

Malthusians hit Paris with drive for depopulation and genocide

by Frédérique Vereycken

On Dec. 6-7, 1993, the first colloquium of "Equilibrium and Population" was held at the French Senate. This association, recently created by a group of doctor-journalists, benefitted from major institutional support for the symposium from the European Community, the International Planned Parenthood Federation (IPPF), the United Nations Population Fund (UNFPA), the Rockefeller Foundation, and Population Action International.

The meeting is part of the buildup to the third United Nations world conference on population, which will be held in Cairo, Egypt in September 1994. As shown in the previous article, the objective of the U.N. conference is to force international acceptance of mandatory population reduction goals, as a condition for aid and loans to all nations—especially the nations of the Third World. This program amounts to outright genocide.

The goal of the Equilibrium and Population association, in the words of its president Mrs. Tesson-Millet, is "sensitizing the public and mobilizing politicians to the problem of demographic growth." It was an occasion for gathering the top malthusian mouthpieces in France, a country still relatively resistant to "zero growth" ideology. The speeches presented a catastrophic vision of the world, a rejection of any reference to economic and political problems, and great reticence about revealing the drift of certain "family planning" programs.

First, some figures were presented. According to the UNFPA, three children are born each second, and world population, which is now about 5.57 billion, will grow to 6.2 billion in the year 2000, and to 11.6 billion by 2200. In the view of all the participants in the conference, such growth bodes future catastrophe. Parviz Khalatbari, a professor at Humboldt University in Berlin, who spoke of "apocalypse," explained his pessimism as follows: "Our Earth is a small planet with limited resources, limited land, limited possibilities. All this is simply not compatible with an unlimited population growth." Prof. Elie Schneour, director of a research institute and member of the Cousteau Society, shamelessly dredged up the discredited theories of the 18th-century British Parson Thomas Malthus: "The rate of

human procreation is geometric and that of foodstocks is arithmetic." We live, say these "researchers," in a reservoir of fixed resources, which has already been depleted, and any population growth could only destroy this "ecosystem." According to UNFPA statistics, under "demographic pressure," 10,000 species allegedly disappear each year as well as 20 million hectares of forest, as the "greenhouse" effect produced by human activity portends climatic disaster.

The population explosion supposedly causes hunger, unemployment, and the rural exodus. Hence, the increase in the number of people is allegedly behind all the evils afflicting what Mr. Mahler, the IPPF chairman, calls the "global village." Dr. Segal of the Population Council presents himself as the "most optimistic." He does not deny that in certain cases, such as India, the standard of living today has improved over the period when world population was only 2 billion. But then he brushes the example aside: "An India where there would be a half-billion inhabitants in the year 2000, which is already enormous, instead of the billion which we must expect, could catalyze a high level of development." In all these cases, human beings are considered as burdens to be borne and not as a source of wealth. For Segal, "It is evident that the quantity of human lives has a negative effect on the quality of life. For a developing country with a growing population, like Alice in Wonderland, you have to run faster to be able to stand still. To achieve national objectives, the best strategy is to balance the number of persons and their needs with the available resources." This concept of equilibrium is precisely what one uses when one studies an ecosystem made up of animals!

Dr. Maurice King makes no bones of his bestial model in his definition of "the demographic trap": "A population is caught in a demographic trap when it has to exceed or is projected to exceed the combination of the following elements: capacity of an ecosystem to support the population, capacity for obtaining products issued from other ecosystems, capacity to migrate toward other ecosystems so as to sustain its standard of living." If you wanted to describe a population of sheep isolated on an island already saturated with sheep, you would use exactly these terms.

The difference between man and beast

What is the trap in malthusian philosophy? Malthus and his disciples have forgotten one thing: the difference between man and beast. This difference is called human creativity, and it permits, through the invention of new technologies, the defining of new resources and the opening of new degrees of freedom in man's use of nature. From this standpoint the notion of limited resources is false, because they are not defined by themselves, but by human action on the universe. The only condition to be fulfilled for humanity to continue this progress is that of creating the conditions which make possible the process of discovery/development. All such economic and political questions were, of course, discarded by this symposium.

