

in terms of advising Washington on how commitment can be best achieved in terms of the particular circumstances of that country being alert to take timely initiatives on their own to further these objectives.”

The need for police-state ‘discipline’

In contrast to the “uncommitted” countries, which are subject to special covert targeting, the progress report cites countries allegedly committed to, or at least not opposed to birth control. These countries include most of Asia, notably the People’s Republic of China. The study claims that “almost one-half of the world’s population live in developing countries whose leaders are committed to population policies and programs. This represents roughly two-thirds of the developing world.” This account contrasts with statements made in the 1974 Kissinger memorandum, in which hostility toward population control by such states was considered far more prevalent.

However, the study notes that even in these nations, population reduction is often difficult to implement without an appropriate form of government, even if public education, dispensation of birth control devices, and other measures are vigorously pursued:

“Many leaders recognize that all these measures, significant as they are, will not help reduce population growth rates sufficiently to avert major disasters. Prerequisites for real success are likely to involve three approaches that are interrelated and have proved highly effective, as follows:

“1) strong direction from the top;

“2) developing community or ‘peer’ pressures from below; and

“3) providing adequate low-cost health-family planning services that get to the people.

“With regard to 1), population programs have been particularly successful where leaders have made their positions clear, unequivocal, and public, while maintaining discipline down the line from national to village levels, marshalling government workers (including police and military), doctors, and motivators to see that population policies are well administered and executed. Such direction is the *sine qua non* of an effective program. In some cases, strong direction has involved incentives such as payment to acceptors for sterilizations, or disincentives such as giving low priorities in the allocation of housing and schooling to larger families.”

Thus it can be said that by 1976, the U.S. government was committed to an imperial policy which had the following components: a plan to enfeeble the power of the developing sector through fostering population decline; a plan to undermine states opposed to population control; a plan to create or strengthen Third World police-states as a means of enforcing population control. A central principle of this policy was the idea that Third World economic development represents a threat to U.S. national security, and that those advocating such development policies had to be crushed.

Bush backed Nazi

by Kathleen Klenetsky

On Aug. 5, 1969, George Bush, then a Republican congressman from Texas, invited William Shockley and Arthur Jensen to testify in front of the Republican Task Force on Earth Resources and Population.

The two men had triggered an international furor by insisting that blacks are inferior to whites in the domain of intelligence. Despite the blatant fraudulence of their claims, Bush did not utter a peep of criticism; instead, a month later, he presented a summary of their testimony to his colleagues, “so that all Members of the House can share the information we heard.”

Explaining that his hearings had centered on three subjects, including “the hereditary aspects of human quality” and “the environmental problems created by our rapid rate of population growth,” Bush described Shockley’s comments in the following words:

“Dr. Shockley stated that he feels the National Academy of Sciences has an intellectual obligation to make a clear and relevant presentation of the facts about hereditary aspects of human quality. Furthermore, he claimed our well-intentioned social welfare programs may be unwittingly producing a down-breeding of the quality of the U.S. population.”

Shockley and Jensen offered specific proposals to deal with the “down breeding” caused by blacks’ alleged inferiority. Shockley campaigned for a Sterilizations Bonus Plan, under which those with low IQs, drug addicts, and those with diabetes, epilepsy, and similar diseases would be paid for submitting to sterilization.

Shockley was especially concerned about the black reproduction rate. “If those blacks with the least amount of Caucasian genes are in fact the most prolific and also the least intelligent,” he claimed, “then genetic enslavement will be the destiny of their next generation.”

Shockley and Jensen were both highly critical of U.S. social programs, especially welfare, claiming that they “may be encouraging dysgenics—retrogressive evolution through disproportionate reproduction of the genetically disadvantaged,” as Shockley wrote in 1979.

Bush: an enemy of life

Bush’s promotion of Shockley and Jensen’s Nazi-style crackpot genetic theories was no aberration. It was part and

'race scientists'

parcel of his devotion to the cause of neo-malthusianism, which, by definition, is a eugenics program directed at wiping out the "unfit," the "racially inferior," and the "useless eaters."

Despite his convenient conversion to a "pro-life" position during his 1980 presidential campaign, Bush's record reads like the implementation of Hitler's *Mein Kampf*. Over the course of his political career, Bush has played a critical role in the war on human life which the establishment, through the Club of Rome and other neo-malthusian outfits, has been waging for the past three decades.

