

EDITORIAL

Genocide: It's Not a Mistake, It's a Policy

by Dennis Small

It is a truism that “death is a natural part of life”—but genocide is not.

From Gaza to Haiti to Sudan, from Argentina to Egypt, Mankind is witnessing the intentional elimination of millions upon millions of human beings whose future contribution to humanity's development is being snuffed out. Don't look for explanations in the specific circumstances of each case—the gruesome bombings in Gaza; the satanic gangs in Port-au-Prince; the scorched-earth Schachtian economic policies in Buenos Aires.

The policy of mass killing—of genocide—is intentional. And for that very reason it can be reversed, rooted out through a policy of peace through development, premised on the very dignity and sanctity of human life which the Malthusians deny.

The late, unlamented Prince Philip (1921-2021) said it in 1988: “The more people there are, the more resources they'll consume, the more pollution they'll create, the more fighting they will do. We have no option. If it isn't controlled voluntarily, it will be controlled involuntarily by an increase in disease, starvation and war.... In the event that I am reincarnated, I would like to return as a deadly virus, in order to contribute something to solve overpopulation.”

Before him, Bertrand Russell (1872-1970), the most evil man of the 20th Century according to Lyndon LaRouche, said it in 1951: “War has hitherto been disappointing in this respect [population control], but perhaps bacteriological war may prove effective. If a Black Death could spread throughout the world once in every generation, survivors could procreate freely without making the world too full.”

And earlier still, Thomas Malthus (1766-1834) famously pronounced in 1791: “We should facilitate,

instead of foolishly and vainly endeavoring to impede, the operations of nature in producing this mortality; and if we dread the too frequent visitation of the horrid form of famine, we should sedulously encourage the other forms of destruction, which we compel nature to use. In our towns we should make the streets narrower, crowd more people into the houses, and court the return of the plague.”

This policy has oozed from the very pores of the British Imperial oligarchy for centuries. Recall the writing of that most vile of British liberal “philosophers,” David Hume (1711-1776), who in Volume 12 of his *The History of England* famously expounded on how “Britishers from the East India Company manifested the immense superiority of the British character.... They considered war with the natives merely as a commercial adventure: by so much risk encountered, a certain quantity of blood spilt, and a certain extent of territory desolated, great sums were to be gained.”

This British disease of Malthusianism has taken over the U.S. Establishment, emphatically including the State Department, especially since the 1970s years of Kissinger and Brzezinski. In a February 20, 1981 interview widely [reported by EIR at the time](#), Thomas Ferguson, then Latin American case officer at the State Department's Office of Population Affairs (OPA), matter-of-factly discussed the case of El Salvador:

The government of El Salvador failed to use our programs effectively to lower their population. Now they get a civil war because of it. Alone, that might not do anything to the population, but there will be dislocation, maybe even food shortages. They still have too many people there....

We must reduce population levels. Either governments do it our way, through nice, clean methods, or they will get the kinds of mess that we have in El Salvador, or in Iran, or in Beirut. Population is a political problem. Once population is out of control, it requires authoritarian government, even fascism, to reduce it....

To really reduce population quickly, you have to pull all the males into the fighting, and you have to kill significant numbers of fertile age females. You know, as long as you have a large number of fertile females, you will have a problem.... In El Salvador, you are killing a small number of males and not enough females to do the job on the population. If the war were to go on for 30 or 40 years, then you would really accomplish something....

The quickest way to reduce population is through famine, like in Africa, or through disease, like the Black Death. What might happen in El Salvador is that the war might disrupt the distribution of food: The population could weaken itself, you could have disease and starvation, like what happened in Bangladesh or in Biafra. Then you create a tendency for population rates to decline rapidly.

Ferguson could just as well have been talking about Gaza today.

Or take William Paddock, an agronomist who was one of the early pioneers in population-control theory along with his State Department brother Paul, who used the case of Mexico to make the same point, stating in 1975 (as [reported](#) in *EIR* in 1980):

“The Mexican population must be reduced by half. Seal the border and watch them scream.” Asked by a journalist how population would fall so drastically, Paddock explained: “By the usual means: famine, war and pestilence.... Wars are an ineffective way of lowering the population size. So I would not recommend war. Of course the population size is going to fall in Mexico. You know that if it continues to grow the way it is, one of the four horsemen of the apocalypse will take over: it will be war, it will be famine, it will be disease, something is going to happen.”

Lyndon LaRouche, America’s foremost economist

and statesman of our time, addressed this underlying Malthusian policy paradigm in remarks to an *EIR* conference on May 16, 1982, warning that a new military doctrine of “Third World population war” was underway.

The proposed new policy, manufactured in Britain and sometimes called a ‘population war’ policy, is to gear U.S.A. and NATO forces for ‘conventional warfare’ against populations of developing-sector nations.... [The Carter administration documents *Global 2000* and *Global Futures*] define the principal strategic threat of the 1980s to be not the Soviet military forces, but the size of the population of Latin America, Africa, and Asia. They assert that the excessive numbers of black, brown and yellow-hued peoples are consuming altogether too much of the natural resources of the territories they inhabit, natural resources which the Anglo-Saxon race must conserve for its own future needs....

The purpose is not to reduce the populations of Latin America, Africa, and Asia simply by U.S., British and French soldiers’ shooting down the civilian population; rather, the scourge of war in these regions of the world is intended to destroy large portions of the basic economic infrastructure of the targeted nations. The purpose is to create the conditions of famine, epidemic disease and pestilences which will be sufficient to cause the desired increases in the death rate.

(See [EIR’s 1992 Special Report](#): “The Genocidal Roots of Bush’s ‘New World Order.’”)

If that policy and concept of man is odious to you, then [register](#) for the upcoming [Schiller Institute conference](#), “The Oasis Plan: The LaRouche Solution for Peace Through Development Between Israel and Palestine and for All of Southwest Asia.”

Come prepared to discuss Helga Zepp-LaRouche’s [Ten Principles](#), including her argument that “The basic assumption for the new paradigm is, that man is fundamentally good and capable to infinitely perfect the creativity of his mind and the beauty of his soul, and being the most advanced geological force in the universe, which proves that the lawfulness of the mind and that of the physical universe are in correspondence and cohesion, and that all evil is the result of a lack of development, and therefore can be overcome.”