

Why genocide is now respectable in the U.S.

by Lyndon H. LaRouche, Jr.

The following is excerpted from the keynote speech of chairman Lyndon H. LaRouche, Jr. at the conference of the International Caucus of Labor Committees held in New York, Dec. 31, 1981.

We seem to be all safely here, despite a massive campaign of vilification and dirty tricks aimed at preventing this speech and this conference from ever occurring. I understand that at last report there were ten distressed individuals marching around making animal noises of protest across the street, and charging me, among other things, with threatening to take away their drugs. They have charged me in other leaflets with planning to destroy them with atomic, bacteriological, and chemical warfare. That's the first time I have ever heard *soap* referred to in such terms.

Turning to the matter that shall occupy our attention today, it is now a generation and a half since, at the end of World War II, the full horror of the Nazi concentration camps were opened up to public opinion. It is now a generation and a half since the Nuremberg trials, which dealt, although in a superficial way, with some of the things that the Allied forces chose to examine, while ignoring others.

And yet, today, when those of us who were adults or young adults during the last war, are now only becoming grandfathers, and when our children represent the consciousness of nations, we find that not only is it public policy of a number of institutions, public and private, international as well as national, but also the policy of

institutions considered generally respectable, *to propose that we accomplish genocide on a scale 100 times greater than that perpetrated by Adolf Hitler.*

In fact, this genocide is being perpetrated not as the re-eruption of something which is unconnected to the past, but rather, the forces behind today's genocide *were* the forces behind Adolf Hitler.

Consider the case of Averell Harriman's circle. Averell Harriman is presumably a respectable former governor of New York State, a dignified man of 90 years of age. But look at the reality of what squats on Averell Harriman's periphery. Consider his Churchillian wife, who spawned Winston Churchill III, Pamela Churchill Harriman, who is consciously part of this proposal for genocide, as well as for the destruction of the United States. She is the leader of an organization, presumably associated with the Democratic Party, called the "87 Committee," which is determined to eliminate the constitutional order of government in the United States, preferably by 1987.

Senator Edward Kennedy is a sponsor of this proposal to destroy the United States Constitution, although I thought he had taken an oath once or twice.

Look back to 1932. There was a conference held at that time in New York City, an international conference on *eugenics*. It was sponsored by persons associated with a New York institution called the American Museum of Natural History. The conference sponsors included the distinguished mother of Averell Harriman.

The conference sponsors also included a gentleman



At the ICLC international conference.

who today provides a link between the forces behind Hitler then, from the American side, and the forces behind the new genocide today. His name is William Draper.

This conference, a conference on eugenics, was held on the eve of putting Adolf Hitler into power. Hitler was not put into power by Germans. He was put into power on orders from London and New York City, by the Morgan interests inclusively. The celebrated foreign visitors and speakers at this eugenics conference in New York City included Nazis and others, peddling their racial theories.

The point is that the distinguished mother of Averell Harriman and William Draper thought this was all very nice. Eugenics means "racial purification." They praised this movement. Draper specifically praised Adolf Hitler for his spokespersonship for genocide directed at racial purification, which was then called eugenics.

And who is behind the genocide proposals of today but the same crowd, the same unnatural Museum of Natural History. This is a gang of so-called "patricians." American patricians are cheap imitations of the British aristocracy. William Draper, during the war, distinguished himself as an American general. The American military in its wisdom understood his natural talent. They put him in charge of the division for bombing civilians.

Then in the postwar period, General William Draper was sent to Germany, to "re-educate" the Germans and free them of the taint of support for Adolf Hitler and

Hitler-like ideas. However, Mr. Draper didn't re-educate himself, because in the postwar period this gentleman, a "patrician" long associated with the investment banking firm of Dillon Read in New York, has continued his genocidal activities without shame and even, indeed, with greater arrogance. He established an entity called the Draper Fund as a vehicle for genocide proposals today. And was it not William Draper III who was appointed by the Reagan administration to head the Export-Import Bank, a very crucial institution for promoting genocide?

