

with them, to fund them over the last 20 years, an industry that considered our pronuclear magazine “too radical.”

It means digging into the history of the environmental movement: who funds them, who is behind them. The facts will shock you. They have continued to shock me, although I have been looking at this for many years.

What rational person could conceive that, immediately after World War II, after millions of people had been killed, a small group of oligarchs would rush to put into effect a plan for population control, aimed especially at black, brown, and yellow peoples? Who could conceive of the evil ideas of Bertrand Russell or H.G. Wells, who were willing to support anything—including nuclear war—to stop civilian nuclear power from being developed and enabling the world to support a growing population? Who could imagine that behind the nice cute-animal-loving environmental groups there is a small group of the wealthiest people in the world, including the royalty, who have created animal preserves and land preserves in order to run drugs, smuggle goods, loot raw materials, and train guerrilla armies to carry out the wars that depopulate places such as Rwanda. Who would imagine that behind the enviro-babble of “empowering women” and “reproductive health,” stands this same small group of oligarchs and their helpers which intends to use the population conference in Cairo to put into place a one-world government whose draconian, anti-science, and anti-people regulations will supersede national laws?

This is some of the shocking history that *21st Century* will present in detail in future articles. Our aim is to give “ammunition” to the scientific soldiers in this war to save civilization, to arm them so that they can fight to win over the minds of the majority of the so-called environmentalists who think that they are saving a fragile Earth or a cute species and have no idea of the consequences of their actions.

The future we can build

But the picture is not entirely grim. Our world is a mess, yet change for the better is within our reach. Who would have thought that the Berlin Wall would come down, that Israelis and Arabs would not only decide on peace but would do so around a development program that includes great projects and nuclear-powered desalination? Even in the United States, where there is a nominally antinuclear administration and a Department of Energy whose top staff is right out of the anti-nuclear Natural Resources Defense Council and Union of Concerned Scientists, there is hope for change. The administration is backing a civilian nuclear program for North Korea, for example, as a way of bringing that nation into the 20th century. This is a very important political opening, and one we have to support and broaden.

And there is more on the good side: Today we have so many exciting technologies that are state of the art, but that have not been developed to their full potential: Food irradiation, superconductivity, nuclear propulsion, magnetically

levitated trains, biotechnologies, advanced nuclear reactors. There are yet even more technologies not yet at this stage, technologies that will be created by the next generation. And science today has the potential of discovering and understanding how the universe works, from the very small—biophysics—to the very large—astrophysics.

This scientific legacy is ours. It is what scientists and intellectuals of the past few hundred years fought for. Its development will enable us to lengthen the human lifespan, to bring the developing sector up to the living standards of the industrialized nations, to take mankind out to settle other planets.

But this can only happen if you act now and fight for it, not just in the confines of the scientific community, but in the broader world community. It can only happen if you see in the sharpest way possible that whether civilization survives or we devolve to a Stone Age culture depends on what you do.

I appeal to you, to ABEN, to fight. Don't let the environmentalist leaders—these elitists with their six-figure salaries—don't let these yuppies take your scientific optimism away. Don't let them steal your future and your children's future.

Letter to the editor

More people needed to maximize development

The Aug. 26 *Feature* story comparing the physical economy of Taiwan to the People's Republic of China was an excellent demonstration for the policies of *The Science of Christian Economy* [by Lyndon LaRouche, Washington, D.C.: The Schiller Institute, 1991]. But I want to volunteer one possible shift of emphasis.

The authors imply at several points that the continuous technological progress in Taiwan's physical economy—the rise in *potential* population density—made possible the rapid growth in Taiwan's population density since World War II. Actually, it appears from the data presented, that Taiwan's already high population density as of 1960 (higher then, than Japan's today), preceded the greatest boom period of Taiwan's physical economy. Taiwan's population density in the 1960s was nearly five times that of the Mainland; now it is about three times as high. The gap in productivity and wealth per capita, however, is greater now, than it was then.

Why not conclude that Taiwan's relatively very high population density in the postwar period, when its growth seemed to be most rapid in that parameter, was an essential condition for the rapid technological progress and per capita growth of its physical economy since? It is not simply that nations *may have* higher population density by virtue of economic development; they need more people in order to maximize that development.

Sincerely,
Paul Gallagher
Dillwyn Correctional Center
Dillwyn, Virginia