

The World Bank, Population Control, and the Liberal Economic Order

By

Leah Kazar

Thesis Submitted in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements for the

Degree of Bachelor of Arts

In the Department of History at Brown University

Thesis Advisor: Professor Naoko Shibusawa

April 7, 2017

Acknowledgments

Above all, I would like to thank my thesis adviser, Professor Naoko Shibusawa, for guiding me through the thesis writing process. From helping me find a topic to her instrumental role in encouraging me to refine my arguments, Professor Shibusawa has been an invaluable resource and mentor. Indeed, I do not think I would have been able to write this without her.

I would also like to thank the members of the K-Team writing group: Aditya Kumar, Mae Rochelle-Verano, Nicolas Montano, Patrick Chung, Ida Yalzadeh, Nicole Sintetos, and Marco McWilliams, whose feedback, encouragement, and snacks have kept me going and helped me write a much more considered and interesting thesis.

Additionally, I'd like to thank Bertha at the World Bank Group Archives, who was an excellent resource and great help in finding materials on the World Bank's population policy over the years.

Finally, I would like to thank my parents, who let me talk through potential topics and arguments with them whenever I hit roadblocks in my work. My father also deserves special mention for spending countless hours working to retrieve my thesis notes from an external hard drive after it crashed this fall. The support of my parents in the writing of this thesis, and my education in general, is why I am where I am today.

Introduction

In April of 1977, Dr. R. T. Ravenholt, the director of the U.S. Government's Office of Population, was in St. Louis to attend the annual meeting of the Population Association of America. While there, Ravenholt dropped a bombshell: in an interview with the *St. Louis-Dispatch*, he stated that as many as 100 million women worldwide would be sterilized if various U.S.-sponsored population programs met their goals. The *Dispatch* ran with the headline, "U.S. Goal: Sterilize Millions of World's Women."¹ Indeed, some of these programs were being executed just down the road from the site of his interview, at the Washington University in St. Louis School of Medicine. There, the medical school hosted trainings on sterilizations as part of the United States Agency for International Development's (USAID) Program for International Education in Gynecology and Obstetrics (PIEGO). PIEGO facilitated sterilization technique trainings for doctors from around the globe—even when those in their countries of origin rejected the practice.² Through programs like PIEGO, the United States could work to meet Ravenholt's lofty population control goals around the world.

Ravenholt's reasoning for why such goals were worthwhile was fourfold. The first was humanitarian: a reduction in the number of people in developing nations would allow their governments to better provide for those who were left, and an increase in the overall standard of living. After all, "Resources divided by population equals well being."³ The second was the United States' "moral responsibility" to help solve a problem it had abetted by creating the medical advances that bolstered population increases around the globe. The third was economic:

¹ Paul Wagman, "U.S. Goal: Sterilize Millions of World's Women." *St. Louis Post-Dispatch*, April 22, 1977; Box 3; Record Group 286: Records of the United States Agency for International Development; National Archives and Records Administration, College Park, MD, 1.

² Michael S. Burnhill and Thomas S. Moulding, "Evaluation of the Program for International Education in Gynecology and Obstetrics," *USAID*, September 17, 1976, available at http://pdf.usaid.gov/pdf_docs/Pdaaa502a1.pdf.

³ Paul Wagman, "U.S. Goal: Sterilize Millions of World's Women," 1.

population control was necessary in order to maintain “the normal operation of commercial interests around the world.”⁴ Without a reduction in idle hands whose discontent would otherwise urge them to “rebel against the strong U.S. commercial presence,” U.S. economic hegemony was not secure.⁵ The fourth reason built off of the third: a continuation of population explosions would result in horrific socioeconomic conditions conducive to revolutions that could be harmful to the United States.⁶ Using this reasoning as a justification, Ravenholt hoped that U.S. programs would make sterilization available to all of the world’s 570 million fertile women. If population control policies were effective, up to one quarter of them could be sterilized.⁷

