

California's Nazi eugenics laws behind Proposition 187

by Mark Calney and Leo Scanlon

As the legislative agenda of the "Conservative Revolution" sputters to a halt in Congress and faces further rebuttals from state legislators, it is clear that the reports of popular support for draconian "reform" of the welfare and food stamp programs, as advocated by House Majority Leader Richard Arney (R-Tex.) and Sen. Phil Gramm (R-Tex.), was a myth created out of whole cloth. It will soon be clear as well that the passage of California's Proposition 187—which was touted as the second great leg of the Conservative Revolution in the November elections—was a "victory" built on shifting sand.

The authors of Proposition 187 have lied about the nature of immigration in the United States, and have fabricated the evidence which alleges a "crisis" of immigration policy. The networks involved represent a long tradition of hostility to the U.S. Constitution, and the anti-immigration propaganda today is based on the same fraudulent social science, pioneered in the United States in the 1920s and 1930s, which was called on to justify the race purification policies of the Nazi Party in Germany.

It is disturbing that such low-grade propaganda schemes could have as great an impact as they did on the electorate in California, but already many people are waking up to the fallacy that Proposition 187 represents.

What is more important, is that citizens understand the strategic significance of the immigration, for there is much more at stake here than foolish prejudices.

The history of immigration restriction in the United States illustrates the role this issue has played as a marker for broader strategic concerns. From the founding of the nation through the end of the 19th century, American System economic policies fostered an active recruitment of skilled and unskilled labor from Europe. The pamphlets circulated by Benjamin Franklin and his allies advertised the freedom of opportunity, and the high wage levels which work in the

New World offered. This attitude persisted despite perennial campaigns of nativist movements against Catholic immigrants. These outbursts reflected prejudices which were common in the republic, but did not shape national policy until the 20th century.

There was some anti-immigrant agitation in the late 19th century, and laws were passed preventing "labor contracts" and similar mechanisms which allowed low-paid workers to be temporarily imported but never settled. The 1892 Chinese Exclusion laws directed at Chinese labor on railroad projects are a well-known example. But the United States maintained, into the 20th century, its strategy of encouraging immigration to build a populous and, thus, powerful republic.

The next great wave of agitation was directed not at people from Africa, Asia, or Ibero-America, but at German immigrants who had been settling the Midwest in increasing numbers since the end of the Civil War. The propaganda directed against them was as bloodcurdling and racist as any written against Spanish or Asian immigrants today.

The issue involved was not merely a racial or ethnic conflict. The attack on German immigrants in the United States was organized by the British secret services beginning in 1914, and escalated as the British House of Windsor prepared for war on the European continent. By 1917, it had been made illegal in more than 17 states to speak or sing the German language, and rowdy mobs, whipped up by agents of the British war propaganda machine, routinely stopped the performance of German Classical music and drama. This cultural warfare did not abate with the end of World War I, but escalated dramatically. By 1921, the United States saw the first successful legislation designed to limit immigration. These laws allowed a number of each nationality to immigrate equal to 3% of the number of that nationality residing in the country as of 1910. This law completed the destruction

of the census as it was designed by the founders, and turned it into the instrument of social control and manipulation that it is today.

By 1924, new legislation cut the numerical quotas to one-half of the 1921 levels by allowing in only 2% of the 1890 number of a given nationality. This began the phase of overt discrimination against southern Europeans and Slavs which would continue through World War II, when millions of Jews, fleeing persecution in Europe, were denied entry into the United States because of such immigration restrictions.

The population control measures which the House of Windsor has been advocating represent a death warrant for the American Republic. Immigration restriction, eugenics, and environmentalism are each integral to that insidious campaign.

Rethinking their support

On Jan. 27, pro-Proposition 187 activists held a rally on the steps of the Glendale courthouse in Southern California, to demand that President Clinton stop his proposed financial stabilization of Mexico and to promote a "Proposition 187-style" anti-immigration amendment to the U.S. Constitution. Glenn Spencer, the spokesman for the group, told the assembled media, "It boils down to this: Do we want to retain control of the Southwest more than the Mexicans want to take it from us?" He compared the conflict to the Vietnam War, saying, "It's a struggle between two groups of people for territory."

Flush from their victory in the California election last November, backers of Proposition 187, such as the Federation for American Immigration Reform, are now openly demanding such anti-American measures as a moratorium on legal immigration and refugee entries.

