

## REVIEW & OUTLOOK

### Paying for Abortions

By now, the evidence about coercive birth control in China is overwhelming. Fox Butterfield, in his book "China: Alive in the Bitter Sea," described how neighborhood cadres monitor women's menstrual cycles. CBS's "60 Minutes" recently reported on involuntary abortions. And China scholar Steven Mosher, in his book "Broken Earth," described what he saw in one rural village:

"[The pregnant women] sat listlessly on short plank benches in a semicircle . . . where He Kaifeng [a top cadre and Communist Party member] explained the purpose of the meeting in no uncertain terms. 'You are here because you have yet to "think clear" about birth control, and you will remain here until you do. . . . None of you has any choice in this matter. . . . Then, visually calculating how far along the women in the room were, he went on to add, 'The two of you who are eight or nine months pregnant will have a Caesarean; the rest of you will have a shot which will cause you to abort.'"

What is less well known, however, is that the U.S. government supports this "family planning." It does so by contributing to the United Nations Fund for Population Activities (\$38 million this fiscal year), which in turn is giving \$50 million over four years to China's birth-control program. The contribution is probably breaking U.S. law, which prohibits U.S. aid for forced sterilization or abortions.

The UNFPA naturally resists this conclusion. "This organization has never funded an abortion of any kind," says Rafael M. Salas, the agency's executive director. He says the UNFPA's agreement with China prohibits coercion. And while abuses may

occur, Mr. Salas says, the UNFPA has no evidence that this has happened in China.

We respect Mr. Salas's protests, but we also find it hard to believe that some of that money isn't going to pay for forced abortions. And even if the money goes only to Peking's birth-control bureaucracy, it still supports a policy that requires the chilling coercion that Mr. Mosher describes. In totalitarian China, policy flows from the state down, and political control is rigid enough to make sure it's enforced. Nor can the Chinese toss out the government if they don't like its policy, as the Indians did a few years back when they opposed Indira Gandhi's forced sterilizations.

The U.S. Agency for International Development is concerned enough to have begun investigating UNFPA's funding in China. Jay F. Morris, deputy administrator of AID, says "there's no denying what the Chinese are doing" with birth control. But he says that so far, AID hasn't any evidence that its money is subsidizing coercion. As for concern about indirectly subsidizing a policy, Mr. Morris says: "That's a much larger issue that we really don't deal with."

We realize that China's huge population presents a unique birth-control problem, but "poison shots" and "struggle sessions" aren't the solution. Countries with far higher population densities—such as Taiwan and South Korea—have prospered without such measures. They've recognized that the best birth-control policy is an economic policy that produces rapid growth. China may believe that only coercion will work, but American taxpayers shouldn't have to subsidize it.

## Where Population Control Cuts a Different Way

PARIS—At a January 1983 news conference, President Francois Mitterrand declared that France's low birth rate was one of its major problems. From about 2.5 children a couple in 1972, it had fallen to less than two in 1982. But a birth rate of 2.1 is needed to maintain the current French population of 55 million.

France isn't the only West European nation with a declining birth rate. In 1982, the average for the nine Common Market countries was 1.67 children a couple, with

### Europe

by Richard Tomlinson

West Germany last at 1.4. Yet only France appears to be worried about it.

The problem of *denatalite*—as the low birth rate is called—is a regular item for both the French press and television. A recent opinion poll in the magazine *Paris Match* revealed that out of 1,000 people questioned, 59% thought the French birth rate was insufficient, while only 32% believed it was adequate.

This French preoccupation with population figures has long historical roots. Although France was the most populous European country in the 19th century, it had by 1940 lost that position to Germany. Marshal Petain, who signed the armistice with Hitler, attributed the French defeat to this population imbalance. And when Gen. Charles de Gaulle liberated France in 1944, he declared a national goal of "12 million beautiful babies in 10 years."

In 1946, with 16% of the population over age 60, France possessed the largest proportion of old people of any nation in the world. As that percentage only increases, the support burden imposed on younger, working French by current law grows more onerous. In fact, the progressive aging of all the European populations threat-

ens the assumptions upon which postwar welfare states were built.

The French further worry that the decline in their population will also mean a decline in their influence. Georgina Dufoix, minister of family affairs, declared in a recent interview that *denatalite* puts at risk France's place in Western civilization, and the French public seems to agree. In a poll conducted by *Paris Match* last November, more than half the respondents thought that if the birth rate continued to fall, France's standing in the world would be undermined. Mrs. Dufoix's preoccupation with this theme is an illustration of how, once in power, the left has borrowed the nationalist rhetoric of Gaullism.

Curiously enough, the French apparently all agree that the birth rate ought to be increased, and so the traditional left-right distinctions do not seem to apply. While deploring the "statism" of the Mitterrand government, for example, the French right advocates direct state intervention to raise the birth rate. The champion of this policy is Michel Debre, De Gaulle's prime minister from 1958 to 1962 and a presidential candidate in the last election.

The left, though concerned about the birth rate, is dubious about the notion of an official policy on birth rates. Mrs. Dufoix argues that most attempts to increase the population by direct means, in Romania and East Germany as well as in France, have failed. The current French government, she says, prefers "to create a favorable environment for family life." The specific encouragements for large families in the government's new program include paying families at the birth of a third child about \$125 a month for two years; in addition, all families will be entitled to an allowance of about \$85 a month from the third month of the mother's pregnancy to the child's third birthday. So the present socialist government now has a *politique de natalite* in all but name.

President Mitterrand's reluctance to ad-

mit this derives from two sensitive and related issues: women's rights and the place of immigrants in French society. Mr. Debre and his supporters are quite explicit in citing feminism as one of the key forces behind the declining birth rate. They would like to restore the role of women as non-working wives and mothers. They also demand a ban on all contraceptives, an end to legalized abortion, and pressure on cohabiting couples to marry (the argument being that unmarried couples have fewer children). As the president who first created a ministry of women's rights, Mr. Mitterrand clearly wishes to dissociate his government from such goals.

The immigrant question is potentially even more explosive. No one knows for certain how many immigrants are in France. According to the French government's statistics service, at the end of 1982 the number of immigrants was about 4.5 million, or 8% of the total population. Other estimates put the figure as high as six million. Yet everyone agrees that the presence of immigrants is increasing, because the government cannot control their entry into the country and their birth rate is much higher than the rest of French society. Some demographers have predicted that within 20 years immigrants will constitute almost 25% of the population.

The reason that President Mitterrand's revised immigration policy is inseparable from his concern about the birth rate lies in a traditional French preoccupation: Not only do they worry about the effect *denatalite* will have on France's world standing, they also fear that it will undermine the nation's "Frenchness." The opposition has been quick to exploit fears of immigration. Last July, Jacques Chirac, mayor of Paris and an unofficial leader of the opposition, declared that "the threshold of tolerance has been passed" regarding immigrants, and an electoral pact between Mr. Chirac's *Rassemblement pour la Republique* and the racist National Front has raised a storm. Even Mrs. Dufoix, who is also re-

sponsible for immigrant affairs, warned that immigrants had to realize they had duties as well as rights in relation to French society.

At least part of this derives from the traditional claim that foreigners take away jobs from natives. When combined with the other fear—that some ethnic groups simply are unable to become truly "French"—it makes for complex policies. The Mitterrand government itself has opted for a narrow definition of "Frenchness," contradicting a much older tradition that had made the definition as wide as possible. Since Jan. 1, for example, the government has been offering Algerians who wish to return home about \$5,000 to help toward their repatriation expenses. This revives a program of the Giscard regime, which it was estimated "saved" 40,000 jobs at a cost of 700 million francs (currently about \$85 million).

