

## EIR Special Report

# The U.N. population conference: Dare call it genocide!

by Mark Burdman

“Population projects prepared by the United Nations, the World Bank, and other organizations found that *if past trends continue*, world population will increase by one-third in the last two decades of this century, reaching 6 billion by 2000. Moreover, if these trends continue into the next century, world population may reach 12 to 15 billion before growth stops. These bleak figures represent a marked improvement over the demographic perspective just a decade ago. At that time, world population of more than 7 billion was thought likely by the end of this century. The reduction of a billion in the projected world population did not come about by chance [emphasis in original].”

—from the Preface to *Toward Population Stabilization: Findings from Project 1990*, published by  
The Population Institute, Washington, D.C.

This quotation from a report prepared by one of the United States' most prestigious population-control organizations demonstrates eloquently why the United Nations Non-Governmental Organizations bureaucracy, in one of its first acts at the Aug. 6-14 Second International Population Conference in Mexico City, chose to refuse U.N.-sanctioned distribution of a document prepared for the conference by the Club of Life, which was attending the conference with full NGO status. That report, entitled “How to Stop World Depopulation by the Year 2000,” charged that leading individuals and institutions of the population-control movement are responsible for “genocide 100 times worse than Adolf Hitler.”

In their own words, the authors of the Population Institute's *Project 1990* confess that they stand guilty of the Club of Life's charge—and boast that they intend to commit vastly worse such crimes in the decade ahead. Not even hiding behind the unscientific claim that population control will somehow enhance the economic well-being of the Third World, they openly admit that they have *no interest* in economic development. “All talk of new global economic systems and large development projects is a waste of time, a distraction from avoiding population catastrophe,” says Population Institute head David Poindexter (see article, page 22.)



*Club of Life supporters demonstrate in front of the Mexico City conference hall housing the Second International Population Conference. In the decade since the first conference, the population-control fanatics have brainwashed many Third World countries into accepting the alleged "economic necessity" of reducing population growth. The Club of Life delegation, whose policy document was suppressed by the U.N. bureaucracy, constituted the sole anti-Malthusian rallying point at the conference.*

When *Project 1990* speaks of "the demographic perspective just a decade ago," it refers to the landmark moment in the world depopulation movement: the First International Conference on Population in Bucharest, Romania. Since that time, as the institute boasts and as *EIR* independently discovered in monitoring developments at the Second Population Conference in Mexico City, the depopulators have been dramatically, or shall we say tragically, successful in luring developing-sector countries away from the primary focus on global development policy with which they had challenged the depopulators at Bucharest in 1974, and toward a dangerous acceptance of the presumed "necessity" of reducing population.

To the casual observer, the terms incessantly used to drum home the depopulators' message—"population stabilization," "population equilibrium," "lowering the rate of fertility," "family planning assistance," and the like—may have an almost academic, policy-neutral ring about them. A decade of opposition, in large part mobilized by Club of Life founder Helga Zepp-LaRouche and her husband Lyndon LaRouche, to "limits to growth" Malthusianism, has forced the depopulators to sugar-coat their marketing of the modern-day equivalent of the Nazis' "useless eaters" policy. The "newspeak" terminology masks the *content* of the policies—denial of credits for new technologies, induced food shortages and famines, coercive application of mass sterilization and abortion, fomenting of regional wars between nations, and, as in the case of Kampuchea, outright mass murder—that, threaten to reduce the population *potential* of the globe by vastly more than the one billion population-reduction figure that the Population Institute labels a "marked improve-

ment" in the past decade's demographic situation.

Indeed, this "did not come about by chance."

Yet the despair which has led many developing-sector countries to accept the arguments of Malthusianism could be rapidly reversed. Willful action by populations of nations whose organic impulses are *anti-Malthusian* could, at this late date, prevent a new holocaust. The potential role of the United States is crucial: Third World governments have been brainwashed to accept the Malthusian arguments in large part because the population-control bureaucrats are backed by the muscle of U.S.-based institutions, and because of the cultivated mythology that the American economic success is a function of "family planning" and a lowered birth rate—when exactly the opposite is true. To the extent that the American population acts to reverse the "post-industrial society" disease within American life itself, to assert a vigorous economic expansion as the foundation of national political life, and to oblige President Reagan to stop compromising with Malthusians within his own advisory circles, then the right "message" will have been sent out. This will help break the suicidal pessimism that the Malthusians have, to a larger extent than their stupidity and venality would merit, injected into governments and nations.

The developing sector's eagerness for an end to such pessimism, and its deeply ingrained hatred of the Malthusians, were evident in the extensive coverage the Club of Life received in the Mexican press when it exposed the genocide plans of the population-control institutions, the State Department, the International Monetary Fund, the grain cartels, and Gnostic pseudo-religious cults.