Though Ravenholt’s comments represented how many Western elites viewed the population debate, his position was not met with uniform complacency. Students at the Washington University in St. Louis School of Medicine objected to USAID’s use of their school to train doctors from around the world in techniques they claimed would be used on the poor and disenfranchised in developing countries. Ravenholt dismissed these dissenters as “radicals” who he believed wanted to promote the revolutions he so valiantly sought to prevent.⁸ These critics, who held that economic development would naturally limit population growth, in turn saw Ravenholt’s claims as outrageous. Highlighting the Cold War context of this debate, some of them countered with the Cuban example, drawing attention to the fact that the nation was deemed overpopulated until the radical reorganization of its economy finally gave resources and jobs to those formerly deemed extraneous. This played into the Cold War “us vs. them” logic of the day, and made it easy for Ravenholt and his ilk to dismiss protestors as “leftists.”⁹

⁴ Ibid.

⁵ Ibid.

⁶ Ibid.

⁷ Ibid., p. 6

⁸

⁹ Ibid.

Ravenholt ultimately denied that he had ever said such things to the *Post Dispatch*. He held that he never advocated for one-quarter of the world's reproduction-age women be sterilized, and emphasized the voluntary nature of U.S. programs' sterilization efforts.¹⁰ An internal USAID memo called the *Dispatch* article "a deliberate effort to distort the information" that was provided by Ravenholt in his interview, in which he did not speak to the commercial interests of the United States, nor to strict sterilization goals made by the United States government.¹¹

Regardless of whether or not Ravenholt indeed made the statements alleged in the article, this incident highlights the conflicts expressed in the population control debate in the latter half of the 20th century. This thesis will address the themes suggested by this vignette, including those embodied in Ravenholt's excuses, the ensuing debate, and the context in which this situation occurred. How could people like Ravenholt justify U.S. and Western-led intervention into the population policies of other nations? More specifically, I am interested in how nations like the United States that fashioned themselves as champions of free choice and free markets, and ostensibly abhorred top-down economic planning, could justify their promotion of top-down population policies. Wouldn't such a position pose a fundamental contradiction?

My answer lies in the broader context of the population debate, starting with a more informed definition of capitalism. Though freedom of choice is often the purported *modus operandi* of capitalism as held by its advocates, capitalism is at its core a system built on the private ownership of the means of production, or capital, that above all else seeks to amplify the gains accrued from capital investments. It is not a system that is built fundamentally on freedom

¹⁰ R. T. Ravenholt, Letters: As To Sterilization, *St. Louis Post Dispatch*, May 3, 1977; Box 3; Record Group 286: Records of the United States Agency for International Development; National Archives and Records Administration, College Park, MD.

¹¹ Douglas H. Huber, memo to Sander Levin, Assistant Administrator, PHA USAID, Department of State from Cholera Research Laboratory DACCA, Department of State, April 26, 1977; Box 3; Record Group 286: Records of the United States Agency for International Development; National Archives and Records Administration, College Park, MD.

for all, nor does it necessarily lend itself to increased choice.¹² By viewing the United States and largely U.S.-led institutions like the World Bank as agents of capitalism, rather than free markets, their involvement in promoting population policy can be made more legible. Specifically, they were acting in a way that saw excess population as a resource sink that prevented the capital accumulation that was required by their beliefs about development.

I also hope to investigate how and why developing nations' governments accepted such policies, with the answer lying in the nature of the embedded liberal institutions like the World Bank and internalized beliefs about the nature of modernity. Though dissent did arise to population policies, accompanied by a recognition of their place in agendas of Western-dominated capitalist expansion, it was ultimately ineffective. This failure arose from the unique positioning of embedded liberal institutions like the World Bank, which gave nations reliant on their funding the opportunity to present their grievances but ultimately dismissed them in the context of an overwhelmingly liberal economic ideology. Furthermore, this dominant liberal ideology allowed developing nations, even when rebelling against the excessive capitalism they saw in the West, to internalize onto liberal ideas about what modernity should look like. Consequently, they often implemented their own population programs and extractive economic systems in order to achieve the prosperity promised to them by the West. Overall, population control policies became commonplace because of their relationship to the overwhelming dominance of Western-dominated capitalism and liberalism.

