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This report is your weapon in the war to end the reign of the British monarchy.

To maintain power after its financial system blew up in 2008, the British monarchy is now moving to implement their “Great Reset”—massive population reduction globally through the imposition of a “Green New Deal,” enforced by the financial oligarchy centered in the City of London. By imposing the “Great Reset,” the British monarchy risks the outbreak of war, which could quickly lead to nuclear war, given that its targets include China and Russia.

The British Monarchy’s pursuit of this Great Reset through the Green New Deal is presently at the center of all global political and geopolitical turbulence.

Xi Jinping and Vladimir Putin, who have cooperated on the economic development policy inspired by Lyndon and Helga LaRouche known as the World Land-Bridge, the New Silk Road, or the Belt and Road Initiative, are now facing regime-change operations against them. The Atlantic Council issued its so-called “Longer Telegram” calling for the overthrow of Xi, and the baseless “Navalny Affair” is being used in ongoing efforts to overthrow Russian President Putin.

The most striking example of British-led regime change was the recent coup against Donald Trump, where one of his first actions as president—pulling the US out of the Paris Climate Accord—was identified by a 2018 House of Lords report as being central to why a second term of Donald Trump would mean the end of the “special relationship” between the U.S. and the United Kingdom. Biden and his handlers have now reinstated our colonial subjugation via the Paris Climate Accord.

Lyndon LaRouche, his wife Helga Zepp-LaRouche, and their collaborators have led this war to shut down the British monarchy for over half a century. However, the enemy of humanity is not simply the personalities of the monarchy per se, nor their agents or fellow conspirators in the City of London and “The City’s” branch office in Wall Street, nor even is it their enforcement wing known as the “Military [Intelligence] Industrial Complex,” nor is it “Big Tech” and their massive censorship and cancel culture; it is not even their subservient political class globally—though they are all obviously complicit in this evil.

The actual enemy of humanity is the satanic personality of Zeus, enforced through a satanic culture. In the ancient Greek tradition, the Olympian Zeus sought to destroy humanity, which was saved, and made fully human, by Prometheus, who gave to humans the gift of “fire”—scientific and artistic insight. For violating the rules of Zeus’s oligarchical system, Prometheus was tortured and brutalized by Zeus, who ruled out scientific advancement for the “mortals” to keep them in a perpetual state of feudalism.

Does this sound familiar?

Although Zeus may have been a caricature of an individual within history, he is the historic personification of an oligarchical system where its core conception is based on denying humanity the right to progress under the enforcement of the rules of “entropy” for humanity. Today that same satanic conception is expressed in environmentalism or ecology, where the law of the jungle is applied to human society and economy, through the assertion that there exist “limited resources,” thereby denying the divine spark of human creativity which creates resources.

LaRouche identified the “fire” of Prometheus as the progression of humanity’s increase in the energy density of that fire—as we see in the higher orders of energy density moving from wood to coal, and from there to oil and gas, and from fission to the coming breakthrough in fusion—as essential for sustaining more people on the planet. Developments in science and art create in turn a culture capable of sustaining future breakthroughs in technologies that utilize energy at higher orders of energy flux density, which is necessary to increase the maximum human population that can be supported comfortably on this planet and beyond—what LaRouche measured by his metric called “potential relative population density.”

The Promethean spirit has been at the center of the republican movements from Plato through the Christians who brought down the Roman Empire, and on to the greatest expression of that fight—the American Revolution, which in turn inspired the republican movements, with their own unique cultural characteristics, across the world since then. Those fighting to shut down the “Great Reset” do so in the spirit of those republican tendencies against feudalism and oligarchism.

It is now time to rally the patriots of all nations on this planet to end the reign of the British monarchy and stop their Great Reset.

Join The LaRouche Organization to do that, and circulate this report far and wide.
The New Deal for Humanity Is Not Green, But Human!

by Helga Zepp-LaRouche

Feb. 3—Literally before the eyes of the world public, the greatest villainy against the common good is currently underway, which will make the rich even richer and the poor even poorer, and which will have catastrophic consequences: hunger riots and absolute social chaos in the industrialized nations, genocide against the so-called developing countries, and in the view of the financial oligarchy, a third world war of the NATO states against Russia and China will soon become almost inevitable. All of these disastrous developments will be the consequence, if all investments are steered into "green" branches of industry, and a complete phase-out of investment ensues through the central banks, not only from nuclear power, but also from fossil fuels, as in the “Green Deal” of the European Union (EU) or the “Green New Deal” of the Biden administration.

What should be obvious to every medium-sized company in the productive economy, is surprisingly only slowly entering the public debate: The transformation of the economy—also promoted as the “Great Reset” by Prince Charles and Klaus Schwab of the World Economic Forum—would mean extensive deindustrialization and a massive sacrifice of the population’s prosperity. Eric Heymann, a senior economist at Deutsche Bank Research, in a mid-January article, criticized the “dishonest debate” through which the EU wanted to impose its Green Deal on the population, which “would not be feasible without a substantial portion of eco-dictatorship”—and even that is the understatement of the year!

If, as the architects of the Green Deal want, all industrial companies are subject to “taxonomy,” i.e., their so-called CO₂ footprint will be recorded, a classification system for “ecologically sustainable” economic activities will be enforced, and all private activities will also be subject to the dictates of supposed climate protection—then this will only be possible with a dictatorship and mind control that will make the Inquisition look like a picnic.

If this green utopia were ever to become a reality—and it cannot, because it will lead to chaos beforehand, as we shall see in a moment—the extremely inflated prices would determine exactly the size of the house or apartment in which anyone can live, to what temperature it can be heated, which electrical devices are still allowed, how far you can travel with which means of transport, how often you can eat meat or whether you can eat exotic fruits at all. And of course, every euro and every dollar spent on “climate protection” is one that is missing for investments in education, health systems, research,
infrastructure, modern communications, internal and external security, pensions and leisure activities.

Mass Wasted Production, Mass Death

The federal states and municipalities in which fossil fuels were previously extracted or processed in “brown” industrial plants, would have massive losses in tax revenues and jobs would disappear. At the same time, many more landscapes would be spoiled by armies of wind turbines, seas of solar panels, and endless transmission lines, which would not only carve up nature and destroy the habitat for wild animals and kill millions of birds, but would also by no means be safe from terrorist attacks. It would require millions of onshore and thousands of offshore wind turbines, millions of charging stations and vehicle battery modules, billions of backup energy storage modules, which would require enormous amounts of concrete, steel, copper, plastic, rare earths and other materials. And that, in turn, would require enormous expansion of mining and quarrying in all these areas, which even the Greens themselves would not like.

The main problem, however, would be that this green transformation would absorb materials, industrial capacities and manpower, all of which ultimately represent total waste, and would tie up the capacities that are urgently required for the long-term economic survival of society. With the exit from nuclear energy and fossil fuels, energy production would be thrown back to a level that existed before the industrial revolution, with solar and wind energy (or hydrogen, which is obtained from modern energy-dense sources).

At the core of the economic and scientific method that Lyndon LaRouche developed, is his recognition—and he scientifically established it—that there is an integral relationship between the energy-flux density used in the production process, and the relative potential population-density made possible by it. The number of people who could live on Earth during the hunter-gatherer period, when only wind and sun were available for the propagation of rabbits and berries in the “production process” at that time, was somewhere in the range of a few million. Even with the mastery of electricity and a few other technological advances, wind and sun remain energy sources with much the same energy-flux density as they did over 10,000 years ago.

Hans Joachim Schellnhuber, Commander of the Order of the British Empire (CBE), founder of the Potsdam Institute for Climate Impact Research, who has long propagated the “Great Transformation and Decarbonization of the World Economy,” associates that energy-flux density with a “carrying capacity” of the Earth of at best one billion people. Today almost 8 billion people live on Earth, and according to estimates by the UN, around 2.5 billion people will live in Africa alone in 2050, that is, significantly more than Schellnhuber thinks is good for the whole world.

The really horrific effect of the transformation of an economy into one in which only green technologies are used, consists not just in the monetary waste alone. Even more seriously, the energy-flux density which would then be used in the economies of the Western states would mean not only the end of these states as industrialized nations, but also the destruction of the industrial capacities necessary to overcome the underdevelopment of the so-called developing countries.

In view of the already rampant COVID-19 pandemic in the countries of the Global South, the mutations that have already occurred and will certainly continue to occur in the future, as well as the famine of “biblical dimensions” as David Beasley of the United Nations’ World Food Program put it, there is a risk of mass death on an unprecedented scale. The Malthusian financial oligarchy which, since the publication of the unscientific propaganda of the Club of Rome (on the alleged limits to growth), has declared the purported overpopulation of the Earth to be the main danger, then only needs to let the four horsemen of the apocalypse—war, hunger, disease and death—run free to bring the population down to the desired level.
‘A Long-Term Power Failure’

But as already mentioned at the beginning, the green utopia will never become reality in its propagated form anyway, because one cannot get out of nuclear energy and fossil fuels in relatively highly industrialized nations like those of the trans-Atlantic sector without provoking blackouts and a crash into chaos. The pan-European electricity network came dangerously close again on January 8 of this year, when, triggered by a failure in Croatia, a near blackout occurred that could only be bridged by additional energy supplies from other countries to stabilize the network.

According to experts of the Austrian electricity supplier EVN, it was the second most serious major disruption in the European network to date, in which the third of four warning levels was reached and sensitive machines had already reacted to the reduction in electrical frequency. Numerous power plants had to supply additional energy, pumped-storage hydroelectric plants and the still-existing gas power plants had to be mobilized, so that the safety net could be saved from blackout in a kind of fire brigade operation. But it was a close call.

The current course of the financial oligarchy, to push through the decarbonization of the economy by all means, can only be described as a breakneck policy of the highest risk, in which the prospect of making a killing in speculation on the planned $30 trillion that will be spent on the Great Reset has swept away any concerns for the common good of society. But this policy is life-threatening for a very large number of people. It is high time to deal urgently with the matter that the Office for Technology Assessment at the German Bundestag (TAB) considered in a 2011 study, entitled “Endangerment and Vulnerability of Modern Societies—Using the Example of a Large-Scale and Long-Term Power Failure.”

Due to the extreme complexity of a modern, high-tech society based on the division of labor—in which various critical infrastructures, such as information technology, telecommunications, transport and traffic, energy supply and health care are intertwined—these societies are highly vulnerable, as repeated terrorist attacks, natural disasters and particularly serious accidents have made clear. All of these systems depend on a supply of electricity, and a prolonged and widespread power failure would have devastating consequences. The studies come to the conclusion that a collapse of the entire society could hardly be prevented.

The immediate consequences would include: the failure, immediately or after a few days at the latest, of telecommunication and data services, landline telephones, local exchanges, cellular networks, emergency power supply, public broadcasters (and thus communication between authorities, the population and companies using telephones), and the Internet. Transport and traffic by road, rail, air and water would stop immediately or after a few hours, and traffic would be chaotic immediately after the power failure. Crossings, tunnels, and barrier systems would be blocked, long traffic jams would arise, numerous accidents would occur, rescue services and care for the injured would sometimes become impossible, people would be trapped in subways, trains and elevators.

Fuel for vehicles would become scarce and the supply of food and medical supplies to the population would be interrupted. There would be a major collapse in medical and pharmaceutical care for people, which would be severely restricted after just 24 hours. Perishable drugs such as insulin, blood reserves and dialysis fluids would hardly be available. Emergency services could no longer be reached by emergency call. Serious damage to health or the death of many people can be expected in the first week.
As a result, public order will begin to collapse, part of the population will show great helpfulness, but another part will be more ruthless, more aggressive and more violent. Apathetic or panic-like behavior will occur. According to the TAB report:

Power failure as a prime example of "cascading damage effects" should therefore continue to have high priority on the agenda of those responsible in politics and society, also in order to raise awareness of this issue in business and the population. The TAB report presented should also make a contribution to this.

Obviously, these “responsible persons” have in the past decades shown an enormous ability to do exactly the opposite, and to almost completely suppress any awareness of the enormous risks of their policies. This is so with regard to the consequences, for example, of the nuclear phase-out and the now planned phase-out of fossil fuels industries in countries like Germany, and soon the EU and the United States, as well as with regard to the neo-liberal living on the edge for profit maximization. When President Richard Nixon destroyed the Bretton Woods system in 1971 by breaking the fixed exchange rates and uncoupling the dollar from a gold peg, it was Lyndon LaRouche who farsightedly published the forecast that a continuation of these monetarist policies would necessarily lead to a new depression, a new fascism, and the danger of a new world war, or—on the contrary—a turn to a new, just world economic order.

LaRouche thereafter carefully analyzed every additional step in the direction of further deregulation of the financial markets in favor of speculation and pointed out its consequences.

Now we have reached the end of the road: Behind the attempt to impose the Green New Deal on the world is the desperate attempt of the financial oligarchy of the City of London, Wall Street and Silicon Valley to hook the hopelessly bankrupt financial system up to life support once more, by injecting an enormous sum of $30 trillion, and thereby to reap one last gigantic profit for the speculators of this world. After us the deluge! There are "super investors" like Jeremy Grantham of the Boston asset management company Grantham, Mayo, Van Otterloo & Co., who, in his analyses, is convinced that human behavior is the same as that of rats:

We will have a few weeks of extra money and a few weeks of putting your last, desperate chips into the game, and then an even more spectacular bust.... When you have reached this level of obvious super-enthusiasm, the bubble has always, without exception, broken in the next few months, not a few years.

How bad will it get? Like the crash of 1929, says Grantham.

Another implication for the self-destruction of the West by the Green New Deal is the almost 100% probability that its implementation would lead to World War III and the extinction of humanity. If the West dismantles itself economically through green policies, while China and all of Asia rise unstoppably, there is a growing risk that this will lead to a nuclear showdown, as, given the current NATO policies and the various U.S. security doctrines, it cannot be assumed that NATO would dissolve in a peaceful manner similar to that of the Soviet Union and the Warsaw Pact. Admiral Charles Richard, Commander of the U.S. Strategic Command is just one of many military men who has just expressed the opinion in the monthly Proceedings published by the U.S. Naval Institute, that a nuclear war with Russia or China is more likely and that the United States must therefore modernize its nuclear arsenal—which is already in full swing.

**Choose Durable Human Survival Instead**

Even if many institutions seem to have decided on the course outlined here, it is not too late to take the alternative. The COVID-19 pandemic has demonstrated how extremely vulnerable we really are as a human species, and that realistically we only have one chance to ensure our long-term survival—by coming together in a new paradigm of cooperation among all nations of this world to dedicate ourselves to the real common tasks of humanity.

The key to overcoming the crisis lies in an image of man that does not see mankind as a parasite on nature, whose activities pollute and destroy poor Mother Earth,
so that it would be good to reduce the number of people as much as possible (just not so far as to leave the oligar-
chy without enough service personnel!). Man is simply
not a manipulable, sensory being that can be kept under
control by the modern form of bread and circuses and
degradation by the entertainment industry.

Mankind is the only species whose creative reason con-
forms to the laws of the universe, and is even a devel-
oped integral part thereof. It is precisely this ability that
allows humanity time and again to discover new revolu-
tionary hypotheses about the physical laws of the uni-
verse, which are then used in the production process to
define completely new platforms of the human standard
of living, life expectancy, understanding of the climate
change that has been taking place for millions of years,
and further perspective for creating the prerequisites for
future interstellar space flight through the colonization
of nearer space.

That is where, at last, we will understand what climate
change is all about, how the cyclical movements of our
galaxy affect the so-called climate. In order to solve the
problem, however, we do not need solar panels or wind
turbines, but rather the use of nuclear fusion as a driv-
ing force for the manned missions to Mars and beyond.
Man is the being that can perfect himself intellectually
and morally without limit, because that corresponds to
the laws of the universe of which humanity is the devel-
oped part.

We need to reset the reset, and we need a positive re-
definition of man’s mission in the universe.

In her article in the EIR Special Report on the Great Reset, “How the Pandemic Delivered a Reality Shock
to the ‘Great Reset’ Plan—A review of COVID-19: The Great Reset, by Klaus Schwab and Thierry Malleret,”
Andrea Andromidas highlights quotes from World Economic Forum founder Schwab and his accomplices that
make it clear that the Davos oligarchs feared the power of governments acting on behalf of the general welfare
principle to defeat Covid-19.

The Davos crowd took the motto of “never let a good crisis go to waste” in order to implement their post-
Covid-19 vision of a Great Reset, which stands absolutely opposed to Helga Zepp-LaRouche’s idea of a “World
Health System” and a plan to create 1.5 billion productive jobs globally.

On page 144, Schwab indicates the intent:

In reality, what happens with the fight against climate change in the
post-pandemic era could go in two opposite directions.
1. The first corresponds to the narrative above: the economic conse-
quences of the pandemic are so painful, difficult to address and complex
to implement that most governments around the world may decide to
“temporarily” put aside concerns about global warming to focus on the
economic recovery. If such is the case, policy decisions will support and
stimulate fossil-fuel heavy and carbon-emitting industries by subsidizing
them. They will also roll back stringent environmental standards seen as
a stumbling block on the road to rapid economic recovery and will en-
courage companies and consumers to produce and consume as much as
possible.

2. The second is spurred by a different narrative, in which businesses and governments are emboldened by a
new social conscience among large segments of the general population that life can be different, and is pushed by
activists: the moment must be seized to take advantage of this unique window of opportunity to redesign a more
sustainable economy for the greater good of our societies.

Andromidas concludes her article:

The Davos Forum will push for the second way. What they call “the greater good of our societies”—or “stake-
holder capitalism”—is in reality zero-growth fascism. In the second part of the book, Schwab and Malleret inform
us of how they intend to invest in activism, and use lies as well as new measures of control for that purpose, be-
cause otherwise they are finished.

Our job is to make sure that such Malthusianism is finished off once and for all. We need to bring the pandemic
under control by means of progress and open up a new period of development for humanity.
IN THE FOOTSTEPS OF GEORGE III

Prince Charles Invented and Runs the ‘Green New Deal’

by Richard Freeman

Feb. 1—Prince Charles launched on January 11, 2021 the “Terra Carta for Nature, People and Planet (Earth Charter),” to push through a green genocide program of radical population reduction, shutting down agro-manufacturing production, and building a $40 trillion green speculative-financial bubble, all implemented through a central bankers’ dictatorship. If this Prince and his associates are not stopped, they will destroy the cognitive powers of man, halt capital-intensive, power intensive development of agriculture and industry, and bring down civilization.

