

ECO-TYRANNY

How the Left's Green Agenda Will Dismantle America

BRIAN SUSSMAN

Bestselling Author of *Climategate*



WND Books
Washington, D.C.

Copyright ©Brian Sussman 2012

All rights reserved. No part of this book may be reproduced in any form or by any means, electronic or mechanical, photocopying, scanning, or otherwise, without permission in writing from the publisher except by a reviewer, who may quote brief passages in a review.

Book Designed by Mark Karis

WND Books are distributed to the trade by:

Midpoint Trade Books
27 West 20th Street, Suite 1102
New York, NY 10011

WND Books are available at special discounts for bulk purchases. WND Books, Inc., also publishes books in electronic formats. For more information call (541) 474-1776 or visit www.wndbooks.com

First Edition

ISBN 13 Digit: 978-1-936488-50-6

Library of Congress information available.

Printed in the United States of America.

DEDICATION

For Elisa, Sam, Ben, Josh, Makayla, and the next generation of patriots.
That you may be able to stand your ground.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

FOREWORD

PART ONE

ONE

Tyranny Spawned

TWO

Green the New Red

THREE

Unveiling the Agenda

FOUR

Gore's Welt on America

FIVE

Global Whining

SIX

Green Gospel

PART TWO

SEVEN

Solar and Wind: The Inconvenient Truth

EIGHT

We Own It—Let's Drill It

NINE

Oil Independence

TEN

Nuke It

ELEVEN

Dam It

TWELVE

Red, White, and Green

AFTERWORD

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

APPENDIX

NOTES

INDEX

FOREWORD

WHILE I CAN'T LAY CLAIM to being a lifelong conservative, I can declare that I've always been vehemently opposed to communism and socialism. No doubt, my parents influenced my convictions, particularly the story my dad told regarding his father's coming to America from Russia, shortly after the start of the Russian Revolution in the early 1900s. My grandfather was only thirteen years-old when his parents sent him to the United States with a single admonition: "Make money, send for your brother."

Indeed, Grandpa did just that. Without knowledge of the language, or the culture, he immediately embraced America's free-market system, buying used goods—a.k.a. "junk"—and reselling the merchandise door-to-door. Eventually, he sent for his brother, and they became wildly successful entrepreneurs.

Had my grandfather remained in Russia, the pall of communism would have darkened his life, as it did for millions of others. Instead, he came to America, eagerly partook of life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness, and became a self-sufficient, contributing member of society. He was proud to be an American.

My grandfather's experience was just as the founders of this nation had intended. He was able to utilize his personal abilities to freely and independently engage in useful commerce. He would eventually purchase a home, construct a store (which he also owned), provide for his family, and create meaningful jobs for other citizens. Like millions of others, Grandpa was able to succeed because the government stayed out of his way, allowing him the opportunity to either make it, or fail on his own accord.

My grandfather's success led to the overriding political philosophy espoused by my parents throughout my upbringing: "Government is but a necessary evil." Of course, this quote was actually extracted from Thomas Paine's pamphlet, *Common Sense*, published in 1776, in which Paine states, "Government, even in its best state, is but a necessary evil; in its worst state, an intolerable one."

What Grandpa escaped was the intolerable ideology of Karl Marx, which was sweeping his homeland when his parents put him on a ship bound for Ellis Island, New York. The core of Marx's message was the denial of private property. What Grandpa found in America was the antithesis of Marxism—the pursuit of happiness via his right to personal property, *and* a property in his personal rights.

The term "property," as understood by America's founders, does not limit the meaning to merely land or material possessions. Property includes one's thoughts, opinions, beliefs, ideas, and unalienable rights. No one articulated this ideology better than James Madison who, in a 1792 essay entitled, *Property*, stated:

[Property] embraces every thing to which a man may attach a value and have a right; and *which leaves to every one else the like advantage*. In the former sense, a man's land, or merchandize, or money is called his property. In the latter sense, a man has property in his opinions and the free communication of them. He has a property of peculiar value in his religious opinions, and in the profession and practice dictated by them. He has property very dear to him in the safety and liberty of his person. He has an equal property in the free use of his faculties and free choice of the objects on which to employ them. In a word, as a man is said to have a right to his property, he may be equally said to have a property in his rights.

While much could be written regarding the usurping of property rights involving the non-physical—this book is dedicated to the tyranny that befalls the United States in the form of the physical—specifically land and natural resources. Even more so, this book exposes how environmentally-based government policies are being used as the lever of choice to engage in this travesty.

For many decades, the U.S. federal government has been instituting laws and regulations purposefully designed to smother physical property rights. Simultaneously, the feds have been engaged in amassing millions of acres of land—exactly what the founders *did not* want to occur. What the government is doing is part of a centralization of power, which Thomas Jefferson labeled the “feudal-ruler” form of government. In the feudal-ruler scheme, the rights of the government become superior to the rights of citizens. Such a system is foundational to Marxism in that the government demands control of property, because he who controls the land and its resources, controls the people. Thus, when citizens are unable to own land and property to grow crops, establish a business, or build home to shelter their family, they are at the mercy of those who hold that power. Likewise, when a country’s natural resources, necessary to sustain life, are withheld from the populace, or doled-out like airline peanuts, the citizens are beholden to the control of those in authority above them.

In other words, when the government controls the land, the water, the minerals, timber, oil, and gas, they control *us*.

ECO-TYRANNY

In 2010, WND Books published my first book, *Climategate, A Veteran Meteorologist Exposes the Global Warming Scam*. What makes that book unique is that in it I reveal the political and financial foundation driving those who are pushing the theory of anthropogenic global warming and climate change. However, while I was researching *Climategate*, I was astonished by a recurring theme: since the inception of the environmental movement, its leaders have been consumed with eliminating capitalism and ushering in a global era of socialism. Their call for being “green” goes far beyond demanding clean air, pure water, healthy forests, and alternative sources of energy. The leftists at the helm of the environmentalist hierarchy want to *control* the air, water, forests, and natural resources. Because I only touched on this research in *Climategate*, I felt it necessary to write another book that would provide the most comprehensive exposé of how the left’s green agenda is trashing American liberty.

My interest in pursuing this book went into hyper-drive in 2010, when a former Department of Interior official in Washington, D.C. told me of a secret draft document created by the Obama administration that detailed a 25-year plan to purchase, or takeover, millions of acres of private property in order to connect land owned by, and managed by, the federal government. This colleague had seen a few pages of the paper, and believed it was part of a larger plot to “divide the country into sectors where all humans would be herded into urban hubs” with the bulk of the nation’s land “returned to a natural state upon which humans would only be allowed to tread lightly.”

