

hegemony in Italian finance. In and around his Mediobanca, rotate the biggest corporations in Italy, starting with FIAT and Montedison, Spergemina (the financial holding led by the Agnelli family), the groups Pesenti, Pirelli, Orlando, Olivetti, Ferruzzi, Ligresti. In banking and insurance, Cuccia's empire includes Assicurazioni Generali di Venezia (led by François Bernheim, Lazard partner and board member of Mediobanca), Alleanza, SAI, Toro, Banca Commerciale (recently privatized), Credito Italiano (remember, those banks used to be the owners of the state-controlled Mediobanca; now they are controlled by the private Mediobanca!), Credito Romagnolo, and, recently, the president of the Banca di Roma, Pellegrino Capaldo, was brought onto Mediobanca's board. Further, the German groups Commerzbank and Allianz have recently entered into partnerships with Mediobanca, while Deutsche Bank, through its participation in FIAT, has obvious connections to the Cuccia group. Galli foresees that soon Mediobanca might form a single group with Lazard through the mediation of Deutsche Bank. This operation would put Cuccia, according to Galli, at the same level as the most important international financiers.

The privatizations are Cuccia's triumph. The contrast has been between his method of privatizing by creating "syndicates of control," which holds the "control package" of the business, versus Prodi's policy to privatize through the "public company" system (wide, "popular" shareholders). Cuccia so far has won.

As Galli points out, Cuccia has always won. Recently Berlusconi, who remained somewhat outside the Mediobanca-led group, has become closer to Cuccia, since the Banca Commerciale has been overseeing Berlusconi's Fininvest shares allocations. And Lamberto Dini, the former director of the Bank of Italy who was always close to Andreotti (who, in turn, always opposed Cuccia), and who recently led the Italian government, according to Galli, "realized that, if he really wants to continue his political adventure" (Dini founded a new party which participates in the elections allied with the Progressive Democratic Party, PDS, formerly the Communist Party), he had better ally with Cuccia.

This is the conclusion of Galli's book: At the moment, there is no possible opposition to Cuccia. He represents Italian finance. Is this Cuccia's merit? asks Galli. There has been no one capable of resisting him or of operating better than he did, answers Galli, and at the political level, nobody ever tried to establish any policy that could actually challenge his.

That is, no one has challenged Cuccia's power since the courageous opposition by Enrico Mattei: The man who gave Italy nuclear energy; the man who made Italy energy-independent. Today, over 30 years after Mattei's death, the energy deficit is the major source of Italy's foreign deficit, with all its consequences for the national economy. *Il Padrone* Cuccia, whose interest never lay in the improvement of Italy's economy, now has a real empire.

'A permissible sort of extinction'

by Katharine Kanter

Histoire de l'Eugenisme en France (The History of Eugenics in France)

by Anne Carol

Seuil, Paris, 1995

396 pages, paperback, 190 FFr.

The author of this book holds a Ph.D. in history and teaches at the University of Aix en Provence; her study on eugenics in the French medical profession, though flabby in its conclusions, puts into the hands of the general reader original texts from the eighteenth century onwards, so unguarded in their contempt of man, that they are scarcely to be believed.

Busy as some people are these days bashing the Germans, they tend to put out of mind not only the existence of a powerful Fascist movement in England in the 1930s, led by cocktail party lion Oswald Mosley; they would prefer to overlook the fact, that Mosley's movement grew out of what has become, since the 1820s in both England and France, the predominating outlook among the upper classes: militantly anti-Christian, nihilist, and elitist, epitomized by Charles Darwin, his cousin Dr. Galton, and the Huxley family. Today, its chief political expression is monetarism, sometimes called "Thatcherism," which is none other but a rationalization for a religious belief in survival of the fittest. Central to its rites, is the rite of human sacrifice.

Origins of the eugenics movement

In pursuit, no doubt, of convergence with England on such matters theological and philosophical, French men of leisure and hobby philosophers plunged feet forwards into the spiritual desert left by the French Revolution. What took place, is precisely as John Stuart Mill prefigured it, in a letter dated 1841 to Auguste Comte: "Like you, I am quite of the opinion, that the combination of the French with the English spirit, is one of the most pressing needs of intellectual reorganization." Mill took over the Chair of Political Economy at Haileyburg College from Thomas Malthus and Adam Smith, while one of Comte's disciples, Clémence

Royer, was the translator of Charles Darwin's works into French.

As early as 1826, the latifundist Girou de Buzareingues had produced something entitled "On Generation," in which he purports to found the science of Anthropotechny, based on his studies of veterinary breeding practices. By 1841, one F. Devay, in "On the Perfections Which Might Be Brought to the Human Species," was proposing that one should study the practice of horse breeders, because "veterinary physiology can greatly elucidate the question which so concerns us"; his near homonym Debay, in "History of Metamorphoses in Man and the Monstrous," written in 1845, said: "Horse breeders know that two nags will never bring forth a fine steed; the same be rigorously true of man."

