

by the admission of the health secretary himself when he remarked that "aid from international donors, particularly the United States, hinged on a successful birth control program" (*Philadelphia Inquirer*, July 26, 1993, p. 7).

It is most instructive to see how present events show clearly the implementation of NSSM-200's strategy (see chart).

I thought that the last vestige of U.S. imperialism was removed from the Philippines when Americans shipped out of Subic Bay. But now it seems that U.S. imperialism has not only come back, but is being supported and propagated by the Philippine government and NGOs. This time it has come back in the shape of demographic imperialism, about which Pope John Paul II wrote in 1987: "It is very alarming to see governments in many countries launching systematic campaigns against birth, contrary not only to the cultural and religious identity of the countries themselves but also contrary to the nature of true development. It often happens that these campaigns are the result of pressure and financing coming from abroad, and in some cases they are made a condition for the granting of financial and economic aid and assistance. In any event, there is an absolute lack of respect for the freedom of choice of the parties involved, men and women often subjected to intolerable pressures, including economic ones, in order to force them to submit to this new form of oppression. It is the poorest populations which suffer such mistreatment, and this sometimes leads to a tendency toward a form of racism, or the promotion of certain racist forms of eugenics" (*Sollicitudo Rei Socialis*, no. 25).

The point of this paper is not to deny the existence of a population problem in the Philippines, nor the need to slow down the population growth rate to a level truly conducive to national development.

My point is that we should make sure that the decisions regarding our population growth are at least truly made by us and are not being made by others for us. Allowing others to dictate how our population should grow (or not grow) and what means we should use to regulate our population growth is one of the most abject forms of subjection.

---

## Interview: Sen. Francisco Tatad

---

# Ramos's birth plan is a 'foreign import'

*The Philippines senator who has been the most active in blowing the whistle on the real agenda behind the overpopulation myths is Francisco "Kit" Tatad. On Sept. 1, the day*

*that Senator Tatad was reached by telephone by EIR, he had just delivered a lecture on the subject at the University of the Philippines. "I've been trying to point out that this program is not indigenous to the country; that it has been imported from outside . . . to satisfy the strategic interests of the wealthy countries," the senator told EIR's Lydia Cherry. "I think this is beginning to sink in, very slowly, among the young people who have been brainwashed by the media blitz being conducted by the Department of Health right now."*

**EIR:** There has been quite a fight over the population control programs being pushed on the Philippines by international agencies.

**Tatad:** To make a general statement, the Philippine Constitution of 1987 chose to reject a provision in the old Constitution or the 1973 Marcos Constitution, which allowed the state to determine population targets. This was debated in the Constitutional Commission which drew up that Constitution. In place of that provision, the new Constitution decided to carry numerous pro-family, pro-marriage, and pro-life provisions. The preamble itself, in an unprecedented and unique way, used the word "love" — "in a regime of love, justice, freedom," etc. The other provisions are quite specific: The first provision that I can mention appears in Article II, Section 12, which says that the state shall equally protect the life of the mother and the life of the unborn from the moment of conception. There are numerous other provisions in this Constitution which talk about the sanctity of family life, the inviolability of marriage, that the family is the basic, autonomous social institution, and so forth.

I'd like to concentrate on that provision which I quoted previously, which says that the state shall equally protect the life of the mother and the life of the unborn from the moment of conception. Now the government concedes that that provision does not allow abortion, but the government is trying to split hairs by saying that since contraception is not mentioned, therefore the government can undertake a program of contraception. I take the position that when the Constitution says that the state shall protect the life of the unborn from the moment of conception, it is saying, that it shall do nothing to prevent women from conceiving. Otherwise, the provision should have read, "The state shall protect the life of the unborn provided the life survives the government contraceptive program." That would be some kind of double-dealing; we do not believe the Constitution speaks in this manner. . . . This does not mean the state is going to prohibit private individuals from using contraceptives, but at least it is very clear that the government itself shall not get involved in pushing this. This is the constitutional basis of my position.

**EIR:** Does the fact that the Ramos government is pushing this very hard, in spite of your Constitution, mean there has been pressure from international funding agencies?