Using the wealth of the House of Windsor, but much more from the City of London-Wall Street banks, insurance companies, and a host of governments, HRH the Prince of Wales has been building toward this strategy for the past five decades.

Charles derives this capability, certainly not from himself, but from being embedded in a network of institutions. One such institution is the monarchy, which con-
sists not just of the royals, but hundreds of persons, from Oxford and Cambridge universities, financial institutions, and law firms. Indeed, the monarchy is embedded in a Quartet consisting of the monarchy, the City of London, the Bank of England, and the intelligence services, which has been in operation since the 1694 creation of the Bank of England.

Charles works with more than a hundred governments, but he emphasizes that corporate private business is necessary to implement his policy, as governments need to and can enunciate the policy, but do not have the power to carry it out. This is an embrace of corporativist-Synarchist top down control, above and beyond government, as was the case for Hitler, Hjalmar Schacht, and Mussolini.

We look at three pivotal examples that indicate that Prince Charles, and those for whom he is a point person such as the Bank of England and the City of London, are the ones who began to originate and implement the green fascist dictatorship policies, often a full 10-20 years before others knew of them.

The first example is Charles’ critical role, along with his father, the Royal Consort Prince Philip, and the World Wildlife Fund, in running the precedent-setting 1992 Rio Earth Summit, which set the paradigm of harsh measures to fight the fake Global Warming; the second, is the Prince of Wales’ setting up of the Green New Deal in Britain in 2008, a full decade before it was allegedly first brought forward in the United States; and the third, is Prince Charles’ establishing the internal dictatorship of “only” accounting rules, a fundamental part of the guts of the “Great Reset’s” plunge of the world into destruction.

1. Prince Charles, Prince Philip and the WWF Launch the Pioneering Green Genocide of Rio’s 1992 Earth Summit

I just wonder what it would be like to be reincarnated in an animal whose species had been so reduced in numbers that it was in danger of extinction. What would be its feelings toward the human species whose population explosion had denied it somewhere to exist.... I must confess that I am tempted to ask for reincarnation as a particularly deadly virus.

This was Prince Philip, Duke of Edinburgh, Royal Consort of the Queen of England, in his foreword to the 1987 book, If I Were an Animal. Philip repeated a variant of the quote in 1988 to the German news agency Deutsche Press Agentur.

Thus the Royal Consort expressed his view, that the “lives not worthy to be lived” (in the Nazis’ phrase) include not only the Jews, Gypsies, the seriously ill, and other despised groups, but the entire human population—reserving the need for perhaps several hundred million of “the right sort” and their servants. Culling the human herd is a repeated theme of his.

Philip decided, on behalf of the institution of the British Monarchy which he represented, to bring back the policies of the Nazi regime which had not succeeded in its 1933–45 mission, under the guise of environmentalism. These policies included eugenics; the concentration workcamp policies of the Hitler–Hjalmar Schacht regime of looting those beaten down who could be looted, and killing those who could not; and conducting a central bank financial dictatorship, such as that of Hitler’s Reichsbank chief Hjalmar Schacht.

The outward aspect of what had been done under Hitler and Schacht, would be changed: the myth would be presented, starting at Rio in 1992, that anthropogenic climate change requires decarbonization of the world economy. Such a drastic measure would lower the world economy’s energy-flux density, setting off a downward spiral of disintegration. The onrushing breakdown of the
biggest derivatives-laden financial bubble in world history will make consequences even worse.

But the ultimate object targeted for destruction, is man’s creative cognitive powers, which is the means for man’s discovery of new physical scientific principles, which makes revolutionary scientific advances in the physical economy, which uplifts man out of poverty and into full humanity. It is these principles which man celebrates in classical art and music, and which will allow mankind to lift off from Earth, and extend his dominion over the galaxy. The oligarchy attempts to stifle those powers, and it is those powers that will allow mankind to defeat Prince Charles’ scheme.

The World Wildlife Fund, later renamed the Worldwide Fund for Nature (WWF), is a nexus that the British Empire had set up in 1961, to organize for green genocide. Three principal founders give the intent of the organization:

- Julian Huxley—In 1907, Huxley founded the British Eugenics Education Society in Britain; he was shortly to be joined by H.G. Wells, and Leonard Darwin, one of Charles Darwin’s sons. The rubble from World War II was still warm when in 1946, he helped create and made himself director of the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO). In a statement of direction, in a policy paper called “UNESCO: Its purpose and its philosophy,” Huxley revealed the intent to revive eugenics:

  The dead weight of genetic stupidity, physical weakness, mental instability, and disease-proneness, which already exist in the human species, will prove too great a burden for real progress to be achieved. Thus even though it is quite true that any radical eugenic policy will be for many years politically and psychologically impossible, it will be important for UNESCO to see that the eugenic problem is examined with the greatest care, and that the public mind is informed of the issues at stake so that much that now is unthinkable may at least become thinkable.

- Prince Bernhard—Royal Consort to Queen Juliana of the Netherlands, and first WWF president. Having joined the Nazi brownshirts on Hitler’s accession in 1933, he moved on to the fierce Schutzstaffel (SS) in 1934. For cosmetic reasons, Bernhard resigned from the SS, but to show that nothing had changed, he signed his “resignation” letter, “Heil Hitler!” The Prince worked for the German chemical giant IG Farben, a central cog in the Nazi corporatist machine. He joined the statistics department of IG Farben’s Berlin N.W. 7 department, the key Nazi overseas espionage center. Farben developed the gas Zyklon-B, which was used to gas people in the concentration camps starting 1942. In 1937, as a respectable suitor, Bernhard married Queen Juliana of the Netherlands.

- Prince Philip—son of Prince Andrew of Greece and Denmark, husband of Queen Elizabeth II, and Duke of Edinburgh. Of Philip’s four older sisters, three were married to German aristocrats who were part of Nazi circles in Germany. Philip appears to have been significantly informed and also involved in these networks. In June 1945, the British Royal Household dispatched a “former” MIS agent, to retrieve (presumably to conceal) Prince Philip’s wartime correspondence with this network.

Both of Prince Charles’ parents were products of this Nazi milieu, as Queen Elizabeth’s father King George VI and his wife were involved in appeasement circles, that at different times during World War II, tried through channels to reach an “understanding” with the Nazi German regime. There was, notoriously, King Edward VIII, an outright collaborator of the Nazis, who was forced to abdicate in December 1936, to make way for Elizabeth’s father, King George VI. This informed the upbringing of the Prince of Wales, the heir to the throne.

There were several other environmental organizations: The International Union for the Conservation of Nature, Friends of the Earth, etc. But Prince Philip used the WWF as his home platform for his attempt to transform the world economy.

**Prince Charles’ Transformation: The 1992 Rio Summit**

In 1989, Princes Philip and Bernhard, and various prominent City of London financiers, decided to hold a singular conference in 1992, the United Nations Earth Summit in Rio de Janeiro. This WWF crew decided to use the Canadian Maurice Strong, a leading idea pro-
moter for Prince Philip, and a money-raiser for the WWF who had founded the 1001 Club in 1970 as a means for super-wealthy patrons to fund the WWF.

Strong expressed his charming view to the National Review on September 1, 1997:

If we don’t change, our species will not survive.... Frankly, we may get to the point where the only way of saving the world will be for industrial civilization to collapse.

Consider what Strong must have meant by “the world,” thus “saved,” in that statement.

An oil developer in Alberta, first executive director of the United Nations Environment Program, and a leading figure in the WWF, Strong would be the Secretary General of the Earth Summit.

But with Philip’s and Strong’s mentoring, Prince Charles would now take on a leadership role. Charles had delivered his first environmental speech in 1970, at age 22. He then took on more responsibilities. But for the Rio summit, he was placed in a leadership position to personally organize for the conference, overcome differences between nations, and help shape the agenda.

Author Jonathan Dimbleby in his 1994 authorized The Prince of Wales: A Biography, described what happened:

By 1991, the momentum generated by the Prince’s speeches had secured him an international reputation. In the run-up to the Rio summit, which was planned for 1992, the Prince was determined to have his own input by bringing together key international figures in an attempt to achieve a degree of harmony between the conflicting attitudes of Europe, the United States and the developing nations, led by Brazil. He alighted on the idea of using the royal yacht [the Britannia] as the base for a two-day international seminar at the end of an official tour of Brazil in April 1991. Among others, he invited Senator Albert Gore; senior officials from the World Bank, chief executives from such as Shell [the Anglo part of the Anglo-Dutch Royal Dutch Shell oil company] and BP [British Petroleum Company]; the principal non-governmental organizations; European politicians, including the British ministers of Overseas Aid and the Environment; and, most important of all, the host of the prospective summit, President Fernando Collor of Brazil.

The Rio Summit, Agenda 21, and ‘Divine Nature’

The Rio Earth summit was an extravaganza attended by more than 100 heads of state, and 38,000 people. It made three big shifts.

First, when the UN Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (UN IPCC) was founded in 1988, it defined climate change as “any change in climate over time whether due to natural variability or as a result of human activity.”

But at the Rio Earth Summit, that phrase was replaced by a UN Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC), which stated, “human activities have been substantially increasing the atmospheric concentration of greenhouse gases.”

Second, the Conference adopted a policy called Agenda 21, which stated: “All energy sources will need to be used in ways that respect the atmosphere.” Agenda 21 was the first UN document to identify roles and responsibilities for local and federal governments to pursue “sustainable development,” and stated that these governments would have to come up with a way to reduce greenhouse gases by a large percentage, voluntarily. The next UN summit, in 1997 in Kyoto Japan, made these sharp reductions in greenhouse gases of the Agenda 21 mandatory—the “Kyoto Protocols.”
Third, in a 1992 essay, Maurice Strong evaluated one of the strong points of the 1992 Rio Summit:

> It is simply not feasible for sovereignty to be exercised unilaterally by individual nation states, however powerful. It is a principle which will yield only slowly and reluctantly to the imperatives of global environmental cooperation.


Not only was sovereignty to be abrogated, but Strong gave the 1992 conference a pagan religious undercurrent. At the plenary session, as Secretary-General of the conference he stated:

> The responsibility of each human being today is to choose between the force of darkness and the force of light. We must therefore transform our attitudes and values, and adopt a renewed respect for the superior law of Divine Nature.

The Rio Summit was a model-precedent. From that 1992 Earth Summit forward, the UN decided to hold a global conference every five years on either the environment or sustainable development; and the agenda and discussions of those subsequent UN summits were usually framed and based on the principal ideas and agenda of the first 1992 Rio Earth Summit.

When Prince Charles played his leading role in 1991-92 for the Rio Earth Summit, he was 44 years old. By comparison, look at what others who are participating in the green finance agenda today were doing: Mark Carney was 27 years old, and working on his economics doctorate at Oxford, while making money at Goldman Sachs. Christine Lagarde was 36 years old and concentrating on working her way up the financial hierarchy in France. Bernie Sanders first got elected to the U.S. House of Representatives. Alexandria Ocasio-Cortez was three years old, and Greta Thunberg was not yet born. Charles was the one creating policy.

2. Prince Charles and His Allies Created the Green New Deal

Common folklore/mythology, backed by the media, has it that Rep. Alexandria Ocasio-Cortez (D-NY) and Sen. Ed Markey (D-MA), came up with the idea of a Green New Deal in 2017. This was then introduced as a joint resolution into the Congress by Ocasio-Cortez and Markey in February 2019. The Green New Deal is at the heart of the Biden administration's policy initiatives.

In truth, the Green New Deal was developed in the United Kingdom explicitly by the policy networks of Prince Charles. Two of the most important men in developing the Green New Deal in Britain, under Charles’ supervision, are Tony Juniper and Jonathan Porritt, two of the more murderous environmentalists in the world. Both have served as Special Adviser to Prince Charles on the environment, and have been in his inner circle for decades. They created the Green New Deal in 2008, and exported it to the United States.

Author Jonathan Dimbleby wrote in the authorized biography cited above, about Charles’ inner circle:

> By this time [1986], the Prince had started to form around him a core of environmentalist advisers, which he described in a letter to a friend as “a small team of knowledgeable people who can help me put as much pressure on international agencies, governments, and so on, via speeches, lunches, and dinners, as possible.”


Jonathan Porritt was knighted Commander of the Order of the British Empire (CBE) in 2009 for his role in developing the genocidal Green New Deal in Britain under Charles.
Juniper led the entire operation to have the Parliament of the United Kingdom adopt the Climate Change Act of 2008, one of the first laws of its kind anywhere in the world. The Act made it the duty of the British Secretary of State to ensure that the net UK carbon account for all six Kyoto greenhouse gases—carbon dioxide (CO₂), methane (CH₄), etc.—for the year 2050 is at least 80% lower than the 1990 baseline, supposedly to avoid dangerous climate change. The January 26, 2019 *Times of London* referred to Juniper as “Prince Charles’ Green Champion.”

Jonathan Porritt was a leading member of Britain’s radical Ecology Party since its founding in 1976, and its director as of 1979; in 1985 it was renamed the Green Party of England and Wales, and for a time, he was co-chairman. In 1986, Charles anointed Porritt as his trusted adviser, meaning that Charles and Porritt have worked together for 35 years. From 2000 to 2009, by appointment of Labour Prime Minister Tony Blair, Porritt chaired Britain’s Sustainable Development Commission (SDC), whose charge was to advise the UK on steps to be taken including cutting physical-economic production, to reduce “greenhouse gases.”

But by far, the most dangerous feature of Porritt, which makes him most endearing to the Prince of Wales, is that he is one of the most open ultra-Malthusians in the world, calling, in effect, for halving the world’s population. In 2008, Porritt became a patron of the Optimum Population Trust, which is perhaps the world’s leading advocate for genocide. According to the March 22, 2009 Times of London, Porritt delivered a speech in which he praised research by the Optimum Population Trust, “suggesting that the UK’s population must be cut to 30 million [from then 62 million—ed.] if the country wants to feed itself sustainably.” In November 2018 Porritt became president of the OPT, now renamed Population Matters.

Under the supervision and ideology of Charles, Porritt, and Juniper, the Green New Deal was created in 2008, to serve as the program for Britain, but especially as a basic template for America, which imitated its broad outline and several of its particulars. Export to America was intended.

For all this work, upon Charles’ recommendation, Queen Elizabeth designated Porritt a Commander of the British Empire (CBE).

The other patrons of Population Matters make clear its murderous intent. One patron is Sir David Attenborough, who has been described by several media as effectively a member of the Royal Family. Attenborough has been a father-figure and adviser to Charles since Charles was 8. He is one of Queen Elizabeth’s closest non-Royal friends and trusted advisers. Attenborough has stated:

> The human population can no longer be allowed to grow in the same old uncontrolled way. If we do not take charge of our population size, then nature will do it for us.

Another patron is Paul Ehrlich, author of the discredited 1968 farce, *The Population Bomb*, who has advocated reducing the world’s population by several billion people.

This fully resonates with the Prince of Wales. In a speech on June 10, 2010 to his Oxford [University] Center for Islamic Studies, Charles vented that the population of Lagos in Nigeria has risen from 300,000 to 20 million during his lifetime. He continued, “I could have chosen Mumbai, Cairo, or Mexico City; wherever you look, the world’s population is increasing fast.” He said the Earth could not “sustain us all,” particularly in the developing sector if a “vast proportion” is consuming natural resources at “Western levels.” President Barack Obama copied Charles’ remarks in a tirade to young Africans a few years later.
3. Imposing the Reporting Mechanism for the Reset—Toward Bankers’ Dictatorship

Prince Charles, acting on behalf of the financier power, the Bank of England, et al., has, since 2004, drawn up and attempted to enforce with increasing intensity, a body of green “accounting-integrated reporting rules,” upon industrial and energy corporations, farms, etc. This is called “taxonomy” in “green finance” circles. He has created, or modified existing regulatory bodies, endowing them with the authority to impose harsh penalties upon corporations that do not comply with anti-greenhouse gas accounting rules—which could place non-abiding corporations into bankruptcy. In Charles’ world, all physical production increases anthropogenic Climate Change. Man violates primitive Nature through scientific progress.

Charles thought that the United Nations’ 1992 Rio Summit on Climate Change, and subsequent UN conferences on this subject in 1997 and 2002, were valuable in setting parameters for climate change regulations. But corporations could pay lip service, and then evade the proposed rules, with no penalty to themselves. The rules would never go into effect. He believes rules—called integrated reporting rules—must be surgically inserted into corporations, to make them comply and not evade. Corporations must reveal every significant investment or expenditure they made from the standpoint of whether it would increase Climate Change.

In 2004, Charles and HSBC Bank (the Hong Kong and Shanghai Banking Corporation), the world’s leading drug bank, founded Accounting for Sustainability, or A4S. On its website A4S states, under the heading “Why Sustainability and Finance”:

[Corporate] finance teams are an asset to their organization and a vital element in building a sustainable world. To live up to this potential they need to recognize the risks and opportunities associated with sustainability and be able to act on them.

Finance teams in an organization are critical in an organization because they control the flows of money and finance that are critical in enabling or blocking what the organization does. [Emphasis added.]

Finance teams could control the flows of money: Charles and the City of London wanted them to depart fossil fuel-based electricity, manufacturing, infrastructure, and scientific research and development, and move into a burgeoning green speculative bubble.

To make this work, Charles and his team developed a series of integrated reporting risks, risks which would supposedly say how dangerous an investment is, strictly from the standpoint of whether it would allegedly increase Climate Change. These are some of what are officially called “physical risks,” “legacy risks,” “financial risks,” “production risks,” “competitive risks,” “litigation risks,” and “reputational risks.” This risk assessment would be applied not only to energy companies, but the banks, machine tool companies, and many firms down the line.

A company can be assigned a risk for any activity that contributes to “global warming,” no matter how many steps removed from the supposed global warming-initiating incident it is.

Now “risk management teams” which the companies have been compelled to hire, may report to the company’s board of directors that the company has serious risks that threaten its stability. Heads of government regulatory bodies, whose teeth have been sharpened on
environmentalism, may rule that the company is not in compliance, and must make immediate changes. Credit rating agencies—like S&P Global Ratings and Moody’s Investor Service—may strip away positive credit ratings. A company will fear being accidentally or otherwise caught up in regulatory action which would cause them to be delisted, put out of business or even prosecuted.