The DOI official’s words seemed to corroborate what my research revealed. After some digging, I was able to see the document for myself, at which point all of my suspicions were confirmed, and *Eco-Tyranny* was soon underway.

The plans that the left have for America are being tirelessly woven into the fabric of our society. Unless this plot is stopped, life for our children and grandchildren will not represent anything that once made America uniquely *American*.

FEDERAL LAND OWNERSHIP: ORIGINAL INTENT

Nothing is taught in our schools regarding federal land ownership. I'm sure most people think national parks and forests are as American as apple pie. Actually, they're not. The fact is our founders did not want the U.S. to be in the business of holding any property, other than that which is necessary to maintain a limited, central government.

So concerned were they about this issue that in October 1780, even prior to the ratification of the Articles of Confederation, the Continental Congress adopted a general policy for administering any North American land transferred to the Federal Government:

The lands were to be “disposed of for the common benefit of the United States,” and were to be “settled and formed into distinct republican States, which shall become members of the Federal Union, and shall have the same rights of sovereignty, freedom and independence, as the other States....” Additionally, the lands were to “be granted and settled at such times and under such regulations as shall hereafter be agreed on by the United States in Congress assembled...”¹

The original intent was that any land bequeathed to the federal government, or obtained via treaty or purchase, would be allocated accordingly. This distribution resolution gave way to the original colonies ceding their “western” lands (between the Appalachian Mountains and the Mississippi River) to the central government between 1781 and 1802. In turn, ownership of these lands was transferred to private individuals and the states, with the proceeds being used to pay Revolutionary War soldiers, finance the new limited central government, and settle additional territories. Further federal land acquisitions continued thereafter, including the Louisiana Purchase in 1803, the Texas Annexation of 1845, the Oregon Treaty in 1846, the Mexican Cession of 1848, and the purchase of Alaska in 1867. However, the U.S. policy at the time of these arrangements was a planned transfer of ownership to individuals, states and territories; additionally government-owned land could also be used to house federal offices, create right-of-ways for interstate infrastructure (at the time, trains), and military installations.

Since our founding, the federal government has acquired 1.8 billion acres in North America, of which 1.1 billion acres have been properly disposed. The remaining lands are now under the control of four agencies: Bureau of Land Management, National Park Service, Fish and Wildlife Service (all divisions of the Department of the Interior), and the Forest Service, part of the Department of Agriculture. Specifically these gubnoting agencies control all public lands including national parks, national recreation areas, national forests, wilderness areas, heritage lands, wild and scenic rivers, historical sites, open spaces, and treasured landscapes.

United States' land policy markedly changed in 1832. It happened in Hot Springs, located in the Territory of Arkansas, so-named for its naturally-fed pools of hot spring water. The springs were considered therapeutic and able to cure a variety of ailments including arthritis, tuberculosis, skin diseases, and even cancer. Bleeding-heart members of Congress determined that the supposedly supernatural waters needed to be protected, and soon a first-of-a-kind law was made establishing the “Hot Springs Reservation.” Next, a military hospital was constructed adjacent the springs to provide veterans the opportunity to be healed of various ailments by the miraculous waters. Eventually, some 100,000 hot baths were provided to the poor annually. Applicants for the free soaks were required to make an oath that they were without the means to pay for the baths, with violations being a misdemeanor subject to fine and/or imprisonment.

Hot Springs was the first slip down the proverbial, slippery slope.

The next slide came with the establishment of two iconic natural parks. In 1864, Congress donated the federally held Yosemite Valley to the State of California, with the proviso that the state would guarantee its preservation. While the decision was in keeping with the general intent of federal land ownership (transferring federal property to a state), it was a deal that was carried out with obvious strings attached: the feds were mandating what the state could do with the property. This land swap provided profound inspiration to an eclectic explorer, Dr. Ferdinand Hayden, of Massachusetts.

Hayden was a trained surgeon and geologist, as well as a self-described “naturalist.”² He was also an incredible networker.

For many years, adventurers had spoken of the beautiful upper reaches of the Yellowstone River and a mysterious place nearby known as Colter’s Hell. Located in what is now Wyoming, the region, filled with hot springs, steam vents, and geysers, was first discovered by a mountain man named John Colter. In 1804, Coulter headed west with the Lewis and Clark expedition, but separated from the group after a clash of personalities. That’s when he happened upon the spectacular expanse near the Yellowstone River, which looked more like Hell than Heaven. Upon returning to civilization and sharing the stories of what he had witnessed, most cast him off as a kook.

Decades later, in 1871, intrigued by the stories put forward by Colter, Dr. Hayden led an impressive survey team to the Yellowstone Basin to find, and document, Colter’s Hell. Upon his return East, Hayden mounted an emotional campaign to promote and protect the natural wonders of the region—just as had been done with Hot Springs in Arkansas, and Yosemite in California. Hayden made his case in a well-received article for a very popular publication, *Scribner’s Monthly*. The piece included brilliantly detailed illustrations of the wonders his team had witnessed in upper Yellowstone, created by fellow expedition member Thomas Moran, one of the nation’s best painters. The public response to the article and realistic artwork were overwhelming.

Also on Hayden’s journey was William Henry Jackson, arguably America’s best photographer. Following the piece in *Scribner’s*, Hayden’s next public relations blitz placed Jackson’s stunning photographs on stereographic cards (postcards) produced by a friend, Charles Bierstadt, the leading manufacturer of the popular medium. Bierstadt fashioned the cards into a handsome album, and Hayden shared the photographs with Jay Cooke, a railroad magnate who helped finance the Union Army during the Civil War. Hayden was planning the Northern Pacific rail line and, as Hayden had hoped, Cooke became hopeful that putting Yellowstone on the map would increase ridership on his lines.

Cooke effectively lobbied Congress, passing around the photo album, and eventually Congress passed a bill calling for Yellowstone to officially become “a public park or pleasuring-ground for the benefit and enjoyment of the people.”

The legislation was presented to President Ulysses Grant on March 1, 1872. Given the unique relationship between the former general of the Union troops and the Civil War financier, Mr. Cooke, there was little doubt that this bill would be vetoed. Once signed, Yellowstone became the first national park in the world.

With two major revisions to U.S. land policy completed, there was a third slip down the slope that has kept us sliding ever since: the Casa Grande National Monument in Arizona.