**Tatad:** The government has been pushing the program actively through the encouragement and obviously the support of foreign funding institutions. The International Planned Parenthood Federation people have been here; they have been received by President Ramos in Malacanang Palace. They are reported to have offered, or probably given, some donations. And then, AID [U.S. State Department Agency for International Development] is very active in promoting its program in the Philippines. It is the main source of funds for this program.

The secretary of health held a planning conference with population workers in July in Manila. At this conference it became clear that the Department of Health was going to spend something like 160 million pesos on a media-intensive program to push population control during the next eight months in 10 pilot areas: 10 million for public relations, whatever that means; 30 million for the media, whatever that means; and 80 million for services.

We raised a protest against this. We were assured by the secretary of health that this was not money coming from the coffers of the Philippine government, but from foreign funding institutions—namely AID and I think Johns Hopkins University [in Baltimore]. We don't really know the truth. I am asking for a formal Senate inquiry to find out about this money, where it is coming from and what conditionalities are attached to this money. Even if the funds were to come from foreign institutions, it still remains very clear that they are going to be using government personnel paid by taxpayers on government time. So this is still a government program. It is quite objectionable that the personnel of the Philippine government are out there in the field pushing the foreign-directed, foreign-funded population control program.

**EIR:** As early as 1970, when an official questionnaire on development problems was circulated by the United Nations, virtually all of its member nations identified *too small a population* or *too low a population growth* as a major problem impeding their development. Now nobody would say this. This gives you an indication of how strong this population campaign has been.

**Tatad:** It's obviously because the population control program in the West has been *so successful* that it has caused a permanent recession of people in the West. And the women of the western industrial countries no longer would like to give birth to children. We can only look forward to a graying and dying population, and probably we are seeing the beginning of the death of certain ethnic stocks in Europe, for instance. So it becomes necessary, as U.S. National Security Study Memorandum 200 shows, that something be done to contain the growth of the more fertile nations, to keep a balance. But of course we know this is a desperate move that will not succeed. The mostly Islamic populations do not believe in this. They are supplying the labor shortages of the industrial countries in Europe.

**EIR:** In the Ford Foundation's 1992 annual report, a letter from the foundation's president devotes the first four pages to what Ford is doing to stop population growth in Nigeria, Indonesia, and Brazil.

**Tatad:** That is unfortunate, but you know, the myth continues to be propagated through various means. It started with Thomas Malthus in 1798. Malthus himself saw the fallacy of his theory, and very few have cared to repeat what he said since then until Paul Ehrlich came along in 1968 with his *Population Bomb*. I'm afraid that the otherwise respected Paul Kennedy repeats the same theory in his latest book, *Preparing for the 21st Century*. So the intellectual underpinning is still there. Paul Kennedy says that the population explosion is going to be one of the first problems of the 21st century. This myth, this hoax that has been discredited totally by knowledgeable persons and by objective facts, continues to be resuscitated.

I find it also ironic that in the late U.N. document on the migration crisis, one of the proposed solutions to the problem is a more intensified population control program, whereas it is clear that the migration crisis of the western societies has been created by the *success of their own population control policies!* There is a labor shortage in those countries—this is one of the reasons there has been so much migration from Asia, Africa, and Latin America. And now the solution that is being proposed is, "Stop your growth rate because we can't afford too many of you. Already, there are too many of you."

**EIR:** Are there conditionalities on population that are part of the IMF and World Bank loans to the Philippines?

**Tatad:** The conditionalities have never been fully disclosed, even to members of Congress. But, we must presume that it is there. Because if you read the NSSM-200 document closely, it is very clear that the World Bank is the chief funder of this program and that the AID is the chief implementor. One, I think, has the benefit of the doubt for assuming that it is one of the conditionalities.

**EIR:** How have other congressmen there responded to this NSSM-200 document?

**Tatad:** In the Senate there are 24 members. In the last session there were only two of us taking the same position on this issue, openly. As of a few weeks ago, at least four others have joined us. . . . They see that the majority of the population is in favor of our position.

**EIR:** Some people are saying that coordination is needed between the Christian and Muslim countries to derail the upcoming U.N. conference on population that will be held in Cairo.

**Tatad:** I would like to see that happen. Although separated by a number of things as far as doctrine is concerned, both the Catholic Church and the Islamic faith, I think, agree on this basic issue of natural law as far as procreation is concerned.