

# Russian, British pseudo-scientists regurgitate malthusian numerology

by Mark Burdman

In 18th-century Venice, ex-monk Giammaria Ortes, from whom Britain's Parson Thomas Malthus later plagiarized his arguments for why population had to be drastically limited, performed a series of arithmetic calculations, and concluded that the earth could sustain no more than 3 billion people. Despite, or more likely because of the fact that Ortes was a notorious incompetent, a group of pseudo-scientists today is disinterring his corpse, and insisting that the planet, indeed, can sustain no more than 3 billion persons, and perhaps as low as 1 billion. Ortes, of course, had the excuse that population, then, was much lower, so his calculations were futuristic. But his disciples today are advocating genocidal depopulation on a level far worse than the combined deprivations of Hitler, Stalin, and Mao Zedong.

Ortes's disciples are stepping forward to make their case in the runup up to the Sept. 5-13 U.N.-sponsored International Conference on Population and Development in Cairo. Among other criminal insanities, they are openly debating whether the American population should be reduced to between 40 and 150 million over the coming decades. It would be an illusion for northern populations to believe that only the developing sector nonwhite groups are being singled out for slaughter by the Cairo population crowd.

## 'Humanity has gone beyond the limit'

Early this year, as the Cairo preparations begin to go into full gear, the 2-3 billion "optimal world population" figure was being promoted by U. S. "population bomb" lunatic Paul Ehrlich of Stanford University; Cornell University agricultural economist David Pimentel, in a speech at the annual meeting of the American Association for the Advancement of Science; and by Russian Secretary for the Ecology, Viktor Danilov-Danilyan, on March 17 for the Moscow release of a book written under his guidance, *Ecology Between Past and Future: The World and Russia*.

These views are being endorsed by Arkady Fedotov, a Russian scientist writing in the Russian Foreign Ministry's *International Affairs*, and by the very well-connected British ecologist Norman Myers. In the July 1994 issue of *International Affairs*, Fedotov claimed to be presenting "scientific" proof that the earth can only sustain between 1-3 billion people. Fedotov, a physicist, with 44 years of experience, heads a section at the Russian Academy of Sciences Moscow

Radiotechnical Institute.

Fedotov began: "What is the state of the biosphere, humanity's cradle and habitat? Is humanity immortal, or is an eternal night closing in on it?" Early on, Fedotov criticized environmentalists for not paying enough attention to "biospheric stability and the limit of the biosphere's potentialities." Meanwhile, "capitalist private enterprise . . . is destroying the biosphere. . . . The Earth's quantitative potentialities have already been exhausted, and humanity is heading for catastrophe. Nevertheless, research ignores the pre-catastrophic character of the present period, thereby leading people astray.

"The biosphere as a living self-regulating system has lost stability under the impact of man's economic activities, and is undergoing intensive destruction," he continued. "The stability threshold of its continental part has been exceeded five to seven times over. . . . The Earth's capacity to bear the burden put on it by man's activities has a quantitative limit comparable to that of the load which an airliner can carry or an apple-tree support. *Far from everybody is psychologically aware of the fact that there is a limit to anthropogenic activities and that this burden can be computed.*"

According to Fedotov, "To estimate the limit of the Earth's potentialities, such as that of population growth, science offers two models, which may tentatively be called a resource model and a biospheric one." The former is the latest Meadows/Randers study commissioned by the Club of Rome, which, claimed Fedotov, is flawed because it allows for too many people, i.e., a limit of some 8 billion. The "biosphere model" is based on "the theory of stability evolved by Russian physicist Victor Gorshkov." Based on Gorshkov's studies on "the stability threshold or ecological limit" of human activity, it can be substantiated that "only 1 to 3 billions" can be sustained. Fedotov says Gorshkov's model is preferable, since it is "based on the properties of the living system." He added: "*The very determination of the admissible size of the world population is an outstanding scientific achievement of the last quarter of the outgoing century.*"

"The biosphere lost stability early in this century. To restore its stability, it is indispensable not only to restrict the world population but to give the surviving virgin natural entities of the Earth the status of a sanctuary. The biosphere

cannot be stabilized by merely rationalizing economic activities through, say, resource-saving technologies or wasteless cycles. *Humanity has gone beyond the limit of the Earth's potentialities*. The world system has entered a period of global crisis. This fundamental definition of the present period should underlie strategic programs for the development of all nations" (all emphasis is original).