Personal Bias and Disclaimer

¹² For example, as Thomas Piketty notes in *Capital in the 21st Century*, capitalism unimpeded naturally tends towards oligarchy and monopoly, leading to the concentration of wealth and a reduction of choices for the vast majority of people. Thomas Piketty, *Capital in the 21st Century* (Cambridge, MA: Belknap Press, 2015).

In the spirit of full contextualization, I believe it is necessary to disclose my own biases with respect to the highly contentious topics covered in this thesis. Perhaps most importantly, I am pro-choice. In the context of this thesis, my bias in this regard is perhaps most marked in my insistence on the importance of bodily autonomy. I hold throughout my thesis that population control policies were a violent expression of power that targeted the autonomy of women, especially marginalized women, worldwide. Someone who believes that bodily autonomy is not a fundamental right would surely have written a very different thesis, and one that is less critical of the mechanisms that allowed powerful institutions to violate women's choices about their own bodies.

Relatedly, I would also like to be clear regarding my criticisms of the population control debate. Though I criticize population control efforts as coercive and an abuse of power, I want to be clear that this criticism does not extend to all family planning measures, including abortion rights. It is easy to look at the roots of organizations like Planned Parenthood and dismiss all interventions in the name of family planning and control over reproduction as some nefarious plot to control women's bodies. However, in my view, a restriction on abortion rights and forced sterilizations are two sides of the same coin. Both are used to restrict bodily autonomy and turn women's bodies into sites of political control. Both violate women's right to choose how they live in their own bodies, and assert that powerful institutions (which are more often than not male-dominated) have the ultimate right to dictate some of the most intimate aspects of people's lives.

Another contentious topic I tackle throughout this thesis is the nature of capitalism. I believe, building on ideas promoted by scholars as diverse as Samir Amin and Thomas Piketty, that capitalism tends towards monopoly and the control of resources in the name of profit.

Oftentimes, this control turns violent. I challenge the notion that the establishment of unfettered capitalist economies is the best path towards prosperity, and refute the ideology that capitalism promotes free markets. This stems from my own experience studying the history of capitalism, and observations regarding its reliance on growth and exploitation through any means necessary. Indeed, a proponent of free trade or an ardent believer in unfettered capitalism would have a very different perspective on the topics tackled in this thesis.

Existing Literature and New Contributions

My work seeks to bridge gaps in the literature by using ideas about the nature of capitalism to analyze the involvement of international institutions like the World Bank in population control policies. As previously stated, I will show how population control fit part and parcel into a larger shift toward capital's domination, and how the limitation of population growth in a society in which excess hands were no longer productive but potentially dangerous was targeted as a path to development. I map an analysis of capitalist expansion onto the history of population control in the context of development that I have not found in any of my source literature. I undertake this project using archival resources from the World Bank and, to a lesser extent, the United States Agency for International Development. To do this, I work off the contributions of many scholars who have already written extensively about the subjects of population control and liberal capitalism. Ultimately, I weave these two sometimes-disparate bodies of work together in order to establish the connection between population control and a capitalist mode of development.

The initial source that prompted my interest in this topic was Matthew Connelly's *Fatal Misconception*, which examines the population control movement in the 20th century by looking

at the international institutions involved in the ideology and implementation of population control policies. Connelly exposes some of the racist and eugenicist roots of population control and provides a helpful historical basis on which this thesis builds. I also draw from Betsy Hartmann's *Reproductive Rights and Wrongs*, which chronicles the power dynamics at play in the population control movement. Perhaps most importantly, Hartmann's theoretical conjectures regarding the use of population control policies as assertions of power over the bodies of the marginalized is a fundamental concept used in this thesis. Her analysis of population control as a colonial project is likewise important in my exploration of neocolonial capitalist expansion in relation to the population control movement. Critically, I use Hartmann's ideas about uneven resource distribution rather than population as a true cause of stunted development in order to underpin my evaluation of capitalism's role in the population control movement.

