

---

## On the 50th Anniversary of V-E Day

---

# Celebrate the victory over fascism, by destroying fascist policies today

by Nancy Spannaus

*Mrs. Spannaus is president of the U.S. Club of Life.*

As the world gears up for celebrating V-E Day on May 8, the 50-year anniversary of the military defeat of fascism in Europe, it is high time we carried out some serious reflection on the crimes of the Nazis. Not the normal kind of hand-wringing on the horrors of the past, or revenge against 85-year-old former concentration camp guards. Let me be blunt: We must stop patting ourselves on the back at a point where we are condoning the *same kind of crimes* coming from the *same kind of ideology* promoted by leading institutions today. We must stop the perpetration of Nazi-like crimes today.

Now, I am well aware that the crimes to which I refer, are not necessarily the ones which others proclaim. Among the mythologies which have been spread since World War II have been the identification of fascism with nationalism, military establishments, "authoritarianism," and even certain specific nations, like Germany. Those who made up these stories, like Prince Philip or Margaret Thatcher, are covering up for their own crimes against humanity.

Lyndon LaRouche and those of us who have worked closely with him for decades now, have pointed to two major sewers of fascist policies today—the dividing lines between those who value human life, and those who seek to turn man into a beast. LaRouche's first economic forecasts warned in the 1950s of the resurgence of *fascist economics*, this time on a world scale. The practices of austerity, which used up human labor as the Nazi concentration camps did, were on the agenda of the world's leading financial institutions, LaRouche charged, if scientific and technological progress were abandoned.

In 1982, LaRouche's wife, Helga Zepp-LaRouche, launched the Club of Life, an organization to fight such a fascist resurgence in other areas of policy as well—from the cultural and social realms, to economics per se. The Club of Life set out to destroy the rationale for all policies which relegated groupings of people to the status of "useless eaters," and concentrated its sights against all its manifestations, including cultural pessimism.

Not only were these warnings not heeded, but the grisly

toll from these fascist policies gets worse by the day. The bankrupt global financial system, presided over by the International Monetary Fund (IMF) and the World Bank, is dictating conditions to nations everywhere that condemn people to death in order to pay the debt. The fascist cultural policy, which defines the human being as a consuming beast, is leading to additional massive sacrifice of human life in widespread practice of euthanasia, abortion, drug-use, and other degradation.

To those who now find themselves shocked at the mass death in Africa, or the outright murder of helpless individuals in nursing homes in order to cut costs, we can apply the dictum of the Nuremberg trials after World War II: *You knew, or should have known*, that your policies would lead to such crimes against humanity. We warned you from the late 1960s forward of what the consequences of IMF conditionalities would be. We warned from the 1970s forward, that Malthusian ideology would lead to genocide as well.

We could once again review where these fascist policies have come from—showing the continuity of the policymakers from Hitler's period to today. But today, let us concentrate on the two policy areas where our warnings have been the loudest: economics and health care. Let us hold up a mirror before you, and demonstrate without a doubt that we as a civilization are now repeating the very policies which led to the necessity for the worldwide mobilization to defeat Hitler 50 years ago. Then let us recommit ourselves to defeating fascism, by stopping these anti-human policies in their tracks.

### **Nazi euthanasia: the Earle Spring case**

There is no question but that the major industrialized countries of the world today are deliberately, explicitly reinstating the Hitlerian policy of Nazi euthanasia. This crime, for which the World War II victors tried Nazi doctors for "crimes against humanity" at Nuremberg, is now being rationalized as economically, socially, or morally necessary. The courts are approving it; the referenda ("popular opinion") are approving it; and some parliaments, such as that in the Netherlands and China, are doing the same.



Associates of Lyndon LaRouche rally against the International Monetary Fund in Washington in 1983. Many defenders of the "single issue" of the "right to life," support economic policies that are leading to the deaths of millions.

Lyndon LaRouche and the publications associated with him first raised a major alarm about this practice back in January 1980, in the case of a 78-year-old Massachusetts pharmacist by the name of Earle Spring. Spring was ordered by Massachusetts Probate Court Judge Sanford Keedy to be removed from kidney dialysis treatment, medication, and the special diet he needed to survive—so that he might “die with dignity.”

