

Club of Life white paper: 'How to stop global depopulation by the year 2000'

As we reported in our Sept. 4 issue ("The U.N. population conference: Dare call it genocide!"), the Club of Life submitted a white paper refuting the arguments of the population control lobby to the Aug. 6-13 Second International United Nations Conference on Population held in Mexico City. That document was suppressed by the U.N.'s Non-Governmental Organizations bureaucracy, whose spokesman, Virginia Saurwein, argued that its contents "might offend" some conference participants. Nevertheless, the document circulated widely, particularly among those delegations that had not yet accepted the Malthusians' insistence that they give up their battle for a high-technology economic growth policy, and instead kill off their own people. The Club of Life's charges received widespread coverage in the Mexican press. We publish here excerpts from that suppressed document.

Genocide one hundred times worse than Hitler

It is the sober estimate of the Club of Life that the policies of the International Monetary Fund (IMF) and World Bank, along with the international "population control" lobby, can be demonstrated to have *already* been responsible for killing *ten times* the number of people murdered by Adolf Hitler. In a very short period of time that level could reach 600 million—100 times Hitler's death toll.

We can take a guidepost from a statement made by leading member of the genocide lobby Orville Freeman at the 1982 Woodlands Conference on Sustainable Societies. Freeman, who was U.S. Secretary of Agriculture under Presidents Kennedy and Johnson and is a long-term insider in the population lobby, reported that world conditions in 1982 were "similar to 1972-73 when 500 million people died of malnutrition and starvation."

If that many people died in one year of severe crop failures and drought, can less than that number have died over the *full decade* of depression which the world has suffered since?

Over the past decade the world's nations have been deliberately suffocated by a combination of usury, underpaying for raw materials, denial of high technology imports, and genocidal "conditionalities," usually imposed by the IMF. That process has taken its greatest toll in Africa—where food production per capita has gone down, diseases such as malaria are expanding, and entire countries are on the verge of

extinction. This *devolution* has not yet succeeded—according to any statistics available—in an absolute *decrease* in population. But it has reduced the rate of decline of mortality, so that that rate stands at *almost double* that in the (formerly) industrialized nations of the United States and Western Europe. Yet Africa, with a population less than half a billion for the entire continent, is the area about which the population lobby screams the loudest about "overpopulation."

This policy puts the population lobby in the tradition of the emperor cited by Pope Paul VI: faced with the news that his kingdom did not have enough hats for all his subjects, the emperor called for the beheading of the "excess" population.

Let us take a heuristic device from the U.N.'s own statistics to approximate the scale of outright murder that has occurred since 1974. Our starting point is the "death differential," the difference between the crude death rate in the "Third World" nations and that in the industrialized world. If the development policy outlined at various U.N. conferences, including Bucharest [the 1974 First International Conference on Population—ed.], had been implemented, there should be no such differential. Yet the so-called crude death rate in sub-Saharan Africa still stands at 17.7/thousand—compared to a rate of 9.1/thousand in the industrialized world. That is a difference of more than 8 individuals per thousand—totally unnecessary, deliberate deaths.

If this differential is multiplied by the populations of only the 24 most famine-ravaged nations of Africa, one comes up with a most conservative figure of 11,790,000 (nearly 12 million) deaths over the decade of 1974-84!

By extending this rule of thumb to other regions of the world—including accepting some of the most unbelievable figures about crude death rates—the death toll from the combined area of Africa, South Asia, East Asia (not including China), and North Africa and the Middle East, amounts to a death differential of *nearly 72 million people over the decade!*

This figure omits the deaths from starvation and malnutrition occurring in areas whose reported "crude death rate" is now less than that in the United States—especially Ibero-America. Countries like Bolivia and Colombia have reported infant mortality rates anywhere from 5 to 20 times that of the industrialized countries. In places like Mexico and Brazil, "middle income" countries under the diktat of the IMF, that rate is rising rapidly—thanks to the IMF-mandated cutbacks in health care, sanitation infrastructure, and food production for the domestic market.

We should also add into the death toll the fact that individuals in Africa have a life-expectancy of nearly 30 years less than that of the advanced sector. While the U.N. has had a goal of raising average life expectancy in the Third World to 62 years by 1985, it has now proposed to *lower* that level. Can this be called anything less than accession to genocide?