The U.N. Population Fund's objective seems to be exclusively limiting births, according to Dr. Nafis Sadik, its executive director: "There is no need to wait until there is economic development to attain lowered fertility." Any mention of the economic austerity imposed on the Third World is hence ruled out. Dr. Singing, of the Rockefeller Foundation, represents this new "school" of demographics very well. He claims that demographic transition (passage to a situation where the birth rates and death rates are low) can be effected outside any economic progress and is not linked to the level of development. He recounted, "In the 1960s, the initial family planning policies and the climate of urgency which they reflected revealed the possibility of conflicts between individuals' plans in the realm of procreation and the demographic targets of governments whose goal was to rapidly diminish the birth rate. This potential for conflicts was reinforced by the belief that family planning programs would not be effective without great economic and social transformations. The pessimists developed impressive and persuasive theories on the reasons which prompted poor, uneducated couples to need a lot of children. At present, however, it seems evident that the theories concerning the economic and social causes of high fertility have not enabled us to see the extent of unwanted pregnancies and births in most of the countries concerned. Unfortunately, the weight accorded by the experts to investments designed to reduce poverty have led most of the donor agencies to underinvest in family planning activities during these past 20 years."

Priority must be accorded development

This new concept of "demographic transition" is an Anglo-Saxon brainchild, and finds little acceptance in France. Even when they share the malthusian notion of limited resources, French demographers bridle at such extremes of irrationality, insisting that there is a link between the number of people, the size of the family, and the living standard. It suffices to study the history of the demographic transition in Europe. Thus, for Jacques Véron of the National Institute for Demographic Studies, "Poverty in Third World countries is not only a result of demographic growth but is also a cause

of it. . . . The experience of the last 40 years shows that it has been possible to radically modify the evolution of fertility by putting into place birth limitation policies: Demographic change is not produced outside a transformation of the economic and social context. For rationalities to be modified and real choices to be exerted, a minimal development is indispensable. Therefore, priority has to be accorded to development." Professor Vinokur of the University of Nanterre (Paris) also explained that demographic transition cannot take place without development. The two French researchers were violently attacked and almost ridiculed for this approach, especially by Singing.

Why such ferocity for evading any reference to the economic conditions to which developing countries are subjected? Behind the demagogic and feminist diatribes about a purportedly "unsatisfied demand of women for family planning," so dear to Mr. Singing, the name of the game is to avoid at all costs any questioning of the policy carried out by the big financial institutions (International Monetary Fund, World Bank, etc.) toward the Third World. There is no legitimacy in the crushing debt of these nations, which have been the helpless victims of the dizzying rise in interest rates and plunging raw materials prices.

But to save the world financial system and its insane monetarist logic, the financial "elites" must pursue this policy of looting and prevent any real development. The policy consists of considering the Third World as a mere reservoir of resources and coheres with the malthusian philosophy professed by financial circles. From the malthusian viewpoint, the only appropriate "aid" is to help cut down the number of useless eaters.

True purposes concealed

How can this depopulation policy have been accepted? First, because the real drift of family planning and the coercive measures are skillfully disguised. Thus, in this symposium, Mechai Viravaidya (president of Population and Community Development, the PDA) came to proudly present the "Thai model." "In Thailand the annual rate of growth went from 3.2% in 1973 to 1.3% in 1993," Mechai said, but he presented nothing on the methods used. The 1990 report of the World Bank gave the details: "Marathons of vasectomies took place on work holidays and on the birthday of the king. In 1983, a team of 40 doctors and 80 nurses carried out a record 1,180 vasectomies during the holiday. The PDA guarantees free, comfortable, and effective vasectomy services in dispensaries and mobile units. From July 1980 to June 1984, some 25,412 vasectomies were thus carried out. Households which use family planning may rent buffalos to work their fields for half the price. They are encouraged to sell their products through the intermediary of the family planning service for prices 90% of those which the ordinary intermediaries offer, and to buy fertilizers and seeds at 30% less than they would pay on the market. Such a program

proposes charging to the villagers who practice contraception lower rates for transporting their products to the markets and free suckling pigs." Given the conditions of life, who could speak of "free choice"?