In conjunction with these sources about population, I have also utilized scholarly work about the postwar economic order in order to inform the economic side of my arguments. I build on John Ruggie and Eric Helleiner's interpretations of the World Bank as an embedded liberal institution in my analysis of the World Bank's particular brand of capitalist promotion. Ruggie and Helleiner have shown that the World Bank was established through a particular compromise between proponents of free-trade oriented capitalism and those advocating for a more Keynesian, statist approach to governance. This allowed for the mollification of critics of unfettered capitalism without changing the basic tenets of free trade supported by the liberal historical environment. Additionally, I build off the work of Paul Cammack, who discusses the capitalist accumulation supported by the World Bank's policies and its spread of hegemonic liberal ideology. Finally, though not always explicitly present in the text, I use the ideas of capitalist systems formulated by Ha-Joon Chang's *Bad Samaritans* (establishing the hypocrisy of free

trade ideology), Thomas Piketty's *Capital in the 21st Century* (establishing the tendency of capitalism towards accumulation and wealth concentration), and Samir Amin's *The Liberal Virus* (establishing the dominance of American economic liberalism throughout the 20th century).

Research Methods

The summer before the start of my senior year, I went to the World Bank archives in Washington, DC to look for sources to help me start my thesis. I was unsure about what I was going to find, but was hopeful the archives would house some illuminating documents about the nature of the Bank's population control programs. I asked the archivists to pull any documents that had any mention of population or family planning in them, figuring that such a broad search would surely lead me to at least a few interesting results. Like many researchers before me, however, I soon found out that the documents at the Bank were not exactly what I had hoped to find. Many of the sources having to do with population control were of a more administrative nature, and often involved correspondence between employees about certain bureaucratic matters like where to find funding for various programs or travel itineraries. I had, at the very least, hoped to get a better sense of the Bank's implementation of its population programs (including the reaction of the communities in which the programs were executed), but no such documents were on-hand. I asked the archivist if such sources existed, but it seemed unlikely that they were available (not to mention that I would have had to wait about 3 months for the declassification of additional sources).

Though I was extremely discouraged at first, at the recommendation of my thesis advisor I decided to reevaluate the sources I had found. Leafing through over 3,000 pages of archival sources surely must have yielded at least a few worthwhile results, and I delved back into the

World Bank documents to see what I could make of the documents at my disposal. I tried to focus on what had seemed exciting to me during my research, and found that I was mostly interested in internal correspondence and memos describing and justifying the Bank's population programs from a top-level perspective. As someone interested in economic history, I was especially intrigued when employees discussed the ways in which development programs with population focuses could be justified by free-market economic ideologies. In response, I decided to pivot towards a more intellectual history of population control and its economic justifications, using the sources I had found over the summer in addition to anything else that I could find, including academic, governmental, and other resources.

Ultimately, I engaged in a close reading of a few key documents about the World Bank and USAID's stance and approach to population control, combined with historical background and theoretical analyses, to write my thesis. Though the documents that were of interest are spread in time frame and context, together they help paint a picture of these institutions' role in and implementation of population policy. Throughout, this work is intertwined with secondary sources that provided a broader understanding of the ways in which the population debate unfolded in the context of expanding liberalism. In this way, I could evaluate the intellectual justifications and structural underpinnings of the population control movement and its relationship to development with the sources that were available to me.

The sources that I originally hoped to find still interest me, but the angle I decided to pursue was ultimately more accessible given my limited time frame and resources. It is my hope that my work will still contribute to the existing literature and to more general debates about population, economics, development, and ideology formation.

Thesis Overview

My first chapter provides background on the context of the population control movement and the World Bank as an institution. It traces the history of thinking about population from Malthus's treatise on population in 1798 to Paul Ehrlich's publication of the *Population Bomb* 170 years later. It highlights how concerns about population were in fact often concerns about increasing numbers of the marginalized, from Malthus's resentment of the poor relying on state welfare in the 18th century to Ehrlich's concerns about the proliferation of people living in slums in Delhi. It chronicles how such concerns were naturally incorporated into ideas about development, as Americans became more and more concerned about poor black and brown bodies abroad (and those that seemed to be infiltrating their country). This chapter also looks at the history of the World Bank and the development of the new postwar economic order that allowed for such population concerns to flourish. It uses the conceptualization of the Bank as an embedded liberal institution in order to aid in an analysis of the Bank's capitalist ideology. Ultimately, these two phenomena came together in the involvement of institutions like the Bank in population planning, fitting together naturally as population policies were used as an instrument of capitalist expansion built on the backs of the bodies of the marginalized.

