

# Philly bluebloods push Nazi eugenics

by Patricia Salisbury

A widely publicized Dec. 12 editorial in the *Philadelphia Inquirer* has called for reestablishing the Nazi policy of eugenics in the United States. Entitled "Poverty and Norplant: Can contraception reduce the underclass?" the editorial took the occasion of federal government approval of Norplant, a contraceptive which can be implanted in a woman's arm which can prevent pregnancy for five years, to propose that the new contraceptive could be the perfect way to rid the world of all the unwanted black babies being born. Impoverished black mothers, the editors wrote, could be encouraged to join the program through the incentive of increased welfare benefits.

The editorial sparked a protest rally the next day outside the *Inquirer's* editorial offices, organized by the Schiller Institute, associated with jailed statesman Lyndon LaRouche, in coordination with a number of black community activists and right to life leaders. Over a bullhorn, the rally organizers denounced the editors for turning poor mothers and babies into scapegoats for the stupidity and immorality of government economic policy.

## Community demands retraction

So outrageous was the editorial that the Schiller protest was immediately joined by minority members of the *Inquirer* staff that afternoon. The protest from the black community grew so fast that by Dec. 23 the paper had been forced to issue an apology for its editorial. But the deadly seeds had already been sown: Across the country, the *Inquirer's* apology was treated as a signal by other news media to rush to the defense of its eugenics policy proposal.

The Dec. 13 protest rally forced a meeting with editorial page editor David Boldt and Donald Kimelman, who wrote the editorial. At the meeting, the protesters demanded that the *Inquirer* retract its editorial, and undertake a full investigation of both government-endorsed genocide policies, and of the government persecution of political figures who oppose those policies, such as the jailed former U.S. presidential candidate Lyndon LaRouche.

Donald Kimelman attempted to soften this blatant espousal of genocide with the usual protestations that it was

the good of those condemned to be poor that he really had at heart. However, as a leaflet distributed by the Schiller Institute pointed out, this is hardly a new or convincing excuse. In her 1920 book, *New Woman, New Race*, Margaret Sanger, founder of the Planned Parenthood movement, declared that "The most serious evil of our time is that of encouraging the bringing into the world of large families. The most immoral practice of the day is breeding too many children. . . . *The most merciful thing that a large family does to one of its infant members is to kill it*" (emphasis added).

When Boldt and Kimelman continued to refuse to retract on all counts, an outpouring of rage from minority institutions and leaders was triggered. Local television interview shows, radio talk shows, and local and national newspaper article were devoted to the incident. Well-known members of the Philadelphia black community denounced the editorial in the strongest possible terms. *Philadelphia News* syndicated columnist Chuck Stone wrote, "Hitler could have written the same editorial without pausing to breathe between the sentences."

So strong was this sentiment and support for the Schiller Institute demand (see *Documentation*) that Boldt and Kimelman be fired, that their apology finally appeared on Dec. 23. But even there, the editors recanted not so much the views the editorial had expressed, but only the specific words they had chosen to use.

## Pump-priming for a national 'debate'

Some other news media took this as a cue to give their readers a peek at the swastikas on their underclothing. On Dec. 27, the *Richmond Times-Dispatch*, newspaper of record in Virginia's state capital, ran an editorial titled "Journalistic thought police" which argued that the *Inquirer* editorial had "simply noted the obvious fact, that Norplant, considered a safe and highly effective contraceptive, offers society yet another way to curb the expansion of an underclass, most of whose members face futures of disorder and deprivation." The *Times-Dispatch* accused those objecting to this glorification of eugenics, of being bullies.

Virginia has long been a hotbed of "race-purification" efforts: In the 1920s it adopted eugenics legislation which was later followed as a model by the Hitler regime in Germany.

Propaganda in favor of eugenics also went out nationally in the Dec. 31 issue of *Newsweek*, which commented on the furor over the article: "With luck, the debate about the issues of poverty will continue openly and honestly. . . . However offensive the editorial, Kimelman was clearly on to something. His underlying question was whether there might be creative approaches for working on the myriad problems of what has come to be called the underclass. The old answers have mostly failed. After the shouting stops, the problem will remain. It's too important to become taboo."

