
I. Science vs. Superstition

The Green New Deal Is Fascist

by Rachel Brown

Feb. 11—The only problem with the Green New Deal now being not-so-subtly inserted into the “fresh and new” narrative of “Resistance” followers like Alexandria Ocasio-Cortez (or destroyed Democrats like Elizabeth Warren), is that it’s not new, it has nothing to do with Franklin Roosevelt’s New Deal, and it’s inherently fascist. The actual policy construct had its origin in the “environmentalist movement” of Nazi supporters Prince Philip and Prince Bernhard,

founders of the World Wildlife Fund and defenders of anti-human eugenics. This “movement” was forced onto the United States during the anti-technology “cultural revolution” of the 1960s and was reinvigorated by British puppet Barack Obama. This “movement” began the destruction of the physical economy we see today, and one which current advocates of the “Green New Deal” apparently intend to continue. In their narrative, fundamental scientific principles of how to achieve greater living standards for a majority of the population are not only ignored, but outlawed, and efforts are being made to brainwash a new generation of young climate zombies, who know nothing about science, but do not let their ignorance stand in the way of their obsession that there is a climate catastrophe.

Although many versions of the Green New Deal have been proposed, they all contain identical components of decarbonizing the U.S. economy, reverting to lower levels of energy technology, and condemning U.S. industry and agriculture to fatally destructive con-



CC/GreenNewDeal_Presser
Freshman Rep. Alexandria Ocasio-Cortez (center) presents the Green New Deal, with Sen. Ed Markey (right), in front of the Capitol Building in Washington, D.C. in February 2019.

ditions. New York Governor Andrew Cuomo has just proposed a budget dubbed “The Green New Deal,” which would mandate the New York State electric power generating sector to achieve 100 percent carbon-free energy production by 2040. Ocasio-Cortez’s Soros-backed proposal also calls for 100% of energy to be “zero-emission,” as well as for “upgrading” every building for “energy efficiency,” and eliminating carbon output “as much as technologically feasible”

from transportation and infrastructure. It also claims to be capable of attaining the effect of “eliminating poverty.” How this would be done is apparently based on job creation by making buildings “energy efficient,” rebuilding our power grid, and building more solar/wind farms—and also proposals for taxation of higher incomes and increasing wages (generally considered different “topics”), which would have the same effect.

New Age Hocus-Pocus

What’s wrong with these proposals? The quality of life and access to resources for an individual in society are not based on simply having a job, or even a certain wage level, but are determined by the investments made by society to increase overall physical productivity throughout the nation, as achieved by implementation of scientific discoveries applied throughout the production process. Access to infrastructure of the highest technological level, to the highest possible modes of power production and distribution, to large-scale water



USAF/Nadine Y. Barclay

Solar panels on 140 acres at Nellis Air Force Base near Las Vegas, Nevada.



CSAC

Wind turbines in Solano County, California.



management and forestation, and to scientific education, all increase the quality of labor, making each individual “laborer” more valuable and powerful, as properly understood through the Leibnizian—and Hamiltonian—notation of “labor power.” All current “Green New Deal” proposals condemn the population to perpetual low-quality levels of employment and deny the “laborer” access to his humanity through participation in a progressive, creative process.

The jobs created in a “Green New Deal” would exist in a process characterized by negative physical economic return, downshifting the level of energy-throughput in the economy and ensuring that future generations will inherit a world of poverty and decreasing resources.

The technologies that the non- thinking “greenies” espouse as “renewable,” such as solar panels and windmills, require large amounts of production and high cost for a very small amount of electricity output. Then, because these technologies are cost inefficient, these energy sources are highly subsidized by taxpayers. People are paying to have negative-return energy technologies produced; a net loss for society!

This would ultimately mean genocide for the human population. From a truly humanist, scientific standpoint, the only rational basis for an economic driver program is to increase the quantity and quality of resources available per capita, at a higher rate of total “free energy” return, for the society taken as a whole. That is, the effort put in, to the output coming out—for basic processes of production of necessary components of the economy, required for sustaining human life at current conditions—must reach greater levels of efficiency, while the magnitude and quality of these components increases.

However, since 1979, the U.S. economy has failed to reach “break even” in the ratio of net physical output to input functions for basic processes. Look at the proportion of exports of manufactured goods to exports of services, for example. If higher levels of energy-flux density derived from known physical principles, such as nuclear fission and fusion power, are not made available to society, this process of decay of productive power and living standards will result in insufficient resources to maintain the human population.



LoC

Industrial use of electricity per person is about 17 times that of residential. Shown here is a large electric phosphate smelting furnace at a TVA chemical plant the Muscle Shoals area of Alabama in June 1942.