Casa Grande is an ancient village of mud huts and buildings created by indigenous people in what is now Coolidge, Arizona. The village was abandoned around 1450. As westward expansion increased, fanciful articles regarding Casa Grande’s mysterious dwellings began circulating in the 1860s. Soon, with stagecoach travel available into the area, increased public interest was creating both a tourist

attraction and a treasure hunt for collectors of antiquity.

Once again, a Massachusetts blueblood rose to the rescue.

In 1883, philanthropist Mary Hemenway financed an expedition led by anthropologist Frank H. Cushing to document the deterioration of the Casa Grande. Following the journey, Hemenway urged Massachusetts senator George F. Hoar to present a petition to Congress in 1889, requesting that the government take steps to repair and protect the ruins. The legislative efforts were successful, and restoration began the following year. In 1892, President Benjamin Harrison set aside one square mile of Arizona Territory surrounding the Casa Grande Ruins as the first prehistoric and cultural reserve established in the United States. Harrison derived his power to protect the property via the Land Revision Act of 1891. That act gave the president unilateral authority to “set aside and reserve...any part of the public lands wholly or partly covered with timber or undergrowth, whether of commercial value or not.”

In other words, the act gave the president sole power to establish reserves, national forests, and national monuments. However, the law did not present the executive branch the authority to use or develop resources on the reserved lands.

By that time, our slip down the slope had become a slide gaining speed and out veering out of control. Terminal velocity was finally reached in the Taylor Grazing Act of 1934. Enacted to address the deterioration of public rangelands, this law provided direct authority for federal management of these lands, and implicitly began the aggressive move toward ending property disposals, and instead retaining land in federal ownership.

In 1976, with the Democrats in control of both bodies of Congress and Republican big-government advocates Gerald Ford and Nelson Rockefeller as president and vice president, the most sinister and greedy land grab law was crafted and signed. The Federal Land Policy and Management Act (FLPMA) officially declared that the U.S. was to retain the remaining lands in federal ownership and use the government’s power to attain even more.

As you will later read, the 1976 FLPMA was everything eco-socialists desired, including the United Nations’ environmental policy-maker, Maurice Strong. As you will see, that same year Strong would tell the World Conference on Human Settlements (known as “Habitat One”), “Public ownership of land is justified in favor of the common good, rather than to protect the interest of the already privileged.”³

Perhaps the most tyrannous aspect of the FLPMA was the government’s newfound ability to use eminent domain to confiscate and acquire private property for reasons heretofore never considered. In the past, the Constitution’s Fifth Amendment provided eminent domain to be considered generally for the purpose of constructing infrastructure (roads, airports, reservoirs, federal buildings, etc.) that directly benefitted serving the needs of the people. The FLPMA now allowed the government to “acquire...by purchase, exchange, donation, or eminent domain, lands or interest therein,” with the caveat that the properties “so acquired are confined to as narrow a corridor as is necessary to serve such purpose [in gaining access to] the National Forest System.”⁴

Today, the FLPMA is used by environmental activists, who, strategically working with private individuals, non-profit organizations, and local and state governments, cobble together millions of acres land adjacent federally-owned property. Once acquired, the new parcels are given to the feds, thus forever taking the property off the books for future development.

The FLPMA, was succeeded by the Ecosystem Management Initiative (EMI), instituted by President Bill Clinton and Vice President Al Gore two decades later, as well as the founding of The National Landscape Conservation System (detailed later in [Chapter Four](#)). The EMI gave the federal

government the power to pronounce and protect ecosystems (a very vague term), and the National Landscape Conservation System (NLCS) declared 27 million acres of federal land to be “landscapes” that must be protected. A primary goal of the FLPMA, EMI and NLCS is to continually hunt for more land to protect from future development, including the extraction of resources such as oil, gas, and coal.

President Obama is not without blame in this fall from liberty. As you will later see, his autocratic Great Outdoors Initiative was the most aggressive attempt to codify these elements of eco-tyranny.

NO WAY

Over the course of reading *Eco-Tyranny*, you will likely experience moments where you literally find yourself exclaiming aloud, “No way!”

My wife will be the first to tell you that throughout my media career in San Francisco, both as a television meteorologist and science reporter, and then as a radio talk show host, I’ve presented my audience with facts that commonly generate a “no way” response.

In this book, most of the “no ways” will be generated from facts and figures related to the environmental movement, and often you will be shocked.

However, this book is not intended to create hysteria; it’s a book designed to expose the truth. I want Americans to see how Marxists have hijacked the environment in order to push a grossly anti-American agenda. They are using our schools, our religious heritage, non-profit institutions, businesses, and all facets of government to forward their radical plans.

But, there is hope. Besides a comprehensive investigation into their liberty-vanquishing plan, I will also present solutions on how we can restore our property rights, reclaim our resources, create jobs, and reassert ourselves as the most exceptional nation on the planet.

The timing of the release of *Eco-Tyranny* is also no accident. *Climategate* was published prior to a vote on the America Clean Energy and Security Act, a.k.a., Cap-and-Trade. My goal was to arm the voters with the facts so that the bill would not become law. The legislation passed the Nancy Pelosi-led House of Representatives, but it failed to make it through the Senate. That failure was a major victory. Many legislators who supported the legislation were voted out of office in the 2010 elections by informed, motivated, and activated constituents.

Now, this book arrives in time for one of the most important elections in decades. My hope is that it will serve to educate, motivate, and activate *you*, to make sure that representatives are elected into public office with the intention of reversing the leftist course of the wrongs that have been done, and placing us back on a path toward eco-liberty.

Let us be reminded of timely words of wisdom, spoken by an original patriot:

No people will tamely surrender their Liberties, nor can any be easily subdued, when knowledge is diffused and Virtue is preserved. On the Contrary, when People are universally ignorant, and debauched in their Manners, they will sink under their own weight without the Aid of foreign Invaders.

—Samuel Adams, signer to the Declaration of Independence

PART ONE

TYRANNY SPAWNED

POLLUTION NEVER HAS BEEN Earth's most troubling foe—Marxism has. And Marxists have always seized upon pollution, both real and imagined, as an effective weapon in their unrelenting war on freedom.

Karl Marx founded a philosophy that inspires dictators and demagogues. Commencing with the Russian Revolution in 1917 to the present, Marx's tyrannical ideology has been responsible for the documented deaths of more than 110 million individuals around the world. Hundreds of millions more have been forced to live in oppressed societies, void of the inalienable rights of life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness.