But many Californians who voted for Proposition 187 are starting to question their support for what they thought was a measure to stop state government subsidies allegedly going to illegal Mexican immigrants. Many voted for this proposition in order to protest the ubiquitous growth of "government bureaucracy," and only now realize that Proposition 187 mandates the creation of a veritable gestapo informant machine to identify "suspected illegals."

As usual, such populists are "a day late and a dollar short." Those who designed and funded the initiative, such as the Pioneer Fund, and some of its political supporters, such as Gov. Pete Wilson (R) and the Conservative Revolution crowd, have long advocated a radical authoritarian role for government—whenever it comes to reducing population.

Their theories and programs are heir to the legacy of the eugenics movement in California—the movement which inspired and energized the Nazi movement and the government it created in Hitler's Germany. It is also instructive that the environmental movement has always been an arm of the eugenics movement. The Nixon administration provided a fertile ground for this unwholesome brew, and the same forces today have created the support for Proposition 187. This picture will be repugnant to many who have supported 187 in



E.S. Gosney, founder of the Human Betterment Foundation.

the hope that they are challenging the "liberal establishment." All the better. The founders of this republic knew well that there is only one defense against the tyranny of populist ignorance: the truth.

California's race 'scientists'

Now that we know the laws of heredity, it is possible to a large extent to prevent unhealthy and severely handicapped beings from coming into the world. I have studied with great interest the laws of several American states concerning prevention of reproduction by people whose progeny would, in all probability, be of no value or be injurious to the racial stock. I'm sure that occasionally mistakes occur as a result. But the possibility of excess and error is still no proof of the incorrectness of these laws.—Adolf Hitler¹

It was California's race "scientists" who shaped the creation of the Nazis' German Law on Preventing Hereditarily Ill Progeny. A representative of the American Committee on Maternal Health visited Nazi Germany in 1935 and, after discussions with members of the Nazi administration and the judges of their Heredity Health Courts, stated:

The leaders in the German sterilization movement state repeatedly that their legislation was formulated only after careful study of the California experiment as reported by Mr. [E.S.] Gosney and Dr. [Paul] Popenoe. It would have been impossible, they say, to undertake such a venture involving some 1 million people without

1. Otto Wagener, *Hitler aus nächster Nähe: Aufzeichnungen eines Vertauten 1929-1932*, ed. Henry A. Tuner (Frankfurt am Ullstein), 1978, p. 264.

drawing heavily upon previous experience elsewhere.²

In 1909, Charles M. Goethe, a prominent Sacramento banker and funder of the eugenics movement in the United States, wrote and organized the passage of the California Sterilization Law, making California the second state to enact such a measure (the first was Indiana). By 1930, in the wake of the Supreme Court decision in *Buck v. Bell*, which backed compulsory sterilization, California aggressively exercised its "state's right" to enforce the "eugenic sterilization" of 6,787 human beings who were considered "genetically defective." That is more than twice the number of forced sterilizations that took place during that period in all the other states of the Union combined.

The number of non-"Aryans" sterilized in California was higher than their respective proportion of the total population of the state. African-American inhabitants over 21 years of age made up 1.5% of the 1930 state population, but comprised 4% of the total sterilized. Some 20% of the men and 11% of the women sterilized were not U.S. citizens, with the proportion of Latin races being particularly high. According to California's eugenicists, "Mexican-Indian stock . . . showed an average of intelligence lower than that of the American Negro."³

The California Sterilization Law was organized in direct response to what Goethe termed the "eugenic aspects of immigration control. . . . The most pressing problem was to halt the then current inflow of millions of 'new immigrants.'"⁴

Goethe had been chairman and organizer of the Immigration Study Commission which monitored the enforcement of the Quota Acts of 1921, 1922, and 1924, which eugenicists referred to as the "Second Declaration of Independence." The primary focus of the group, however, was to lobby to extend the Johnson Immigration Restriction Act to include Ibero-America, especially to restrict Mexican immigration.

Human Betterment Foundation breeds race 'scientists'

Goethe later founded the Eugenics Society of Northern California, which led to his involvement in the establishment of the Human Betterment Foundation (HBF) in Pasadena in 1929. The founding chancellor of Stanford University and an original HBF trustee, David Starr Jordan, was vice president of the Eugenics Society of England. In 1912, one year after the death of British eugenics pioneer Sir Francis Galton, Jordan attended the First International Congress of Eugenics, held at the University of London, as a vice president of the

American delegation.

