

past 30 years. If German citizens today could recall how differently they thought back in 1960, they'd barely recognize themselves. Yes, they've changed *that* much, step by step, over the past 30 years. The only worthwhile antidote, is to confront people polemically, since what's at stake here, is not only Germany's survival, but the survival of human civilization itself.

Q: You have challenged German President Roman Herzog to a public debate on Germany's future course. He thinks that the Netherlands and New Zealand are models to be emulated. What do you think?

Zepp LaRouche: President Herzog lacks any "vision for Germany," and then he comes up with this pathetic reference to Sweden, the Netherlands, New Zealand, and the United States. Sweden is, in fact, the model for destruction of the social-welfare state. Holland has distinguished itself internationally through its policy of passive and active euthanasia: Every year, there are 50,000 cases of active euthanasia, the large majority of which occurred without the patient's approval. And that's certainly not a model that we need in our history here in Germany again. New Zealand is likewise an example for wiping out the social safety-net. In the United States, it is said that 12 million new jobs have been created; but people need to work two or three of those jobs at the same time, in order to have the same standard of living that they could have obtained with only one source of income 30 years ago. As a result, 80% of all Americans are in the process of becoming significantly poorer, while a tiny sliver of the population has become enormously richer.

I have challenged President Herzog to hold a public discussion with me on these matters, because, in my view, the Eurasian Land-Bridge—the central focus of rebuilding the world economy—points up an entirely different, and far more realistic perspective.

Our future will be decided on the fate of the Eurasian Land-Bridge. The question is, how much destruction will be wreaked, before people finally fight through to its implementation—whether there will be another one or two generations of destruction, or whether we can decide to build it right now.

And in that event, there is no reason why the world can't experience the greatest economic miracle in human history; and there's no reason why we can't also get over the present cultural and moral crisis, and call forth a new cultural renaissance, in which humanity's best cultures collaborate—for example, Christianity, the positive tradition in Islam, as it bore fruit in the Arab renaissance of the caliphs around 800 A.D., and China's Confucian tradition.

Up to now, President Herzog has not felt the need to reply to my challenge. But I hope that he will do so sometime in the coming weeks and months, which will certainly be stormy times, full of social unrest, strikes, and stock market crashes; and, there will be growing public pressure on politicians to put their money where their mouths have been.

Sweden's history of forced sterilization

by Lotta-Stina Thronell

A two-part series on eugenics in Sweden's *Dagens Nyheter* on Aug. 20 and 21, has blown the cover off this country's 40-year history of legalized forced sterilization. The series by Maciej Zaremba, a Polish Catholic emigré to this predominantly Protestant country, struck a raw nerve in Sweden and overseas, by effectively showing how leading members of Sweden's Social Democracy, from the beginning of the century to the late 1960s, defended the Darwinian idea that human beings who could be legally classified as mentally retarded, promiscuous, or unproductive, should be deprived of the right to bear children. Zaremba succeeded in finishing off the myth that the Social Democracy was the protector of society's poor and oppressed: Quite the contrary, the poor were the very targets of the forced sterilization. Between 1935 and 1976, approximately 60,000 people were forcibly sterilized, with full sanction of the law.

Major newspapers throughout Europe reported on Zaremba's exposé. On Aug. 30, British journalist Jonathan Freedland wrote an astounding admission in the London *Guardian*, saying, "Forced sterilizations in Scandinavia have shocked the world. But the great founding fathers of British socialism had dreams almost as vile as those of the Nazis." Freedland named the high priests of British socialism: "The names of Russell, Webb, and Shaw still retain their luster—despite their association with the foulest idea of the 20th century. They escaped the reckoning. Perhaps now, posthumously, it's time to see them, and much of socialism itself, as they truly were."

The UN apparatus

While Zaremba's retrospective is all very well, he failed to put the spotlight on the fact that the very same Malthusian fascist ideology behind the forced sterilization laws, is still the underlying axiom for the thinking of most of the bureaucrats in the UN apparatus. In 1994, *EIR*'s Torbjörn Jerlerup, showed how, in the 1950s, Sweden took the point in overseas "population aid" ("How Swedish Race Hygienists Became the UN's Top 'Population Experts,'" *EIR*, April 8, 1994). Sweden, in the 1950s, wrote Jerlerup, launched the world's first bilateral aid projects to control "overpopulation" in Sri Lanka, India, and Tanzania. Parallel to this, the same Swedes who were proponents of forced sterilizations, such as Alva

and Gunnar Myrdal, and who were also in charge of the bilateral population control aid programs, were pushing for the UN to establish a special population institution, now enshrined in the UN Population Fund (UNFPA). In 1992, the UNFPA had \$220.7 million at its disposal, of which \$28 million came from Sweden and \$26.5 million from Norway; in short, Scandinavia's two largest countries financed almost one-quarter of that year's UNFPA budget! Most of the UN's sterilization and birth control projects have been conducted through the UNFPA and the UN Development Program.