Russia must take the lead in bringing humanity to "sustainable development," he asserted, propounding such concepts as "anthropogenic load" and "bioconsumption," to show which countries are supposedly most destructive of the biosphere. The worst two are Japan and Germany; but Russia, because it is so vast, is among the least destructive. From this, he concluded that Japan should pay \$100 billion and Germany \$57 billion into a "Global Ecological Fund," a kind of biospheric-damage compensation tax.

"Russia," he went on, "may be more prepared than any other major country to fit into the model of a sustainable world system. . . . We have a larger ecological reserve than other major countries. . . . In this pre-catastrophic period, it could not only devote a model for its own optimum development but work out a concept of harmonizing interaction between the biosphere and humanity and offer it to the world community."

Not one contention of Fedotov is backed up by the slightest shred of proof. Rather, his article is a mixture of numerol-

ogy, cabbalism, and Mother Earth-Gaia worship. It represents a slap in the face to that rigorous and positive tradition in Russian science represented by Mendeleev, Vernadsky, and many others.

It is frightening that such lunatic drivel would be published in the magazine that is officially sponsored by the Russian Foreign Ministry. On its editorial board are Foreign Minister Andrei Kozyrev, as well as U.N. Undersecretary General Vladimir Petrovsky, scientists Roald Sagdeev and Yevgeni Velikhov, and others of the "condominium" ilk. A deputy editor, Mikhail Kaloshin, wrote a stridently malthusian piece for the magazine in 1990, likening man to a "virus" and endorsing radical policies of "global ecology" (see *EIR Feature*, June 24, 1990). *International Affairs*, by the way, is now published in Minneapolis, Minnesota, by East View Publications.

### 'Thinking the unthinkable'

From the British side, the rallying cry to genocide is coming from Dr. Norman Myers, currently at Green College, Oxford, where he works under Sir Crispin Tickell, former British ambassador to the United States. Tickell has likened the growth of human beings to the growth of vermin (see *EIR*, April 29, 1994). Myers is a chief adviser to the British government for the Cairo conference, and also advises the White House, State Department, and Pentagon in the United

## Philip: 'Keep darkies from having babies'

A British insider who has discussed "population issues" intimately with Prince Philip for many years showed his irritation at the prince's openly racist views on population control. This individual, usually quite deferential about the Royal Consort, told a journalist: "Population is a major issue, but it involves many parameters. It involves a higher rate of literacy for women, and some security for the lives of children. You just can't approach it the way that he does. Prince Philip frankly believes that if we would stop all the 'darkies' from having babies, we would be better off; that's what he really thinks. His views are very naive and primitive. Do you know, he recently told a conference at St. George's House, Windsor Castle, that women should be sterilized after having a third child? He was then reminded that he was the *fifth* child of his mother, and that he and the Queen have had *four* children. But what can you expect? He represents a very strong feeling in the North, that the white middle- and upper-class can have children, but not the people in the South."

Asked if he knew anything further about Philip's statement that he would like to be reincarnated as a deadly virus, he laughed. "I never heard that one, but it certainly doesn't surprise me!"

This individual represents a growing number of malthusians and ecologists who are nervous that too openly advocating genocide will cause a backlash against Cairo '94. He said he was opposed to the approach of Paul Ehrlich and Dr. Norman Myers, who insist that the "carrying capacity" of the planet is around 2-3 billion, as well as to those "conservationists" who are "waiting for the next virus to kill people, as Gaia's solution to the population problem."

Similarly, he warned the malthusian lobby against "making a caricature" of the Vatican's opposition to population control. Instead, they should try to orchestrate a dialogue around a misrepresentation of the church's view. "There is merit in the Vatican's idea that the issue is not *controlling* life but improving the *quality* of life. The problem is the either/or view: that either we control population or we value life." If a useful dialogue with the Vatican could occur at Cairo, he stressed, the September 1994 population conference could "serve a useful purpose."—Mark Burdman

States. In a recent interview with an Italian journalist, Myers asserted that he agreed with Pimentel and Ehrlich on the "carrying capacity" of the earth.