The second chapter engages in a close reading of World Bank texts to establish the ways in which capital formation was carried out through population policies. It examines the Bank's own explanation of its rightful place in population planning in order to address how institutions promoting free choice in terms of economic markets could simultaneously endorse more draconian, top-down social measures through family planning. It concludes that the answer lies in the liberal endeavor of capital formation: that is, while free choice is used rhetorically by liberals to promote their ideology, capitalism does not indeed promote the same ideals. What is

required for capitalist formation, in the view of capitalists from the United States and the Western world, was what was indeed pursued: superfluous hands needed not to come into existence in the first place. Furthermore, this chapter examines the specific ways in which the World Bank carried out population policy, including information, education, and communication campaigns as well as incentive schemes that further played into the logic of capitalism while engaging in the rhetoric of the free market. This chapter establishes the connection between population policy both conceptually and in practice to capitalist conceptions of development.

The third chapter centers on the 1974 Bucharest Conference on World Population in order to explore the linkages between population policy and economic ideology. This chapter zooms out to look at the international politics of the population debate and examine in broader terms the ways in which liberalism upheld population concerns even when confronted with disagreement from developing nations. Following the second chapter's examination of how the tools of population policy were used to aid in capitalist development, this chapter engages in how those tools were perceived and justified in a broader context. Significantly, it examines the fact that the only major challenge to population planning was brought about by those seeking a new economic order that differed from the Western-dominated capitalism promoted by the World Bank in order to reaffirm the ties between capital domination and population planning. This chapter also examines the cause of liberalism more broadly and holds that challenges to population policies failed because of the embedded liberal positioning of the World Bank. As I will explain, this context allowed for the institution to continue in its larger liberal aims of capitalist expansion while also providing a pressure valve for discontent from developing nations. Finally, this chapter examines the case of the Indian Emergency Period to discuss the limits of dissent in an environment dominated by liberal ideology, evaluating the ways in which the very

countries that sought to disrupt the overall economic system had also often internalized liberalism, as long as that liberalism was seen to benefit them. Throughout, the domination of liberalism allowed for the continued assertion of the necessity of population control, and consequently population policies persisted as a way of achieving capitalist development.

Ultimately, this story is of interest to those who wish to learn more about the expansion of capitalism abroad and the ways in which economic imperatives play out through the control of marginalized bodies. It is fundamentally a story of liberalism, and how governing ideologies are used, spread, and supported by the ruling class in order to hold on to power. Though population control advocates sometimes couched their concerns in scientific terminology, their beliefs were ultimately rooted in liberal ideology. Furthermore, the story of the World Bank's role in population is of continued relevance today, as international institutions continue to push liberalism and hegemonic ideas about development on countries throughout the world. The history analyzed in this thesis offers important insights into the ways in which liberal ideology harnesses and subverts people's most intimate decisions, and the ways in which this process is still ongoing.

Chapter 1: Origins of the Population Control Debate and Postwar Economic Institutions

The battle to feed all of humanity is over. In the 1970s and 1980s hundreds of millions of people will starve to death in spite of any crash programs embarked upon now.

Paul Ehrlich, *The Population Bomb*¹³

Introduction

In 1968, Paul Ehrlich published *The Population Bomb*, a “horrificing” book that predicted catastrophe borne from a population explosion.¹⁴ Too many hands and too many mouths would soon be vying for ever-scarcer resources, and there was no way out. As Ehrlich asserted, hundreds of millions would starve as the result of the ticking time bomb that was population increases. *The Population Bomb* detailed the dangers of world population growth and the necessity of a “population control” program that would regulate “the numbers of human beings to meet the needs not just of individual families, but of society as a whole.”¹⁵ In the opening of the book, Ehrlich described his personal experience with the perceived population problem “one stinking hot night in Delhi,” when, on a flea-encrusted bus, he passed through a slum.¹⁶ Enmeshed by throngs of people, Ehrlich characterized the Indians he sees as dirty, poor, and unsanitary, contributing to a “hellish” scene.¹⁷ Frightened by the mob he perceives around him, a new, visceral understanding of the population problem dawned on Ehrlich. Though Ehrlich had already expressed concerns over population growth in his academic work as a biologist, it was not until his experience in Delhi that he came to understand the problem “emotionally,” as well

¹³ Paul R. Ehrlich, *The Population Bomb* (New York: Ballantine Books, 1968), xi.

