

How the liberal New York Times promoted 'Nordic supremacy'

by Robert Zubrin

The *New York Times* is a leading public advocate of various Club of Rome prescriptions for reducing the populations of the Third World, claiming that such efforts stem from its concern over the misery the poor non-white children of the world could avoid if only they did not exist. Yet, when one examines the history of the *Times* and notes that for three quarters of a century up to World War II the august liberal organ actively campaigned to promote the program of Nordic race supremacy and international racial purification known as eugenics, later to be made famous in the gas ovens of Auschwitz and Buchenwald, a somewhat less liberal motive for the *Times's* current concern for non-Nordic overpopulation suggests itself.

Promoting the Darwin hoax

The foundation for the eugenics movement was laid by the English Malthusian Charles Darwin, whose fraudulent theory of Natural Selection attempted to explain progress in nature as being caused by the extermination of inferior races by superior races. Since Darwin's theory was transparently an attempt to give scientific respectability to the reactionary social theories of Malthus and Herbert Spencer by portraying them as the causes of the well-known phenomenon of evolution, the American Association for the Advancement of Science and even the British Association for the Advancement of Science refused at first to take *The Origin of Species* seriously. The *Times*, however, took it upon itself to promote Darwin right from the beginning. On March 28, 1860, shortly after its publication, the *Times* ran a 5,000-word summary and review of *The Origin of Species*, pointing out that Darwin's theory is "the doctrine of Malthus applied with manifold force to the whole animal and vegetable kingdom." Thus, while Darwin's book admittedly contained a number of errors from a scientific standpoint, its political and ideological value to the oligarchy was unsurpassed. "We look upon the contribution of Mr. Darwin as a most legitimate and successful attempt to extend the domain of science—as indeed the most important of modern contributions to philosophic zoology. . . . The most important contribution to modern thought is undoubtedly the indirect teachings of

physical science. For magnificent though the direct teachings be, the indirect are perhaps still more wonderful; the former have relation but to the material world, while the latter influence the whole of man's speculative activity. Indeed, the only part of science that can ever profoundly touch the great laity are its glorious indications."

AAAS and BAAS to consider Darwin, "The truth is, the utility of these associations for the encouragement of science . . . is extremely doubtful. They tend rather to check all advance. . . . They become studious of orthodoxy and conservatism. Daring opinions are not daringly questioned, but silently ignored. . . ."

The *Times* continued to pump Darwin, and when, in 1877 the American Museum of Natural History was opened to become the temple of Darwinian race science in the United States, the *Times* could only describe it as "the most brilliant daylight assemblage that New York has ever seen."

The *Times* and Galton

By 1869, the purpose of Darwinism had already been made totally clear by Darwin's cousin, Sir Francis Galton, who basing himself on Darwin's publications, founded the cult of eugenics as such. Mankind was divided into races of various degrees of quality, Galton said. "It is with the most unqualified manner that I object to the pretensions of natural equality. . . . Visitors to Ireland after the potato famine generally remarked that the Irish type of face seemed to have become more prognathous, that is, more like the Negro in the protrusion of the lower jaw; the interpretation of which was that the men who survived the starvation and other deadly accidents of that horrible time were more generally of a low and coarse organization. . . . It strikes me that Jews are specialized for a *parasitical* [Galton's emphasis] existence upon other nations, and that there is need of evidence that they are capable of fulfilling the varied duties of a civilized nation by themselves."

American WASPs were no good either: "England has certainly got rid of a great deal of refuse, through means of emigration . . . turbulent radicals and the like, men who are decidedly able but by no means eminent, and whose zeal,

self confidence, and irreverence far outbalance their other qualities.”

ording to a eugenic caste system. “I do not see why any insolence of caste should prevent the gifted class, when they had the power, from treating their [lower caste] compatriots with all kindness, so long as they maintained celibacy. But if these continued to procreate children, inferior in moral, intellectual and physical qualities, it is easy to believe that the time may come when such persons would be considered as enemies to the State, and to have forfeited all claims to kindness.”

for babies, ranging from A to X. A-class babies were worth nothing, while the “worth of an X-class baby would be reckoned in thousands of pounds.”