Yet despite the suffering Marxism has unleashed on the planet, we are continually lectured—by politicians, government bureaucrats, professors, environmental groups, and movie stars—that the world's foremost enemy is pollution, particularly greenhouse gas emissions. Our greatest challenge, they insist, is curtailing such discharges into the atmosphere and restoring the global environment; if we don't, they claim, the earth's ecological system will die.

It's all a lie.

There is no such planetary crisis. It's a concocted calamity churned out initially by Marx himself and furthered by his modern devotees. It's what I have named the "green agenda."

Is there pollution? Sure. Can it be cleaned up? Absolutely—and in the United States we have done a remarkable job of doing so. But to declare that there is a dire *global* eco-emergency, particularly one that is fueled by the use of fossil fuels and subsequent carbon dioxide (CO₂) emissions, emanates from an anticapitalist plot that's been playing for nearly 150 years.

Born in Germany in 1818, Karl Marx lived sixty-five years, during which time his twisted mind conceived and perfected an atrocious plot to infect the world with his philosophy of "organized collectivism"—a.k.a. communism, or, for the more politically correct, socialism. Marx began his rebellion as a student at the University of Berlin, where he was strongly influenced by the philosophy of radical thinker Georg Hegel. Hegel held that Christianity had a negative effect on society and that a new religion built on scientific reason was needed. Marx was so taken by Hegel that he joined a group known as the Young Hegelians. Their initial goal was straightforward: liquidate Christianity.

What was the Young Hegelians' beef with the Church? They were convinced it was a system of *beliefs*, as opposed to facts. Christianity proclaimed there was a single God who was said to be especially fond of the human race; this God even created heaven for those who are good and hell for those who are bad. In addition to these beliefs, Christians (and Jews—the Hegelians weren't keen on their religion either) believed that God made them in His image and told them they were to "fill the earth and subdue it; and have dominion over the fish of the sea and over the birds of the air and over every living thing that moves upon the earth" (Gen. 1:28). While conservative Bible scholars are convinced the original language in the verse implies reasonable stewardship of the earth's magnificent resources, Hegel saw this verse as giving religious zealots license to overpopulate the planet and rape its assets. Likewise, the Young Hegelians saw religion as a societal illness that could be cured through proper scientific reasoning and education.

Hegel also lectured that everything in the universe could be explained through his system of rational thinking, known as the “dialectical process.” This idea was originally conceived by Greek philosophers; Hegel’s version of this process held that contradictions in nature do not harm one another, but instead lead to a higher level of development, particularly personal development—hence no need for religion. Marx would eventually take Hegel’s dialectic theory and refine it for political purposes.

In 1841, Marx received a doctorate in philosophy; his thesis was on Epicurus, the ancient Greek philosopher and quasi-atheist who taught that the physical world was all there was and all there would ever be. Epicurus believed the fundamental constituents of the earth’s system were indivisible, invisible bits of matter known as “atoms.” By Marx’s time, Epicurus’s theory of matter was known as “materialism,” and Marx was a true materialist.

MARX AND MATERIALISM

In 1842, Karl Marx met Frederick Engels, and together, the two began developing a propaganda campaign that would alter the course of the world. Holding parallel views on materialism, dialectics, and even the abolition of a supreme being, the two were convinced science was the ultimate path to godlike superiority. They held that “if science can get to know all there is to know about matter, we will then know all there is to know about everything.”¹

For Marx and Engels, matter—atoms, molecules, and the otherwise unseen—was the alpha and omega of reality. Matter provided the complete explanation for plants, animals, man, intelligence, planets, and solar systems. They also believed that time, certainly not a divine Creator, was the magic wand that allowed all matter to come together to create the universe in which we live. Marx and Engels’s convictions were later neatly articulated by modern astronomer Carl Sagan, a prime guru of today’s environmentalists, who most famously said, “The cosmos is all there is, or was, or ever will be.”²

To codify their secular belief system, Marx and Engels prescribed three laws of matter: the law of opposites, the law of negation, and the law of transformation. Together, these planks provide the rationale for today’s green agenda.

The Law of Opposites is an extension of Hegel’s work and supposedly illustrates how everything in existence is a combination of dialectics working in unity. For example, electricity is characterized by a positive and negative charge. Atoms include protons and electrons, which are contradictory forces working in unity. Even the human race is composed of opposite qualities: altruism and selfishness, courage and cowardice, humility and pride, masculinity and femininity. To function properly, Marx believed, these opposite forces must be kept in balance; if they aren’t, discord is certain. Thus, the law of opposites demands that humans must be kept in check, because, as the most advanced creatures, they can wreak the most havoc—hence, the need for a tightly regulated, often heavy-handed system of government. This is why socialists in the United States slobber over Castro’s Cuba and herald Venezuela’s Hugo Chávez, as heroes. According to the law of opposites, demagogues are essential to effective, masterful governance.

The law of negation adds a somewhat metaphysical component to Marx’s madness that provides a key pillar for today’s environmentalists, declaring that all nature is constantly expanding through death. To support this “law” Engels created an awkward illustration using barley seed, which germinates—via its own death or negation—and produces many new plants. This concept seems especially clumsy when applied to the human race, but Engels rationalized it by claiming that “out of this dynamic process of dying the energy is released to expand and produce many more entities of the

same kind.”³

In other words, all species possess an inherent tendency to proliferate. However, Marx and Engels believed nonhuman species bear automatic mechanisms to properly manage such expansion and prevent their increases from growing out of control, but the extended family belonging to *Homo sapiens* are incapable of such self-regulation. Thus, the law of negation casts mankind as an ever-consuming population bomb that places the entire planet at risk. As a result, negation insists that systems must be put in place to maintain sustainability, including mechanisms to ensure human population control when necessary.

The law of negation is the motivating factor for an eco-buzzword with which we are constantly assailed today: “sustainable.” Toyota tells us its Prius is “the vehicle that started the sustainable transportation revolution.”⁴ Whole Foods Market states that they sell fish that were “caught in an environmentally sustainable manner.”⁵ The intentions of such marketing plans are clever, but carried to an extreme, the concept of sustainability involves much more than battery-assisted cars and farmed fish—it’s a call for government policies that demand changes in human behavior and lifestyles under penalty of law.

The third Marx/Engels axiom is the most arrogant: the law of transformation, which states that a continuous quantitative development by a particular species often results in a “leap” within nature, whereby a completely new form or entity is produced. This law was bolstered by the findings of Marx and Engels’s contemporary, Charles Darwin. Darwin’s theory of evolution sealed the communist founders’ convictions that such “leaps” not only allowed for the origin of new species, but a leap *within* a species—particularly *Homo sapiens*—which could enable some to advance to new levels of reality.

