

# U.S. stance toward the Third World: hostage to the genocide lobby

*Testimony given before the Senate Foreign Relations Subcommittee on Western Hemisphere Affairs on March 20 put evidence before the public that U.S. foreign policy toward Central America in particular, and the rest of the developing world generally, is being controlled by a "population-control lobby" that is running wild.*

*Dr. Jacqueline R. Kasun, from the Economics Department of Humboldt State University in California, presented well-documented testimony about the secret conditions the population controllers have placed on U.S. aid to the developing sector—conditions that have turned those countries away from the United States.*

*EIR does not totally agree with Dr. Kasun, particularly in her recommendations on economic policies for Central America; she also neglects to mention that these population-reduction conditions are the core of the Kissinger Commission report on Central America (see EIR, Feb. 14). But she presents excellent evidence of the fact that these conditions are not only based on fraudulent assumptions, but also are bound to turn the rest of the underdeveloped sector against the United States.*

*Dr. Kasun's footnotes are available upon request.*

. . . In response to these growing, multiple problems created by misguided central planning for development and unfavorable world economic conditions, the U.S. Agency for International Development [a branch of the State Department] has since the mid-1960s insisted that Central America, along with all other countries receiving our foreign assistance, must control its supposedly "excessive" population growth. Positing, as Richard E. Benedick, State Department coordinator for Population Affairs, has put it, that controlling population is a "matter of urgent global priority," that "the 'right' to multiply indiscriminately represents a misplaced morality," and that "strenuous efforts will be required to reach the two-child norm," AID has poured millions of dollars into the population-control activities of the Pathfinder Fund, the Population Council, Planned Parenthood, the As-

sociation for Voluntary Sterilization, the U.N. Fund for Population Activities, and related agencies in Central America. In 1978, AID inserted Sections 102 and 104(d) into the foreign Assistance Act to require that countries receiving our aid must demonstrate a commitment to population control. This, of course, is the basis of those so-called "requests" for "population assistance" which AID reports from countries receiving our aid. They are *required* to "request" population assistance.

These strong statements and forceful actions by AID, however, represent the beliefs of a rather small but superbly organized and well-financed (with U.S. government funds)

---

## What 'population problem' in Central America?

Country or State	Persons per square mile 1982	GNP per capita, dollars, 1981
CENTRAL AMERICA	121	n.a.
Honduras	84	\$ 600
El Salvador	574	650
Nicaragua	47	860
Guatemala	163	1,140
Costa Rica	112	1,430
California	151	n.a.
India	570	260
China	285	300
South Korea	1,080	1,700
West Germany	643	13,450
Japan	825	10,080
New Jersey	986	n.a.
Rhode Island	898	n.a.

**Source:** Population densities from *Statistical Abstract of the United States, 1982-83*; GNP figures from World Bank, *World Development Report 1983*.

---

special interest group. They do not represent the consensus among development economists. The assumptions of the population-control lobby have been strongly criticized by many distinguished economists, including Julian Simon, Goran Ohlin, Mark Perlman, Peter Bauer, Fred Glahe, Colin Clark, and Richard Easterlin. The fact is that world resources are fully adequate to permit economic development and comfortable living standards for all peoples. Less than half of the earth's arable land is in use, and yields could be increased many times over. World agricultural resources are capable of feeding 10 to 25 times as many people as now live on earth, using present agricultural methods. Supplies of industrial metals and energy are not running out but are increasing. . . . The world's entire population could be settled in the state of Texas with a large suburban home with front and backyards for each three-person family, and all the rest of the world would be empty.

There is no economic evidence, though many economists have searched for it, that rapid population growth retards the growth of the gross national product or restrains investment. Investment depends not on the birth rate but on opportunities for the efficient and profitable use of economic resources. Countries which offer these opportunities will attract investment capital, and the data show that countries with rapidly growing populations have achieved just as high rates of investment and equal or better rates of output growth, as compared with countries having low population growth. . . .

There is resistance to AID population control in Central America, as there has been throughout the world. Chris Hedges in the *Christian Science Monitor* of January 13, 1984 described the bitter response of El Salvadorans to AID's sterilizations drive which uses a quota system to achieve more than 20,000 sterilizations a year in that country, reportedly without adequate provisions for voluntary consent. In a country where "death squads" operate widely, is it realistic to expect that a sterilization drive, promoted with all the diplomatic and financial leverage of AID, should observe the niceties of true voluntarism?

The Agency for International Development is well aware of the resistance which its population-control programs elicit in many countries; AID officials have spoken frankly about it. Richard Benedick has reported extensively to Congress on the "sensitivity" of these programs and the "lack of commitment" and "opposition" to them on the part of foreign peoples. One of the first acts of the Sandinista government in Nicaragua was to close the despised AID birth-control clinics. The Sandinistas declared that from now on birth control was to be the private business of citizens and not the business of the government. Similarly, soon after the United States' ignominious ejection from Iran, the Khomeini government made this same symbolic gesture, closing the AID-financed birth control clinics which had spearheaded the movement for population control in Iran.

One AID memorandum of 1982 frankly stated that all

support for these programs would collapse if the United States stopped financing them and forcing them as a condition for receiving our aid. It is reported in Mexico that the price which the Mexican government has to pay for International Monetary Fund assistance in solving its recent balance-of-payments crises brought on by misguided economic "planning" was to agree to a vigorous drive for population control. The Mexican government is now committed to reducing population growth to 1% per year by the year 2000; this implies a limit of two children or less per family, depending on how soon Mexican families comply with the program to reduce births. AID has stated that the "sensitivity of population programs" is so great that it is desirable to use the "multilateral agencies"—in Mexico's case, apparently, the IMF—as surrogates for AID itself in many cases.

The response of AID and its client agencies in the population-control network to what they admit to be widespread resistance is to try harder—to spend more money and apply more leverage. Benedick insists that "the U.S. should seek to keep the population problem at the forefront of the world's agendas" and that we should "assign . . . a population officer in the staffing of every Embassy where population facts are important"—that is, of course, in his view, everywhere.

Moreover, the drive for population control in countries receiving our aid is only one of the goals of the population activists in the Department of State. State Department Document NSSM 200, classified in 1974 and not declassified until 1980, clearly states that population control is to prevail also in the United States:

Constructive action by the U.S. will further our objectives. To this end we should: . . . Urge the adoption . . . of specific population goals including replacement levels of fertility of DCs and LDCs by 2000. . . . After suitable preparation in the U.S., announce a U.S. goal to maintain our present national average fertility no higher than replacement level and attain near stability by 2000.

The document furthermore states that, to attain these goals, "mandatory programs may be needed." In the meantime the population activists seek now to increase their bitterly resisted programs in Central America by exploiting the need for emergency assistance in that troubled region.

Bizarre as it may seem, the plain fact is that the foreign policy of this great nation has been, is being, used—"taken hostage" may not be too strong a term—by a very special interest group with a monomaniac world view, the belief that what it calls "overpopulation" is at the root of all human problems and that the United States must lead a world crusade against population, regardless of cost. Such fanaticism must not be allowed to dominate or to use our foreign policy. The United States needs secure peace in Central America, not an AID sterilization drive to be defended and promoted at the risk of our sons' lives. . . .