

ARMSTRONG WILLIAMS

Yesterday, Congress voted on two resolutions funding "international family planning," programs: one offered by the White House, the other a bipartisan alternative. Both resolutions spend hundred of millions of American taxpayer dollars on the racist assumption that Africans, Latin Americans, and Asians are overbreeding pests in need of our benevolent assistance in limiting the number of their offspring.

American taxpayers are forced to pick up an enormous tab for global contraception programs of questionable value, either way. Both bill represent an appalling display of arrogant American cultural and racial imperialism. Under the president's proposal, though, we are required to pay for abortions and abortion lobbying as well.

The Democrats in the White House, ostensibly minority-friendly, pushed for a privileged vote on their population control resolution, H.J. Res 36, which has no restrictions on funding for organizations that promote and provide abortion. At the core of the bill is the belief that the populations of Asia, Africa and South America are so much overbreeding human vermin to be sterilized and controlled.

To advance this noble aim, the White House asked Congress to pry open American wallets to the tune of \$543.6 million. The money would go to organizations like the International Planned Parenthood Federation, which lobbies for performed abortions, effective immediately. This is a \$123 million addition to an already hefty appropriation for the fiscal year.

Like most organizations clamoring for the federal dollars taken from American families, recipients foretell dire consequences of failing to fund them. "Cuts and restrictions to international family planning programs constitute a serious health threat to women, children and families across the world," they insist. Unmentioned is the fact that funding for the Agency for Interna-

Devious deal on population funding?

tional Development (AID), the primary source for U.S. international population control spending, has already grown exponentially in recent years. From 1992 to 1995, AID's funding ballooned from \$325.6 million to \$582.7 million—a 79 percent increase. Rest assured that as genuine Third World health problems persist, so will the calls for more "family planning" funding.

"Family planning" compassion actually focuses less on real health needs than on pushing contraception on poor foreigners, and, in the president's resolution, in exterminating them through abortion as well. At a recent press conference, Dr. Stephen Karanja, a Kenyan ob/gyn described how contraceptive paraphernalia are readily available and administered indiscriminately in his sparsely populated country, often causing life-threatening injuries.

Meanwhile, he has no penicillin, no chloroquine to fight malaria, and no clean water, because most American aid goes to population control rather than real medical treatment.

Supporters of the White House resolution contend that restrictions on the direct use of tax dollars for performing abortions means American hands are clean. A first-year accounting student could see through that ruse. Money an organization receives subsidizes that organization, and its activities, regardless of accounting gimmicks. The contention is a fig leaf designed to hide the ugly truth: Far from

making abortion more rare, the president is pushing to make abortion more plentiful around the world — and with our money, at that.

The alternative, bipartisan resolution sponsored by Rep. Christopher Smith, New Hampshire Republican, along with Reps. Henry Hyde, Illinois Republican, and David Oberstar, Minnesota Democrat, H.R. 581 has the singular grace that no money will go to organizations that perform or promote abortions, reinstating the longstanding "Mexico City" policy that Mr. Clinton repealed in 1993. But, in its way, the proposal is even sadder, because it displays just how dismal the political situation on Capitol Hill has become.

To garner support, and call the president's bluff on the abortion funding issue, the pro-life contingent concedes even more money, \$713 million, for population control, effective immediately. It does restrict U.S. promotion of abortion, but at what a price. It is a rear guard action indicating that Americans have already lost the war.

Worse, the lesser-of-two-evils proposition has garnered only lukewarm support among the Republican leadership. The Republican platform calls for an end to subsidizing the global social engineering of "population control" elitists. The House leadership should be faithful to the party's stated principles and flatly refuse money for that purpose. They have failed not only that, but also even to resist the president's pro-abortion resolution. That is a disgrace.

Both options display the appalling racist cultural imperialism inherent in our current foreign policy priorities, but the president's resolution would plunge American taxpayers directly into the business of abortion on a global scale. In their neo-Malthusian quest to stem the four horsemen, the Democrats are once again trying to take advantage of the American taxpayer.

Armstrong Williams is a nationally syndicated columnist.

METROPOLITAN TIMES

C6 FRIDAY, FEBRUARY 14, 1997

Regional News



PRINCESS ANNE

Contraceptive how-to set as school goal

Ninety percent of ninth-graders should be able to identify and explain how to use four forms of birth control to combat high teen pregnancy rates, a Somerset County Health Department work group said.

The panel spent 18 months studying and prioritizing health problems in Somerset County.

A quarter of all babies born in 1995 in the county had teenage mothers.

Currently, ninth-graders learn about types of contraception but not their application in a mandatory health class, said Charles Simpson, supervisor for instruction at Somerset County schools.

"I'm 100 percent against it," said Jack Paul, president of the Woodson Boosters, a PTA organization. "I believe [sex education] is up to the parents."

Casey Todd, a member of the same PTA, felt differently. "We have to face reality," he said. "Our children need to know."

