

Congressmen plan hearings to impose population control

by Lonnie Wolfe

The Congress of the United States will soon hold hearings—unless they are stopped—on legislation that would make zero growth of the American population into the goal of domestic policy. The sponsors of the Population Policy Act of 1981 acknowledge that their primary concern is not the passage of their bill, but the use of the congressional hearings to induce Americans to accept a policy of population reduction—by any means necessary.

Sponsored by Rep. Richard Ottinger of New York, the Population Act calls for the United States to commit itself to “zero population growth.” The bill is now scheduled for hearings in April before the Subcommittee of Census and Population of the House Post Office and Civil Service Committee.



The bill calls for the creation of an Office of Population Policy within the Executive Office of the President. It states that its purpose is to “declare a national policy of coordinated planning for the nation’s population change and to establish a goal of eventual population stabilization in the United States as the keystone of population policy.”

States Mike Kitch of Zero Population Growth, Inc., one of the private organizations pushing the bill: “We have to make people accept some difficult choices as inevitable. Global 2000 says that if they want the good life, we are going to have fewer people alive in the year 2000 than anyone dreamed possible.”

The Washington nerve center

The Ottinger bill was prepared in consultation with the State Department, formulators of the Global 2000 policy report and its implementation plan, *A Global Future, Time to Act*. The functioning machine that exists within the U.S. government that has been quietly carrying out the Global 2000 mass-murder policy has its nerve center in the State Department’s Bureau of Oceans, International Environmental and Scientific Affairs. Within the bureau, which was set up by Henry Kissinger in 1975, is the Office of Population Affairs (OPA). “The quickest way to reduce population is through famine,

like in Africa, or disease, like the Black Death,” said Thomas Ferguson of the OPA this month.

The Ottinger bill would upgrade this bureaucracy, and expand its purview to the United States. HR 907 specifically charges the new Office of Population Affairs with responsibility for updating the Global 2000 report and recommending policy to force global population stabilization.

Richard Ottinger, a self-professed liberal and environmentalist, has been described by David Barnhizer of the Natural Resources Defense Council as “one of our key assets in the U.S. Congress.” Barnhizer is an aide to Russell Train, former head of the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency and the U.S. director of the World Wildlife Fund, an agency that includes Prince Bernhard of the Netherlands and Prince Philip of Great Britain and other members of the European nobility. Barnhizer is the executive director of the U.S.-based Committee for the Year 2000, a group founded to make sure that Global 2000 is implemented. Its members include Train, former Secretary of State Cyrus Vance, former U.S. Ambassador to Britain Elliot Richardson, and Arco chairman Robert O. Anderson.

Another associate of Barnhizer, Donald Lesh, the U.S. director of the Club of Rome, also called Ottinger “an important asset.” Lesh, a former National Security Council staffer under Henry Kissinger, worked with Barnhizer in putting together a grouping of environmental and population groups tentatively called the “Citizens’ Committee for Global 2000.”

Among the leaders of this group is Roy Morgan of Zero Population Growth, Inc., an outfit supported by former Attorney General and Khomeini backer Ramsey Clark. ZPG helped Ottinger’s staff draft HR 907.

‘Making our work easier’

As Barnhizer told a reporter recently, “We would like to get this bill passed. But if we don’t, we want to guarantee that it provides us with a forum to bring the Global 2000 ideas before the American public.” The people in the State Department who are carrying out policies of planned genocide against targeted populations, as in El Salvador, say that such discussion “makes

our work a little easier . . . less out of left field, so to speak.”

Three days after the bill was introduced, this network provided Ottinger, a member of ZPG’s board of advisers, with a podium. The congressman told a leadership conference sponsored by the Audubon Society that Global 2000 “reminds us of the scale and urgency of the problems we have created for ourselves. . . . No problem is more fundamental than the continuing growth of the world’s population. As the comic strip character Pogo once said, ‘We have met the enemy and he is us.’

numbers as an accelerating, vicious spiral, one which depletes our resources and corrodes the environment at a rate which is endangering the complex and fragile systems on which life itself depends.” The conference called for full backing of Global 2000 and HR 907.

Ottinger and his backers have made several efforts to pass similar legislation. In the past, the bill was killed each time by Rep. Jack Brooks, the Texan who heads the government Operations Committee.



But this year, Ottinger’s office cleverly decided to introduce the legislation as a rider on a census-related bill, steering it away from Brooks’s wastebasket.

It has found favorable hearing with population subcommittee chairman Robert Garcia of the South Bronx, who is a co-sponsor. He plans to use the Ottinger bill to hold hearings on the Global 2000 report itself.

Liberal Republican Pete McCloskey of California, is also a co-sponsor of the bill. McCloskey told a reporter that he wanted to make sure that Congress debates the Global 2000 issues. McCloskey is the co-chairman of the Congressional Environmental Study Conference (see *EIR*, March 3).