Jessica Mathews, vice president of a key zero-growth think tank, the World Resources Institute, attested to Bush's yeoman's work on behalf of the neo-malthusian agenda in a *Washington Post* commentary published last year. "In the 1960s and '70s," she wrote, "Bush had not only embraced the cause of domestic and international family planning, he had aggressively sought to be its champion." He "shepherded the first major breakthrough in domestic family planning legislation in 1967" and "later co-authored the legislation commonly known as Title X, which created the first federal family planning program."

"On the international front," she continued, Bush "recommended that the U.S. support the United Nations population fund. . . . In his defining maiden speech as U.S. representative to the U.N.," he "named population and environment as top priorities."

The genocide lobby's man in Washington

Bush deserved every word of Mathews's accolade. During his two terms on Capitol Hill (1966-70), he belonged to a small group of congressmen who successfully conspired to force a profound shift in the official U.S. attitude and policy toward population expansion. Embracing the "limits to growth" ideology, Bush and his coterie labored to enact legislation which put population control at the center of U.S. domestic and foreign policy.

Bush arrived in Congress just as the neo-malthusians were girding themselves for the final assault against the Judeo-Christian concept that every person possesses a divine spark through which he is capable of making a unique contribution to the welfare of humanity. In contrast, the zero-

growthers claimed that man is a "cancer" who is uncontrollably devouring the world's fixed resources, and who must be stopped at any cost.

The battle was fully joined in 1968, when Pope Paul VI issued his encyclical *Humanae vitae*, which excoriated the neo-malthusian mentality and its goals: "Let it be considered also that a dangerous weapon would be placed in the hands of those public authorities who take no heed of moral exigencies. . . . Who will stop rulers from favoring, from even imposing upon their people, the method of contraception which they judged to be most efficacious?" As for poor countries with a high population rate, the encyclical said: "No solution to these difficulties is acceptable which does violence to man's essential dignity. . . . The only possible solution is one which envisages the social and economic progress both of individuals and of the whole of human society. . . ."

Bush was squarely on the other side. Just days after *Humanae vitae* was issued, he announced, "I have decided to give my vigorous support for population control in both the United States and the world," adding: "For those of us who feel so strongly on this issue, the recent encyclical was most discouraging."

Bush pushed, prodded, and cajoled his fellow congressmen into enacting legislation that contributed to bringing about the kinds of "1984" horrors of which Paul VI warned. "He was really out front on the population issue," a zero-growth activist recently said. "He was saying things that even we were reluctant to talk about publicly."

Prior to the mid-1960s, the U.S. government had refused to become involved in population control. As late as December 1959, political opposition to population control was so strong that President Eisenhower said, "Birth control is not our business. I cannot imagine anything more emphatically a subject that is not a proper political or governmental activity . . . or responsibility."

But within a few short years, U.S. policy had undergone a 180-degree turn. No longer was it taboo to push population control; it was taboo to oppose it!

Bush played a pivotal role in this shift. Shortly after arriving in Washington, he teamed up with fellow Republican Herman Schneebeli to offer amendments to the Social Security Act which placed priority emphasis on what was euphemistically called "family planning services." Their avowed goal was to reduce the number of children born to women on welfare.

The Bush-Schneebeli amendments were largely prompted by Dr. Alan Guttmacher, president of Planned Parenthood, and a protégé of its founder, Margaret Sanger. Years before Hitler's rise to power, Sanger was leading the charge for wholesale sterilization of "unfit" and "inferior races" in the name of "race betterment."

Although Planned Parenthood eventually toned down the racist rhetoric, claiming instead that "family planning" was a boon to the poor, its basic goal of curbing procreation

among “undesirables” never changed.

Bush was a big fan of Planned Parenthood. Like his father, Prescott, whose affiliation with the group cost him the Senate race in 1950, Bush championed Planned Parenthood at every opportunity. In 1967, he urged “government agencies [to] work even more closely with . . . Planned Parenthood.” A year later, he called on those interested in “advancing the cause of family planning” to “call your local Planned Parenthood” to offer your “help and support.”