From wire dispatches and staff reports

Too Many People? Not by a Long Shot

By STEVEN W. MOSHER

Confounding the doomsayers, world population growth is slowing dramatically. The U.S. Census Bureau recently reported that the globe's population grew by only 79.6 million in 1996. This is seven million fewer than the 86-plus million in 1994, the high-water mark of population growth. It is a round 20 million less than the 100 million figure population-control alarmists like Vice President Al Gore were tossing around until recently.

The immediate reason for this decline, which has since been confirmed by the United Nations Population Division, is shrinking family size. The Census Bureau reports that the world's total fertility rate—the number of children born per woman during her lifetime—has declined to 2.9, its lowest level ever. In 1985 the world-wide total fertility rate was 4.2. In many countries, couples commonly stop at one or two children.

There are now 79 countries representing fully 40% of the world's population—with fertility rates below the level necessary to stave off long-term population decline. The developed nations are in the worst straits. Already 15 of them, including Russia, Germany and Italy, each year fill more coffins than cradles. Virtually all the others will soon follow suit. Efforts by anxious governments to arrest this looming demographic disaster have proved largely futile. In Germany and Japan, for example, despite hefty financial rewards to women willing to welcome more children into the world, the maternity wards remain empty.

But this "birth dearth," as Ben Watenberg has called it, has now spread well beyond the developed world. There are now 27 "developing" countries where women are averaging fewer than 2.2 children. These include such unlikely candidates as Sri Lanka and Thailand. The human face of this population implosion is melancholy—villages bereft of children, schools closed for lack of students—and the economic consequences are grim: Labor shortages cramp production, the housing market grows moribund, and this in turn creates a drag on real estate and other sectors of the economy. How much of Japan's continuing economic malaise can be directly traced to a lack of young people to power the economy?

While the population of portions of Africa, Asia and Latin America will continue to grow for several more decades, the rest of the world will soon be in demographic free fall. The bottom line: Population will peak at seven billion or so in 2030, and then begin a long descent. (This is essentially the U.N. Population Division's Nov. 13 "low variant" prediction, with African, Asian and Latin American total fertility rates adjusted to converge on those of present-day Europe, or 1.35 children per woman.)

How have those in the population-control crowd taken all this "good" news? Their response has been curiously schizophrenic. On the one hand, they are quick to claim credit for progress made and ask for money "to finish the job." But in the same breath, they hotly deny that they are principally interested in reducing human

fertility at all, claiming they have other, laudable goals in mind, such as reducing maternal and infant mortality, improving reproductive health care, "investing in women," and the like.

Anyone who has seen the checkered path of other countries' family-planning programs will find it hard to take either claim seriously. Something over two-thirds of the world's fertility decline can be accounted for by simple modernity, as women marry later, have greater educational opportunities and work outside the home. The only population-control programs that have enjoyed conspicuous success have relied on the more or less compulsory sterilization of large numbers of women. The most notorious example is China, where for a decade and a half the government has mandated the insertion of intrauterine devices after one child, sterilization after two children, and abortion for those pregnant without permission.

But the use of force in family-planning programs is not limited to China. Doctors in Mexico's government hospitals are under orders to insert IUDs in women who have three or more children. This is often done immediately after childbirth, without the foreknowledge or consent of the women violated.

Perhaps the practice in Peru, where women are offered 50 pounds of food in return for submitting to a tubal ligation, cannot properly be called coercive. Still, there is something despicable about offering food to poor, hungry Indian women in return for permission to mutilate their bodies. And the potential for direct coer-

cion is ever present, given that Peruvian government doctors must meet a quota of six certified sterilizations a month or lose their jobs.

So tainted with coercion is the whole notion of population control that many of its strongest advocates have quietly reinvented themselves, and are now posing as social-reformers eager to help women. The whole process resembles the strange metamorphosis of Soviet communists into Russian social democrats after the U.S.S.R. collapsed. It deserves the same level of credence.

But let us, for the sake of dialogue, take at face value all the fine words about improving health and saving lives of Third World women and children. Let us then agree to redirect the \$385 million to be spent on population control programs this year into bona fide health-care programs run by bona fide health-care agencies (not family planning groups in disguise). Let us save the 2.1 million children each year who, according to Unicef, are dying from vaccine-preventable diseases. Let us provide Vitamin A supplements to poor children, averting one to two million deaths each year.

Humanity's long-term problem is not going to be too many children, but too few: too few children to fill the schools and universities, too few young people entering the work force, too few couples buying homes and second cars. In short, too few consumers and producers to drive the economy forward. The imploding markets of Europe and the economic sluggishness of Japan will spread soon enough to the U.S. and the rest of the world. Why spend hundreds of millions of dollars a year on contraception and sterilization that will only bring that day closer?

Mr. Mosher is president of the Population Research Institute and author of "A Mother's Ordeal: One Woman's Fight Against One-Child China" (HarperCollins, 1994).