Click here for Full Issue of EIR Volume 11, Number 27, July 17, 1984

Will the U.N. population conference be the occasion for overturning Malthusian dogma?

by Nancy Spannaus

A document prepared by the National Security Council of the Reagan administration for the United Nations Population Conference this August has delivered a sharp challenge to the genocidalists who run the international population lobby. Fights have erupted not only between the Reagan administration and the professional genocidalists, but also between the State Department and the executive branch itself.

At present the battle remains unresolved, with the Agency for International Development (AID), the key genocidalist agency within the State Department, vowing to fight to the end to maintain their 20-year commitment to what they euphemistically call "population control."

Driven out of the woodwork to defend the depopulators have been some of the leading scions of the genocide lobby, including former Maryland Sen. Joseph Tydings and former World Bank president Robert Strange McNamara. McNamara has written a major new document in *Foreign Affairs*, the journal of the Council on Foreign Relations, threatening "coercive government sanctions" if the nations of the Third World in particular do not immediately decide to reduce their population. McNamara, who has expanded his interest in counting dead Vietnamese to counting dead nonwhite people in general, also plans to go on tour on behalf of the "population issue." (See National News).

Coming forward on the side of the National Security Council has been the pro-life lobby of the United States. Unfortunately, that lobby is controlled at the top by a group of genocidalists every bit as rabid and racist as McNamara and his friends. This fact will not be lost on the nations of the developing sector as they look for allies in the North against the murder being carried out by the depopulation lobby.

It is in the interest of making possible such an alliance that we subject the NSC document to careful scrutiny, demonstrating precisely where its arguments fall into the pitfalls which basically moral individuals, including President Reagan, would wish to avoid.

The wrong goals

The NSC draft document for the Population Conference opens with a statement of general administration policy on population which demonstrates the guts of the problem. While stating that the Reagan administration disagrees with certain "choices of strategies and methods" of previous administrations, it affirms that "there is no question of the ultimate need to achieve a condition of population equilibrium."

This statement not only coincides with the major premise of the genocidalists who promote abortion and forced sterilization, but *it is also totally false*.

We live in an expanding universe, whose lawfulness has been successfully dominated by the creative powers of man's intellect and its application through ever more advanced technology to the point of increasing the earth's population density by three orders of magnitude. This is not only a historical fact, but corresponds to necessity. Mankind cannot survive for long at any given level of technology, since each level defined sooner or later reaches a limit as resources become more costly to extract, if not scarce. But, as he advances his technological level, man finds it necessary to *increase his population density* as well.

Given this reality, a goal of "population equilibrium" leads inevitably to the condemnation of a large portion of the population to death.

The point is underlined by reference to the specific situation which we now face with respect to energy. Implementation of current energy technologies—including nuclear fission, but not nuclear fusion—would not provide sufficient resources to provide for a human standard of living for the entirety of the world's 4.7 billion people, much less the more than 6 billion projected to be alive by the year 2000. However, if mankind were to make the necessary commitment to enter the thermonuclear fusion age, the program's implementation would require as many as *10 billion people* in order to achieve the necessary division of labor.

Although it does not reflect the absolute hatred of people that the depopulation lobby does, the NSC document shares another of that grouping's major tenets: the desirability of reducing population growth to the level now predominating in the so-called "advanced sector." The argument is that such a reduction—which has brought most of Western Europe into a situation of absolute population decline, and the United States close to it—is the "natural" result of industrialization and progress.

Nothing could be further from the truth. The United States, for example, during its major period of "domestic" population growth before the civil war, was doubling its population every 25 years—a rate of growth even higher than that which

© 1984 EIR News Service Inc. All Rights Reserved. Reproduction in whole or in part without permission strictly prohibited.

today throws the population lobby into a tizzy in the developing sector. The decline in the U.S. population growth coincided with a shift in the cultural matrix from optimism, to a Spenglerian-style pessimism. This began at the end of the last century, with the increasing dominance of the British philosophical outlook. It is that outlook which is resulting in the breakdown of the family and the increase in homosexuality and other hedonistic illnesses responsible for a decline in U.S. population growth.