While this practice was evil in itself, there was another complication here. *Earle Spring did not want to die!* In the course of an international mobilization against the court decision, the LaRouche Presidential campaign was able to get nurses to interview Spring. In an affidavit eventually submitted to the Massachusetts Supreme Judicial Court judge who ordered Spring to be placed back on dialysis, nurse Donna McDonough put it this way:

“I asked him if life was good. He said, ‘Yes.’

“I asked him if he wanted to die. He thought for a moment and said, ‘No.’ ”

The Spring case contained all the elements which advocates of the Nazi practice of euthanasia champion today. First, it was Spring’s family which petitioned the court to take him off dialysis. Second, the excuse was that Spring was not “mentally competent” to decide to live. Third, it was argued by some medical personnel that kidney dialysis treatment had to be rationed, and that giving him the treatment, as was eventually ordered by Judge Francis Quirico, was “extraordinary,” too costly, and therefore unjustified.

Even at the time, LaRouche’s fight to save the life of Earle Spring went against the pro-fascist tide. Other Presidential candidates refused to respond to LaRouche’s plea to intervene. The *New York Times* had already gone on record back in May 1978 to the effect that “the effort to provide all the medical care anyone might want—or even need—is simply beyond the nation’s resources.”

### LaRouche on the ‘Right to Life’

As the Earle Spring case raged, and LaRouche’s associates sought support for his right to live, quite naturally we were in touch with organizations which claimed to be concerned with the fight for the Right to Life. To say that the response was disappointing, would be an understatement. Some leading individuals responded, but not the organizations as such.

In response, LaRouche wrote a document entitled “The Truth About the ‘Right to Life,’ ” published in *New Solidarity* newspaper on Jan. 25, 1980. The document identifies the critical economic area of continuity between Hitler’s fascist crimes, and those crimes being committed in the area of medicine today. We quote at length:

“The principle of the ‘right to life’ zoomed into importance as a major international issue during 1973 and 1974. This fight for the principle of life was prompted chiefly by the evil proposals of a United Nations-linked organization called the Club of Rome.

“The Club of Rome commissioned an evil, fraudulent report entitled *Limits To Growth*. The Club of Rome used that fraudulent report to support the argument that the human population must be reduced to as little as 1 billion persons by about the year 2000.

“In the context of that Club of Rome propaganda campaign, a variety of anti-life proposals were circulated by immoral professors and other influentials. Leading Club of Rome spokesman Aurelio Peccei promoted an ‘objective discussion’ of the conditions under which cannibalism might be regarded as ethically tolerable, as a means to solve problems of hunger. There was an attack, chiefly from leaders of the British medical profession, against the U.S. medical practice of ‘overuse of kidney machines’ to keep patients alive, and proposals for denying medical procedures to senior citizens

as a way of 'letting nature take its course' in cutting down that portion of the human population. . . .

"Despite the shift in public-relations posture by the Club of Rome, that evil association continues the same genocidal doctrine and practice to the present time. It is supported by such United Nations institutions as Unesco, Unitar, Unctad, Unido, and by the World Bank of Kennedy ally Robert S. McNamara.

"Because of the spread of such evil, genocidal policies through the 'conditionalities' policy of the International Monetary Fund and the 'appropriate technologies' policy of the World Bank, the question of the 'right to life' has rightly become one of the leading moral issues of political concern today.

"The practical form the principle of the 'right to life' takes in political affairs is this. Positively, we who support the principle of 'life' say that we will tolerate no economic or other policy, either nationally or internationally, which requires or promotes genocide by any means or in any guise. Negatively, all of those who actually support the principle of 'life' agree, we denounce as satanically immoral any political figure or governmental administration which supports the 'conditionalities' policy of the International Monetary Fund or the 'anti-technologies' policy of the World Bank and so-called Brandt North-South Commission. . . .

"In this context, the moral issues of abortion properly occupy a prominent position. Unfortunately, some evil persons who support every anti-life policy but abortion have infiltrated the 'right to life' organizations in an effort to make abortion the *only issue* of those organizations. Such persons are to be denounced as either immoral fools or willful frauds. Abortion is a proper issue, but it is immoral to pretend that abortion is the beginning and end of the issue of the 'right to life.' It is immoral to do nothing against the proposed genocide of half the human population, and to defend only the fetus in the early term of pregnancy."