To get companies to shut down production, shift to regressive technologies like windmills, and invest in a worthless green speculative bubble is insane from a business strategy. At first it was voluntary, but Charles had to make it mandatory. This required creating the Task Force on Climate Related Financial Disclosure, nestled within the Bank for International Settlements. That part of the plan was achieved in 2015.

**Creation of Accounting for Sustainability**

As noted, Prince Charles established the Accounting for Sustainability (A4S) in 2004 with the support of the HSBC bank, notorious for the Opium Wars. HSBC lent Prince Charles one Russell Picot, who would be a shared asset, and whom Charles would deploy over the next dozen years. As the July 2019 *By All Accounts* magazine reported:

> The opportunity to combine [Picot’s] personal convictions with the environmental and social aspects of reporting came in 2004 when the Prince of Wales invited HSBC’s chairman, along with some other corporates, to help set up Accounting for Sustainability.

Picot heaped praise on Charles, saying “The Prince is an extraordinary man…. He has championed environmental and climate issues for many decades.”

Charles’ A4S set up the Accounting Bodies Network (ABN) as a collaboration between A4S and professional bodies across the globe, including most of the top accounting bodies in the world. Together the Network represents over 2.5 million professional accountants and students across 179 countries, representing two-thirds of the world’s accountants; they support the A4S agenda.

All told, the corporatist alliance he pulled together in the leading and most powerful financial institutions in the world, represented combined assets under management, or in the case of banks, direct assets of the bank, totaling more than $30 trillion. The organizations that he lined up to support his objectives had a combined membership of more than 9 million people.

In 2010, Charles launched the International Integrated Reporting Council (IIRC), for the sole purpose of bludgeoning corporations and national governments to adopt integrated reporting.

**Taking Over: Mark and Diana Carney**

Mark Carney, former Governor of the Bank of England (2013-2020), is one of the most powerful central bankers of the 21st Century. Carney also served simultaneously as chairman (2011-2018) of the Financial Stability Board (headquartered at the Bank for International Settlements in Switzerland). But Carney became a strong and open supporter of Green Finance only after Prince Charles had indoctrinated and taken him over. Charles was assisted in this by the fact that Diana Fox Carney, the banker’s “eco-warrior” wife, answers to the Prince both as chair of the Trustees of the green charity Ashden (he is its royal patron, Porritt and Attenborough are her fellow trustees); and as board member of the World Wildlife Fund UK’s Council of Ambassadors. Prince Charles now heads the WWF-UK, founded by his father.

Through Carney, Prince Charles has created the most powerful banker enforcement arm to date for the Green New Deal. This is the Task Force on Climate-Related Financial Disclosures, which includes 34 central banks and large private banks and funds, headed by Carney and Sir Michael Bloomberg. Carney aggressively demands that banks enforce the “taxonomy” to cut down all fossil fuel investment, saying repeatedly that companies that don’t comply “will cease to exist.”

The story of Prince Charles’ takeover of Carney’s activity is sketched in *EIR’s* October 18, 2019 profile, “Mark Carney, the Prince (Charles) of Central Bankers.”
Carney’s words at Charles’ 70th birthday gathering in 2018 are indicative:

It is to HRH’s credit that this happy occasion is marked by a serious discussion of the risks and opportunities posed by climate change and the transition to a low-carbon economy. His Royal Highness has provided inspirational leadership on these critical issues for decades. Indeed if we had heeded his advice when it was first offered, we might have already solved the Tragedy of the Horizon!

I have had the great pleasure of engaging with HRH on a number of occasions, and I can think of few people more knowledgeable about the sustainability agenda or as committed to it. Four years ago, he rightly put me on the spot, highlighting that climate-related risks will have serious financial impacts, and asking what regulators were doing about them. HRH’s challenges are even more germane today as the… time to act continues to shorten. [Emphases added.]

In 2017, this central bankers’ task force began issuing recommendations to companies to aid them in their disclosures of “pertinent information” related to climate-related risks. The adoption of these integrated reporting disclosures would be voluntary. But in November 2020, the Bank of England issued this statement:

The Bank of England, jointly with the other members of the Government–Regulator TCFD Taskforce, set up to examine the most effective way to approach climate-related financial disclosures, has published an interim report setting out an indicative path towards *mandatory* climate-related disclosures across the UK economy, aligned with the recommendations of the Taskforce on Climate-related Financial Disclosures (TCFD). [Emphasis added.]

This is the iron enforcement mechanism—forcing corporations and financial institutions to move out of physical production for human existence, and into an immense green speculative bubble—that the green bankers’ dictatorship depends upon.

In the summer of 2018, the huge Wall Street fund manager BlackRock, Inc. took the side of the Prince and Carney, teaming with the latter at the Federal Reserve’s Jackson Hole, Wyoming annual bankers’ conference to add a deadly new tactic, which the BlackRock executives themselves called “regime change.” Central banks should take the field of fiscal spending away from governments which are slow to act.

---

BlackRock’s March to World Power

by Karel Vereycken

Besides the British Monarchy, only one other entity has become as nearly synonymous with the agenda of the Great Reset: Black Rock. It was BlackRock that announced the agenda of “regime change” at the August 2019 central bank forum in Jackson Hole, where a central banker’s dictatorship was to impose a green agenda that would lead to the British Monarchy’s dream of global depopulation. It is BlackRock, along with Vanguard and State Street, that make up the Big Three of the “asset managers”—whose assets under management surpass
the GDP of China. While BlackRock’s actual ownership of $165 billion in assets is relatively small as compared to the $3,100 billion of assets owned by the largest U.S. bank, JPMorgan Chase, BlackRock’s power does not come from its actual assets, but rather those it has under management. So where did they get this immense power?

A New Venetian ‘Fondi?’

Like the fondi of Venice—funds that could be accessed for the lavish lifestyles and political dealings of the Venetian Oligarchy but never drawn down—BlackRock plays a similar role in asset management of the City of London and their branch office in Wall Street. Following the repeal of the Glass–Steagall firewall between speculative financial activity and commercial banking in Franklin Roosevelt’s Banking Act of 1933, giant banks such as JPMorgan Chase and Goldman Sachs—which have supplied, and hired, one top public official after another—became the rulers of this increasingly deregulated world.

However, after the famous “Lehman moment” of 2008, some elementary prudential rules were enacted to try to prevent excessive speculation and systemic risk. Wall Street lawyers and greedy money sharks, of course, invented smart ways to sail around these obstacles. Armed with super-powerful computers using sophisticated algorithms, the “Big Three” giant asset managers (BlackRock, Vanguard and State Street), became the kings of the day. Information is power, and they controlled that information. Here is how it happened.

As in Silicon Valley, Algorithms Decide: Black Rock’s Magic Lamp of Aladdin

In the immediate aftermath of the 2008 meltdown, it was nearly impossible to separate trash financial paper from legitimate assets. Enter BlackRock’s “Aladdin” (Asset, Liability, Debt and Derivative Investment Network). This electronic application—a cluster of 6,000 high-performance computer servers constantly monitoring nearly $18 trillion in financial assets, 8% of the world’s total—now keeps track, in real time, of some 30,000 investment portfolios, including BlackRock’s own along with those of competitors, banks, pension funds, and insurers.

Thanks to this highly sophisticated computer system managed by a 2,000-person army of mathematicians and IT specialists, BlackRock, in a joint venture with Google, has shifted part of its investments from human analysts to the algorithms of its artificial intelligence platform.

Equipped with this very powerful analytical tool, and having access, as a major shareholder, to the balance sheets of a huge part of the Western economies, BlackRock has been increasingly called on to advise governments in crisis situations.

Since 2008, new technologies have transformed the world of finance. First, the spectacular advancement of computer technologies, notably the development of High Frequency Trading (HFT), has brought many private as well as institutional investors to shift capital from “actively” managed mutual funds to “passively” (computer) managed index mutual funds and “exchange traded funds” (ETFs).

While active management requires traders and fund managers who try to buy stocks that will outperform others, “passive” management—the use of mathematical algorithms—turns out to work better, and to be safer and cheaper. When the stock market rises steadily, tracking a stable basket of values with an algorithm brings greater returns than analysts’ intuitions. Academic research regularly demonstrates this.

This capability has led to BlackRock’s meteoric rise to power, as the world’s largest asset manager, with $8.67 trillion in assets under management as of January 2021. For BlackRock, index “products” represent more than $5 trillion of that total. Today, BlackRock employs 13,900 people spread over 30 countries, tasked with selling financial products or investing in new companies. With the profits earned by selling financial advice to pension funds and institutional investors, BlackRock bought shares of 17,000 companies and firms, not only in the United States but worldwide—and they never fail to vote at each general meeting. French economic journalist Grégoire Favet writes:

As soon as BlackRock appears as one of your shareholders, your company stands out from the crowd and gains a huge amount of prestige. When you are Larry
Fink, you can talk as equals with the director of the IMF or a head of state.

BlackRock’s Larry Fink has already been received twice at the Élysée since the election of Emmanuel Macron.

Hence, the Big Three (BlackRock, Vanguard and State Street) together constitute the largest shareholder of all U.S. corporations and are the largest shareholder in each of 88% of the S&P 500 firms.

**BlackRock’s Real Capital—Political Capital**

While it was the shift towards passive fund management, coupled with the supercomputers of Aladdin, which gave BlackRock its power as an asset manager in the aftermath of the 2008 meltdown, its real assets lie in the control of “political capital.” As an “asset manager,” BlackRock avoids regulation applied to the sketchy financial products of investment banks and hedge funds, because Fink and BlackRock “pushed hard to successfully resist the designation of asset managers as systemically important financial institutions (or SIFIs), which would be subject to additional regulation like larger capital requirements,” according to *The Intercept* in 2016. BlackRock has also in recent years conducted “stress tests” for the Federal Reserve and European Central Bank, yet has interests in the very same assets of those banks and financial entities who are a part of these central banks. Is that not a blatant conflict of interest?

In 2009, U.S. Senator Chuck Grassley asked the same question about this conflict of interest, between auditing on behalf of the public sector while investing in the private sector:

How is it that only one company is qualified to manage these assets recovered by the government? They have access to information about when the Fed will try to sell securities and at what price. And they cultivate highly developed financial relationships with people around the world. The potential for a conflict of interest is great and it’s complicated to regulate.

BlackRock has set its sights on Europe and spends heavily to recruit top political figures possessing large address books. Notably this includes the failed successor of Chancellor Merkel, Friedrich Merz; the former head of the Swiss National Bank, Philip Hildebrand; the former UK Finance Minister George Osborne; or Paschalis Bouchoris, the former head of the Greek privatization program. Larry Fink can fly to Europe and in less than five hours get an appointment with most EU presidents, prime ministers, or CEOs of large corporations.

---

**For Biden, Only BlackRock’s Life Matters**

This year’s Davos “Great Reset” agenda meeting has no doubt accelerated the transition into green finance. It is no surprise that Joe Biden, who has made the Green New Deal his policy, picked several high-level officials of BlackRock to be part of his administration. BlackRock is also home to key figures in the fight to prevent the LaRouche movement’s organizing to reinstate the Glass–Steagall firewall between speculation and legitimate banking—the first step in LaRouche’s Four Laws.

As reported by David Dayen, in a 2016 article in *The Intercept*, Larry Fink, betting Hillary Clinton would win the elections, assembled a veritable shadow government full of former Treasury Department officials at his company. Fink has made clear his desire to become treasury secretary someday. The Obama administration had him on the short list to replace Timothy Geithner. When that didn’t materialize, he pulled several members of prior Treasury Departments into high-level positions at the firm, which may improve the prospects of realizing his dream in a future Clinton administration.

The article continues:

“Fink also opposes efforts to reinstate the Glass–Steagall firewall between investment and commercial banks, as does [Hillary] Clinton.”

What BlackRock had wished to impose under Hillary Clinton and failed to impose under Donald Trump, it now hopes to implement under Biden. From the beginning, Biden’s donors had suggested that he appoint Larry Fink as Secretary of the Treasury! As a symbol, it was probably a bit too controversial as a starter. Instead, Biden appointed lawyer Adewale “Wally” Adeyemo, the former chief of staff to Larry Fink, as Assistant Secretary of the Treasury, that is, as the number two to Janet Yellen, Obama’s former Federal Reserve Chairman. Adeyemo got his start at the Brookings Institution’s Hamilton Project, and later became Treasury Secretary Jack Lew’s deputy chief of staff. He then operated as a chief negotiator for the major ultraliberal free trade agreement called the Trans-Pacific Partnership. Under Obama, in 2015, he was appointed Deputy National Security Advisor for International Economics and Deputy Director of the National Economic Council. He then became the first president of the Obama Foundation.

Next, Biden named Brian Deese as director of the National Economic Council. On BlackRock’s website, Deese’s CV reads as follows:
Brian Deese, Managing Director [of BlackRock], is Global Head of Sustainable Investing at BlackRock. The Sustainable Investing team is focused on identifying drivers of long-term return associated with environmental, social and governance issues, integrating them throughout BlackRock’s investment processes, and creating solutions for our clients to achieve sustainable investment return. Previously, Brian worked in the White House under President Obama where he was the President’s senior advisor for climate and energy policy, helping to negotiate the Paris Climate Agreement and other national and international initiatives.

Third, Michael Pyle, an Obama administration veteran who also worked on economic policy in Hillary Clinton’s presidential campaign and whom we mentioned before, was nominated as chief economist to Vice President Kamala Harris.

Joe Biden initially envisioned even nominating Tom Donilon, the president of the BlackRock Investment Institute (BII) as head of the CIA, but that didn’t materialize. Tom Donilon, besides being the brother of Biden’s main media advisor Mike Donilon, is a member of the Trilateral Commission and the Council on Foreign Relations, and has served on the steering committee of the secretive Bilderberg Meetings.

BlackRock is working overtime to bring a willing Biden into the British genocidal plan to “green” the world’s finance—not to save the climate, but to save their doomed and already collapsing empire of debt “assets” and fictitious capital.

Brian Deese (right), formerly Global Head of Sustainable Investing at BlackRock, and now the Director of President Biden’s National Economic Council, yucks it up with Al Gore and then-Secretary of State John Kerry in Paris in 2015.

The Pentagon and Climate Change

It comes as no surprise that one of the first actions of the Biden regime was to reinstate the U.S. commitment to the Paris Climate Accord. The decision by Trump—one of the first actions of his Presidency—to pull the US out of the Paris Climate Accord was one of the central reasons the British establishment concluded that the “special relationship” of strategic, economic and intelligence sharing between the US and UK would not survive a Trump second term.

The issue of anthropogenic climate change has nothing to do with the environment, but has everything to do with the strategic objectives of the British monarchy—to kill as many people as possible who are willing to accept the fraud of the Great Reset agenda, and aim nuclear weapons at those who don’t. The US presidency is central to carrying out the aims of the British monarchy, and the coup directed against Trump over 2016–2020 was essential to those aims.

The House of Lords Select Committee on International Relations published in 2018 a report, UK Foreign Policy in a Shifting World Order, where they laid out that a second term of Donald Trump would not allow the British to attain their strategic objectives that were later outlined in the Great Reset.

From the section, “Disruption and change to the global balance of power” of the report:

The US Administration has taken a number of high-profile unilateral foreign policy decisions that are contrary to the interests of the United Kingdom. In particular, US withdrawal from the Paris Agreement on climate change, the Iran nuclear deal and the UN Human Rights Council, and the imposition of trade tariffs on its allies, undermine efforts to tackle pressing global challenges of critical importance to the UK.

Continuing, the House of Lords report says that the “UK and US are deeply entwined through defence and intelligence links, and connections between officials,” and though they say those ties are strong enough to withstand the actions of Trump and that they are reaching out to “those parts of American society which share our views and values,” they nonetheless go on to conclude:
However, the difficulty the UK and its allies have faced in trying to influence the US demonstrates the challenge of working with the Administration. How damaging this will be to what has hitherto been the UK’s most important international relationship will depend on whether the current approach is an enduring trend. Should President Trump win a second term, or a similar Administration succeed him, the damage to UK-US relations will be longer lasting; and the Government will need to place less reliance on reaching a common US/UK approach to the main issues of the day than has often been the case in the past. [emphasis added]

This report was published at the end of 2018, in the thick of the British-instigated efforts to oust President Trump via allegations of Russia collusion. It should be noted that the British operations around the elections of 2016 and 2020 also targeted the entire political landscape of the United States, including the Democratic Party and any voices that were even remotely critical of perpetual wars or Wall Street bailouts—such as Tulsi Gabbard, or even the severely compromised Bernie Sanders. In the end, the British have installed a mentally deficient figure in the form of Joe Biden, and a creepy Kamala Harris who is increasingly taking over functions for Biden.

The destruction of the U.S. political process is essential for the Great Reset, to have lackeys to do the bidding of the British, since the implications of imposing the anti-growth policies of the Great Reset on nations around the planet through political, economic and military force could lead quickly to World War III.

Climate Change at the Pentagon

On January 27, the Biden White House issued Executive Order 14008, titled “Tackling the Climate Crisis at Home and Abroad,” which puts the non-existent climate crisis at the center of US foreign policy and national security:

It is the policy of my Administration that climate considerations shall be an essential element of United States foreign policy and national security:

The Executive Order directs the Director of National Intelligence to prepare, within 120 days, a National Intelligence Estimate on the national and economic security impacts of climate change. It directs the Secretary of Defense, in coordination with the Commerce Department, NOAA, EPA and other agencies, “to develop and submit to the President, within 120 days of the date of this order, an analysis of the security implications of climate change (Climate Risk Analysis) that can be incorporated into modeling, simulation, wargaming, and other analyses.”

It also directs the Secretary of Defense, along with the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, to consider the security implications of climate change, including any relevant information from the Climate Risk Analysis … in developing the National Defense Strategy, Defense Planning Guidance, Chairman’s Risk Assessment, and other relevant strategy, planning, and programming documents and processes. Starting in January 2022, the Secretary of Defense and the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff shall provide an annual update, through the National Security Council, on the progress made in incorporating the security implications of climate change into these documents and processes.

