement believe anything if it is attached to the label “green,” rarely questioning if the statement is true or not.



For example, it is an accepted fact in environmental circles that man is not part of the ecology, only its destroyer. Say the Greens, man’s every action results in damage to the environment and to the plants and animals which are forced to co-exist with him.

Based on that premise, the entire economy of the United States has been transformed to reduce man’s earthbound “footprint,” as human civilization recedes back to that of cave dwellers freezing in the dark. The result is not only a new dark ages for the community of man, but also for the environment.

The anti-human policy says forests must be left alone, never cared for by man. This leaves dead trees to lie on the floor of the forest to rot. Say the environmentalists, this is the natural way. For centuries man has taken care of the forests, clearing out dead wood, improving their ecologic health. No more. The National Forest Service demands that the dead trees stay on the floor, rotting away — in a “natural” habitat.

The fact is, such policy is actually more destructive to the environment. That’s because leaving the dead trees to rot builds up tinder on the floor of the forest. When a forest fire breaks out the fires burn so hot it is nearly impossible to put them out. We’ve all read about how much hotter the fires seem to be today. This is the reason. Moreover, in some cases the floor of the forest is so full of dead and rotting wood that the kindling reaches as high as ten feet, making it nearly impossible for animals to move through it. But that, say the Greens, is the natural, and therefore the right way.

One more thing: the rotting trees bring disease and termites to the other trees, causing more trees to die. In addition, the termites produce about one fourth of the methane that the Greens so fear as a cause of global warming. So, the correct course is clear — clean out the dead trees and make a termite homeless — for the environment. But the Greens refuse to budge to logic.

Environmentalists loath the concept of private property. Only man, they say, can come up with the concept of buying and selling land that is not his. Only man can conceive of fencing in the wilderness. The rest of the natural world lives in harmony, they say, taking only what they need. The idea of ownership of private property is inconceivable to the natural world, say the environmentalists.

Here’s a question I’ve always wanted to ask an environmentalist. Have you ever stuck your hand in a



Written by on February 1, 2011

---

bee hive? If so, do you have any doubt that the bees have a concept of private property, ready to defend it to the death? Other animals move about the land, marking their territory as a warning to others to stay away. Why? Because it's HIS land. Is there any difference between marking your territory with urine and building fences (other than the obvious sanitary issue)? Bears have territory. Lions have territory. And anyone truly in tune with the environment understands that fact. Only self-appointed environmental experts fail to grasp the massive natural property rights claims that exist throughout the animal world. Apparently, if they can't see a physical fence as man tends to build, then it doesn't exist, according to the myopic view of the Greens.

The worst environmental lies come in the policies of endangered species and reintroduction of dangerous predators. For several hundred years our ancestors worked diligently to remove predators from the land so they could live in peace, without fear for their children and live stock. Over the past 20 years, environmentalists have forced government policy to bring back the wolves and Grizzly bears that the ranchers and farmers fought so hard to get rid of. We need to replace the natural environment that man has destroyed, say the Greens. Nature demands it, they claim. Disaster will befall us if we don't, goes the mantra.

When the people protested, saying the wolves and Grizzlies would destroy their lives and livelihood, the Greens said it wasn't so. Man could live in harmony with these predators, they claimed. In one classic community meeting, when residents expressed their fear of Grizzlies living next door and the possible results that could have on the safety for their children, they were comforted by the local Fish and Wildlife agent who said, just put bells on your children. If there is a "bad" bear out there, the bells will scare them away. Such comforting words caused one wise resident to respond, "seems to me the only way to tell a good bear from a bad bear is if it has bells in its poop." Such is the lunacy of "going Green." It has nothing to do with true conservation of the environment."

**Tom DeWeese** is Founder and President of the [American Policy Center](#) and editor of *The DeWeese Report*. The above article was originally published in April 2010 by the American Policy Center and is reprinted here with permission



Written by on February 1, 2011

## Subscribe to the New American

Get exclusive digital access to the most informative, non-partisan truthful news source for patriotic Americans!

Discover a refreshing blend of time-honored values, principles and insightful perspectives within the pages of "The New American" magazine. Delve into a world where tradition is the foundation, and exploration knows no bounds.

From politics and finance to foreign affairs, environment, culture, and technology, we bring you an unparalleled array of topics that matter most.



### What's Included?

- 24 Issues Per Year
- Optional Print Edition
- Digital Edition Access
- Exclusive Subscriber Content
- Audio provided for all articles
- Unlimited access to past issues
- Coming Soon! Ad FREE
- 60-Day money back guarantee!
- Cancel anytime.

**Subscribe**