### **Who is the enemy of life?**

LaRouche elaborated on the way in which demands for fascist economic policies necessarily lead to genocide, although advocates of such policies may attempt to justify them on the basis of other reasons.

"In its early form—the 1973-74 propaganda of the satanic Club of Rome—the promotion of mass death and even cannibalism was plainly advertised as a product of a certain economic policy. The argument was that the utopian 'zero' economic and technological growth required a massive reduction of the earth's human population. It was proposed that the world must let three horsemen of the apocalypse—famine, epidemic, and homicidal social chaos—take their 'natural course.' It was proposed that this general approach be supplemented by measures of euthanasia (against the old and grievously ill) and various modes of intensified birth-control, especially in undeveloped nations.

"Unless this economic motivation behind the anti-life forces is pinpointed, one cannot properly identify the enemies of life, nor can one combat those evil forces effectively.

"The supporters of the Club of Rome and of entities allied to the Club of Rome all premise their arguments for genocidal policies on the policy of 'zero' economic and technological growth. They argue, quite consistently, that without technological and economic growth the world cannot sustain its present level of human population, about 4 billion persons, let alone the 6 billion who should exist by the end of this century or thereabouts. Therefore, their argument continues, in order to achieve the goals of 'zero growth,' we must reduce the world's human population to levels which can be sustained without such necessary measures as the development of nuclear energy. The estimate of the world population which could be sustained without nuclear energy and other advanced technology is somewhere between 1 and 2 billion persons. Therefore, to achieve their economic utopia of 'zero growth,' the human population must be reduced by at least one-half during the coming two decades.

"Every proposal for eliminating human life—whether Peccei's earlier efforts to have cannibalism regarded as an ethical solution to the food-shortage problem, the euthanasia provision of various health bills, and increased emphasis on abortion almost as a way of day-to-day life—are all products of that economics-rooted determination to halve the human population by the year 2000 or thereabouts."

### **How genocide would occur**

LaRouche then noted how parallel this genocide is in form with Hitler's, although in fact, Hitler's crimes are dwarfed in numbers of people killed.

"The present-day model for reducing the world's population by half or more over the coming two decades is Adolf Hitler's Nazi Germany. The 'fiscal austerity' policies introduced to Germany by Nazi Finance Minister Hjalmar Schacht were a form of economic cannibalism. An economy ruled by the kind of 'fiscal austerity' policies introduced by Hjalmar Schacht cannot survive without cannibalizing parts of its own economy and population, and without proceeding further to cannibalize the economies and populations of its neighbors. Once such a policy is adopted and maintained, the remaining policy question is which sections of the population shall be condemned to a slave-labor/death-camp elimination, which nations shall bear the greater relative brunt of the looting and genocide. In the Nazi case, it was Jews, Slavic people, gypsies, and communists who were placed at the head of the line leading into the slave-labor/death-camp slaughter.

"It is the economics of Hjalmar Schacht which stand behind the present policies of the Club of Rome, World Bank, International Monetary Fund, and U.N.O. organizations such as Unesco and Unitar. . . . Today, Nobel Prize-winner Milton Friedman is the leading American supporter of the policies of Nazi Minister Hjalmar Schacht. Most leading U.S. academic economists support the same drift in economic and monetary policy as Lerner, Friedman, and other bald-faced defenders of Schacht's economic policies.

"This adoption of Nazi economic doctrines by most leading

professional economists in the United States today is not inconsistent with the influence of Cambridge University's John Maynard Keynes. Keynes's famous 'General Theory' was first published, not in an English-language edition, but in a 1936 German-language edition. For the 1936 Berlin edition of his 'General Theory,' Keynes wrote a special preface. In that preface he identified the Nazi regime as inherently better suited to carrying out his policies than the Western democracies. Lerner, Galbraith, and others are therefore able to 'defend' their present-day policies as a consistent outgrowth of their stand as leading Keynesians. Friedman has been rightly identified by Cambridge University's Mrs. Joan Robinson as a 'degenerate Keynesian,' as a relatively stupid person who cannot comprehend the subtler features of economics. . . .