In an article entitled "The Big Squeeze" published in the November-December 1993 issue of *Earthwatch*, Myers mused about the possibilities of drastically reducing the American population. Myers cited the works of Cornell University's Pimentel, that "each American consumes 47 times more environmentally based goods and services than does a Chinese. . . . The average American family comprises two children, but when we factor in how many natural resources these children consume and compare the American lifestyle with the global average, then the average American family, in 'real world' terms, contains something like thirty to forty children."

Myers went on: "Like all other developed countries, however, the United States does not have even the basic makings of a population policy. Though it often criticizes developing countries that fail to implement their population policies with sufficient vigor, the United States shows no signs of asking itself what its carrying capacity might be. Lindsey Grant, a noted population expert, estimates that in order to sustainably support the economy at today's levels, without depleting natural resources, the U.S. population should number between 125 and 150 million, or about the size it was in the 1940s. A leading ecologist, Robert Constanza, puts the figure at 85-170 million, depending on per-capita consumption. Pimentel calculates 40-100 million for a self-sustaining society with a quality environment. The Ehrlichs (of 'Population Bomb' notoriety) estimate around 75 million, about the size of 1900."

Myers insisted that "the United States would have to clamp down completely on immigration—a tough measure for a nation that owes its existence to immigrants." He asserted that, "to get down to 150 million would need no more than a century-long birth rate of 1.5 children per woman (down from today's 2.0), a rate that has already been adopted by Germany, Italy, Austria, Greece, Spain, Portugal, and Japan. A solid start could be achieved by eliminating teenage pregnancies . . . that costs the United States \$25 billion a year on support services."

Myers continued: "Who knows? Americans might soon find they're turning a profound problem into a glorious opportunity. The first step would involve the most adventurous, the most creative and the most incisive environmental measures that humans have ever taken. Let us get on with thinking the unthinkable, rather than letting forces of environmental circumstances do our thinking for us."

Myers is such a savage, that he wouldn't even spare his own fellow Britons. An accompanying box, with the title "Brave New Worlds," lists the various options worked out by "population theorist" David Richardson for reducing Britain's current population of 57 billion, to anywhere from 50 million to a level of 7 million, depending on what environmental "benefits" would accrue from such reduction!

## France signs on to Cairo genocide

by Frédérique Vereycken

France has announced its plans to take part in the United Nations International Conference on Population and Development in September in Cairo, and released its official position in a document that fully endorses the malthusian premises of the conference's organizers. Prepared by the National Institute for Demographic Studies (INED), the document was edited by the ministries of cooperation, social affairs, foreign affairs, and education. Titled "France's Contribution to the International Conference on Population and Development (1994)," it has been sent to the U.N. Population Fund (UNFPA) to be integrated into the conclusions of the Cairo conference.

"The neo-malthusian idea of a negative effect of demographic growth on economic development is still a reality," the report proclaims. "It continues to provide the principal justifications for policies that regulate births, even if it is not the only one."

The report asserts that, in the past, when there was a sustained rate of growth and international finance, major rates of sustained growth were "absorbed" (p. 3). In today's "economic conjuncture," however, this "absorption" is no longer possible, hence the necessity to decrease the rate of demographic growth. The very term betrays the malthusians' disdain for mankind: Human beings are presented as fundamentally passive, tolerable burdens only during a period of major financial flows; the hypothesis that there is a connection between population and a sustained rate of growth is not even considered.

The INED's recommendations specify: "France elaborates its demographic and cooperation policy in this domain, in conformity with the recommendations adopted by the U.N. in its global plan of action on population at the Bucharest Conference in 1974, followed by that in Mexico in 1984, and in the Agenda 21 of the Rio Conference in 1992" (p. 22). The report emphasizes France's agreement with malthusian policies for the Third World: "The understanding of the necessity for France to take a clear policy position on the population of the Third World was highlighted at the Mexico conference in 1984" (p. 22).

France's response to the U.N. conferences was to create the French Center for Population and Development in 1988 and to increase its hitherto timid financial support for the UNFPA. And, since 1987, the minister of cooperation has intervened into the domain of birth control by providing fi-