Jordan was also one of the original trustees of the Carnegie Foundation, which took over financing of the operations of the Eugenics Record Office (ERO) in Cold Spring Harbor, New York.⁵ ERO was founded by the Harriman family as the U.S. branch of Galton's eugenics laboratory. Jordan is probably better known today as one of the founders of the Sierra Club and the founder of the Bohemian Club of Northern California.

The HBF was incorporated as a charitable organization in 1929 in the city of Pasadena by E.S. Gosney, a former sheep rancher and banker. Paul Popenoe, a biologist, eugenics author, and director of the Los Angeles Institute of Family Affairs, became the secretary of the HBF and its chief "researcher" and spokesman. The HBF maintained a staff of about 30 drawn from California's top universities, the medical establishment, lawyers, bankers, media executives, religious leaders, and others.

HBF's members included: Harry Chandler, president of the *Los Angeles Times*; Henry M. Robinson, an original trustee of the HBF and president of Los Angeles's First National Bank, who was one of the three American members of the Inter-Allied Reparations Commission following World War I (the other two being Charles Dawes and Owen Young); Rabbi Rudolph I. Coffee of San Francisco, who served as vice president of the California Prison Association; Samuel J. Holmes, professor of Zoology at the University of California at Berkeley and author of *The Trend of Race* (1921) and *Studies in Evolution and Eugenics* (1923); Robert Millikan, founder and administrator of the California Institute of Technology (an HBF trustee); William Munro, formerly of Harvard, who set up CalTech's humanities program; and Lewis M. Terman, head of the Department of Psychology at Stanford University who developed the Stanford Binet IQ test.

The University of Southern California has always been a hotbed of eugenics theorists and activists. Rufus B. von KleinSmid, president of USC from 1921-47, was a member of the HBF, as was Justin Miller, the dean of the USC Law School and an original trustee of the HBF. In addition to holding various positions at the U.S. Department of Justice and serving on the Washington, D.C. Court of Appeals, Miller was vice chairman of the executive committee of the U.S. National Commission for Unesco (1947-50). Unesco was created to spread the pagan and racist theories of Julian

5. Averell Harriman's father E.H. Harriman was given the Union Pacific Railroad through capital supplied by the British royal family's personal banker Sir Ernst Cassell. With the resulting fortune, the Harriman family created the U.S. branch of Sir Francis Galton's laboratory as the "Eugenics Record Office" at Cold Spring Harbor, New York in 1910, thus launching the eugenics movement in the United States. The Carnegie foundation shared in the management of this eugenics center. In 1931, Averell Harriman merged his personal bank with Brown Brothers, the family firm of Bank of England Governor Montagu Norman. The following year the Harriman family sponsored the 1932 world eugenics meeting in New York to promote Adolf Hitler's race program.

2. Marie E. Kopp, "Legal and Medical Aspects of Eugenic Sterilization in Germany," *American Sociological Review*, 1, 1936, p. 763.

3. Paul Popenoe and Roswell Hill Johnson, *Applied Eugenics*, p. 294. Macmillan Company, New York, 1933.

4. C.M. Goethe, *Seeking To Serve*, p. 182. Keystone Press, Sacramento, 1949.

Huxley and other retainers of the House of Windsor.

Joseph Widney, USC president prior to KleinSmid, wrote a tome in 1907 entitled *Race Life of the Aryan People*. Widney was a straightforward racist who stated, "The Black and the White could live together with the White as master . . . but they can not live together as equals"; he promoted a Darwinian vision of a new global Aryan empire.

The goal of the HBF was to implement the objectives stated by Sir Francis Galton in his *Memories* (1908), where he wrote that the first object of eugenics "is to check the birth rate of the unfit, instead of allowing them to come into being, though doomed in large numbers to perish prematurely. The second object is the improvement of the race by furthering the productivity of the fit by early marriages and healthful rearing of their children."

Then, as now, the race purification movement depended greatly on the "private studies" which it financed in order to generate the hysterical propaganda in favor of its legislative agenda. The HBF reiterated that "its first major problem is to investigate the possibilities for race betterment by eugenic sterilization, and to publish the results."⁶

Extensive research to survey the data on California's sterilization law had been undertaken by Gosney and Popenoe and published in 1929 as a book entitled *Sterilization for Human Betterment*. That study received the "most hearty and unreserved cooperation of the State Department of Institutions" (formerly the State Department of Lunacy) which had conducted the sterilization operations. Aaron J. Rosanoff, California Commissioner of Lunacy from 1920 to 1940, was also chairman of the Committee on Immigration of the Eugenics Research Association, and worked with Charles Davenport, the director of the Eugenics Record Office in Cold Spring Harbor.