### No 'single-issue' defense possible

"Therefore the only efficient defense of the principle of 'life' is a direct attack on all those professed 'environmentalist' and others who support 'neo-Malthusian' policies. It is the neo-Malthusian policies of Barry Commoner, Governor Brown, and others, which are the premise and motive for the promotion of genocidal policies pushed variously by the Club of Rome, the World Bank, the International Monetary Fund, the U.N.O., and the Georgetown University-based Kennedy Center for Bio-Ethics. Remove the motive for genocide and the danger of genocidal violations of the principles of life is easily pushed aside.

"Although prominent New Hampshire supporters of the candidacy of Gov. Ronald Reagan have publicly supported a 'Right to Life' amendment, Reagan supports economic and monetary policies which are fully consistent with the 'neo-Malthusian' doctrines of the IMF, World Bank, and so forth. It might be that Reagan himself would oppose abortion now, contradicting his earlier signature on a pro-abortion law enacted in California. However, such an anti-abortion stand by Reagan supporters is a fraud. They might take a posture of defending fetuses, but continue to support economic and monetary policies which threaten to reduce the population of the world by half or more.

"Therefore, one's suspicions are rightly aroused whenever one encounters persons and groups who allege that abortion is the one and only issue of the 'right to life' effort. They are misusing the issue of abortion to pull supporters of life away from the leading issues of life in the world today. They are immoral individuals who implicitly insist that they are willing to let half the world's population be wiped out in genocide, clinging to the pretext that they have saved, perhaps, one or two fetuses."

In conclusion to his 1980 statement, LaRouche made the following statement of principle:

"There is a commitment to a pro-life position embedded in the U.S. Constitution. There is a commitment to scientific and technological progress, to the development of the productive powers of labor—all through fostering the creative potentialities of the individual. Our nation's heritage obliges

us, the custodians of that heritage today, to not only foster scientific and related progress in knowledge, but to base the practical relations of one citizen to another on the practical realization of those reflections of the divine qualities of the individual citizen.

"Each life is potentially sacred to us. A scientist may make a discovery of universal importance, a discovery which serves as the foundation for subsequent further advances in seeking atonement of the mind with the lawful ordering of Creation. A teacher assimilates and disseminates that knowledge, realizing the creative work in a universalizing way. A working person translates that into universal practice. A parent nurtures the young minds capable of becoming such scientists, teachers, working persons. Each such individual life adds something irreplaceable to our species' labor as the instruments of God in the continuing work of Creation. Each life is sacred.

"To develop a fetus into a human being is a sacred undertaking, an act of creative work of an instrument of continuing Creation. To develop a child, once born, communicating the power of love to the newborn infant, is also such sacred work. On this point, no admissible differences exist among moral persons.

"Nor does any man have the right to terminate his own or other lives because that life has been savaged by illness or pain. We lack the power to know what another smile of lovingness might contribute. We have no right to practice euthanasia against the sacred mind of a single living person, even if those mental powers are reduced. . . ."

### IMF conditionalities are a Nuremberg crime

The emphasis which LaRouche has put on fighting fascist economics flows from the fact that such economic policies deny the nature of man as *imago viva Dei*, in the living image of God. But it is worth recalling at the current juncture, that LaRouche wrote a very specific document drawing out this point back in August 1982, in an open letter addressed to governments which were members of the IMF.

"Conditionalities" are a "Nuremberg crime," LaRouche wrote, addressing in particular the fact that the usurious practices of the international bankers had unleashed the Four Horsemen of the Apocalypse in the least developed countries, which amounts to genocide. The so-called developed countries will come next, LaRouche warned, citing the international bankers as "Lombards" in the following context:

"To employ Lombards' austerity measures, is to reduce investment in production and basic economic infrastructure. This is a reduction in the living standards of populations, which, at a certain point, lowers the average conditions of life of many below the level at which individual life can probably survive. When the screws of Lombards' austerity are tightened to a certain degree, now as during the 14th century, a genocidal, savage reduction of the population—mass-murder, pure and simple—erupts."

In a section entitled "The Echoes of Nuremberg," LaRouche wrote:

"The aggravated degree of austerity being practiced, has reached the point that officials of governments and supranational institutions are placing themselves personally at jeopardy under provisions of the 'Nuremberg Code.' In Africa and elsewhere, ladies and gentlemen, you are already complicit in what *you know or should have known* to be mass-murder against entire nations.

