

NGOs flaunt bid for power at U.S. pre-Cairo meeting

by Carl Osgood

The dangerously growing clout of the United Nations "non-governmental organizations" or NGOs was made clear at the recent four-day conference on "Population and the Quality of Life," held in Arlington, Virginia, during the week of June 27, sponsored by the National Council on International Health. The conference, billed as a pre-Cairo session building up to the U.N. Conference on Population and Development (ICPD) in Cairo next September, was attended by about 1,000 people, including big names in the population-fear lobby, their junior partners from developing nations, and spokesmen from the top anti-human organizations ranging from International Planned Parenthood Federation to the Population Council.

A major theme of the conference was how NGOs could and will be used to effect changes in public policy, i.e., how to destroy the ability of any elected government to resist the Nazi-modeled policies of coercive eugenics which are the real Cairo agenda. This theme was emphasized in addresses to the conference by Undersecretary of State for Global Affairs Timothy "Globaloney" Wirth, the Clinton administration's point man for Cairo, and J. Brian Atwood, administrator of the U.S. Agency for International Development. This theme was also discussed in several working group sessions on NGOs.

The chairman of the NGO Planning Committee, Billie Miller of Barbados, went so far as to brag about the unprecedentedly high participation of NGOs in the Cairo conference, with over 1,000 accredited with the U.N. Secretariat. At the PrepComm III meeting in New York, "governments increased the access and influence of the nongovernmentals by inviting NGO colleagues onto their delegations" and "yielded time on the floor to NGO representatives to present positions on issues ranging from women's health to indigenous peoples rights." This NGO participation left "stronger language on reproductive health and rights" in the Cairo document, although much of this language is still in brackets, to be argued over at Cairo. Atwood added that U.S. AID is "emphasizing the involvement of NGOs at every stage of the development process, from planning to execution."

NGOs claim to represent grassroots activist movements, but in many cases, their funding comes from the major one-worldist American foundations, such as the Ford Foundation and the Pew Charitable Trust. NGOs dominate the delivery

of health services in many very poor countries, such as Bolivia and Cambodia. There are 120 NGOs operating in Cambodia alone. In Bolivia, the Andean Rural Health Care Project is the primary provider of health care in the rural regions. They act as a substitute for and a brake on the development of a government-backed health care infrastructure, for the exclusive purpose of foisting Darwinian policies on desperate rural populations, which will cut the birth rate and preclude modern health services.

Wirth attacks the pope

One of the worries of the malthusian fanatics which was in evidence at the NCIH conference is that opposition is developing against the Cairo agenda. Tim Wirth took great pains in attempting to refute some of the charges that have been leveled against the September conference, such as the charge that the draft program promotes policies like those of Communist China, in which the state forces couples into sterilization, abortion, and other violent methods of curbing births. He claimed that the Cairo Plan of Action "says it's wrong for family planning programs to be driven by population targets and quotas. Instead, programs should be based on provision of services that individuals want and will use." "We must reject the coercion that forces abortion or sterilization and," he added in a swipe at the Vatican, which insists on defending the rights of unborn human beings, too, "reject the coercion that forces a woman to bear a child, and we should reject strategies that in some way are intended to discourage contraceptive use." Wirth also railed at those who "have said that ours is an 'imperialistic' approach."

Accompanying this worry was the omnipresent concern to mitigate, coopt, or reinterpret the criticisms of the Catholic Church against the Cairo agenda. Diane Sherman, co-chairman of the communications working group within the U.S. Network for Cairo '94 said, during the U.S. Network's discussion group, that one of her duties was to "respond to the Vatican's attempts to undermine the Cairo document with its campaign of misinformation." Wirth dishonestly quoted the Pontifical Academy of Sciences on "the unavoidable need to confront the population issue" as if this represented the Vatican view, to imply that Pope John Paul II was isolated in his intransigent opposition to the Cairo conference. (The three-year-old Pontifical Academy of Sciences report, never ac-

cepted as the basis of church policy, was recently resurfaced by the media in Europe to fan dissension against the pope.)

