

Global Warmers Brand Democracy An Obstacle to Their Green Fascism

by Cedric Gougeon and Elodie Viennot, LaRouche Youth Movement

What we need from scientists are estimates, presented with sufficient conservatism and plausibility but at the same time as free as possible from internal disagreements that can be exploited by political interests, that will allow us to start building a system of artificial but effective warnings, warnings which will parallel the instincts of animals who flee before the hurricane....

June 18—Thus spake anthropologist Margaret Mead at her 1975 conference, “The Atmosphere: Endangered and Endangering,” in North Carolina. Forty-four years later, on the 88th birthday of Prince Philip, these words could well have been used as the introduction to the June 8-10 conference in Essen, Germany, titled “The Great Transformation—Climate Change as Cultural Change.” The conference, organized by the Institute of Cultural Studies Institute (KWI) of Essen, was a psychological warfare weapon aimed at using pseudoscience and world dictatorship, to force people to accept deindustrialization and dramatic population reduction—all in the name of saving the planet from “global warming.”

The title of the fourth panel speaks for itself: “How Can Democracy Cope with This Climate Stress?” The conference program asserts baldly: “Democratic regimes are not well prepared for the level of participation that is required: Can free democratic societies cope with the effects of grave changes in the global climate, or might authoritarian regimes possibly be better placed to enforce the necessary measures?”

Are you shocked? You shouldn’t be! Prince Philip himself has proclaimed that the world’s population should be reduced to 2 billion (it is now 6.7 billion), a reflection of the London-centered oligarchy’s view of

man as cattle.

Fortunately, two members of the LaRouche Youth Movement (LYM) intervened at the conference to expose the real face of the Green propaganda. We circulated a leaflet on “the fraud of global warming,” and an article denouncing the role of former British Prime Minister Tony Blair in promoting the Green fascist lies and global imperial agenda.

What ‘Great Transformation’?

To set the sophisticated tone for the event, the first session was introduced by KWI psychology professor Harald Welzer, and Andreas Ersnt, deputy executive director of the Center for Environmental Systems Research, University of Kassel, on the relationship between “knowing” and “acting.” The real problem with people today, they said, is that even though they have the “knowledge” to act, they don’t act accordingly (an echo of the “behavioral economists” in the Obama Administration).

The first question, posed to the panel by a physical scientist, was directed to Welzer: “What differentiates you from the pseudo-religious group you described earlier?” The professor defended himself by saying that data were simply a question of interpretation, and that since the axiom of this conference is that man-made global warming is real, his own role is simply to study how to reconcile the gap between knowing and acting.

In response to a question from the LYM, attacking Prince Philip’s genocidal policies underlying the whole “climate change” scam, Ernst avowed that we need international agreements on population reduction. This, after the Hon. Sir Jonathon Espie Porritt, 2nd Baronet, CBE, a senior “green” advisor to British Prime Minister Gordon Brown, had called not long



EIRNS/Simon Jensen

LaRouche Youth Movement organizing in Hamburg, Germany, against the global warming hoax. The sign reads, "Solidarity with Trees: 'We want more CO₂'" The LYM also intervened at the international conference in Essen, sparking outspoken criticism of the global warming fanatics from others in the audience.

ago for slashing the British population by half!¹

As tensions escalated, a Swedish member of the audience, who has conducted studies on how climate change was brought onto the Swedish political agenda, said that the panelists were doing exactly what "the Swedish government did in earlier decades, to create fear, similar to the fear of nuclear power, in order to transform society. You should remember that the Swedish Royal Academy of Sciences, in 1921, conducted studies of human skulls; the idea was to promote eugenics, in order to sterilize women with low IQs, and to reduce living standards in northern Sweden. The idea only came to Germany afterwards. These people had the idea of bringing the population down to 2 billion."

To which the moderator replied, "I would like to en-

courage the next comments and questions not to open different agendas than those presented for this panel."

A German climatologist pointed out that 40% of Germans still don't buy the idea of "man-made" climate change, because there is not enough "education" on the subject. KWI director Claus Leggewie, a member of the Scientific Advisory Council on Global Environmental Questions, created by the German government at the end of 2008, accused the climatologist of political manipulation, simply for mentioning the great number of "climate skeptics."

Another scientist charged one of the panelists with presenting irrational myths about a catastrophic rise in sea levels. "Sea-level rise is a natural phenomenon," he said, "and when you talk about an ice cap which is at -45°C, it is unscientific and simply idiotic to even pretend that several degrees will make any difference." To which the poor anthropologist responded: "I'm sorry, but I'm not a scientist; I'm not competent to respond on that issue."