Spreading the 'success'

HBF vigorously campaigned to spread the "success" of California's compulsory sterilization law to other states and internationally. Their publications included books and pamphlets and a popular textbook, *Applied Eugenics*, written in 1918 by Popenoe and Roswell Hill Johnson, which was in daily use in classrooms of higher learning around the nation until the start of World War II. In 1933, the year that Hitler came to power, a newly revised edition was released and translated into Japanese.

Rudolph Hess, the deputy leader of the Nazi Party, employed a popular Nazi expression with the identical theme: "National Socialism is nothing but applied biology." This phrase was first coined in 1931 by German eugenicist Fritz Lenz. Lenz worked closely with California's HBF and co-authored, with Eugene Fischer, the German textbook on eugenics. Popenoe had translated a 1924 article by Lenz about the German eugenics movement, which stated that there was

6. Paul Popenoe and E.S. Gosney, *Twenty-Eight Years of Sterilization in California*, p. 41. Human Betterment Foundation, Pasadena, 1939.

virtually no difference between U.S. and German eugenicists *except that the United States was more advanced in terms of legislation.*

The HBF called for the mass sterilization of the "eugenic deficient," which included not only those termed insane or "mentally deficient," but also those with inherited diseases and physical defects such as the blind, deaf, and epileptic, as well as the economically dependent. They calculated that 4% of the population were "mentally disabled" or "deficient" and had to be sterilized. This number was determined to be 200,000 Californians and 4.8 million in the entire United States. Adding in those people who were termed "mentally diseased," the HBF estimated that the number of those needing sterilization nationally to be "nearly 10 million." These figures do not include other categories of "deficient" people, such as the blind.

As in Nazi Germany, race purification was always touted as a form of "fiscal conservatism." The HBF estimated that maintaining 60,000 "mental defectives" in institutions cost the taxpayers \$30 million a year in direct outlay (1929 dollars). Sterilization of "mental defectives" inside and outside of institutions, the HBF asserted, will eliminate those costs through the removal of future generations of "mental defectives." On a global scale, they estimated the savings to be \$5 billion annually.

The attack on a living wage

Finally, the eugenicist movement aggressively opposed the labor reform efforts which were catalyzed internationally by the work of Pope Leo XIII and his collaborators. Catholic activists, Protestant reformers, and Jewish organizers all were fighting to eliminate the misery and slave-labor conditions which prevailed wherever the "Manchester School" of free trade held sway. The eugenicists knew that a "family wage" was the surest guarantee of family formation, and demographic expansion.

In their book *Applied Eugenics*, Popenoe and Rosewell presented the full and consistent basis for the argument which has been revived by Gramm and Armev in their speeches opposing President Clinton's attempt to raise the minimum wage:

A minimum living wage is desirable for every man, but the idea of giving every man a wage sufficient to support a family can not be considered eugenic. . . . It is an attempt to make it possible for every man, no matter what his economic or social value, to support a family. Therefore, insofar as it would encourage men of inferior quality to have or increase families, it is unquestionably dysgenic.⁷

This fundamental aim of the Conservative Revolution today is obscured by their touting of "family values."

7. *Applied Eugenics*, p. 334.

The 'California model' emigrates to Germany

The Germans are beating us at our own game.

—Joseph S. DeJarnette, member of the Virginia sterilization movement

In 1932, the Third International Congress of Eugenics, held in New York City's American Museum of Natural History, outlined the race and population program of the Anglo-American financiers (the Harriman and Mellon families especially) who bankrolled the movement. Representatives of a new party in Germany, acclaimed internationally for their radical fiscal conservatism and commitment to reducing Germany's national debt, were in attendance. Months later, their leader, Adolf Hitler, would come to power.

Dr. Ernst Rudin, a representative of the new Nazi movement, was elected the federation's president at that 1932 congress. Rudin was head of the Munich-based Kaiser Wilhelm Institute for Psychology and the Kaiser Wilhelm Institute for Anthropology, Eugenics, and Human Heredity (Berlin) which was created and funded by the Rockefeller Foundation. (See Anton Chaitkin's "Rockefeller and Mass Murder," *New Federalist*, Aug. 22, 1994.)

