

IPPF malthusians outline their plans for global genocide in the 1990s

by Jutta Dinkermann

“Ten years to shape the future” is the headline of the first issue of the 1990s of the eco-fascist *People* magazine published by the International Planned Parenthood Federation. The special issue incorporates *Earthwatch*, an environmental supplement published jointly by the IPPF, the World Conservation Union, and the United Nations Population Fund, and with supplementary support funding from the World Bank and the World Wide Fund for Nature. Everybody who is somebody in the international eco-fascist movement has outlined their programs for the 1990s in this edition, the entire issue of which is an outrageous declaration of war against the human race. Within its pages, leading malthusians, using the bogus pretext of environmental degradation, reveal their plans for genocide on a global scale.

“The 1990s are coming with a roar. The revolution of perestroika which is defusing the Cold War is being matched by the democratic force of people power sweeping across Eastern Europe,” the introduction reads. “Quieter, but equally significant is the global awakening of the threat to the planetary environment caused by human activities and increasing populations, both rich and poor. . . .

“Both the World Bank and the OECD [Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development] have begun to speak with a new urgency on these themes. . . . There is absolutely no doubt that to achieve this environmental goal we must come firmly to grips with the population issue. . . .

“The publication of the long-term World Bank study on sub-Saharan Africa also breaks new ground calling [on governments] . . . to ‘grapple with two major trends: explosive population growth and accelerating environmental degradation.’ It finds echoes in the end of the year report by the chairman of the Development Assistant Countries of the OECD, Mr. Joseph Wheeler, who was equally forthright in stating that the environmental challenge could not be met unless we move towards more sustainable levels of population growth. . . . But two big changes are apparent in approaching the topic since our previous *People/Earthwatch* review in 1983.

“First is the greater urgency given to environmental concerns by the thinning of the ozone layer and the threat of

global warming. . . . Second is the much greater acceptance by the conservation community that population is a crucial factor in all this. In 1983 we criticized the World Conservation Strategy for being ‘strangely silent’ on the issue of population. Today, the World Conservation Union (IUCN) is circulating a new draft strategy which has a forceful, targeted chapter on population, setting out the need for high-population growth rate countries to reduce their rates of population growth . . . and for reduced resource consumption in the rich countries. . . .

“In our previous joint issue Harford Thomas wrote: ‘The time available to adjust to a sustainable relationship between population and environment is limited. It could run out.’ Norman Myers warns in even more stark terms in this issue, that ‘the window of opportunity’ provided by the 1990s to make or break our future world is here and now.”

IPPF: Implement the Chinese model

The IPPF strategy for genocide is presented by Norman Myers, the editor-in-chief of the *Gaia Atlas of Planet Management*, who endorses the brutal methods used in the People’s Republic of China. “Our present total of 5.2 billion people is projected, according to a median calculation, to grow to 10.5 billion before it finally levels out at zero growth early in the 22nd century,” Myers writes. “But if we could enable all developing countries to follow the path of China, South Korea, Taiwan, Java, Thailand, Kerala State in India, Sri Lanka, Tunisia, Zimbabwe, Cuba, and urban communities of Colombia and Mexico, we could hold the final total as low as 8.5 billion or even fewer. . . .

“Conversely, if more developing countries follow the unfortunate path of the Philippines and most countries of black Africa, where population growth rates are still rising, we could end up with as many as 14 billion people or even more.

“The difference between the two outcomes—a Golden Age versus a Heaven Forbid scenario—is 5.5 billion people. . . . What a splendid opportunity still awaits us, what a positive payoff lies ahead! But we have little time left. . . .

“The demands of today’s 5 billion people are imposing

enough strains upon Earth's life-support systems. According to the World Hunger Project, the planetary ecosystem could, with present agrotechnologies and with equal distribution of food supplies, support 6 billion people if they all lived off a vegetarian diet. If they derived 15% of their calories from animal protein, as do many people in South America today, the total would slump to 4 billion; and if they gained 25% from animal protein, as is the case with most people in North America today, then the Earth would support only 3 billion."

