

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