By the time of his death in 1911, Galton, with the active support of, among others, the *New York Times*, had built eugenics up into powerful upper-class cult of race purification. On Jan. 20, 1911, the *Times* editorial bemoaned his passing: “Another Giant Departs.”

Francis Galton should have been confined to circles so much narrower than those of other men to which he belonged is not easy to see. That he stood near, if not close, beside the leaders who made the second half of the 19th century more important in the history of science than all preceding centuries put together is doubted by none who knows the extent and originality of his researches, his accuracy as an observer, and the practical value of his many achievements.

“It was Galton, not Bertillon, that made anthropometry a science. . . . He was the father of modern meteorology as well as eugenics, the science which is denounced and derided by people who have not taken the trouble to find out its meaning or its purpose.

“He was certainly a very great man, with hardly a peer for success in turning scientific hypothesis into practical application. Perhaps only his cousin, Darwin, was indubitably greater among the Victorian giants.”

The *Times*, which by this time was running numerous news articles covering the “authoritative” spokesmen on the hereditary roots of crime, alcoholism, and disease, gave glowing coverage to the First International Congress of Eugenics held in London in 1912, noting happily in one article that “Professor Giuffrida Ruggeri of the University of Naples, in the course of an address, declared that thanks to the researches in the U.S., it was now certain that the races of man acted in exactly the same way as the races of animals.”

On Dec. 21, 1912, the *Times* ran a lengthy letter from Maj. Leonard Darwin, Charles Darwin’s son, explaining eugenics, with an accompanying editorial endorsement. “There is nothing new in the letter for those who have given some real study to the subject, but it deserves careful reading by the people who have somehow acquired the absurd notion that what the eugenicists propose is the management of society after the methods of a stockfarm. . . . It is only because of this strange apprehension—impossible of entertainment

by anybody who has read even one authoritative book by the disciples of Galton—that we so often hear adverse criticism, savage or contemptuous, of eugenics and the eugenicists.”

his accompanying letter, Darwin explains that eugenic education campaigns could discourage the “unfit” ing, and that while “there will always remain a class quite outside the pale of all moral influence, in these cases “surgical sterilization”

was to administer “the poor law so as not to encourage reproduction on the part of degenerate paupers.”

Closing the golden door

In 1921, the Harriman and Morgan families, who controlled the Eugenics Record Office, the American Museum of Natural History, and the *New York Times*, summoned the international eugenics movement to New York to participate in the massive Second International Congress of Eugenics at the Museum, whose purpose would be to convince Congress to pass the Immigration Quota Acts of 1921, and 1924, all but banning access to the United States for Italian, Jewish, Russian, Polish, and other “non-Nordic”

Times gave this festivity tens of thousands of words of favorable news coverage every day from Sept. 21 to Sept. 29, 1921, running, in full, Museum President Henry Fairfield Osborn’s keynote tirade against non-Nordic immigrants on the front page of the editorial section of the Sept. 25, Sunday *Times*. “In the United States, we are slowly waking to the consciousness that education and environment do not fundamentally alter racial values,”

Times. “We are engaged in the serious struggle to maintain our historic republican institutions through barring the entrance of those who are unfit to share the duties and responsibilities of our well-founded government. The true spirit of American democracy that all men are born with equal rights and duties has been confused with the political sophistry that all men are born with equal character and ability to govern themselves and others, and with the educational sophistry that education and environment will offset the handicap of heredity. South America is examining into the relative value of the pure Spanish and Portuguese and of various degrees of racial mixture of Indian and Negroid blood in relation to the preservation of their republican institutions.”

ed calls for forced sterilization and punitive taxation against the poor, were endorsed editorially by the *Times* the same day. After saying that eugenics had been a beautiful dream of Plato (sic), the *Times* went on: “It remained for the 19th century, under the impulse of the biologic illumination given it by Charles Darwin, to take eugenics seriously as a science and as a possible program.

“In the process the dream has become not less beautiful, but more so. . . .