The Draper Fund

The Draper Fund is dedicated to committing genocide, primarily in Latin America, Africa, and Asia. It retains on its staff General Maxwell Taylor, the body-count collector for Robert S. McNamara. McNamara reminds us that the worst murderers in the world are not people with guns, but accountants. Taylor demanded a thousand bodies a day, men, women, and children in Vietnam, because Robert S. McNamara, the accountant whiz-kid, demanded a thousand bodies a day. General Maxwell Taylor is still engaged in the body-count: not a thousand bodies a day as in Vietnam, but now, the murder of billions.

Maxwell Taylor, the official of the Draper Fund, publicly states that there are only 20 developing nations of the world which are to survive. *The others are to die.* He proposes that Nigeria will be one of the more fortunate nations of Africa; it is permitted to retain half

its present population. The rest, says Maxwell Taylor, are to die.

State Department policy

Consider the Delphi project out of Connecticut which we have uncovered, which has a consulting relationship to the U.S. State Department as well as to the Pentagon. The Delphi project created a computer trick, which is nothing but a trick, to convince people, including heads of developing-nation governments, that they had to support population policies which represent, in fact, genocide among the developing nations of the world.

In 1969, that unspeakable creature, Henry Kissinger, secured an official position at the National Security Council and later went on to make an already-bad state at the State Department even worse. He made official a number of institutions in the U.S. State Department which are officially committed to genocide.

In the National Security Council, the Ad Hoc Committee on Population Affairs is committed to planning genocide as a strategic objective of the United States. In the State Department, the Office of Population Affairs under the direction of James Buckley of New York is committed to genocide on this scale. The Bureau of Oceans, Environment, and Scientific Affairs is committed to genocide on a global scale.

We are talking about billions of people. Sometimes these people are modest: those who aren't so radical talk only of hundreds of millions. The *Global 2000 Report to the President*, that great humanitarian Jimmy Carter, proposed only to eliminate about 200 million. But that is cosmetics. The policy, in the minds of those who wrote the report and authored the policy, is to kill 2 billion people at minimum. *And the policies they propose will kill at least 2 billion people.*

Jimmy Carter's second Secretary of State, the former Senator Edmund Muskie, stood at a State Department press conference to present *Global 2000* and to acknowledge it meant population reduction by the end of this century on the order of billions. And he, Edmund Muskie, praised the report on that account. According to the terms of the Nuremberg Code, Ed Muskie should have been hauled off to Nuremberg then and there, indicted, tried, and duly hanged.

Euthanasia: now in process

There is another level to this policy. It is called euthanasia; you may call it pulling the plug. Like the policy of genocide in general, *euthanasia is already going on.* Genocide is already in process.

President Jimmy Carter set in motion more genocide than Adolf Hitler in his four years in office—we just don't count the bodies. You have to look into Latin America, into Africa, into Asia, and count the number

of people that died because of decisions taken by Jimmy Carter's administration. Think of a nation that would vote to renominate a Carter for the Democratic Party leadership. There are lessons to be drawn.

Just so, euthanasia is already in process inside the United States of America. What does this mean? It means pull the plug. "We have too many old people. They cost too much, don't you know?" This is already in progress as a policy, in New York City, for example.

It is very simple to kill a person who is vulnerable: euthanasia. Withdraw medical services. Use medical science to determine what kind of care people get, and what kind they don't get.

But at Nuremberg, we recognized that the first step to mass murder by the Nazi machine was the introduction of euthanasia in the 1930s. There was a famous Nazi doctor trial at Nuremberg, in which the featured, indicted figure was Dr. Karl Brandt (whose relationship to Willy Brandt is only spiritual). Dr. Karl Brandt was indicted and committed to death for committing that crime.

But do you know that those in this state who defend euthanasia include leading reform rabbis! They say that they will not oppose euthanasia. The same rabbis who are out there cheering a holocaust protest against *some* of the people that were murdered by the Nazis, are condoning euthanasia today. By the standards of the Nuremberg Code, they are themselves indictable.

The Nuremberg Code was explicit, and as far as it went, was wise. It recognized that officials of government who "knew or should have known," including judges, newspaper officials, professors, and others who "knew or should have known" that the consequence of their advocacy or crimes of omission was to promote genocide, were therefore guilty of genocide.

This is correct, because without the infrastructure of support represented by such persons, the little SS man who did the dirty work could not have functioned. It is the professors, the judges, the officials, the accountants, the doctors who make genocide policy. We judged it so at Nuremberg, and we were right.

