

# A guided tour of the malthusian elites behind Cairo '94

by Mark Burdman

*The report below, describing the network of well-funded institutions behind the United Nations Third International Population Conference, was originally written in 1992 for a special report issued in German by EIR Nachrichtenagentur, GmbH. It has been brought up to date.*

During 1992, the seminal event of the international oligarchy was the United Nations Conference on Environment and Development (UNCED), the so-called Earth Summit in Rio de Janeiro, Brazil. As extravagant and as massively financed as that event was, it was only a prelude to the next global event envisioned by the oligarchs: the United Nations Third International Population Conference, scheduled to be held in Cairo, Egypt, on Sept. 5-13, 1994. According to U.N. sources, the theme for the 1994 conference will be "Population, Sustained Economic Growth, and Sustainable Development." The *U.N. Chronicle* predicted that likely topics on the agenda will include "regionalization of persistent high rates of population growth," "population and sustainable development," "continuing unmet family planning needs," "population policy implementation," and "the demographic impact of AIDS."

The Cairo gathering is being held as the twentieth anniversary commemoration for the U.N.'s First International Population Conference in Bucharest, Romania, and as the tenth anniversary commemoration of the Second International Population Conference in Mexico City. Bucharest '74 can be considered, historically, as a key initiating moment for the malthusians, at which a "World Population Plan of Action" was formulated. Already in 1992, the U.N.'s Population Commission had issued a call, in anticipation of Cairo '94, for the "international community [to] reiterate its support of the World Population Plan of Action."

The preparations for Cairo '94, including the current media buildup, represent a new phase in what might be called the strategy of "malthusian geopolitics" or, alternatively, "geopolitical malthusianism." This seeks to place malthusian considerations at the heart of all international strategy, including the potential deployment of military forces. No longer is the cruder variant of the malthusian argument used—namely, that population growth, unless severely curtailed, must necessarily outpace the capability of producing food. Rather, today's neo-malthusian argument holds that population growth, and the resultant growth in human activity, is

threatening to destroy the biosphere, or ecosphere. This is argued under the rubric, "sustainable development," a term which connotes halting scientific and technological progress, in deference to the protection and preservation of "Mother Nature."

Added into all this, is a hardly subtle form of racism, in which animus is directed against the nonwhite-populated developing countries of the southern hemisphere. This perspective is often euphemistically referred to, with the overt racism hidden, in the argument purveyed by leading western think-tankers and strategic institutes, that "now that the East-West Cold War is over, we can deal with the 'real agenda,' which is a North-South (or, better, North versus South) agenda."

## Earth Summit pushes population reduction

The conceptual-philosophical arguments for the malthusian perspective came together at the Rio summit, although with a perverse twist. In Rio, various spokesmen made declarations demanding strict population control measures. However, since population was not formally on the agenda, and since the Vatican and several governments resisted efforts to ratify the policy of coercive population-control methods, malthusian spokesmen, in mock or real outrage, screamed that the Earth Summit was a failure, and that a new initiative would have to be taken to deal with the central issue facing the world: rapid population growth, especially in the Third World. Such a complaint, often interspersed with more or less vitriolic attacks against the Holy See, was uttered prior to and/or during the Earth Summit by: Britain's Prince Charles, the Church of England's primate Archbishop of Canterbury George Carey, official representatives of the British government to Rio, former German Chancellor Helmut Schmidt, then-European Community Environment Commissioner Ripa de Meana (since appointed Minister of the Environment in Italy), and others.

This campaign was essentially phony. Although the Vatican and related opposition was real, and did throw a monkey wrench into the population agenda at Rio, the simplistic argument that Rio "ignored the population issue" is a lie. For one, the regrettable truth is that even the Vatican and related opposition weakened their own position, by submitting formal statements giving lip service to the idea that human population growth was problematic. More significant, in the



*Prince Charles with Dan and Marilyn Quayle, 1989*

period leading up to the summit, the U.S. State Department, the British government, and others had intensively lobbied to place the issue on the agenda—so much so, that Nancy Carter, the U.S. State Department's Coordinator for Population Affairs, was able to write a "Dear Colleague" letter on Sept. 17, 1991, declaring that she was "pleased to report" that at a just-concluded preparatory meeting for the Earth Summit in Geneva, "population issues were well-integrated into the Agenda 21 structure and have been accepted as part of the UNCED deliberations." And indeed, Agenda 21, the official working document for the Earth Summit, contained clauses dealing with the "population problem," including the blunt formulation that "the growth of world population and production combined with unsustainable consumption patterns places increasingly severe stress on the life-supporting capacities of the planet."