Liberal congressman James Scheuer of New York presented the new rationale for Global 2000 at hearings Feb. 27 of the Subcommittee on International Economic Policy of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee. Scheuer told Senators Charles

Mathias, the Republican committee chairman from Maryland, and Chris Dodd, the freshman Democrat from Connecticut, both supporters of the Global 2000 report, that the most vital strategic question facing the United States is “global overpopulation.”

Scheuer served on the special Presidential Commission on Population and the American Future established by President Nixon in 1969. That commission, headed by population reduction advocate Laurence

Rockefeller, reached the conclusion that “population growth must no longer be seen as a measure of this nation’s progress” and called for “zero population growth.” At the hearings, the New York congressman called for an end to large-scale economic development.

There is an understandable reluctance on the part of the backers of Global 2000 to come right out in public and say that they are proposing policies that will kill—by one means or another—more than 2 billion people.

The idea is to “soft-pedal” the policy, said a spokesman for the Brandt Commission-linked Overseas Development Council. “It gets problematic to say that you can’t improve the human condition. It is embarrassing to say that you can’t have improved health care and mortality because we have too many people.”

Documentation

From Richard Ottinger

From an interview by EIR’s Barbara Dreyfuss with Rep. Richard Ottinger (D-N. Y.) on March 12.

EIR: What is your concern about overpopulation?

Ottinger: The government is ignoring population in making policy. There are huge effects on programs, financing schools without adequate students, building hospitals in areas that are losing populations; these are wasteful. Everyone should have a population policy. We are funding foreign countries to stabilize their populations, but we don’t . . .

We have a huge problem with immigration, Mexican immigrants. Then we run into the problem of refugees, Cubans, Haitians, Indonesians. There is a tremendous problem serving the number of people coming here. It will be more serious as we ignore other countries, and stop our aid and international assistance; then people will want to come here. If Reagan does what he says on food stamps, then we will have large immigration from Puerto Rico. It is much cheaper to continue food stamps to Puerto Rico than have half a million more Puerto Ricans in New York.

EIR: Do you see the overpopulation question as a national security question?

Ottinger: Sure it is. We have a much greater demand on our food stocks and we will make God-like decisions on who lives and who doesn’t. There is not enough food to feed everyone who is starving in Latin America, Africa, Asia. We are going to have to decide if we let 1 million Africans, or Asians, or Latin Americans die. The situation is not yet at this point, but with the multiple prob-

lems in the Third World it will become critical. It can happen anytime, if there is a drought someplace or a weather condition. As the price of oil escalates, the underdeveloped countries find it more and more difficult to grow their own crops, especially as oil-based fertilizer and importing energy eat capital.

The Reagan administration answer to energy problems in the Third World is to send nuclear plants. This is interesting, since there are not even electricity grids to use the electricity from nuclear plants. But it is a serious problem that can't be ignored. . . .

EIR: William Paddock said in a speech two weeks ago in Washington that it is better for Third World countries to have constantly changing governments, constant destabilization, and then the population problem will be taken care of. How do you see it?

Ottinger: All kinds of things can happen, like the civil war in El Salvador can go in and wipe them out, and it will solve the population problem. Argentina, Chile, Brazil, when you get a bad country—and we are backing anyone who says they are against an uprising—the communists will take advantage of it, and we will be on the side of dictators, and the population problem will be solved by war. It is a miserable way to do it.

EIR: What are the prospects for your bill establishing an Office of Population Policy?

Ottinger: Congressman Garcia has assured me that hearings will be held after the budget is finished.

Ottinger addresses ZPG

From Rep. Richard Ottinger's statement last month in the Congressional Record on H.R. 907; as reprinted in the ZPG Reporter, Vol. 13, No. 1. In January, Representative Ottinger received a special award from Zero Population Growth, Inc.

Changes in the nation's population—whether they be in fertility, mortality, immigration, or distribution—affect all of us. . . . In spite of this, the federal government simply does not have the capacity to plan ahead for these changes and no systematic focus on them is presently required. This is the aim of H.R. 907. . . .

In 1938 . . . the National Resources subcommittee on Population Problems recommended in its report to President Roosevelt that . . . transition from an increasing to a stationary or decreasing population may on the whole be a benefit to the life of the nation. . . .

In 1972, the National Commission on Population Growth and the American Future recommended that organization[al] changes be undertaken to improve the federal government's capacity to develop and implement population-related programs. . . .

The President's Council on Environmental Quality (CEQ) and the U.S. Department of State last summer released the *Global 2000 Report*. . . . It concluded that a continuation of present trends would lead to a world in the year 2000 that would be "more crowded, more polluted, less stable ecologically, and more vulnerable to disruption than the world we live in now."

The followup report, *Global Future: Time to Act*, released on Jan. 14, proposed a series of concerted actions. . . . To improve the U.S. capability to respond to global resource, environmental, and population issues, the report recommended that the responsibility for developing and coordinating U.S. policy on these issues be centralized in one agency, preferably in the Executive Office of the President. . . . H.R. 907 responds to these recommendations.

Mr. Speaker . . . according to a 1976 Gallup poll, 87 percent of the public favor an end to U.S. population growth.

