

‘Ecological’ Irrationalism Is Leading to War

by Lyndon H. LaRouche, Jr.

*[Published in **Executive Intelligence Review**, Volume 17, Number 12, March 16, 1990. View [PDF of original](#) at the LaRouche Library.]*

It would be impossible to save the Soviet or the United States economy, unless we immediately repudiated that to which Mr. Gorbachov, President Reagan, and President Bush ostensibly subscribe currently in the context of the United Nations Organization meeting, at the end of 1988, i.e., the so-called environmentalist or ecological pact.

Ecology, as it is popularly defined in the news media and political process today, is a form of irrationalism, we might say anti-Christian, almost Satanic, and sometimes literally Satanic, anti-Christian ideology, which is totally opposed to all scientific procedures, scientific knowledge.

None of us who are sensible, would oppose, but would rather promote, things which actually benefit the ecology, such as the improvement of large-scale water-management systems respecting the water crisis in, for example, the Soviet Union or North America, where neglect of previously established water-management programs is leading to a true ecological catastrophe. None of us who are sensible would object to large-scale reforestation, particularly of reserve land, mountain land. This is sometimes a very difficult process to do; it requires very sophisticated steps, but none of us who are sensible would object to that sort of thing. None of us would object to new kinds of zoning requirements, which have a more rational approach to planning of cities, but a rational approach which is actually embedded in some of the best city-planning in Italy and so forth, earlier in this era.

None of us would object to, as sensible, the substitution of nuclear energy for wasteful or dirty forms of combustion such as primitive uses of so-called solar power which are ecologically disastrous if we use or apply it on a large scale, or to other use of biomass as a fuel, generally, which is wasteful and ecologically counterproductive. We would all insist on going to thermally much more efficient forms which are intrinsically much cleaner. We would desire to get, as soon as possible, to a second generation of thermonuclear fusion, and with the possibility of large plants in the terawatt scale, and we should be planning for the use and control of the matter-antimatter process, something which should be feasible as an achievement during the second half of the coming century.

None of us would object from a sound, scientific, ecological standpoint, to the fostering of the development of high-speed rails rather than continued increase of highway transport in general, that is, long-range highway transport policies. None of us would object to the use of high-speed rails as an ecological and economically superior approach to a replacement of air-traffic congestion from short hauls of 250–500 mile flights, and that sort of thing.

None of us would object to any of the other things which make the world safer and better for life from a scientific standpoint.

For example, none of us would object to destroying the ecologically disastrous agricultural policies which put formerly fruitful and ecologically positive agricultural land into the status of ecologically disastrous wasteland, a key factor in the growth of weather instability.

So, none of us are opposed to sound ecology, to cleaner cities, to cleaner air, to that sort of thing, but the negative, unscientific and pagan, sometimes outrightly Satanic, approaches of the World Wildlife Fund and other institutions of that sort, which are also racist and pro-genocidal, those things we must abort immediately.

Ecologism May Lead to War

Now, it is well known as Dr. Alexander King of the Club of Rome and of other institutions has stated frankly: The real purpose of ecology is to eliminate from this planet what some white racists consider, in the tradition of Adolf Hitler, an excess proliferation of populations of persons of darker complexion. This, in the words of Alexander King, includes Mediterranean peoples, that means Spaniards, Italians, some darker-complexioned fellows in the south of France, Yugoslavs, or part of the people in Yugoslavia, Greeks, Turks, Arabs, the Jews naturally, the darker-skinned Jews—Sephardic Jews—in particular, and so forth and so on.

This abomination must stop.

Now not only is this morally and scientifically reprehensible, but unless we do that, we shall probably go to the thermonuclear war which some fellows wishfully think we've already escaped. Without a destruction, an extirpation, a condemnation, a rejection, of this pagan ideology of unscientific, anti-scientific ecologism, it will be impossible to revive the economies of the Soviet region or of North America or of Britain. Therefore, these unscientific views must be rejected, for if they are not, it will be impossible to prevent the collapse of economy, as we see now going on as a physical-economic breakdown crisis in the Soviet Empire and in North America, for example; and thus, we create the conditions under which Russian military superiority, in the context of demobilization of the West, leaves the Russians no apparent solution to their insoluble, internal economic and related social and

political crises, but to use their military margin of superiority, to extract loot from other parts of the world. That is the condition for war.

Therefore, you have to choose between ecologism and war. And I can assure you that a general thermonuclear war is not good for the ecology of this planet.

Ecologism Creating Worldwide Famine

Now let's turn to something else. We have, on this planet, a global famine. A famine which has contributed in large part to the death of a half-billion people during the period of application of so-called International Monetary Fund conditionalities. At least, that's the calculations cited by Egypt's President Hosni Mubarak recently. And I concur with that as a rule-of-thumb measure.

We have the creation of food shortages in the United States. We don't see it as an absolute blankness on store shelves, we see it as a constriction of supply in the pipeline, and in the form of sudden and spectacular increases in food prices coming down the way. Rather than seeing some people not getting any food simply by fiat, we see simply the price mechanism, or the market mechanism, so-called, determine who does and does not get food, and thus the food shortage adapts itself, say, to the U.S. economy. We have conditions of genocidal starvation, however, in Africa, and we're approaching that condition throughout much of Asia.

Therefore, the production of adequate food supplies—with the aid of water management programs, improvements in general transportation, the generation and distribution of power, and basic urban social and physical infrastructure, which is essential to servicing the agricultural world sector for food production—without these measures, we are doomed to worsening famine.

So, we must have the economic conditions in terms of policy, which foster an increase in the production of food, and in policies which ensure that the farmer growing food is able to retain as his price, the cost, plus a little bit better, of the production of the food he or she supplies.

Without that, all talk of ending famine is hopeless. Without such measures, without the reversal of ecological and present agricultural department policies in the United States, there is no solution to a worsening famine, and to a worsening scale of death, especially among the poor of the world, inside and outside the United States. And with the impending general financial collapse of 1990, the number of poor in the United States susceptible to victimization by famine, is about to increase most dramatically.