The congress was opened by Charles Davenport, its incumbent president and the Harriman family operative from the Cold Spring Harbor eugenics center, who said, "Can we by eugenical studies point the way to produce the superman and the superstate? Progress will come slowly. . . . I think we are justified in having faith that the future will bring precise knowledge in human biology, and education will establish the desired mores."

California had already established an impressive track record on that front. It was to California that the new Nazi regime of Germany looked for help in its quest to obtain the eugenicists' dream of "race purification." And indeed, the Rockefeller-Rudin apparatus became a part of the Nazi state, when Rudin was appointed head of the Racial Hygiene Society.

As part of the Task Force of Heredity Experts chaired by SS chief Heinrich Himmler, Rudin and his staff drew up the Nazi sterilization law. The law was adopted in July 1933 and described as an *American model law*. U.S. eugenicists were ecstatic.

Popenoe of the HBF (and also a member of the board of directors of the American Eugenics Society in the 1930s, 1940s, and 1950s) wrote an article in the U.S. eugenics *Journal of Heredity*, which praised Hitler for placing "his hopes of biological regeneration solidly on the application of biological principles of human society." He stressed:

Hitler is surrounded by men who at least sympathize with the eugenics program. . . . The policy of the present German government is therefore to gather about it the recognized leaders of the eugenics movement, and to depend largely on their counsel in framing a policy which will direct the destinies of the German people, as

Hitler remarks in *Mein Kampf*, "for the next thousand years."⁸

Declaration of Independence attacked

Such fawning praise for the Nazis by U.S. eugenicists was no surprise. In 1933 (as they had earlier in 1918), Popenoe and Johnson attacked the U.S. Declaration of Independence and "the self-evidence of the truth that all men are created equal. . . . That phrase has long been a favorite with the demagogue and the utopian. . . . The American educational system is based largely on this dogma, and much of the political system seems to be grounded on it."

They identified the unity between those "right" and "left" forms of tyranny which arise from this rejection of the premise of the U.S. Constitution. "Fundamentally, eugenics is anti-individualistic and insofar a socialistic movement, since it seeks a social end involving some degree of individual subordination. . . . Good government is then an aristo-democracy. In it the final control rests in a democratically chosen legislature, to which *only the qualified* may be candidates" (emphasis added).⁹

In response to the international outcry against Nazi eugenics laws which was raised by sane governments and individuals, Nazi spokesmen continually stressed that their laws were not as "radical" as those already implemented in the United States, especially California. Unlike the system in the United States, they noted, someone who was slated for sterilization in Nazi Germany could appeal their case to the Heredity Health Courts. They also reminded critics of how the U.S. Supreme Court had upheld compulsory sterilization in 1916 and 1927.

Nazi propaganda gleefully reported that according to a survey of the HBF, the overwhelming majority of Californians supported sterilization laws. In 1930, Gosney and Popenoe's book *Sterilization for Human Betterment* had been translated into German and widely circulated.

As opposed to the demands of the California HBF—to sterilize 4% of the population—Hitler stated that his modest proposal was to sterilize only 400,000 Germans, about 1% of the population.

Conversely, eugenicists elsewhere used the passage of the Nazi sterilization law to their advantage. Joseph DeJarnette, a leader of the Virginia eugenics movement, sent a letter in 1934 to the state government demanding that the state extend its sterilization law to more closely resemble the comprehensive German law.

After Hitler came to power, collaboration between the German and American Nazi eugenicists significantly increased. Popenoe was given prominent coverage in the Nazi press as an internationally renowned eugenics expert. Goethe traveled annually from California to Germany after 1933 to

8. Paul Popenoe, "The German Sterilization Law," *Journal of Heredity*, 25, 1934, p. 260.

9. *Applied Eugenics*, pp. 43, 306-311.

exchange information and observations among eugenicists.

During the latter half of 1933, the HBF mailed a pamphlet regarding the California experience in forced sterilizations to German race hygienists and Nazi administrators responsible for enforcement of the German race laws. Gosney praised the fact that, "with the adoption of a eugenic law by Germany, more than 150 million civilized people are now living under such a law."

Herbert Linden, one of the top Nazi politicians who promoted sterilization, used the California HBF pamphlet to further the cause of the German sterilization law. Linden, a prominent member of the Health Department at the Third Reich Ministry of the Interior, later became a chief organizer in the physical extermination of more than 100,000 mentally handicapped people.

In 1934, the California eugenics movement, with the help of a German Nazi who was visiting with his fellow eugenicists in Pasadena, organized an exhibition at the Los Angeles County Museum to promote the eugenics program of the Nazi government, especially sterilization.