War on the poor, blacks

The Bush-Schneebeli amendments were aimed at reducing the number of children born to blacks and poor whites. They required all welfare recipients, including mothers of young children, to seek work, and they barred increases in federal aid to states where the proportion of dependent children on welfare increased.

Reducing the national welfare bill was a prime Bush concern. Talking about rising welfare rolls, Bush lamented in July 1968 that “our national welfare costs are rising phenomenally.” Worse, “The fastest-growing part of the relief rolls is aid for dependent children (AFDC).”

He frequently motivated his population control crusade with thinly veiled appeals to racism. Like Shockley, Bush worried publicly that blacks had more children than whites. Blacks must recognize, he said, “that they cannot hope to acquire a larger share of American prosperity without cutting down on births.”

In 1970, Bush spearheaded the fight for President Richard Nixon’s Family Assistance Program (FAP). Falsely billed as a help to the poor because of its income-floor provision, the measure mandated every able-bodied welfare recipient, except mothers with children under six, to take a job. Bush liked FAP since it would force the lazy to work: Whereas “the present welfare system encourages idleness by making it more profitable to be on welfare than to work, and provides no method by which the state may limit the number of individuals added to the rolls,” under FAP, “if an individual does not work, he will not receive funds.”

This was just the beginning of Bush’s efforts to eliminate the world’s “useless eaters.” Over the next few years, the zero-growth gang jacked up its crusade for radical population control, and Bush goose-stepped right along. In rapid succession, he proposed bills to create a National Center for Population and Family Planning and Welfare, and to rename the Interior Department the Department of Resources, Environment, and Population.

In the foreign policy arena, he helped shift U.S. foreign assistance away from funding development projects, to underwriting population control. “I propose that we totally revamp our foreign aid program to give primary emphasis to population control,” he stated in the summer of 1968. “In my opinion, we have made a mistake in our foreign aid by concentrating on building huge steel mills and concrete plans

in underdeveloped nations.”

On the domestic side, one of his more important initiatives was his sponsorship of the Family Planning Services and Population Research Act of 1970, brainchild of Sen. Joseph Tydings, a key zero-growther.

Signed into law by President Nixon on Dec. 24, 1970, the Tydings-Bush bill drastically increased the federal financial commitment to population control, authorizing an initial \$382 million for family planning services, population research, population education and information. Much of this money was funneled through private institutions, particularly local clinics run by Planned Parenthood. The Tydings-Bush measure mandated the notorious Title X, which explicitly targeted “family planning” assistance to the poor.

Bush and his fellow neo-malthusians talked constantly about the importance of disseminating birth control to the poor. They claimed there were 5 million poor women who wanted to limit their families, but could not afford birth control. In introducing the House version of the Tydings bill, Bush ally Rep. James Scheuer (D-N. Y.) ranted that while middle-class women “have been limiting the number of offspring for years, women of low-income families” were not. “If poverty and family size are so closely related we ask, ‘Why don’t poor women stop having babies?’ ”

The Bush-Tydings measure took a giant step toward getting them to do so. An analysis by the Alan Guttmacher Institute found that since Title X went into effect, “2.3 million unintended births were averted and that each dollar invested in family planning by government yields a savings of \$2.00 in health and welfare costs alone.” Others put the “cost-benefit” ratio much higher. A 1975 study estimated that every dollar invested in “family planning” saved \$25-70 in welfare and other costs.

Bush’s task force from Hell

One of the main outlets Bush used for his zero-growth agenda was the Republican Task Force on Earth Resources and Population, which he founded and chaired. This is the panel to which he invited Jensen and Shockley. Comprised of over 20 congressmen, the group functioned as a bloc to promote the zero-growth cause; its hearings provided a public forum to nearly every neo-malthusian around.

For example, on July 24, 1969, it heard from Gen. William Draper, then national chairman of the Population Crisis Committee, and a close friend of Bush’s father, Prescott. According to Bush, Draper warned that the population explosion was like a “rising tide,” and called for using “our God-given brain power to bring back a balance between the birth rate and the death rate.” Draper also lashed out at the Catholic Church for frustrating population control efforts in Ibero-America.

A week later, Oscar Harkavy, chief of the Ford Foundation’s population program, testified. Bush summarized his remarks thus: “The population explosion is commonly recog-

nized as one of the most serious problems now facing the nation and the world. Mr. Harkavy suggested . . . that we more adequately fund population research. *It seems inconsistent that cancer research funds total \$250-275 million annually, more than eight times the amount spent on reproductive biology research*" (emphasis added).