During the summit itself, there were also numerous population-related declarations. Maurice Strong, UNCED secretary general, declared that "the population needs to stabilize itself, and quickly. If it does not do so, nature will do it more brutally." Norwegian Prime Minister Gro Harlem Brundtland, chairman of the U.N.'s World Commission on Environment and Development that bears her name, declared, "Poverty, environment, and population can no longer be dealt with—or even thought of—as separate issues; they are interlinked in practice and cannot be delinked in the formulation of policies." World Bank President Lewis Preston endorsed the idea of an ambitious program of global "family

planning" linked to foreign debt reductions to reduce population growth rates, since such growth "is putting unsustainable pressure on the use of natural resources." Then-U.S. Sen. Timothy Wirth, a key member of the U.S. congressional delegation to UNCED, issued a public statement June 16 that in Rio, "even the Holy See . . . was talking about population as an issue. Everybody understands that this issue of population must be addressed." Wirth urged that the working foundation set up by the Rio conference be used to "begin preparations for the 1994 U.N. Conference on Population and Development," and vowed to reintroduce a "comprehensive population bill" calling for a major international campaign to bring down population growth rates. Today, Wirth is still pushing the same agenda in his new position as State Department counselor in the Clinton administration.

### **Thinking the unthinkable**

Even as this propaganda offensive progressed, abetted by such events as the genocidal war against Iraq, there has been increasingly open discussion of matters that formerly were kept under wraps. What follows are only a few of the trends in propaganda and policy discussion that emerged with greater clarity after the 1992 Rio Earth Summit.

- Highest-level strategists in Britain began mooting strategies to combat the "population threat" from China and India, either by using nuclear weapons against one or the other country, or, alternatively, by provoking a war between the two. The U.S.-based Population Crisis Committee, in a

1992 report, warned darkly of the threat posed to the world by population growth in these two countries, particularly by a potential 2 billion Indians, and insisted that China maintain an authoritarian communist regime that can enforce strengthened population-control measures.

- French malthusian Jacques Cousteau reported in an interview with the magazine *Le Nouvel Observateur* that he had held discussions with the U.S. Central Intelligence Agency about the potential U.S. use of nuclear weapons against refugee flows from South America into the United States: "Do you know that the Americans are constructing a wall on the border with Mexico, where the immigration is the strongest? At this moment, the wall is only 35 kilometers long. But the Americans are hypocrites. They say that the wall aims to stop drug traffic. I asked CIA men about this threat. They told me, 'We do not care; we have the nuclear bomb.' More and more people are willing to use the atomic bomb if the situation arises that 1 billion people are migrating toward the West."

Asked to comment on this, a senior figure in the London think-tank circuit said that he shared the aims of those cited by Cousteau, but did not necessarily approve of the means proposed to attain them: "We need military means to counter these refugee flows, yes, I agree, but not nuclear, rather conventional. . . . We have to think in these terms of reference. After all, these refugees coming into Europe may have AIDS. . . . Sooner or later, the problem has to be faced; the problem is obvious: overpopulation."

British Foreign Secretary Douglas Hurd, in two policy addresses during September 1992, identified "refugees and migration" as the biggest threats facing Europe. Various reports are coming from central and western Europe about advanced preparations and/or contingency plans for the substantial, multi-tiered deployment of military forces to stop large-scale population flows westward.

- In mid-1990, British influentials began debating, in the pages of the London *Times* and elsewhere, the merits of a proposal by University of Strathclyde Chancellor Sir Graham Hills, for placing contraceptives into the world food supply in order to reduce population growth in the developing sector. Another 1990 proposal, prominently published and favorably commented on in an editorial in the British medical journal *Lancet*, was that of University of Leeds professor of public health Dr. Maurice King. He proposed denying needed public health measures to the Third World, so that the death rate of Third World children would be increased. Such ideas have long been popularized by Prince Philip, international president of the World Wide Fund for Nature, who once mused that he wanted to be reincarnated as a deadly virus so that he could reduce world population.

- The magazine *Science*, organ of the American Association for the Advancement of Science, published an article in the spring of 1991 by University of Colorado anthropologist Warren Hern, purporting to prove that human population



*Jacques Cousteau: nuclear weapons should be used to stop refugees*

growth is to the Earth's environment what the growth of cancer cells is to the human body.

- When the war in the Persian Gulf erupted, the Italian magazine *Panorama* reported that an American pilot had written the following words on a bomb that he was soon to drop on Iraq: "For birth control in Iraq." Truly, it could be said that George Bush and his "coalition" allies implemented, by military means, the malthusian perspective.

- The World Bank and International Monetary Fund have put themselves openly on the side of "population control" and "sustainable development," and have determined to skew their lending policies toward such perspectives. In late-summer 1992 interviews with the European press, IMF Managing Director Michel Camdessus stressed that his institution was fully committed to bringing about the "sustainable development" perspective agreed to at the Earth Summit.

