



Brzezinski's 'Paddock Plan' for the Mexican population

by Tim Rush

On Aug. 11, 1980, the Mexico City newspaper *El Heraldo* published an eight-column front page story: "Brzezinski Tries to Destabilize Mexico: LaRouche." In it, *El Heraldo* reproduced extensive excerpts of the 1980 draft Democratic Party program of U.S. Democratic presidential candidate Lyndon H. LaRouche, in which LaRouche accused U.S. National Security Adviser Zbigniew Brzezinski of trying to implement the "Paddock Plan" for Mexico. The ultimate purpose of Brzezinski's actions, LaRouche charged, was to keep Mexico in maximum economic backwardness, induce a process of "Iranization," and through the resulting destabilization take control of Mexico's oil.

The original impetus for LaRouche's charges were declarations made by Paddock in the 1975-76 period that "the Mexican population must be reduced by half. Seal the border and watch them scream." Asked how population would fall so drastically, Paddock explained at the time: "By the usual means—famine, war and pestilence."

LaRouche characterized this as a policy of genocide, and linked it to the policy planners of the then-incoming Carter administration, in a major nationwide election-eve television broadcast on Nov. 1, 1976, viewed by a minimum of 20 million Americans.

The *El Heraldo* coverage—bolstered by five additional columns and editorials over the succeeding two weeks—sent a shock wave through Mexican political circles: What is the Paddock Plan? And what is the link to Brzezinski?

The *El Heraldo* splash also provoked a panicked response from the U.S. State Department, which dispatched the American embassy in Mexico City to try to discredit the LaRouche charges by sending *El Heraldo* an unsolicited packet of slanderous press coverage of LaRouche.

Brzezinski linked to a plan to reduce Mexico's population by 50 percent and destabilize the country? "Preposterous," argued the State Department.

American businessmen eager to do business with an economically thriving neighbor might also question how any U.S. government would want such a policy implemented.

Yet a series of exclusive *EIR* interviews with Paddock—and with a group of his closest collaborators—not only reconfirm the original 1976 charges, but add new information which fully confirms Paddock's link to Brzezinski—and to even higher levels of the Anglo-American policy elite. Paddock has functioned for 15 years at the inner core of genocide planners directly tied to NATO and its zero-growth propaganda arm, the Club of Rome.

The "Paddock Plan" emerges, in the course of reviewing this history, not as a single published document per se, but as something much more powerful: as a strategic approach toward Mexico and other Third World countries, adopted as policy by the highest echelons of the Anglo-American elite and which determine U.S. policy toward Mexico today.

Who is William C. Paddock?

Paddock received training in plant biology at Cornell University and began a career in tropical agronomy in the late 1940s. For the decade of the 1950s he lived in Central America, primarily Guatemala and Honduras, and took frequent trips to Mexico. In the 1960s, he established a private consulting firm in tropical agronomy, Paddock and Paddock, and devoted increasing portions of his time to work with his brother, Paul Paddock, in researching the issue of world population growth. Paul Paddock (deceased in the early 1970s) was a career State Department officer serving in Mexico in the late 1930s.

The first fruit of their joint research was a 1963 book, *Hungry Nations*. In 1967 they published their magnum opus: *Famine—1975!*

The core concept of this book is that the idea of "triage" has to be extended from wartime use to broad application on entire Third World populations. "Triage" was coined during the First World War to describe the process of dividing war wounded into three groups when medical resources were insufficient: those capable of surviving without medical care, those uncertain of survival even with medical care, and a middle group of moderately wounded who would live if treated.

Only the third group would be given medical attention.

The Paddock brothers immediately emerged as part of a triumvirate of figures today viewed as the pioneers in population control theory. The other two were Paul Ehrlich and Garrett Hardin (see interview.)

Hardin, a University of Chicago-trained biologist, issued a 1968 manifesto for the American Academy for the Advancement of Science which for the first time openly stated that the voluntary birth control programs were insufficient to halt world population growth. "The population problem has no technical solution," Hardin insisted, and what people must face is that the "freedom to breed will bring ruin to us all." Coercive methods by state authorities are required to reduce populations, he argued.

A few years later, Hardin expanded his argument for "coercion" to encompass the concept of "lifeboat ethics," the companion concept to Paddock's "triage." If a lifeboat is overcrowded, and taking on more people will mean the entire boat sank, it is justified to deny survival to the latecomers. In the case of food and population, the "rich nations" are now floating lifeboats in a sea surrounded by drowning "poor nations," Hardin propagandized. "For the foreseeable future, our survival demands that we govern our actions by the ethics of a lifeboat, harsh though that may be," Hardin testified in congressional hearings *against* U.S. aid allocations to famine-ridden countries.