It is also too early to tell what effect—if any—President Mitterrand's population program will have. The figures for 1983, recently released by the government, are not encouraging. Though there was a net increase in the French population of 192,000, the number of births in 1983 fell to 750,000 from 800,000 a year earlier, while the birth rate fell to 1.8 a woman (extrapolated over lifetimes), the lowest ever recorded in peacetime.

Despite the ideological pitfalls of the current program, President Mitterrand can at least take credit for addressing a problem generally ignored in Western Europe. In the next 20 years, however, the other EC nations will either have to face their demographic stagnation or see their much-vaunted social welfare systems disintegrate. Today's experiments in France might hint at what the rest of Europe will do tomorrow.

Mr. Tomlinson is a British historian.

TESTIMONY

of

Jacqueline R. Kasun  
(Ph. D., Columbia University)  
Professor of Economics  
Humboldt State University  
Arcata, California

Senate Foreign Relations Subcommittee  
on  
East Asia and Pacific Affairs  
Senator Frank H. Murkowski, Chairman  
March 22, 1984

10AM DIRKSEN SENATE OFFICE BLDG #419

It is now widely known that the People's Republic of China is operating the world's most coercive program of population control, including forced abortion, sterilization, and infanticide.

What may not be so widely known is that United States foreign aid dollars are supporting the Chinese program. According to the Population Reference Bureau, a population activist group supported by the United States government, the Chinese population control program receives about \$50 million a year from the United Nations,<sup>1</sup> whose largest supporting donor is the United States. The Chinese program also receives support from the International Planned Parenthood Federation which in turn gets a large part of its money from the United States government.<sup>2</sup>

The Chinese program of population control has been operating with varying degrees of intensity since the 1950's. It has been intensely studied and widely reported in the house publications of American population organizations--the Population Council, the Population Reference Bureau, Worldwatch, and related groups. Cultural exchanges between China and the United States have taken Americans to China and brought Chinese to this country to study and explain the system. American television and Steven Mosher's recent book Broken Earth: The Rural Chinese (Free Press, 1983) have brought it to public attention.

By the early 1970's the system of birth quotas was in effect in China. The quota system meant that couples who had pregnancies out of turn were denying that privilege to others and were therefore subjected to intense peer group pressure for abortion and/or sterilization. Punishments--such as loss of pay and employment and dismissal from school--and rewards--



such as payments for sterilization and vacations for abortion--were in effect.<sup>3</sup> The program was greatly admired by enthusiasts such as the U.S. State Department's Ambassador Marshall Green for its use of the so-called "village system" of population control, because this system uses group rewards and peer pressure as means of enforcement.<sup>4</sup> When the group reward (such as additional seed or fertilizer for crops) depends on meeting the village birth reduction quota, group pressure on recalcitrant couples is very effective. The U.S. Agency for International Development admired the village system so much that, under the direction of Dr. R. T. Ravenholt, the agency introduced it into AID's program for Indonesia.<sup>5</sup>

From the two-child family of the 1970's it was only a step for China to the one-child family norm proclaimed in 1979. Increasing reports of repression and resistance began to reach the outside world at the same time as the evaluations by the United States-based population organizations became ever more admiring and funding from the United States increased.<sup>6</sup> By 1982 Christopher Wren was reporting in the New York Times on thousands of Chinese women being "rounded up and forced to have abortions." He described women "locked in detention cells or hauled before mass rallies and harangued into consenting to abortions." He told of "vigilantes [who] abducted women on the streets and hauled them off, sometimes handcuffed or trussed, to abortion clinics" and of "aborted babies which were...crying when they were born."<sup>7</sup> Michele Vink reported in the Wall Street Journal on women who were "handcuffed, tied with ropes or placed in pig's baskets" for their forced trips to the abortion clinics.<sup>8</sup> As Steven Mosher points out, the People's Republic press itself now openly speaks of the "butchering, drowning, and leaving to die of female infants and the maltreating of women

who have given birth to girls "<sup>9</sup> in this society where only the son can care for his parents in their old age.

As the horror of the system has mounted, so have the accolades in the population lobby press. The Population Reference Bureau lists it among "well-designed family planning programs."<sup>10</sup> Worldwatch, which is supported by the United Nations and therefore indirectly by the United States, cites it among its "Population Policies for a New Era."<sup>11</sup> Planned Parenthood of Korea, which receives support from International Planned Parenthood, which in turn receives support from the United States, has launched its own one-child family drive.<sup>12</sup> Topping it all, Rafael Salas, director of the U.N. Fund for Population Activities which was created at the urging of the U.S. Agency for International Development and which receives financial support from the United States,<sup>13</sup> has presented the Chinese government with an award for excellence. I am proud to say that a distinguished member of my profession, Dr. Theodore Schultz, a Nobel Laureate enlisted as an adviser to the U.N. Fund for Population Activities, told the agency to remove his name from the award.<sup>14</sup>

The honey-voiced narrator of a Nova film being shown on public television in the United States assures us that this brutal program is necessary in order for China to "modernize" and to avert what she calls the "catastrophe" of excess population. The fact is, the Chinese system is catastrophe. It robs human beings of their dignity, treating them as if they were livestock being bred for the convenience of the state. The Chinese system of population control is not the result of overpopulation in China but rather the result of the catastrophic misdirection of policy and abuse of power by the

Chinese government.

After more than three decades of economic mismanagement by their central planners, the Chinese people have realized one of the slowest rates of development and lowest standards of living on earth. Though they have vast industrial and agricultural resources and are an industrious and intelligent people, their output in 1981 amounted to only \$300 per person, barely enough for survival. Most of their economic resources are unused. For example, less than a third of their agricultural land is in crops.<sup>15</sup> Far more densely populated nations around them in Asia have forged ahead of them in economic development. Taiwan, with a population density more than five times as great as China's, produces eight times as much per capita and has a larger volume of trade.<sup>16</sup> The Republic of Korea, with a population density four times as great as China's has a per capita output almost six times as great as China's.<sup>17</sup>

From the Great Leap Forward through the Proletarian Cultural Revolution and up to the current one-child family drive, recent Chinese history has consisted of one mad experiment after another, with devastating consequences for the Chinese economy and the Chinese people. What China needs is not population control but political rationality and economic efficiency. According to Christopher Wren, the Chinese estimate that it now costs more than \$865 to prevent one birth in Guangdong.<sup>18</sup> This is almost three times the per capita gross national product and fifteen times the annual cost of supporting a child in China. What this means is that with a tiny fraction of the effort now being lavished on stamping out births, the Chinese could support the children in question and still have enough left over to mount a sizeable investment program for the improvement of their economy. A

HOW BAD IS THE SO-CALLED "POPULATION PROBLEM" IN CHINA ?

Many countries are more crowded than China, but few produce as little per person, as the following table shows:

<u>Country or State</u>	<u>Persons per square mile 1982</u>	<u>GNP per capita dollars 1981</u>
Taiwan	1482	2,280 <sup>a</sup>
Rep. of Korea	1080	1,700
Japan	825	10,080
West Germany	643	13,450
United Kingdom	595	9,110
India	570	260
Switzerland	398	17,430
China	285	300
France	256	12,190
United States	64	12,820
Pennsylvania	264	n.a.
Maryland	429	n.a.
New York	371	n.a.