As alarming as syncing US foreign policy and military strategy to the climate change fraud is, the “Whole of Government” approach by Biden’s handlers is even more frightful. The Secretary of Defense will be one of many cabinet members that are part of the newly formed “National Climate Taskforce,” which will have among its various responsibilities the enforcement of “30×30 Conservation”—30% of federal lands and waters taken out of productive use by 2030—i.e., no offshore drilling, no cattle-grazing, no forestry etc.

Biden’s newly appointed Defense Secretary, Lloyd Austin, declared his full support for this madness: “Since 2010, the Department of Defense has acknowledged that the planet’s changing climate has a dramatic effect on our missions, plans, and installations.”

As Austin indicated, the Pentagon has included the issue of climate change in a number of its documents over the last decade, including National Defense Strategy reports. Before he recently passed on to his own version of global warming in Hades, George Shultz, the leading neocon and architect of the last half century of end-
less warfare, also promoted the climate change agenda from the standpoint of the British geopolitical outlook. In the May/June 2020 issue of the New York Council on Foreign Relations journal *Foreign Affairs*, Shultz teamed up with fellow former Secretary of State James Baker to push the US in the British direction on climate change, and explicitly attack the Belt and Road from this standpoint. After promoting one of the City of London's carbon pricing schemes, he demands that the US seize “climate leadership,” by adopting a policy to “encourage US trading partners to raise their standards or penalize them for their polluting ways.” The targets include LaRouche’s Four Powers: “China, Russia and India” (the nations which, along with the US, constitute LaRouche’s Four Powers) which now “operate under lax environmental standards and produce goods in a more carbon-intensive manner,” and who “currently pay no penalty.” Russia, they say, “has flooded the world with cheap oil and gas... and unveiled a new generation of nuclear plants and fuel agreements with developing countries... creating closer geopolitical relationships.” China is “promoting carbon-intensive industrialization in other emerging economies, often powered by new coal plants built through its Belt and Road Initiative.”

On March 3, 2021, U.S. Secretary of State Antony Blinken followed up on Biden’s executive order by echoing the ancient neocon warmonger Shultz, in attacking China and identifying that nation’s power to prevent the Great Reset by offering nations an alternative with the Belt and Road Initiative:

> China is the only country with the economic, diplomatic, military, and technological power to seriously challenge the stable and open international system—all the rules, values, and relationships that make the world work the way we want it to.

Biden’s choice to run planning at the Pentagon, Colin Kahl, told the Congress March 4 that the Biden Administration will fully endorse the 2018 National Defense Strategy, which “accurately identifies the strategic competition with China and Russia as the primary challenge animating the global security environment.” Kahl went on to say that “Russian behavior indicates it seeks to undermine and overturn the rules-based international order established during the post World War II period,” accusing Moscow of “blatant disregard for the sovereignty of its neighbors.”

This is essentially what was stated in 2018 by the House of Lords report, where the British say that “The rules-based international order in all its manifestations—which is critical to the UK’s national interest—is under serious threat from multiple directions”:

> The policies of major powers—Russia, China and increasingly the United States—present considerable challenges to the multilateral institutions that underpin this order. Yet many of the problems facing states, such as climate change, terrorism and migration, are increasingly complex and trans-national. The Government should make the defence of the rules-based international order a central theme of all its bilateral relationships. This is particularly important in the UK’s engagement with the US, China, Russia and emerging powers such as India.

They later ask, “How should UK foreign policy adapt to the rise of China as a global power, particularly in the light of President Xi’s ambitions for a new era in Chinese influence and China’s extensive ‘one belt, one road’ initiative?”

The British monarchy intends to answer that question with war if need be. The geopolitical doctrine of Halford Mackinder, outlined in his 1904 article “The Geographical Pivot of History,” was used by the British to start the two world wars of the 20th Century. Mackinder was explicit that the railroads of China must not connect to Europe via the Trans-Siberian railroad, nor the other routes of Eurasian integration, such as the Berlin to Baghdad railroad, which represented the new type of development against which World War I was created. Preventing the New Silk Road outlined by Lyndon LaRouche and Helga Zepp-LaRouche, in the form of China’s Belt and Road Initiative today, could lead to the final world war. We must shut down the British Great Reset to stop it today, and launch a new era of peace through development.
Who Invented Malthus?

An excerpt from Lyndon LaRouche's 1983 book, *There Are No Limits to Growth*

We begin with the case of the Reverend Professor Thomas Malthus himself. Who and what was behind his writing of his 1798 *An Essay on the Principles of Population*? It was the same stratum of wealthy families behind Malthus then, which has been behind the orchestration of neo-Malthusian propaganda and movements again, today.

During the year 1751, the leader of the cause of American Independence, Dr. Benjamin Franklin, wrote and published a pamphlet, *Observations Concerning the Increase of Mankind*, in which he argued, on premises of economic principles, for increasing rapidly the population of North America. A friend and admirer of Franklin, Gianbattista Beccaria, translated this pamphlet into Italian, and published it in Italy. The Italian edition of this pamphlet was greeted with an attempted rebuttal published by Giammaria Ortes, a leading spokesman for the powerful rentier-financier families of Venice.

Ortes's attack on Franklin found its way to Britain, and, at a somewhat later date, an ambitious young graduate of Oxford University's divinity school, Thomas Malthus, plagiarized and published Ortes's arguments as his own *Essay on the Principles of Population*. At that time, Malthus was in the service of the British Prime Minister, William Pitt the Younger. It was Pitt who sponsored the first, 1798 publication of Malthus's famous work. As Pitt stated to the British Parliament, it was Malthus's *On Population* which was used for the 1800 reform of the British Poor Law; Britain ceased to give financial assistance to its own “useless eaters.”

That was the origin of the name “Malthusianism.”

In honor of Malthus’s achievement, the British East India Company created the first professorship in political economy to be established in Britain, appointing Malthus as first occupant of this position, at the Company’s Haileybury College, where its own agents were trained. All the notable British economists—excepting the special case of Dr. Karl Marx—from Adam Smith and Jeremy Bentham, through John Stuart Mill—were, like Malthus, agents of the British East India Company. Most, like Bentham, Malthus, David Ricardo, James Mill and John Stuart Mill, were associated with and coordinated by Haileybury.

This connection among British political economy, Malthusianism, and the African slave-trade and China opium-trade, is indispensable for understanding the nineteenth and twentieth centuries’ eruptions of Malthusianism....

Adam Smith had defended the opium-trade in a manner consistent with his Scottish Calvinist’s Jesuitical morality:

> The care of the universal happiness of all rational and sensible beings, is the business of God and not of man. To man is allotted a much humbler department: the care of his own happiness, of that of his family, his friends, his country.... But though we are... endowed with a very strong desire of those ends, it has been entrusted to the slow and uncertain determinations of our reason to find out the proper means of bringing them about. Nature has directed us to the greater part of these by original and immediate instincts. Hunger, thirst, the passion which unites the two sexes, the love of pleasure, and the dread of pain, prompt us to apply those means for their own sakes, and without any consideration of their tendency to those beneficent ends which the great Director of nature intended to produce them.

In the case of the British East India company and its American agents, the African slave-trade and China opium-trade; and, in the case of the leading American families, treason; were pursuits of profit by means of which they and their descendants might become wealthier, more powerful, and even all the more paragons of respectability.

The African slave-trade, the China opium-trade, monstrous usury, and the profitable occupation of treason, were the hallmarks of moral character and philosophy of the British East India Company and its American agents. These were the Malthusians then; their descendants, and the Swiss and “black nobility” descendants, are the force behind neo-Malthusianism today.
Intelligent control of population is a possibility which puts man outside competitive processes that have hitherto ruled the modification of species, and he can be released from these processes in no other way.

There is a clear hope that, later, directed breeding will come within his scope, but that goes beyond his present range of practical achievement, and we need not discuss it further here. Suffice it for us here that the world community of our desires, the organized world community conducting and ensuring its own progress, requires a deliberate collective control of population as a primary condition. —H.G. Wells, *The Open Conspiracy: Blue Prints for a World Revolution* (1928)

H.G. Wells should not be dismissed as a kook writing bad “science fiction,” but rather should be understood as one of the architects of the modern British Empire. The quote above is from “The Open Conspiracy,” which literally was, and is, the open conspiracy of all the foot-soldiers of the British monarchy, including the Davos oligarchs, whose plan is to depopulate the planet and return to feudalism under a one-world government—what Wells and others called “socialism.”

H.G. Wells’s collaborator in designing the modern British Empire, Lord Bertrand Russell—whom LaRouche referred to as “the most evil man of the 20th Century”—was also explicit on the geopolitical aims of population control, especially those of skin color not preferred by the British.

According to the US Department of Energy’s (DOE) “Ultimate Fast Facts Guide to Nuclear Energy,” the average 1,000 MWe (1 GWe) nuclear reactor requires approximately one square mile to operate. That same DOE guide says that utility-scale wind turbines need 360 times more area and utility-scale solar panels requires 75 times more. However, if capacity factors are considered, those figures shoot even higher. EIR estimates that creating “1.5 Billion Productive Jobs” would require 8,000 GW of electrical generation capacity globally. To make that much energy with wind turbines would require land area the size of Canada and the United States combined; with solar panels, land area covering 75% of the lower 48 states. For small modular nuclear reactors, such as NuScale’s SMRs, it would only require land area the size of New York City’s Queens and the Bronx.

The British monarchy knows these figures—implementing green technology is part of their population reduction policy.

The white population of the world will soon cease to increase. The Asiatic races will be longer, and the negroes still longer, before their birth rate falls sufficiently to make their numbers stable without help of war and pestilence... Until that happens, the benefits aimed at by socialism can only be partially realized, and the less prolific races will have to defend themselves against the more prolific by methods which are disgusting even if they are necessary. —Lord Bertrand Russell, *The Prospects of Industrial Civilization* (1923)

These quotes by Wells and Russell indicate what the Green New Deal is really about. While there are many who do not understand that population reduction is the goal of green energy, those steeped in this “open conspiracy” understand it completely. Consider the following cases of the land use required to sustain human population with wind, solar and biomass generating facilities—the British intent is genocide.
The Monarchy Moves For The Great Reset Before The Coming Crash

The trans-Atlantic financial system died in 2007. Lyndon LaRouche announced its death on July 25 of that year and prescribed the remedies required to create a new system:

First of all, this occurs at a time when the world monetary financial system is actually now currently in the process of disintegrating. There’s nothing mysterious about this; I’ve talked about it for some time, it’s been in progress, it’s not abating. What’s listed as stock values and market values in the financial markets internationally is bunk! These are purely fictitious beliefs. There’s no truth to it; the fakery is enormous. There is no possibility of a non-collapse of the present financial system—none! It’s finished, now!

The present financial system cannot continue to exist under any circumstances, under any Presidency, under any leadership, or any leadership of nations. Only a fundamental and sudden change in the world monetary financial system will prevent a general, immediate chain-reaction type of collapse. At what speed we don’t know, but it will go on, and it will be unstoppable! And the longer it goes on before coming to an end, the worse things will get. And there is no one in the present institutions of government who is competent to deal with this. The Congress, the Senate, the House of Representatives, is not currently competent to deal with this...

You have to change the world monetary-financial system immediately, and you can only do that with a couple of small nations. You can only do that from the top. You have to pull together the might of the world, the major powers of the world and those who will support them, and say, “We’re going to change immediately the world monetary system. We’re going to get rid of the floating-exchange-rate monetary system. We’re going back immediately to a fixed-exchange-rate system.” Because if we do not go back to a fixed-exchange-rate system, of the Franklin Roosevelt prototype, then there’s no possibility of preventing a general collapse and disintegration of the world economy. It can’t be done. Therefore, you have to have a power group which says, “We’re going to save this planet from Hell.”

What we have witnessed since the 2007 collapse is now euphemistically referred to as the “everything bubble.” From the stock market to housing to commercial paper, the system has been pumped up by the fraud of “quantitative easing” (QE), which will eventually lead to hyperinflation. The monarchy’s Great Reset of a Green New Deal, enforced through the “regime change in monetary policy,” was announced by BlackRock at the 2019 meeting of central bankers in Jackson Hole. BlackRock insisted that this regime of central bank control of gov-
ernment spending must be enforced before the coming phase of the crash. They are attempting to create a new green bubble to replace the everything bubble, but the price of that bubble will be paid in human life, since their financial system cannot support present levels of the global population. This is related to LaRouche’s forecast of the end of the Bretton Woods system in 1971, where he warned that the wave of speculation unleashed by the British financial oligarchy would lead to a schizophrenic dissociation between the financial system and the physical economy it was supposed to reflect. LaRouche also warned of the rise of fascist movements in order to impose the British financial oligarchy’s diktat—today’s Green New Deal and Great Reset.

In 1995, LaRouche developed the “Triple Curve/Typical Collapse Function” diagram to describe the process of physical breakdown when the financial system deviates from the real economy. The “Triple Curve” had three features: geometrically increasing rise in debt (“financial aggregates”); monetary aggregate rising even more rapidly in an attempt to liquefy good and bad debt alike; and the physical economy in accelerating decline.

The present ongoing collapse is obvious to anyone not paying attention to the stream of lies coming from the City of London’s propaganda wing known as the international media. At the end of 2020 total global debt reached $281 trillion according to the Bank for International Settlements, up $21 trillion or 7.5% in just a year. Total U.S. debt rose to $69 trillion, up 11% during the past year. The Federal Reserve’s balance sheet has reached $7.6 trillion, indicating it has doubled bank reserves in 16 months by monetizing Treasury debt and buying mortgage-backed securities (MBS) from big banks—including another $90 billion in the past week alone. The U.S. money supply (M2) has increased by 26% in the year since February 2020, the largest one-year jump since 1943. And the physical economy? Some 19 million people received unemployment benefits in the week ending Feb. 7, with 7 million more “out of the workforce but wanting work” according to the Labor Department; that is 16% unemployment.

That is LaRouche’s Triple Curve “Typical Collapse Function”—financial collapse or hyperinflationary explosion. Some market experts like Michael Burry of The Big Short fame now foresee the latter coming soon.

Wall Street’s banks continue to go further out on speculative limbs. According to the FDIC, U.S.-based banks, as of Feb. 10, have received $800 billion in additional deposits since July 2020, while their loans and leases outstanding have dropped by nearly $300 billion in the same seven months. Concentrating on the biggest Wall Street banks, they have continued shifting their assets to trading desks and “fixed income” interest rate arbitrage: JPMorgan Chase from 34% of assets last January to 42% now; Goldman Sachs from 63% to 78%; Morgan Stanley from 50% to 56%, and so on.

What must be done in such danger, LaRouche showed, is to use new national credit, to rapidly add new productive employment and increase productivity in production generally by technological breakthroughs in new economic infrastructure—for example, in nuclear pow-
er, crash programs for fusion power and space exploration, very high-speed transportation of people, goods, machinery. If, instead, we allow the Green New Deal’s “great leap backward” in human productivity, with such throwback technology as just failed in Texas—if we allow the governors of other states to push through this “Texas model” of wind and natural gas backup—we will pay very dearly in human life.

We know what Lyndon LaRouche said must be done in such a situation. Put through a Glass–Steagall reform to break up Wall Street’s speculative casinos, and quickly create a national credit facility by nationalizing the Federal Reserve or creating a Hamiltonian national bank. Inject that credit into the economy through infrastructure agencies in particular, to create new productive employment and raise productivity with new technologies—exactly what the trillions in so-called COVID-19 “relief” spending has not done. Pay farmers fair prices to raise and process food. Take the breakthroughs of the spacecraft at Mars and put human beings on the Moon again.

The report you are reading, adapted from the EIR report, The Great Leap Backward: LaRouche Exposes the Green New Deal, is a critical tool to speed those actions Lyndon LaRouche would have insisted on.

Climate Change: Science vs. Nonsense

Before we dive into a few basic absurdities of the fraud of catastrophic man-made climate change, we should remember that the essential argument of the Great Reset and the Green New Deal is premised on the fraud that carbon dioxide (CO₂) is driving extremely dangerous climate change, and must be eliminated by moving toward “carbon neutrality”—so long as it is not with nuclear power.

It used to be called “global warming,” but when warm parts of the world got colder, they decided to just start blaming any variation in weather on the actions of humanity—particularly those actions which increase the living standard of human beings that the British monarchy would rather exterminate on their warpath back to the days of feudalism.

People have accepted these arguments often out of fear of being ostracized from their peer groups in a classic form of behavior modification (brainwashing), straight out of the handbook of London’s Tavistock Clinic. Others are unable on their own to make heads or tails of the theory, due to a lack of scientific rigor, caused by decades of cultural degeneration. Still others accepted the fraud, thinking that CO₂ is some sort of pollution, listed by Obama as a dangerous pollutant, even though plants love it!

Indian Prime Minister Indira Gandhi, a friend of Lyndon LaRouche and Helga Zepp-LaRouche, once asked “Are not poverty and need the greatest polluters?” The answer is yes, but the oligarchs at Davos intend to force humanity back into mud-huts, burning wood for heat, as the drive for including biomass as a “renewable” energy source attests.

Warming and cooling trends have existed since the beginning of this planet, since they are almost entirely driven by processes in our solar system, our galaxy, and even beyond. The following quick points are a reminder of that reality, and a reminder that there is no “consensus” of CO₂ as the leading cause of perilous climate change:

• Climate is determined by long-range solar astronomical cycles that are driven by the regular periodicities in the eccentricity (about 90,000 to 100,000 years), tilt (40,000 years), and precession (21,000 years) of the Earth’s orbit. Over the past 800,000 years, the Earth’s climate has gone through eight distinct ice age cycles of glacial buildup followed by relatively warm interglacial periods lasting about 10,000 years. The current interglacial period has lasted more than the 10,000-year average. Could a new “ice age” be coming?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Correlation of Interglacials with Orbital Eccentricity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Eccentricity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Over long time scales, astronomical cycles determine the climate. From this standpoint, we are overdue for an Ice Age!
Collaboration between nations will be critical to the future of humanity: new discoveries, asteroid defense, and mining of helium-3 from the surface of the moon for fusion power on Earth and beyond. In February 2020, the U.S., China, and the U.A.E. all had newly arrived missions to Mars as initial steps in continuing exploration and settlement of the Red Planet.