¹⁴ The American Biology Teacher, “Review: The Population Bomb by Paul R. Ehrlich,” *The American Biology Teacher* 31, no. 4 (April 1969): 267.

¹⁵ Paul R. Ehrlich, *The Population Bomb*, xi.

¹⁶ *Ibid.*, 2.

¹⁷ *Ibid.*

as intellectually.¹⁸ While Ehrlich acknowledged that “[o]ld India hands will laugh” at his experience, he nevertheless asserted that the masses of people he encountered in Delhi spelled disaster for the planet. Population increases in India, and across the globe, would come to imperil United States and endanger world stability.¹⁹ Reflecting on the prospect of worldwide calamity, Ehrlich urged the United States to intercede in the “plight of our less fortunate fellows on Spaceship Earth” in order to help both them and Westerners to survive.²⁰

Ehrlich’s opening salvo touches on some of the main themes that would come to characterize the population control movement his work helped to spark. Among them are the disdain for black and brown people worlds away who are seemingly multiplying so fast that they endanger the future of Westerners like Ehrlich. Accompanying this feeling is the desire to control this increase for the welfare of the multiplying, who will not be able to reap the fruits of capitalist modernity without limiting their numbers. Of course, the desire for population control also complements the wishes of Americans like Ehrlich who just wanted to be able to visit New Delhi without interacting with so many locals. Ehrlich’s parable also highlights one of the main motifs of population control—that is, the notion of control itself. Specifically, as he discusses the necessity of placing the good of the whole over the needs or desires of the individual, Ehrlich strikes a seemingly communitarian, anti-individualistic tone. This tone would seem to subvert the ideals of the fiercely free-market-touting United States, whose top officials and citizens would go on to spearhead population control programs carrying Ehrlich’s mantle. How, then, could this contradiction have come about?

¹⁸ Ibid., 1.

¹⁹ Ibid.

²⁰ Ibid., 3.

The Population Debate from Malthus to Ehrlich

Before we can fully explore this conflict, however, it is important to situate Ehrlich's experience within the broader historical context of concerns over population. Perhaps the most well known instance of similar population-based fears occurred a century and a half earlier. In 1798, Thomas Robert Malthus, an English pastor and political economist, published *An Essay on the Principle of Population*, instigating decidedly gloomy conversations about the dangers of population increases.²¹ Malthus's basic argument was as follows: "population, when unchecked, increased in a geometrical ratio, and subsistence for man in an arithmetical ratio."²² Consequently, the number of people on the planet would increase much more quickly than the food sources available to support them. Very soon, there would be more people on the planet than food to feed them. Such an occurrence seemed imminent, especially because of the advent of new technologies that were allowing humans to live longer than ever before. Like the population control advocates who would come after him, Malthus believed that this uncontrolled population growth, if unchecked, would inevitably lead to war and famine as large populations vied for ever-diminishing food supplies.²³ Such an end was the only way that a natural balance between humans and agriculture could be restored if society did not take swift action immediately.²⁴

Like some more modern advocates of population control, Malthus held a particular disdain for the poor, who he saw as primarily responsible for exacerbating the population

²¹ Though Malthus was a member of the clergy, the influence of religion on his work is complicated. Malthus dedicated some of his *Essay* to reconciling his theories with Christian theology, but much of this consideration seems teleological rather than inspired by Biblical precepts. For a more in-depth discussion, see D. L. LeMahieu, "Malthus and the Theology of Scarcity," *Journal of the History of Ideas* 40, no. 3 (July–September 1979): 467–474.

