The U.N. population program: genocide on the China model

by Linda Cellini

"Asia is the world's laboratory for population. . . . What we have learned in Asia is a pretty good indication of what can and cannot work elsewhere."

Steven W. Sinding,
U.S. Agency for International Development

In August 1984 representatives of 160 nations will gather in Mexico City for the World Population Conference, at which advocates of Zero Population Growth (ZPG)—the genocide lobby—will hold up China as their model for curbing population growth. The tragedy that has occurred in the Peoples' Republic of China since it initiated the policy of a one-child limit on family formation in 1980—a tragedy that has seen a resurgence of infanticide in the late 20th century—is one that the World Bank, the United Nations, and the "population experts" intend to see repeated throughout the world.

The World Bank's Annual World Development Report, released on July 11 with great fanfare from the international press, sounded the alarm that the world's population will explode from 4.8 billion to about 10 billion by the year 2050. A. W. Clausen, the World Bank president, said in a speech in Kenya that his bank's prognosis "may well be optimistic" and that population levels could exceed 11 billion by 2150—a situation he termed "unacceptable."

The World Bank report hails "progress" in lowering the birth rate to a 2% average in the developing countries—down from 2.4% in 1965. The lower average is primarily due to a sharp fall in the Chinese birth rate during that period (China's growth rate reached a low of 1.17% in 1979).

In the Summer 1984 issue of Foreign Affairs, published by the Eastern Establishment's Council on Foreign Relations, former U.S. Defense Secretary and World Bank president Robert S. McNamara writes, referring to the one-child campaign and reports of female infanticide inside China:

"If present growth trends continue, I expect such coercive measures by governments and such brutal actions by families to be common by the end of the
century.” He concludes that population growth levels by the year 2010 “will happen either because of humane and voluntary measures taken now, or because of the old Malthusian checks. Or perhaps even more likely, in tomorrow’s world, it will occur as a result of coercive government sanctions and the recourse by desperate parents to both frequent abortion and clandestine infanticide.”

Coercion for a ‘good cause’?

These are the policies that the “population experts” at the United Nations, World Bank, and International Monetary Fund hold up for the rest of the world. And they are not ashamed, as Robert McNamara is not, to describe such methods as “coercive.” Paul Ehrlich of Zero Population Growth (ZPG) fame, a fervent advocate of triage for the starving Third World, bluntly calls the ZPG-lobby’s policies “coercion in a good cause.” He suggests that the United States assist such “causes” with logistical support in the form of helicopters, vehicles, and surgical instruments.

Lester Brown, head of the genocide lobby’s Worldwatch Institute, prefers to use more circumspect language. “Continued population growth,” he says, “is intolerable. . . . You need a system of incentives and disincentives like in China. I would not call it coercion, because it has a bad connotation and there is nothing bad about what the Chinese are doing. It is a very strong program of incentives not to have large families. They don’t give you food, housing, if you violate the prescribed population, family growth limits [emphasis added].”

And a representative of the Washington-based Population Crisis Council, on which Robert McNamara sits, explained: “I am not concerned about those stories about strapping women to the abortion table. The important thing is to achieve zero-population growth.”

The Malthusian trap

In 1980, to the applause of the World Bank, the People’s Republic of China launched a campaign to prohibit couples from having more than one child, mandating that births must be “planned” with the consent of the local Communist Party. For his role in such efforts, Qian Xinzhong, China’s minister in charge of its State Family Planning Commission, was awarded the United Nations Population Award in September 1983.

Reports on the grim reality behind the genocide lobby’s statistics are increasingly coming to light, including in China. A Canton newspaper reports:

At the Sun Yat-Sen hospital in Canton the women line up in a corridor along rows of wooden benches to await their abortions. A middle-aged doctor stands by the open doorway of the operating room, marshaling them through like a traffic warden. Inside the small room three old steel-frame beds are positioned against a wall of grubby white tiles. Another doctor moves along the ends of the beds with a vacuum machine and a tangle of rubber pipes. After each operation the woman is allowed to rest for about five minutes before being told to walk out and make way for the next patient.
Last year 624,000 abortions were done in this province, 80% of the pregnancies were terminated by order . . . one third of the abortions were done in the sixth month of pregnancies or later.