Dr. Joseph Barzelatto, who runs the Ford Foundation's gamut of "family planning" programs, revealed, in response to a question from *EIR*, that a conference that he attended in Brussels, last May, which brought together Protestant, Muslim, Jewish, Catholic, and other theologians to discuss Cairo-related issues and gloated that "there were Catholic theologians there who were totally against what the pope is saying." This opposition will be expressed in a report which will be delivered to ICPD Secretary General Nafis Sadik on July 19.

Conference attendees and organizers were confronted twice during the conference by picket lines organized by the Schiller Institute, led by Alan Ogden, a Virginia congressional candidate who is a LaRouche Democrat, demanding the cancellation of the Cairo conference. The pickets, with signs demanding "No World Government" and "The World Needs More People," confronted each person entering the conference, to demand they cease working on this new Hitlerian genocide.

'Sexual rights' before governments

Population controllers have long realized they have to "sell" their programs in order to make them more palatable to those who might not accept them otherwise. "Eugenics," meaning "good birth," was a nice-sounding term until the atrocities of the Nazis were exposed to the world and the terms "birth control" and later "family planning" were invented. Now we have a campaign for the "empowerment of women," through giving them "reproductive rights" and education, or "human security" which, in the words of Tim Wirth, can be measured "most ominously in the rapid, unprecedented pace of population growth which dwarfs all trends in its implications." In his remarks, AID administrator Atwood blamed all the problems of Africa on population growth. On Rwanda, in particular, he said that "there are extremists in that society as there are extremists in every society. The elements that help those extremists are population growth, food scarcity, environmental degradation and the inability of governments to react to provide social services."

The policy is a carbon copy of Henry Kissinger's 1974 National Security Study Memorandum 200 which defined population growth in poor countries as the number-one threat to U.S. national security, but the insidious new twist is to induce poor women to inflict it on themselves under the illusion of acquiring greater rights and power.

There is to be a heavy emphasis on "women's health and reproductive rights" at Cairo and on making available reproductive health services (exclusively those services which *prevent* reproduction, of course) accompanied by a heavy dose of Madison Avenue-style marketing campaigns, such as that being used by the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services to increase condom use in order to "prevent" the spread

of AIDS. A speaker from the Mexican NGO, MexFam, delivered a paper on how such methods can be used to increase use of "family planning" services in rural Mexico.

This emphasis is not limited to NGOs, of course. The U.S. government, primarily through the offices of Tim Wirth and Brian Atwood, has made the cause of "women's reproductive rights" a centerpiece of its international policies. Atwood outlined how he is reorganizing AID to put women's issues at the "center of everything we do."

That the emphasis on "reproductive rights" is intended to bring about a fundamental change in traditional national structures is no secret. The Ford Foundation's Dr. José Barzelatto told the opening session that "it is reasonable to predict that, a few years from now, Cairo will be seen as representing a conceptual shift from family planning to sexual and reproductive health." What this means, is that there will be an "international recognition of sexual and reproductive rights" that goes beyond "improving existing health services" in the area of population control to recognizing that "sexual and reproductive rights are a social good, independent of the issue of population."

World Bank: Stop military, public industry, higher education

What was not discussed at the conference was the role of the International Monetary Fund and World Bank, the U.N.'s supranational siblings, in denying the nations of the developing world the ability to develop. National development is not only not promoted, but even ruled out, by being considered impossible. The most rabid malthusian to address the conference, Margaret Catley Carlson, the president of the Population Council, claimed that "there is nothing in human history that says we can adjust our food production systems, our distribution systems, our energy systems, the way we run our democratic societies. . . There is nothing that suggests that we can absorb that amount [1 billion people in a decade] of growth in that amount of time without causing major disruptions."

The question was raised of the impact of the IMF's structural adjustment policies to Tom Merrick, the senior population adviser, in the Population, Health, and Nutrition Department of the World Bank. Merrick claimed that the structural adjustment programs are designed to "address distortions in economic policy which keep countries from improving both at societal and individual levels." Among the "distortions" Merrick listed were state-owned industries, military spending, and higher education, which Merrick claimed, tends to produce gaps in education. He further claimed that "there's no evidence that the distorted policies which adjustment seeks to correct have ever really benefitted the poor or reduced poverty." There is certainly no evidence that these structural adjustment programs have ever done anything more than further impoverish nations that were already backward to begin with.