Thus, the law of transformation confirmed an elite status within the human race; and those born into evolution’s aristocracy possess a duty to dictate how the underdeveloped shall live. Taken to an extreme, transformation could also determine who shall die.

With these new revelations, Marx and Engels arrogantly boasted, “The last vestige of a Creator external to the world is obliterated.”⁶

I’ve often summarized the laws of matter this way:

Committed Marxists are convinced that phenomena such as love, passion, value and feelings aren’t “real” because they’re not composed of matter; even consciousness, and especially faith in God, are simply the result of material interactions within the human mind. In addition, Marxists contend that some people are randomly spit out of their mother’s womb with a better brain than most. Those with the best brains have a Darwinian authority to rule over those with the lesser brains, lest those with the deficient brains destroy the planet and kill one another; thus, the need for a heavy-handed form of government loaded with burdensome regulations, and the perfect excuse for socialism, communism, and fascism.

Over the ensuing years, Marx never drifted from his materialistic assumptions and antagonist view of Christianity. Instead, he was able to neatly tuck those ingredients into his theory of organized collectivism, providing it with a holistic framework from which society could be rebirthed.

Today, such a patrician worldview resonates with those who consider themselves to be politically liberal, and resonates even more so with those liberals who are the direct products of America’s elite colleges and universities. Through advanced education and absorption of information, this “elite” caste surmises that they can become masters of the universe. Theirs is an amoral system in which

there is no room for absolute truth, only relativism, lest they be forced to acknowledge a divine being who has an absolute rule of law, which would force them to throw out their dogma, or else move forward filled with guilt about their waywardness.

Marxists believe *they* have the power to define all societal morality, rules, and laws subject to their goals. Hence, the inalienable rights of life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness as recognized by America's founders are viewed as absurd, because an imaginary God cannot declare rights. Marxism demands that all so-called rights be issued by the government in the form of laws. And just as a law can be issued by the government, so shall it be taken away by that government if deemed necessary.

WHY MARX LOATHED AMERICA

Karl Marx and his followers were well aware of the Republican form of government established in America—and loathed it. Marx perceived America's founders as reckless, religious buffoons who were peddling dangerous propaganda—especially the inalienable rights of their Declaration of Independence. To the collectivist, such freedoms were—and are—preposterous. The *life* of an individual is not unique—just a fragment of the ever-multiplying collective mass—the result of a random, cosmic, Darwinian accident. Likewise, *liberty* is an unattainable sentiment. Left to their own devices, the human masses are wholly incapable of coexistence without formidable government control and regulation. Furthermore, the *pursuit of happiness* is the most egregious maxim of all, and Marx was aware of the origins of this key phrase. It was penned in direct reference to the words of English philosopher John Locke, who in his 1690 essay, *Concerning Human Understanding* wrote, “The necessity of pursuing happiness [is] the foundation of liberty.”

Locke also made the tenacious argument (in [chapter 5](#) of the *Second Treatise* on civil government from his work *Two Treatises of Government*) that human happiness is directly linked to one's personal property, and that property included tangible elements, such as land, natural resources, and material goods, and, as well, the intangible elements of speech, thoughts, and beliefs. Locke further stated that God had even given mankind the right to physically defend his property.

America's founders understood that property was synonymous with liberty and security. They comprehended that in a capitalistic, free-market economic system void of overreaching, central government regulation, a new worker or immigrant could progress up the class ladder in conjunction with his or her effort and reap the happiness associated with owning his or her own business, farm, home, and estate. Regarding the potential for abuse within such a capitalistic framework, George Washington insisted that “virtue or morality is a necessary spring of popular government.”⁷

Likewise, John Adams said, “Public virtue cannot exist in a Nation without private Virtue, and public Virtue is the only Foundation of Republics.”⁸ In other words, our Founders realized there would be scoundrels who would abuse American liberty, but they knew such risks are worth taking, as the alternative would lead down the slippery slope of government-led tyranny. As Patrick Henry famously proclaimed in 1775: “Is life so dear, or peace so sweet, as to be purchased at the price of chains and slavery? Forbid it, Almighty God! I know not what course others may take; but as for me, give me liberty or give me death!”⁹

Such professions were highly offensive to Marx, as he was convinced that virtue and morality were the products of confused brain matter. Capitalism, he believed, *always* results in a class struggle between the owners and controllers of the means of production (the *bourgeoisie*) and the mass of common laborers (the *proletariat*). Marx was convinced the proletariat were oppressed and exploited by the bourgeoisie—period. He also concluded that because capitalism is designed to seek a profit, it

is the proletariats who suffer, because profit is made off of their labor, and their labor causes the degeneration of their lives, health, and ability to enjoy life.

As an antidote to the presumptuous experiment being conducted in the United States, in 1849, Marx and Engels presented to the world their final formula for revolution, which they called the *Manifesto of the Communist Party*. This infernal document would eventually be known as *The Communist Manifesto*.

In [chapter 2](#) of their manifesto, Marx and Engels boldly stated the goal of their envisioned new world order: “The theory of the Communists may be summed up in the single sentence: abolition of private property.”

Property is not just the house and land you may own—it’s your car, possessions, business, thoughts, ideas, beliefs, and goals. It was as if Marx and Engels looked both God and humankind in the eye, raised their middle fingers and shouted, “No!” Personal property, they declared, is a myth; *matter* is all there is, and no individual can claim matter as his or her own.

GUANO: THE FIRST ENVIRONMENTAL CRISIS

Marx perceived the environment as an effective apparatus to justify his hatred of capitalism and liberty, though at the time, the term used was not “environment” but “nature.” In many ways, Karl Marx was the premier environmentalist and founding father of the green agenda.

In 1862, a fellow materialist and academic colleague of Marx, German chemist Justus von Liebig published an updated version of an otherwise boring book he wrote twenty-two years prior, titled *Organic Chemistry in Its Application to Agriculture and Physiology*. The new edition was unique in that for the first time, a scientist used his lectern to create an environmental argument to attack capitalism. The issue at hand was bird droppings, or *guano*.

In the mid-1800s, Britain’s citizens were living longer and healthier lives in comparison to the rest of the world. Much of this good fortune was the result of newly developed domestic farming techniques that were able to deliver an abundance of affordable food to the people. One of the key ingredients to the Brits’ farming success was the use of guano, an efficient fertilizer. Farmers were willing to purchase the ordure from anyone who would sell it at a reasonable price. Guano imports to England first began in 1841, and twenty years later, it is estimated some 3.2 million tons of the phosphate-rich additive had been brought into the country.¹⁰ Guano was being carried to market from mountaintops, fields, and caves in Europe, North America, South America, Africa, and the Caribbean islands.

