

had an economy which is capable of producing. We didn't have to destroy our industry. We didn't have to destroy our agriculture. We didn't have to destroy our infrastructure. We didn't have to bleed our government down to the point that the emergency relief capabilities are a pitiful drop in the bucket against the magnitude of a storm of this type. That didn't have to happen.

And then people will go out with hand-wringing exercises in public. All the politicians, saying, oh, how much we're trying to do, we have so little, but we're trying to do so much to help these poor people, our fellow citizens who have been victimized by this storm.

Doubletalk! Are they willing to learn the lesson, that our people in the future must never be left as vulnerable as they were in this case? Never have to live in such poor conditions in the next generation as they came to in this? And that our government never had to be so poor, that we had to doubletalk our way around the fact that we didn't have adequate resources in the budget on the state and local level to meet the catastrophe represented by a storm or something else similar, such as this one?

In watching these reports on this storm, I thought about such things. I thought about the bigger picture. And I wish you would, too. Let's get rid of the kind of policy thinking which has brought us to this low pass. Let's get rid of the kind of policy thinking which was pointed at the head of Johnson, like the guns that shot down Kennedy, that began to turn us down with this post-industrial society nonsense that has ruined us over the past 25-odd years. Let's get rid of the nonsense which has come out of the mouths of every presidential candidate nominated by either the Republican or Democratic Party since; by Nixon, by Ford, by Carter above all, by the Reagan people, especially by the Bush people, by Carter-Mondale in 1980, by Mondale in 1984, by Dukakis in 1988. And above all, by that silly Clinton and Gore of 1992.

Are you going to be complicit in casting your vote for either set of those jokers and to perpetuate the kind of policy that has brought us to this mess, which is so disgusting and so pitiful today? The pitiable character of our nation—so clearly exposed in my view, by the sights of the progress of Hurricane Andrew.

## Bring some sanity to environmental policy

*A supporter asked Lyndon LaRouche about his policy toward the development of the Artic National Wildlife Area Refuge. The opening up of ANWAR for oil development is a major political issue in Alaska. It is the region on the North Slope of Alaska, east of Prudhoe Bay, bordering Canada. Currently Prudhoe Bay is about two-thirds depleted, and Alaskans fear a shutdown of the state's economy if ANWAR is not opened up. The entire wildlife refuge is 19 million acres; the area to be developed is 1.5 million, directly on the coastal plain. The candidate gave the following reply on Aug. 23.*

The idea of a wilderness reserve is a piece of ecological insanity, to which some people are greatly attached. From the standpoint of the environment, the so-called ecology, and the economy combined, the more intelligent and sane outlook is the multiple-use reserve areas. And the area in question, and the question of oil development, should be classified as a multiple-use area for recreation, for wildlife, for maintaining natural cover, and so forth; and maintained in the same sense that one maintains a modern farm.

Within that, there should be a rational allocation for development of natural resources, with a provision to protect these resources from filth and destruction; but otherwise, mankind should get the benefit of this.

What people have to understand in this era of irrationalism in the name of environmentalism, is that the basic policy that mankind and nations such as our own, in particular, ought to take on these questions of environment, is that we have to live in the number of square kilometers which are allotted to our nation and to our state, respectively. We don't wish to turn any of this into a desert—or into a wilderness, for that matter. We do wish to do those things which are necessary to maintain the land we have, and to improve it, in the same sense that an intelligent, modern farmer does it; and, at the same time, to get our economic needs satisfied by this use of land.

There really is no conflict in doing that. All it amounts to, as any farmer can tell us, it takes a certain amount of work, or a certain amount of investment—however you're accounting it—to maintain the land you're using in healthy condition. And obviously that can be done on this North Slope question. We can maintain this area the way we wish to leave it to our posterity, but at the same time, we can get the vital economic uses out of it that we require. We simply have to figure the cost of maintaining the area as a part of the cost of using the natural resources which it has available for us.

Obviously, I would view the shutting down of Alaska's sources of income for its development as a piece of insanity. There is a sane, rational solution. We don't have to go to these extreme, environmentalist wilderness ideas; nor do we wish to allow somebody to make an uninhabitable, disgusting, and unusable site out of an area which we wish to leave to our posterity.