Government demands to meet sterilization quotas resulted in an estimated 8.86 million sterilization operations being performed in China in February 1983 alone. That is, more people were sterilized in that month in China than the total number born in the United States for the years of 1982 and 1983 combined. If you added the total 1980 populations of Connecticut, Rhode Island, Maine, New Hampshire, Vermont, Delaware, and the District of Columbia, you would still have approximately 240,000 people fewer than the number of men and women sterilized in that one month in China.

What the zero population growthers have perpetrated in China is what they have in store for all of the developing sector—and for the industrialized West as well. The deepening of the economic crisis is what will force countries to accept the Malthusian logic that population growth must be curtailed. Thus, while China’s population policy deserves scathing criticism, attention must also be drawn to the economic duress which drove the leaders of more than 1 billion people to restrict their numbers.

For the Malthusian policy to succeed in the United States, the last shreds of American morality will have to be scrapped. In a media blitz not unlike that targeting the developing countries, the U.S. population has been barraged by editorials on the new tradition of America’s "no-child" families, on getting serious with population control, and on fighting the threat of future crime waves by eliminating burgeoning pregnancies among destitute teenagers.

Despite eye-witness accounts of handcuffed women “criminals” carted off for abortions in their seventh month, forced sterilizations, or financial penalties of up to $3,000 for the unauthorized birth of a child, China is being heralded throughout the U.N. literature as the leader which cut its birth rate by more than half in the last 10 years. Officially, China’s goal is to drop its birth rate down to five per thousand by 1985. Unofficially, some committed ZPG ideologues intend to cut China’s population in half, period.

After the International Monetary Fund tightens the conditionality vise around the necks of starving African countries, coercing them to deflate their currencies, to cut critical food imports, to dismantle vital infrastructure including health and educational services, the African governments are made to confront their by now dwindling capability of feeding millions of starving citizens. After the carefully controlled argument convinces the leaders that this “surplus population” stands in the way of development, the Malthusian trap is sprung. In desperation, the countries “voluntarily” consult the genocide experts—the World Bank, the U.N. Fund for Population Activities (UNFPA), the Population Council, U.S. Agency for International Development (AID), International Planned Parenthood, and others. It was Willy Brandt’s Independent Commission on International Development and the 1981 World Bank Annual Report which called China’s population control program a success and a model for all nations to follow.

These groups, as part of the U.N. Population Task Force, have targeted over 55 countries, 33 of them in Africa, for “special attention.” All but five of the U.N. targets in Africa have populations which have been decimated by up to 10 years of drought and famine. It happens that at least 12 of these countries have now been slated for total economic shutdown by the elimination of funding by the International Monetary Fund. Should any government or lending agency attempt to save these countries from being wiped off the face of the earth, it will in turn be penalized by today’s stormtroopers in the IMF.

Against the grain of Chinese culture

How does a program of forced sterilization and abortion come about in a country whose people have favored large, close-knit, extended families for millennia? When the present regime of the People’s Republic of China came to power in 1949, it committed itself to combat the horrendous mor-
China’s population potential, considered an encumbrance to economic growth by the Malthusians of East and West.

tality levels which plagued its peoples and initiated a major health care drive to extend the longevity of the population. This was so successful that the population doubled in size. In 1979 the average lifespan of the Chinese was 64 years; in India it was 51. To engage in a program that severely cuts into the infant mortality and simultaneously extends the lifespan of the population over 30 years in which the population doubles from 500 million to over a billion is not generally the thrust of a society bent on internal genocide.

Why then would a government insist on a politically disastrous program which risks massive internal rebellion among its people, genocidal atrocities by overzealous party bosses, and possible takeover of various government sectors by the U.N. ZPG maniacs and their legions of technical advisers? China’s leaders have convinced themselves that they have no choice.

In 1980 a major political battle shook the top circles of the Chinese government around the issue of making the one-child family a law. It was voted down, and the policy was not made legally mandatory. The leadership recognized that the policy was antithetical to China’s own cultural heritage, and would not be accepted. But a more significant answer must take into account China’s primary goal since 1980—

developing the vast infrastructure of the country.

1) China needs rapid modernization. It has opened its doors to acquiring Western technology and know-how. Not since Chou En-lai’s recognition that it is technology, not Mao Tse-tung’s brute labor power, that is the key to modernization has there been such an emphasis on programs to build critically needed infrastructure.