Source: Population densities from Statistical Abstract of the United States, 1982-83; GNP figures from World Bank, World Development Report 1983.

(a) Federal Reserve Bank of San Francisco

sustained and efficient development program of this magnitude would bring China to comfortable prosperity rather than the ruin which it is now producing.

The United States cannot change the government of China. We cannot stop their mad experiments upon their own people. We can and we should, however, separate ourselves from this savagery. We should, like Professor Schultz, let the world know that we do not countenance or support such things. For the sake of our national honor and our name in history, we should--we must--immediately terminate all support for the U.N. Fund for Population Activities, for the International Planned Parenthood Federation, and all organizations which support population control in the People's Republic of China.

References:

1. Population Reference Bureau, Intercom, May/June 1983.
2. International Planned Parenthood Federation, Report to Donors, 1980, p. 40.
3. Pi-chao Chen, "Lessons from the Chinese Experience: China's Planned Birth Program and Its Transferability," The Population Council, Studies in Family Planning, Vol. 6, No. 10, October 1975, pp. 354-366.
4. Ambassador Marshall Green, "U.S. Perspectives on World Population Issues," The Conference Board, Dallas, Texas, March 30, 1977.
5. AID, Memorandum for Assistant Administrators, Mission Directors, AID Representatives and Principal AID Officers, 11 June 1980; Hearings of Select Committee on Population, 95th Congress, 2nd Session, Vol. II, April 25, 26, 27, 1978.

6. U.N. Fund for Population Activities, 1980 Report and 1981 Report.
7. Christopher Wren, "Chinese Region Showing Resistance to National Goals for Birth Control, " New York Times, May 16, 1982.
8. Michele Vink, "Abortion and Birth Control in Canton, China," Wall Street Journal, November 30, 1981.
9. Steven W. Mosher, "Why Are Baby Girls Being Killed in China ?" Wall Street Journal, July 25, 1983.
10. Population Reference Bureau, Intercom, March/April 1983, p. 7.
11. Worldwatch Paper #53.
12. International Planned Parenthood Federation, People, Vol. 10, No. 2, 1983, p. 28.
13. NSSM 200, "Implications of Worldwide Population Growth for U.S. Security and Overseas Interests," December 10, 1974, declassified on December 31, 1980, pp. 121-122.
14. New York Times, June 24, 1983.
15. Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations, FAO Production Yearbook 1980.
16. World Bank, World Development Report, 1979, 1980, 1981, 1982.
17. Ibid., 1983.
18. Wren, op. cit.



WHAT SOME ECONOMISTS HAVE SAID ABOUT "OVERPOPULATION":

Peter T. Bauer, London School of Economics: "It relies on misleading statistics; it misunderstands the determinants of economic progress; it misinterprets the causalities in changes in fertility and changes in income..."<sup>1</sup>

Mark Perlman, University of Pittsburgh: "...if we use antinatalist programs, we do so for reasons other than those simply offered by what we as economists now know."<sup>2</sup>

Goran Ohlin, University of Uppsala: "...the more rigorous the analysis and the more scrupulous the examination of the evidence, the smaller is the role attributed to population as an independent source of economic problems."<sup>3</sup>

Nick Eberstadt, Harvard Center for Population Studies: "Over the past decade and a half the American government has led a far-reaching and well financed effort to reduce fertility and curb population growth in the world's poorer regions... The spirit animating the American approach...was Malthusian. Malthusian theory is a poor foundation for economic development policy."<sup>4</sup>

Richard A. Easterlin, University of Pennsylvania: "...there is little evidence of any significant association, positive or negative, between the income and population growth rates."<sup>5</sup> "...of the increase in population that the present world growth rate would produce in  $7\frac{1}{2}$  centuries, most would take place in the last 150 years of the period projected."<sup>6</sup> "it is difficult to build a strong case for such programs of population control."<sup>7</sup>

Colin Clark, Oxford University: "This hysterical clamour about population growth leading to poverty, famine and uncontrollable environmental deterioration is not only false; it has a still graver fault. It effectively distracts attention from the political questions, which will constitute the world's real problems."<sup>8</sup>

Julian L. Simon, University of Illinois: "Tens of millions of U.S. taxpayers' money is being used to tell the governments and people of other countries that they ought to take strong measures to control their fertility...But no solid economic data or analyses underlie this assertion. Furthermore, might not such acts be an unwarranted interference in the internal affairs of other countries?"<sup>9</sup>

Fred R. Glahe, University of Colorado: "...nations with the highest population growth rates have also experienced the highest growth in real output per capita on the average...it should be pointed out that there is no law of diminishing returns with respect to technology..."<sup>10</sup>

- 
1. With Basil S. Yamey, "The Third World and the West: An Economic Perspective," in W. Scott Thompson (ed.), The Third World: Premises of U.S. Policy, San Francisco: Institute for Contemporary Studies, 1978.
  2. "Some Economic Growth Problems and the Part Population Policy Plays," Quarterly Journal of Economics, Vol. 89, No. 2, May 1975, pp. 247-56.
  3. "Economic Theory Confronts Population Growth," in Ansley J. Coale (ed.), Economic Factors in Population Growth, New York: John Wiley, 1976, p. 1.

4. "'Population Control' and the Wealth of Nations: The Implications for American Policy," a Report prepared for the Undersecretary for Security Assistance, Science and Technology, November 24, 1981.
5. "Population," in Neil W. Chamberlain (ed.), Contemporary Economic Issues, Homewood: Richard D. Irwin, 1973, p. 347.
6. Ibid., p. 339.
7. Ibid., p. 337.
8. Population Growth: The Advantages, Santa Ana: Life Quality, 1975, p. 105.
9. The Ultimate Resource, Princeton University Press, 1981, p. 7.
10. With Dwight R. Lee, Microeconomics: Theory and Applications, New York: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich, 1981, p. 189.

## INTERNATIONAL

## Malaysia Promotes Idea of Big Families To Spur Economy

\* \* \*

Premier Sees Population Rise  
Fueling Industrial Growth;  
Economists Aren't So Sure

By JOHN BERTHELSEN

Staff Reporter of THE WALL STREET JOURNAL

KUALA LUMPUR, Malaysia — Going against the world-wide trend, Malaysia has decided to deemphasize family planning and to encourage families to have up to five children as the country seeks to multiply its population almost five-fold by the end of the century.

Prime Minister Mahathir Mohamad's aim of increasing this predominantly agricultural country's population to 70 million from the current 14.8 million was declared national policy by Parliament last week. Mr. Mahathir says the larger population will provide the domestic market necessary for Malaysia's industrial growth, and make the country less dependent on foreign purchases of its farm products.

Economists give mixed reviews to the Mahathir plan, which is a complete reversal of 18 years of national programs to limit family size. Environmentalists have greeted it with consternation, and some government officials have indicated they have reservations.

### Some Dubious

The prime minister has long contended that Malaysia's export-oriented economy is a hostage to foreign nations, especially as protectionism increases. In December university economists and government family planners met to discuss Dr. Mahathir's idea for an expanded population. But few conclusions resulted from the meeting and some economists were dubious about the plan.

Salleh Ismail of the University of Malaya noted that middle-income city dwellers are unlikely to change their fertility patterns, so that if rapid growth does occur it would probably take place among the rural poor. Other economists worry about strain on government resources such as health facilities and schools that would be caused by such a large population increase. Some economists also say unemployment would increase.