The article elaborates various environmental hoaxes, the so-called "threats for the planetary ecosystem," such as the supposed threat to the ozone layer, tropical deforestation, the greenhouse effect, destruction of wildlife habitats. Myers continues:

"But not all humanity is equally responsible for the present debacle. Much more environmental destruction occurs at the hands of the 1 billion ultra-rich people and the 1 billion super-impooverished people than the other 3 billion people in between. The one billion at the top of the pile generally do not feature high population rates, but such are their materialist lifestyles—many of them, for instance, consume 100 times as much commercial energy as do most Bangladeshis, Ethiopians, and Bolivians—that in certain respects the additional 1.75 million Americans each year may well do as much damage to the biosphere as the 85 million additional Third Worlders.

"By contrast the 1 billion people at the bottom of the pile see little alternative to their environmentally destructive lifestyles. . . . These are the communities, too, who feature the highest fertility rates. To them must be supplied the motivation as well as the facilities to practice family planning."

Worldwatch: halve population growth

The Worldwatch Institute outlined its global action plan to halve population growth by the year 2000. Lester Brown, the institute's president, addressed his plan as follows:

"Population stabilization is the only acceptable goal in a world where growth in human numbers is leading to a life-threatening deterioration of environmental systems. In 13 countries—most in Western Europe—home for some 266 million people, birth rates have already fallen to the point where births and deaths are in balance. . . . The wide availability of family planning services and liberal abortion laws provided the means for them to do so.

"The contrasting prospects of these countries and those where populations are projected to double, triple, or quadruple is alarming. The experience of recent years indicates that rapid population growth and social progress are not compatible over the long term. Countries either make the shift to smaller families, as China has done, or their life-support systems begin to break down, as is occurring in many African countries. Given the conditions of these systems and the trends in per capita food production and income, many countries may have delayed too long in implementing effective

population policies including family planning.

"At this point, the only socially responsible step for the United Nations, the World Bank, and the international development community is to work towards a sharp reduction in the world growth rate, one patterned after the rapid declines in fertility that occurred in both Japan and China. Each of these countries halved its rate of population growth within a matter of years. . . .

"Given the experience of Japan and China, a global effort to cut world population growth in half by the year 2000 does not seem out of the question. . . . If national governments become serious, it is possible to lower the global birth rate of 28 to 19 [per thousand] by the end of the century, a decline of one-third. Assuming that the death rate for the world remains at roughly 10 per thousand, this would cut the rate of world population growth in half, to below 1% per year.

"Much of this decline would have to occur, of course, where population growth is most rapid—Africa, Latin America, and the Indian subcontinent. Industrial countries, such as the United States, the Soviet Union, and Japan, where population growth is now well below 1% per year, can easily follow the industrial societies of Western Europe to zero population growth. . . .

"The model for this continues to be the projections undertaken in China in the mid-1970s as part of the post-Mao reassessment. International development agencies can be of major assistance in undertaking these studies."

Nafis Sadak, executive director of the U. N. Population Fund and another ecofacist, elaborates in *People* that "Numbers have grown dramatically, but the planet has not. We are beyond the point where the Earth can absorb the effect of our depletions. . . .

"Damage to the ozone layer is already spreading skin cancer in the Southern Hemisphere; the buildup of the 'greenhouse gases' threatens some coastal regions and even whole countries with destruction, as global temperature rises.

"These effects are largely the results of increasing resource use in the richer countries, but the implications of population growth in the poorer countries are also frightening to contemplate. . . .

"In the past cities were centers of culture and enlightenment. . . . But today's cities are sucking in the poor and dispossessed at such a rate . . . that they are in danger of becoming unintentional Frankenstein's monsters, parasites on the countries which support them. . . .

"An end to poverty would certainly solve the problem—but the very means of defeating large-scale poverty are those which have created the other half of the environmental problem—urban growth, industrialization, and intensive agriculture.

"The solutions open to us must therefore include slower population growth, so that the curve flattens out sooner rather than later; [and] an all-out assault on the present sources of environmental destruction."