

National Academy of Sciences hosts Cairo '94 depopulation rally

by Anton Chaitkin

Strategists of the U.N. population conference known as Cairo '94, planned for September, staged an important preparatory rally at the National Academy of Sciences (NAS) in Washington, D. C. on June 30. Some of the more nightmarish themes and objectives of global empire came out of the closet in a made-for-television production carefully designed for public acceptance. The meeting was broadcast nationally by Cable News Network on July 3.

But the controlled atmosphere was disrupted by the appearance on the previous day of the Schiller Institute's full-page advertisement in the *Washington Post*, signed by some 300 prominent international figures, blasting the "U.N. Killer Conference," and by a spirited picket line outside the NAS meeting.

The event was co-sponsored by Ted Turner (Cable News Network), the Pew (Sun Oil) Charitable Trust, and a section of Harvard University.

On behalf of Ted Turner and CNN, moderator Marvin Kalb introduced the event by saying that the world is "frighteningly overcrowded."

Vice President Albert Gore spoke first. His remarks stood in contrast to the moderate statements made by President Bill Clinton at his recent meeting with Pope John Paul II, where he stated his opposition to forced abortion and to one-world utopian schemes.

Gore pointed to three problems: "population explosion," "global climate change," and "the disappearance of germ plasm," which he identified as "symptoms of a deeper underlying crisis in the relationship between human civilization and the environment of the Earth itself." Stressing that population has only recently dramatically expanded, Gore declared that this growth is not sustainable.

Besides the increase of population, he blamed this crisis on "the scientific and technological revolution, which has greatly magnified the ability of human beings to have an impact on the earth's environment"; and on a "philosophical shift . . . characterized by an arrogant assumption that we are somehow separate from the Earth's environment . . . that we are exempt from the laws of nature and the laws of ecology."

Gore then threw overboard the fondly held explanation that lowering population in poor countries would alleviate the poverty. Quite the contrary, he said, they would probably

remain poor, while they were being depopulated, and offered a typically "multicultural" explanation.

"There has been a misunderstanding on the part of developed countries. . . . We noticed . . . that wealthy countries have relatively stable population growth, and that other countries do not. And so . . . we came to the conclusion that rapid economic development which can fairly be assumed will produce increases in income levels, will lead to the kind of demographic transition that took place" in the West, where fertility rates are dropping below the level needed for the population to reproduce itself.

"And that wasn't correct," he continued, because "the model of economic development that produced that growth is not easily transplanted into a completely different societal and environmental context. It is not easily accelerated without changing the dynamics of culture and society within which the growth process is engendered. The distribution of wealth is not the same, and so on. . . . We failed . . . to look at the deeper reasons why the demographic transition took place in wealthy countries." Gore enumerated these as 1) the "education and empowerment of women"; 2) the availability of birth control and of information about birth control; and 3) "the survival of children."

"The nations that have the highest infant mortality and child mortality rate almost always have the largest families. . . . If all three are not present and you still have rapid economic growth it's not necessarily going to work at all. The flip side of it is, that if all three of these factors are present, the demographic transition can occur *in the absence* of a big change in income levels.

"There is the province in southwestern India, Karela . . . one of the poorest parts of India, where there is virtually zero population growth, because these three factors are present. . . . [There is] a high level of literacy and education and empowerment among women, excellent child survival rates, and universal, ubiquitous availability of birth control and knowledge about birth control. And so even though they have remained poor, they have a stable population. Now it seems to me that our challenge ought to be to really focus on these three factors, and attempt to create a partnership between North and South, between the developed countries and the developing countries, in a way that is appropriate to the cultural, societal context in each nation . . . a worldwide



Vice President Al Gore shares the podium with U.N. Population Fund head Nafis Sadik (left), who is also the secretary general for the International Conference on Population and Development, and an uncomfortable Ambassador Ahmed Maher El Sayed of Egypt (right). The U.N. Cairo conference aims to enforce one-world government through depopulation.

effort to create these three conditions, everywhere on the face of this Earth” (emphasis in original).

Gore’s ‘final solution’

The moderator asked Gore to comment on the challenge of the Vatican to the globalist depopulators who are organizing the Cairo conference. Gore referred to the pope’s “excellent” stand on the environment. He said both sides can choose cooperation or confrontation. The best way to work this out, he asserted, is for the Catholic Church to continue to speak its mind and help with issues like health care which we all agree on, while he and his co-thinkers go ahead with birth control. He then added that both health care and birth control are necessary for the “final solu—” catching himself and continuing “resolution of the problem,” as the select pro-New Age audience laughed nervously.

Among the other panelists, Timothy E. Wirth, U.S. undersecretary of state for global affairs, declared, “We are the last great superpower.” He said people at the United Nations applaud the United States when it takes leadership on these issues.

Jack Rosenthal, assistant managing editor of the *New York Times*, said there are exaggerations on both sides, and he thought the United States should give up what he asserted was its overconsumption.