Lake Chad Replenishment Project (Transaqua)
Transaqua would replenish the depleted Lake Chad, irrigate 12–17 million acres of land, and create 4,000 MW of hydroelectric capacity.

Humanity’s Future in Space
Nuclear /fission power will be essential during the time required for the successful crash program to develop fusion power. Modern fission reactors have improved in efficiency and safety. Small modular reactors could be mass produced on an assembly line and shipped around the world to speedily overcome the global power shortage.

The World Landbridge

Nuclear /fission and fusion

Lake Chad

Replenishment Project (Transaqua)

Transaqua would replenish the depleted Lake Chad, irrigate 12–17 million acres of land, and create 4,000 MW of hydroelectric capacity.

Nuclear /fission power will be essential during the time required for the successful crash program to develop fusion power. Modern fission reactors have improved in efficiency and safety. Small modular reactors could be mass produced on an assembly line and shipped around the world to speedily overcome the global power shortage.
Collaboration between nations will be critical to the future of humanity: new discoveries, asteroid defense, and mining of helium-3 from the surface of the moon for fusion power on Earth and beyond. In February 2020, the U.S., China, and the U.A.E. all had newly arrived missions to Mars as initial steps in continuing exploration and settlement of the Red Planet.

Humanity's Future in Space
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• One of the leading theories on the relationship of solar cycles to climate change, hypothesizes that the magnetic field of the sun alters the galactic cosmic radiation that interacts with Earth’s atmosphere. Danish scientist Henrik Svensmark and Israeli researcher Nir Shaviv say that solar activity (as measured, for example, by the count of sun-spots), deflects cosmic radiation that would otherwise interact with our atmosphere to catalyze the formation of clouds. Less solar activity means more cosmic radiation, more clouds, and cooler temperatures.

• Rising Sea Level: There is no catastrophic, apocalyptic rise in the level of the ocean, which has been rising at about half a foot per century since the end of the little Ice Age, with no acceleration; the exponential increase in CO₂ levels has had no impact whatsoever.

• The IPCC, or Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change, advertises its scary pronouncements as a “consensus,” but in fact, it has ignored the opposing views of reviewers and many of the scientists listed as members of the IPCC. Sceptics are often bludgeoned by the claim that “97% of all climate scientists agree that global warming is caused by man.” So where does this famous “consensus” claim come from?

The answer is: “It depends.”

Some studies are based on surveys of scientists, while others are based on reviewing published papers and then judging (in the view of the researcher) whether the paper endorsed the hypothesis of significant human involvement in climate change. Not surprisingly, this technique is open to enormous error and bias.

Try asking “does the climate change?” Yes, obviously. Inquire “does human activity have in influence on the climate?” Sure, human beings have some effect.

Now pose more important questions, such as “how much?” and “what to do about it?” Then you’ll find that the seeming clarity implied by the “97%” figure vanishes.

Does the potential risk caused by carbon dioxide justify denying development and causing millions of deaths every year through energy poverty perpetuated by extremely expensive, inefficient power sources such as wind and solar?

Would the costs of accommodating to slightly warmer weather be dramatically higher than the costs of upending industrial civilization to prevent the output of carbon dioxide?

These are the real questions that need answering.

The cold truth is that for the British monarchy, the ends justify the means.

Forbidding the use of carbon-based fuel, while preventing the adoption of nuclear technology, will kill billions of people, since “interruptibles” like wind, solar and biomass cannot possibly sustain the present world population.

Learn more about why CO₂ reduction is costly, deadly, and unnecessary: thelarouche.org/co2
THE REAL HUNGER GAMES

British Crown Think-Tank: We Intend To Take Away Your Food

by Gretchen Small

Feb. 5—The lead story on the website of Her Majesty’s Royal Institute of International Affairs (RIIA) since February 3, is a “research paper” laying out a strategy to systematically reduce food production and consumption worldwide. It proposes doing so by using methods similar to those being employed now to drive down energy use by banning fossil fuels—all in the name of defending “Nature.”

This document from the RIIA, “Food System Impacts on Biodiversity Loss: Three Levers for Food System Transformation in Support of Nature,” baldly admits that the intent of the monarchy’s policy is to raise the cost of food worldwide, and forcibly reduce world food production permanently. To propose doing so at a time when famine threatens hundreds of millions of lives, and an even greater number of families are going hungry in “rich” and poor countries alike, makes it undeniably clear that this is a plan for depopulation.

The five authors who wrote the paper are all veterans of the “climate crisis” mafia, starting with lead author Tim Benton, who heads the Energy, Environment and Resources Program at Chatham House (as the RIIA is known). Benton was one of the authors of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change’s “Special Report on Climate Change and Land,” and the “UK Climate Change Risk Assessment 2017.”

Royals: ‘Reduce Food Demand’ Worldwide

The premise of the RIAA study is that “the production of food is the primary cause of biodiversity loss globally,” on land, and in freshwater and the seas. “The area of land occupied by agriculture has increased by around 5.5 times since 1600 and is still increasing,” it says. “Currently, cropping and animal husbandry occupy about 50% of the world’s habitable land.” Production of food is harmful for “degrading or destroying natural habitats and contributing to species extinction.”

They object that for decades,

Policies and economic structures have aimed to produce ever more food at ever lower cost. Intensified agricultural production degrades soils and ecosystems, driving down the productive capacity of land and necessitating even more intensive food production to keep pace with demand. Growing global consumption of cheaper calories and resource intensive foods aggravates these pressures. Current food production depends heavily on the use of inputs such as fertilizer, pesticides, energy, land and water.

Therefore, the RIIA proposes three “levers” for crushing the current “cheaper food paradigm.”

First: “Change dietary patterns to reduce food demand.... Continued growth in food demand exerts ever-growing pressure on land resources.” How? The most “crucial element ... to bring food system emissions in line with the temperature goals of the Paris Agreement on climate change,” say they, is to downshift hu-
manity away from high-value meat protein diets into predominantly plant-based diets—and to lower plant food consumption too, by reducing “overconsumption of calories.” Americans are singled out. The Royals calculate that "a switch from beef to beans in the diets of the entire U.S. population could free up ... 42% of U.S. cropland—for other uses such as ecosystem restoration or more nature-friendly farming."

Second: Land must be taken out of farming, “protected and set aside for Nature.” Not on any small scale, either:

This will typically require significant areas of land to be left or managed for nature, primarily because the extinction risk for any species grows as its population size shrinks, and because many large animals require a large area of habitat to sustain an adequate population.

Third: Farming must be transformed; there must be a forced reduction of the inputs used in modern farming, including of the machinery which has freed men and women from backbreaking labor in the fields.

No one “lever” will work without the others, they repeat, but “dietary change”—reducing “food demand”—is “essential in order to preserve existing native ecosystems and restore those that have been removed or degraded.”

Since most of humanity will never voluntarily accept such policies, “global guidelines in policy areas such as responsible investment, dietary change and nature-based climate change mitigation solutions” are required. “Incentives” and “responsible investment”—cutting credit to modern farming, as also to modern forms of energy—will be necessary. Such are the proposed measures of the RIIA to the series of international conferences and summits scheduled for 2021 on “food systems and biodiversity,” and the first "UN Food Systems Summit" later in the year.

Fake meat, poverty for farmers, and starvation for us all—European farmers roll in their tractors to protest.

**USDA Analysis Reveals: ‘Green Deal’ Farming Cuts Food, Cuts Population**

by Marcia Merry Baker

Jan. 10—The European Commission (EC), executive arm of the European Union, released its “Farm to Fork and Biodiversity Strategies” in May 2020. Those so-called strategies are the core part of its new EU Green Deal, whose consequences will directly result in significantly less food output, and more hunger and hardship for millions of people. Farmers have taken to the streets with their tractors over 2019–2020 in Germany, the Netherlands, and elsewhere to oppose the EU dictates, which technically are to be imposed nation by nation over the next 10 years, with an EC review session scheduled for 2023.

The gist of the new approach is simple: First, farmers are ordered to use less land for crops and livestock, less fertilizer, less crop-protection chemicals, and so on. This guarantees less food output. Second, for the first time ever, the purpose of agriculture laws will be changed from food production, to so-called environmental enhancement, and lessening carbon emissions. The stated EC goal is "to reconcile our food system with the needs of the planet"—not the human population! The EC set out a timeline for action, including revamping the EU-wide Common Agriculture Policy (the farm/food support law, begun in 1962), and starting up a “carbon farming initiative” in 2021.

In November, the U.S. Department of Agriculture’s Economic Research Service published a devastating
analysis of the impact of the Green Deal’s Farm to Fork/ Biodiversity Strategies, coming on top of the pandemic. The title of the U.S. Department of Agriculture’s Economic Research Service report is, “Economic and Food Security Impacts of the European Union Green Deal’s Farm to Fork and Biodiversity Strategies.” It is 52 pages long, with full-page, detailed data tables provided, as well as charts.

As reported by the USDA, the agricultural input reductions called for in the EC Farm to Fork/Biodiversity Strategies—called “Strategies” in their report and in this article—are: Land in agriculture, cut by 10%. Fertilizer use, cut by 20%. Pesticide use, cut by 50%. Antimicrobials—meaning anti-biotics and other medications—cut for livestock by 50%.

The justification for these cuts is given in various ways in the EC “Strategies” plan, which calls for a more “sustainable” way to produce food, that provides “stewardship of the environment.” The false premise here is that technology and scientific advance ruin the environment, and growth and population must be limited. This is a see-through rehash of the old Parson Malthus (1766-1834) claim that occasional depopulation is necessary to balance “nature” and people; Malthus worked for the British East India Company.

The EC speaks of achieving by 2030, a “fair, healthy, and environmentally friendly food system.” Whatever the rhetoric, major agro-food cartels (Unilever, Nestlé, Walmart, Cargill, JBS, etc.) are already in motion against governments and farmers in many nations, consolidating extreme control, and issuing decrees—green or not—about production. In India, for example, thousands of farmers have been protesting in the capital for two months.

Theoretically, the implied declines in food production from implementing the Strategies could be offset by other factors, such as higher-yielding seeds, adding more labor, or cushioning the impact of lowered output by decreasing waste in the food chain. These mitigating factors were not included in the USDA study, as they are not spelled out in the EU Strategies plans.

On the Global Scenario, the USDA report states, “When the Strategies are adopted at the global level, the number of food insecure people increases to 185 million... The increase in food insecurity is spread across all regions, but Africa (80 million) and other Asia (72 million) continue to be the most impacted. This is because they could experience the largest increase in commodity prices and the largest GDP declines.”
ECONOMIC STUDIES

A Disaster for the United States Economy

by Paul Gallagher

*Man, unlike the beasts, is able to change his population density by development.* —Lyndon LaRouche

Feb. 5—The human species is, we must realize, also tragically able to decrease its population density by great masses of unnecessary deaths, either by war, or by intentionally reversing development, forcing into reverse the advance of mankind’s scientific and technological capability. Examples of intentional depopulation can be seen in the history of the British Empire’s impositions on their colonies, as in 19th-Century India and China; and in what that empire sought to do to its American colonies, helping trigger the War of Independence. It is seen in the plan originated in Britain’s World Wildlife Fund and similar imperial bodies decades ago and is now shamelessly called the “Green New Deal,” as if FDR could have stood for such a thing.

In Germany or the United States, the continued imposition of a “Green New Deal” means tremendous price increases for electric power, industrial chaos, blackouts.... But in Africa, India, or any less industrially developed nation, it means population reduction by millions of unnecessary deaths.

What It Means To Shut Down Coal

With shock, the South African government learned late in 2020 that its new coal-power projects are cancelled, and it is under pressure to close down, in this decade, many of the coal-power plants which provide the lion’s share of electric power to the country. The world’s biggest fund management company, Wall Street’s Black-Rock, Inc., pressured South Korea’s leading power engineering company, KEPCO, which was building the South African power complexes, to abandon them.

Following this shock, the new CEO of the South African national power utility ESKOM (Electrical Supply Commission), under the same pressure, announced that South Africa would close one-third to one-half of its coal-fired plants by 2030—15–20 gigawatts. This is 30% or more of its total electric power capacity, in a nation which suffers chronic local and regional blackouts! In 2020, ESKOM had discussed requesting proposals for up to 12.5 GW capacity in small modular nuclear reactors; but this idea is not near realization or financing. Proposing to replace coal power with wind and solar is pathetic.

South Africa is a nation twice the size of the U.S. state of Texas, and with a comparable population density, but only half the electric power generation capacity. Just as overpriced projects of giant wind farms in the windiest parts of West Texas, with 750-mile new transmission lines to bring the power to the Gulf Coast, have been abandoned more than once, so any similar idea for South Africa is an expensive folly and would leave a completely unreliable electric grid even if it could be done.

Worse, electricity use per capita in South Africa has been dropping since 2008 and is now (2019) 3,800 kWh for the United States, the continued imposition of a “Green New Deal” means tremendous price increases for electric power, industrial chaos, and blackouts. Shown: A U.S. coal-fired power plant.
per year, less than half of the European level and 1,000 kWh/year less than in 1997 according to the IEA. The country’s hospital systems are, in some regions, over-whelmed already by the COVID-19 pandemic and subject to electricity unreliability. If this drop is extended and worsened by attempts to cut down the overwhelmingly dominant electricity source, reduction of the population will be a fact.

Dr. Kelvin Kemm, CEO of Stratek CC and former board chairman of the South African Nuclear Energy Corporation, made clear in his presentation on September 6, 2020 to a Schiller Institute webinar, that South Africa needs small modular nuclear plants as soon as possible to be built near population and production centers, where distribution lines can be made adequate.

**Bloomberg’s and Fink’s ‘Beyond Coal’**

The incoming Biden Administration has a policy of prohibiting any new power production with coal. The nominated Secretary of State, Anthony Blinken, denounced coal-power plants during his confirmation testimony, while blaming their construction on China. “We are not going to allow foreign investment in dirty technologies,” Blinken told the U.S. Senate, specifically referring to China’s building of coal-fired power plants in Belt and Road nations.

BlackRock CEO Larry Fink released a letter to corporate CEOs, timed with the World Economic Forum summit, in which he stated:

> More and more people understand that climate risk is investment risk. When finance really understands a problem, we take that future problem and bring it forward. That’s what we saw in 2020....

In other words, what the public is told is the risk of future effects of climate change, is actually made by huge funds like BlackRock into the immediate risk of denial of investment.

In the United States, half of all coal-power plants have been closed over the past five years by BlackRock’s and Sir Michael Bloomberg’s “Beyond Coal” drive, in spite of President Donald Trump. While the larger and more modern ones remain on line, for now, rated coal-electric generating capacity has fallen by half. Coal-power electric generation fell by 25% in the United States in 2020 alone. This was not a function of lower economic activity under the pandemic. Wind and solar-power generation rose by 12% in the same time; natural-gas turbine generation by 9%; while nuclear power generation fell by 2.5%.

The Energy Information Agency (EIA) says that total electricity consumption in the United States in 2020 was approximately 7% less than two years earlier, and will remain at that depressed level in 2021. Since coal was slightly above 20% of electric power generation in 2020, the drop in coal power almost entirely accounted for the drop in power overall. The two will continue together.

Neither solar- and wind-power capacity, nor the cycling gas turbine generation capacity necessary to back it up, are being, or can be put on line in the United States as rapidly as coal-power capacity is being taken off. Nuclear power capacity is slowly shrinking at the same time. According to the U.S. Energy Information Administration (EIA) total electricity consumption dropped in 7 of the 13 years from 2007 to 2019, including 3% in 2019, and then the above-cited 7% drop in 2020. Per capita annual electricity generation and use has fallen since 2009 from nearly 14 MWh to 11.5 MWh, a huge 17% drop, which was accelerating in 2019 and 2020. Industrial electricity use per capita has dropped by 25% during that decade-plus,
Productivity Progress Reversed

One way of expressing productivity in industrial processes would be the ability to use less energy, less work, to produce the same product, and therefore to produce more and better output with the same input of energy and work time. Technological progress usually accounts for this increase in productivity. The "Green New Deal" proposes to reverse that across the U.S. economy.

The plan by that name, introduced during 2019–20 by Senators Bernie Sanders and Edward Markey and Representative Alexandria Ocasio-Cortez, and supported then by many other Democratic officials, proposed to replace both 100 million gasoline-powered motor vehicles with electric vehicles, and half of the coal and oil used in residential and commercial heating with electricity. This would require roughly 360 gigawatts (a gigawatt, GW, is one million kilowatts) of new electric power capacity in the U.S. fleet of power plants. But since at the same time, the Green New Deal also eliminates coal-fired power production in the provision of electric power for industry, and replaces it with "renewables," about 485 GW of new electric power capacity would be needed.

But all electric power capacity is not the same by any means. A wind farm of, say, 1,000 megawatts (a megawatt, MW, is one thousand kilowatts) of rated capacity, takes 7–10 years to build, and its "median performance"—actual electricity generated—is half or less than that of a 1,000 MW coal-fired plant, which takes three years to build. (A solar farm generates one-quarter or less.) To make up for this, closer to 900 GW of new electric power would be required if in the form of wind power (much more than that if solar); and it will take three times as long to add it, than if the new power were in the form of modern "clean" coal-fired power plants—which emit carbon dioxide but release very low levels of nitrous oxides, sulfur dioxide, and particulates.

A huge bill of materials would be required to build the 200,000 or so large wind turbines necessary for this, not to mention an impossible/unavailable bill of materials for all the electric vehicles (see "Electric Vehicles, But No Electricity" in this report). But leave these huge obstacles aside for the moment and consider: Since all these different forms of power plants are produced by industrial processes, industry would be using far more energy and expending far more work-time, than the existing energy and work it is replacing in the form of electricity from coal-fired and nuclear power plants.

This would seem to be central to the definition of lowering economic productivity.

Anti-Productivity in Detail

Consider the replacing of 100 million gasoline burning motor vehicles with electric vehicles (out of about 250 million personal motor vehicles and trucks on American roads). If they are driven 50 miles/day, these 100 million electric vehicles will require 1,300 gigawatt-hours (GWh) of electric power per day, or 13% of total current American electricity use.