Pressured by the international and domestic outrage sparked by Zaremba's revelations, the Social Democratic government fairly quickly gave in to calls from the opposition parties to officially investigate the sordid history. (It is noteworthy that Prime Minister Goeran Persson, a loudmouth who claims that had he not entered politics, he would have wanted to be a clergyman, has failed to denounce the brutality of forced sterilizations.) An expert commission has been established, chaired by a 75-year-old theology professor, Carl-Gustaf Andrén.

According to Andrén, the commission will investigate the issue of forced sterilization in its historical and international context. Areas of study will include how "development optimism got its breakthrough in the 19th century, before World War I. Darwin's genetics, technological innovations, the development of medicine — all this belongs together and created a climate in society that one has to understand, if one wants to understand the sterilizations." The commission is to present its report by the end of 1999.

Social Democrats or social Darwinists?

No sooner was the commission announced, than social Darwinists crawled out of the woodwork to cautiously defend legalized forced sterilization. One of the worst defenses was uttered by Professor Tännsjö in *Dagens Nyheter*, on Aug. 29. "The thesis that forced sterilization is wrong in all situations (which I have zealously defended all these years) is in reality highly debatable," he wrote.

Tännsjö goes on to argue that the social workers and physicians who applied the forced sterilization law, in most cases did it to prevent "irresponsible parents" from having more children whom "they couldn't take care of." This Orwellian continues: "Women in this situation today, are talked into agreeing to an abortion, and, along with the abortion, to allow themselves to be sterilized. In the past, they were forced into sterilization (sometimes with the help of the forced sterilization law, sometimes with the argument that if they did not agree to be sterilized, they would not be permitted to go through with an abortion)." Tännsjö continues his outrageous apology for Nazi medical practices with the disclaimer: "Remember that, as a consequence of modern reproductive techniques, sterilization is no longer irreversible. With the means of modern reproductive techniques, a sterilized person can give birth!"

A few days later, P.C. Jersild offered his defense, conceding that, "Concerning the assaults by the Nazis, it would be dangerous to allow time to water down the guilt. . . . But one has to weigh in the course of time, when making moral denunciations. One example is how one should view forced sterilization laws that were enacted democratically and by friendly agreement between Swedish political parties in the 1930s." The "social and political reality" of the 1930s "didn't allow abortion for unwanted pregnancies." Jersild brags that, since 1976, Sweden has allowed free abortion, "And abortions have not increased much lately, with approximately 33,000 being done per year. We are, in other words, fairly content with ourselves."

Content? Brainwashed, one should say: The same mentality that led to a consensus for forced sterilizations in the 1930s is behind not only the ease of obtaining an abortion. The same social Darwinist consensus led in the 1970s to the ease with which government authorities could take children from their parents, into forced custody. Integral to this "contentment," were the late Social Democrats Gunnar and Alva Myrdal. On Sept. 15, the conservative daily *Svenska Dagbladet* printed hitherto unpublished excerpts from a 1981 TV interview with Gunnar Myrdal on their 1934 book *Crisis in the Population Question*. The interviewer asked Myrdal if he did not "feel" that it was wrong to talk about eugenics in our time, to which Myrdal replied:

"I still think that it is more than justified to try to prevent the reproduction of 'inferior individuals.' And it is possible to define 'inferior individuals.' They are the feeble-minded, and so on. I do not know exactly what rules we apply today, but I assume that we are trying to prevent the feeble-minded from having children. And if we do not do that, I think that we are stupid."

Overturning the axioms

In the midst of this raging debate on eugenics and forced sterilizations, the small, but influential LaRouche-affiliated European Labor Party (EAP) has launched a campaign against this effort to defend social Darwinist practices, especially by challenging students through the EAP newspaper *Ny Solidaritet*.

Boldly asserting the headline "Darwin Was Wrong: The Human Being Is Not an Animal," the paper confronts the students with the fact that British quack biologist Charles Darwin got his start defending the practice of chattel slavery, which President Abraham Lincoln abolished! Contrary to the eugenicist utopians in Sweden, Lincoln's associate, economist Henry Carey (1793-1879), and German-American patriot Friedrich List (1789-1846) played a major role in the industrialization of Sweden in the 19th century, and Darwin's reactionary ideas became part of destroying the growing republican potential in European countries. Darwin, who is an icon to hordes of race hygienists, is still treated as a great scientist in Swedish textbooks.