The Club of Life's policy document identified precisely

the global perpetrators of Malthusianism, provoking howls of rage from the organizers of the conference. One stated U.N. reason for suppressing the Club of Life documentation was the identification of John D. Rockefeller III as a controller of world genocide. "The conference receives funding from the Rockefeller Foundation," U.N. official Virginia Saurwein protested. More than that: One of the two official awards of the Conference went to Dr. Sheldon Segal, director of Population Studies at the Rockefeller Foundation in New York and a man who has devoted his scientific career to finding new technologies to prevent conception. The other award went to Dr. Carmen Miro, a "birth-control" specialist from Panama, whose main thesis is that Central America suffers from "over-population." Given the fact that that region of the world is currently being killed off in regional warfare, we can see the future for the human race mapped out by the individuals and institutions behind the Mexico City event.

### **The genocide lobby—East and West**

From evidence accumulated in Mexico City, it is clear that the "genocide lobby" spans the nominal "East-West" divide of global politics; oligarchies on both sides employ the population-reduction policies and methods invented for modern usage by the British East India Company and its propagandist Parson Thomas Malthus two centuries ago. If the West should be castigated for allowing Gnostic pagans like Robert McNamara (who made a secret visit to Mexico City midway through the Conference to confer with officials from the World Bank, Population Crisis Committee, Rockefeller Foundation, and other Malthusian institutions) to dictate to the Third World, the Great Russian chauvinists and their friends are, if anything, even worse.

Not only did the Russians vote against a joint Vatican-U.S. government proposal outlawing abortion as a means of population control, but the Soviets, Cubans, and others used the conference as a platform to harangue against the "aggressive imperialism" of the United States as the main threat to the developing sector, and to push their full gamut of proposals for "disarmament"—of the West.

East German delegates from the Institute for Sociology and Social Policy and from the Institute for Health Care happily boasted, in private discussions with *EIR*, that the German Democratic Republic's main achievement has been to achieve "zero population growth" and a working policy relationship with the International Institute for Applied Systems Analysis (IIASA) near Vienna. IIASA was established in the early 1970s by joint arrangement of the Soviet government and the U.S. liberal Eastern Establishment's McGeorge Bundy and Henry Kissinger, for cooperating in constricting world food, population, and technology. On the first day of the conference, IIASA, in conjunction with the United Nations Fund for Population Activities (UNFPA) and the Food and Agriculture Organization (FAO), circulated a report on the "population-carrying capacity" of the globe, claiming

that a "Malthusian" solution would be needed, because the ability to produce food was "limited" in many regions.

The Bulgarian representation to the conference was most crude in displaying the racist motivations behind the thinking of East bloc imperialists. "We need an expanded fertility rate for Bulgarians, but the rest of the world's population is growing at an excessively high rate," was the essence of the Bulgarian position.

### **The developing sector caves in**

Caught in the squeeze play between cynical Eastern imperialism and Western Malthusianism, the developing-sector nations are being manipulated into a position not unlike the "self-governing councils" appointed by the Nazis for "internal affairs" in the concentration camps.

One frustrated African representative told *EIR*: "At Bucharest, the Group of 77 (developing countries) took a strong position that development is the key to how to deal with the problem of population. But since that time, we have felt a sense of failure. The International Monetary Fund has been very hard on us, we suffered serious famine in 1977-78, it is very hard, and there's no unified fight for development."

This was reflected as well in public positions taken by leading governments. India, for example, whose "population problem" was universally cited in the conference halls and corridors as the "proof" of the need for population-control measures, presented an amendment-resolution to the final conference 89-point declaration calling for increased financial assistance to population programs by the U.N. In an interview with the official UNFPA publication *Populi*, circulated at the conference, Prime Minister Indira Gandhi stated that India's ultimate aim is "zero population growth."

In the case of the keystone nation of Nigeria, the official statement presented to the conference, authored by Chief of State Major-General Muhammadu Buhari, contrasted the early '70s—when "population growth was not considered to be a matter of great concern, because of the view that Nigeria is blessed with a large area of arable land and abundant natural resources which could be exploited to achieve a better living condition for the people"—with the situation now, when "it is evident that the view has to be reappraised. . . . Something has to be done to ensure that the galloping population growth rate and over-urbanization do not eclipse efforts being made by the government to improve the economy and enhance the quality of social services available for the people."

In the case of Indonesia, the world's fifth most populated country and a critical member of the Group of 77, Minister of State for Population and the Environment Emil Salim praised the population policies of the World Bank and such fanatical population-reduction organizations as the International Planned Parenthood Federation, the Population Council, and the Pathfinder Fund. "Since the first International Conference on Population in Bucharest in 1974, the achievements in population are significant, but not sufficient," he stated. "The world can not afford . . . faster population growth

in developing countries.”

