in the increase in relative population growth potential.

Thus, in *The Population Explosion*, the Ehrlichs savage Pope Paul VI for his 1968 encyclical, *Humanae Vitae*, which confirms the church’s opposition to artificial birth control: “The bishops . . . defended the encyclical by announcing that ‘the world’s food resources theoretically could feed 40 billion people.’” Even if possible, the Ehrlichs scoff, “Is any purpose served in turning Earth, in essence, into a gigantic human feedlot?”

Treating humans like animals to be slaughtered, the Ehrlichs never once question whether, properly managed, the scientific and technological breakthroughs to support 40 billion people at a high level of culture, might not translate into benefits for Earth, perhaps a re-creation of a veritable “Garden of Eden.” Instead, they respond to this vision of the bishops with childish sarcasm: “In one sense they were right. It’s ‘theoretically possible’ to feed 40 billion people — in the sense that it’s theoretically possible . . . for you to play Russian roulette ten thousand times in a row with five out of six chambers loaded without blowing your brains out.”

**Virtual environmentalism**

The key to the Ehrlichs’ pseudo-scientific hoaxes is that they do not understand the fundamental scientific processes of the biosphere, but instead rely upon rigged computer models that give them a “virtual environmentalist” view of real world processes.

For example, throughout *The Population Explosion*, they refer to computer models of the environment that “prove” that “overpopulation” is responsible for “global warming,” even though they admit that they cannot be sure that there is actually a process of global warming under way. As to the computer model of the environment developed by the Ehrlichs, in their capacity as members of the Biological Sciences Department of Stanford University, a spokesman from their office stated that on questions of demographic overpopulation in general, they rely on the computer models of the United Nations and a non-governmental organization known as the Population Reference Board (PRB).

Anne Ehrlich refused to identify for this author the axiomatic assumptions that were built into the computer model that she and her husband claim proves that overpopulation causes global warming. (A spokesman for the PRB distanced his group from the Ehrlichs, stating: “They have their axe to grind, which is that overpopulation is the cause of every human catastrophe.”)

The fundamental problem with the “virtual environmentalism” of a computer model is the old problem of “garbage in, garbage out.”

Kissinger’s NSSM 200

The first person who linked “overpopulation” to U.S. national security interests was Henry Kissinger, who, as National Security Adviser, oversaw the drafting of National Security Study Memorandum 200, entitled “Implications of Worldwide Population Growth for U.S. Security and Overseas Interests,” which was a highly classified document when it was completed on Dec. 10, 1974.

On Nov. 26, 1975, with Kissinger now Secretary of State, his successor as National Security Adviser, Gen. Brent Scowcroft, issued National Security Decision Memorandum 314, which formally adopted NSSM 200 as official (covert) U.S. policy on population matters. The following are some brief excerpts from NSSM 200:

The World Population Plan of Action is not self-enforcing and will require vigorous efforts by interested countries, UN agencies and other international bodies to make it effective. U.S. leadership is essential. . . .

Assistance for population moderation should give primary emphasis to the largest and fastest-growing developing countries where there is special U.S. political and strategic interest. Those countries are: India, Bangladesh, Pakistan, Nigeria, Mexico, Indonesia, Brazil, the Philippines, Thailand, Egypt, Turkey, Ethiopia, and Colombia.

Together, they account for 47% of the world’s current population growth. . . .

Moreover, short of draconian measures there is no possibility that any LDC [Less Developed Country] can stabilize its population at less than double its present size. For many, stabilization will not be short of three times their present size. . . .

Population growth per se is not likely to impose serious constraints on the global physical availability of fuel and non-fuel minerals to the end of the century and beyond. . . .

The important potential linkage between rapid population growth and mineral availability is indirect rather than direct. It flows from the negative effects of excessive population growth on economic development and social progress, and therefore on internal stability, in overcrowded underdeveloped countries. . . .

The real problems of mineral supplies lie, not in basic physical sufficiency, but in the politico-economic issues of access, terms for exploration and exploitation, and division of the benefits among producers, consumers, and host country governments. In the extreme cases where population pressures lead to endemic famine, food riots, and breakdown of social order, those conditions are scarcely conducive to systematic exploration for mineral deposits or the long-term investments required for their exploitation.