Wyoming Republican Sen. Alan Simpson, a 33rd Degree Mason and co-chairman of the editorial board of the *Scottish Rite Freemasons Journal*, said that he had sponsored a bill on population stabilization. “I got into this issue from the standpoint of immigration restriction,” Simpson explained.

He said that only a few other congressmen are going to accompany him to the Cairo conference; most are afraid of it because “extremists” keep raising extraneous issues such as abortion and sterilization, which get back to the voters.

Calling a spade a spade

When the moderator asked for audience questions, this reporter was first in line, with a query to Undersecretary Wirth: “Aside from public relations, what is the difference between the Cairo conference, and the 1932 Eugenics Congress in New York, where they called for sterilization and doing away with excessive non-white people, and whose participants went on to write the race laws for Adolf Hitler?”

Wirth angrily replied, “There is absolutely no reference anywhere in this [draft Cairo] document to any kind of racism or any kind of sterilization or whatever. There is a point of view taken by the Lyndon LaRouche group in the United States, which is reflected in the question here, that is certainly out of phase with, I think, any statement, any position taken by any nation around the world. Certainly radical elements have a right to state their position, but that is not found any place in any of the [Cairo] documents or the United States of America.”

Shortly after this interchange, panelist Rev. Joan Brown Campbell, general secretary of the National Council of Churches, pointed to the fact that “there is a demonstration outside the building” (see box). She called on the media present not to cover the protest. Rather, she said, the media should “expand the center” and make agreement and consensus exciting and not look for disagreement.

A jittery Marvin Kalb, a former national TV newsmen and now a Harvard professor, asked, "Will the demonstration be on the news?"

A woman college student asked the panelists: "Every baby is a potential vote in an increasingly democratic world. . . . Given the world's track record on minority rights, what would motivate political leaders to encourage their constituency to shrink in size, rather than to increase?" She was answered by Raúl Yzaguirre, head of the foundation-sponsored "La Raza" Hispanic organization, who responded that "we need to stress quality over quantity" (which, of course, had already been repudiated by the vice president). Dorothy Height, president of the National Council of Negro Women,

Protesters 'unfair' to Cairo-maniacs

A spirited demonstration against the Cairo '94 conference by members of the LaRouche political movement outside the National Academy of Sciences auditorium threw a spanner in the careful orchestration of the one-worldists. One protester, dressed in a robe as Death, sported a little button that said, "I Love Cholera." On his back he had a sign that said "My friends at the ADL say 'if you are against genocide you are anti-Semitic.'" Other demonstrators wore signs reading, "Boutros-Ghali is a new Ghengis Khan, killing nations with his condom on"; "U.N. equals United Nazis"; "U. N. Conference is Wirthless."

Picketers chanted, "U.N. goals for '94: famine, AIDS and bloody war"; "United Nations, Lucifer's slave, wants 3 billion in the grave"; "How does the U.N. fight disease, with condoms and vasectomies"; "Boutros-Ghali's killers in blue, after the Bosnians it will be you"; "Cairo conference says oh no, testicles have got to go."

An A-frame signboard informed passersby: "Free sterilizations, guest surgeon Lorena Bobbitt." A news reporter was seen taking notes on the signs and chants. To the great consternation of conference attendees, passersby laughed at the signs and loved the rally. A frantic official from the State Department Agency for International Development tried to buttonhole picketers, "You are wrong. You are lying."

Inside, as the meeting concluded, an enraged New Ager approached *EIR*'s Anton Chaitkin, gesticulating: "Your movement is causing terrible damage. It is not fair to compare this with Adolf Hitler." She did not wait for a reply.

hastily managed to change the subject to women's rights.

What are the actual limits to the ability of scientifically guided agriculture to produce food on an expanded scale for a growing population? asked another questioner. In reply, Stanford University biology professor Harold Mooney attacked scientific agriculture altogether, saying that hundreds of obscure species are disappearing, and that fertilization now applies 150 pounds of nitrogen per acre "that is not intended to go there. . . . How far can we go?"

Image-makers for genocide

Other panelists then added their comments:

● Ellen Goodman, a syndicated columnist, said that children used to be the very image and symbol of hope. Now we associate them with the population bomb. To help people to deal with this we have to manage this issue in a very careful way.

● Henry W. Kendall, physics professor at the Massachusetts Institute of Technology and chairman of the anti-science Union of Concerned Scientists, said that the public in the United States and other countries "believes there is a magic bullet or a set of magic bullets which will save us. The scientific community does not believe this." He asserted that population will be reduced voluntarily, with mercy, or naturally, with brutality.

● Ronald Lee, professor of demography and economics at the University of California at Berkeley, remarked that depopulation cannot be fit into a market schema; we have to be prepared to accept things we do not like, to effect the necessary changes.