K.S. Jomo, professor of economics at the University of Malaya, commented that the new population policy is positive because it "rejects the neo-Malthusian perspectives on population" that have governed such agencies as the World Bank and because it "rejects the view that poor people are poor because they have large families."

### Few Details

At the same time, Mr. Jomo said, there isn't any "particular justification for the (prime minister's) belief that economic growth can be predicated on local markets." He compared Bangladesh, with a large population and almost no domestic markets, to Australia and Scandinavian nations, which have small populations and proportionately large domestic markets.

Mr. Mahathir hasn't provided many details on the population plan. He did say at a news conference last week there would be additional tax relief for working mothers with more children.

In order to attain a population of 70 million by the end of the century, Malaysia's population would have to grow 9% annually, implying "ludicrously high fertility rates," two Malaysian health specialists said in a report. The growth rate is currently 2.5%.

With 70 million people, Malaysia would have a population density of 21.2 people per square kilometer, compared with 4.3 today. China has 10.3 people per square kilometer and the U.S. 2.4.

## Paying for Abortions

By now, the evidence about coercive birth control in China is overwhelming. Fox Butterfield, in his book "China: Alive in the Bitter Sea," described how neighborhood cadres monitor women's menstrual cycles. CBS's "60 Minutes" recently reported on involuntary abortions. And China scholar Steven Mosher, in his book "Broken Earth," described what he saw in one rural village:

"[The pregnant women] sat listlessly on short plank benches in a semicircle . . . where He Kaifeng [a top cadre and Communist Party member] explained the purpose of the meeting in no uncertain terms. 'You are here because you have yet to "think clear" about birth control, and you will remain here until you do. . . . None of you has any choice in this matter. . . . Then, visually calculating how far along the women in the room were, he went on to add, "The two of you who are eight or nine months pregnant will have a Caesarean; the rest of you will have a shot which will cause you to abort.'"

What is less well known, however, is that the U.S. government supports this "family planning." It does so by contributing to the United Nations Fund for Population Activities (\$38 million this fiscal year), which in turn is giving \$50 million over four years to China's birth-control program. The contribution is probably breaking U.S. law, which prohibits U.S. aid for forced sterilization or abortions.

The UNFPA naturally resists this conclusion. "This organization has never funded an abortion of any kind," says Rafael M. Salas, the agency's executive director. He says the UNFPA's agreement with China prohibits coercion. And while abuses may

occur, Mr. Salas says, the UNFPA has no evidence that this has happened in China.

We respect Mr. Salas's protests, but we also find it hard to believe that some of that money isn't going to pay for forced abortions. And even if the money goes only to Peking's birth-control bureaucracy, it still supports a policy that requires the chilling coercion that Mr. Mosher describes. In totalitarian China, policy flows from the state down, and political control is rigid enough to make sure it's enforced. Nor can the Chinese toss out the government if they don't like its policy, as the Indians did a few years back when they opposed Indira Gandhi's forced sterilizations.

The U.S. Agency for International Development is concerned enough to have begun investigating UNFPA's funding in China. Jay F. Morris, deputy administrator of AID, says "there's no denying what the Chinese are doing" with birth control. But he says that so far, AID hasn't any evidence that its money is subsidizing coercion. As for concern about indirectly subsidizing a policy, Mr. Morris says: "That's a much larger issue that we really don't deal with."

We realize that China's huge population presents a unique birth-control problem, but "poison shots" and "struggle sessions" aren't the solution. Countries with far higher population densities—such as Taiwan and South Korea—have prospered without such measures. They've recognized that the best birth-control policy is an economic policy that produces rapid growth. China may believe that only coercion will work, but American taxpayers shouldn't have to subsidize it.

FOROAL WALL STREET JOURNAL 4/9/84



# China Steps Up Sterilization as Population Control

In a further escalation of its population control program, China's government may have begun to require sterilization of couples with two or more children.

A directive to this effect from the central government appears to have gone out to lower officials, probably during December 1982. The matter was mentioned in a central-government circular on propaganda published in February 1983: "Permanent birth control measures [i.e., sterilization] are to be carried out among those who already have two children. Remedial measures [i.e., abortion] are to be taken as quickly as possible among those who are pregnant without quota [permission]."

Subsequently, provincial governments have published sterilization decrees, for example, the *Hebei Daily's* April pronouncement that "sterilizations will be carried out in 1983 in the province, and that the task will be basically completed during the next year for all couples of childbearing age who should undergo sterilization [i.e., couples who have had two or more children]."

UN officials contacted about the policy expressed grave misgivings about any forced sterilization policy to a *Washington Post* reporter, adding that the international organization could not assist a family planning program with an official coercive policy—the UN currently gives China about \$50 million annually in population assistance. However, the UN has an "out" because important Chinese family planning pronouncements often never attain "official" status. So government spokespersons can say (as one told the *Post*) that sterilization is merely being "recommended" to

couples with two or more children, and that coercion or force is not a part of the policy. However, he said that disincentives included fines or other economic penalties.

The new policy would seem to indicate that China's present one-child policy, inaugurated in 1979 and already the strictest population control policy of any nation in the world, is meeting resistance from the Chinese people. And that China's government leaders are feeling frustrated in their attempts to check their country's population growth and have seized on sterilization as the "easiest" form of fertility control.

To succeed in limiting China's population to "only" 1.2 billion by 2000 essentially requires precipitous declines in fertility. While rigorous family planning campaigns can persuade couples to begin using one contraceptive method or other, there is no way of ensuring that a couple will continue to use family planning, especially if they are ambivalent about the program. And in China, there are cultural and economic reasons to have more than one child (See INTERCOM, August 1981 and January/February 1983). With a contraceptive program, an individual must be continually persuaded, one way or other, but after an individual has been persuaded to undergo a sterilization operation, further persuasion is, needless to say, unnecessary.

The central government is serious. The actual implementation of this policy, however, is in the hands of officials lower down. And the real question is, will the bureaucracy follow through on this policy, which is bound to be controversial among the people affected by it? □

**The West German census, set for April 27, 1983, has been postponed for an indefinite period, following a decision by the Federal Constitutional Court that legal safeguards were insufficient to protect citizens' confidential information.**

The decision follows months of mounting protest against the census, which became a potent national political issue. The antinuclear Greens Party had charged that the \$154 million census amounted to an invasion of privacy. During the early part of 1983, some 240 anticensus groups were created, sponsoring anticensus billboards and staffing hotline phones.

The census would have provided information supplementing that of the national registry system, which is adequate but not the complete system that some other European countries have. The census was originally supposed to be conducted in 1980, but insufficient funding forced its postponement to this year.

**African drought causing worst famine in a decade.** Newspaper accounts are now reporting a famine which could result in a death toll as bad as the early 1970s drought which is thought

to have claimed 300,000 lives. The current situation has been exacerbated since this is the second drought year in a row. In hard-hit Ethiopia, Hussein Rahman of the United Nations World Food Program has indicated that, while there is probably enough food in the country for now, the problem of getting the food to the people in the interior has stymied many relief efforts. In the town of Addis Zemen, the grain warehouse is full, but there are few trucks to deliver it. The need for trucks and transport aircraft is immediate. Many farmers have had to sell their oxen and eat their seeds to survive, making the prospect for agricultural recovery even dimmer.