One author that Anne Carol does not mention, however, happens to be the very founder of the French Society of Anthropology, Paul Broca, who launched the Society, the first of its kind in the world, in 1858. He saw his task as "refuting the reign of mankind" over the earth. A fervid admirer of Aristotle, Broca developed a theory of racial inequalities based on craneo-morphology, etc., which purported to show that slavery could be "legitimate." The Society of Anthropology became the center, not only for anthropomorphological studies which, in many cases, antedate the work done in Germany on racial hygiene, but for an anti-Christian cult, "transformism," the term used for a somewhat more sophisticated form of materialism. Indeed, the hard core of the School of Anthropology had set up, in 1866, a "more intimate circle" called "The Materialist Group."

Following Carol's argument—and the sheer number of eugenicists of the most vicious sort she cites in her study, is staggering—such views were not, and are not confined to star-gazers, laboratory nerds, and assorted wizards. On the contrary, the Darwinian-Galtonian faction was, and is, on the inside track of the French medical profession. And they get Nobel prizes. Charles Richet, a ferocious racist, founder of the French Society of Eugenics (1912), was awarded the Nobel Prize in 1913, as was his co-thinker, Alexis Carrel, in 1912. In "Human Selection" (1912, published 1919), Richet wrote: "By proposing to wipe out abnormal beings, I will doubtless cross the blushing lilies of our age. People will call me a monster, simply because I prefer healthy children to the defective, and I see no social reason to preserve defectives."

In 1935, Carrel wrote a best-seller, *Man, That Unknown*, in which he baldly states that there "should be set up a euthanasic establishment, supplied with the appropriate gas" to do away with criminals and dangerous madmen. Mussolini, *dixit* Carrel, is a "genius, comparable to Pasteur or Einstein," and Germany—this is 1935—"swept up in the passion to create."

The University of Lyon had, until very recently, a medical faculty named in honor of Alexis Carrel, until a campaign

by the Schiller Institute encouraged some to become more discreet in their enthusiasms.

A soul mate of Carrel, Dr. Binet-Sanglé, wrote in *The Art of Dying* (1919): "The State, by allowing poor breeders to multiply, is responsible for the great many defectives around us. . . . The Institute for Euthanasia shall repair this damage. It should be part of the Public Health Service." There must be encouraged "the suicide of poor breeders, and to that end, created an Institute for Euthanasia, where those degenerates who are tired of life shall be put to death, with protoxyde of azote or laughing gas . . . and the same applies to bad subjects, who shall have slipped through the net of anti-birth prophylaxis, or abortion."

Binet-Sanglé informs us that he long pondered over the means to dispatch his fellows to the other world: Would it be a blow by club to the head? Electrocutation? Hemlock? Too long, too unsure, too painful—until he hit upon the solution of laughing gas.

Binet-Sanglé's name, in French, sounds very much like "cinglé," which means "loony." A rabid anti-clerical, all "mystics" he dismissed as neurotics. This led him to a highly original biography of the Savior, "The Life and Folly of Jesus," dubbed "Life of Jesus by a Madman" by uncharitable contemporaries.

As early as 1909, the *Chronique médicale*, the doctors' review, launched a readers' referendum on abortion. The question was, would the readership support modifying the prohibition in Article 317 of the Penal Code, for eugenic reasons? One of the most celebrated doctors of the day, M. Naquet, considered "abortion to be a duty when the unhealthy fruit of a tuberculoid, a syphilitic, an alcoholic or a madman, shall be extirpated" (*Chronique médicale*, 1909). He proposed the model which we find in China today: forced abortions.

According to Dr. Forssner, speaking to the Anti-Tuberculosis Union in 1924, two French doctors, Professor Bar and Dr. Sergent, had already practiced so-called eugenic abortions.

Modest proposals such as that of Binet-Sanglé were to be endorsed in 1935 by Alexis Carrel, and, only a few short years later, gratified by the most thorough trials *in vivo* any man of science might wish for, in the extermination camps—and in the psychiatric hospitals of France, where, during World War II, 40,000 patients are said to have been allowed to die of hunger.

Not a plot?

At this point, Carol flies to assure us that "this hecatomb was definitely not a plot, comparable to what was done in Germany between 1939-1940," and she periodically breaks in upon her own argument to reiterate: "French eugenics is *not a plot*. To claim that there was anything coherent about it, is an artificial, even fallacious, endeavor." And why should

there not be a plot?

