

Is Henry Wallich prosecutable under the Nuremberg Doctrine?

by Lyndon H. LaRouche, Jr.

Henry Wallich is a supporter of the doctrine of genocide of the Club of Rome. In his capacity as an official of the Federal Reserve System, Wallich is demanding implementation of economic and monetary policies whose precalculable effect is genocide among populations of developing-sector nations. Therefore, according to arguments submitted by U.S. Justice Robert Jackson and officials in the postwar Nuremberg Trials, Henry Wallich is indictable for capital crimes against humanity.

Justice Jackson's brief on this matter includes the stipulation that the mere fact that no existing statutes may exist covering certain categories of crimes does not prevent the perpetrator from being held accountable for such crimes. If the Justice's argument to this effect be held true, then Henry Wallich today is walking in the shadow of the gibbets of ignominy. He is willfully causing the deaths of millions by means of famine, epidemic, and related causes, and is on that account a mass-murderer, purely and simply. He is a capital offender in the specific sense Justice Jackson's arguments stipulate.

This matter is not one for an ordinary judge or attorney of the present time. An ably qualified attorney today is one skilled in guiding his clients through the murky and treacherous swamps which our accreted legislative and judicial law has become, a body of law which in its entirety is often far removed from, or even sometimes hostile to the notions of natural law known to our republic's founding fathers from such authorities as Nicolaus of Cusa, Grotius, Puffendorf, and such moral philosophers of the law as William Shakespeare and John Milton. Perhaps numerous among our practicing attorneys might wish to plead a case on premise of such natural law, but they would be usually perplexed to discover a judge who would hear such a plea.

The matter of the indictment of Henry Wallich pertains not to the extant corpus of legislative and judicial law as ordinarily practiced today, but to a higher body of law, the higher body of law informing the composition of most ele-

ments of our Federal Constitution. Today, such matters of higher law are usually abandoned in our courts, and left, if merely by default or otherwise, to philosophers. Thus, it is a matter on which I am among those best qualified to judge, and among the rarer few such likely to assume the duties of delivering judgment.

Since Mr. Wallich has not yet been indicted, and I am not presiding over his trial on charge of the indictment, I limit myself to stipulating the lawful conditions bearing upon his prospective indictment. If, in proceeding so, I appear to indict, try, and convict him, the courts before which such indictment and trial are conducted in that fashion are, first, the court of his own conscience—if, indeed, he has one, and, second, the conscience of his peers. For you, too, in condoning the presence of such men as Henry Wallich on our Federal Reserve Board, are to that degree complicit in the mass-murders Wallich is perpetrating.

The philosophy of law of the United States

The United States of America is a federal constitutional republic, and on that account an heir of the republican tradition associated early with Solon of Athens, the tragedian Aeschylus, and Socrates and Plato. We stand in a republican tradition directly and irreconcilably in opposition to the sodomy-ridden, slave-murdering form of society exemplified by Lycurgus's Sparta, and to the evil law and social practices of the ancient Chaldeans, and the Assyrian, Babylonian, Persian, Roman, Ottoman, Austro-Hungarian, and Russian empires, or the wicked Holy Alliance of Clement Prince Metternich.

As the writings of Philo of Alexandria, the Apostles, and St. Augustine affirm this, in principles of law, Judeo-Christian law coincides with the republican law of classical Greece.

The modern commentaries on such a body of Judeo-Christian republican law are most efficiently traced to the writings of Dante Alighieri (e.g., his *De Monarchia*) and of Cardinal Nicolaus of Cusa (e.g., his *Concordantia Catholi-*



Henry Wallich

ca). Grotius, Pufendorf, and Leibniz best exemplify the successors of Cusa. The informing of the literate popular mind of these matters during the 17th through early 19th centuries is most notably the dramas and other writings of William Shakespeare and John Milton (for the English language) and Friedrich Schiller (for German).

The special significance of the contributions of Dante and Cusa is that they, above all others, were the architects in law of the modern form of sovereign nation-state republic, who considered not only the lawful ordering of internal affairs of such republics, but of the higher, common body of law properly regulating affairs among such sovereign states. Therefore, whenever a question of natural law is posed to us today, we are obliged to refer to such literary precedents in formulating our own judgments in the matter at hand, as in the present instance.

It is also relevant, from study of primary sources expressing the views of the founders of our federal constitutional republic, that although the opinion on matters of natural law among those circles was more informed by the successors of Dante and Cusa than those two authorities themselves, the prevailing views expressed were in accord with the influence of such authorities. To that degree, the intent of our Federal Constitution, and the intent to establish a practice of consti-

tutional law, as distinct from Roman or British law, is clear to similar effect.

It is relevant to remark at this point, that the present functioning of the Federal Reserve System is explicitly in violation of provisions of our Federal Constitution, including Sections 8 and 9 of Article 1, and that Henry Wallich's capital offenses against natural law were not feasible if the Federal Reserve were not already in flagrantly explicit violation of the plain language and intent of our Constitution.

As to the Judeo-Christian substrate of our republic's natural law, the following are to be stressed in the present instance.

We are enjoined, by the Book of Genesis, that the ordering of life in society shall be by means of labor to produce the physical means of human existence. We are also enjoined that mankind must be fruitful, must increase the population to fill the earth, and must exert dominion over all other objects and creatures of nature. On this account, the teachings of the Club of Rome and like-minded neo-Malthusian institutions and persons are in axiomatic and clear violation of fundamental premises of Judeo-Christian law.