Though von Liebig well understood the theoretical benefits of utilizing guano as a fertilizer, he had significant personal displeasures regarding its usage. First, he felt that guano hunters were destroying nature while collecting deposits of the organic material. Second, he contended that greedy guano traders were taking advantage of underpaid workers in order to turn a profit. Third, von Liebig was angered that the crops that benefited from the guano were growing at a rate that he believed superseded nature’s intention. This increase in yields created more feed for livestock, and more vegetables and meat for Londoners to eat. The people were now living longer, healthier lives and tended to have larger families. Larger families, von Liebig complained, require larger houses and more animals for transportation. More food was necessary to sustain these larger families. Lastly, a teeming population and additional animals meant more excrement and pollution.

Von Liebig described guano as being at the center of a “robbery system.” Using variegated imagery, von Liebig said Great Britain’s use of guano

deprives all countries of the conditions of their fertility. It has raked up the battlefields of Leipsic, Waterloo and the Crimea; it has consumed the bones of many generations accumulated in the catacombs of Sicily; and now annually destroys the food for a future generation of three millions and a half of people. Like a vampire it hangs on the breast of Europe, and even the world, sucking its lifeblood without any real necessity or permanent gain for itself.¹¹

Dr. Justus von Liebig was the first recorded fellow traveler with a physical science PhD to attack capitalism based on environmental standards. His strategy would be thoroughly vetted by Marx and eventually become the lever of choice for future socialists and communists in the twenty-first century who, like a henhouse full of Chicken Littles, would try to convince the world that the earth is warming, the ice is melting, the sea is rising, the polar bears are dying—and it's all *your* fault.

MARX GOES GREEN

At the time of von Liebig's launch on Great Britain's agricultural methods, Marx was in the process completing one of his signature works, *Das Kapital*. Marx was quite impacted by von Liebig's complex book on organic chemistry and in an 1866 letter to Engels, wrote, "I had to plough through the new agricultural chemistry in Germany, in particular von Liebig...which is more important for this matter than all of the economists put together."¹²

Marx believed that the earth possessed what he commonly referred to as "natural wealth," which he described in *Das Kapital* as "fruitful soil, waters teeming with fish, etc., and...waterfalls, navigable rivers, wood, metal, coal, etc."¹³ Marx, like von Liebig, was convinced such natural resources did not belong to man and could only be utilized if necessary for the absolute common good, and without anyone garnishing a profit along the way.

In *Das Kapital*, Marx went on to state that one of "von Liebig's immortal merits" was having "developed from the point of view of natural science, the negative, i.e., destructive, side of modern agriculture."¹⁴

Regarding von Liebig's extreme criticism of the guano trade, Marx focused less on the cycle of secretions and more on the sheer economics. Marx felt that in addition to British farmers exploiting natural wealth (in this case, the natural wealth was twofold: the guano and the crops) in order to garner a surplus profit, the upper class was exploiting the lower class.

He saw it like this: lowly human laborers, who were used to extract guano in faraway places for shipment to England, were being sorely underpaid and thus abused by their well-to-do employers. Marx perceived further injustice as the guano was spread on the fields by low-wage laborers.

As the crop yields expanded, natural wealth was further abused as the farmers gained higher profit margins. The bountiful crops also provided an overabundance of feed for the livestock, which enabled their upper-class owners to reap additional profits by raising more animals for less.

Like von Liebig, Marx also believed that eventually city dwellers were able to purchase more food at a lesser cost, encouraging them to have larger families. Larger families required bigger houses to be built by more exploited workers. The urban population boom required more horses for transportation and more subsequent waste (animal dung and the human stuff too) to be removed from the cities and hauled to the dump, again by exploited, underpaid laborers.

Marx perceived all of this as nothing more than a vicious cycle created and perpetuated by a lust for profit. He succinctly described the process of this modern system of agriculture, stating, "The

increased exploitation of natural wealth by the mere increase in the tension of labor-power, science and technology give capital a power of expansion.”¹⁵

Further, Marx implied that this new capital-based system of agriculture was irrational. “The moral of history,” he said, “is that the capitalist system works against a rational agriculture, [and] that a rational agriculture is incompatible with the capitalist system.”¹⁶

What Marx stated in *Das Kapital* is still held as gospel by his minions today: no one has the right to make a profit off of natural resources, such as food, water, timber, coal, gas, or oil. And whether it is saving the forests, whales, snails, or the climate, it all comes back to a deep-rooted belief that the quest for such profit is immoral and will ultimately destroy the planet unless ground to a halt.

Conversely, as a conservative looking upon British farming in the 1860s through the rearview mirror of history, I see an excellent market opportunity. Farmers recognized a demand for their vital products and wished to increase the supply. Science proved that by adding nutrients to the soil, crop yields would become robust. Bird dung, a messy substance no one was fond of, was discovered to be rich in phosphate nutrients, and farmers began using it on their fields with great success. It was a win-win: the droppings actually had value, and farmers began collecting the poop wherever it was found. When the local pool of droppings was expended, businesses were created to locate and import new sources of the wonderful fertilizer. Jobs were created as people were hired to work in all phases of the guano trade, and their lives were made better. Ships were built and various tools were fashioned to support the new industry—again employing more people.

In the farming community, business was booming. More crops meant lower prices for the consumer and higher profit margins for the grower. Feed for raising cattle, sheep, pigs, and chickens was more abundant. For the first time, food rich in protein was available to more people, and their health was subsequently improved. Additional businesses were established to support the farming industry. Britain’s unemployment rate decreased, crime was reduced, and lifestyles vastly improved.

Yes, there was more human and animal waste, but its cleanup also created a new industry—waste management. It, too, provided both honest work and the incentive for some to get better jobs.

However, Marx was incapable of envisioning prosperity in a positive light, and his followers are beset with that same problem today. In fact, in *Das Kapital*, Marx sounds like a modern-day environmental activist:

All progress in capitalistic agriculture is a progress in the art, not only of robbing the laborer, but of robbing the soil; all progress in increasing the fertility of the soil for a given time, is a progress towards ruining the lasting sources of that fertility. The more a country starts its development on the foundation of modern industry, like the United States, for example, the more rapid is this process of destruction.¹⁷

Today’s followers of Marx have not changed. They continue to perceive capitalism as unjust, the use of natural resources for profit immoral, and the human population something that must be controlled.