The worst statement was the “Heads of State Declaration for Population Stabilization,” signed by 18 nations, predominantly members of the British Commonwealth. This document attributes depletion of natural resources and “degradation of the environment” to “unprecedented population growth. . . . We believe that the time has come now to recognize the worldwide necessity to stop population growth within the near future. . . .” One signer of that document, Jordan’s King Hussein, stated in a separate message to the conference: “In the decade since the first World Population Conference in Bucharest, the world has experienced a tremendous demand on its limited resources. It is caused largely by a phenomenal population surge, accompanied by rising expectations for better living conditions and services. . . . The challenge lies in working the proper balance between finite resources and unchecked population growth.”

Such Malthusian doom-and-gloom was countered to some extent by the presentations of representatives from Brazil, the Vatican, and a few African nations, but, in the face of the unwillingness of nations to mount an effective campaign on behalf of the development and growth of their populations, the Club of Life emerged as the sole authentic anti-Malthusian rallying-point. This role was recognized by a significant minority of developing-sector representatives, as well as individual journalists and attendees from the North, particularly from the United States, who were aghast at the conference’s obsession with “family planning” and “population control,” removed from any political or economic context.

The Club of Life insisted that a discussion of “population” divorced from consideration of economic policies oriented to creating breakthroughs in technology and scientific knowledge—which for their realization require a vastly increased world population—is not only absurd, but genocidal in content. As Lyndon LaRouche’s concept of “potential relative population density” explains, population growth has been the foundation of any progress and development the world has ever known. The Club of Life’s intervention made a significant contribution to limiting the ability of the conference organizers to implement their policies in the period ahead.

### **The conflicting U.S. position**

Although the White House had attempted to give the U.S. intervention in Mexico City an anti-Malthusian bent, and the Reagan administration had decided to cut funding for population-control programs internationally, yet the State Department’s depopulation lobby managed to significantly erode the effect of this stand.

While the original American policy document presented before the conference was itself a compromise—“the National Security Council wrote the first four pages, the State Department the second three, so there are two policies down here,” in the words of the Population Crisis’ Committee’s Larry Kagan—the final, revised U.S. policy statement presented on Aug. 9 made obeisances to the population-control

argument. The first paragraph argued that “it is sufficiently evident that the current exponential growth in global population cannot continue indefinitely. There is no question of the ultimate need to achieve a condition of population equilibrium. The differences that do exist concern the choice of strategies and methods for the achievement of that goal.”

U.S. delegation chief James Buckley and Peter McPherson, head of the Agency for International Development (AID), announced at a press conference that the United States had suddenly decided, in a reversal of policy, to restore and expand funding for the UNFPA, supposedly on the basis of assurances from UNFPA head Rafael Salas, the conference chairman, that the monies would not be used for “coercive” policies or for abortion. But since Salas had given the same assurances months before the event, the turnabout reflects a combination of pre-Republican Party Convention electioneering and State Department manipulation.

Throughout the week, Buckley was observed huddling with William Draper III, a fanatical Malthusian. After one such discussion, Draper marched off to a private strategy session with friends in the Population Crisis Committee and the International Planned Parenthood Federation, to discuss ways in which he and McPherson could outflank White House opposition to providing American funds for population-control programs. The meeting ended abruptly when Draper declared: “I have to go to a World Bank lunch. I hear Robert McNamara is there.”

Although the American position was intrinsically, if not fatally, flawed by its insistence that “free-market economics” was the most efficient way to achieve a lowering of the fertility rate, State Department-AID-World Bank subversion had the ultimate damaging effect.

By the Aug. 11-12 weekend, McPherson was joined in his iniquity by a six-person U.S. congressional delegation, in Mexico City to attend another Malthusian conference, sponsored by the World Parliamentarians for Population and Development. The delegation’s chief spokesman, Rep. Sandor Levin of Michigan, was formerly head of population policy for AID. At an Aug. 11 press conference, Levin claimed that a “global consensus” had been reached that “rapid population growth undermined economic development.”

When this reporter rose to challenge Levin’s contention on the basis of the example of “that well-known under-populated country, the United States,” which has always grown most effectively during periods of rapid population growth and stagnated in periods of “population stabilization,” the press conference moderator changed the subject and called on another journalist!

As Rep. Pat Schroeder of Colorado then expressed the mentality behind this action, “If we in Mexico City discuss economic policy and don’t stick to the one issue of family planning, everything we are doing will unravel.”

Wittingly or not, the congresswoman has drawn the lines of battle between the genocide lobby and its opponents, rallied under the banner of the Club of Life.