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It began as a cloud no smaller than a man's hand, of the same configuration - but the fist was clenched and threatening.

In February, 1970, the president of Planned Parenthood-World Population asked, "Can equilibrium or even slowing of population growth be achieved by voluntary means or will coercive measures by government uae be necessary?" Asking and answering, his reply was, "Voluntary measures should be tried in the critical decade ahead - but if the rate of population growth has not been slowed to 1.5% or less by then, coercive measures may be necessary."1

This coercive concept in reproduction is not new, and even though the motives and intentions of prior coercers were different, the goals of the prior and the imminent coercers are the same: a limited, selective reproduction.

Sterilization experiments in order to ascertain the efficacy of a drug known as caladium sequinum were suggested to one Reichsfuehrer S. S. Himmler by another Adolf Porkony in October, 1941. Dr. Porkony wrote: "On the basis of this research, it was possible to produce a drug which after a relatively short time would have imperceptible sterilization on human beings. Then we would have a new powerful weapon at our disposal."2

The Deputy Gauleiter of the Lower Danube, S. S. Obergruppenfuehrer Gerland, in 1942 pointed out that these experiments were successful as was expected, it would be possible to sterilize practically unlimited numbers of people in the shortest time and in the simplest way conceivable.3 The Obergruppenfuehrer of World Population in 1981 may cherish a higher ideal than that elaborated upon by Gerland.

It is paradoxical that the Third Reich should have a message with humane overtones for the present president of World Population. One defendant at Nurenberg, a Dr. Karl Gebhardt, held and stated the opinion that a sound population policy could not be realized by negative measures only.4 His medical attitude was not based on the principle of negative selection and the destruction of unworthy lives or the prevention of propagation of undesirable beings, but, on the contrary, he was led by the conviction that these human beings must be helped in so far as medical science was able to help them at all. For other reasons - and perhaps anticipating a conflict with the World Population group - he was executed by decree at Murnberg, on June 2, 1948.

The present policy of the World Population planners is different, more parochial and less humane than that elaborated upon by the late Nazi Gebhardt. The sustaining of the depressive and inadequate is, at present, regarded as diluting a positive reproductive potential, and it is theorized that it will "ultimately lead to genetic collapse."4

We shall require a new nomenclature for the future World human. Once in some circles Aryans was definitive, this has a poor connotation, and superseding race and nationality, the new man may be called Citizen of World (C.O.W.).

It is not my intention to confuse population control for the purposes of genocide with population control for population control. Semantics is semantics. The president of World Population says that to be successful and free of the charge of genocide, "the policy must always be administered and serviced by the indigenous population."5

With alacrity, for no recommendations have been made for this function in the United States, I nominate the Navaho as administrators, and the Sioux, the Nez Perces, the Algonquins, the Blackfeet, the Mohawks and the Plutes to supply the service. The lesser tribes can function in a clerical capacity in the program. For the dissenters that claim that American Indians are not autochthonous and allege their migration via the Bering Strait, I have a simple query; "Do you want the Russians to manage the program?"

Who is indigenous on the Continent, South America, and Asia will be decided later by branch offices of World Population in these areas. Some dispute is expected in the Arab-Israeli sphere, between Nigeria and Biafra, and between black and white. This aspect of things is expected to be "ironed out" - if not figuratively, then literally. After all, the policy of the plan is coercive.

For want of a hypo-spray injection technique to be used every 3 to 6 months (an ideal of the incumbent president of World Population), abortion will be resorted to voluntarily and by directive. It will be chiefly for the recalcitrant. There will be no medical reason for abortion; none will exist. In 1969-1970 when the reasons for 70% to 80% of the abortions performed in the United States were listed as psychiatric, this reasoning is eternally true when experts in this field spelled out their position - "that psychiatry seldom can assert with authority that a woman needs an abortion."6 Those with lingering doubts that the conceptus might have human characteristics were reminded that this was not so; yet, knowing that this was their origin, then felt less than human.