Paul Ehrlich's 1968 book, *The Population Bomb*, popularized Paddock and Hardin's work. It became a national bestseller across the United States. "Many apparently brutal and heartless decisions will have to be made," Ehrlich wrote.

This seminal work by Paddock, Hardin and Ehrlich took place during the same years, under the broad direction of a larger effort: the creation of the Club of Rome by the planning agencies of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) (see Part II).

The Club of Rome, officially created in 1969 based on organizing efforts in which Zbigniew Brzezinski played a prominent role, immediately launched the umbrella concept within which triage and lifeboat ethics found their place: Limits to Growth.

The 1973 split-off

A year after the Club of Rome's *Limits to Growth* "computer" manifesto by Meadows and Forrester, Paddock and Hardin split a group out from the more "mainstream" family planning organizations to found an organization dedicated explicitly to popularizing the need for coercive programs to reduce births.

This was the Environmental Fund, created in 1973. Its "statement of purpose" described it as "an effort to stimulate thinking about the unthinkable." The Fund has "no use, no time, and no interest" in merely voluntary birth control programs, observers have stat-

ed. It is with the formation of the Environmental Fund that what can be called the U.S. "Genocide Lobby" formally takes shape.

Two of the Environmental Fund's seven board members are directors of the Atlantic Council, the official policy arm of NATO. These are Justin Blackwelder (see interview), the Fund's president, and Adolph W. Schmidt. Schmidt's background is particularly noteworthy. He served as a member of the U.S. delegation to a half dozen of the most important NATO policy councils of the 1957-1967 period leading into the creation of the Club of Rome. He then served for a period of time as the first chairman of the Population Crisis Commission before being named U.S. ambassador to Canada from 1969-74.

"Almost 100 percent" of the funding for the Environmental Fund, according to reliable sources, comes from the Mellon family (Gulf Oil heirs) of Pittsburgh. There is also a direct family connection. Cornelia May Mellon Scaif sits on the board of directors of the Fund; Adolph Schmidt's wife is Helen Sedgely Mellon. Paddock himself provides funding, from a small personal fortune of unexplained origins but linked by some also to the Mellons. (Paddock owns three homes, including one in the Bahamas.)

Policy in high places

After 10 years of indirect collaboration, Zbigniew Brzezinski directly put his name to Paddock's work. In the summer of 1976, Brzezinski sent in his name as an official endorser of an Environmental Fund's full-page newspaper manifesto printed in the *New York Times* and the *Wall Street Journal*, which demanded more than birth control to halt population growth. Though he refrained from further direct endorsements after assuming his post as National Security Adviser a few months later, Paddock assured a reporter for the *Executive Intelligence Review* last week that Brzezinski "agrees with my views."

At the time of his endorsement, Brzezinski was the executive director of the Trilateral Commission in New York, a leading member of the New York Council on Foreign Relations, and chief foreign policy adviser to Democratic presidential candidate Jimmy Carter.

This was just one of many indications that Paddock's work was being incorporated directly in planning at the top of America's elite.

That same summer of 1976, George W. Ball published a new work, *Diplomacy in a Crowded World*, in which he extolled the work of William and Paul Paddock, along with collaborators Ehrlich and Hardin, as one of the formative influences on his proposals. Ball, an elder statesman of the Eastern foreign policy establishment, served as Undersecretary of State for Economic Affairs from 1961 to 1966, and since 1968 as a senior partner in one of Wall Street's most powerful

investment houses, Lehman Brothers. Citing *Famine—1975!* as back-up, Ball wrote in *Diplomacy* that the U.S. had to learn to “be cruelly kind instead of kindly cruel.”

Ball went on to cite Mexico as a leading example of the problems “foreign” population growth creates for the United States. Mexico’s population will exceed 130 million by the year 2000 “unless new and stringent measures are taken,” Ball threatened, impelling “an increasing number” of “unwanted” Mexicans across the border into the United States.

William Paddock’s work continued. His Environmental Fund again played a leading role in formulating policy in 1980, this time advising the drafting of the State Department’s latest “futurist” forecast: *Global 2000*. Issued last month, *Global 2000* is cited by several Environmental Fund directors as “an excellent report, very hard-hitting. . . . We should be proud that a government report is so good.” (See *EIR*, Aug. 12, 1980.)