**On June 15, 10 years after its *Roe v. Wade* decision declaring the choice of abortion as a constitutional right, the U.S. Supreme Court reaffirmed that right in a 6-3 ruling against an Akron, Ohio, ordinance. Declared invalid were requirements for a 24-hour waiting period, second-trimester abortion in hospitals only, and a ruling requiring a physician to tell a woman that a fetus is a human from the moment of conception.**

CONGRESSMAN

# CHRIS SMITH

4th NEW JERSEY



WASHINGTON OFFICE:  
422 CANNON HOUSE OFFICE BUILDING  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20515  
(202) 225-3765

2333 WHITE HORSE/MERCERVILLE ROAD  
SUITE H  
TRENTON, NEW JERSEY 08619  
(609) 890-2800

222 HIGH STREET  
BURLINGTON CITY, NEW JERSEY 08016  
(609) 386-5534

7703 MAPLE AVENUE  
PENNSAUKEN, NEW JERSEY 08110  
(609) 663-3937

## OPENING REMARKS REP. CHRIS SMITH

### SMITH OFFERS AMENDMENT TO END U.S. AID TO CHINESE FORCED ABORTION POLICY

Mr. Chairman, I rise to offer this amendment in an attempt to end our complicity in and unwitting approval of the barbaric and utterly savage population policy in China that includes forced and coerced abortion.

Specifically, my amendment would bar the use of American taxpayers' funds to finance population planning programs in the People's Republic of China unless the President first certifies to Congress that he is satisfied that the government of that country does not carry out any population planning programs that include forced or coerced abortion. This amendment is in the finest tradition of our human rights policy.

The amendment applies to both direct funding to China, a policy that could well come in to being within the coming year and to international organizations like the United Nations Fund for Population Activities (UNFPA) and voluntary organizations which carry out population planning programs in China.

Mr. Chairman, I suspect that there will be those today who will say that the occurrence of forced and coerced abortion in China cannot be proven, which is what the Communist officials say. To them I say the evidence is overwhelming and even if you have doubts, my amendment includes a certification requirement. Mr. Chairman, likewise, I suspect that there will be those who argue that U.S. funds are not used to pay for abortions directly. To them, I would suggest that pouring millions of dollars into organizations that are an integral part of China's repressive population program makes us partners in the repression of women and children in China for clearly, our dollars further the goals and objectives of that policy and the methods employed. It seems clear to me that the proposed \$50 million grant to China by the United Nations Fund for Population Activities (UNFPA) of which the United States donates approximately 25%, significantly improves China's ability to expand and implement its aggressive population program.

Mr. Chairman, there is an abundance of evidence that the People's Republic of China has embarked on one of the most brutal and repressive population control policies the world has ever known. In order to enforce the government's 1979 "One Child Per Family" norm, coerced and forced abortion has become commonplace. Not rare, but commonplace.

Well documented stories of women being hauled into clinics often in late stages of pregnancy to undergo forced abortions have been reported by reputable journalists and responsible news media including 60 Minutes, the New York Times and the Wall Street Journal. In its February 1984 "Country Reports on Human Rights Practices for 1983" the U.S. Department of State states on Page 746:

Each province sets guidelines for the desired number of children to be born during the year. These guidelines often become translated into rigid quotas at lower level units such as factories and communes. In such units, women must apply for permission to have a child. Those becoming pregnant outside the "plan" are subject to peer pressure, harassment, and sometimes economic penalties and in many cases are forced to have abortions, even in late stages of pregnancy.



I recently contacted Elliot Abrams, Assistant Secretary of the Bureau of Human Rights and Humanitarian Affairs to ask his view on whether or not forced or coerced abortions were part of China's population policy. According to Mr. Abram's office, it's an "indisputable fact."

On April 9, the Wall Street Journal carried an editorial: "Paying for Abortions" in which they called for termination of U.S. funds to China's program.

...By now, the evidence about coercive birth control in China is overwhelming...China Scholar Steven Mosher, in his book "Broken Earth", described what he saw in one rural village:

"(The Pregnant Women) sat listlessly on short plank benches in a semicircle...where He Kaifeng (A top cadre and Communist Party member) explained the purpose of the meeting in no uncertain terms. 'You are here because you have yet to "think clear" about birth control, and you will remain here until you do... None of you has any choice in this matter...' Then, visually calculating how far along the women in the room were, he went on to add, "the two of you who are eight or nine months pregnant will have a Caesarean; the rest of you will have a shot which will cause you to abort." What is less well known, however, is that the U.S. government supports this "family planning" ...We realize that China's huge population presents a unique birth-control problem, but "poison shots" and "struggle sessions" aren't the solution...China may believe that only coercion will work, but American taxpayers shouldn't have to subsidize it.

In the May 16th, 1982 edition of the New York Times, veteran reporter Christopher Wren quoted Mr. Li Hanbo, the Deputy Director of Guangdong Province Family Planning Program who said: "There is no question of forcing pregnant women to have an abortion".

The New York Times article goes on to say:

Elsewhere in this coastal province two women were locked up for 15 days as "sorceresses" for inciting pregnant women at their farm commune to flee from family-planning workers. All but 9 of the 325 women with unauthorized pregnancies were later given abortions... Those incidents, reported by the Canton radio, are but two skirmishes in a desperate battle that the provincial authorities have been waging over birth control. Harsher reports reaching Hong Kong last summer charged that thousands of pregnant women in Eastern Guangdong were rounded up and forced to have an abortion.

Broadcast newsman, Morley Safer narrated a segment on 60 Minutes aired on February 12, 1984 that provided further insight and documentation of coerced and forced abortion in China.

Entitled "No Brothers, No Sisters," Morley Safer begins by saying "Imagine the world this way, by law, one child per family, which would eventually mean a world without brothers and sisters...but how does a government, even a totalitarian government, impose such a policy? How do you dictate one child per family? That's what the BBS and "Nova" ...went to China to find out." 60 Minutes continued: Chong Zuo is considered to be a model town in the attempt to achieve a nation of one-child families...Madam Chen is the official in charge of Chongzuo's one-child policy. She tells the representative of each factory the quota of births they've been allocated for 1983. So far, they've kept to their quota.

...Madam Chen: There was a pregnant woman in Wazan factory. We persuaded her to have an abortion. We took her to the hospital. That night she changed her mind and escaped. The doctor didn't notice, and she escaped. She ran off to Shanghai. The Shanghai people helped us find her, and we brought her back to the hospital for the abortion. We were all very busy finding her. Such things happen.

...Safer: Workers must have their factory's permission to get married. To get that, they must receive instruction in family planning and pass a written test. They must be over 24 years old. When they get their permission, they are told by Dr. Chen, the Family Planning Officer, when they can try for a child.

...Safer: In each team of 16 women there's an informer, a tattletale. She's constantly alert for anyone who might be pregnant without permission, any whispers of someone acting suspiciously maternal.

Madam Chen goes on to say:

...Chen: "Controlling the population is our aim. Less birth is our aim. Punishment is not our aim. The fines are to enable us to control the population. If they prefer the fine and have a child, we have not succeeded in our aim. Our job is to finish the baby in the stomach. So when you have got rid of one there will be one less person."

Later in the broadcast, Morley Safer introduced us to another population control leader. And we get a good look at the methodology of coercive abortion...

