

“Lacklove,” or
“Notes on the Crime of Genocide”
an essay by John Bart Gerald

It is a danger implicit in democracy’s rule by the majority, the threat of genocide by consensus. An entire society that condemns the crime of genocide and then calls it by another name can be both criminal and righteous. When legal restraints to the majority or empowered portion of the society are taken away, then that society is in a position to threaten the minority (and any individual within a democracy is also a minority). When the legal restraints affirmatively expressed in civil rights laws, human rights law and Charter Rights, are removed, then the balance necessary to the safety of minorities is removed.

As if speaking with a single voice all the US controlled human rights organizations have attempted to condemn the Iraqi people to death, by refusing to deal with two major attempts to conquer Iraq, within the perspective of the United Nations Convention on Genocide.

Because of the Convention on Genocide, any use of weapons of mass destruction may be considered criminal, since these indiscriminately destroy civilian populations. In economic warfare where the ruling classes of supposedly “enemy” countries often have more in common than citizens within a country, all rulers may eventually be called to account for the effect of their policies on the poor.

It seems that the purposes of any war are acquisition or conquest, profits for the arms merchants, and the destruction of underprivileged population groups. Economists will say that the destruction of a targeted area’s people is collateral damage, but the people won’t. Usually this applies to the residents of the battlefield, particularly if their group hinders access to native oil or mineral deposits, or access for their conveyance to market, or the tactical military use of the region.

The poor of Western countries, primed on television and mass culture entertainment which

leads teenagers to armed attacks on their schools, are enlisted to terminate the existence of entire population groups in areas where Western corporations expand their interests.

By 2004, this mechanism has become clear as an economic tactic of corporate expansion. A difficulty with US foreign policy which allows such a mechanism, is that in each instance a genocide is commenced.

It is not always a genocide which is accomplished overnight, but the condemning of a portion of humanity - usually an ethnic or national population group without substantial allies, to death.

The thoughtful ask, to what purpose ? The thoughtful do not understand easily the nature of conquest, the glorification of competition which leads to conquest rather than cooperation, the misuse of Darwin's sense of natural selection, to serve the interests of a few. The perspective of conquest is ultimately hinged with cost effectiveness.

It will be cost effective for large corporations and the countries they use, to destroy resistant cultures, societies, ethnic, religious etc. groups: they have done this recently to Yugoslavia, Kosovo, Iraq, and previously to Vietnam. They have accomplished their goals in Afghanistan. In all the above the native peoples or historic inhabitants of the targeted areas now live in ecologically hazardous conditions which can only lower birthrates if in fact the people are allowed biological continuation by what has been wrecked on their habitats.

These are each genocides because there is no truthful way to avoid awareness that there is intention to terminally destroy the groups within the habitat. Because the destruction is inevitable but sometimes very slow, it requires a certain amount of disinformation to the public over the years. Otherwise, the people would easily understand the crime and stop it. It is not that people are intrinsically angels, but that Genocide simply isn't a crime that benefits people. It certainly doesn't benefit its victims, or all those in bondage through fear of being exterminated. It doesn't benefit the

perpetrators, because they become people who can never heal to a sense of oneness with humanity, if in fact they are allowed to live or partake in society. Ecologically, genocide despoils the habitat for all other people.

But it's more than that. Genocide isn't civilized in the sense that it is so criminal, people reject it as a military or political tactic, much as they reject murder or torture. One doesn't want to build a life on the fruits of terrible crimes. So the only people who benefit from genocide are those directly sharing its profit, for example the property of victims, and the professional people who effect the genocides because that is what they are paid to do. These people or groups usually have an agenda based on furthering their own economic interests, and define their group or tribe by exclusions that make their victims somehow less human. The dehumanization of intended victims often begins with deprivation of the basic legal rights, such as right to a fair trial.

Parallel to any genocide are the efforts to hide and disguise its profit. As a corollary you will find concurrent efforts to legitimize any actions necessary for the genocide, which are otherwise largely arbitrary. This is clear if you study how and why the US and its Coalition went to war in Iraq in 1990 and the US and essentially Britain, in 2003. By hiding the economic benefits - essentially making early profits and withdrawing, or by deferring the profit - companies and individuals avoid appearing to have the intention of genocide.

When this happens again and again and again, for example when it is impossible to avoid the conclusion that destabilisation of a country will assure ethnic warfare, and when the controls of extreme warfare are removed or denied as an adequate United Nations force was in Rwanda, the resulting crime is not a mistake, nor is it unforeseen.