Keep that figure in mind to consider the second "leg" of the Green New Deal, "electrification of all buildings." The claim is constantly repeated, of replacing fossil fuel use in residential and commercial buildings, primarily for heating, with electricity. Approximately 20% of the current 4 million GWh-equivalent of U.S. residential and commercial energy use per year is currently not provided by either electricity or natural gas. (Gas is, of course, a fossil fuel, but it is given an opportunistic pass for decades to come by some Green New Dealers.) Replacing that 20% with 800,000 GWh/year of electric power requires raising U.S. generation and use by another 20%, beyond the 13% for electric vehicles. But because it is intermittent, the median output of a given electric capacity of wind power is half that of the same capacity powered by coal; for solar power, it is one-fourth that of coal power. So, at best, replacing that 20% of residential and commercial energy use with electricity produced by wind and solar will actually require 1.6 million GWh/year or more of added power capacity. That means adding 440 GW of new capacity at the median output of wind, which is considerably better than that of solar; and the 100 million electric vehicles discussed above will require 280 GW new capacity at the median output of wind.

So, the total new capacity required for just these so-called "sustainable" goals of the Green New Deal, 720 GW, is equal to two-thirds of the entire United States electric power fleet.

Thirdly, some 9% of the United States’ total energy use consists in industrial use of coal and oil for energy. If even half of this were supposed to be replaced by “renewable” sources—which, in the “green finance” taxonomy, don’t include nuclear electric power—that would require building wind and solar power equivalent to another 125 GW capacity—but actually more, 250 GW at the median output of wind turbines. So, the Green New Deal would
require adding, in total, the equivalent of nearly 90% of the United States current electric power fleet, which has 1,100 GW rated capacity.

If all this were wind turbine power, by a very conservative rounding down of specifications given in the U.S. Department of Energy’s “Ultimate Fast Facts Guide to Nuclear Energy,” it would cover 6.5% of the United States’ land mass, 250,000 square miles of wind farms, the size of Nevada, Arizona and half of Colorado. If solar, it would devour the area of five such states. Also needed: conservatively, 150–200,000 miles of new long-distance high-voltage transmission lines, even assuming that local distribution lines would be able to distribute all the additional power. And we’re not talking about the power losses in transmission along these very long new high-voltage lines.

Almost buried under this Green New Deal scheme would be the only sensible act suggested by it—electrifying rail passenger and freight transportation and raising it to higher speeds. This, by contrast, would require only an addition to U.S. total electric power capacity of about 1%, or 10–12 GW of new power; or 25–30 GW new power to include the additional construction of 10–12 new high-speed rail corridors. But in the Green New Deal, electrification of existing rail lines is not proposed.

Electricity Grid Nightmare

These comparisons of different power sources are summarized in a more compact form on page 38.

That electricity would become twice, perhaps three times as expensive as the current average 10–11 cents/kWh in America, can be assumed from the experience of Germany and Denmark which are well embarked on this road, though not this far. This will cut capital investment and power use in industries of every type. In areas where concentrations of high-technology industry remain, such as the northern Midwest states, the South and Southwest, the attempt to use electricity grids largely supported by intermittent power technologies will cause damaging power interruptions—and the same is true regarding modern medical centers with complexes of hospitals and clinics.

But much more dangerous will be the condition of the now much larger, supposedly much "smarter" electric grid. If anything like the scheme described above could be carried out, it would require a U.S. electrical capacity of some 2,000 GW installed, nearly half of which would be wind and solar farms whose generated output fluctuates daily between zero and 40–50% of their rated power capacity. Since no electric grid obeying the laws of electrodynamics, no matter how “smart,” could cope with
this constant huge fluctuation, the 1,000 GW of newly added power would consist of a mix of wind and solar farms, and large numbers of new natural gas-powered turbine plants which “back up” these “renewables”—better called “interruptibles.” The other half of the U.S. fleet would also continue to include a very large number of gas turbine plants, with declining numbers of nuclear power plants and hydroelectric dams, and some biomass mini-plants.

A very large share of the natural gas and nuclear plants—while capable of relatively stable and reliable operation for the gas turbines and extremely reliable operation for the nuclear plants—would instead be ramped up and down, shut down and restarted, according to the demands of the intermittent and fluctuating output levels of the “interruptibles.” The performance of the nuclear plants in particular would be degraded by this, and their operating lifetimes shortened closer to the very short lifetimes of the wind turbines and solar farms.

And the more wind and solar were added to the grid, the more unstable it would become, as amply shown by the German “energy transition” since 2011. To the prospect of a nationwide blackout due to existing but remote threats—a huge solar coronal ejection directed at the Earth, or an EMP attack using nuclear weapons—we will have added the increasingly grave threat of a nationwide blackout due to our own policy of returning to “throwback” energy technologies with low energy-flux densities.

---

Steel- and Auto-Making Productivity Falls

The other crucial economic sectors in which the Green New Deal would do irreparable damage, are agriculture and livestock raising, and steel production. A 2020 study by a think-tank for the OECD called SYSTEMIQ, which was created under the Paris Accord to look for long-term arcs of change in various sectors under a Green Deal, made the shocking forecast that world steel production would decline by 23% between now and 2100 under what it called “the Paris Effect”!

In the eyes of these neo-Malthusians, the global steel sector already “suffers from overcapacity.” The Malthusian solution is revealed in the graph accompanying the study’s chapter on steel, where global steel production is assumed to decrease from 2,342 metric tons (Mt) per year to 1,786 Mt by the year 2100. Within this total, the segment of “primary production” further shrinks 50%—because primary steel production requires large-scale heating and burning of carbon fuels—while the segment of “recycled” steel by electric-arc and similar processes more than doubles, comprising more than half of all steelmaking by 2100.

Recycled steel is inherently of a lower quality (strength) than high-carbon primary production product, and some special grades of steel cannot be reliably produced by recycling at all.

The sponsors of this SYSTEMIQ include Lord Nicholas Stern, another protégé of Prince Charles, and Klaus Schwab of the World Economic Forum, and the Green Finance Institute.
So, it is not only difficult to see where all the materials for hundreds of millions of very large lithium batteries for electric vehicles will come from; it is hard to see even where the high-quality rolled steel products to make the vehicles themselves will be coming from. (Not to mention the special steels required for rails for high-speed and magnetic-levitation rail transport.)

The Example of California

California is as far ahead of the rest of the United States in implementing the Green Deal, as Germany is in making a cautionary tale for Europe.

California’s governor in 2005 issued an executive order, then made law by its 2006 Global Warming Solutions Act, that it would cut CO₂ emissions to just 20% of the 1990 level by 2050; and, among other things, that it would not only eliminate coal power but refuse to import coal-fired power from any other state. It has since done these things. But its attempt to replace coal and nuclear with constantly expanding wind farms, solar farms and natural gas turbine plants has failed.

Electric power generation in California dropped by 2.7% in 2019, while “interruptible” power technologies rose from 55% to 57% of total rated capacity. The state’s target is that this will become 100% by 2045. Coal has been eliminated in the state, and nuclear power plants, which once had combined installed capacity of 12 GW, now are at 2.4 GW from a single plant, Diablo Canyon, and will go to zero in 2024.

The state’s per capita energy consumption is the third lowest in the nation. Regarding actual generation of electricity as opposed to installed capacity: Coal power has been completely eliminated in the state; residual nuclear energy is just 2.6% of total generation compared to 19% nationwide; wind, solar, biofuel and hydro accounted for 36.6%—double the national average—and natural gas turbine plants for 60%. This is precisely the Green New Deal profile for electric power, as detailed above.

The result is also predictable. In-state generation of electricity fell by 5% in 2018 before the above-cited 2.7% in 2019, the result of shutting (inclusive of 2020 actions) about 12 GW of gas turbine capacity. The residential electricity price is 50% above the national average; the commercial electricity price, 70% higher; and the price for industrial electricity, 150% higher.

California suffered regional power blackouts three times in 2019 and 2020 combined. These occurred because the state government attempted to shut down some of the (“polluting”) gas-turbine capacity, which had replaced coal and nuclear and had become the back-up redundant power for the wind and solar farms. With power demand high in the summer, the state regulator, which already was far above any other state in importing power from other states, tried to import still more at high-demand times of day and was rebuffed. Blackouts ensued, primarily in the southern part of the state.

Remarkably, after the August 2020 “high-level emergency” declared on the grid, with wholesale electricity prices reaching $1/kWh and the ensuing regional blackouts, California’s governor acknowledged that the state’s economically suicidal energy policy was responsible. Governor Gavin Newsom said the displacement of fossil fuel by solar and wind was “a moral and ethical imperative” but it had created “gaps in reliability” in the electric grid. Thus, we are morally and ethically required to have unreliable electricity supplies through a “Green New Deal.”

Manufacturing growth has been rendered nearly impossible in a state which once led the nation in high-skilled aerospace manufacturing, for example. California had 2,050,000 manufacturing jobs in 1990 but is down to 1,220,000 at the start of 2021, a 40% drop. During the gain of approximately 600,000 manufacturing jobs nationwide during the Trump Administration’s first three years, California’s manufacturing employment stagnated; it remains at the level of 2015.

California imports one-third of its total electricity—and will not, by law, import power produced by coal. Were even a significant minority of states to reach that situation, regional power blackouts would become a certainty, producing chaos in industry, medical care, and many other fields.

In a nation in which states with a great deal of nuclear and coal power, such as Pennsylvania, Illinois and Alabama, are the biggest exporters of power; and states like California and New York, with no coal and only residual nuclear power, are the biggest importers; the consequences of imposing California’s Green New Deal nationwide are obviously dangerous. The biggest electricity importing states also exhibit lower, and falling per capita electricity use; New York’s electricity use, for example, as of 2018 became the fourth-lowest per capita, above only California, Rhode Island, and Virginia. New York has just eliminated 13% of its power capacity by closing the remaining Indian Point nuclear reactors, and despite plentiful hydropower, is getting most of its power from “interruptibles” and from natural gas.
The British monarchy is desperate to launch their Great Reset before the onrushing collapse of their financial system. They know that nations around the world are increasingly orienting towards the burgeoning New Paradigm of joining economic growth, and fear that in the face of the collapse, they would lose control of their geopolitical system. For half a century, Lyndon LaRouche, his wife Helga Zepp-LaRouche, and their collaborators, have been organizing that New Paradigm, preparing for this moment of systemic collapse.

At the leading edge of the New Paradigm is the Belt and Road Initiative of China, announced formally in 2013 by Xi Jinping. The BRI was inspired by Lyndon LaRouche and Helga Zepp-LaRouche’s policy called the New Silk Road, which they intended to ultimately become a “World Land-Bridge” to connect all nations on the planet, ending British geopolitical warfare with a policy of “peace through development.” The other leading edge of international collaboration around a New Paradigm is in space, where, as of this writing, the three nations of the United States, China and the United Arab Emirates have recently arrived at Mars. However, it is China’s lunar program that hints at an explosive potential for humanity—the eventual mining of lunar helium-3 as a fuel for fusion power. It is estimated that there is a 10,000-year energy supply for our planet in the form of helium-3 on the surface of the moon, and the Sun sends more every day in the form of solar wind. A breakthrough in fusion would be the death knell of the argument of limited energy resources used to justify the zero-growth agenda of the British monarchy.

In this war to end the reign of the British monarchy and their Great Reset, and establish a New Paradigm for humanity, it is critical to educate the “mass strike” dynamic globally in the economic thinking of Lyndon LaRouche. Donald Trump’s actions to pull out of the Paris Climate Accord, moving on the Artemis program for space exploration, and lifting economic regulations for fossil fuels and promoting nuclear power, indicated his commitment to reviving manufacturing and the physical economy more generally. However, without Glass–Steagall and a Hamiltonian credit policy, there was no ability to adequately fund the large-scale infrastructure he had called for, and no way to break the political power that Wall Street holds over both sides of the aisle in Congress. Perhaps for political reasons or otherwise, Trump also confused his political base by referring to the growing stock market bubble as a success of his presidency. Without clarity on the absolute necessity of LaRouche’s Four Laws, Trump and the American people have not adequately demanded the required policy to deal with this crisis. It is now critical for the leadership of this global “mass strike” process to understand, and fight for, the policies required under the guidance of LaRouche’s scientific approach to physical economy.

Two essential and related concepts from Lyndon LaRouche’s voluminous writings on the science physical economy are critical to educate the global mass strike...
dynamic—energy flux density and its relationship to potential relative population density. These are at the core of the third and fourth law of LaRouche's Four Laws contained earlier in this report.

The following excerpts are from LaRouche's 1983 book, There Are No Limits to Growth. The following excerpt outlines LaRouche's conception of “potential relative population density”:

Given a population inhabiting a certain territory, and let that territory be measured in square kilometers of habitable area. By developing and using the natural resources available in that area, how many people can be maintained through the work of the population's labor force? On the average, the answer is given as the average number of persons per average square-kilometer. Persons per square-kilometer is population-density.

That figure is not an adequate measurement. Land varies in quality, so that one square-kilometer is not of the same quality for human habitation as another square-kilometer. Those desirable qualities of land, which express such differences, are variable qualities. Man may improve the land, or deplete it. The quality of land is the net result of combined depletions and improvements of its qualities. Therefore, we say that the value of all square-kilometers are not the same; they are different, and they are variable. Therefore, we must measure population-density in terms of relative qualities of the land inhabited: relative population-density.

The present level of population is not necessarily a measurement of what the population level could be. We must determine what that population could become, as a maximum, given the kinds of production technologies presently in use. What is the potential level of population, given those technologies? That is the general meaning of potential relative population-density.

We have already indicated that the potential relative population-density of primitive society is about 0.06 to 0.10/square-kilometer: about 10 millions maximum population. There exist today approximately 4.5 billion individuals, more than 100 times the levels of primitive man. Since a factor of “10” is called one order of magnitude, this means that mankind has raised its potential relative population-density by two orders of magnitude. With full use of existing levels of technology, combined with the thermonuclear, directed-beam, and bio-technology coming into existence now, our planet could sustain a population of tens of billions of persons, and at an average standard of living higher than that for the United States during the early 1970s: a rise above primitive society by three orders of magnitude!

The next excerpt looks at the relationship between “potential relative population density” and the energy flux density of the system, where he begins, having just laid out the situation in which the technology of production remains constant and costs rise due to depletion of the existing resource base:

At the point the society's potential relative population-density falls below the population-density of the existing population, the Four Horsemen of the Apocalypse enter. Famine promotes desperate strife. War and bloody civil commotions worsen the conditions of famine. The famine-stricken population becomes a breeder of diseases, spiraling into epidemics and pandemics, as was the case during the early fourteenth century Europe. The breakdown of agriculture and hygienic institutions promotes the eruptions of pestilences. The society is conquered, collapses, or changes its ways abruptly.

Technological progress prevents such catastrophes in two related ways. First, simply by increasing the productive powers of labor, technological progress overcomes the rising costs of production of essential raw materials. Second, technological revolutions redefine the range of usable natural resources, and introduce new kinds of raw materials to the bill of requirements, just as the industrial revolution's use of coal overcame the threatened collapse of Europe caused by exhaustion of forests.
Technological progress is indispensable even to maintain a constant level of potential relative population-density. Therefore, constantly rising levels of energy supplies, both per square-kilometer and per capita are indispensable to the survival of society. These growing energy supplies must become relatively cheaper: The cost of producing the average amount of increased energy per capita must tend to be significantly less than the old cost of producing less energy per capita. The energy-flux density of energy supplies must also increase, at least in a general way. There must also be periodic revolutions in the definition of the term “natural resources,” even under conditions of a constant potential relative population-density.

The collapse in potential relative population density that LaRouche just outlined is exactly the effect that will only accelerate under the Green New Deal. Either we reverse course, or billions will die in relatively short order. What follows are only a sampling of the required policies that Lyndon LaRouche, Helga Zepp-LaRouche, and their collaborators have been promoting for decades to bring about a New Paradigm for humanity.

See the centerfold for examples of these projects.

THE FOUR NEW LAWS TO SAVE THE U.S.A. NOW!

Not An Option: An Immediate Necessity

by Lyndon H. LaRouche, Jr.

The following statement is for immediate action. The priority is assigned to all means and measures of public action, nationally and internationally, without reservation. That priority is existential for the policies of our republic, and for the general information of, and by all relevant circles worldwide, beginning this date of June 8, 2014.

The Fact of the Matter

The economy of the United States of America, and also that of the trans-Atlantic political-economic regions of the planet, are now under the immediate, mortal danger of a general, physical-economic, chain-reaction breakdown-crisis of that region of this planet as a whole. The name for that direct breakdown-crisis throughout those indicated regions of the planet, is the presently ongoing introduction of a general “Bail-in” action under the several, or more governments of that region: the effect on those regions, will be comparable to the physical-economic collapse of the post-“World War I” general collapse of the economy of the German Weimar Republic: but, this time, hitting, first, the entirety of the nation-state economies of the trans-Atlantic region, rather than some defeated economies within Europe.

A chain-reaction collapse, to this effect, is already accelerating with an effect on the money-systems of the nations of that region. The present acceleration of a “Bail-in” policy throughout the trans-Atlantic region, as underway now, means mass-death suddenly hitting the populations of all nations within that trans-Atlantic region: whether directly, or by “overflow.”

The effects of this already prepared action by the monetarist interests of that so-designated region, unless stopped virtually now, will produce, in effect, an accelerating rate of genocide throughout that indicated portion of the planet immediately, but, also, with catastrophic “side effects” of comparable significance in the Eurasian regions.

The Available Remedies

The only location for the immediately necessary action which could prevent such an immediate genocide throughout the trans-Atlantic sector of the planet, requires the U.S. Government’s now immediate decision to institute four specific, cardinal measures: measures which must be fully consistent with the specific intent of the original U.S. Federal Constitution, as had been specified by U.S. Treasury Secretary Alexander Hamilton while he remained in office: (1) immediate re-enactment of the Glass–Steagall law instituted by U.S. President Franklin D. Roosevelt, without modification, as to principle of action. (2) A return to a system of top-down, and thoroughly defined, National Banking.
The actually tested, successful model to be authorized is that which had been instituted, under the direction of the policies of national banking which had been actually, successfully installed under President Abraham Lincoln's superseding authority of a currency created by the Presidency of the United States (e.g., “Greenbacks”), as conducted as a national banking-and-credit-system placed under the supervision of the Office of the Treasury Secretary of the United States.