Laissez-faire means genocide

Despite the wrongheaded philosophical context in which it is presented, the NSC document takes on some of the most virulently anti-human aspects of the genocide lobby's plans. "More people do not mean less growth; that is absurd on its face," the document reads. "Indeed, both in the American experience and in the economic history of most advanced nations, population growth has been an essential element in economic progress.'

And again: "Population control is not a panacea. It will not solve problems of massive unemployment. Jobs are not lost because there are too many people in a given area. Jobs are created by the conjunction of human wants and investment capital. Population growth fuels the former; sound economic policies and properly directed international assistance can provide the latter. Indeed, population density may make the latter more feasible by concentrating the need for both human services and technology."

Why then, the document asks, is there a "population problem"? Its answer is twofold: The first is the adoption of what is called "economic statism" by the developing countries; the second is the "outbreak of an anti-intellectualism, which attacks science, technology, and the very concept of material progress" in the West.

While perfectly correct on the second point, the NSC's authors undermine their argument by demanding the dismantling of what they call "governmental control of economies, a pathology which spread throughout the developing world with sufficient virulence to keep much of it from developing further." In practice, what does dismantling of government controls of the economy in developing sector countries mean? Pure genocide.

This is not a hypothetical question. Current plans by the International Monetary Fund and the international usurers in Switzerland and London call for the elimination of any sovereign governments which could serve as points of resistance to total recolonialization of the world economy. The form this takes is a protest against too much government control—where the governments in question are resisting the total buying up of their economies by the international financiers.

The situation of Mexico demonstrates the case most clearly. In general, the authors of the NSC population document would agree with the Mexicans that population growth per se is not their problem. But, as they did in many interviews with this news service, these same "pro-lifers" insist that the fact that Mexico cannot provide adequate jobs and progress for its population is due to "too much government control." In the process, these so-called pro-lifers totally exonerate the policies of looting imposed on Mexico by the IMF and the credit cartels which set outrageously discriminatory terms of trade, while attacking the weak, but lingering government programs which resist them. Thus, they in fact demand policies that will starve millions of Mexicans to death.

What are these government programs? Tariff barriers, for one. Also price-setting of consumer goods to try to ensure that the population can afford to eat. Even more crucial is the government resistance to a free market in foreign investment, which currently prevents foreign capital from buying up industries in crucial areas of the economy. Such a government measure is an elementary measure of national sovereignty—one which formed the basis of U.S. Treasury Secretary Alexander Hamilton's economic scheme to free the United States from the depredations of Great Britain.

There is no such thing as a "free market" economy. There are only economies controlled through government institutions, or economies controlled by the most powerful private interests. In the 1800s, the "invisible hand" was the British East India Company and Baring Brothers bank. Today, it is comprised of a small group of mostly European oligarchical families who control the major international banks, insurance consortia, and commodity cartels. This group is the only alternative to control and direction of economic growth by sovereign governments, and the policy of this grouping is genocide.

"Trust the people, trust their intelligence and trust their faith, because putting people first is the secret of economic success everywhere in the world," the NSC document quotes President Reagan from his 1981 speech before the World Affairs Council of Philadelphia. "That is the agenda of the United States for the United Nations Conference on Population this year, just as it remains the continuing goal of our family planning assistance to other nations."

Should the United States actually proceed with this plan, it will be simply taking genocidal government programs of population control—as they are now being imposed by governments such as China and agencies like the AID—out of the hands of governments, and putting them into private hands. It is not depopulation that "free market" genocidalists like Friedrich von Hayek and his ilk object to—it is only the expense and model of doing it through government programs.

Sincere pro-lifers have so far won only a pyrrhic victory against the depopulators. The real alternative to such genocide is a program of massive economic growth promoted by sovereign governments—a program in which every new human life is respected as the potential source of new wealth and creativity which it is.

The author chairs the U.S. branch of the international Club of Life organization.