"To this point, the worst among you reply with words to the effect: 'So, what?' Such fellows have argued, to the effect of these words: 'Perhaps, we are increasing the death rates, even to as great a degree as you accuse us of doing. So, what? There are too many people living already, especially among the darker-skinned populations of the world. So, what, if many of them must die for the sake of our monetary policies? Show me anywhere today, a court which has the inclination and power to put me and my friends on trial because of these policies. We are running the world's monetary institutions, and we shall do as suits us. Good day! I have nothing more to say, wasting time arguing with you on this subject.'

"This is a fair description of arguments this writer has heard from financial officials and others repeatedly since late 1975 and early 1976: in Basel, Paris, the Federal Republic of Germany, London, the United States, and elsewhere.

"The racist component of such arguments is no exception. Such racialist motivations for the policies of the Club of Rome were volunteered by a former official of the OECD [Organization of Economic Cooperation and Development], recently, Dr. Alexander King. King identified himself as the creator of both the Club of Rome and of the present career of Aurelio Peccei. . . .

"Not only the policies of the Club of Rome, but the *Global 2000* and *Global Futures* reports issued by the outgoing Carter administration, are explicit policies for genocide against, especially, populations of the developing nations. The same policies are espoused by London's Chatham House [the Royal Institute of International Affairs] in its 'Year 2000' proposal. Although economic warfare against populations did not become generally a component of U.S. government policy until Henry A. Kissinger became national security adviser in 1969, the first law to this effect was enacted on the sponsorship of Sen. William Fulbright (D-Ark.) as early as 1963.

"These racialist, neo-Malthusian policies are endemic among the policymaking public and private institutions of nations, and extend into eastern European capitals through such institutions as the International Institute for Applied Systems Analysis (IIASA). It is the influence of such neo-Malthusian policies and their supporters which is chiefly responsible for widespread condoning of economic-monetary measures of genocide against targeted LDCs [lesser developed countries] and other nations today.

"To such political figures and their accomplices, a clear warning must be issued. Remember: The Nuremberg tribunal was created *after 1945*. 'Where is the court which would try you for your support of genocidal policies today?' Perhaps there is none. Can you be certain one will not spring into

being tomorrow?

"Unless the recent 15-year direction in international monetary and economic policies is reversed immediately, we must divide the otherwise unforeseeable course of future developments into three categorical ranges of possibilities. If the worse among the sponsors of neo-Malthusian doctrines have their way, this new depression will lead through a 'new dark age' into what is best described as one-world-government modeled on Malthusian world-federalist policies afoot today: the end of civilization. Second, there is the likelihood of thermonuclear war erupting because of the extent of destabilization and maddened desperation the foreseeable collapse of institutions will produce. Third, peoples may arise to resist these two alternatives, and with such effectiveness that the perpetrators of genocidal policies are brought to justice, justice applied with more vigorous resolution than during the Nuremberg proceedings.

"The long moribund Nuremberg Code of justice for crimes against humanity will be then revived. It will be revived, predictably, because the victors' sense for the importance of law will prompt them to revive previously existing law, where it is available from recent history, to order the indictments, trials, and sentencings."

### **The tasks before us today**

It is all too hideously clear that the warnings which LaRouche gave in the early 1980s and earlier were not heeded. Hundreds of millions have died needlessly due to IMF actions to deny development to areas such as Africa and Ibero-America. A similar process of strangulation by IMF policies is dramatically visible in the former East bloc, and in the so-called advanced sector as well.

The cultural pessimism which has resulted from these horrors has been overwhelmingly ugly. There are intellectual circles which have raised again the argument that fascist policies and methods will be "necessary" to deal with a world driven mad by economic and social collapse. Already, we see the reemergence of fascism's ugly twin, communism, in eastern Europe, as a "reaction" to the depredations of the IMF austerity. In the West, the disaffected and enraged are being inundated by fascist ideology by the likes of the Conservative Revolution think-tanks, in hopes of building a popular base for fascism once again.

It is high time we looked into the mirror—and recoiled. The emaciated concentration camp victims in Bosnia, the starving elderly patients in the nursing homes, the children dying of disease in refugee camps—these are the totally foreseeable results of a fascist ideology and economics that denies the value of human life. We must take decisive measures now to rip those policies out of our ruling institutions, and out of ourselves.

Then we can say that we rightly commemorated the victims of fascism, and the heroes of the war against fascism, 50 years ago. We carried on their work, and ensured that they didn't die in vain.