“Scientists are now convinced that Nature herself, if we can only make Nature free to work out her ends, arranges these things [“the union of the fit”] devise, being in fact the original eugenicist. This is the cheer-

ing message of Maj. Leonard Darwin. . . . [But] civilization as now organized, does not leave Nature as fresh as she has been in the past to procure the survival of the fit. Modern philanthropy, working hand in hand with modern medical science, is preserving many strains which in all preceding ages, would have been inexorably eliminated. As early as 1859, Charles Darwin pointed out that the noblest impulses and finest achievements of modern life were ceaselessly lowering the average human fitness. . . . While life has become easier in the lower ranges, it has become more difficult for the well born and the educated, who pay for modern philanthropy in an ever lessening ability to afford children of their own. There is a very serious question whether the 20th century will be able to maintain and pass onward the infinitely intricate and specialized structure of civilization created by the 19th century." Four days later, the *Times* editorialized that while eugenicist talk is "painful to ears that in the past have heard little except boasts of our superiority, exultations over our achievements, and rarely or never a hint that 'progress' as we have understood it, is not to go on forever," our willingness to heed the eugenicists' warnings will "make all the difference between extermination and a happy and prosperous survival."

The *Times* and the related Morgan-Harriman (including Averell Harriman) crowd sponsoring the conference were successful. The Immigration Quota Acts were passed, and as a result, 3 million European Jews who would have escaped European eugenicists by emigrating to the United States between 1921 and 1941 were exterminated instead.

The coming to power of the Nazis in Germany made it nakedly obvious what eugenics was really all about, so that starting in the early 1930s, it was necessary for the respectable *Times* to distance itself slightly from the eugenics movement with a few minor editorial caveats. Nevertheless, the *Times* continued to build the American eugenics movement with favorable news coverage until 1938. Thus, the *Times* gave over 10,000 words of favorable coverage to the infamous Third International Congress of Eugenics held at the Museum in 1932, which unanimously elected as its President leading Nazi race scientist Dr. Ernst Rudin, later to write Hitler's laws defining Jews as non-citizens and also set up the T4 program which trained the "medical" personnel to run the death camps. In fact, the *Times* printed virtually in full and without adverse comments on its front page Aug. 23, 1932, Henry Fairfield Osborn's speech calling for extermination of the 10 million U.S. unemployed to prevent them from passing on their "unfit" genes.

That the *Times* should give such play to Osborn, who after all was the nephew of the J.P. Morgan who controlled, (and whose family still controls) the newspaper, comes as no surprise. But it was certainly an injustice, that, when Adolf Hitler in 1934 gave Osborn the Goethe Medal for his work in spreading Nazi science in the United States, he did not provide a similar award to the editors and publishers of the *New York Times*.

LaRouche hat not yet in the ring

The highly controversial international political figure, Lyndon H. LaRouche, Jr., will probably fight for the 1984 Democratic presidential nomination, but he is not prepared to throw his hat in the ring just yet.

The 1980 Democratic presidential contender explained his policy in a statement issued in response to President Reagan's State of the Union address.

"During the period into June 1983, the United States will face eruption of the most deadly crises of the twentieth century. Whether we get through these crises successfully or not will depend on decisions made chiefly by the incumbent President Ronald Reagan.

"During this period of crisis, my chief duties as a citizen will center around my skills as our nation's leading economist. This is not bragging, this is a simple matter of fact. Over the past three years the LaRouche-Riemann quarterly forecasts for the U.S. economy have been the only competent forecasting by any published source. All alternative forecasting, whether by the U.S. government or private forecasting services, has been wrong to the point of being absurd.

"Now, the world has already entered a new general economic depression, potentially far worse than that which erupted during the 1929-1931 period. Since last August, when the Mexican debt-crisis almost triggered a worldwide collapse of major banking institutions, we have been in a perpetual and worsening worldwide financial crisis. Unless the President of the United States makes the correct decisions, a chain-reaction of worldwide financial collapse could begin on almost any morning of the business-day in London, Basel, or Tokyo; within a matter of hours, or over two to three days, as much as three-quarters of the banking structure of the United States could be bankrupted.

"During this period, it is important that I create no obstacle of partisanship which might prevent the President and leading circles within the Congress from making use of my expert advice. There will be time enough to think of the 1984 presidential campaign, if and when President Reagan successfully steers this nation through the horrifying financial and economic crises of 1983.

"It is important that I speak now, to separate myself from those men seized by misguided, petty personal political am-