At the same hearings where Shockley and Jensen testified, Bush also heard from Paul Ehrlich. Founder of Zero Population Growth and author of the 1968 bestseller *The Population Bomb*, Ehrlich urged the government to institute "drastic policies" to "establish a reasonable population size," such as "the addition of . . . mass sterilization" agents to U.S. food and water supplies.

In February 1969, Bush and the task force proposed a Joint Committee on Population and Family Planning, to "focus national attention on the domestic and foreign need for family planning." "We need to make population and family planning household words," Bush told the House. "We need to take the sensationalism out of this topic so that it can no longer be used by militants who have no real knowledge of the voluntary nature of the program but, rather, are using it as a political steppingstone.

"A thorough investigation into birth control and a collection of data which would give the Congress the criteria to determine the effectiveness of its programs must come swiftly to stave off the number of future mouths which will feed on an ever-decreasing proportion of food," he added.

Opening the door to legalized abortion

On July 18, 1969, President Nixon, responding to the urgings of Henry Kissinger and the Rockefeller family, called for a blue-ribbon Commission on Population. Bush was ecstatic. This was something he himself had proposed numerous times; on July 21, he issued a statement to "commend the President." "We now know," he intoned, "that the fantastic rate of population growth we have witnessed these past 20 years continues with no let-up in sight. If this growth rate is not checked now we . . . face a danger that is as defenseless as nuclear war." Within weeks, Bush's task force had introduced the requisite legislation, and the Commission on Population Growth and the American Future quickly got under way.

Headed by John D. Rockefeller III, the commission represented a radical, government-sanctioned attack on human life. Its final report, issued in 1972, asserted that "the time has come to challenge the tradition that population growth is desirable: What was unintended may turn out to be unwanted, in the society as in the family."

Not only did the commission demand an end to population growth and economic progress; it also attacked the foundation of Western civilization: man's reason. "Mass urban industrialism is based on science and technology, efficiency, acquisition, and domination through rationality," it said. "The exercise of these same values now contain the

potential for the destruction of our humanity. Man is losing that balance with nature which is an essential condition of human existence."

The commission made numerous recommendations to curb both population expansion and economic growth, among them, liberalizing laws restricting abortion and sterilization; having the government fund abortions; and providing birth control to teenagers. Its impact on American attitudes on population growth and personal morality cannot be underestimated; it certainly accelerated the plunge into outright genocide. One of its immediate effects was to break down the last barriers to legalized abortion. Just one year after its final report, the Supreme Court delivered its *Roe v. Wade* decision.

Weeding out the 'unfit'

The drive for population control which surfaced in the 1960s amidst a stream of propaganda about the "population bomb" and the "limits to growth," was merely a retooling of the old eugenics movement, which had been forced underground temporarily when the world recoiled in horror at its logical culmination in the Nazi movement.

By the mid-1960s, the eugenicists had resurrected themselves as the population-control/ecology movement. Planned Parenthood was a perfect example of the transformation. Rather than demand the sterilization of the "inferior" races, the newly packaged eugenicists now talked about giving the poor "equal access" to birth control, and "saving the environment." "Welfare recipients" became the new codeword for the "genetically unfit."

But nothing had truly changed—including the use of coercion. While advocates of government "family planning" programs insisted that these were strictly voluntary, the reality was far different. By the 1970s, the number of involuntary sterilizations being carried out, by programs which Bush helped set up, had skyrocketed, especially among blacks and other minorities.

In a 1974 court ruling, U.S. Judge Gerhard Gesell found, "Over the last few years, an estimated 100,000 to 150,000 low-income persons have been sterilized annually under federally funded programs.

"Although Congress has been insistent that all family planning programs function on a purely voluntary basis," he wrote, "there is uncontroverted evidence . . . that an indefinite number of poor people have been improperly coerced into accepting a sterilization operation under the threat that various federally supported welfare benefits would be withdrawn unless they submitted to irreversible sterilization." He concluded that the "dividing line between family planning and eugenics is murky."