FAIR and the drive to shut the border

Paddock’s 1975 commitment to spark population reduction in Mexico by halting the flow of workers to the U.S.—“Seal the border and watch them scream!”—took active institutional form in 1978-79, when he split a separate agency out of the Environmental Fund, which is dedicated to halting immigration into the U.S.

This was the Federation for American Immigration Reform (FAIR). Paddock sits on the board of directors and, according to Washington sources, is a principal funder.

The chairman of the board is Dr. John Tanton (see interview), a Michigan doctor who first worked closely with Paddock in the mid-1970s at the Environmental Fund. At that time Tanton was also president of the Zero Population Growth organization; Paddock served on the ZPG board, whose executive director today is Roy Morgan (see interview). Subsequently Paddock quite ZPG because he felt the organization did not adequately endorse coercive methods of population reduction. Tanton, left because, in Morgan’s words, “ZPG’s position on immigration was too moderate.” Tanton is also a member of the U.S. Association of the Club of Rome.

Also on the board—and a major funder—is Sidney A. Swensrud, former chairman of Gulf Oil Corporation. This is an extension of the Mellon connection at the Environmental Fund.

On the congressional side, FAIR virtually runs the office of the leading Senate proponent of immigration reduction, Walter D. Huddleston (D-Ky.). One top FAIR official terms Huddleston “the key person in the entire Congress” in this area. In June Huddleston led a successful Senate fight to set a ceiling on fourth quarter 1980 legal immigration at a level 30 percent below previous quotas.

On the House side, FAIR is working in collaboration with Clair Burgenor of California and Hamilton Fish of New York, but “neither has an individual staff person who is energetic and really tying into the issue.”

Financing for FAIR was officially \$200,000 in 1979. During the first six months of 1980 it doubled to \$400,000. FAIR contracted a major Washington public relations firm to design a one-million-piece mailing in late spring. Based on this mailing, FAIR is attempting to increase its current membership base of 1,500 to 15,000 by the end of the year.

“We plan to be ready for a big push when the new Congress convenes in January,” a spokesman said.

FROM THE POPULATION PLANNERS

Paddock: ‘Growth is something you have to stop’

On Aug. 28 and 29, the EIR conducted interviews with William Paddock. Excerpts follow:

Q: What is the “Paddock Plan”?

A: I think that what that Paddock Plan is referring to is a proposal that I made in Houston about three years ago, in which I proposed that the U.S. agro-scientific organizations deny research to countries that could not get their population growth under control. If you do anything to increase food production through more agricultural technology, all you are doing is increasing future suffering, because there will be more people, population will expand to absorb that food, and the results will be a greater disaster. . . .

Q: This is Malthus’s theory.

A: Sure, yes.

Q: Did you propose in that plan that Mexico should reduce its population by half?

A: Well, I have never said that. But I think it would be an excellent thing.

Q: How can you motivate people to reduce the birth rate?

A: . . . You’ve got to break the syndrome of wanting more and more children. That is one aspect of it. Another aspect is that you can do it with taxation; you can change the tax fare for people with fewer children rather than more children. You have disincentives for children. In the case of Singapore today, if you have three children,

the third child, the fourth and fifth, are not allowed to go beyond high school. You deny the children certain privileges of education. Now, that is very, very hard on the children, but it gets the message to the parents. . . . Now, in the case of China, they have lowered the birth rate significantly for the past 10 years since the Cultural Revolution, and they have done it largely by making it illegal to get married before the age of 25 or 26 years. . . . In China it's a little bit different because there is no premarital sex and it's a very pure Oriental society, which is not true for Western civilizations. But first the government has to make a decision to have fewer people; once they make the decision they start analyzing what do we do about it. Most countries don't have the guts to do it. Most politicians don't; it's not a popular thing.

Q: And the case of Mexico?

A: Mexico simply can't handle 60 million people, much less 120 million, in 25 years. . . . Any fool knows that . . . Mexico has a very poor piece of real estate. Agriculture is not worth a damn. Iowa has more good agriculture than all of Mexico put together. . . . Think how prosperous Mexico would be today if it had the population of 1933, 18 million.

Q: But you have to have *some* rate of growth.