“Why would we do that ?” as an answer to a charge of genocide, can be answered - at least in terms of contemporary genocides, with the word, “profit,” direct profit. The destruction of Yugoslavia,

Afghanistan and Iraq, each is an action for corporate profits - Euro-North American economic warfare. Countries of the Americas taken over by the US elites through death squads and anti-communism, were for profit. Vietnam and Korea were both wars of economic defence. Neither involved attacks on Western nations, territories or peoples.

It is no coincidence that the awareness of genocide as a tactic of our Judao-Christian civilization, and the laws governing it, marked the end of overt colonialism. Any arrogant group that would control another group for its own purposes alone, risks at least the psychological destruction of that victim group. Colonial aspects of the Vietnam war were clear to the French, less to Americans who thought they sent their sons to rice paddies to fight Communism, in a kind of madness where communism is now replaced by religious fundamentalism. From the vantage of these years later the aim of the Vietnam war seems to have been a genocide of the Vietnamese. Or was the agent orangng of the land mass meant to be considered a carelessness ?

The destruction of a national group was initially prepared for by the division of the country into North and South - then the battle between the two as in "divide and conquer." If one would speak of doctoring a country as a body politic, Vietnam could only find its health in wholeness. North and South Korea exist within a similar tension. As in Yugoslavia, whenever a country is broken down it is a prelude to ongoing war, a setting of one part against the other with destruction of all or emergence of one dominant section as the sure result. To live with balanced tension is more complex and is apparently allowed unless it controls wealth wanted by the global elites.

Any war of the people's resistance against a foreign power occupying, has the Convention on Genocide on its side. That is why the powerful let it fall out of print at the United Nations in the late 1980's, and why the US will continue to subvert it, as long as the US intends to extend its domain in other countries, particularly by military force.

Therefore it is not likely that any US control group will strengthen the Convention on Genocide. I wish this were not so. Some will find the support for humanity there in US history, but not in contemporary policies. It helps to question again the gradual eradication of American leaders throughout the Sixties, who provided some defence against genocide. So it isn't so surprising that most US and Western which increasingly means NATO countries, have human rights organizations which are basically "dummy organizations," managing large amounts of philanthropic capital, staffed by committed millionaires and professionals whose first duty is to cover their government's proactive participation in acquisitive genocides. Often nonprofit corporations paying their executives stout salaries, the non governmental organizations are not taking chances that risk their national group's policies of capital management.

The heads of US human rights organizations for example, are not in jail. Nor are they risking arrest. Nor are they resisting. My guess is that they are eating well while the North Koreans starve in great numbers. But it is the "business as usual" approach to major crimes that calls our North American human rights community into question. Not one of our major human rights groups has challenged either Gulf War within a perspective of the United Nations Convention on Genocide, despite the deaths of over a million and a half children from the effects of war and withholding of necessary civilian supplies by Sanctions. The civilian deaths were foreseen, reported, and ignored in favour of the war agenda, and partly because human rights organizations and the media remained insensitive to the issue of genocide.

In January 2004 the stock market hummed along. By March the US Democrats have put forward an alternative to a war-making criminal presidency, maybe, but not on the grounds that the US President broke major international laws in waging aggressive war and genocide in Iraq, but that an obviously criminal administration in an obviously criminal situation, had lied - as his entire intelligence

apparatus had - to trick a Congress of millionaires who needed no tricking under the banners of profit, into accepting a criminal war.

The point from these observations is that I have not found existing recourse for any genuine complaint about North American genocides were the Nazi perspective to reappear and activate. There are moral people and proper organizations. I think of the government of Canada as relatively ethical. But the fault seems to be in deep mind control mechanisms which must have been purposefully implanted in the mass culture - which shut our eyes to the terrible crimes made necessary by capitalism.

The difficulty of a single ideology winning out in the world is that capitalism has never shown itself to be tolerant of difference. Rather it feels threatened by any challenging ideology, to the point of exterminating it. One remembers the lists of thousands of Communists and Trade Unionists, as well as people who didn't like Americans (these were called "shooting lists") that US intelligence operatives handed over to the military authorities in Indonesia as well as Chile. In addition to Western countries and the US in particular, who can't be relied on for countering genocide (and the best reference for this is the retired Lt. General Romeo Dallaire when he speaks on Rwanda), and particularly genocides they are responsible for, one has to include in the same area of doubt all countries and institutions that rely heavily on capitalism.

If genocide is intrinsic to corporate capitalism, why is it even an issue? It is a real concern because the people do not like it or accept it. Genocide degrades us to the same level of non-care and ugliness as the elites who perpetuate such crimes for profit. Because we refuse the lacklove which leaves entire portions of humanity to the choices of a targeting room filled with military lawyers, because we refuse to deny loving, we will stand against genocide as we can, but we can't be sure that capitalism will survive our victory.

Copyright 2004 © by John Bart Gerald