In 1936, Harry Laughlin, the assistant director of the Eugenics Records Office in Cold Spring Harbor, thought that "Hitler should be made honorary member" of the Eugenics Research Association.¹⁰ He purchased and circulated an English version of the motion picture "Erbkrank" ("Hereditary Defective"). It was a sterilization propaganda film produced by the Racial Political Office of the Nazi Party which depicts mentally handicapped people as being "lower than animals" and costing the state millions of marks.

Laughlin convinced millionaire Wickliffe Draper and his Pioneer Fund, which would later finance California's Proposition 187, to finance the distribution of the Nazi film. A flier advertising the film was sent to biology teachers at 3,000 U.S. high schools in the United States.

On the related issue of immigration, Nazi "race betterment" proponents were particularly impressed by how America's immigration policy combined eugenic and ethnic selection. In 1934, Nazi race anthropologist Hans F.K. Günther told an audience at the University of Munich that "American immigration laws were accepted by the overwhelming majority, although the United States appeared the most liberal country of the world."

At the 1936 conference of the International Federation of Eugenics Organizations in the Netherlands, HBF's Charles Goethe, as president of the Eugenics Research Organization, explained to the delegates that the United States had taken strong measures to prevent the further admission of undesirable immigrants and to purge the existing population.

His eugenics colleagues in California had already put forward their program on immigration (which had been translated into German), which included the statement: "No one

10. Laughlin Papers, "Hitler and the Jews," handwritten comment in the margin of a *New York Times* article "Nazis Open Race Bureau for Eugenic Segregation," May 4, 1933.

will be admitted to the United States as a permanent resident, who is not superior to the average of the population already here. . . . Large numbers of persons should not be admitted, who are radically dissimilar to the present population."¹¹

The fraud of cost

The proponents of Proposition 187 claim that illegal Mexican immigrants cost the California taxpayers approximately \$18 billion a year. This estimate is based on a study by Donald Huddle titled "The Net Costs of Immigrants to

In response to the international outcry against Nazi eugenics laws, Nazi spokesmen continually stressed that their laws were not as "radical" as those already implemented in the United States, especially California. As opposed to the demands of the California Human Betterment Foundation—to sterilize 4% of the population—Hitler stated that his modest proposal was to sterilize only 400,000 Germans, about 1% of the population.

California." The study, which Governor Wilson has constantly referred to, was commissioned by the Carrying Capacity Network, a zero-population-growth group based in Washington, D.C. Paul Ehrlich, a fanatic anti-population advocate, is a member of its board.

(The idea of "carrying capacity," i.e., the limit of population related to an allegedly fixed limit of resources, originally comes from the 18th-century Venetian hoaxster Giammaria Ortes. It was plagiarized by British East India Company propagandist Thomas Malthus, and published in his treatise "An Essay on the Principle of Population.")

In February 1994, a response to the material produced by the modern advocates of the "carrying capacity" hoax was released by the Tomas Rivera Center, a think-tank in Claremont, California. "How Much Do Immigrants Really Cost?" a study by Dr. Jeffrey Passel, exposed the Huddle and related studies to be statistical frauds based on a fallacy of composition.

For starters, Passel discovered that the Huddle study made a \$30 billion mistake. Huddle's projections were based

11. *Applied Eugenics*, p. 291.

on assuming that no immigrants die or leave the United States after 1992, and that immigrants who enter after 1994 pay no taxes. Huddle excluded from his report (to name only some of the more egregious examples) Social Security, gas, and sales taxes paid by immigrants in California. The statistically irrefutable conclusion is that immigrants actually make a net contribution to the California economy of more than \$12 billion a year.

The Conservation Foundation

How then does this fakery become so entrenched in supposedly “conservative” quarters, such as the machine allied to Governor Wilson? While Wilson was a U.S. senator, he was simultaneously on the board of trustees of the malthusian Conservation Foundation, along with Interior Secretary Bruce Babbitt and George Bush’s good friend William K. Reilly. These men, and the ideas they represent, should be carefully studied by those farmers, ranchers, and miners who supported John Huffington’s Senate bid.

The Conservation Foundation was a eugenics propaganda organization begun by the families tied to the House of Windsor and its allies in Holland and Belgium. These are the networks who launched the World Wildlife Fund in 1961. Its U.S. founder was Henry Fairchild Osborne, the nephew of Fairchild Osborne, who co-hosted the 1932 International Eugenics Conference cited above. The foundation also helped to spawn such groups as the Environmental Defense Fund in the 1960s.