### **The British view: humans as vermin**

The malthusian Weltanschauung is being intensely pushed by such institutions as: the Trilateral Commission; the Ditchley Foundation; the Club of Rome; the Inter-Action Council; important components of the United Nations Organization apparatus, including the United Nations Fund for Population Activities (UNFPA) and the United Nations Development Program (UNDP); various ecologist and conservation groups, such as the World Wide Fund for Nature and the International Union for the Conservation of Nature; various nominally scientific institutes, such as Britain's Royal Academy and the U.S. Academy of Sciences; and such pseudo-religious organizations as the World Council of

Churches. Such groups receive support from governments around the world, such as the U.S. State Department.

But before enumerating what these agencies are doing, it is necessary to stress that the command center for such propaganda is Great Britain. The British establishment plays a special role in promoting the modern-day variant of the worldview earlier promulgated by British East India Company propagandist parson Thomas Malthus. Today, one hears these arguments from Prince Philip, Prince Charles, Church of England head Archbishop of Canterbury George Carey, and others.

Perhaps the quintessential expression of the British Weltanschauung has come from Sir Crispin Tickell, former British ambassador to the United Nations and a chief ecological adviser to recent British governments. On April 26, 1991, Sir Crispin was the featured speaker at St. George's Chapel, St. George's House, Windsor Castle, the place where the British royal family worships. Delivering the 14th annual St. George's House lecture, with Prince Philip at his side presiding over the gathering, Sir Crispin exclaimed:

"As the population rises to 8 or 10 or even 14 billion in the next century, let us remember the fate—or perhaps the parable—of Easter Island in the Pacific over about 1,000 years ago. A handful of people arrived by boat; they multiplied; they cut down trees; they cultivated the land; they multiplied again; they divided into little nations; they fought each other over diminishing resources and deteriorating land; they cut down what remained of the trees; now they could not escape; they suffered a drastic decline in numbers and living standards; finally they achieved a miserable stability. By the time Captain Cook arrived at the end of the eighteenth century, he found the wreck of a society on an ecological ruin. . . .

"The price of sticking to our present systems of value and not adapting to new ones is intolerably high. So far, all past human civilizations have crashed. None over time has reached a well-regulated steady state with population in balance with natural resources. There is no reason to believe that ours is any different. Indeed current signs are to the contrary. . . .

"For biologists a familiar experiment is that of the Petri plate. Petri plates are round dishes with transparent food on them disposed to allow the investigator to see colonies of microbes with the naked eye. From small beginnings, the microbes multiply at an accelerating rate. They are at their most prolific as they reach the edge of the plate. Then the food runs out, the microbes die in their multibillions, and extinction takes place."

On April 10, 1991, Sir Crispin told the London *Independent* that a key policy priority, now that the Persian Gulf war was over, was for the United States to drop the Reagan-era aversion to radical population control measures, and to play a leading role in bringing such measures to implementation. He warned that "escalating population growth is acknowl-

edged as one of the most serious causes of increase in greenhouse gases and global warming."

Not surprisingly, Tickell was one of the chief strategic architects of Anglo-American-French strategy against Iraq. It was he who hosted the ambassadors of the "Permanent Security Council Five"—the United States, Great Britain, France, China, and Russia—at his residence in New York, beginning in 1987; and it was he who set the tone for the response to the Iraqi invasion of Kuwait, in a number of well-publicized declarations from early August 1990 until he left his post some weeks later.

## Of Trilaterals and friends

As to the malthusian institutions themselves: The following list provides profiles of some, but certainly not all of the

## Boutros-Ghali: British satrap for new world order

The first African and Arab to hold the post of United Nations secretary general, Boutros Boutros-Ghali comes from a distinguished and wealthy Egyptian Coptic Christian family. He has multiple ties to British intelligence.

The Boutros-Ghali family first began work for the British government in the nineteenth century, when Boutros-Ghali's grandfather, Boutros Pasha, signed the Anglo-Egyptian treaty of 1899, which established formal British rule over Egypt and Sudan. With such patronage, Boutros Pasha rose in the colonialist government to become prime minister in 1908-10. In 1919, he was assassinated by Egyptian nationalists for his role in betraying Egypt. Boutros-Ghali's uncle Wassif Pasha was a key figure in bringing Egypt into the British-controlled League of Nations, the U.N.'s predecessor.

In 1949, Boutros-Ghali received a doctorate in international law from the Sorbonne in Paris. It was here that he met his wife, Leah Nadler, a wealthy Jew from Romania, during the same period that other wealthy Romanian Jewish families were building Israel. With such patronage, Boutros-Ghali rapidly began playing an important role within the Egyptian establishment. From 1949 through 1979, he was professor of international law at the University of Cairo, where he became an important figure in Egyptian academic circles. Among his early sabbaticals was as a Fulbright Scholar to Columbia University in 1954. In 1965, he became president of the Egyptian Society of International Law. In 1975, he became president of the Center of Political and Strategic Studies, affiliated

leading groups involved in planning the malthusian strategic perspective.