The case of Brazil was barely mentioned, although according to Rep. Ervin Bonkoski of the French National Assembly, in recent years more than 20 million Brazilian women have been sterilized, among them very poor women who may know nothing of the irreversible nature of the operation or know nothing about it at all.

Dr. Segal, who directed the original team of researchers who produced Norplant (the contraceptive implant which makes a woman sterile for five years), kept mum on the heated polemics which have been touched off by the use of this means of contraception in questionable conditions in the black ghettos of the United States. There was total silence on the conditions in which family planning programs are carried out on the ground, while the broad public is fed speeches on human rights. "The right of individuals and couples to freely determine the number of births and to dispose of the means they want was recognized for the first time in 1968 and this right of the human person has been accepted almost by the entire world," reported one of the UNFPA brochures.

The second "factor of acceptance" of this policy of depopulation of the Third World is cultural pessimism. As a result of it, Malthus's axiom on the limitation of resources is more and more widely accepted, including by those scientists represented at the Senate symposium by Prof. F. Gros (permanent secretary of the Academy of Sciences of France). He reported on a meeting of the world scientific academies which was held this year and which went totally down the malthusian road.

To conclude, let us examine the purpose of this meeting in the French Senate. First, for all these family planning pushers it was the occasion to review 30 years of activities. Dr. Sadik of the UNFPA spoke of "cautious optimism." Sadly, she has something to be smug about. Today women in the Third World have 3.5 children each, as against 6 in 1965. The rate of use of contraceptives (all methods including sterilization) went, during the same timespan, from 8% to 50%. Since 1975, the rate of world population growth has remained unchanged at 1.7%. The "best" results, according to Dr. Segal, have been in Thailand, Indonesia, Mexico, Colombia, Brazil, and Bangladesh.

In September 1994 the third United Nations world conference on population will occur. The "Equilibrium and Population" colloquium in the French Senate is part of the buildup to it. Already, the objectives have been defined. According to the study by the Population Council's Dr. Segal, "If the United Nations estimates that the world population will reach some 6.7 billion people within ten years, a threshold not to be exceeded, we must supply the Third World in the next ten years with 50 billion condoms, 11 billion contraceptive pills,

178 million sterilizations, and 400 million Norplant implants." Moreover, the long-term objective is zero growth, because, according to Segal, "The Third World has already gone halfway toward the level of simple replacement."

To attain this goal, Joseph Speidel, president of Population Action International, pleads for a massive increase in the annual world family planning budget. From \$4.6 billion today, he demands spending \$11 billion per year up to the year 2000. The Third World would supply half this sum, the rest would have to come from developed countries. In its brochure on family planning and donor countries, the PAI regrets "that in certain countries the Catholic Church or the religious beliefs of this or that functionary of the aid bureaucracy has exerted a behind-the-scenes influence which has kept governments from more actively supporting family planning interventions abroad." France is a particular target because it has dedicated only 0.03% of its total aid budget to the Third World to family planning and, according to PAI, "it has practically no population experts in its foreign aid services." France is therefore "invited" by PAI to upgrade its contribution to birth control.

'Durable' development

Besides obtaining zero growth, the objective is the adoption of a model of "economic development" called "durable" development. A U.N. document on population and the environment says:

"Once the correlation between the growth and distribution of the population and the degradation of the environment are admitted as factors in the economic equation, the perspectives of future development are profoundly changed. It could be that we have accomplished progress in the past which is costing the future very dearly. Certain analyses call into question the very notion of economic growth detached from the expenditure of available resources. A large part of what has been taken for economic development could prove to be illusory in the long term, obtained at the cost of technological schemes which merely put off the day when we will have to step up to the cashier and pay up the hidden costs."

"Durable" development is what takes into account the so-called limitation of resources and the so-called harmful effects of man on nature. The economic equation is that of Paul Ehrlich (Stanford University): $I = PAT$, where I represents the impact of man on the environment; P the population (an absolute figure, growth); A per capita consumption; and T technology. The goal of "durable" development is that of decreasing I —therefore, decreasing the number of people, their individual consumption, and the technological level!

The result of such a policy will be genocide under the cover of preserving ecology. Its purpose is the destruction of all physical economy, including that of the developed countries, and the elimination of a part of the world population.