The financial backers of Proposition 187 share the same profile. Proposition 187 was co-authored and promoted by the Federation for American Immigration Reform (FAIR), an organization founded in 1979 by William Paddock, author of the “Paddock Plan.” As a U.S. State Department agronomist, Paddock co-authored the book *Famine 1975! America’s Decision, Who Will Survive?* His plan was simple, as he restated in a 1975 interview about his book: “The Mexican population must be reduced by half. Seal the border and watch them scream.” Asked how this population reduction would be accomplished, Paddock replied, “By the usual means: famine, war, and pestilence.”

In a 1980 interview, Paddock stated, “If you do anything to increase food production through more agricultural technology, all you are doing is increasing future suffering. . . . Think how prosperous Mexico would be today if it had the population of 1933, eighteen million.”

In 1973, Paddock, along with Garrett Hardin, founded the Environmental Fund, with money from the Mellon family. The fund described itself in its statement of purpose as “an effort to stimulate thinking about the unthinkable”—that governments must implement coercive, not voluntary, birth control. In 1979, Paddock spun FAIR out of this Environmental Fund, in order to have an organization dedicated to ending immigration into the United States.

In 1980, there were five directors of FAIR. Besides Paddock, one was former Standard Oil (i.e., Rockefeller) vice

president and Gulf Oil (i.e., Mellon) president Sidney Swensrud. The chairman was Dr. John Ianton, a board member of the Environmental Fund who was also president of Zero Population Growth (ZPG) and a member of the Club of Rome.

Proposition 187’s co-author, Alan Nelson, was an employee of FAIR, which accepted more than \$1 million from the Pioneer Fund. The Pioneer Fund, as cited above, was founded by eugenicist Harry H. Laughlin of the Eugenics Record Office with money provided by Wickliffe Draper. The Pioneer Fund continued to finance the American Eugenics Society and Birthright, Inc. through 1945, and has continued to fund eugenics “research” by those who purport to show that African-Americans are genetically inferior to whites.

The recipients of Pioneer Fund grants include Arthur Jensen, Roger Pearson, Hans J. Eysenck, Robert A. Gordon, J. Philippe Rushton, and Linda Gottfredson. The fund also bankrolled such publications as *Aryan Evolution*.

Eugenicists and environmentalism

There is nothing new in the close connection between the eugenicist movement and the environmentalist movement, and only those ignorant of history will be shocked to learn that the Nixon administration was a launching pad for both.

In April 1970, Henry Kissinger’s geopolitical games in Southeast Asia were exacting a toll in blood that threatened to bring down the Nixon administration. At just this moment, a bipartisan group of prominent advocates of population control—Nicholas deB. Katzenbach, William Draper, Clare Booth Luce, and other Anglophile luminaries—put their efforts behind a drive to build campus support for “Earth Day.”

The idea of mobilizing college students behind some “cause” other than ending the Vietnam War, represented a godsend to the administration, and millions of dollars (from the now notorious CREEP coffers of Nixon’s reelection campaign), as well as the public endorsement of Nixon and other officials, were put behind the “anti-pollution” movement.

The establishment network backing “Earth Day” was the population control movement, and especially its leader, John Moore. Moore, “the Dixie Cup King,” had organized the merger of Margaret Sanger’s Planned Parenthood Federation with his own World Population Emergency Campaign in 1961. His movement, which was earlier called the “eugenics movement,” had its roots in the malthusian theory that social problems are the product of genetic inheritance.

In Moore’s view, the missing element in the fledgling environmentalist movement of 1970, was a clear commitment to population control. So, in conjunction with the Nixon administration, he put his money, and his paid spokesman—Paul Ehrlich—to work, building campus events nationwide, centered on the theme “people pollute.”

On April 22, 1970, “Earth Day” dawned and anti-war protesters grabbed up Ehrlich’s book *The Population Bomb*, a propaganda piece which has long since been discredited. But Moore reprinted Ehrlich’s hook in the millions of copies for the occasion, and by the end of the day, the protest junkies

were hooked on an ideology that kills more people every year than all the bombs dropped on Vietnam.