Contrary to *Newsweek's* hopes, the shouting is unlikely

to stop. Schiller Institute organizers are continuing to expose this revival of eugenics for what it is, and renewed their call for the firing of the *Inquirer* editors and an investigation of genocide policies.

---

## Documentation

---

# Citizens revolt against 'Inquirer' genocide call

*The following are excerpts from newspaper articles appearing nationally since the anti-genocide revolt began in the Philadelphia Inquirer news staff, sparked by a Schiller Institute demonstration on Dec. 13.*

*Philadelphia Inquirer*, Dec. 14, "Protesters picket *Inquirer* over editorial on Norplant":

"About a dozen protesters who identified themselves as followers of Lyndon LaRouche set up a picket line shortly before noon yesterday. . . . 'Inquirer, go implant yourself!' read one of the protester's signs. During the demonstration, Philip Valenti of Lansdowne set fire to a copy of the *Inquirer* and posed for a photographer as a breeze fanned the flames. . . .

"Members of the group met later yesterday afternoon with *Inquirer* editorial page editor David Boldt. 'They made it clear that the specter of eugenics should never be raised, and they have a point,' Boldt said afterward."

*Philadelphia Tribune*, Dec. 14, "Black *Inquirer* workers walk out over editorial":

"An editorial in Wednesday's *Philadelphia Inquirer* reasoned that the combining of topics could be considered 'deplorably insensitive.' Many black employees thought that was an understatement and walked off their jobs Thursday afternoon in protest."

*Philadelphia Daily News*, Dec. 18, column by Chuck Stone, "Black women, Norplant and sterilization":

"Hitler could have written the same editorial without pausing to breathe between sentences. . . . Were Don Kimelman, deputy editor of the *Inquirer*'s editorial page, less blinded by his Nordic arrogance, he might have recognized how much President Bush's veto of the Civil Rights Extension Act and his administration's sorry-assed racist efforts to cut off all scholarship aid for minority students were just as

significant in perpetuating the structural poverty of African-American children."

*Washington Post*, Dec. 18, "*Inquirer*'s birth control bomb—staff uproar over Philadelphia editorial":

"An uproar about an editorial that advocated birth control for poor black women and that has bitterly divided the staff of the *Philadelphia Inquirer* burst into public view over the weekend as the paper's top local columnist likened the editorial page editor to former Ku Klux Klansman David Duke."

*Philadelphia Inquirer*, Dec. 19, letter to the editor, "Norplant editorial exhibited 'classic racism'":

"The message behind your Dec. 12 editorial 'Poverty and Norplant' was crystal clear—poor women shouldn't have babies, African-Americans shouldn't have babies but, most of all, poor African-Americans shouldn't have babies. . . . That suggestion treads dangerously close to state-sponsored genocide." Signed by Vanessa Williams, Philadelphia Association of Black Journalists.

*Philadelphia Inquirer*, Dec. 21, "LaRouche followers protest an editorial in the *Inquirer*":

"About 20 protesters who identified themselves as followers of Lyndon LaRouche demonstrated for two hours outside the *Inquirer*'s offices at 400 N. Broad yesterday, demanding the dismissal of an *Inquirer* editorial writer and the paper's editorial page editor. . . .

"The demonstrators, who called the editorial racist and said that it supported 'Nazi eugenics,' called for the dismissal of David D. Boldt, editor of the editorial page, and Donald Kimelman, who wrote the editorial. 'We need more children; we need more black children, not fewer,' said Philip Valenti, leader of the demonstration and a member of the Schiller Institute, a LaRouche support group."

*Philadelphia Daily News*, Dec. 31, opinion column by syndicated columnist Cal Thomas:

"But then, given the general moral decline of the country, perhaps the *Inquirer*'s idea was just slightly ahead of its time. After all, our nation already allows abortion on demand, pulls feeding tubes from 'hopeless cases' like Nancy Cruzan . . . promotes 'living wills,' . . . whatever color. . . .

"If this sounds disturbingly similar to the thinking of those who created the Third Reich, it should. It was this attitude that led to the destruction not only of the German handicapped, but ultimately the unwanted unborn of Eastern Europe, and the Jews.

"When an individual's value is determined by his or her income, we have departed from the Jeffersonian ideal of 'endowed' rights to a form of eugenics that Planned Parenthood founder Margaret Sanger dreamed would come to pass."