

## LaRouche refutes 'Great Apes' theory

*In an unpublished piece, written on Dec. 30, 1994, Lyndon LaRouche wrote, under the heading, "The Keystone of Physical Economy":*

The science of physical economy depends upon the demonstrable fact, that the characteristic feature of the existence of the human species sets mankind absolutely apart from, and above all other forms of life.

Were mankind a higher ape, the potential population-density of the human species would never have exceeded several million living individuals. . . .

The earliest surviving record which shows explicit human knowledge of the nature of this superiority of mankind over other species, is found in the first chapter of the first book of Moses. As Philo ("Judaeus") of Alexandria read those verses, man is in "the image of God the Creator," not

according to some notion of bodily image, but, rather, in respect to an efficient creative power of the individual human intellect. By aid of the development of this distinctive faculty, absent in the beasts, mankind can discover valid, higher principles of nature, and this to such effect that mankind's intellect, so informed, can create new states of nature never before existing in the universe, new states of nature expressed as a measurable increase of mankind's power over nature, per capita, per family household, and per square kilometer of land-area in use. . . .

For introductory classroom instruction, the behavior potentials of a beast can be compared to a formal euclidean geometry. Certain axioms and postulates are given, as if on blind faith (as if "self-evident"). Many different theorems are possible in this geometry, but each and all propositions acceptable as theorems must be consistent with each and all of the original set of axioms and postulates. For this purpose, consistency is defined by deductive logic. An ape is capable of "insight," but not willful acts of creative reason. There is no creativity in a deductive logic, nor can creativity be represented in any mathematics which copies the principles of a deductive logic. . . .

al body" would only secondarily be the "immediate practical value" it would have for apes. "Perhaps even more significant . . . will be its symbolic value as a concrete representation of the first breach in the species barrier," they write.

And this co-authored by the man castigated in leading German circles, today, as an intellectual descendant of the Nazis!

### The phony DNA argument

Following the introductory "Declaration," there is a contribution by Jane Goodall, entitled "Chimpanzees—Bridging the Gap." Goodall's claim to international prominence, is that she spent some 30 years co-habiting with apes. She writes: "We come up, again and again, against that non-existent barrier that is, for so many, so real—the barrier between 'man' and 'beast.'" Goodall, echoing Prince Philip, attacks "anthropomorphism," citing alleged findings that the DNA of man and ape differs "by only just over 1%." From that standpoint, "who are we to say that the suffering of a human being is more terrible than the suffering of a nonhuman being, or that it matters more?"

(Of course, the argument against Goodall, that an ape could never reproduce the mental functions necessary for writing as she does, is double-edged: Apes, to their credit, could never produce such drivel as she does.)

Goodall has been attacked by even some of her professional colleagues involved in "great ape" work. Ronald Nad-

ler works at the Yerkes Primate Center, in Georgia, a place known for some bizarre projects in recent years. Having studied great apes both in the wild and in captivity, he charged, in a mid-1993 statement, that Goodall has "exaggerated the intellectual nature of the animal and also exaggerated the negative aspect of the conditions in which we keep them." He derided her claim that conditions for apes in laboratory are "like a concentration camp," and insisted that she is "neglecting the real benefits to mankind which derive from research" on apes.

(Goodall herself, meanwhile, seems to have had second thoughts about all this. She is quoted in the Jan. 14, 1996 London *Sunday Telegraph*, saying that she has now come to realize that apes behave in "awful" ways, and are therefore no better, and maybe worse, than humans.)

One of the "big guns" pulled out by the Great Apes gang is Oxford University Prof. Richard Dawkins, collaborator of Prince Philip and follower of the late Lord Bertrand Russell. He spends a good deal of his time simulating "Darwinian evolution" on his computer, and coming up with oddball proofs on the "randomness" of the human race. Dawkins epitomizes biological, or bio-genetic reductionism run wild. The July 29, 1995 London *Guardian* wrote of him: "The discovery of DNA, he says, means that Darwinism can be retold digitally; there is no need for any other explanation of the universe beyond that of the selfishness of the gene. . . . Dawkins attended church as a child but rejected it in his teens, when he