FROM MARX TO LENIN

There are three additional founders of the green agenda that need to be brought into our discussion, whose names you may be unfamiliar with, but who certainly need to be noted, as they are revered by environmentalist teachers and leaders today.

Sir Edwin Ray Lankester was a zoologist at University College, London, and noted as the greatest Darwinist of his generation—in fact, it is well established that Lankester’s family were friends with Charles Darwin, and much has been written of little Ray being “carried on the shoulders of Darwin” as a child.¹⁸ Though Lankester was some thirty years younger than Marx, the two were close friends, colleagues, fellow materialists, and socialists. Lankester was a frequent guest at Marx’s household in the last few years of Marx’s life and attended his funeral.

Regarding *Das Kapital*, Lankester once wrote Marx that he was absorbing Marx’s “great work on *Kapital*... with the greatest pleasure and profit.”¹⁹

Lankester was the most eco-socialistic thinker of his time, writing powerful papers on species extinction due to human causes with an urgency that would not be found again until the late twentieth century. Lankester’s most popular screed was *Nature and Man*, in which he described humans as the “insurgent son[s]” of Nature.²⁰ According to Lankester,

We may indeed compare civilized man to a successful rebel against nature who by every step forward renders himself liable to greater and greater penalties... He has willingly abrogated, in many important respects, the laws of his mother Nature by which the kingdom was hitherto governed; he has gained some power and advantage by so doing, but is threatened on every hand by dangers and disasters hitherto restrained: no retreat is possible—his only hope is to control...the sources of these dangers and disasters.²¹

Lankester’s star pupil was Arthur Tansley—the man noted for coining the term *ecosystem*. Born in 1871, Tansley was never able to interface with Marx, but was a fellow Darwinist, materialist, socialist, and a foremost academician specializing in botany. Tansley was deeply concerned with “the destructive human activities of the modern world.” He argued, “Ecology must be applied to conditions brought about by human activity.”²²

In the 1940s, Tansley had a young protégé named Charles Elton, who worked with him to further develop the ecosystem concept. Elton’s fiery writing style set the stage for the coming generation of eco-authors. In a blazing 1958 condemnation of the use of pesticides, Elton declared that “this astonishing rain of death upon so much of the world’s surface” was largely unnecessary and threatened “the very delicately organized interlocking system of populations” in the ecosystem.²³

From Karl Marx to Charles Elton, a mere three degrees of separation bring us to the modern, radical environmental movement. However, there is another historical figure that must be properly highlighted, in that he was the first political leader to practically implement the green agenda.

VLADIMIR LENIN: THE COMMUNIST GREEN GIANT

Vladimir Ilyich Lenin. Mention the name to any U.S. citizen who is formerly from the Soviet Union and the instant response will be visceral. Lenin was the Marx-honoring Communist who overthrew Russia and birthed a movement of tyranny that eventually plunged Russia and eastern Europe into several generations of doom and misery.

Lenin was born in 1870 into a family steeped in revolutionary thought. When he was seventeen, his older brother was executed for attempting to assassinate the czar. Several years later, Lenin began to engross himself in the works of Marx. By the early 1900s, he was a well-known Marxist author writing books on materialism and socialist economic theory. In 1916, he penned the angry missive *Imperialism, the Highest Stage of Capitalism*. Having gained a significant following by October of the

following year, he and a small band of cohorts staged a cunning coup. Lenin was named chairman of the new government, and the Russian Revolution had begun.

Immediately, members of the former regime were arrested and in many cases immediately executed. Banks were quickly nationalized, private businesses taken over by the state, and a supreme economic council was formed to run the economy. All private land, including any property belonging to the church, now belonged to the new Soviet state. A civil war ensued as freedom lovers tried to withstand the new government and its Red Army, but they were eventually, and brutally, defeated. Estimates vary as to the number who died in the war, but between men killed in action, those executed by the Red Army, civilian casualties, and military members who perished of exposure and disease, the number is likely more than a million. Russia's economy was devastated by the war, with factories and infrastructure destroyed, livestock and raw materials pillaged, mines flooded, and the people without hope.

Lenin's country was a horrific mess. Yet one of his top priorities from the very beginning of his brief seven-year reign was to institute a green agenda. Besides being a devout student of Marx, Lenin was familiar with von Liebig and Lankester and, like them, believed that nature's resources should never be used for profit—only for the good of the people, and then, only if absolutely necessary. In fact, as the Supreme Soviet leader, Lenin would be known for being far kinder to nature than he was to the people he ruled.

Within his first year as party chairman, 1918, he issued a mandate titled Decree on Land. It declared all forests, waters, and minerals to be the property of the state. Later that same year, as local officials began to clear portions of the forest for firewood and construction material, Lenin issued a stern diktat titled Decree on Forests. From that moment on, the forests were protected and only certain small, insignificant sectors were established for harvest. Lenin's decree declared the protected areas as a "preservation of monuments of nature."²⁴

Animal rights came next with the decree "On Hunting Seasons and the Right to Possess Hunting Weapons," which began to be enforced in May 1919. It banned the hunting of moose and wild goats, and ended the open seasons for a variety of other animals in spring and summer.²⁵

Lenin's counsel in crafting this green agenda came from acclaimed Russian agronomist N. N. Podiapolski, who urged the creation of *zapovedniki*, or nature preserves. In such preserves, nature would be totally left alone—no hunting, harvesting, clearing of dead growth, mowing, sowing, or even the gathering of fruit. Humans would not be allowed in such regions. Podiapolski recalled one meeting with Lenin, convened despite the chairman's involvement in a fierce military campaign:

Having asked me some questions about the military and political situation in the Astrakhan region [a fertile area rich in natural resources located in southwestern Russia on the delta of the Volga River, sixty miles from the Caspian Sea], Vladimir Ilyich expressed his approval for all of our initiatives and in particular the one concerning the project for the *zapovednik*. He stated that the cause of conservation was important not only for the Astrakhan region, but for the whole republic as well.²⁶

Podiapolski drafted a resolution that was eventually accepted by the Soviet government in September 1921, titled "On the Protection of Nature, Gardens, and Parks." A commission was established to supervise execution of the new laws. One of its first tasks was to create another *zapovedniki* (named the Ilmensky preserve) in the Chelyabinsk region on the slopes of the south Ural Mountains, an area rich in coal, iron ore, nonferrous metals, and gold. Despite the great potential

economic value to the state, Lenin believed the minerals were much more important for what they could teach scientists about geological processes. In Lenin's Russia, scientific understanding took priority over meeting the needs of his people, the majority of whom were living in utter poverty.