Ignoring population growth and changes won't stop them from reshaping our lives and our children's futures. . . . For example, it is nonsensical to use taxpayers' money to finance new school construction for communities which attention to demographics could have foretold would have excess facilities. . . . That is why I believe Congress must act now to improve our ability to forecast and respond to these changes.

From a population defender

EIR recently interviewed Robert Sassone, director of the Life Amendment Political Action Committee (LAPAC), and author of several books refuting overpopulation theory.

EIR: What are your views on Global 2000?

Sassone: We have encouraged these population people to substantiate their allegation of the great need for limiting populations and the alleged problems, and they have never done this.

EIR: What do you think of the Ottinger-Garcia bill to set up a permanent Global 2000 agency to monitor success toward reducing world population by 2 billion people?

Sassone: In the House Select Committee on Population, [Ottinger] refused to admit sufficient testimony from opponents, and was interested in creating publicity for his views. We don't feel the Ottinger bill can pass. We oppose it, but it is not our primary focus. . . . It's not that serious—it looks like it won't fly and there are more important objectives. If it did look like it was possible to pass it, then we'd do something.

Primarily, we're working toward the 1982 elections. We select districts like that of Ottinger and decide whether to run against them. LAPAC is a loosely organized

group and what we do is go into areas and educate existing groups. We've been very successful. On our Senate hit list in 1980, we were successful in nine out of ten cases.

EIR: Whom did you help to defeat?

Sassone: McGovern, Frank Church, Senator Culver and Javits in New York. Our primary objective is passage of the human life amendment and reduction of . . . abortions. The government has been acting as an agent of change in morality and of family life. We are concerned with . . . euthanasia, but this is a lesser threat at present.

EIR: On Feb. 17 LAPAC and others met with President Reagan and OMB head Stockman. Paul Brown of LAPAC, presented a White Paper outlining possible budget cuts targeting population control, including the Ottinger bill.

Sassone: Brown gave them a paper suggesting several things, primarily Planned Parenthood and Congress, they are our hit list. . . .

EIR: What is your evaluation of the Malthusian advocates?

Sassone: The thing with advocates like Ottinger is that they'd support reducing world population no matter what the population actually is. The whole population at present can be supported at better than American standards. The question is whether we see man as an animal or not—the population people see men as animals and they support killing people like cattle.

When people see El Salvador as accomplishing reduction by killing people, this is based on the fact they see men as animals. There are several hundred million malnourished in the world. We can feed them by helping them to grow food. The opponents say we've lost the battle and the population has to be cut. This is a regressive approach, opposed to people and progress.

EIR: How do you feel about technology export?

Sassone: I'm talking about selling or giving technology away, or merchandising it in places that are too poor to buy it. For example . . . you can eliminate malnutrition in the world by simply producing 10 million radios—simple radios with a stationary frequency—you could provide weather predictions, when the monsoon is coming. You can, with satellite broadcasts, start to basically educate them. You can indicate step one, step two. . . . Egypt is considered underdeveloped, yet they grow 10 times per acre more than India.

EIR: The difficulty in India is irrigation.

Sassone: We could educate them about the effects of tube wells, they've got enormous amounts of underground water that can be tapped. I'm not saying the U.S.

should go around building Aswan dams . . . but the Aswan dam in Egypt . . . has proven tremendously successful. In India you have a system very similar. The Himalayas can be drained, they have plenty of water for irrigation. They can be educated for better use of fertilizers. . . . We could double or triple food production in India.

EIR: The Mexican government is interested in arranging technology transfers for oil. What are your views?

Sassone: We should encourage them. If they can eliminate starvation, I'd cooperate. I'm not saying you can necessarily send the most advanced plow or combine, it might be better to start with simpler plows. . . . We start by analyzing what can best be used.

EIR: Do you think budget cuts will hit the indicated planned parenthood and other programs?

Sassone: I don't know yet. Global 2000 is dead. The only way they'd get it through now is by sneaking it through Congress. They've got to disguise it. A lot of the killing programs were gotten through this way by disguising them in vague sounding language.

From the Washington Post

From an editorial in the March 8 issue of the Washington Post, titled "Anti-Abortion Goes International":

That foes of abortion would be finding comfort, and policy-level jobs, in the Reagan administration was perhaps predictable. . . . What was not so widely expected, however, was that anti-abortionists would start going international—to impress their point of view upon the extensive family-planning programs that the United States conducts and supports abroad.

It isn't yet clear whether anti-abortionists can muster the strength, either in the administration or in Congress, to achieve any substantial part of what is for some of them their maximum objective. This would entail removing the United States not only from programs that "promote" abortion but also from family planning, contraceptive programs and population control efforts overall. It is clear that a guerrilla war has been begun and, further, that many of those fighting it are terribly confused. . . .

There is a view on the fringe that the "population crisis" is the artificial creation of statist and planners and that there is no real squeeze of people on resources anywhere. But it is only a view on the fringe. . . . It would be a genuine calamity for American interests if the new administration were to be misled or intimidated into turning away from requests by other nations to help them deal with what they identify as their family-planning needs.