...Safer: Mr. Ming is the leader of a work brigade of 500 families in a commune just outside of Chongzuo...There are no two-children families in the commune, but Mr. Ming's record is being threatened by this couple, Jeng Hu and Man Zue, who wanted to have a second child. It took weeks of persuasion to change their minds, and now, six months pregnant, Man Zue has agreed to have an abortion...It was this woman, Mrs. Feng, a family planning officer, who commanded the persuasion. Mrs. Feng decides which women can have a child...Mrs. Feng called and said, I have to tell you why you mustn't have this child. Man Zue said, come back and tell me after the baby is born. Mrs. Feng brought along the leaders of the brigade, who spent several evenings telling her that one child is good for the country, that it's also good for you...Next night, more senior officers of the commune came to the house. They went through it all again and again, very slowly. The next night an even more senior official came, and he said the same things... And so it went on, night after night. Man Zue said, I think they found me very difficult. In the end, she got worn down. She said, after awhile I knew they would just keep on and on and on...Finally, she did agree to have the abortion, at six months pregnant. She'll be given an injection into the womb that will kill the baby. The dead baby will then be delivered within 24 hours. Man Zue did sign the one-child certificate.

A Wall Street Journal correspondent, Michele Vink, reported in the November 30, 1981 edition of the Journal,

...In Dongguan County in eastern Guangdong, for example, a reporter for Hong Kong's leftwing newspaper Zheng Ming Ribao saw pregnant women herded into vehicles and taken to hospitals for abortions. "The vehicles were filled with wailing noises, and the scenes were really bitterly distressing." He reported. One woman already nine months pregnant arrived at the hospital, he wrote, and immediately received an injection. "Three hours later the baby was born -- but then it stopped breathing," the reporter said. Some pregnant women reportedly were handcuffed, tied with ropes or placed in pig's baskets... Though doctors aren't supposed to perform abortions past the eighth month of pregnancy, they do, a Chinese source reports. "Every day hundreds of fetuses arrived at the morgue," he says. A woman with an unauthorized pregnancy is likely to receive an injection from hospital doctors before labor, resulting in a stillborn child or a baby so ill that it dies in a few days, the source adds.

Fox Butterfield, a highly respected reporter and former New York Times Peking Bureau chief writes in his book China: Alive in the Bitter Sea:

In recent years the street committee has gained a further and more extraordinary power--the right to decide which couples in the neighborhood may have children. This prerogative is part of the government's tough new campaign to reduce China's rate of population increase. Each province and city has been awarded a quota for the number of babies to be born per year, and the street committees then determine which families may use the quotas. "We give first preference to couples without children," said Mrs. Tiem, a street committee member I got to know. "If a couple already has two children or more, we tell them not to have any more."

...Mrs. Tiem (a "street committee" member) was frank about how her street committee administered the program. "We assign a person to keep track of each woman's menstrual cycle. If someone misses her period and isn't scheduled to have a baby, we tell her to have an abortion. There isn't room for liberalism on such an issue."

Nick Eberstadt, a visiting fellow at Harvard University's Center for Population Studies wrote in the New York Times, April 22, 1984:

...So, increasingly, the population program turned to coercion...in some areas, women with "unauthorized" pregnancies were rounded up and ordered to submit to injections of abortifacients. Official edicts warned that those "who attempt to defeat the fertility plan" would be considered "enemies of the people" -- a threat that any adult who lived through the Cultural Revolution understood only too well. Families that defied the "one child norm" were faced with monthly fines that often meant semi-starvation.(...) Almost a quarter of the United Nations Fund for Population Activities' \$50 million bequest to Chinese population programs is American money. Failure to act against these grave and obvious human rights abuses would expose America to some very serious charges--and those charges would be right.

In their book One Billion: A China Chronicle (1983), Jay and Linda Matthews wrote:

...The new birth control campaign had just begun and commune officials wanted to make an example of her...Finally, under intense pressure, the couple agreed to let the doctors induce early birth at seven months and let the baby die if it was a girl. But when a commune official standing by in the delivery room saw it was a boy, he reneged and insisted it not be saved. The husband and mother-in-law were on their knees at the delivery room door, pleading for reconsideration, but their child died because the nurses were not allowed to put it in an incubator. Some days later the mother-in-law saw the four-year-old son of one of the officials playing by a lake. In a rage, she threw the child into the water, then jumped in herself, and both drowned...Compulsory sterilizations and abortions have become common.

Mr. Chairman, the repressive population policies have also led to an alarming increase in infanticide. In his article "Why are Baby Girls Being Killed in China?" Steven Mosher points out:

...The wave of infanticide sweeping China is a direct consequence of a population-control policy of unprecedented severity. It restricts families to one child, ignores the realities of old-age economics in the countryside and systematically denigrates the value of human life. Parents are permitted to have only one child, and then only after a "birth quota" has been issued by the authorities. While the birth of a son has always been a more important event than the arrival of a daughter. Peking's policy of one child per family has raised the stakes. For the peasantry birth has become a kind of Russian roulette: The arrival of a son heralds a relaxed and secure old age: The coming of a daughter portends poverty and slow starvation during one's declining years. It is not "feudal nonsense" but brutal economic reality that moves the parents to hope for a man-child. If the child isn't male, then the choice is a stark one: Either kill or abandon the newborn female infant, reserving your one-child quota for the birth of a boy, or face a harrowing old age. It is no surprise that many peasants decide in favor of their own security, and trade the infant's life for their own.

It is also an act in which the Chinese state is a silent accomplice. The English-language China Daily printed in Peking may publish editorials lamenting the resurgence of infanticide, but the implementation of the birth control policy at the grass roots encourages cadres to overlook the willful murder of female infants.

County, commune and production brigade cadres are told how many births their unit is to be allowed each year and are promoted and otherwise rewarded on the basis of whether they succeed in meeting the quota. It isn't in their interest to prevent female infanticide. Each girl who dies at birth or disappears soon after is one less head that they will be held to account for in the annual birth control report. Not only are forced abortions being performed up to the time of birth, there are even cases of officially sanctioned infanticide. In one incident shortly after I left Guangdong province, a young woman pregnant for the first time gave birth to twin boys. What should have been an occasion for rejoicing quickly turned tragic as the cadres present asked her which one she wanted. Both of them, she replied, but to no avail. One of the babies-she could not and would not choose which - was taken from her and put to death.

Moreover, Mr. Chairman, many of China's own newspapers have admitted the rise in infanticide.

On March 3, 1983, the "People's Daily" wrote "the butchering, drowning and leaving to die of female infants and the maltreating of women who have given birth to girls has become a grave social problem."

An article in the April 11, 1983 New York Times written by Li Jianguo and Zhang Xiaoying - pseudonyms for two Chinese students attending school in the United States states:

According to news reports in China's dailies, during the last two years large numbers of female infants have been butchered, drowned or left to die, and numbers of women have suffered gross maltreatment as a result of nationwide implementation of the Government's population control policy.



We learn, from the People's Daily, the Liberation Daily, the Worker's Daily, Canton Evening News and The Chinese Youth that these illegal incidents happen not only in villages but in cities as well. In the areas most seriously affected, female infants and women who have given birth to female infants have been forced to die. As a result, nationwide, male infants have begun to far outnumber female infants. Both of us, citizens of the People's Republic of China, are deeply ashamed of, and mortified by, this utter barbarism and disregard of humanity. We are filled with boundless indignation that during this last quarter of the 20th Century such atrocities take place in our country. They reflect, on the one hand, the persistence of feudal thought and traditional indifference to the welfare of women and female children, and, on the other, the backward, benighted conditions of poverty and ignorance under which most parts of China still lives. But if China has curtailed population growth and lengthened the life of an average individual at the tragic expense of the lives of newborn girls, would it not be the greatest irony possible for Mr. Qian to receive this award at this time?