The figure also neglects the extensive murder of infants—both born and unborn—now going on in China.

In reality, one should add to those who died due to deliberate denial of development, the millions who were prevented from being born by sterilization, abortion, and other anti-natalist policies. As indicated in U.N. documents, the annual world population growth rate between 1975-80 was now 1.7%, down from 1.95% over the 1965-70 period, and the real increase in population was 75 million individuals a year between 1975-80. If the rate of annual growth had remained at 1.95%, however, the yearly growth would have been 86 million people a year, or 11 million more. Calculate this over the five-year period of 1975-80, and we're talking about a minimal toll of 55 million, going up over 100 million by 1984. We are indeed getting close to one hundred times worse than Hitler. . . .

A lobby for genocide

It doesn't take much looking to find that the Population Lobby, its founders and its current leaders, are sincerely committed to mass murder of black, brown, and yellow people. After all, the East India Company—infamous for its slave trade, massacres and other oppression in India and the United States—was the employer of Parson Malthus.

It was while working at the East India Company's Hailysburg College that Malthus developed his fraud that population growth must outstrip agricultural growth—unless population be checked by pestilence, famine, or war. For those who feared these "natural disasters," he offered another measure—voluntary "population control" all the way from sterilization to euthanasia to birth control.

It was up to Malthus' successors, Darwin and Galton, to make explicit that it wasn't just the poor, but also the "inferior races," who had to apply this remedy. This is the very same motive that leads population agencies like the International Planned Parenthood, the Population Council, and the Draper Fund to concentrate on reducing Third World populations today.

The eugenics movement founded by Galton, Darwin, et al. began to flourish in the second half of the 19th century, but not always under its own name. Some of its devotees went into the mental hygiene movement, others into environmentalism, and others into birth or population control. Who were the sponsors of this multi-named, but singlemindedly genocidal movement? The racist oligarchy of Great Britain and its allies!

The leading representative of this oligarchy, the most evil man of the 20th century, was Lord Bertrand Russell. Russell

was violently anti-capitalist, anti-nation state, and anti-human. He put it this way in his *Prospects of Industrial Civilization* (1923):

Socialism, especially international socialism, is only possible as a stable system if the population is stationary or nearly so. A slow increase might be coped with by improvements in agricultural methods, but a rapid increase must in the end reduce the whole population to penury. . . . The white population of the world will soon cease to increase. The Asiatic races will be longer, and the negroes still longer, before their birth rate falls sufficiently to make their numbers stable without help of war and pestilence. . . . Until that happens, the benefits aimed at by socialism can only be partially realized, and the less prolific races will have to defend themselves against the more prolific by methods which are disgusting even if they are necessary.

Russell was particularly concerned to dispense with modern agriculture, the technological advance that allowed for a rapid increase in population. To him industry and agriculture "waste the world's capital of natural resources." Hence, when bad times come—a condition he considers inevitable—"it must be inferred that industrialization characteristic of the last 150 years will be rudely checked."

Did Russell realize this meant depopulation? He sure did. In his 1951 prospectus for genocide, *The Impact of Science on Society*, he wrote:

But bad times, you may say, are exceptional, and can be dealt with by exceptional methods. This has been more or less true during the honeymoon period of industrialism, but it will not remain true unless *the increase of population can be enormously diminished*. At present the population of the world is increasing at about 58,000 per diem. War, so far, has had no very great effect on this increase, which continued throughout each of the world wars. . . . War . . . has hitherto been disappointing in this respect . . . but perhaps bacteriological war may prove more effective. *If a Black Death could spread throughout the world once in every generation, survivors could procreate freely without making the world too full* . . . The state of affairs might be somewhat unpleasant, but what of it? Really high-minded people are indifferent to happiness, especially other people's. . . . (emphasis added)

Russell was no isolated crank. His role as godfather of a whole series of pacifist, "liberal," international organizations is well known. In the same way he speaks for the thinking of the entire Western oligarchy—as the coincidence of his ideas with those of Club of Rome head Alexander King, Bank for International Settlements head Fritz Leutwiler, and former World Bank head Robert McNamara shows.