Another Cassandra, extrapolating from lemmings, guppies, red grouse and a variety of animal life including the American executive, warned that if over-population doesn't kill, the stresses from the consequences of it will.7 Once, we were "a little lower than the
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The specter of hunger is in his retinue. It is diminished, however, by the recognition that one can farm can produce enough grain for the tenants of more than a thousand high-rise apartments. He makes a study of the millions of cans of food on our store shelves designated for our feline and canine friends.

The young too, being in, share our aims. But there is a small, discordant note. Increasingly as they reject our politics, our social order, our religions, our judicial systems, they may have a further distance for our future goals and the methods we will utilize.

This is best exemplified and ponderous with implication in the reporting of the Harvard Bulletin. "When the team of Harvard scientists who isolated a pure gene from a living organism announced the discovery late last year, they took care to tell the public exactly how they had about it. They called a press conference to express their fear that it may the long run the tool they had discovered would be used to lose more evil than good on mankind."

One of the scientists, Jonathan Beckwith '57, Professor of Bacteriology and Immunology, told a Harvard reporter recently who he had so clearly disavowed himself from those scientists who work quietly, preferably away from matters capable of horrendous effect on society. "People need to be informed of what will be influencing and controlling their lives," said Beckwith. "They should be involved in the development of ideas, in some of the decisions. Too often they have no idea of the negative effects until a process is finished and it is too late. Look at the pollution problem."

Speaking specifically of the discovery, he and his co-workers had made, Beckwith said, "By manipulating genes, it will be possible to cure disease, but it will also be possible to apply the same techniques to changing psychology. It would be easy to put something into the water supply, or to inoculate people, to change their attitudes, to bred out aggression or dizziness."

Beckwith's main fear is of those who might control genetic engineering, should it occur. "Once a government accepts or forces birth control, it is an easy step to accept genetic engineering," he said. Suspicious of the ability of a society that is built, he believes, on the premise that businesses, whose primary concern is making money, will make wise decisions, Beckwith is equally suspicious of a government whose policies, he feels, consistently go against the interests of business. Intellectuals are not necessarily to be trusted, either: "Elite scientists often have contempt for people. They would find that the highest form of life would be an Einstein, and would seek to reproduce qualities they favor. This implies a feeling of superiority that is very dangerous."

For the solution of this problem, we do not need the Apocalypse, the Cassandras, the extrapolators from guppies, or the mailed fist of some social reformers. We are done with the Obergruppenfuhrers — even those of the occasional tender theme.

If our vision is to be that of life, we need a sweet reasonableness, an urgent but gentle concern, a clarity in our motives, a careful design in our method. We will need a refining of...
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Statement On The Packwood Family Limitation Proposal

1Robert J. Dwyer
Archbishop of Portland in Oregon

"The power to tax is the power to destroy," is John Marshall's famous dictum to find a fresh application in an attempt to employ the taxing power to undermine the morality of our people and destroy the integrity of the family? There is reason to fear that this is the thrust of a radical proposal for population management and control, prominently sponsored by Oregon's Senator Robert Packwood, which is making rather a strong bid for popular support. It would use the power to tax as a threat and deterrent to any American family which would presume to exceed a given norm of population limitation.

Marshall's phrase, found in his judgment striking down the effort of the State of Maryland to impose a tax upon the United States Bank, back in 1819, echoes as a refrain through the decades of American constitutional history. The Federalist Chief Justice was perfectly clear in his mind that if any State, motivated by whatever high theory of republicanism, were to be allowed the right to levy taxes on the Federal government or its agencies, ultimately no limit could be assigned to the extension of that right, and the end of the national compact would be in sight.

The lapidary dictum has been transposed, during the subsequent century and a half, to serve in dozens of contexts, some of which would be hard to reconcile with its original framework. It has been used as a bludgeon to clobber the national government itself, when the case was argued that Federal taxation was in fact destroying the several States or at least reducing them to practical impotency. It has been cited (with full conviction or with tongue in cheek) by all manner of business men and industrialists, some of them honest men striving to wrest a living in a highly competitive world, some of them the "malefactors of great wealth" who were the objects of Teddy Roosevelt's unmitigated wrath. It has been thus used in protest against taxation from any source, Federal, State, or local, which they saw as threatening the confiscation of their goods, or the cramping of their style of life, or the curtailment of their profits.