2) China desperately needs foreign trade. It can only modernize through importation, and that requires foreign exchange. But China is a net food importer; here is the crux of its economic problems. Only 12% of its land is arable, yet in some areas yields are as high as in the United States. There is no doubt that with massive capital investment for irrigation and energy, China could become self-sufficient and possibly even produce a surplus.

The quandary is clear to the Foreign Exchange Ministry. As the population increases, China must relinquish its limited foreign exchange to feed its growing numbers. This eliminates the possibility of modernizing, and assures future famines, death to millions. It is not surprising, then, to learn that China’s population policies are formulated in the Ministry of Foreign Trade, under the leadership of Chen Muhua Wang.

3) China does have an ambitious city-building plan and a commitment to her people, those presently residing in its choked cities and villages, as well as the expected 200 million more to be born by the year 2000. In the next 20 years, the Chinese government would like to create whole new cities to handle about 50 million people in the sparsely populated western sector of the country. Cities of 20,000 to 40,000 people will be doubled in size and modernized to house another 100 million people. These will provide another industrial base for the eastern part of the country. And finally, the smaller towns which service the agricultural areas will be built up with local industry for another 50 million citizens.

But China’s scheme envisions borrowing on an enormous scale, which becomes increasingly impossible given the current crisis in the world economy. As interest rates become extortion rates and world trade declines, the possibility of China, or any other country, launching a massive infrastructure buildup evaporates.

China’s commitment to population control is tied to her immediate economic predicament. As for the U.N. family of certified genocidalists, they are intent on making the China program work—against the grain of the people, against all odds—because these neo-Malthusians of the West need that success to bludgeon the rest of the globe into accepting the elimination of 2 billion people by the year 2000. China is gambling that it can control the “assistance” it receives from the West’s population-reduction experts and pull out when credit becomes available. But the nature of that “assistance” from the west threatens to destroy the very fiber of the culture which has allowed China’s large population to rebound after
centuries of countless famines and wars.

Chi-hsein Tuan, a research associate at the East-West Population Institute (which received a U.S. AID grant for $7,000,000 for 1982-83 analytcal activities concerning Asian/Pacific countries) explained that the government’s policy was based on a novel U-shaped transition curve. The theory is that fertility should be brought down below replacement level and kept there for a number of years, then raised to achieve replacement level fertility at the ideal population size. The pursuit of this goal has led to the single-child family program.” While the hesitant leadership was unable to enforce such a program due to the decentralization of the last seven or eight years, it has also been unable to restrain the ideologues who have sprung up in crusade proportions to implement the goal at whatever cost. It was that pursuit which the Population Crisis Committee warmly praised as “surprisingly effective . . . the world’s most comprehensive battle to control population growth.”

Four birth-control campaigns

Since the establishment of the communist regime in 1949, there have been four birth-planning campaigns:

- The First Campaign, 1956-58;
- The Second Campaign, 1962-66;
- The Wan Xi Shao (Later, Longer, Fewer) Campaign, 1971-1979;
- The One-Child Campaign, 1979 to the present.

China’s initial resistance to population-control policies under Chairman Mao changed with the legalization of abortion in 1954 and the launching of a large-scale publicity campaign to control population growth in 1956, all in order to “facilitate the country’s drive toward economic prosperity.”

West finances China’s population control

The population experts of the United Nations and its affiliated Non-Governmental Organizations are financing and promoting the population control policy of the People’s Republic of China as a model for the rest of the developing sector to follow. At its 27th session in June 1980, the United Nations Governing Council approved Fund for Population Activities (UNFPA) assistance to the PRC to the tune of $50 million for four years in support of China’s comprehensive population program. The Chinese government’s contribution for the program was about $143.21 million. The participating agencies were the World Health Organization (WHO), U.N. Development Program/Asia and Pacific Programme for Development, Training, and Communication Planning, the Programme for the Introduction and Adaptation of Contraceptive Technology, the Rockefeller Foundation, and the U.N. Fund For Population Activities.

Some of the projects under the program are: population census taking, training in demography, establishing a modern professional publicity and education network for family planning, providing modern equipment for condom production, installation of oral contraceptive facilities, research in male methods of fertility regulation and strengthening of training centers for family planning personnel at provincial, prefectural, and commune levels “so as to ensure zero population growth by the year 2000.”