Alexander King, currently head of the Club of Rome, and formerly an official of the OECD, thinks like Bertrand Russell. King believes, as he said in an interview in June 1981, that “the thing to be feared is that the white world as we know it, including the U.S.S.R., could become a very highly militarized ghetto of the rich, armed with sophisticated weapons, and surrounded by a world that is overpopulated and hungry.” King’s solution? Reduce the population in the Third World!

The international bankers think in a similar manner. We quote only one example of their outlook, which was documented in a Club of Life White paper issued in February 1983. We quote Professor Herbert Giersch, a member of the Institute for International Economics in Washington, D.C. and the Mont Pelerin Society:

Third World countries have lived too long on the illusion of cheap capital. It was manna coming down from heaven, under the form of concessional lending, aid, low interest rates, and this was usually wasted on prestige projects, capital-intensive activities, very long-term payoff projects, a great roundaboutness of production. . . .

The main problem in the LDCs is that, this populist pressure has led them to an *overvaluation* of the human factor. They all thought that the future was bright and cheap! So they refused and they refuse to defer present consumption. They put too much of a claim on the present. All these countries are in a mess.

We should put a big pressure on them, the LDCs. They must abide by the conditionality of IMF loans. They must reduce the claim of the present generation on resources. They must lower wages, incomes. You have to be firm with such countries, not permissive. The Group of 77 will break down as a result of debt. Some LDCs seem to have started to learn their lesson. . . .

The Hitler model

From the mentality of a Russell, and his circle of British degenerates such as Julian and Aldous Huxley, H. G. Wells, and Aleister Crowley, enforced by the financial power of the British bankers, came Hitler’s fascism itself. Just as the “more prolific races” were slated for destruction by Russell, so the Jews and Slavic races were treated by Hitler. The justification—lack of sufficient food and other resources for the entire population—is just the same as that of the population lobby today.

A 1941 directive by Goering laid out the following policy for the Russian occupied farm territory:

The German Administration in these territories (the directive declared) may well attempt to mitigate the consequences of the famine which undoubtedly will take place and to accelerate the return to primitive agricultural conditions. However, these measures will

not avert famine. Any attempt to save the population there from death by starvation by importing surpluses from the black-soil zone would be at the expense of supplies to Europe.

Goering’s attitude was also expressed as follows, in a statement to Italian foreign minister Ciano:

This year between twenty and thirty million persons will die of hunger in Russia. Perhaps it is well that it should be so, for certain nations must be decimated. But even if it were not, nothing can be done about it. It is obvious that if humanity is condemned to die of hunger, the last to die will be our two peoples. . . . In the camps for Russian prisoners they have begun to eat each other.

Is there any objective difference between this point of view, and that of those who refuse to send the credit and physical resources into Africa to prevent mass starvation of more than 20-30 million people? We think not.

The denial of advanced technology, including “expensive” health care and technologies that require education, to the Third World also had its analogue in Hitler’s policy. An official in Rosenberg’s ministry put it this way, in a letter written in 1942:

The Slavs are to work for us. In so far as we don’t need them, they may die. Therefore compulsory vaccination and German health services are superfluous. The fertility of the Slavs is undesirable. They may use contraceptives or practice abortion—the more the better. Education is dangerous. It is enough if they can count up to 100. . . . Every educated person is a future enemy. Religion we leave to them as a means of diversion. As for food they won’t get any more than is absolutely necessary. We are the masters. We come first.

Lest one think that Hitler personally did not think of “population control” in this way, we quote his own view on July 22, 1942, as reported in the book “*Hitler’s TableTalk*”:

I recently read an article from the pen of some Herr Doktor advocating the prohibition of the sale in the Occupied Territories of contraceptives. If any criminal lunatic should really try to introduce this measure, I’d soon have his head off! In view of the extraordinary fertility of the local inhabitants, we should be only too pleased to encourage the women and the girls to practice the arts of contraception at all times. Far from prohibiting the sale of contraceptives, therefore, we should do our utmost to encourage it. . . .

In all seriousness, however, there is a very real danger that these local inhabitants will increase too rapidly under our care and domination. Their conditions of life will inevitably improve under our juris-

diction, and we must take all the measures necessary to ensure that the non-German population does not increase at an excessive rate. In these circumstances, it would be sheer folly to place at their disposal a health service such as we know it in Germany; and so—no inoculations and other preventive measures for the natives! We must even try to stifle any desire for such things, by persuading them that vaccination and the like are really most dangerous!