²² Thomas Malthus, *An Essay on the Principle of Population* (London: Joseph Johnson, 1798): Chapter 2.

²³ Thomas Robertson, *The Malthusian Moment: Global Population Growth and the Birth of American Environmentalism* (Rutgers, NJ: Rutgers University Press, 2012), 5.

²⁴ Kenneth Smith, *The Malthusian Controversy* (New York: Routledge, 1951), 6.

problem as underdeveloped individuals unable to restrain their sexual urges.²⁵ Malthus believed that one of the answers to the population problem was discouraging the poor from procreating, at least at their current levels. He consequently came out against England's Poor Laws, which, among other things, gave funds to the poor to bring the total income of laborers up to a subsistence level.²⁶ Malthus saw the Poor Laws as enabling an easier existence for the poor and consequently as a means of further encouraging unbridled population growth in the lower classes.²⁷ In an 1803 essay, Malthus discusses his belief that alms encouraged the growth of the population and destroyed natural checks and balances on human growth. The poor, assisted by the state, were allowed to reproduce without being forced to work to try to increase the food supply in conjunction.²⁸ Nor would they be forced to work difficult jobs in industry in poor conditions that might discourage the poor from reproducing in the first place; in Malthus's view, state support only incentivized further reproduction by the poor by making their lives livable.²⁹ He thus advocated for the abolition of poor relief, and accepted the possibility of individual hardship in order to enable the creation of a more stable world. Malthus's views worked in tandem with a contemporary ideology that posited that relief for the poor was a distortion of the free market and its natural checks and balances. A reform of the English Poor Laws in 1834 followed Malthus's arguments.³⁰ Here is one early example of population concerns working in tandem with capitalist ideology to manipulate the marginalized.

As we now know, Malthus's catastrophic predictions were wrong. Population did not increase to such an extent in the 19th century that the world descended into irreversible chaos.

²⁵ Thomas Robertson, *The Malthusian Moment*, 4.

²⁶ Albert Fishlow, "T.R. Malthus and the English Poor Laws," *Social Science* 33, no. 1 (January 1958): 46.

²⁷ Kenneth Smith, *The Malthusian Controversy*, 59.

²⁸ Anne Digby, "Malthus and Reform of the English Poor Law," in *Malthus and His Time*, ed. Michael Turner (London: Palgrave MacMillan, 1986), 157.

²⁹ Albert Fishlow, "T.R. Malthus and the English Poor Laws," 46.

³⁰ Anne Digby, "Malthus and reform of the Poor Law," in *Malthus past and present*, ed. Jacques Dupâquier, E. Grebenik, and Antoinette Fauve-Chamoux (London and New York: Academic Press, 1983), 97.

His mistake was twofold. First of all, Malthus could not envision the technological advances that would increase the availability of food, subverting his theory of stunted arithmetic growth. Perhaps more importantly, Malthus did not recognize the human tendency to have smaller families as peoples' social welfare increases.³¹ It would turn out that famine, war, and disease were not the only possible checks on population, but that the individual choice to have fewer children was even more powerful. The 19th century saw many people, after reaching a higher standard of living, choosing to have fewer children and thus slowing the population growth Malthus so urgently argued against. However, this was not a solution Malthus could have foreseen, given his profound disdain for the poor. For Malthus, continued suffering seemed to be the only thing that would adequately convince the poor to abandon their large families. Government aid or sponsored employment would only erroneously encourage their growth.³² In fact, the common tendency to have smaller families as standards of living increased would prove to be the most powerful force in population control—not repressive policies or a dismissal of the welfare of the poor.

For the most part, Americans did not share in Malthus's pessimistic views as his ideas proliferated in the beginning of the 19th century. In the 1800s, Americans saw an abundance of national resources as their "birthright," and rarely invoked Malthusian fears.³³ In the 1890s, Malthusian concerns began to crop up when the closing of the frontier made Americans worried about limits to their prosperity and resources.³⁴ However, these fears were short-lived. Malthusianism only seemed to gain serious ground after World War I, when, as the United States

³¹ Betsy Hartmann, *Reproductive Rights and Wrongs: The Global Politics of Population Control* (New York: Harper & Row, 1987), 14.