'Respectable' institutions

Among the institutions which are implementing genocide today is the Club of Rome. A person who is a member of or supporter of the Club of Rome is by the standard of the Nuremberg Code indictable for crimes against humanity, and, in the Club of Rome's case, for capital crimes against humanity. But who created the Club of Rome? The Club of Rome was created by NATO, as an official act of NATO and its Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development.

In a recent period, the NATO official responsible for creating the Club of Rome, Dr. Alexander King, outlined in detail how he took a fascist refugee from Italy,

Aurelio Peccei, who had been hiding in Argentina as the official representative for several Venetian-controlled firms, laundered him through the United Nations (which is a nest of genocidalists), and made him the leading figure of the entity called the Club of Rome.

It is not just a club. Leading people and institutions of the world are part of the Club of Rome. In Germany, a section of the Christian Democracy around Edouard Pestel are openly Club of Rome advocates. Sections of the Free Democratic Party of Germany are advocates of either the Club of Rome or *Global 2000*, which is merely Carter's version of genocide as opposed to Peccei's. In the German Social Democratic Party, there are factions sponsoring with Willy Brandt a North-

South policy which intends to perpetrate genocide, and which will and is perpetrating genocide through the Socialist International's influence today.

The Socialist International is an institution that contains some of the worst mass murderers in the world. Olof Palme, a figure of the Socialist International from Sweden, is a raging genocidalist.

In America, the Aspen Institute is committed to genocide. The Ford Foundation is committed to genocide. In Westchester County, New York, we have Rep. Richard Ottinger, who is a fanatical genocidalist. Senator Packwood of Oregon is committed to genocide. Run down the list of the U.S. Congress on both Senate and House sides, and you will find people who are openly

The ICLC conference

The accompanying statement by *EIR* founder LaRouche is excerpted from his keynote address at the Dec. 31 session of the International Caucus of Labor Committees' year-end conference in New York City. LaRouche is the chairman of the ICLC, which comprises Labor Committees in North America, Western Europe, and Latin America. The conference brought together almost every member of the North American organization, with invited guests, as well as delegates from Mexico, Colombia, West Germany, and Italy, including Hega Zepp-LaRouche, Chairman of the European Labor Party.

Presentations to the audience of 600-800 focused on two dimensions of the ongoing war to secure human progress and civilization: identification of the international sponsors of genocide, and the means they have used to brainwash the American population into passive acceptance of national decay and global mass murder; and revival of classical culture and pedagogy in music, art, science, and language, as a *political weapon* for reversing the advent of a new Dark Age.

The Dec. 31 presentations began with an address by *EIR* Editor-in-Chief Criton Zoakos on "How Venice Organized the Mutual Destruction of the Ottoman and Russian Empires" in parallel with current British manipulation of a no-win conflict between the United States and Soviet Union. The session following LaRouche's speech was devoted to Kepler and the Golden Mean principle as the basis for science education.

Discussions of the development and degeneracy of

languages was the subject of a panel on Jan. 1 which covered English, classical Greek, Latin, Italian, and Sanskrit. The second session began with a report on "Who's Who in the Fight Against the Malthusian Genocidalist Takeover of the Democratic Party Today," by Warren Hamerman, an ICLC executive committee member as well as chairman of the National Democratic Policy Committee, followed by a speech on the California situation by Will Wertz, candidate for the California Democratic senatorial nomination there.

The use of computer simulations, television, and "consensus" techniques to brainwash both policy-makers and the population was the first topic in the Jan. 2 panel.

Mrs. Zepp-LaRouche that afternoon delivered a major speech on the chief mental block Americans and others have in understanding the current resurgence of fascism: the belief that fascism was a strictly German or Italian phenomenon. The fundamental characteristics, she said, are a program for genocide justified on racialist or Malthusian motives; economic austerity and looting; and a fascist mass movement controlled by an oligarchic elite that uses violence to impose its irrational Nietzschean will. The counterposition to the philosophy of cultural pessimism and bestiality is the tradition of Augustinian Christianity and Neoplatonic Judaism, formulated in scientific terms by Cardinal Nicholas of Cusa, and reaffirmed by the papal encyclical *Laborem Exercens*. Mrs. Zepp-LaRouche concluded by proposing the rapid founding of a "Club of Life" to counter the Club of Rome.