The fact that Hitler resorted to even more drastic measures of depopulation should not obscure the philosophical agreement he has with the population lobby today. The cheaper the means of reducing population, the better—that's the Nazi doctrine.

Birth control means genocide

The birth control movement itself was begun by Annie Besant, the well-known Theosophist cultist, in Great Britain. Besant was a leading member of the London Neo-Malthusian Society, beginning in 1861. She began the first birth control clinic in Holland in 1879.

It was at Besant's side that Margaret Sanger, the founder of the U.S. birth control movement, studied both the theory and practice of Malthusian genocide. In 1916 Sanger returned to the United States to found the New York Birth Control League, and then the Birth Control Review. The Birth Control League was later to become Planned Parenthood.

The Birth Control Review was openly racist. On its masthead was the slogan: "Birth Control: To Create a Race of Thoroughbreds." It opened its pages to Nazi spokesmen such as Nazi doctor Ernst Rudin. Contributor Will Durant published an article in the Review which said that birth control was the only way to stop the "so-called yellow peril . . . so as to decrease the quantity of people whose unchecked reproduction threatens international peace."

Sanger's successor Alan Guttmacher was hardly less explicit in his racism. In 1969 he wrote, "Each country will have to decide its own form of coercion, determining when and how it should be implemented. . . . The means presently available are compulsory sterilization and compulsory abortion."

Should it then be any surprise today that the population control movement, which advertises its interest in promoting "freedom of choice," has put its support behind the draconian measures being implemented by the Chinese?

Robert McNamara of the World Bank has admitted that he was the first to suggest "the introduction of, or at least experimentation with, incentives and disincentives encouraging low fertility." Such incentives and disincentives have included the withholding of sewage treatment, and other local projects, unless the birth rate goes below a certain level. In China the idea has been taken further—including the denial of the means to feed a child born without permission!

It has become popular, during the recent round of articles

and reports by McNamara and current World Bank head A.W. Clausen, for officials to deplore the "widespread coercive measures" of the Chinese regime—as if the key Population Control organizations had not promoted them. At the same time, McNamara and Clausen threatened the world with the Chinese model.

McNamara puts it this way in his recent article, "The Population Problem," in the journal of the U.S. Establishment, *Foreign Affairs*:

In the end, population growth in most countries will surely be halted substantially below the levels shown in Table III [11 billion by 2005—ed.]. That will happen either because of humane and voluntary measures taken now, or because of the old Malthusian checks. Or perhaps even more likely, in tomorrow's world, it will occur as a result of coercive government sanctions and the recourse by desperate parents to both frequent abortion and clandestine infanticide (i.e., China).

Not all of the population lobby is so indirect about their support for the Chinese model. "Asia is the world's laboratory for population. . . . What we have learned in Asia is a pretty good indication of what can and cannot work elsewhere," says Steven W. Sinding, of the Agency for International Development (AID), the division of the U.S. State Department responsible for administering "population programs."

More direct are Lester Brown, head of the Worldwatch Institute; Paul Ehrlich of Zero Population Growth; and a representative of the Population Crisis Council, an organization on which McNamara also sits.

Brown: "Continued population growth is intolerable. . . . You need a system of incentives and disincentives like in China. I would not call it coercion, because it has a bad connotation and there is nothing bad about what the Chinese are doing. It is a very strong program of incentives not to have large families. They don't give you food, housing, if you violate the prescribed population, family growth limits."

Ehrlich: "coercion in a good cause."

Population Crisis Council representative: "I am not concerned about those stories about strapping women to the abortion table. The important thing is to achieve zero-population growth."

It is unfortunate, but true, that some of these racist Malthusians took refuge from the beginning in the United Nations. We refer in particular to Sir Julian Huxley, the founder of U.N.ESCO. Huxley was an officer of the Eugenics Society of Britain and the Euthanasia Society, as well as the more respectable organizations such as the Abortion Law Reform Association and the National Association of Mental Health. From the beginning he was determined that the nonwhite populations of Africa not be too numerous—we can clearly see that he has succeeded in his intent. . . .