As you well know, Mr. Chairman, it is common, accepted practice for our government to withhold federal dollars to programs, projects and institutions that are found to be practicing racial or sexual discrimination, a prudent policy, I might add, that I strongly support.

There are numerous examples of laws and regulations that stipulate the loss of federal funds if certain conditions are not met. Examples are to be found in laws pertaining to the handicapped, to HUD grants, to the loss of highway funds and sewage treatment monies if, for example, provisions of the Clean Air Act are not adhered to.

Even Presidential candidates recognize that denial of U.S. funds for programs provides real leverage. According to the Chicago Sun Times, Senators Gary Hart and Alan Cranston--the latter while still a candidate--promised to deny federal projects to states whose Legislatures fail to ratify the Equal Rights Amendment.

I believe we would be utterly remiss and irresponsible if, when fully informed of the use of forced abortion in China, we were to look the other way and pretend it did not exist or that it was completely out of our hands. We do have some clout in this grisly matter. We can make a difference. We do have some tools at our disposal--namely our funds and our outrage--to press for reform.

Mr. Chairman, UNFPA has three options if my amendment passes and eventually becomes part of the law. First, they can exert their considerable influence and clout to exact reforms in Chinese population policies. Or, second, they can disengage and get out--an unambiguous message to the Peking government that the world community will not tolerate--or walk hand in hand with a policy of--forced or coerced abortions. Or thirdly, UNFPA might decide to continue on in China, without our aid, and thus itself look the other way and pretend forced abortions aren't really occurring. Of course, this would make a mockery of the United Nations often stated commitment to human rights.

I would suggest to my colleagues that we in this body have an obligation, a duty, not to be partners in this cruel repression of Chinese women and children. I would suggest that if we fail to take action, the cancer of the Chinese experiment will worsen and intensify and thereby claim more victims. I would remind my colleagues that such a policy would never be tolerated here. The outrage, I hope, would be deafening. Civil libertarians would assail such a policy, and they would be right. Human rights activists would assail such a policy, and they would be right. Religious and moral leaders would assail such a policy, and they would be right. Government leaders and editorial writers would assail such a policy and they would be right. Liberals, moderates and conservatives would assail such a policy, and they would be right.

Forced and coerced abortion would never be tolerated in our own backyard. It is no less offensive I hasten to point out in someone else's, even if they live on the other side of the world.

Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to support my amendment. Our traditions, our laws, the generous impulse of our people call for us all to do nothing less.



NATIONAL SECURITY COUNCIL  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20506

3775  
Add On

May 30, 1984

MEMORANDUM FOR CHARLES HILL  
Executive Secretary  
Department of State

SUBJECT: International Conference on Population

Attached is a draft position paper for the International Conference on Population in Mexico City, August 6 - 13, 1984. The paper was prepared by the White House Office of Policy Development, in coordination with our staff.

Please provide your comments or concurrence by Wednesday, June 13. Please respond jointly to Robert C. McFarlane and John A. Svahn, Assistant to the President for Policy Development.

  
Robert M. Kimmitt  
Executive Secretary

DRAFT Statement

For many years, the United States has supported, and helped to finance, programs of family planning, particularly in the less developed countries. This Administration has continued that support but has placed it within a policy context different from that of the past. It is sufficiently evident that the current exponential growth in global population cannot continue indefinitely. There is no question of the ultimate need to achieve a condition of population equilibrium. The differences that do exist concern the choice of strategies and methods for the achievement of that goal. The experience of the last two decades not only makes possible but requires a sharper focus for our population policy. It requires a more refined approach to problems which appear today in quite a different light than they did twenty years ago.

First and most important, in any particular society today, population growth is, of itself, a neutral phenomenon. It is not

necessarily good or ill. It becomes an asset or a problem only in conjunction with other factors, such as economic policy, social constraints, need for manpower, and so forth. The

~~relationship between population growth and economic development~~  
is not a negative one. More people do not mean less growth; that is absurd on its face. Indeed, both in the American experience and in the economic history of most advanced nations, population growth has been an essential element in economic progress.

Before the advent of governmental population programs, several factors had combined to create an unprecedented surge in population over most of the world. Although population levels in many industrialized nations had reached or were approaching equilibrium in the period before the Second World War, the baby boom that followed in its wake resulted in a dramatic, but temporary, population "tilt" toward youth. The disproportionate number of infants, children, teenagers, and eventually young adults did strain the social infrastructure of schools, health facilities, law enforcement and so forth. It also sustained strong economic growth and was probably critical in boosting the American standard of living to new heights, despite occasionally counterproductive government policies.

Among the less developed nations, a coincidental population increase was caused by entirely different factors, directly related to the humanitarian efforts of the United States and other western countries. ~~expansion of health~~

services -- from simple inoculations to sophisticated surgery --

~~services -- from simple inoculations to sophisticated surgery --~~

[REDACTED] by modern [REDACTED] millions to survive  
[REDACTED] and [REDACTED] the sharing of technology, the  
[REDACTED] the spread of western  
[REDACTED] in the [REDACTED]  
[REDACTED] the [REDACTED]  
[REDACTED] the [REDACTED]

The result, to no one's surprise, was more people, everywhere. This was not a failure but a success. It demonstrated not poor planning or bad policy but human progress in a new era of international assistance, technological advance, and human compassion. The population boom was a challenge; it need not have been a crisis. Seen in its broader context, it required a measured, modulated response. It provoked an over-reaction by some, largely because it coincided with two negative factors which, together, hindered families and nations in adapting to their changing circumstances.

The [REDACTED] these factors was government [REDACTED]  
[REDACTED] a pathology which spread throughout the developing world with sufficient virulence to keep much of it from developing further. As economic decision-making was concentrated in the hands of planners and public officials, the ability of average men and women to work towards a better future was impaired, and sometimes crippled. Agriculture was devastated by government price fixing that wiped out rewards for labor. Job creation in infant industries was hampered by confiscatory taxes. Personal industry and thrift were penalized, while dependency upon the state was encouraged. Political considerations made it

difficult for the economy to adjust to changes in supply and demand or to disruptions in world trade and finance. Under such circumstances, population growth changed from an asset in the development of economic potential to a peril.

The worst consequence of economic statism was that it disrupted the natural mechanism for slowing population growth in problem areas. The world's more affluent nations have reached a population equilibrium without compulsion and, in most cases, even before it was government policy to achieve it. The

individual families, of reproductive behavior to economic opportunities. Economic freedom has led to economically rational behavior. As opportunities and the

That historic pattern would already be well under way in many nations where population growth is today a problem, if short-sighted policies had not disrupted economic incentives, rewards, and advancement. In this regard, localized crises of population growth are evidence of too much government control and planning, rather than too little.

The recent boom in the population boom into a crisis was confined to the western world. It was an outbreak of an anti-intellectualism, which attacked science, technology, and the very concept of material progress. Joined to a commendable and long overdue concern for the environment, it was more a reflection of anxiety about the unsettled times and the uncertain future and disregard of human experience and scientific

sophistication. It was not unlike other waves of cultural anxiety that have, over the centuries, swept through western civilization during times of social stress and scientific exploration.