A: You don't have to have any growth. It would be beautiful if they were 18 million now. You can look at the statistics and see what happens to the world population if it grows one percent. We would all be dead in one hundred years. *Growth is something you have to stop.* No alternative, even a half of a percent, or a quarter of a percent, would eventually completely inundate the world. But don't think you have to have growth. That's one of the most foolish things to think in terms of growth of population. . . . There are two ways to control your population: you either increase the death rate, or you lower the birth rate.

Q: What would be a realistic growth rate for Mexico now?

A: Zero. Or a minus one or a minus two percent would be delightful for Mexico. . . .

Q: You said there are two ways to control the population: increase the death rate or decrease the birth rate. So far we have talked about the second way. How do you foresee the first way being done?

A: Well, of course I am not going to advocate increasing the death rate. Why should I—why should anyone? But you know that the only alternative that you have if you cannot lower the birth rate, then you've got to increase the death rate if you want to lower the population size of the country. I would not recommend war, because war is a very ineffective way of doing it. During the Vietnam

war the population of Vietnam increased by 10 percent. During World War II the population of Europe increased 10 percent. That is why I say that wars are an ineffective way of lowering the population size. So I would not recommend war.

Of course the population size is going to fall in Mexico. You know that. If it continues to grow the way it is, one of the four horsemen of the apocalypse will take over, it will be war, it will be famine, it will be disease, something is going to happen. I don't know when, five years, 50 years, but the population size will come down.

Q: What do you think about the possibility of combining the two ways?

A: Well, increasing the rate of death is a very hard thing to talk about or to analyze. No government is going to stay in power with that policy, even a military government.

The only choice would be that if the government is totally committed to this, they could put more money into services that provide birth control information than they do into caring for the aged, for example. There is always a limit on how much money is available for medicine. The government can't make a commitment to one end of the scale or the other. So when they have \$100 million to spend on medicine, they can decide to spend a greater percentage on birth control information than they do on caring for the aged, or a pure water system. And if anyone objects, well, you say we don't have any more money to spend, money is limited.

Q: Do you have ties to the Club of Rome?

A: No, I'm not a member. I think their Limits to Growth is a computer study of something that we have been saying for years. To me there was nothing surprising about it. The conclusions are very logical. Ultimately you know that industrial society is going to collapse.

Q: LaRouche says that Brzezinski has taken a lot of the so-called Paddock Plan to shape his policies toward Mexico. Can you comment on this?

A: Well, I don't believe that. But Brzezinski did sign one of our early statements for the Environmental Fund and we used his name in some of our advertising. . . . I helped write those statements, so you can say we were in agreement. . . .

Q: So you are saying he generally agrees with all of your views?

A: I would not say in general; I would think he would agree with my views.

Q: Who would be a good President for you?

A: I did like Bush, but of course we don't have that choice now.

Morgan: 'We support holding the line'

Roy Morgan, the Executive Director of Zero Population Growth (ZPG), gave the following interview to EIR on Aug. 29. Paddock split from ZPG in the mid 1970s due to differences over just how radical antipopulation measures should be.

Q: Why did Lyndon LaRouche single out the name of Paddock? Was it his "lifeboat ethic"?

A: Well, he [Paddock] is in the lifeboat school. I can't agree with that lifeboat approach. Their approach is, for their own good, to shut the borders and let them drown in their own waters. That's the whole lifeboat theory, that you're doing people a disservice by letting them come into this country. Our position has been in the middle. We're opposed to reducing immigration. We support holding the line where it is.

Our approach to stopping illegal immigration into this country might be different from FAIR's. I don't think they would be the least bit disturbed if the border were manned. We just don't see an armed border. . . . We've never supported putting the military on the border. We've never supported round-ups, [and other] simplistic, black and white solutions.

Q: Have you been working with the Hesburgh Commission?

A: Yes, we do a lot of work with them, a tremendous amount.

Q: The funding for ZPG, where does that come from?

A: It comes from private members: $\frac{2}{3}$ from subscribing members, and $\frac{1}{3}$ from foundations and funds. We have no federal money. There are about 30 foundations, mainly small ones, but we've also had money from the big ones. We had a little bit of money from the Rockefeller Foundation; we had 2 years of grants. We've had money from another fund in St. Louis, which is the group that developed Emco foam products, birth control products. . . . We've had money from family members of companies such as Life Saver candy. . . . Prentice Hall family money through their personal family foundation money comes to us. A guy that was formerly with Standard Oil; a guy that was formerly international VP of Texaco. We have some ESSO family money. The strangest thing is we get money through the foundations, from companies that would not normally want to be identified with ZPG. You know what I mean. Can you imagine big corporate types from Gulf & Western,

Standard Oil, Texaco, ESSO, Sun Oil Company, Prentice Hall, and candy companies providing money? . . .