1) **The Pintasilgo Commission.** During the autumn of 1992, a special Commission on Population and the Quality of Life was formed, headed by former Prime Minister of Portugal Maria Lourdes de Pintasilgo. This group is the linear successor to the earlier Brandt, Palme, and Brundtland commissions, and provides the main conceptual input for Cairo '94. As Bucharest was patronized primarily by John D. Rockefeller III, so the Pintasilgo Commission is being patronized by the Rockefeller Foundation in New York, as well as by the Ford and MacArthur Foundations, and by the governments of Britain, Sweden, the Netherlands, the United States, Canada, Switzerland, and others. Pintasilgo herself is a member of the Club of Rome and a close collaborator of

Helmut Schmidt's Inter-Action Council of Former World Leaders, two leading malthusian organizations. Some of the other members include France's "humanitarian" supranationalist Bernard Kouchner; Palestinian negotiator Hanan Ashrawi; former Japanese minister of foreign affairs Nakayama; former Nigerian leader Obasanjo; Dutch Minister of Development Jan Pronk; and Gorbachov intimate Aleksandr Yakovlev of Russia. It also includes Washington, D.C. Congresswoman Eleanor Holmes Norton, who has been active with the Anti-Defamation League of B'nai B'rith and related forces in keeping the statue of Ku Klux Klan founder Albert Pike standing in the national capital, despite a nationwide movement of protest against this insult.

2) **The Trilateral Commission** was set up by David Rockefeller, chairman of Chase Manhattan bank, together

with the semi-official government newspaper *Al-Ahram*.

In October 1977, Boutros-Ghali's career took a dramatic turn when President Anwar Sadat appointed him minister of state for foreign affairs. The context for the appointment was Sadat's desire to strike a deal with Israel; Boutros-Ghali was taken by Sadat to Jerusalem for his speech there in November 1977. As foreign minister, Boutros-Ghali played a key role at the Camp David summit of September 1978, and had a major role in negotiating the Camp David accords, signed in 1979, which formalized a separate Egyptian-Israeli peace. The Camp David deal resulted in Egypt's break with the Arab world, and consequently a greater financial dependency on the West.

Since that time, with its foreign policy managed by Boutros-Ghali, Egypt has been transformed into one of the region's main Anglo-American assets. In 1990-91, Boutros-Ghali played a leading international role in justifying the U.S. war with Iraq. He also played a major role in sabotaging Arab efforts to find a diplomatic solution to that crisis prior to the war. Boutros-Ghali was appointed U.N. secretary general in 1992, with the public backing of the Center for Strategic and International Studies in Washington, D.C., an affiliate of London's Chatham House, which Boutros-Ghali, along with Henry Kissinger, has long worked with. He also received backing from former State Department Intelligence Director Ray Cline's Global Strategy Council. Boutros-Ghali has served as an adviser to the council's Global Water Technology Summits.

### **Boutros-Ghali's 'reform' plan**

On July 1, 1992 Boutros-Ghali issued a 48-page report to the U.N. Security Council entitled "An Agenda for Peace: Preventive Diplomacy, Peacemaking, and Peacekeeping." The report had been mandated by a Secu-

rity Council heads of state summit in January, organized by British Prime Minister John Major. The summit called for strengthening the U.N.'s capacity to engage in "preventive diplomacy," and called for the secretary general to make suggestions to that end.

Boutros-Ghali comes right to the point in the introduction to his report: "The improvement in relations between states East and West affords new possibilities, some already realized, to meet successfully threats to common security." "Authoritarian regimes have given way to more democratic forces," he states, referencing the success of the so-called democratization drive throughout the Third World, and not merely the Soviet Union's demise. He adds that much of the world is capitulating to British free trade policies: "Parallel to these political changes, some states are seeking more open forms of economic policy."

This new world order, however, is threatened by "fierce new assertions of nationalism and sovereignty" which undermine "the cohesion of states," through "brutal ethnic, social, cultural or linguistic strife." Moreover, he warns of the supposed danger of economic development: "Progress brings new risks for stability: ecological damage, disruption of family and community life, greater intrusion into the rights of individuals."

To this, he adds the threats of "unchecked population growth, crushing debt burdens, barriers to trade, drugs," and "massive migrations of peoples within and beyond national borders." He defines this assertion of sovereignty, ecological damage, population growth, resistance to free trade, and the like, as "sources and consequences of conflict" which "require the ceaseless attention and the highest priority of the U.N." Boutros-Ghali states that military intervention may be required to deal with these alleged threats, under the new, expanded U.N. conception of "peacekeeping."

with several influentials in the transatlantic policy establishment and from Japan, in the 1973-74 period. The commission was established to provide the policy guidelines for a world that had entered a new era of "energy and resource scarcity" and political instability, following the Henry Kissinger-organized oil hoax of 1973. The Trilaterals specialized in discussions on the subjects of reorganizing the world economy toward a global austerity regime modeled on the policies of Hitler's economics minister Hjalmar Schacht, and, commensurate with this, guiding political institutions into fascist directions, so that austerity could be effectively imposed. Another favorite Trilateral theme was elaborating the modalities for a workable "New Yalta" global crisis-management and power-sharing deal with the Soviet empire.