The combination of these two factors -- counterproductive economic policies in poor and struggling nations and a scientific pessimism among the developed -- provoked the demographic overreaction of the 1960's and 1970's. Doomsday scenarios took the place of realistic forecasts, and too many governments pursued population control measures that have had little impact on population growth, rather than sound economic policies that create the rise in living standards historically associated with decline in fertility rates. It was the easy way out, and it did not work. It focused on a symptom and neglected the underlying ailments. For the last three years, this Administration has sought to reverse that approach. We recognize that some population control programs may make a short-term effort to reduce growth, but this cannot be substituted for the reforms that put a society on the growth path. We are now making efforts toward slower population increase as well.

Nor can population control substitute for the rapid and responsible development of natural resources. In responding to certain Members of Congress concerning the previous Administration's Global 2000 report, this Administration in 1981 repudiated its call "for more governmental supervision and control. Historically, that has tended to restrict the



availability of resources and to hamper the development of technology, rather than to assist it. Recognizing the seriousness of environmental and economic problems, and their relationship to social and political pressures, especially in the developing nations, the Administration places a priority upon ~~technical progress and economic expansion, which hold out the~~ hope of prosperity and stability of a rapidly changing world. ~~That hope can be realized, of course, only to the extent that~~ government's response to problems, whether economic or ecological, ~~enhances individual freedom, which makes~~ true progress possible and worthwhile."

Those principles underlie this country's approach to the United Nations Conference on Population to be held in Mexico City in August. In accord with those principles, we reject compulsion or coercion in family planning programs, whether it is exercised ~~against a society or against individuals within the~~ family of man. The United Nations Declaration of the Rights of the Child (1959) calls for legal protection for children before birth as well as after birth; and the United States accordingly does not consider abortion an acceptable element of family planning programs and will not contribute to those of which it is a part. Nor will it any longer contribute directly or indirectly to family planning programs funded by governments or private organizations that advocate abortion as an instrument of population control. Efforts to lower population growth in cases in which it is deemed advisable to do so must, moreover, respect the religious beliefs and culture of each society. Population

control is not a panacea. It will not solve problems of massive unemployment. Jobs are not lost because there are too many people in a given area. Jobs are created by the conjunction of human wants and investment capital. Population growth fuels the former; sound economic policies and properly directed international assistance can provide the latter. Indeed, population density may make the latter more feasible by concentrating the need for both human services and technology. But as long as oppressive economic policies penalize those who work, save, and invest, joblessness will persist.

Population control cannot solve problems of unauthorized migration across national boundaries. People do not leave their homes, and often their families, to seek more space. They do so in search of opportunity and freedom. Reducing their numbers gives them neither. Population control cannot avert natural disasters, including famines provoked by cyclical drought. Fortunately, world food supplies have been adequate to relieve those circumstances in recent years. Problems of transportation remain; but there are far deeper problems as well, in those governmental policies which restrict the rewards of agricultural pursuits, encourage the abandonment of farmland, and concentrate people in urban areas.

It is time to concentrate upon those root problems which frequently exacerbate population pressures. By focusing upon real remedies for underdeveloped economies, the United Nations Conference on Population can reduce demographic issues to their proper place. It is an important place, but not the controlling

one. It requires our continuing attention within the broader context of economic growth and of the economic freedom that is its prerequisite. Most of all, questions of population growth require the approach outlined by President Reagan in 1981, in remarks before the World Affairs Council of Philadelphia: "Trust the people, trust their intelligence and trust their faith, because putting people first is the secret of economic success everywhere in the world." That is the agenda of the United States for the United Nations Conference on Population this year, just as it remains the continuing goal of our family planning assistance to other nations.

# The Washington Post

© 1984 The Washington Post Company

WEDNESDAY, JUNE 13, 1984

Rowland Evans and Robert Novak

## The Population Policy Battle

A White House position paper putting the United States on record that big government, not big families, causes Third World poverty is under furious assault by the population control lobby.

On May 30, the National Security Council staff forwarded for intragovernmental review a remarkable "draft statement" of U.S. policy for the International Population Conference in Mexico City Aug. 6-13. Departing from past policy, it contends the United States "does not consider abortion an acceptable element of family planning programs and will not contribute to those of which it is part." Nor will this country "any longer" help finance foreign programs "that advocate abortion as an instrument of population control."

A copy was promptly leaked by outraged State Department officials to the population control lobby. Two former senators deeply involved in that movement—Republican Robert Taft Jr. and Democrat Joseph Tydings—sent a passionate letter to members of Congress June 6. Assailing the White House paper for a "fundamentalist, know-nothing" political philosophy," they charged that it "subverts the congressional prerogatives for setting policy."

Thus, when President Reagan returned from

Europe, he found an establishment-populist debate of the kind his political advisers would rather avoid. To bow to establishment pressure by ditching the draft paper would estrange anti-abortion supporters—Protestant fundamentalists and Catholic blue-collar families he needs Nov. 6.

The "pro-lifers" have wanted one of their own heading the delegation to Mexico City. In response, the White House recently informed them it would be headed by a distinguished Catholic layman and abortion hater, former senator James Buckley.

But Richard E. Benedick, the State Department's coordinator of population affairs and a career Foreign Service officer renowned for pressing population control, quickly assembled a delegation to surround if not smother Buckley. His recommendations include not only such pro-control Republicans as Taft and Rep. John Porter of Illinois but two anti-Reagan liberal Democrats, Reps. James Scheuer of New York and Sander Levin of Michigan.

What Benedick had not expected, however, was the draft study prepared by the White House policy development office in coordination with the NSC staff. It would opt for people, not

governments, as the real creators of wealth. Population has become a problem, it said, because of "governmental control of economies, a pathology of which spread throughout the developing world with sufficient virulence to keep much of it from developing further."

That is not the end of the paper's heresies: "Population control is not a panacea. It will not solve problems of massive unemployment." Rather, it suggests "population density" may actually help economic development, adding "that as long as oppressive economic policies penalize those who work, save and invest, joblessness will persist."

Counterattacking, Taft and Tydings wrote members of Congress warning of "a potential foreign policy embarrassment of serious proportions." Noting that the last eight administrations have followed population control policies, it asserted: "No administration—Democrat or Republican—should change that policy unilaterally."

Specifically, the two former senators protested a ban on U.S. aid to governments or private organizations "that also happen to provide financial support for abortion services." They were conceding for the first time that financing abortion goes with U.S.-funded population programs.

Taft and Tydings attached to their letter a Senate Foreign Relations Committee report on the unpassed foreign aid bill as the congressional imprimatur. The U.S. position in Mexico City, said the committee report, "should be in full accord with policies which have been established by the committee and by Congress in cooperation with successive administrations."

That displayed the population lobby's clout. The committee report's words were lifted directly from a sample letter Taft has been urging congressmen to send Secretary of State George Shultz (and was indeed sent him verbatim by the Foreign Relations chairman, Sen. Charles Percy, and the Appropriations chairman, Sen. Mark Hatfield).

The day after he received his Tydings-Taft S.O.S., Porter dutifully took the House floor urging the administration to reject the draft report. But the president will do so at the risk of alienating his core constituency. Jim Buckley would be unlikely to accept his mission to Mexico City unless the Reagan administration opts for economic incentives, not human restraints as the route to wealth for poor nations.

© 1984, News Group Chicago, Inc.