'Lancet' for triage of Third World babies

by Mary M. Burdman

The British Establishment's latest atrocity was published in *The Lancet,* the most prestigious medical journal in Britain, on Sept. 15. In an article by Dr. Maurice King of the Department of Public Health Medicine at the University of Leeds and in its lead editorial, entitled "Nothing is unthinkable," *The Lancet* has published and endorsed an assertion that there should be no public health program to save the lives of children in developing-sector countries who are dying of such easily curable diseases as diarrhea, because the human population has put such a strain on the "ecosystem"
children are going to starve to death anyway.

King's argument and *The Lancet* editorial are based on baldly asserted fraud, written in horror-film language that Hollywood hacks could envy. "Global population grows by a remarkable 1 million more births than deaths every four days,"
shima had been dropped every day since Aug. 6, 1945, it would not have stabilized human numbers."

Stability is not the issue. *Every day* 40,000 children die of hunger and disease, a number that is a full 16% of the 250,000 babies born each day. Many tens of thousands more are crippled by malnutrition and drugs. This is happening in the developing sector; it is also happening in U.S. inner cities.

The fraud of 'sustainable development'

King's argument is based on the supposed existence of something called the "demographic trap,"
up by the Worldwatch Institute in 1987 to frighten people into demanding enforced population reduction in the developing sector. King also relies on the "conclusions"
land Commission, the biggest promoter of "sustainable development,"
that human beings never developed new energy sources, new production capabilities, or pioneered new regions of the globe, and that no such developments can ever be achieved in the future.

Thus we have from Dr. King: "Populations with rapid and sustained growth in the second stage [when death rates are lowered by modern health care] are in danger of exceeding the capacity of their local ecosystems, especially if these are fragile, as in much of the tropics. . . . If the birth rate does not fall the death rate will ultimately rise again, so the population is stuck in the trap. . . . The possible outcomes are limited: The population can a) die from starvation and disease; b) flee as ecological refugees; c) be destroyed by war and genocide; and d) be supported by food and other resources from elsewhere, first as emergency relief and then perhaps indefinitely."
strains, good government, economic investment, and perhaps even sliced bread, apparently do not exist for Dr. King.

Such "ecological transition"
opia, he states. "After decades of decline, the infant mortality rate has stopped falling in at least 21 developing countries, and is rising in others. Incipient ecological collapse is *one of the possible causes* [emphasis added]."
strangulation by the International Monetary Fund's austerity conditionalities are the actual causes.

King permits himself to speculate on just where health officials should "set levels of mortality control"—i.e.,
saving lives. Even while admitting that there are going to be "population crashes"
AIDS pandemic, he asserts that "sustainability" is paramount. This means: "The demographic and ecological implications of public health measures must be understood at all levels. . . . If these are desustaining (sustainability reducing) [i.e., helping more people live], complementary ecologically sustaining measures, especially family planning and ecological support, must be introduced with them. If no adequately sustaining complementary measures are possible, such de- *The Lanc*
sustaining measures as oral rehydration *should not be introduced on a public health scale, since they increase the man-years of human misery, ultimately from starvation* [emphasis added]."

Oral rehydration is a means of saving the lives of children sick with diarrhea, at the cost of pennies per child. UNICEF calls the method "potentially the most important medical advance of this century."

Worse than Hitler

In its editorial Sept. 20, the *Hindustan Times* of India called King and *The Lancet* "barbaric"
their racist demands. There was an outcry against Hitler, it stated; why not against King?

Actually, King and his *The Lancet* publishers are more evil than Hitler. They are self-professed pagans, enemies of the Christian assertion "of the value of each one of us in the wh
eyes of the Creator."
are dark-skinned children. Dr. King has the gall to quote Mother Teresa reminding us "that the world's poorest need our love and compassion."
for sick children "may not necessarily be part of that love," he concludes. As part of the British establishment whose intention is to prevent the poorer countries from getting the development they need, King concludes that nothing should be done to save millions of children's lives.