China has also gotten an assist from other Non-Governmental Organizations. Some of those projects are:

- In 1981-82 the World Health Organization supported research in oral and injectable contraceptives, Intra-Uterine Devices (IUDs), prostaglandins for pregnancy termination, and birth control vaccines.
- The Johns Hopkins University Program for International Education in Gynecology and Obstetrics received a grant for close to $20,000 for reproductive health and endoscopic educational programs for physicians from China. The JHPIEGO has gained international notoriety for its population reduction policies, including the avowed intent to sterilize 25% of the fertile women in the world within the next 10 years! A group of physicians from the Johns Hopkins program signed a statement circulated by the Society for the Right to Die earlier this year endorsing euthanasia for elderly and terminally ill patients in the United States.
- With the help of the International Planned Parenthood Federation (IPPF), the China Family Planning Association was founded in May 1980, primarily to establish links with other international organizations and to mobilize volunteers to assist in the national zero population growth effort and to provide financial assistance. It officially became a member of IPPF in 1981. Besides national seminars on family planning, publicity and education for the family planning workers from the provinces and municipalities, it visits “successful” programs in other Asian countries and Family Planning Associations. IPPF grants totaled approximately $570,000 from 1981 to 1983.
- The Programme for the Introduction and Adaptation of Contraceptive Technology (PIACT) granted a three year UNFPA contract of $7,147,425 for providing technical assistance, training, needed equipment, and supplies to up-
When Dr. Qian Xinzhi, chairman of the State Planning Commission, accepted the U.N. Population award for highest achievement in population reduction last year, he pointed to the revered Chinese economics teacher, Professor Ma Yinchu, as the major innovator in population control when his New Theory on Population was introduced in the early 1950s. Professor Ma, who was educated at Yale University and received his M.A. and Ph.D. in economics from Columbia, was a fervent devotee of the population theories of Parson Malthus, although he opposed abortion as a means to achieve population reduction. Simply put, the professor reversed the standard Western theory that birth rates decline as industrialization occurs, and proposed vigorous reduction of China's population, thinking in this way to accelerate development!

By 1958, the influence of Ma's "theories" came to an end with the Great Leap Forward and Mao's plans to decentralize industry and collectivize agriculture. Professor Ma was removed from his position as the president of Beijing University in 1960 and his theories were banned from the public press.

The Great Leap Forward proved to be a Great Leap Backward into the misery of a dark age, with widespread famine and breakdown of all industry and food production. By the Chinese government's own count, over 20 million Chinese died between 1958 and 1961.

In 1962, a second birth-planning program was launched with the central government playing a much larger role, holding national conferences, and passing new, less restrictive laws on abortion, sterilization, and the distribution of contraceptives. It was the Cultural Revolution which shut down factories and disrupted these activities from 1966 to 1968.

grade and expand contraceptive production in China.
- The Rockefeller Foundation granted $25,000 in 1980 to the Beijing University for research in reproductive biology and $350,000 in 1979 to the Chinese Academy of Medical Sciences to evaluate studies of Gossypol as a male contraceptive.

The U.N. Economic and Social Council for Asia and the Pacific (ESCAP) is the major regional organization through which the U.N. Population Division provides its plethora of "services" and funding in the family planning arena. China is one of the 38 members of ESCAP which has participated in a UNFPA fellowship from the International Institute for Population Studies for training in the field as well as IIPS study tours for the Population Officers of China. In November 1980, China also participated in a jointly sponsored training seminar by ESCAP and the WHO Special Program of Research, Development and Research Training in Human Reproduction.

China participated in a series of activities during 1980-82 with the ESCAP Regional Population Information Center through its Clearinghouse and Information Section, which coordinated in-service training and consultancies to the China Population Information Center with UNFPA funding, while ESCAP intensified its overall program support and technical assistance for the same. ESCAP also sent regional advisers to assist China and Mongolia for the 1980 round of population census.

