

WHAT'S IN A NAME YOU ASK?

July 1, 2003

What is the difference between an Environmentalist and a Conservationist? They are labels that describe particular groups or individuals. Many individuals, myself included, feel both titles fit our personalities.

The reason I ask is because an old friend sent a letter, prompted by my column on a forestry program in disarray in the May 27 *Express* asking the same question.

We go back a long way and I know both terms apply to him as well. I am also certain they apply to the majority of fair-minded thinking people in this nation.

There is, however, a substantial minority where only the term Environmentalist applies. There are other appellations to describe the majority of those people.

The one that comes most readily to mind is Elitist. It means the choice part of segment; especially of a social superior group. A powerful minority or power elite inside the government.

Liberal is another moniker that fits the bill as well. One cannot help but separate the true meaning of liberal from the reality of what the name implies when used to describe a member or supporter of a liberal political party.

A true liberal in no way, shape or manner exhibit the qualities of being open minded. As one who said it much better than I ever could, "being liberal is merely a matter of intellectual dishonesty."

One word effectually describes the modern-day Environmentalist. It is Disingenuous. Whatever they wish to call themselves, they truly are nothing more than Social Engineers. No amount of facts to contrary is ever going to dissuade them from their true goals no matter how many worthy causes they pretend to embrace to cloak their real agenda.

For those in doubt of the truth in that statement you need only to log on my website www.martallen.com. You will see some of most graphic examples of environmental examples of environmental pollution perpetrated in modern times. Its existence and illegitimacy totally ignored by both the State and the people responsible.

It will be interesting to see, if nothing else, if it's questioned by any of the myriad numbers of supposed environmental groups in the State and nation.

You would truly have to believe "the king has no clothes" not to recognize the significance of what the photos depict. As an Assistant Professor of Silviculture of the Department of Forest Resources, University of Minnesota in Grand Rapids, MN said after reviewing the site, "A picture is worth a thousand words."

Further proof that many of the environmental groups actually are counterproductive to their stated causes can be found in the unprecedented number of forest fires today. Typically they have tried to lay the blame on post-logging practices.

Patrick Moore, former Greenpeace President, has blown that myth apart. He is a trained forester and left the organization some five years ago. He claims they have substituted politics for sound scientific facts and management practices that lessened and made fighting wildfires more practical.

True environmentalists do not distort or mislead the public. They adhere to tried and true management practices to protect the environment, not outright lies, deception and obfuscation.

In next week's column I will try to shed some light on what a Conservationist is and how they differ from pseudo-Environmentalists.