Bush and genocide: a family affair

If you believe—as Bush does—in the pseudo-scientific genetic theories promoted by Shockley and Jensen (not to

mention Hitler), you might argue that Bush is genetically predisposed to genocide. After all, he does seem to have inherited his obsession with population control and racial “down-breeding” from his father, Prescott.

A staunch supporter of Planned Parenthood, Prescott Bush was a top partner in the Brown Brothers, Harriman, investment bank. The Harriman family (including Averell, the late Democratic Party elder statesman), along with other leading establishment families, created the eugenics movement in the United States, which instituted the mass sterilization of the “feeble-minded” and “racially inferior” in the 1920s—practices which the Nazis later copied with a vengeance.

The Harrimans helped organize a series of international conferences which brought together all the leading lights in the eugenics movement. At the Third International Eugenics Conference in 1932, the guest of honor was none other than Dr. Ernst Rudin, head of the German Society for Racial Hygiene, who a few years later drafted the Nazi miscegenation laws against the Jews.

One of the U.S. eugenicists who rubbed shoulders with Rudin at the conference was Gen. William Draper, a New York banker and close friend of Prescott Bush, who later became a top population control crusader, and helped organize the Population Crisis Committee/Draper Fund.

Draper summed up his attitude toward the human race in a 1971 article, in which he compared the developing nations to an “animal reserve,” where, when the animals become too numerous, the park rangers “arbitrarily reduce one or another species as necessary to preserve the balanced environment for all other animals.

“But who will be the *park ranger for the human race*?” he asked. “Who will cull out the surplus in this country or that country when the pressure of too many people and too few resources increases beyond endurance? Will the death-dealing Horsemen of the Apocalypse—war in its modern nuclear dress, hunger haunting half the human race, and disease—will the gaunt and forbidding Horsemen become Park Ranger for the two-legged animal called man?”

Draper and Bush collaborated closely during the latter’s congressional career. Bush invited him to testify to his Task Force on Earth Resources and Population; Draper helped draft the Bush-Tydings bill. In September 1969, Bush gave a public tribute to Draper for his relentless pursuit of zero-growth (see *Documentation*).

Draper’s son William III has enthusiastically carried out his father’s genocidal legacy—frequently with Bush’s assistance. In 1980, he served as national chairman of the Bush presidential campaign’s finance committee. During the Reagan-Bush administration, Bush had his friend appointed to key government positions, including Export-Import Bank head, and administrator of the United Nations Development Program, which post he still holds.

This past January, Draper gave a speech to a conference

in Washington, stating that population reduction is the core of Bush’s “new world order.”

From population control to depopulation war

In 1970, Bush lost his race for the U.S. Senate. But that did not deter him from carrying on his campaign against the human race. Appointed by President Nixon as U.S. ambassador to the United Nations, Bush used that post to promote zero growth on a global basis. In 1973, he became U.S. emissary to communist China, where he gave 100% support to China’s savage population control program, which includes sterilization and abortion, as well as infanticide.

Now, as President, Bush has taken his zero-growth insanity to its ultimate conclusion, using the instruments of modern warfare to kill countless numbers of people in the Third World, while simultaneously sabotaging domestic programs on which the lives of millions depend. If Bush is allowed to continue his policies unfettered, there won’t simply be zero growth; there will be zero people.

Documentation

From George Bush’s foreword to the book World Crisis: The U.S. Response, by Phyllis Piotrow, 1973:

The population problem is no longer a private matter. In a world of nearly 4 billion people, population growth and how to restrain it are public concerns that command the attention of national and international leaders. . . . It is quite clear that one of the major challenges of the 1970s will be to curb the world’s fertility. . . .

One fact is clear: In a world of nearly 4 billion people, with some 150 independent governments, myriad races, religions, tribes and other organizations, major world problems like population and environmental protection will have to be handled by large and complex organizations representing many nations and many different points of view. How well we and the rest of the world can make the policies and programs of the United Nations responsive to the needs of the people will be the test of success in the population field.

From George Bush’s testimony before Senate Government Operations subcommittee hearings on the population crisis (the Gruening hearings), Nov. 2, 1967:

With the pill and other devices, we have made great strides in [the population control] field. But even though all government programs in this field, to my knowledge, are

voluntary, I get the feeling that we are still tiptoeing cautiously around the edge of the problem. . . .