● Partha Dasgupta, professor of economics at Cambridge University in England, in a perfect Bertrand Russell accent, said that we have to get the information from the experts, the scientists, to the population. This will lead to the necessary change in the popular conceptions of the problem in each country.

● Dr. José Barzelatto, head of the Ford Foundation's Reproductive Health and Population division, counseled that we must restructure nations to emphasize women's rights and an end to the patriarchal society.

● Prakash Narain Tandon, a professor of neurosurgery in India and a member of the Royal Society of London, proclaimed that he was speaking "for the world's academies of science." He described the recent meeting of many national academies in New Delhi, where self-professed scientists put their stamp of authority on the genocidal program of the U.N. In private discussion, this reporter asked Dr. Tandon if he didn't agree that depopulation pioneer Thomas Malthus was simply a paid liar for the British East India Company. He answered, "Yes, I quite agree, of course: We know what Malthus is, but we don't need him, we have assembled the facts anyway."

● Father David Toolan, associate editor of the Jesuit journal *America*, closed the panel by a direct challenge to the

Pew tells how to make genocide seem acceptable

A packet of literature was provided to participants at the National Academy of Sciences conference, including a "Journalist's Notebook" offering instructions on what Newspeak to use to make global depopulation palatable to readers. The instructions were paid for by the Pew Global Stewardship Initiative, whose advisory board includes Emma Rothschild of Cambridge University and Rabbi Alexander M. Schindler, president of the Union of American Hebrew Congregations. The sheet was prepared for Pew by the Population Reference Bureau, a eugenics organization founded in 1929 by pro-Hitler Guy S. Burch.

"What's in a word?" asked the handout. "Plenty when it comes to population terminology! . . . 'Population control' is a prime case in point. Once widely used, the term is now out of favor with experts in the field because it means negative things to so many people. . . . Nationalists in developing countries may fear that the U.S. is trying to weaken the power of their increasing numbers; people of color may feel that whites are practicing global eugenics.

"'Population control' is still heard on the Indian subcontinent, in China and other Third World places. But knowledgeable westerners wisely talk up less threatening phrases, like 'slowing population growth' or 'stabilizing world population growth.'

"Similarly, 'family planning' is preferred to 'birth control,' a term that dates back to the time of Margaret Sanger and the 'Birth Controllers,' the early crusaders for a woman's right to use contraceptives. In the Third World, however, the word 'control' smacks of coercion and imperialism.

"'Overpopulation' is also old hat. . . . If the world is 'overpopulated,' then who are the unneeded? To the extent that the rich view the poor as surplus, the term is not well taken in developing countries. While population specialists might agree that a country like Bangladesh

doesn't need more people, they assess the numbers in the context of desired human conditions and development.

". . . Population policy and diplomacy are particularly important at the moment. . . . Donor and developing countries are within reach of agreement on how to approach the problem" at Cairo.

Another item in the Pew package, "Population and Political Unrest: Anarchy or Global Security?" was less diplomatic:

"Some . . . suggest that western industrialized countries urge reductions in global population growth because they fear becoming 'outnumbered' and losing their economic ascendancy and strategic advantage. Accusations aside, the transnational nature of population and environment trends raises some basic political questions for the international community. . . . Can nation states tackle these challenges on their own? Or must sovereignty be ceded to new international mechanisms? The forthcoming ICPD [Cairo conference] provides a forum for airing these questions."

Gimme that New Age religion

A 30-page booklet, also prepared for Pew by the eugenicist Population Reference Bureau, on "Religious Communities and Population Concerns," offers the embrace of New Age religion to go with the journalists' Newspeak language:

The United States "has been dominated by the major faith groups linked to the Judeo-Christian tradition." Quoting from New Age authors, the booklet attacks "Christianity's traditional dogma of creation" which allows humanity to "exploit nature for its own ends." It calls for a "return to a kind of aboriginal consciousness of nature."

It quoted "Roman Catholic theologian Rosemary Radford Reuther, one of the leading eco-feminist thinkers": "The term 'Gaia' has caught on among those seeking a new ecological spirituality as a religious vision. Gaia is seen as a personified being, an immanent divinity. Some see the Jewish and Christian male monotheistic God as a hostile concept that rationalizes alienation from and neglect of the Earth. Gaia should replace God as our focus of worship.' "

pope: "My church," he said, will cooperate with this program "at the grassroots level . . . in the schools and the parishes" around the world.

Other panelists included Rep. Cynthia McKinney, a black congresswoman from Georgia; the Egyptian ambassador to the United States Ahmed Maher El Sayed, who said defensively that his country is "very proud" to be hosting the

Cairo conference; Dr. Nafis Sadik, executive director of the U.N. Population Fund, a Pakistani who is a leading figure in the globalist movement based on British colonial ideas.

It was announced that CNN will have a two-hour prime time broadcast advocating population reduction, on Aug. 29, shortly before the Cairo '94 conference opens in September. The hostess will be Jane Fonda.