For the present circumstances, all other banking and currency policies, are to be superseded, or, simply, discontinued, as follows. Banks qualifying for operations under this provision, shall be assessed for their proven competence to operate as under the national authority for creating and composing the elements of this essential practice, which had been assigned, as by tradition, to the original office of Secretary of the U.S. Treasury under Alexander Hamilton. This means that the individual states of the United States are under national standards of practice, and, not any among the separate states of our nation.

(3) The purpose of the use of a Federal Credit-system, is to generate high-productivity trends in improvements of employment, with the accompanying intention, to increase the physical-economic productivity, and the standard of living of the persons and households of the United States. The creation of credit for the now urgently needed increase of the relative quality and quantity of productive employment, must be assured, this time, once more, as was done successfully under President Franklin D. Roosevelt, or by like standards of Federal practice used to create a general economic recovery of the nation, per capita, and for rate of net effects in productivity, and by reliance on the essential human principle, which distinguishes the human personality from the systemic characteristics of the lower forms of life: the net rate of increase of the energy-flux density of effective practice. This means intrinsically, a thoroughly scientific, rather than a merely mathematical one, and by the related increase of the effective energy-flux density per capita, and for the human population when considered as a whole. The ceaseless increase of the physical-productivity of employment, accompanied by its benefits for the general welfare, are a principle of Federal law which must be a paramount standard of achievement of the nation and the individual.

(4) “Adopt a Fusion-Driver ‘Crash Program.’” The essential distinction of man from all lower forms of life, hence, in practice, is that it presents the means for the perfection of the specifically affirmative aims and needs of human individual and social life. Therefore: the subject of man in the process of creation, as an affirmative identification of an affirmative statement of an absolute state of nature, is a permitted form of expression. Principles of nature are either only affirmation, or they could not be affirmatively stated among civilized human minds.

Given the circumstances of the United States, in particular, since the assassinations of President John F. Kennedy, and his brother, Robert, the rapid increase required for even any recovery of the U.S. economy, since that time, requires nothing less than measures taken and executed by President Franklin D. Roosevelt during his actual term in office. The victims of the evil brought upon the United States and its population since the strange death of President Harding, under Presidents Calvin Coolidge and Herbert Hoover (like the terrible effects of the Bush-Cheney and Barack Obama administrations, presently) require remedies comparable to those of President Franklin Roosevelt while he were in office.

This means emergency relief measures, including sensible temporary recovery measures, required to stem the tide of death left by the Coolidge-Hoover regimes: measures required to preserve the dignity of what were otherwise the unemployed, while building up the most powerful economic and warfare capabilities assembled under the President Franklin Roosevelt Presidency for as long as he remained alive in office. This meant the mustering of the power of nuclear power, then, and means thermonuclear fusion now. Without that intent and its accomplishment, the population of the United States in particular, faces, now, immediately, the most monstrous disaster in its history to date. In principle, without a Presidency suited to remove and dump the worst effects felt presently, those created presently by the Bush-Cheney and Obama Presidencies, the United States were soon finished, beginning with the mass-death of the U.S. population under the Obama Administration’s recent and now accelerated policies of practice.

There are certain policies which are most notably required, on that account, now, as follows:

Vernadsky on Man & Creation

V.I. Vernadsky’s systemic principle of human nature, is a universal principle, which is uniquely specific to the crucial factor of the existence of the human species. For example: “time” and “space” do not actually exist as a set of metrical principles of the Solar system; their admissible employment for purposes of communication is essentially a nominal presumption. Since competent science for today can be expressed only in terms of the
unique characteristic of the human species' role within the known aspects of the universe, the human principle is the only true principle known to us for practice: the notions of space and time are merely useful imageries.

Rather:

The essential characteristic of the human species, is its distinction from all other species of living processes: that, as a matter of principle, which is rooted scientifically, for all competent modern science, on the foundations of the principles set forth by Filippo Brunelleschi (the discoverer of the ontological minimum), Nicholas of Cusa (the discovery of the ontological maximum), and the positive discovery by mankind, by Johannes Kepler, of a principle coincident with the perfected Classical human singing scale adopted by Kepler, and the elementary measure of the Solar System within the still larger universe of the Galaxy, and higher orders in the universe.

Or, similarly, later, the modern physical-scientific standard implicit in the argument of Bernhard Riemann, the actual minimum (echoing the principle of Brunelleschi), of Max Planck, the actual maximum of the present maximum, that of Albert Einstein; and, the relatively latest, consequent implications of the definition of human life by Vladimir Ivanovich Vernadsky. These values are, each relative absolutes of measurement of man's role within the knowledge of the universe.

This set of facts pertains to the inherent fraud of the merely mathematicians and the modernist “musical performers” since the standard of the relevant paragon for music, Johannes Brahms (prior to the degenerates, such as the merely mathematicians, such as David Hilbert and the true model for every modern Satan, such as Bertrand Russell, or Tony Blair).

The knowable measure, in principle, of the difference between man and all among the lower forms of life, is found in what has been usefully regarded as the naturally upward evolution of the human species, in contrast to all other known categories of living species. The standard of measurement of these compared relationships, is that mankind is enabled to evolve upward, and that categorically, by those voluntarily noetic powers of the human individual will.

Except when mankind appears in a morally and physically degenerate state of behavior, such as within the cultures of the tyrants Zeus, the Roman Empire, and the British empire, presently: all actually sane cultures of mankind, have appeared, this far, in a certain fact of evolutionary progress from the quality of an inferior, to a superior species. This, when considered in terms of efficient effects, corresponds, within the domain of a living human practice of chemistry, to a form of systemic advances, even now leaps, in the chemical energy-flux density of society's increase of the effective energy-flux-density of scientific and comparable expressions of leaps in progress of the species itself: in short, a universal physical principle of human progress.

The healthy human culture, such as that of Christianity, if they warrant this affirmation of such a devotion, for example, represents a society which is increasing the powers of its productive abilities for progress, to an ever higher level of per-capita existence. The contrary cases, the so-called “zero-growth” scourges, such as the current British empire are, systemically, a true model consistent with the tyrannies of a Zeus, or, a Roman Empire, or a British (better said) “brutish” empire, such as the types, for us in the United States, of the Bush-Cheney and Obama administrations, whose characteristic has been, concordant with that of such frankly Satanic models as that of Rome and the British empire presently, a shrinking human population of the planet, a population being degraded presently in respect to its intellectual and physical productivity, as under those U.S. Presidencies, most recently.

Chemistry: The Yardstick of History

We call it “chemistry.” Mankind's progress, as measured rather simply as a species, is expressed typically in the rising power of the principle of human life, over the abilities of animal life generally, and relatively absolute superiority over the powers of non-living processes to achieve within mankind's willful intervention to that intended effect.

Progress exists so only under a continuing, progressive increase of the productive and related powers of the human species. That progress defines the absolute distinction of the human species from all others presently known to us. A government of people based on a policy of “zero-population growth and per capita standard of human life” is a moral, and practical abomination.

Man is mankind's only true measure of the history of our Solar system, and what reposes within it. That is the same thing, as the most honored meaning and endless achievement of the human species, now within nearby Solar space, heading upward to mastery over the Sun and its Solar system, the one discovered (uniquely, as a matter of fact), by Johannes Kepler.

A Fusion economy, is the presently urgent next step, and standard, for man's gains of power within the Solar system, and, later, beyond.
‘A Green Way of Development’ with Chinese Characteristics

by Richard A. Black, Schiller Institute Representative at the UN

Feb. 3—As a civilizational state with a continuous history going back 5,000 years, China has today created its own definition of the “greening” of economic policy.

Far from the genocidal “Green Deal” policy that Prince Charles Windsor-Mountbatten and his central banker cohorts pushed at the recent World Economic Forum (WEF) in Davos, Switzerland, China’s policy of “a green way of development and life,” as President Xi Jinping calls it, is a policy of a very high energy-density expansion—of nuclear fission power, of the development of thorium-based reactors, and of the achievement of energy production through thermonuclear fusion power whose helium fuel will be mined on the Moon. As is well known, China has very well-defined, medium-term economic goals extending to the year 2035, as well as physical economic plans for the next 30 years, at the 100th anniversary of the “New China.” Note: All of the above-named energy sources are 100% emissions-free!

Along the road to full achievement of this massive expansion of energy production for families, agriculture, and industry, clean coal is currently playing and will continue to play a major role, as well as oil and gas. The “green way of development and life” also means an opportunity for China to take an aggressive approach to dealing with her significant air and water pollution problems, which had built up in the earlier years of unregulated cheap labor factories and heavy industry expansion.

Plentiful, Clean Energy for the World

With 49 nuclear (uranium) fission plants producing electricity domestically—and another 16 more currently under construction—China is collaborating worldwide with nearly a dozen, mostly poor countries to build nuclear fission plants in those countries. They include Argentina, South Africa, Kenya, Sudan, Armenia, and Egypt.
Professor Song Yuntao, Deputy Director of Tokamak Engineering and Design at the Chinese Institute of Plasma Physics in Hubei, says that although critics say that it can’t be done, he is confident that China will start generating power from an experimental thermonuclear fusion reactor (hydrogen) by around 2040. Just last month, China powered up its HL-2M fusion experimental fusion device, its most advanced research facility. The popular media reported:

The development of nuclear fusion energy is not only a way to solve China’s strategic energy needs, but also has great significance for the future sustainable development of China’s energy and national economy.

These developments are a glimpse of what China’s President Xi Jinping meant, speaking at the UN General Assembly in September 2020, when he called on all nations to “launch a green revolution and move faster to create a green way of development and life....” Although China’s stated aim is to shift its energy production profile to achieve what it calls “carbon neutrality” by 2060—a full 40 years from today—it is clear that China’s public policy is to achieve steeply rising energy use per capita in its domestic population, to achieve a steep increase in the average energy-flux density of its power sources, and to contribute to a global “green way of development” by extending the revolutions in nuclear science to the former—currently economically desperate—colonial sector.

China’s calculations for CO₂ reduction pertain to economic activity within her own sovereign borders, and will not affect her programs of urgent fossil fuel plant construction in her many energy-starved Belt and Road Initiative (BRI) partner countries, each of which have their own energy plans. For the so-called developing countries, including China and India, there are no contractual requirements for CO₂ reduction until nine years from today, in 2030.

**China Goes Light: Helium Replaces Carbon**

Although it is open to great debate among climate physicists as to whether climate is affected at all by human activity—as opposed to the activity of periodic changes in the intra-galactic impact of cosmic-ray flux hitting our Earth—China has agreed to shift what it calls its energy structure and its economic structure to reduce both CO₂ emissions and real industrial pollutants of air and water. China plans to continue to increase CO₂ emissions until 2030, and then to decrease emissions by 8-10% per year until reaching, in 2060, “carbon neutrality.”

Professor Song tells us that by that year of 2060, China will have already been producing, for a full 20 years, a portion of its electricity from hydrogen and helium! Carbon will be relegated to our lead pencils, and to our carbohydrate-infused stir-fried noodles! Among the steps China is taking to comply with “the green way of development” are the following:

1. An Atmospheric Physics Research Center has been established in Beijing to calculate changing carbon dioxide emissions.
2. Automobile transportation will be shifted voluntarily to hybrid and electric cars. This will be done through education and economic incentives.
3. Airports, railroad stations and ports will be streamlined for energy efficiency, and car traffic will be internet enhanced to reduce slow moving traffic and traffic jams.
4. Forest stock volume will be increased by 6 billion cubic meters from the 2005 level.
5. The “green water and blue sky project” seeks to purify water emitted from the steelmaking process to allow that water “to meet the standard of keeping fish.”
6. Under construction is China’s thermal power molten salt experimental reactor, the TMSRLF1 in Wuwei, Gansu Province. It will use abundant thorium as its fuel, is by design inherently ultra-safe and economical.

![The Guangdong Nuclear Power Plant in Guangdong, China.](image)
to construct, and can be used to produce hydrogen and for desalination of water, as well as for cheap electricity production.

‘Innovation Will Take a Higher Share’

At a briefing in Beijing last month outlining the economic principles of China’s forthcoming 14th Five Year Plan, leading government economist Dr. Xin Xiangyang said the following:

Now, China has transitioned into high-quality development and is focusing on optimizing the structure of the economy so that people will focus more on the outcome of development and quality…. If we read between the lines, we can see the numbers and quantities. [The objective] to become a leading innovative country means to become among the top three in the world. Innovation will take a higher share. A culturally strong country implies a culture industry of 10% of GDP.

The mariner’s compass for China’s energy policy is to propel China to realizing a moderate level of prosperity within the general population, and to achieving a leading role for the nation globally in science. China is not interested in being Number One. This is very difficult for many—otherwise intelligent—people in the West to understand.

Dr. Xing Jijun, an experienced diplomat from China’s Ministry of Science and Technology (MOST), described China’s outlook at a Schiller Institute forum in New York in 2019. He explained to the American audience that, in science, China would prefer to be Number 2 or 3. He explained: if you’re Number 1, you are always fearful of losing your place. Instead, if you’re Number 2 or 3, you know in what direction you have to go—to “catch up!” He used the example of achieving a 5G network. Perhaps, China will get to 5G first. But then, Japan will make the breakthrough first to 6G … and then, the U.S. gets to 7G first.

Does that sound incredible?

China has been making world breakthroughs in agriculture and industry for 4,000 years—ever since the invention of the weaving of beautiful, natural silk in that earliest period. Why did the “Silk Road” trade develop? The whole world wanted, and paid heartily for, that beautiful, durable silk! Today’s China has resumed that innovation-driven spirit and capability. From that vantage point, think of plasma physicist Prof. Song Yuntao’s forecast of vast electricity production from fusion energy starting in 2040—free from all emissions! Very credible.

China’s National Energy Administration reports the following plan:

1. By 2030, energy production nationwide will be 10% from nuclear fission power, 64.6% from clean coal, yielding an energy use per capita of 5,500 kWh.
2. By 2050, energy production will be 15% from nuclear fission and 50.5% from clean coal, with an increase in per capita energy use to 8,500 kWh. (See “Nuclear Power in China,” a report from the World Nuclear Association, updated in January 2021.)

**First Principles: Two Presidents Stand Out**

While China is promising to significantly reduce all emissions from the use of fossil fuels, in the course of approximately the next half century, it is clear from the above facts that it will do so by simply shifting energy generation from the breaking of chemical bonds to the re-arranging of bonds within the atomic nucleus. The obvious fraud perpetrated by the pompous climate hysterics is self-revealed by the fact that this Zero Population Growth banking crowd bans the use of the many, many forms of emissions-free nuclear energy. China and Russia and all the nations of Africa simply will not submit to being murdered by that fraud!

Thus, the organizing meeting for a world central bankers’ “green” dictatorship, known as the World Economic Forum (WEF), January 25-29, was hit by a needed dose of reality with the major interventions by President Xi of China and President Putin of the Russian Federation. The British Royal family’s plan, known as the Green Deal or the “Great Reset,” was featured in that week-long indoctrination and bullying session. It was aimed especially at the nations of the global South. The plan is for global depopulation, and for the denying of life-supporting energy in the entire former colonial sector, all under the cynical guise of saving the planet from human activity.

Both President Xi and President Putin delivered extended strategic evaluations in their speeches. President Putin warned that “the so-called Washington Consensus” has been based on rules which were “often vulgar or dogmatic,” creating violent international instability with “private debt in conditions of deregulation.”

President Xi warned:

> To build small circles or start a new Cold War, to reject, threaten or intimidate others, to willfully impose decoupling, supply disruption or sanctions, and to create isolation or estrangement will only push the world into division and even confrontation.

Comparing today’s situation to the 1930s which “led to the World War II catastrophe,” President Putin warned the assembled bankers and “green finance” ideologues:

> There is a chance that we will face a formidable breakdown in global development, which will be fraught with a war of all against all, and an attempt to deal with contradictions through the appointment of internal and external enemies, and the destruction of not only traditional values such as the family, which we hold dear in Russia, but fundamental freedoms of choice and privacy.

Both Presidents made clear that the principle of each nation’s sovereign natural right to determine its own development, necessarily combined with its own advancing, energy-intensive scientific progress, is the foundation of humanity’s progress and of a durable peace. The cabal of Sir Michael Bloomberg, British banker Mark Carney (Order of Canada), and the mad greenie, Prince Charles Mountbatten-Windsor, were met with a formidable resistance from two immensely powerful civilizational states, states which have defined “a green way of development” derived from scientific principles.

LaRouche Crushes the ‘Green New Deal’ Fraud

No to the Green Policy; Revive Our Credit System

Here is Lyndon LaRouche’s opening presentation to his Dec. 7, 2012 Friday Webcast. The complete webcast, including the discussion which followed LaRouche’s remarks, is archived at https://thelarouche.org/2012

What I’m going to say today will cause a certain amount of difficulty in the audience, unless we pay close attention to some concepts which are not commonly recognized, which are actually crucial in this particular situation.

Now, the principal subject we’re launching at this event today, is, we are taking the preconditions which are required to prevent the United States from going bankrupt. First of all is Glass–Steagall. But Glass–Steagall alone, by itself, cannot do anything miraculous in terms of changing things. But it is necessary to protect the banking system—that is the honest banking system—and prevent that from being corrupted by the kind of speculation which is being done now, for example, in terms of everything that the Federal government is doing which is wrong. Unless those things are changed, we are in trouble.

So Glass–Steagall is the actually indispensable action without which the United States’ economy is not going to survive. And by not surviving, I mean something relatively immediate. The whole system is now going into the breaking-point of hectic irrationality, in which everything becomes chaotic. And this is the bailout point which corresponds to what happened to Germany, in October, approximately, of 1923, where everything went bankrupt. That’s where we are.

However, as I say, Glass–Steagall is indispensable, but it does not contain a cure. It contains a preventive of gambling, and it is necessary. But here’s where the problem comes in: We’re going to be operating, not on the basis of the present system. That is, if the United States is going to survive; if the U.S. economy is not going to disintegrate entirely, what’s going to have to happen, relatively immediately, now, is the installation of a credit system as the basis of actually creating the potential growth of the U.S. economy. That is, an inflation-free form of growth, or hyperinflation-free form of growth, as the matter is now.