It is therefore all the more significant that, as the 1990s began, the Trilateral Commission began to shift into a more overt focus on ecology and population issues. The feature study released by the commission in 1991 was entitled, "Beyond Interdependence: The Meshing of the World's Economy and the Earth's Ecology," whose main author was James MacNeill, previously the secretary general of the Brundtland Commission. The MacNeill et al. report was aimed at boosting the June 1992 Rio summit. It proposed the creation of new United Nations-centered, world-federalist institutions that could strengthen the "sustainable development" regime worldwide, including, ultimately, an "Earth Council" which could help bring about an end to "obsolete notions of national sovereignty" by early in the next century.

At its 1993 annual meeting in Washington, D.C., the Trilateral Commission issued a report on "International Migrations: A New Challenge for a New Era," which asserted that population control in "high-migration" countries must form the core part of any strategy to control the massive migrations of human population occurring around the world. The study claimed that "population stabilization," rather than economic development, "must be aggressively pursued in the countries which now house the majority of the world's population. . . . Population policy is a first-order priority. . . . The decade of the 1990s presents the last chance for action if world population is to be stabilized by the middle of the next century. With the change of administrations in the United States, a major philosophical shift in official attitudes has occurred which should be the basis for renewed American leadership."

Regarding the U.S. immigration situation, the report recommended that every U.S. citizen be required to carry "secure identity documents," and warned ominously that "new solutions" to immigration "will require Americans to make trade-offs between the commitment to a generous but controlled immigration system and principles of individual freedom as they have been traditionally practiced and perceived."

The Trilateral report also asserted that "migration prevention must become a legitimate objective of international diplomacy and national policy," and said that "states have an

obligation to control entry into their societies."

It furthermore urged more direct U.N. involvement on the immigration front, recommending the creation of an "international migration regime" which would "include new legal instruments and the operational capacity to respond to the full range of international migration situations." In this context, the document noted that "humanitarian intervention" is becoming "a new legal principle which is dramatically changing traditional understandings of sovereignty. Trilateral countries should endorse the idea that violence within a country of groups dedicated to destroying or displacing one another can constitute a threat to international peace and security."

The report was drafted by a four-person task force chaired by Kissinger protégé Robert Hormats, an investment banker with Goldman Sachs and an adviser to Bill Clinton during his presidential campaign. Another author was Doris Meissner, who was nominated last year by President Clinton to head the U.S. Immigration and Naturalization Service.

**3) The Ditchley Foundation** is one of the more prestigious Anglo-American organizations. The chairman of its Council of Management is Sir Anthony Acland, former British ambassador to the United States and a top Foreign Office insider. The chairman of the American Ditchley Foundation is former U.S. Secretary of State Cyrus Vance, of whom it might be said that his malthusian commitments were very ably implemented in the slaughter in former Yugoslavia.

In the first weeks of 1991, Sir Crispin Tickell chaired a conference at Ditchley on the theme "Global Climate Change and Its Implications," in which the neomalthusian viewpoint was embedded. Earlier than that, in October 1989, long before the Gulf crisis erupted, the Ditchley Foundation had held a conference on "Political and Economic Refugees: Problems of Migration, Asylum and Resettlement," at which concern was expressed that "the principle which seems to underlie both immigration and refugee law in modern international society is that which endorses the legitimacy of the sovereign nation-state." The nation-state was an impediment to what must now be done. According to a report from that meeting, participants distinguished between two kinds of states, the refugee "senders" and the "receivers," and discussed measures to deal with what were labeled "refugee-generating countries."

On this basis, the Ditchley participants developed a notion of limited sovereignty: "Consideration should be given to making habitual refugee-sending countries pay for what should be considered a delinquency." Some participants called for "sanctioning outside intervention into the refugee-sending countries in order to eradicate the source of the problem. . . . Strategies of shame were discussed as being applicable," so that "senders would be disgraced in the eyes of other states." Advanced sector nations were referred to as "the gatekeepers seeking to control global population flow."

Around that time, an influential in the continental Euro-



pean policy establishment who has participated in Ditchley events told *EIR*: "The three central items on the agenda for the coming years are migrations of populations, the environment, and Third World instability. The leading policy institutions, like the Ditchley Foundation and the think-tanks, are redirecting their research away from the East-West issues and into these." He said that such "new global challenges" are the essence of what is meant by the term "new world order," and reported a renewed focus on the Club of Rome's early-1970s "limits to growth" concept, with the specific aim, in the 1990s, of disallowing countries like China and India, which have large populations, to build up heavy industries in the traditional sense, because this would "strain the global environment."