That evening the ICLC chorus and orchestra performed Bach's *Jesu Meine Freude* and selections from Haydn's *Creation* and Beethoven's *Fifth Symphony*.

The final report came Jan. 3 on Dope, Incorporated's international and domestic operations.

committed to genocide, who have proposed policies to murder more people than Hitler's regime did—only one generation and a half after the horrors were uncovered at the end of World War II.

The economics of genocide

First, on the economics of genocide: Recently, I have written a number of papers, some published and some to be published in the early months of 1982, dealing with a concoction brewed at a place where many evil things are brewed, Cambridge University. It was brewed by a group of liberals around delightful ladies such as Mrs. Joan Robinson. It is called "systems analysis."

Systems analysis is usually the preferred term of genocide around the United Nations. There are so many Third World, developing nations around the U.N. that you cannot go around saying we plan to have mass murder of developing nations' populations.

Systems analysis is to the present day what the word "eugenics" meant in the time that Cecil Rhodes planned to depopulate Africa of its black people in order to recolonize it with Anglo-Saxons. It is just another name for the same policy.

It should be stressed that, in point of fact, according to Dr. Alexander King and his friends of British intelligence, the real purpose of genocide, the real target is to eliminate people whose skins are a little bit too dark down in those developing countries, and to anticipate that white Anglo-Saxon folk from the north will move in and re-populate these areas after this is all over.

Virtually every university-trained economist today is implicitly a mass murderer, because if you apply to today's situation the kind of economics that every Nobel Prize winner in economics advocates, you must commit mass murder.

Population-potential

If we were to apply to the question of human population the same criteria we use to measure the population of plant-life or beasts—at least, what the British use to measure these things—then we would distinguish only those features of human behavior in which man resembles a somewhat gifted baboon. If we use such criteria to determine what the maximum population of such a species might be on this planet, we would be most generous to say that the highest level of living population of such a species would be several million individuals, living pretty much with the speech level of the baboons or of members of the linguistics profession.

In point of fact, the same people who employ these kinds of statistical methods to determine what the limits to growth ought to be, these Malthusian calculations, also say we have a crisis today because we have about 4.5 billion people living on this planet. That already

means that if their theories are correct, they wouldn't be alive to spout them.

If only we could ignore them on that account.

How do we actually measure human population-potential? How do we defeat and neutralize this nonsense which economists, our Malthusians and our mass murderers advocate?

We measure population-potential of human beings in terms of what we might best term *potential relative population density*. This term signifies that to measure the population potential of any species, you measure the ability of that species to sustain itself by its own efforts on a certain concentration of land as inhabitable terrain. Man, at the point that he resembled Margaret Mead, had the population potential of a gifted, or degenerated baboon. Mead and the baboon are about the same. She is one of the mass murderers, that really ugly, evil old witch who stomped around the halls of the Museum of Natural History with an Isis cane, thinking herself the high priestess of Isis, who, I am happy to report, finally did the much belated service to humanity of dying—and without dignity.

But apart from Mead, that we have achieved a population-density on the order of 4 billion people already signifies that there is something about mankind that is fundamentally different than the baboon. I will admit that there are some political forces on the left who don't believe it, and who consider it macho arrogance to try to place ourselves above the baboon. But apart from them, mankind has demonstrated the ability to willfully increase mankind's potential relative population density.

How? The word technology was discovered by Gottfried Wilhelm Leibniz in the 1670s. But if we understand the term, we can apply it retrospectively to all ages, and say in general that if we generalize Leibniz's notion of technology to account for the transformation in the way that we produce our own means of existence, mankind has improved his technology. We measure the improvement of technology not by any other terms of reference than that increase in potential relative population density.

Admittedly, mankind has not always done this. Many civilizations have died. Many peoples which were once populous relative to their age, collapsed, and a remnant of that population returned to savagery.

Even so, insofar as we have risen above the level of a few baboon-like hominids chasing around the African savannah to have four and a half billion people today, we have achieved that because of those civilizations which have progressed, which have contributed greater knowledge, scientific knowledge, to advance the technology of human existence.