The plot is the French upper class itself. What emerges is the picture of an elite that is gnostic to the core, a gnosticism so pervasive, that it seems perfectly normal to Carol that none of these madmen have ever been excommunicated, nor have any been struck from the medical profession. A remarkable example before our very eyes, is that of Prof. Léon Schwartzberg, who publicly indicts himself in print and on national television, and yet keeps on as the head of the Cancer Unit at the University Hospital of Villejuif.

If it be not a plot, it is all very like one. The Sept. 2, 1985 issue of the newspaper *Nouvelle Solidarité* contains a four-page pullout on “French Anthropology and Eugenism,” an exhaustive demonstration of the extent to which these madmen had collected themselves into highly organized and properly financed groups, well before the Rockefeller Foundation began to finance research on “eugenically useful populations” at the Kaiser Wilhelm Institute for Psychiatry at Munich in 1925, long before the 1932 Rockefeller-sponsored Eugenics Conference in New York, long before the sterilization laws of Virginia and South Carolina. *EIR* has dealt with this material in some depth, notably in the Oct. 7, 1994 issue (“British Psychiatry from Eugenics to Assassination”) and in a book-length study, *George Bush, The Unauthorized Biography*, by Webster Tarpley and Anton Chaitkin (Executive Intelligence Review: 1992).

How ever do they get away with it? Ask Aristotle, who writes: “There shall be a law that shall decide which of the newborn shall be exposed on the mountainside and which shall live; and let there not be allowed to live, a single one of those who are born hindered, that is, who may be born without some of their parts; and if the laws of a country do not allow that they shall be exposed, let there be determined at least, to avoid the weight of excessive numbers, up to what number of children there may be, and then, let those mothers be aborted, before their fruit shall have got life and feeling, for that is what distinguishes between a permissible sort of extinction, and that which is horrid.”

A “permissible sort of extinction,” the exact species of contortion which allows the Gallicans in the church today to find abortion icky, but euthanasia rather less so—at least, not icky enough to actually go out there and whip up the parishioners to fight it.

Now, what makes the lame, the halt, and the blind unfit to enjoy the light of this world? Whence the notion, that the nature of strength and beauty is *of the body*? This is a heresy, which you may call Gnosticism, or Catharism, or what you will; but it is a heresy, and a Christian is under a positive duty to fight it.

Whatever the current Gallican line on abortion, the truly “horrid” fact remains that Aristotle is the single greatest intellectual influence on the French Church—Christ included, and I do not refer to the Sorbonne seven centuries ago, but most

especially, to what has followed upon the Council of Trent. What is peculiar to French Aristotelianism is how precisely it has caught Aristotle’s mental tone of voice, that screechy, theocratic self-righteousness: The State is, if not God, at least on God’s right hand. And God is a very silly thing, if He cannot fit into the schemes which the State has devised for Him.

It is noteworthy that many of these doctors worked in charitable hospices, and that their Modest Proposals generally conclude with an appeal to that Thing worshipped by the French elite as being entirely consubstantial with its interests, namely, to the State, in order that it take the place of God, and snuff out the “unchosen.”

How does Carol then turn round and say, that the only practical consequence of the French eugenics school has been the pre-nuptial examination required by the State? We are in it! The eugenicists are in power! And they do not care how many of the Unfit die. How else did we come to 5 or 6 million unemployed, to 70,000 sleeping on the streets of Paris, to 2 or 3 million living off half the minimum wage? How else did we come to the idea of bailing out the banks by closing hospitals and schools?

And, there is no one, absolutely no one in the French medical profession today, who would write, or even think, what G. Szwarc wrote in 1934: “Duty is not the same thing as Profit, and Dignity is not the same thing as Utility. Our elementary duty as doctors, which is the very core of our medical practice and dignity, is that we shall unceasingly bring pressure upon the legislative and executive branches of power, that there shall be increased the number of asylums, of hospitals, and of schools for handicapped children and adults, and in general, that the budget for health shall be increased” (“Sexual Sterilization and Eugenics,” in the magazine *L’Hygiène Mentale*).

And as M. Gill wrote, also in 1934: “Within a few short years, if this all continues—and it will continue—we shall have to bury that notion so dear to us: the individual value of each man as an individual” (“Sterilization of the Abnormal,” in *Revue Pratique de biologie appliquée à la clinique*).

Carol’s bone-grindingly thorough work leaves no bone unturned, 400 pages of quotations, most as wretched as those I have given here. But, the whole is not without some delightfully funny moments. For example, one Louis Joseph Marie Robert, author of “Essay on Megalanthropogenesis” (1803); he was yet another of those who thought to revive the Spartan system of breeding-stables for the better sort of human being, the whole under the unbending gaze of the State. This prompted a student wag named Fruchier to a vaudeville play, “The Megalanthropist,” which contains the doggerel:

“To thee, author of this system
How annoying it must be
That thy papa had not found it
On that night that he made thee!”