Other organizations such as the International Union for the Scientific Study of Population (IUSSP), the Population Council, the International Committee on the Management of Population Programmes (ICOMP), and the Japanese Organization for International Co-operation for Family Planning, Inc. have also been involved in China's program.
In an attempt to discredit Mao and to sell their one-child policy, the present PRC government claims that Professor Ma’s policy came under attack when Mao reversed Ma’s population control efforts, eventually touching off a baby boom—the supposed cause of China’s problems today. What China’s leaders don’t say is that Mao—although he supported the process of slaughtering more than half of the population boom—the supposed cause of China’s problems today. What China had to have the capability of losing hundreds of thousands more people in the event of nuclear attack. Since that calamity did not occur, Zero Population Growth advocates are quick to point out that Mao’s blow to China’s population-control program could result in a far worse crisis if the children born then are allowed to have even one child now when they marry.

The 1971 campaign, a personal initiative of Zhou En-lai, announced three reproductive “norms”: later marriage, longer spacing between births, and fewer children. After Mao’s death in 1976, the Chinese government publicly stated that the success of the famous “four modernizations” (agriculture, industry, defense, and science) depended on reaching zero-population growth in the near future. In 1979, the present one-child campaign was launched, with the most stringent measures taken to date. As China is a totalitarian regime, all such mobilizations are planned down to the village quotas, which are vigorously upheld by party bosses and bureaucrats eager to prove that they are “on the job.” It is such “commandism” at the lowest levels which spurs an unflinching allegiance to whatever it takes to fulfill the quota that creates the brutal atrocities which have received so much publicity in the West. Provinces were told to take “remedial measures”—a euphemism for abortion—to reduce the birth rate in the villages. Close kin and persons with congenital and genetic diseases were prohibited from marrying.

Last May the Guangdong Province announced its latest policies: “The focal point of family planning work must be compulsory sterilization for either party, husband or wife, of those couples who already have two children.” The results: 940,000 sterilizations were performed within the next six weeks. While such numbers reported either by the party bosses or by eager U.N. statisticians can be easily inflated, such a sterilization crusade by the masses is formidable indeed.

The ‘Granny Police’

One of the features of China’s “success” story being sold to other lesser developed countries is the total effort to cut the birth rate on the part of every level of government. These countries are told that the total infrastructure of government must be adapted to achieve ZPG. Each Chinese organizational unit is integrated vertically into a functional branch of government and horizontally into an administrative level (see family planning chart, page 22).

On one of the lower levels of organization, factories provide each team of 16 women with a birth planning worker, a trade union worker, and a social welfare worker—all carefully involved in “family planning” activity: “No one becomes pregnant without one of us finding out.” When a factory does not go over its allotted birth quota, all the workers receive a bonus.

Workers must have their factory’s permission to get married and the family planning officer will decide when they can try to have a child. Once a planned birth certificate is issued, it must be presented at all prenatal examinations and is used to register the child at the police station.

Outside the factory, there is a second group watching over anyone even thinking of having a second child. The plan to maintain the one-child policy for 100 years is most ruthlessly enforced by the Women’s Federation, which has officials in every one of China’s 2 million villages. It is these women, China’s “Granny Police,” who do little more than follow and post on the village bulletin board the menstrual cycle and the contraceptive method used by each woman in the village. They accompany all women to make sure that their IUDs are in place so that no one is tempted to send a substitute in their name and thus escape detection. It is their business to know what is going on within each family.

The sharp eyes of the grannies are accompanied by 30 or so elderly women who might patrol a neighborhood, constantly delivering the one-baby message and seeing to it that no signs of unauthorized morning sickness crop up. Grannies are adept at training young children in keeping their mother’s pill schedules, and when fairs are held, children are organized as the focal point of attention, singing: “Mummy only had me. We don’t want any brothers or sisters. Everyone is happy. The whole house rejoices . . . la, la, la.”

When one reporter for a Hong Kong newspaper visited in Huiyang Prefecture, Giangdong Province, he found that “trucks were sent into the villages to take women forcibly to hospitals for abortion, some escorted by armed personnel, some bound, and some in cages used to transport hogs. In one of its counties, the public security bureau issued arrest warrants to pregnant women on which the word ‘pregnant’ was entered in the space for the offense charged.” At first the provincial authorities attacked these “leftist” tendencies, but the central authorities overruled them in favor of the prefecture, which was held up as a model for emulation throughout the province. The Huiyang Party Committee was then commended for its “great determination,” for making a “big show of strength,” for observing “the demand and the target.” The prefecture was then congratulated for “speedily lowering its population growth through patient and meticulous ideological work among the masses.”