In matters of law, as distinct from theology, the distinction of Christianity from Judaism is exemplified by the mission of the Apostle St. Paul, in accordance with Christ's teachings recorded in the New Testament. Christ was given by God to save all mankind, that whoever loved God must thereafter love all mankind as Christ expressed such love. The distinctions of race, of nationality, are abhorrent to us, and therefore abhorrent to natural law. Christ freed mankind from the evil pagan heritage of cults of "blood and soil."

In a related matter, it is the policy of our justice under natural law, to destroy the evil and save the sinner, in every case a practical separation between the two can be accomplished.

Yet, in modern proceedings under natural law, we are not permitted to give the weight of law to the pleadings of any religious denomination. Our republic's law to this effect was influenced by such precedents as the Edict of Nantes, the 17th-century law of toleration of Prussia's Great Elector, and the teachings of John Milton. The rigorous argument for such a policy is provided by Cusa, including his *De Pace Fidei*. Affairs of the state must be subject to the special teachings of no religious denomination; the state is permitted to recognize only those ecumenical principles as principles subject to empirical verification. This might appear to create a paradox in our argument for natural law, that, on the one side, we affirm the Judeo-Christian premises of republican natural law, and yet refuse any special interpretation of Judeo-Christian law by particular religious denominations. The fact of the matter is that the ecumenical principles adduced from Judeo-Christian culture's heritage have been proven empirically to be the only known principles of a republic morally fit to exist.

We summarize those empirical proofs.

The first proof of a fundamental distinction between man and beast is obtained most readily by comparing the size and condition of human populations in the most primitive condition of mankind known, the so-called hunting-and-gathering society, with the scale and condition of the human population today.

Labor and increase of population

In a hunting-and-gathering society, approximately ten square kilometers of habitable area are required to sustain the life of an average individual. The life-expectancy of such an individual must have been significantly below 20 years of age, and the conditions of life generally poorer and more precarious than those of the faster, stronger baboon. Yet, through advances typified by the fishing and agricultural revolutions, mankind has presently a population more than a hundred times that of the ten million-maximum possible for primitive mankind, and we have in reach the means for sustaining a population of such tens of billions of persons at a better level of existence than was available in the United States during the early 1970s.

All of this has been accomplished as the fruit of scientific and technological progress. Moreover, it is readily shown that if a society halts technological progress for a protracted period at some point in its existence, that society must collapse and die. The creative-mental powers which give rise to scientific and technological progress are that facet of human nature which absolutely separates man from beast, and requires that human behavior be in every essential respect different than that of each and all varieties of beasts.

Yet, each new human individual is born in a beast-like condition of enslavement to what appear to be original and immediate hedonistic impulses, a condition which Judeo-Christian theology defines as "original sin" of man born of woman. The distinction is that loving direction of the development of that child's mind brings forth expression of a divine spark of Reason, a capacity to produce, assimilate, and employ efficiently such mental-creative productions as those of scientific and technological progress.

The sum of all known human existence proves conclusively that these fundamentals of Judeo-Christian law are true, and all contrary opinion false and also wicked. If a society acts contrary to the implications of these proven truths, that society must die of its own bestiality, as the Roman Empire died of the weight of evil in Roman law and Roman policy generally.

The historical fact, that the possible increase of human population through technological progress is implicitly ordered, shows that despite the contradictions among the scientific and related opinions associated with each technological-revolutionary advance in the human condition, there is a principle consistently embedded in each and all such revolutions, a principle which may be named a "principle of discovery."

Since this principle of discovery brings mankind into increasing mastery of nature, that constitutes empirical proof that such a principle of discovery guides mankind toward increasing agreement between man's will and the implicit will of the lawful ordering of our universe. This principle of discovery expresses the divine spark distinguishing mankind from beasts. If we can but rise in our chosen sense of identity to make this divine spark's development the purpose of our mortal existence, and if we dedicate such exertion to the benefit of all mankind, as if for Christ's sake, we are acting, as Cusa puts this, "in the image of the living God." In the works which successfully satisfy such a requirement, as Cusa puts the point, man "participates in God" by doing God's work, by bringing his will toward greater conformity with God's Will.

The purpose of a republic is the development of the individual according to these principles, to foster the development of such powers and sense of moral identity within the new individual member of society, and to afford the individual the opportunity to employ the developed mental-creative powers in practice to the benefit of present and future generations according to this same principle.

Every right and privilege afforded by states to persons within society must be always subordinate to that purpose of the republic we have just identified. The sacredness of the life of the human individual, the right of the individual to be developed in such a fashion, to such a purpose, and to be afforded all reasonable opportunity to employ such developed powers to the advantage of present and future generations, is the proper definition of *the principle of equity*, as Shakespeare argues for such a principle of equity in his *Merchant of Venice*.

The second-greatest of all crimes is to violate that principle of equity. The greatest of all crimes is to attempt to destroy the institutions of law which afford the protection of such a principle of equity to individuals and nations. The first class of offender is a violator of the law; the second class of offender is an abomination before the entirety of the law.

Henry Wallich is such an abomination before the entirety of the law. He is of the same class as Adolf Hitler, Pol Pot, and the Ayatollah Khomeini, as are all leading supporters of the Club of Rome's and kindred doctrines. They represent an evil which must be destroyed, and also made an example in the conscience of the population that their like might never be tolerated again.

Let Henry Wallich and his kind not protest that we proceed from ex post facto law. The natural law was written by the Creator before any other law was proclaimed. It is the oldest of all laws in this universe, beside which every other provision of law is merely an ephemeral caprice of the passing epoch or moment of history. On this point, the argument of Justice Robert Jackson was well-grounded.

Let Henry Wallich be brought as soon as possible to the processes of true justice.