I get the feeling that it is a little less unfashionable to be in favor of birth control and planned parenthood today than it used to be. If you will excuse one personal reference here: My father, when he ran for the U.S. Senate in 1950, was defeated by 600 or 700 votes. On the steps of several of the Catholic churches in Connecticut, the Sunday before the election, people stood there passing out pamphlets saying, "Listen to what this commentator has to say tonight. Listen to what this commentator has to say." That night on the radio, the commentator came on and said, "Of interest to voters in Connecticut, Prescott Bush is head of the Planned Parenthood Birth Control League," or something like this. Well, he lost by about 600 votes and there are some of us who feel that this had something to do with it.

I do not think anybody can get away with that type of thing any more. . . .

There is a troubling resistance from some of the more militant civil rights groups. Again this is considered hush-hush, but like many of the things in this field, we ought to discuss it. I think there is some feeling among some of the more militant civil rights people that any effort in planned parenthood is going to be to try to breed the Negro out of existence.

From Bush's statement on "Population Control and Family Planning," Congressional Record, July 30, 1968:

The problem of population growth is skyrocketing. . . . Our national welfare costs are rising phenomenally, prompting me to wonder how we can take basic steps to arrest it. . . . The fastest-growing part of the relief rolls everywhere is aid for dependent children: At the end of the 1968 fiscal year, a little over \$2 billion will be spent for AFDC, but by fiscal 1972 this will increase by over 75%. . . . [These] children are often unwanted . . . two-thirds of them come from families where the father is absent. . . . If past trends continue, they will pass on the curse of poverty to their children. It has been shown that of all the families living in poverty, 33% have five children and 43% have six children. Seventy-one percent of the non-white poor families have five or more children. . . . Birth control must come swiftly to stave off the number of future mouths which will feed on an ever-decreasing proportion of food.

The Federal Government, along with many State governments, has taken steps to accelerate family planning activities in the United States, but we need to do more. We have a clear precedent: When the Salk vaccine [for polio] was discovered, large-scale programs were undertaken to distribute it. I see no reason why similar programs of education and family planning assistance . . . should not be instituted on a massive scope. It is imperative that we do so: not only to fight poverty at its roots, not only to cut down on our welfare costs, but also to eliminate the needless suffering of

unwanted children and overburdened parents.

I propose that we increase and earmark appropriations for our already existing family-planning services in all areas. . . . Money spent toward family planning is a good investment, since, in the long run, it will save on such costs as aid for dependent children. . . .

From Bush's call for a National College of Ecological and Environmental Studies, May 28, 1970:

The Republican Task Force on Earth Resources and Population of which I am chairman has been studying environmental problems for the past year. We have become acutely aware of the urgency of these problems and the need to employ the creative talents of our concerned young people.

This is one of the reasons that I introduced H.R. 16847, a bill to establish a National College of Ecological and Environmental Studies. The college would be funded with seed money from federal funds, but the bulk of the cost would be provided by the private and commercial sectors of the country. It would provide for an organized non-political youth forum where needed communications can be channeled into solving environmental problems.

From Bush's tribute to Gen. William Draper, printed in the Congressional Record, Sept. 18, 1969:

Mr. Speaker, I wish to pay tribute to a great American, William H. Draper, Jr. . . . I am very much aware of the significant leadership that General Draper has executed throughout the world in assisting governments in their efforts to solve the awesome problems of rapid population growth. No other person in the past five years has shown more initiative in creating the awareness of the world's leaders in recognizing the economic consequences of our population explosion.

Fortunately, we will be hearing more from Bill Draper as he is now the honorary chairman of the Population Crisis Committee, and will continue to be available for consultation on world affairs for which he is so well qualified.

From General Draper's testimony to the Democratic and Republican presidential conventions, summer 1968:

The age-old method of higher death rates—nature's way of keeping the balance—must give way to deliberate and massive birth control by all the world's people. That's the only humanitarian, the only possible solution. In the U.S., the government should encourage and support the establishment of voluntary family planning services in every suitable publicly assisted health facility throughout the country. Abroad, our economic assistance program should encourage developing nations to recognize that high rates of population growth mean lower rates of individual betterment. The Pope has missed one of the greatest challenges of our time. He has turned his back on the desperate need of the 20th century.