The “achievement” of China’s population control program was reported by Qian Xinzhong, the minister in charge
of the State Family Planning Commission, who boasted that “between 1970 and 1979 the birth rate of the PRC came down from 33.59 to 17.90 per thousand, a decrease of 46.7%. The natural growth rate dropped from 25.95 to 11.7 per thousand, a decrease of 54.9%... from 1970 up to the present [1983], a total of 79 million births have been averted.” However, as one demographic specialist from the Population Council reports, “the old birth and death rates of the ’50’s are widely suspected as being too low, which means that China’s ’progress’ in reducing fertility and mortality rates in subsequent years may actually be underestimated.”

‘China 2000’ for population control

Official sources cited in the Beijing Review have declared that the “optimum population level” for China is between 650 and 700 million and that this goal should be achieved by 2080. China intends to keep her population close to the present 1.2 billion figure by the end of the century. Thus, some of Peking’s population reduction enthusiasts plan to reduce the population by over 500 million over an 80 year period. The one-child policy alone will not achieve that goal. For that particular type of slaughter they have called in the experts, like Global 2000 author Gerald Barney, who was in-

‘Appropriate technology’ for China’s birth control

While there are a number of very highly respected physicians in China’s medical facilities, this handful of doctors, trained in the West, cannot produce a modern health-care delivery system for a country of 1 billion people. So China goes on with its essentially primary health-care program, with the birth-control delivery system built right in. Mao Tse-tung’s “barefoot doctor brigades” allowed each village to select one of its peasant peers to be trained as a health-care worker. These peasants participate in health-care programs by inserting Intra-Uterine Devices (IUDs), delivering babies, and performing induced abortion by vacuum aspiration methods.

According to the minister of health, each of China’s 2,000 counties (each with approximately 400,000 to 600,000 people) has its own general hospital, anti-epidemic station, and maternal- and child-health hospital; 55,000 communes (with anywhere from 15,000 to 50,000 people each), or about 90%, have their own health centers; and about 700,000, or 90%, of the nation’s production brigades (each with up to 3,000 workers) have their own co-operative medical centers. Because it is impossible to allocate a fully trained medical doctor to each village, a barefoot doctor or paramedic is placed within walking distance of every citizen. If you are not too sick to walk to see your paramedic, you might die waiting—there are approximately 600 citizens for each paramedic!

The number of IUDs in place in China far exceeds the total for the rest of the world. Roughly 7 in every 10 IUD users are Chinese. The most popular model with the Chinese officials, for obvious reasons, is the modified Ota ring, which can only be removed with a fine metal hook.

The Chinese were early advocates of vacuum aspira-
China's campaign for the one-child family. In this poster, a "barefoot doctor" explains oral contraceptive use to the happy and prosperous mother of a single child.

visited to China last year and is reportedly working on a “China 2000” paper recommending population control methods suitable for the “specific conditions” of China.

Despite these efforts, the family planning program is failing. Even with the tremendous organization built into the system, the rural areas are not complying and the Chinese have already produced more than half of the population increase projected for the next 20 years.

It is suspected that the official figure of 70% given for the number of married women using some form of birth control in China is highly inflated. In 1979, the number of married women sterilized in China was comparable to that in India, and the United States was not far behind, with its own million sterilizations a year, considered the method of choice in the United States.

A significant portion of the Chinese leadership recognizes that the long-term implications of their program are suicidal. Presently, the average age of the population is 23 years; in 20 years the average age of the population will be 50 years old—resulting in a totally diminished workforce attempting to provide for an extraordinary number of dependent elderly.

Female infanticide

A considerable portion of a $50 million grant to China from the UNFPA (see box pages 24-25) went into developing advanced computerized data systems which allowed China to have the first really accurate census taken in 1982. Chinese planners have received technical assistance from Japan, the Philippines, Canada, the United States, and the U.N. Statistical Office.

The census results? Men now outnumber women in China by 30.7 million. The People’s Daily, the party newspaper, warns: “In 20 years, a great number of young men will be unable to find spouses, if parents cling to their feudal thinking and kill or abandon their unwanted babies.” While infanticide has historically been treated as homicide in China, it will undoubtedly continue because distraught parents are driven to desperation out of fear of not bearing a son to care for them in their old age.