You must understand, the green agenda—from guano to global warming—is not about celebrating the beauty of our planet; it is an assault on mankind. It's an agenda that has no regard for your needs, lifestyle, dreams, desires, or feelings.

During Lenin's reign, Russia initiated the most audacious nature conservancy program in the twentieth century. Starting with a vision created by Marx fifty years prior, Lenin had successfully implemented version one of the green agenda. His accomplishments would eventually (as you will soon see) be celebrated the world over each April.

HITLER'S VERSION

Nazism was another type of socialism practiced by the National Socialist German Workers' Party (aka the Nazi Party), led by Adolf Hitler in the 1930s. Hitler's Nazis held many key tenets in common with the philosophy articulated by Marx. They believed in a government-regulated, planned economy. More important, though Hitler was agreeable to the limited private ownership of property, he was against capitalism and those who sought undue personal profit. During his reign of terror, a popular government slogan was "Fixing of profits, not their suppression."

Hitler also believed capitalism was created by the Jews and once told Italian Fascist dictator Mussolini, "Capitalism has run its course."²⁷

So determined was Hitler to eliminate excessive profit that execution or imprisonment in a concentration camp was the punishment exacted for any business owner who pursued his own self-interest, instead of the interests of the state. This official decree was stamped into the rim of the silver reichsmark coins issued during the Nazi reign: "*Gemeinnutz geht vor Eigennutz*," or "The common good before self-interest."

Additionally, like Marx, Hitler saw nature, not humankind, as supreme. He also insisted that the environment be protected from commercial development, stating, "Man must not fall into the error of thinking that he was ever meant to become lord and master of Nature."²⁸

Like his communist cousins, Hitler perceived pollution as the direct result of capitalism and, as a fellow materialist who spurned belief in the supernatural (despite occasional vague rhetoric about "Providence"), he was completely opposed to the harvesting or mining of natural resources, stating, "The German countryside must be preserved under all circumstances, for it is and has forever been the source of strength and greatness of our people."²⁹

Following Marx, Lenin, and Hitler, a new generation would go forth to further unfurl socialism's green flag, and they would achieve great success with their devious agenda...even in America.

GREEN THE NEW RED

ENVIRONMENTALIST ACTIVISTS ARE DOGMATIC, ideological radicals hell-bent on transforming society into a colossal, highly regulated, redistributive commune void of inalienable rights. Their lack of integrity enables them to look you straight in the eye and lie about the facts, while they spin out tailor-made, cherry-picked research supposedly proving their many fictitious claims regarding the state of the global ecosystem. The primary goal of their green agenda is not a pristine environment—it's about gaining absolute control over your life. A contemporary example of this desire was expressed by President Barack Obama's former "Green Czar," Van Jones—a self-described communist—who stood before a rally attended by thousands of young eco-radicals in 2009, shouting, "This movement is deeper than a solar panel, deeper than a solar panel. Don't stop there. Don't stop there. No, we're going to change the whole system. We're going to change the whole thing!"¹

While Charles Elton's writings from the 1950s successfully illustrated that ecological issues could be used to smear capitalism and American liberty, stronger arguments were interjected into the popular culture in the sixties. Two cunning authors, Rachel Carson and Paul Ehrlich, independently concocted denunciations that cleverly mixed ecology with sociology and political science. Though their books were best sellers, they were peppered with statistics and statements that could not withstand the microscope of truth. Nevertheless the authors, perhaps knowing that most readers would not have the patience or desire to cross-reference their work, brazenly stated what they determined necessary in order to cast our republican form of government and its free markets as failed experiments that could only be resolved with progressive doses of socialism.

Carson came first. She held a degree in zoology and found employment creating brochures for the United States Department of Fish and Wildlife from 1936 to 1950. Though Carson longed to become a successful author, her first effort fell flat, but her second book, *The Sea Around Us*, proved her to be a gifted word stylist. Published in 1951, *The Sea Around Us* is a flowery ode to the mysteries and magic of the sea, within which scientific information is seamlessly interwoven. A decade later, with the release of her epic *Silent Spring* in 1962 (which loses the entrancing expressions found in her first book and instead reads like a breathless, 363-page assault on mankind), Carson revealed how her beliefs were influenced by a cadre of Marxists.

One such associate was H. J. Muller, a Nobel Prize recipient in genetics. Throughout the pages of *Silent Spring*, Carson made several references to Muller's academic work regarding radiation. However, she failed to mention that Muller was an anti-American communist, whose biased research on radiation was conducted to make a case that the United States nuclear arsenal must be destroyed.

In the early 1930s, as a professor at the University of Texas, Muller became a faculty adviser to the National Student League (NSL), a well-known communist organization that was present on many American college and university campuses. At one point, NSL members pledged, "We will not support the government of the United States in any war it may conduct."² Muller even helped sponsor and edit the club's publication, *Spark*, named after Vladimir Lenin's newspaper, *Iskra*, which means "spark."³ Muller eventually became so disenchanted with America that he moved to Nazi Germany in 1932 and then eventually to the Soviet Union.

Muller was one of Carson's go-to experts in providing "research" for *Silent Spring*, which

- [download *The Altar: A Novel of Horror* here](#)
- [click Understanding Quantum Mechanics for free](#)
- [click *River Cottage Veg*](#)
- [download *Overkill \(The Zone, Book 5\)*](#)
- [click Handbook of Spices, Seasonings, and Flavorings \(2nd Edition\)](#)
- [**download Computer Forensics: Hard Disk and Operating Systems \(Ec-Council Press Series Computer Forensics\)**](#)

- <http://xn--d1aboelcb1f.xn--p1ai/lib/The-Altar--A-Novel-of-Horror.pdf>
- <http://aseasonedman.com/ebooks/Understanding-Quantum-Mechanics.pdf>
- <http://www.experienceolvera.co.uk/library/The-Many-Roots-of-Medieval-Logic--The-Aristotelian-and-the-Non-Aristotelian-Traditions.pdf>
- <http://junkrobots.com/ebooks/Statistics-Demystified--A-Self-Teaching-Guide.pdf>
- <http://www.1973vision.com/?library/The-Warcraft-Civilization--Social-Science-in-a-Virtual-World.pdf>
- <http://fortune-touko.com/library/Bite-Sized-Marketing--Realistic-Solutions-for-the-Overworked-Librarian.pdf>