And most people don’t understand that, because they think that money placed in a bank, or a denomination of money placed in a bank or some other kind of institution—represents credit, the basis for credit. It does not. A credit system is based on the growth of per capita wealth, per person in society, or household per society. And that’s very poorly understood, because the assumption that’s made by all the people who are incompetent, ever since they were swallowed by whatever happened years ago, decades ago, is they assume that money deposited in a bank, or attributed to be deposited in a bank, represents value. It does not.

Money is a very tricky thing, money as such, because it has no intrinsic means of defending itself against hyperinflation, or other kinds of problems. So only a certain credit system is the key to this process.

What Is Meant by a ‘Credit System’?

Now, what happens is this. We have now three categories we’re considering. First of all, Glass–Steagall; that is an absolute. Glass–Steagall must be imposed as the original Glass–Steagall form. The Franklin Roosevelt Glass–Steagall Act is what must be done. Anything different than that should get somebody shot, because things are getting that bad these days.

The credit system: What do we mean by a credit system? That the Federal government organizes a system under which credit is uttered, and the anticipation is that there is a time factor, that if we assign a certain value to something as credit, we must assume that by the time that credit has been collected, or realized, that there will be growth in the value of the product, and growth in the value of the credit itself.

This can be interpreted in various ways—it can mean that things become cheaper, and therefore you have a gain, which is margin for profit, because things became cheaper, through productivity, for example, that kind of method. But otherwise, there is no other source of value in terms of money as such, merely as circulated, as is being done now with this hyperinflationary process which is going on now, which is about to destroy the United States. That cannot be tolerated.

So therefore, the value lies in what? It lies in physical values per capita. Now, this also includes the increase of the value of work, the value of production. Because what happens is as we become more efficient, we tend to go into higher technologies, these are more productive. And therefore, we have a difference between the point that the credit was issued first, and the time that it’s matured when the payoff has to come.

So the assumption is, that an increase in productivity can take place in two ways—either in terms of the actual productivity, or the combination of an increase in productivity and also a decrease in the relative cost of the same item. We become more efficient; we can produce the same thing more cheaply. That’s another source. But the point is, the key to the whole system, is that you must realize that there must be an increase in the physical productive powers of labor, as expressed in terms of net production. That that must occur, and that’s the basis of the credit system. That’s where the question of the determination of value lies.

Now, if you want a stable system, you’ve got to have growth—physical growth—or improvement in efficiency of physical growth. So therefore, what you have is, by advancing credit, as if you were loaning money, this money must increase in value. Well, the money doesn’t actually increase in value; the cost of the product decreases in value, in terms of relative value. And that’s the basis of credit.

Credit does not lie in letting money sit in a bank; it must do something. It must change its character; it must be more efficient, or it must be more enriching. It means technological progress; it means higher rates of energy-flux density, which is an essential part of this. People are more skilled; they do a job which is a more skilled job; they produce more value with the same amount of nominal labor. That’s the system. We must generate growth. We must increase the productive power of labor. We must advance technology—absolutely. We must increase the energy-flux density flowing through the entire system.

So, all the myths which Republicans and Democrats alike believe in, with a kind of religious, or, shall we say, Satanic passion, are wrong. The generation of credit, as real credit, occurs only by the increase of the productive power of labor, as measured in physical terms. This means physical terms in the sense that people doing the same thing do it more efficiently, or do it at higher technology.

For example, increase of energy-flux density, in terms of higher density of power per capita. All these factors can lead to the creation of credit potential, on which real credit is based.

So, the basic reform, first of all, is that. The generation of credit is associated with the credit system, not with the simple Glass–Steagall system as such. Therefore,
The principle is elementary. It is the principle of the Pine Tree Shilling of the original Massachusetts Bay Colony. Honest debt to the future can be paid only through honest creation of future physical and equivalent wealth, including the development of the relevant creative powers of the individual citizen and also the children and adolescents of those families. “Such debts of a credit-system must be paid by the fruitfulness of future production, as this principle was already understood by the Winthrops and Mathers of the original Massachusetts colony. Such debts require that the government delimits such accumulations of debt to the efficient commitment to promote that production. Such debt can be lawfully incurred only by a decision premised on a reasonable expectation of the relevant creation of the increased physical wealth, and of the increased physical productivity of the nation. Debts incurred on the account of financial speculation are not legitimate debts of a government.

This describes, in rather plain language, Alexander Hamilton’s great principle as embedded in the subsuming intent of the Preamble of our Federal Constitution. “Debts are good, when they are designed to be made good, as by a credit system based on a commitment to increase the creation of net wealth per capita, and per square kilometer of the territory of a nation.”

—Lyndon LaRouche: “State of the Union: A.D. 2011”

Early Examples of Credit Systems

Let’s take the case of—a nice, hard one: Let’s go back to the middle of the period of the settlement of the Massachusetts Bay Colony. Then we had a system of credit which was set up in that colony, that you would make a commitment to complete something, which would be an increase in technology. Then you would find that that improvement in technology had increased the value of the outgoing credit which had been established. So, the Massachusetts Bay Colony, during this heyday of its growth, was actually the fastest-growing nation in the world, in terms of technology and in terms of its economic measurement. And only after the Massachusetts Bay Colony was crushed by the British interests, then it went back into a poorer condition.

The same thing was started in Pennsylvania, after Massachusetts had been pretty much crushed. And in Pennsylvania, with the influence of Benjamin Franklin, a number of things were done, based on the concept of paper credit, paper money, because the paper money represented credit, but the credit did not lie in the money as such; it lay in the fact of the improvement in the productive powers of labor, either through just the improvement of skill as such, the improvement of working on the basis of a productive product, as opposed to a useless product; and so forth.

So it was actually a physical value in all cases: to increase the productivity of labor, relative to an earlier point in time, and some averaging of the whole process, of the productive circulation process, was to do that.

We’re now in a hyperinflationary system, and it’s about to crash. We’re about to have the highest rate of inflation the United States has probably ever been through. And the problem is that people, including the Republican Party leaders, who are supposed to be hard-boiled, rational people—they’re actually nuts! Their conception of the way the money system works is absolutely looney! The only thing that’s more looney is the Democrats.
Which means we do have a few improvements to make in our product.

Now, I mentioned these things so far: I emphasized credit, the credit system, and the credit system has been the basis for every successful period of growth of the United States, from its beginning—from before its beginning, from the Massachusetts Bay Colony, in its heyday. So, credit is the difference between the productivity of labor per capita now, and what it will be in the improvement over some point in time. So, it’s the ratio of the improvement in potential, of physical potential, represented by advances in technology, or improvement in the rate of technology per capita of the population. And that’s the basis.

NAWAPA, and the ‘Make-Everything’ Industry

Now, we have another aspect of this thing. The credit system as such works in terms of the money system; but the money system only works when it’s treated as a credit system—then it works. But now we have—knowing that we get nothing out of Glass–Steagall in terms of gain—we don’t get anything out of that as such, except to the degree we generate more credit, the realization of more credit. But in the case of the United States, we are so bankrupt, as the result of what has happened, particularly since 2007, but actually earlier—much earlier. But the worst period now has been since 2007, when the take-off occurred, leading into 2008, which led to the bailout money.

So, since that time, since 2007–2008, the United States has been on the road to an increasing rate of bankruptcy. And the result of that is a corresponding, increasing rate of hyperinflation.

We have a lot of labor we can’t employ right now, under present conditions. The banking system does not have the capital to bring this labor, or the production, into being, as such. So, therefore, we have to find some projects which we’re going to give credit to from the Federal government. New Federal credit is going to be supplied to these projects.

These projects will employ some millions, actually, of people. One will be NAWAPA [the North American Water and Power Alliance]. NAWAPA is essential, not only because it does generate a lot of true value and growth; it changes the character of the water system of the United States; it improves the productive power of labor in every way you can imagine. And we’re talking about 6 million jobs, right off the bat. They may not be too efficient at first. We have a few old hands who are now near retirement, or are into retirement actually, who are capable of organizing labor employed for this purpose, in order to get the thing rolling, to get this process of growth rolling. So, the NAWAPA, that’s a big one.

Then we also have another category. You know what
happened some years ago? We shut down the auto industry, essentially, inside the United States. Now, at that point, I was in the middle of this process, on policy. It was obvious to me—and we were boosting that at the time—Ford and some of the other industries were aware of this thing. What we had to do was go to what we did in World War II.

In World War II, the automobile industry, as it became known, was the make-everything industry. Airplanes, submarines, torpedoes—anything you wanted to mention—was made by the automobile industry. The greatest amount of working-space for this kind of production was under the heading of the auto industry. So, the auto industry, during this period of World War II, was the make-everything industry, and it became that as part of the build-up for fighting the war.

At the end of the war, we had this great potential, but what had happened is, you had a terrible President—Harry Truman—and this creep destroyed pretty much everything. He got so disgusting, that the citizens of the United States became disgusted with him, and they decided to dump him. So, we had a better, we had a real President then, after getting rid of this bum. But still it was not—

There was a lot there, but the auto industry of the 1950s also became insane—totally insane. And I was an expert sitting in the middle of this, and forecasting where this thing was going to go. And I had an early date in that period, in which I said it was going to collapse. And it did: The auto industry, and several other industries, went into a sudden collapse, exactly on the day I forecast it would happen.

Well, it was easy for me to forecast, because this involved a lot of contracts, and therefore if you know that something's going to crash, and you have the number of contracts, and the location of the contracts which are subject to this crash, then you can do a pretty good job of forecasting. But I specialize in the future; it's more interesting than the present or past. Sometimes it's worse, but sometimes it's a better experience.

So, therefore, the development of the machine-tool driver: What we lack is an expansion of the general category of a machine-tool driver. And with that, as a supplement to, or complement to what NAWAPA will do as a project, means that we can immediately move into—and I say immediately move into—an end to this chaos, and this insanity of the U.S. economy now. And we can move into a gradual but accelerating rate of recovery of the U.S. physical economy.

Therefore, we can generate the credit on the basis of that recovery. That credit will enable us to rebuild the U.S. economy. But we have to earn our way, by physical increments of real value. And that's the solution we need definitely.

Now, we have a real problem in agriculture. We have deliberately, intentionally, destroyed much of U.S. agriculture. On one part, this destruction of the U.S. economy, its agricultural sector, is a failure to respond to challenges in certain parts of the country. On the other part, it's actually a deliberate process of mass murder of the population.

Let me explain.

The Queen's 'Green Genocide' Program

The mass murder of the U.S. population which is now in progress, is a product of the British Empire, and it's a product of the Queen, herself. Because the Queen herself has adopted, as her responsibility—or her culpability, I guess, better said—in which she's saying "We've got to reduce the population of the planet; we've got to in-
crease the death-rates of people; we’ve got to reduce the world’s population from an estimated 7 billion people now, rapidly to slightly more than 1 billion.” And that’s the genocide program. The “green” program is a genocide program! The green program means, “Don’t do anything that’s going to increase productivity!”

Now this is a sure recipe for one of two things: either hyperinflation, or mass murder—one of the two. And that’s the policy of Obama. Mass murder and hyperinflation—both. And that’s going to become evident in a few weeks—if not next week. But in this immediate period, going into the next year, next calendar year, we’re headed for this kind of crisis: a hyperinflationary crisis.

Now, people are denying it, from the press circles and so forth, the usual gossip circles, but everyone at the same time knows it.

We’re also headed for the threat of a thermonuclear war. And everyone who’s in the military department, and really knows what’s going on in that department, among nations, knows we’re headed for a thermonuclear war, unless we change our policies. And the combination of the green policy—which is a mass-murder policy—together with this threat of thermonuclear war, which is now coming down upon us, means a general threat to the human species as a whole. You’re talking, as the Queen is talking about, a sudden, rapid reduction of the world’s population.

And mass murder is now occurring; it’s accelerated greatly under Obama already. The policies of Obama are actually policies of mass murder against the population: the canceling of health care, the elimination of whole categories of health care, and the acceleration of the death rate, by withholding medical facilities, withholding technology, withholding all kinds of defense against health problems.

So, that’s where we are now.

---

**Mars, and the Defense of Earth**

So, we have also something else to consider. It’s a very practical problem, which only a few people are paying attention to much now. And that is Mars.

Now, Mars is very important in this process, despite what some people don’t know. The Solar System of which we’re a part, is not a fixed system in a fixed position, doing the same-old, same-old, from year to year to year.

The Solar System itself has a limit to its calculated pre-existence. Within 2 billion years, the Sun will go away—that’s the general estimate of the trend right now. And when the Sun goes away, the brightness is going to go out of the universe, for people. So, therefore, we have to have a long-term consideration of what is happening.

We’re now getting an increase in the danger to mankind on Earth and elsewhere, from asteroids and comets, which are becoming an increasing menace to the continued existence of mankind, within the range, say, from the Mars orbit down to the Venus orbit. And this had been worked on for some time by some geniuses of the past, who understood the need to organize a defense of humanity on Earth in particular, against these kinds of dangers, these kinds of threats.

And therefore, it’s important for us, for this, and related reasons, that we look at the Mars project as we’ve defined it, as a defense of Earth project. That is, we are limited in our capability at present, even to locate the asteroid which may kill you in the morning. That’s the situation.

Now, obviously, we can do things about this, but it means a technological acceleration in that direction. And therefore, we have to say that mankind is no longer limited, as a matter of policy, to Earth itself. Because in order to defend Earth from mass killings—which are on the agenda—we don’t know when they’re going to hit in each case, because of the known objects out there, only a
small fraction are actually known to us, identifiable to us, today—it's a tiny fraction. And therefore, we have a major effort to build up a system of detection and defense for mankind, operating within the range of the Mars orbit, and down to the Venus orbit, where all these most significant kinds of things are there. (Comets are a little bit different problem.)

So, therefore, we’ve reached the point that mankind must move from a limitation of living on Earth, to beginning to take over places like Mars.

Now, Curiosity is an example of something in that direction. Curiosity itself is not a solution to this problem, but it's a necessary step in the process of trying to deal with it. So, therefore, we're now going to have to think about integrating Man into the functions of the Solar System, at least in the region between the Mars orbit and the Venus orbit. Because that’s the area we’ve got to solve.

So, all of these processes, therefore, come together in one thing: Mankind is now about to depart from the limitations on Earth habitation. Mankind is going into the Moon, to develop tunnels under the Moon’s surface—the preparations for the mass attack on the mission to Mars. Once we do that—once, say, a generation from now, with a hyper-density of energy-flux density—then we will be able to do that within, say, a week—a week between Moon and Mars landing. Once that is reached, mankind will have a more personally important role, direct role, in terms of this process.

But in the meantime, our job is to prepare the way for that process, and do as much as we can now, in trying to detect the threats to Earth, threats to mankind on Earth, in order to stave off the worst threats we face to now.

So that’s the nature of our real task. We have a real task, and this tiddlywink kind of thing about, “We’re going to fix that with this, with that scheme or other,” forget it! It’s nonsense! Mankind’s increase of the productive powers of labor, in terms of improved technology, increased energy-flux density! Everything about mankind’s survival means energy-flux density increases. Without that, no luck, no survival.

Increasing Man’s Intelligence

So mankind has to change his policy: Dump the Green policy, which is presently the greatest single threat to humanity, that’s a killer! And we have to understand that it is the increase of man’s intelligence, which means also scientific intelligence, the ability to create, the ability to generate higher energy-flux densities per capita and per square kilometer of territory—these are the standards on which credit is generated. It’s to increase the population of the planet: increase it! Stop this killing people: increase it! Because we need more work done. We need, also, increases of the energy-flux density of the work being done. These are absolute necessities for us.

And the crap that’s been shoved into us, all this green crap, has just got to end. We have a population of the planet, and we need every damned individual on this planet: We need ’em! They have a purpose in existing, because they can become more productive, and as they become more productive, then their children become more productive, and so forth; mankind’s ability to cope with these problems increases.

There is no such thing as overpopulation. There’s under-mentation, and that’s what the problem is.

So these are the considerations. You have to think of money as something of fixed value. You walk in with this money: “I got my money! My money! My money!” Right? “This is my money! I’m going to spend it the way I want to! You don’t get any of my money!” That kind of thing. The Andrew Jackson kind of nonsense. So the point is, we need every human being. We need them to live longer and better. We need them to become more creative. We need to have their children better educated, and developed. We need an increase of the potential productivity of the human force, per capita and per square kilometer, and those are the missions that we must fulfill.

There are many things we don’t know yet, but these things we do know: The increase of productivity of labor per capita, with an increasing population, is the absolute necessity, which has to be coupled with the fact that mankind is no longer going to be content to sit on Earth and gossip about the neighbors.

At this point, mankind is going to take an active role in taking over the Mars orbit. We are going to be inhabiting it with all kinds of instruments and so forth that we put there. We’re going to learn how to control these asteroids that threaten us. We have a very poor track on it now. We’re going to learn how to use planets as communications devices, in this process.

These are the things that we must do. And every step we take in this matter increases the productive powers of labor, makes people smarter, makes them more capable, gives them greater incentive, makes them happier. And that’s what we must do.

And all these solutions—which are not solutions, they’re actually threats. The Green problem is not a solution to anything. It’s a threat to humanity! Green people are a threat to humanity.

Have fun!
Did you know...?

- The “Green New Deal” was created by Prince Charles, not AOC?
- The “Great Reset” is a bankers’ dictatorship designed to rid the planet of any serious energy production?
- That BlackRock and other powerful financial institutions will make trillions of dollars from the green swindle, while plunging humanity into a dark age?
- That the Anglo-American military elite are using “climate change” as a means for obtaining global hegemony?
- That they intend to take large amounts of farmland out of production, and collapse the use of fertilizers and pesticides?
- That none of this is about saving the environment, but rather reducing and enslaving the world’s population?
- They don’t intend to debate these policies, but to ram them through, with Executive Orders like President Biden’s E.O. 13990 and E.O. 14008?

Did you know...?

- That we could work with Russia, China, and other nations to free mankind from this British oligarchical nightmare?
- That the concept of “limited resources” is a fraud?
- That “resources” are determined by the level of technology we have achieved?
- That mankind’s creativity will naturally increase energy flux density and allow for an ever growing population?
- That Americans used to believe in that kind of technological progress?

Stop the Green New Deal/Great Reset!
Tell your elected officials today!
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