The government condemns female infanticide and cases are regularly played up in the Chinese press, but it is the government’s own policy which encourages the practice, through a legal loophole which allows for the birth of a second child in the event of the death of the first. It also allows up to three days for the registration of a newborn child—allowing ample time for its murder. One newspaper account tells of a father snatching his newborn daughter from the delivery table and killing her by stuffing cotton into her mouth and throwing her into a bucket of nightsoil. He was sentenced to three years imprisonment—less than the sentence given to those convicted of illegally removing a woman’s Intra-Uterine Device (IUD). One doctor was executed after he was found guilty of this “offense,” when he complied with the wishes of 72 of his patients.

When exposé stories like this hit the Western press, groups like the Population Institute who vigorously support China’s “draconian measures” loudly protest that “the media is simply looking for a ‘good’ story based on the bizarre.”

This nonsense was contested by author Steven Mosher in a recent interview with a representative of the Club of Life. In his book Broken Earth, published last year, Mosher details some of the gruesome aspects of living under the Chinese anti-growth policies. He explains that “the entire health care system has now been subverted for the purpose of the birth control programs. The commune clinic where I lived did nothing else for two months during March and April of 1980 but give women abortions and sterilize them. I am sure that other people in the commune who needed other operations died because they were not given to them. There were simply no other priorities before the push for abortion and sterilization.”

Extending the Chinese model

While China’s more “acceptable” methods of financial incentives and disincentives have been ruthlessly put to use in many surrounding Asian countries, India experimented with the notorious roundup of males for sterilization procedures during the period of emergency in 1975-76. Before that, over 8 million Indian males were voluntarily sterilized. Now, more and more women come to the Indian camps for a laparoscopy, which has become known as the “lunch-break operation,” in which the new sterilization procedure is performed in a few minutes and has the woman back to work in a couple of hours. It is widely believed that it was the forced sterilization policy, which the World Bank supported 200%, that had Prime Minister Indira Gandhi voted out of office.
Such a lesson was not lost on the Chinese leadership.

South Korea’s program of subsidizing those who agree to be sterilized effected a 70% increase in male and 55% increase in female sterilizations in one year. In Thailand, besides the campaign to produce ten thousand vasectomies in honor of the King’s birthday last year, longer range incentives, including the supermarket approach, have been used. Here, villagers’ applications for loans, financial benefits, and cheap housing are granted only after they have registered for contraceptives next door—all under the same roof. Student volunteers are made available to help peasants build storage tanks, irrigation systems, etc. once they submit to birth control measures.

The Population Council agrees that incentives work. “Indonesia has just about cut its birth rate in half,” says one representative. Long-time practitioners of birth control are given awards and free trips to Mecca. Charles Johnson, head of the AID office in Jakarta, says that “with the possible exception of China, Indonesia has now undertaken the most ambitious family planning program in the world. . . . Their success has been . . . offering of low interest loans at the community level.” Several villages, in hopes of persuading their young couples to delay having children, offer a baby pig as an incentive! Keep the baby population down, but raise piglets for profit.

Why the Malthusians look to China

In The Population Bomb, Paul Ehrlich contends that the change from a growth-oriented society in the West to one focused on stability and conservation cannot occur unless Western values undergo a revolution that will bring them closer to the East. “That revolution,” he states, “is going to be extremely difficult to pull off, since the attitudes of Western culture toward nature are deeply rooted in the Judeo-Christian tradition. Unlike people in many other cultures, we see man’s basic role as that of dominating nature, rather than living in harmony with it. . . . Christianity fostered the widespread ideas of ‘progress’ and of time as something linear, nonrepeating, and absolute. . . . Much more basic changes are needed, perhaps of the type exemplified by the much despised ‘hippie’ movement—a movement that adopts most of its religious ideas from the non-Christian East. It is a movement wrapped up in Zen Buddhism.”

That said, it becomes clear why China is considered the premier “pilot project” of global genocide projects. China, after all, had the kind of governmental muscle that was needed to implement the most grotesque of population control measures—no worry here of being voted out of office, as occurred in India with Mrs. Gandhi. Besides, any country which would launch, with the connivance of Henry Kissinger, the bloodiest depopulation war this century has known, in Kampuchea, has “proven itself” worthy of the attention of the population experts like McNamara.