On June 21-24, 1990, Ditchley held another conference on the theme "Elements of Change in International Relations: A Foreign Policy Agenda for the 1990s," the proceedings of which were likened by the June 26, 1990 *Financial Times* to the world conferences at Versailles after World War I, and the 1944-45 conferences at Bretton Woods, San Francisco, Dumbarton Oaks, Yalta, and Potsdam, where the outlines of the political and monetary world order for the post-Second World War period were laid out. Participants included former British Foreign Secretary Sir Geoffrey Howe, Sir Crispin Tickell (then Britain's ambassador to the United Nations), and New York Federal Reserve chief Gerald Corrigan. According to the *Financial Times*'s Edward Mortimer, the consensus at this meeting was that the Third World would be "the object rather than the subject of post-Cold War history, the problem rather than the solution." The "new world" emerging would be a "trilateral or tri-polar" world, based on North America, Europe, and Japan—although, in the words of participants, "we would have to camouflage trilateralism in wider global institutions." Mortimer revealed that "what worried the Europeans most was the prospect of large-scale population movements, heading toward western Europe from east and south." This threat had replaced the Russian military threat as "our main preoccupation."

How policy institutes' thinking is being shaped around such Trilateral-Ditchley ideas, is seen in the case of the German Foreign Ministry-financed Ebenhausen Science and Policy Foundation, whose director Michael Stürmer spoke before a Council of Europe conference in Strasbourg, France over the June 19-20, 1992 weekend. Stürmer identified "four principal sources of instability" over the coming period, the first three being the anticipated explosions in the ex-Soviet countries, "the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction," and "the Islamic 'Arc of Crisis.'" The fourth, described by him as "the most threatening long-term configuration," could result from "the combined effect of unchecked population growth in the poorest parts of the world, especially South Asia and Africa south of the Sahara; migration of people, ecological breakdowns, scarcity of resources, water disputes." "At present," he stressed, "the cause seems to be

unchecked population growth, at a rate of 100 million growth per annum. . . . This means long-term destabilization in large parts of what used to be the Third World, with violent and incalculable spillover effects into the OECD [Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development, the "First World"] zone and further loss of control in the former Soviet Union." Ensuing "scenarios" could include "waves of desperate boat people" trying to reach Europe's shores. "This," he warned, "is a bigger bomb than any other bomb invented yet." The "last resort" of the OECD countries might have to be some kind of "military 'Maginot Line'" to deal with this problem. In autumn 1992, Ebenhausen submitted a report to the German government, outlining this perspective.

Another example of the Ditchley-Trilateral worldview extending into the policy domain, was a November 1990 speech before the North Atlantic Assembly in London by NATO Secretary General Manfred Wörner, in which he discussed an expansion of NATO's role to deal with threats outside the traditional NATO area. Said Wörner: "Along the southern perimeter of Europe, there is to some extent an arc of tension from the Maghreb to the Middle East. Tensions are exacerbated not only by the ambitions of dictators like Saddam Hussein, but also by population growth, resource conflict, migration, underdevelopment, religious fundamentalism, and terrorism."

In September 1992, British Foreign Secretary Douglas Hurd stated, in at least two policy addresses, that the problems of refugees and migrations are the greatest problems facing the European Community. This is stated by the foreign policy spokesman for a government which has mandated extremely restrictive legislation for admission of refugees into Britain itself, and which in its capacity as president of the EC during the second half of 1992, partially succeeded in organizing such restrictive measures throughout Europe.

**4) The Inter-Action Council/UNDP/Population Crisis Committee**, since its founding in 1982-83, has been a prominent advocate of malthusian policies for the developing world. Its chairman Helmut Schmidt (who, as German chancellor, once declared to the parliament that Hjalmar Schacht's economic policies had been right) has been in a declared war against Pope John Paul II, because of the latter's opposition to malthusianism. Schmidt has chosen Ibero-America as a key battleground, because of the strength of the Catholic Church, and because of the still-high rates of population growth in many countries there. Inter-Action's 1992 plenary was held in Mexico, from May 29-31, on the eve of the Earth Summit. Schmidt chose that occasion to sharply criticize the Rio coordinators for not having made population the number-one issue on the agenda.