The Scientific Basis for Economics

In discussing principles of economic advancement, Lyndon LaRouche has made frequent use of a term he coined, “energy-flux density.” As he states in his [book](#), *So, You Wish to Learn All About Economics?*, “We measure . . . concentration of power as increase of energy-flux density. This measures the concentration of power per centimeter of movement, or per square meter of cross-section of action, or per cubic meter of volume of action.” This could be described in other words as “the increase of the power to accomplish work.” As a simple example, a knife blade concentrates power upon a small, focused area, enabling a higher proportion of power exerted, in this case human muscle power, to accomplish useful work.

Physical energy-density, and the level of scientific principle achieved in the process of capturing or producing a given category of energy, for example, as from heat (solar), mechanical (wind), chemical (combustion), or atomic processes (nuclear fission and fusion), determine the effective quality of an energy source. Low energy-dense energy sources such as windmills and solar panels may *appear* to be sufficient—although not really—for basic household electricity purposes, but they cannot possibly achieve the high temperature requirements for production processes in a modern economy. For example, electricity use in the United States, per person employed in mining or manufacturing, is 8.3 kW, while

only 0.5 kW is needed per person for basic residential purposes. It is indicative of the *anti-industrial outlook* of greenies, that they completely ignore this fact.


In fact, a vast increase in power production is what is needed to increase current living conditions and qualities of employment. To truly bring our national infrastructure up to the level required for 350 million people, commuting reasonably and safely, providing for goods to be moved efficiently for commerce, for environmental management of water resources and forests, and most importantly, for creating the conditions for the next necessary scientific breakthrough to be made, will require at least *double* our current electricity use per person. As determined by the nature of population growth and depletion of resources, if an economy is not moving forward, it’s going backwards.

The Current State of Affairs

Another glaring omission of the Green New Deal is the status of the currently decrepit London-centered global financial system. Had the authors of the current “green” proposals truly espoused genuine concern for the health of the U.S. economy and the well-being of the average citizen, this glaring element would not have been ignored. What is required for unwinding the currently unpayable mountains of fictitious debt, is the restoration of Franklin Roosevelt’s Glass-Steagall Act. Wall Street might hate the reinstatement of Glass-Steagall, but that’s just fine. The current Green New Deal proposal fails to address the fact that a complete reorganization of the financial system is required. It also includes proposals for the imposition of “carbon taxes” and “cap and trade” financial markets, all of which would both serve as simply more ways to siphon off wealth from actual producers, and ultimately enrich the people responsible for destroying the U.S. economy.

Ocasio-Cortez now finds it appropriate to publicly attack Franklin Roosevelt’s New Deal, yet ironically her policy bears its name. Her attacks on the original New Deal, as well as the proposals of her own Green New Deal, demonstrate her own stunning ignorance of the basic principles of economics.

Roosevelt thought big! The Four Corners Projects, the Tennessee Valley project, the massive increase in electricity generation and infrastructure building—all of this made possible a gigantic leap in the power and



National Archives

The Bonneville Power and Navigation Dam under construction on the Columbia River east of Portland, Oregon in 1936.

productivity of the nation. It laid the basis for explosive economic development, and it was linked directly to the use of Hamiltonian credit policies to finance the creation of these new potentialities.

Ocasio-Cortez—and the other greenies in the U.S. Congress—want us to go backwards. But there is no going backwards: We progress, or we die.

Instead of the optimism that can be engendered by a new era of scientific discovery and improved living conditions and technologies, the George Soros-funded “Sunrise” movement and related “climate change” organizations seek to create a new generation of young climate zombies who are convinced that somehow the planet is going to heat up, and nothing can be done besides canceling human progress and living a small, inherently detrimental existence. The actual evidence—including the now proven inaccuracy of formerly world-acclaimed climate models, and the willfully dishonest history of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC) itself—has no effect on the minds of the pseudo-religious green activists. Their beliefs are not scientific in nature, but rather are to be lawfully categorized as superstition, the product of cult-like “shared revelations.”

Soros, and ultimately the British oligarchical controllers of this operation, are now attempting to pit their chosen brainwashed youth against all who choose not to accept anti-scientific conditions as their destiny. The Sunrise, or better called “Sunset” movement, proposes, in their youth recruitment video, that young people take

a semester off from school to intervene in the upcoming election, on behalf of “epic, world-wide changes in human history.” Imagine if instead of being lied to and imbued with self-hatred, these young people were offered a summer internship in space program activities, or some other new field of research necessitating incredible human creativity.

Consider this very different approach toward the future of our species:

So mankind has to change its 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 them! 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.

These are the [words](#) of Lyndon LaRouche as he fights to create a new global system that will end the reign of poverty and backwardness of centuries of policies dictated by British imperial policy. Today, thanks to his work, this new system is coming into fruition, and a new generation is being born that has the chance to see a world without hunger, without destitution, and where every child has a role to play in a useful occupation for the human species. Think of these children, think of that potential future—when you claim to want a nation run on windmills.