What that has accomplished is to increase the power of the average individual to command the lawful ordering of the universe. It has increased the density of the

agreement between man's will and the lawful ordering of the universe. It has produced progress and development of the powers of mind, not in an abstract or general sense, but as a purposeful development of those powers of mind.

The world needs more people

This leads to two things. First, it leads to developing our people to be able to create the new inventions of the next generation, and to be able to assimilate those inventions productively. Second, it leads, in that process, to the true objective of this process, the objective of the reproduction of man in larger populations which are *better populations*. The objective of human reproduction is not simply to produce more people, but to produce a higher, more perfected quality of individual. But to do that, to develop a greater individual, a better individual with higher moral capacities, an individual whose acts are in increased conformity with the lawful ordering of this universe, *we have to produce more people*.

As we advance technology, we increase the complexity of the division of labor in society in two ways:

First and most simply, labor itself becomes more complex, more specialized. Therefore, to fulfill all the specialties that are required to maintain the development of society, and its progress, we must have more kinds of work done. Therefore, a greater diversity in the range of skills or activities of human beings is required.

Second, as we develop the machine, particularly the powered machine, we begin to introduce a new dimension of complexity to the division of labor. The simplest way to develop a machine is to examine the motions that are done by hand or animal labor. Then, build a machine which reproduces the necessary motion, putting power behind it. Thus the power to produce is shifted from dependency upon the human muscle to dependency on the powered tool. The form of labor shifts from the bestial aspect of labor to emphasize the creative aspect of labor, which is the human mind's ability to devise and direct these tools. That produces the need for a greater population.

What does this indicate as requirements if we wish to raise the standard of living for the entire world's population today, or for the 6.5 to 7 billion people anticipated from the end of this century? Under normal conditions that would be the world's population at that point. If we wish to achieve a standard of living such that every person in the world could have the standard of living which we consider normal in the United States or Western Europe today, we would require a population of at least 10 billion people worldwide.

In the advanced sector, although we are really very poor relative to what should be, given our resources, because we don't produce much anymore, still we consume an average of about 35,000 kilowatt hours per

person to maintain our level of material culture. In the developing sector, the level of energy available to reproduce the population is about one order of magnitude less, about one-tenth that amount.

It is impossible to solve the problems of food, let alone other problems of developing nations without increasing the number of kilowatt hours available per individual in those cultures to the order of magnitude of 40-50,000 kilowatts over the next period.

We do not have to do it all at once, but we have to get moving very rapidly; to make land fertile requires energy, energy in the form of fertilizers, energy in the production of trace elements, energy for irrigation, energy for mechanization, energy for transportation. It will require 35,000-40,000 kilowatts per person, and if we are not proposing that, we are not serious.

Where's the energy to come from—if we want to do this without polluting the atmosphere or destroying the forests as James Schlesinger wanted to do? We have a certain amount of hydroelectric power of significant potential, and we should use it. But the bulk of the energy needed to enable the human race to live decently, survive, and prevent genocide, must be nuclear energy. This means the full spectrum of nuclear energy, not just fission reactors of any one type. Nuclear energy is the only source we have available to meet this requirement.

Let us consider this for a moment. We know the parameters for constructing a nuclear plant of one gigawatt. We know the labor required to construct it. You can calculate very accurately for policy purposes how many people will be required simply to do all these different kinds of jobs—to produce, maintain, and operate those plants.

We also know the ratio or relationship between the amount of effort society puts into producing energy, and the amount of effort represented in production using that energy. We know this as a ratio of people.

Therefore, if you tell us, for any level of a culture, how many man-years by Western European or North American standards are required to meet the energy requirements of a nation, we can tell you what the total labor force of that nation should be.

By these kinds of calculations and related calculations, we know with absolute certainty that somewhere between the years 2020 and 2030, the human race cannot make it unless we have 10 billion people, because we won't have the labor force to do all the kinds of work necessary to sustain the complexity of production.

Even today, most of the problems in the developed countries, the so-called industrial nations, are due to *underpopulation*.

More people creates the precondition for creating a better quality of single individual by this process of technological progress. Therefore, in terms of people who are against population growth, there must be some very strange kind of motivation behind it.