The Inter-Action Council was originally founded out of the offices of the United Nations Development Program in New York. The current UNDP administrator is William H. Draper III, a friend of George Bush and son of Col. William Draper, Jr., founder of the U.S.-based Draper Fund/Popula-

tion Crisis Committee complex and one of the most rabid malthusian spokesmen in the United States in this century. Son William III told the International Development Conference in Washington, D.C., in a January 1991 speech only days before the Gulf war began, that the core of the emerging "new world order" should be population reduction. Speaking about the issues the United States must face in order to create this new order, Draper said that population pressures must be eased, and affirmed that, "as a rich nation, the United States must contribute to a global campaign to keep human population in harmony with its natural resources. The alternative will be further degradation of the fragile outer layers and atmosphere of our planet and America will not be spared the consequences." The United States was key, he said, since American "leadership and strength" were required "to establish a new atmosphere, a new world order."

Over the past two decades, and especially beginning with Henry Kissinger's reign and continuing through the Carter administration, Draper, Jr.'s Population Crisis Committee, launched in 1966, has established itself within key sectors of the U.S. State Department as a determining factor in U.S. support for malthusianism as a *strategic* objective.

5) **The Club of Rome**, ever since its launch in the late 1960s and early 1970s, and the 1972 release of its notorious *Limits to Growth* report, has been the effective conceptual command-center for the global malthusians. Twenty years later, the Club maintains this position. The same hoaxster who ran the computer-simulation frauds for *Limits to Growth*, Massachusetts Institute of Technology's Dennis Meadows, has now published a new book, *Beyond the Limits*, which elaborates a number of malthusian scenarios for the coming years. In 1992, the Club of Rome Council itself published a study entitled *The First Global Revolution*, which advocates the strengthening of world-federalist institutions, in the context of the Rio meeting, and which states bluntly what it perceives the root cause of the problems to be: "The real enemy is humanity itself." In recent years, the Club of Rome Council, under the direction of club co-founder Dr. Alexander King and new club president Ricardo Diez-Hochleitner of Spain, has been meeting in Spain and in the former Soviet Union, and has been building up a malthusian network in the republics of the former U.S.S.R., particularly trying to manipulate leading Russians into an alliance of the light-skinned North against the dark-skinned South, by playing on Russian fears of the "Chinese population bomb," and of instability in the Islamic regions of the Middle East and Central Asia.

6) **The "Royal Society network" of academies.** In May 1992, various scientific academies had a planning meeting to discuss a Population Conference for 1993, based on a malthusian policy document that had been co-issued by the British Royal Society, the U.S. National Academy of Sciences, and the Royal Swedish Academy of Sciences. The document was issued in order to motivate the Rio Earth Summit

to place population control prominently on its agenda. The mooted conference, provisionally entitled "World Population: A Conference of the World's Scientific Academies," was originally planned for Sweden, to be patronized by the Swedish Royal Academy of Sciences. Later it was decided to switch the venue to New Delhi, India for Oct. 25-27, 1993. Sponsoring academies included the Royal Society, the U.S. National Academy of Sciences, the Royal Swedish Academy of Sciences, the Indian National Science Academy, the Third World Academy of Sciences, the Federation of Asian Scientific Academies and Societies, the African Academy of Sciences, the Chinese Academy of Sciences, the Australian Academy of Sciences, the Royal Netherlands Academy of Arts and Sciences, the Mexican National Academy of Sciences, the Russian Academy of Sciences, the Pontifical Academy of Sciences, the Hungarian Academy of Sciences, the Brazilian Academy of Sciences, and the Pakistan Academy of Sciences. Representatives from 80 academies around the world were invited.

The final statement of the conference, excerpted in the British press, declared, "Let 1994 be remembered as the year when the people of the world decided to act together for the benefit of future generations." According to a paraphrase in the London *Independent*, the scientists vowed to "pressurize their governments to join in an effort to upgrade the environment and reduce the population growth rate to zero."

The ubiquitous Sir Crispin Tickell stated: "What we're aiming at is . . . a fairer distribution of goods around the world and . . . leaving the planet for the coming generations in the same shape that we found it."

Sir Francis Graham-Smith, vice-president of the U.K. Royal Society and a joint organizer of the New Delhi meeting, told British journalists that he was delighted by the conference: "The academies have never even met before, let alone signed a single statement. We started working on this a couple of years ago and [the scientific academies] just fell over themselves to support it. It was like trying to push open a door and seeing it fall off its hinges."

Yet the African Academy of Sciences, in a statement in New Delhi, sharply distanced itself from the final document, asking, "Why are population control targets being thrust for all countries, when thousands of women in Africa suffer from infertility and thousands are killed there by civil war, famines, and AIDS? You cannot preach population control where you need economic development."

According to the London *Daily Telegraph*, only 57 of the 83 invited scientific academies signed the document, which means that 26 did not. The *Telegraph* writes: "The most important dissidents were the Pontifical Academy of Sciences and the Irish Academy of Sciences, which adhered to the Roman Catholic abhorrence of contraception."