Q: Do you work closely with people over at the Club of Rome?

A: Oh, yes, we're kind of friendly. They do international work. We don't do much international work. We know them. They're down the street. We see them at meetings. In the four years I've been here the only thing we've collaborated with them on closely is the "Global 2000 Report."

Q: The Global 2000, I think Muskie had a press conference on that?

A: Yes, it's the report that was put out by the State Department and the Council on Environmental Quality.

Q: Do you know who in the State Department really pushed that?

A: Yes, Assistant Secretary Thomas Pickering. . . . Actually the person who did all the work, the guy who came down from the Rockefeller Brothers Fund about 3 years ago to do it, his name is Jerry Barney, and he was the project director on the report.

Q: So you're very enthusiastic about the report?

A: Yes!

Q: Well, I think you share something then with the Environmental Fund?

A: Oh yes, they're very enthusiastic about it. It's got potential for everybody.

Blackwelder: 'Reduce it right down to zero'

The following interview with Julian Blackwelder, a director of the Environmental Fund, was given to EIR on Aug. 29.

Q: Do you know William Paddock?

A: I guess I know him and his written works better than anyone else here. . . . Obviously the organization, quite aside from Paddock, would dearly love to see stabilized population growth—our corporate purpose is to reduce the world's population, reduce it right down to zero and, if we should really get lucky, lower than that. It will of course happen whether we are successful or not, but there is an easy way and a hard way. . . . Nature is very good about that; when there's too many of something, something happens. . . .

Q: How would you appraise the work of Mr. Paddock?

A: Well, his written work is flawless. . . . Everything worked out the way he said it would. . . .

Q: Rather than focusing it on the need to reduce population, why not look at it from the standpoint of saying we're going to introduce new forms of technology that will allow you to deal with these problems, to produce more food, etc.?

A: Ah, in other words, if we discover that Bangladesh has incurable cancer, we decide to feed the cancer, so that the patient will not die immediately. If you go and feed people whose problem is the fact that their numbers are forever getting greater, all you can possibly do is incubate catastrophe; you keep enlarging the number of people that you know absolutely have to perish in a very unfortunate way sometime in the future, and reasonably soon. . . .

Q: In other words, what you're saying is that there really exist no technologies capable of dealing with these problems.

A: Absolutely not, unless you're talking about a very short-range solution, meaning something that could put off disaster for five years, 10 years possibly. It will of course guarantee that when the disaster comes, it would be much worse than if it came now. So that's another choice you have to make. . . . I think any humanitarian would like to see the population of Mexico reduced in a humane way. Otherwise it will be reduced in a very inhumane way. . . .

Q: Mr. Blackwelder, would you describe your outlook as Malthusian?

A: No, I wouldn't. But if someone said I had a Malthusian outlook, I don't think I would object to it. Malthus was proved right many many years ago, and the people who stand around trying to say he wasn't right, don't have any idea of what he said, and they don't understand the problem.

Q: So, you really have no objections to his thinking?

A: No . . . the principles of course were absolutely right, there's no getting around that. . . . If a country—Bangladesh is a wonderful example—says look, over a period of 50 years we have multiplied to the point where we cannot now or ever again, anywhere nearly keep these people alive and now we want you to do it. I would say the U.S. would be insane to help, because it would just make it worse.

Q: Are you aware of the fact that Malthus was hired as a propagandist for British colonial policy during the time he lived? You know that British colonial policy did not encourage development for its possessions.

A: Oh, in that case, they were wiser than we are—but I wasn't aware of that.

Hardin: 'The best model we have is China'

On Aug. 29 the EIR talked to Garrett Hardin, who is a colleague of William Paddock on the Board of Directors of the Environmental Fund. Mr. Hardin is also a biologist on the staff of the University of California at Santa Barbara.

Q: What is Paddock's population theory?

A: Let me take an extreme example. The country of Bangladesh is almost exactly the same area as the state of Iowa. Iowa has two million people, Bangladesh has 87 million people. Now to say that Bangladesh is short of supplies is missing the point. They're not short of supplies, short of resources; they've got too many people. If they had only 10 million people, which would be five times that of Iowa, Bangladesh would be a rich country. But there's no way that Bangladesh's needs can be met if they continue reproducing.