Environmentalism's racist roots

Moore and Ehrlich were united by their common devotion to the work of William Vogt, chief of the Conservation Section of the Pan-American Union. In 1948, Vogt co-authored *Human Breeding and Survival* with Guy Irving Burch, and the two collaborated with Fairfield Osborn (son of the race propagandist Henry Fairfield Osborn) in writing *Our Plundered Planet*, which launched the postwar effort to unite the conservation movement with the eugenics movement.

Vogt's most famous work was his 1949 *The Road to Survival*, with an introduction by Bernard Baruch; it received an enthusiastic reception by book clubs and the media. The book attacked modern medicine and modern agriculture and argued that the Catholic Church and its opposition to population control represented the greatest "threat to the environment."

Vogt later became the national director of the Planned Parenthood Federation of America, and in this capacity came to the attention of John Moore. Moore decided to put his energies and money behind the eugenics cause. He revived the faltering Population Reference Bureau, reorganized the sterilization movement as chairman of the Association for Voluntary Sterilization, Inc., and unified these movements under the Planned Parenthood Federation. He then organized a provocative ad campaign which gathered the signatures of many prominent Americans, which pushed the "population bomb" thesis, blamed crime and environmental degradation on the infant poor, and cultivated the theme that the Roman Catholic Church is the major threat to civilization. Full-page ads blamed the pope for the fact that the world's poor people do not earn enough money to pay for food. "Pope Denounces Birth Control as Millions Starve," was one typical headline.

The assault on the image of man

Those, like the sponsors of Proposition 187, who proffer that man is biologically or geographically determined, are inherently anti-American and promote an oligarchical world view. Sir Francis Galton, originator of all the modern pseudo-scientific gobbledygook of eugenics and the eugenical strain within genetics, based his thesis on the absurd assertion that the qualities of mind are as heritable as physical traits.¹²

This view of man as a mere beast was openly admitted in a HBF editorial published in the *Eugenics* journal:

It is an interesting fact that much of the leadership of

12. The "bell curve" originates from Sir Francis Galton's perversion of German scientist Carl Friederich Gauss's so-called "law of error," which Gauss had developed to calculate the mean of errors made in the measurement of "true" physical quantities such as planetary positions. Galton, however, was not interested in the mean but the distribution of the deviations from it, and unscientifically applied it to human traits.

eugenics in the United States has been found not in the graduates of the older institutions of classical learning, but among the graduates of the agricultural colleges, who were more accustomed to view man as an animal, and who realized that as an animal he was just as capable of improvement as were species of domesticated animals and cultivated plants.¹³

What makes mankind different from the animals and plants—the creative potential of the human mind—is what the eugenicists and their kind negate. It is precisely that quality which distinguishes man as being created in the image of God, and enables him to participate in the ongoing creation and perfectability of the universe.

As economist Lyndon LaRouche has proven, man willfully expands his population exponentially through his continuing mastery of natural law via scientific discovery and newly defined resources, as no other species can. An idea, such as a scientific discovery, has no weight, size, or other physical quantifiable existence, other than whether or not its application successfully increases what LaRouche termed "relative potential population density" of the nation and mankind as a whole. That quality of creativity is how humanity demonstrates its "improvement." It is not generated from the soil where one lives, or from the color of one's skin.

As HBF president Gosney stated, the enemy of these eugenicist criminals is "modern civilization, human sympathy, and charity [which] have intervened in nature's plan," because "the weak and defective are now nursed to maturity and produce their kind."¹⁴

Such un-Christian, anti-human views are echoed today by the depopulation genocidalists, like Paddock, who demand that no modern technology, medical aid, or food be made available to the underdeveloped nations of the world.

If anyone today still doubts that eugenics and eugenical breeding are a fraud, they should simply make a close examination of that household which is its strongest and most active advocate: the British royal family.

When this article's co-author Mark Calney ran in the Democratic Party primary for governor in the last election, he warned that Pete Wilson was attempting to blame illegal aliens for California's economic collapse just like Adolf Hitler blamed the Jews for Germany's problems. During the spring of 1994, Calney warned Wilson that he had better clean out the insane usurious policies of such things as derivatives in Orange County or the state was headed toward a much bigger collapse. Well, Orange County's economy did collapse, and it wasn't caused by illegal aliens in the county treasurer's office.

13. "The Human Betterment Foundation," editorial reprint from *Eugenics*, Vol. II, No. 3, March 1929, pp. 17-21. (The American Eugenics Society, New Haven, Conn.).

14. Gosney and Popenoe, *Sterilization for Human Betterment*, p. v. Macmillan Company, New York, 1929.