The End of Democracy?

Clearly, the "artificial warnings" and media catastrophism are not working on everybody, and not fast

1. London *Sunday Times*, March 22, 2009, at a conference of his Optimum Population Trust. According to the group's website: "OPT researchers have concluded that, in the absence of radical breakthroughs in energy technology, an environmentally sustainable population for the UK may be lower than 30 million if it is to be largely self-sufficient in clean energy, if continuing damage to local and global environments is to stop, and if its citizens are to enjoy an acceptable quality of life. This research is in part based on the techniques of ecological footprinting, but the key factors determining the need for population reduction in the UK and worldwide are climate change and energy requirements."

enough, and so, according to the speakers in the fourth panel, this is proof that a democratic process will not do the job. As the conference program wrote, “Democratic regimes are not well prepared for the level of participation that is required: Can free democratic societies cope with the effects of grave changes in the global climate, or might authoritarian regimes possibly be better placed to enforce the necessary measures?”

Leggewie, feeling the temperature rising in the audience, felt compelled to reassure them that, of course, the answer to the panel’s title’s question, is that “we need more democracy, much more.”

David Held, co-director of the Centre for the Study of Global Governance at the London School of Economics, made the first presentation of the afternoon, arguing that “democratic participation has proven inefficient,” and is like “trying to square the circle of participation and effectiveness.” A confused silence followed. The first question was, “Could you clarify?” Then, LYM member Cedric Gougeon intervened: “I think you confused everyone in this room, Mr. Held. If you are so sure democracy is the only way, why did you then question it? Are you in the tradition of Margaret Thatcher, the first political figure who aggressively pushed the climate hoax, and who also expressed her great sadness upon learning of the death of her model, [Chilean dictator] Augusto Pinochet?”

Leggewie grabbed the microphone, and explained that they were only opening a “discussion” on democracy, because all decisions must be made within the next ten years, a deadline that no democracy could meet. Even a pro-environmentalist journalist took the mike to express his fear of world dictatorship, while, in private discussion, a shocked scientist referred to the *Brave New World* of British fascist Aldous Huxley.

Promoting Blair’s New Imperialism

The stars of the closing panel, “Road Conditions on the Transatlantic Climate Bridge,” were Obama transition team chairman John Podesta and Prof. Lord Anthony Giddens, former director of the London School of Economics, and a guru of Tony Blair. On June 5, the two speakers were featured at a climate conference in London, that was addressed by Blair himself, who called for the reduction of CO₂ emissions by 90%, through a “revolutionary change” in the way things are run—i.e., Blair’s new imperialism. (See accompanying article.)

The Essen panel posited the need to end national sovereignty, in order to deal with the “climate prob-

lem.” Giddens declared that “a new mixture of hard-headed geopolitical realism and post-industrial utopianism” was necessary, forecasting the next conflict as between China and the U.S.A. Prof. Michael Werz of Georgetown University said that the “melting” of the Arctic is opening more sea access to Russia, which he saw as a threat that will start a battle over water rights. Similarly, climate change is making water in North Africa scarcer, extending the European Union’s territorial security concerns to the Sahara. He concluded that the role of the military in civilian society should be taken much more seriously.

Others focussed on U.S. policies, with President Obama as their great hope. Bill Antholis, managing director of the Brookings Institution, quoted Sir Winston Churchill, “We can always count on America to do the right thing, after it has exhausted all the other possibilities.”

Podesta laid out a plan for climate-change “reforms” in the United States: first, pass the Waxman-Markey green energy bill in the House; then, start to negotiate for the Copenhagen summit; then, confront the Senate (which wouldn’t have the necessary votes otherwise) with a *fait accompli*. In private discussion with Giddens and Held, the latter revealed that, “overpopulation” is the specter lurking behind all of these discussions, and that China is an example of rigorous control—“hopefully, the global government won’t decide directly for you how many children you can have, but. . .”

The concluding remarks of Leggewie aptly summed up this psycho-warfare nightmare: “For the first time in human history, people are gathering and examining something which they don’t see, smell, or taste, which is not affecting them right now. The parallel we can draw, in a secular way, is the focus on the afterlife. We have the churches of the Climate Change religion, with our preachers, as we heard them here, and the fear of Judgment Day.”

HOTLINE

**LaRouche and EIR Staff
Recorded Briefings
—24 Hours Daily
916-233-0630, Box 595**