Q: How would it be possible to reduce a population in such a situation?

A: Well, the best model we have here is what China is doing now. It sounds as though they've got a workable answer. They are divided into many, many small groups; that is, the production group, a group of 100 to 200 people, and each production group is given a budget each year. That is, for the following year you have so many sacks of rice, so much of this, so much of that, and so forth. And on that basis if you want to have five children during the year for the whole group, you can do it. But if you want to have ten children the budget will not be increased. See, the essential thing is to make the group responsible and to give it a fixed budget that will not be expanded just because the need increases.

Q: Are there possible limits on situations, in terms of democratic procedures, where the larger interests of the nation become predominant?

A: Well, that's what we have to wrestle with. And of course this is why the China experience is so interesting because clearly China is not a democracy in our sense at all, and they are not doing this by democratic means, except in part. That is, the decision is made by a very small bunch of people in power and this decision is communicated to the production group. Now within the production group it is carried out by democratic means. That is, the women actually sit down in groups and argue about who's going to have a baby that year, the women

put pressure on each other. Now that is democracy in a sense, but ultimately it's a very coercive democracy. . . .

Q: Do you consider yourself a Malthusian on these questions?

A: Well, if I had to answer yes or no, I would certainly answer "yes." Because I think Malthus essentially had the correct idea. . . .

Q: What do you know about this report by the Council on Environmental Quality, called Global 2000?

A: Well, we kept in touch with that, we know some of the people who are producing that and we were extremely pleased with the final report. We think it's an excellent report . . . very hard-hitting, beautifully done, with adequate backup. We should be proud that a government report is so good.

Tanton: 'Malthusianism is a fine term'

The EIR conducted the following interview on Aug. 29 with John C. Tanton, the founder and chairman of FAIR, the Federation for American Immigration Reform.

Q: Who works with you on the FAIR board?

A: Well, there are five. Paddock I suppose is the best known. Another fellow is Sidney Swensrud, who's been

the president of Gulf Oil for a number of years and has been interested in the population problem for 40 or 50 years. He's worked with Planned Parenthood and the Association for Voluntary Sterilization. Another young lady by the name of Sheri Barnes who was on the Zero Population Growth board with me and on the Planned Parenthood staff for a while.

Q: Have you worked with the Club of Rome?

A: No, we really haven't—although I happen to be a member of the U.S. Club of Rome.

Q: Well, would you term yourself a Malthusian?

A: Well, I think that's a fine term, and I do believe that there is a disparity between the rate of population increase and the rate of substances that support it.

Q: Let me ask you about the situation developing in East Africa, where I understand there's very severe famine at this point and drought. Do you advocate sending in relief in that situation?

A: Well, that's between the rock and the hard spot. I would be willing to send some relief, but I think that in the long term, each region is going to have to learn to feed itself, and its population is going to have to be controlled on the basis of the food that can be produced in that area. . . . It's just not possible to solve these problems by sending them enough food to keep them going, because there's more needed the next year and more the year after that.

The patrons and the theory of Parson Malthus?

Thomas Malthus, widely recognized as the father of today's zero population growth movement, was Professor of Political Economy at the College of the British East India Company from 1805 to 1834. As such, he played an important role in shaping Britain's colonial policies and in implementing those policies in India.

Malthus is best known today for his population theory, elaborated in his *Essay on the Principle of Population*, published in 1798. Malthus argued that population tends to increase faster than food production. Therefore, he concluded, famines and plagues—like those which afflicted India under British rule in

the nineteenth century—were nature's way of checking the inevitable tendency toward overpopulation. To avoid such cataclysms in Britain, he stated, the growth of lower-class families must be discouraged through a policy of high food prices and low incomes.

"The power of population is so superior to the power in the earth to produce subsistence for man, that premature death must in some shape or other visit the human race. The vices of mankind are active and able ministers of depopulation. . . . But should they fail in this war of extermination, sickly seasons, epidemics, pestilence, and plague advance in terrific array, and sweep off their thousands and ten thousands. Should success be still incomplete, gigantic inevitable famine stalks in the rear . . . and with one mighty blow, levels the population. . . .

"Must it not then be acknowledged . . . that the superior power of population is repressed, and the actual population kept equal to the means of subsistence by misery and vice" [first edition, *Essay on the Principle of Population*, Chapter 1].