

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-

financial support to several African institutions and international non-governmental organizations that work along these lines.

Subtle, but no less deadly

In the section on "France's Contribution," there are no wild declarations such as those from some Anglo-Saxons on the necessity for a "new demographic world order." With the French, everything is subtle, *nuancé*, and malthusianism is encased in declarations of good intentions on "the emancipation of women" and the "free choice of couples" (p. 15). Insisting on the complexity of the problem, the editors of the report announce the deployment of anthropologists and sociologists to Africa to adapt the "informative message" about family planning to the cultural realities of the different African tribes. Recent developments in France's Africa policy—devaluation of the CFA franc against the French franc, support for International Monetary Fund policies, etc.—uncover the monstrous hypocrisy behind such professions on the liberty and dignity of the human person. What is actually motivating French leaders to accent their demographic policy with respect to the Third World shows up as a leitmotif throughout the report: immigration.

For example on page 7, INED writes: "The migratory phenomenon leaves the impression of having been suppressed rather than overcome; but the expected increase of

'demographic pressures' demands elaboration of a coordinated strategy among the countries of the North, South, and East Europe. The aggravation of demographic and economic disparities between Europe and Africa and within Europe cannot, in the end, be without consequences for the stability and security of the prosperous nations of the North."

In conclusion, the report calls for "regulation of migratory flows" that takes into account the "economic constraints" of receiving countries (p. 26). The image put forward is that of an aging, prosperous North confronting an impoverished, threatening South that is growing numerically and threatens to invade the North. In an interview with the May 16 issue of *Le Quotidien de Paris*, Simone Veil, who will chair the French delegation at Cairo, explains this geopolitical conception: "In the current state of our demography, and if things continue, we Europeans risk being less numerous and therefore less influential compared to peoples of other continents, who, themselves, have not stopped growing. Traditionally, we know, France has taken recourse to immigration to compensate for its low birth rate, but we are learning the limits of this policy."

France, if it is going to be true to the positive traditions of its history, should take the lead in the resistance to the Cairo conference and erect the bases of a new international financial system that can provide work and food for the billions now and in the future.



Why U.N. plans for world government must be stopped

a special report from *Executive Intelligence Review*

\$250

with authoritative case studies of
**Iraq, Cambodia, El Salvador, Somalia,
and the former Yugoslavia**

- 240 pages
- maps
- charts
- illustrations

Make checks payable to:

EIR News Service, Inc.
P.O. Box 17390 Washington, D.C. 20041-0390