According to one release issued by the conference planners, the aim of the October 1993 New Delhi event was to "present a jointly formulated point of view endorsed by



scientists worldwide demonstrating their concern about the issue of population. A conference statement aimed at governments and international organizations will be issued by the co-sponsoring academies; other academies present at the conference will be invited to subscribe to the statement."

**7) UNFPA/People and the Planet.** The United Nations Fund for Population Activities (UNFPA) is, of course, the main U.N. coordinating institution for population-control measures. Its chairman, Pakistan's Nafis Sadik, has increasingly steered the UNFPA into cooperation and alliance with ecologist "conservation" organizations. Exemplary of this is a new magazine, *People and the Planet*, which is the effective mouthpiece for the Cairo '94 mob. It is co-published by the UNFPA together with the International Planned Parenthood Federation and the International Union for the Conservation of Nature. Various groups are described as "partners in the development and distribution" of the magazine, including the Johns Hopkins School of Public Health, Earthwatch, the International Institute for Environment and Development, Pathfinder International, Population Concern, the Population Council, the Population Crisis Committee, the Population Reference Bureau, the Royal Swedish Academy of Sciences, the Television Trust for the Environment, and the World Wide Fund for Nature.

Of these, the Television Trust for the Environment (TTE) merits special mention. This is one of a group of media outlets that was involved in a series of media projects, prior to and during the Earth Summit, to popularize "sustainable development." This is done through a One World media group, which had earlier been responsible for producing the BBC broadcast "The March," a docu-drama which depicted hordes of desperate Africans marching across the desert and then traveling by boat to the Spanish coast, where they are shot at by armed troops. The video was widely broadcast across Europe, in order to condition people to the malthusian "realities" that would be descending on Europe, should present trends continue.

TTE's international advisory council is chaired by Mostafa Tolba, executive director of the United Nations Environment Program, and council members include Charles de Haes, director general of the World Wide Fund for Nature; Kenton Miller, director general of the International Union for the Conservation of Nature; and Earth Summit secretary general Maurice Strong.

A contributor to *People and the Planet*, British environmentalist Paul Harrison, wrote in 1992 in the London *Guardian*: "My own view is that shortages of food, energy or materials will not directly limit human numbers on a global scale before we limit them voluntarily. If there is a crunch, it is more likely to come indirectly, through climate change affecting food supplies. How many people could live indefinitely on earth at current western lifestyles and technologies? Less than a billion, I would guess."

UNFPA chairman Nafis Sadik announced in October

1993 that she was "meeting Pope John Paul II . . . in a bid to make family planning more acceptable" and "to get the Catholic Church's support." Talking to representatives of the media attending the meeting of scientific academies in New Delhi, Sadik said that Catholics were the only organized religious group opposing contraception, although the church did preach responsible parenthood. According to the *Hindustan Times*, "Dr. Sadik, who hails from Pakistan, admitted that certain Islamic groups were also opposed to family planning. She, however, contended that there was nothing against family planning and contraception in Islam. Several Islamic countries like Indonesia, Tunisia and Egypt were propagating small family norms and have succeeded to a considerable degree in curbing population growth."

**8) World Council of Churches, WWF Network on Religion and Conservation.** The magazine *People and the Planet* credits the Geneva-based World Council of Churches with taking a leading role in organizing religious and church groups behind population-control policies. Because of the WCC, "population became a central talking point" among religious and church leaders at the June Rio Earth Summit, the magazine writes, adding: "The WCC, which is mainly made up of Protestant and Orthodox churches, came out most strongly on the need for population policies. In a pre-summit meeting held in one of Rio's most impoverished neighborhoods, bringing together 176 global church representatives, the WCC argued that couples should have more choice of birth control methods." According to WCC General Secretary Emilio Castro, "While the Catholic Church is against the methodology of using artificial birth control to decrease population growth, the WCC believes that the responsibility of choosing the methodology belongs to the couple." This position will help forward the "right to reproductive freedom." *People and the Planet* contrasted this view with that of the Vatican, as expressed by Vatican representative Angel Cardinal Sodano at the Earth Summit, who warned: "To apply methods which are not in accord with the true nature of man actually ends up by causing tragic harm."

The WCC's activity overlaps that of the Network on Religion and Conservation of Prince Philip's World Wide Fund for Nature, which has sought to mobilize leaders of the world's faiths behind a malthusian-ecologist perspective. The adviser to Prince Philip on such matters, Dr. Martin Palmer of Manchester, England, is also a consultant to the WCC, and has worked with the WCC's Church and Society division on such projects.

Their common aim is to weaken the belief, particularly strong in the monotheistic faiths, that man is made in the living image of God, and that man's activity in promoting scientific and technological progress is consonant with that relationship to the divine. This is to be replaced, in their view, by man's subordination to "nature," in the form of worship of the pagan goddess Gaia, Mother Earth, otherwise known to Bible-readers as the Whore of Babylon.