³² *Ibid.*

³³ Thomas Robertson, *The Malthusian Moment*, 5.

³⁴ *Ibid.*, xiii.

was pulled further and further into world affairs, such issues took on a global, feverish tenor.³⁵

Americans felt a sense of concern over the birth rates of the rest of the world, though their views had a variety of results. Some population control advocates were nativists who wanted a reduction in nonwhite numbers, while others advocated for family welfare and economic wellbeing.³⁶ The issues of the perceived population explosion were made even more real to Americans during the 20th century, as immigration boomed and non-Western Europeans increasingly arrived on domestic shores.³⁷ Along with them, Malthusianism arrived in America.

Just before their arrival, Malthus's beliefs had contributed to a new understanding of man's place in the world, working to complement the increasingly popular fields of eugenics and social Darwinism. Late 19th century work on the importance of genetics in determining human characteristics created an environment in which the socially undesirable were deemed irreparably objectionable.³⁸ Progressives concerned with creating better citizens endorsed a eugenics that would limit the procreation of those they deemed unfit to reproduce.³⁹ Growing from the founding of the Eugenics Record Office, opened in 1912, eugenicist thought peaked in the 1920s and 1930s, the same period in which Malthusianism began to gain ground in the United States.⁴⁰ Eugenics was soon codified as official policy across the country. Starting with mandatory sterilization laws for the mentally challenged in Indiana, 30 other states would pass similar measures to ensure "better breeding."⁴¹ This terminology reveals eugenics' roots in social Darwinism, which held that only the "fittest" should survive and be allowed to direct the future

³⁵ Ibid., xiii.

³⁶ Ibid., 6.

³⁷ Matthew Connelly, *Fatal Misconception: The Struggle to Control World Population* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2008): 10.

³⁸ David Cullen, "Back to the Future: Eugenics—A Bibliographic Essay," *The Public Historian* 29, no. 3 (Summer 2007): 164.

³⁹ Ibid., 165.

⁴⁰ Ibid., 163.

⁴¹ Ibid.

of the human species.⁴² It is no surprise that Malthusian and eugenicist and social Darwinist ideas grew concomitantly: Malthus's ideas of a growing population facing the limits of natural scarcity influenced Charles Darwin's theory of evolution and natural selection in 1859.⁴³ Indeed, Darwinian interpretations of humanity often serve as a vehicle for Malthusian views on population, and accompanied some of the more repressive strains of thought that would use population concerns to commit violence against the marginalized.⁴⁴

One might assume that the Holocaust, with the German search for *lebensraum* and concern over the overpopulation of people deemed inferior, would mark the end of eugenicist and Malthusian thought in the countries that fought so hard to defeat the Nazis. Adolf Hitler was clearly following a Malthusian logic in his political agenda; a passage of *Mein Kampf* has echoes of Malthus and foreshadows of Ehrlich. Hitler states, "The annual increase of population in Germany amounts to almost 900,000 souls. The difficulties of providing for this army of new citizens must grow from year to year and must finally lead to catastrophe, unless ways and means are found which will forestall the danger of misery and hunger."⁴⁵ Hitler found a way to avert this supposedly imminent prospect: through war and genocide. However, in the United States, the Holocaust, instead of being viewed as the culmination of racist, eugenicist strains of thought, was perceived by neo-Malthusians merely as a political endeavor. Population control as a larger movement would continue to exist, though it was reframed slightly as a "family friendly" and rational, scientific means of controlling still-exploding populations.

As people sought answers for why World War II occurred in the years after it ended, overpopulation was sometimes viewed as a cause of the conflict rather than a rhetorical tool used

⁴² Gloria McConaughy, "Darwin and Social Darwinism," *Osiris* 9 (1950): 397.

⁴³ Peter Vorzimmer, "Darwin, Malthus, and the Theory of Natural Selection," *Journal of the History of Ideas* 30, no. 4 (October-December 1969), 527.

⁴⁴ Thomas Robertson, *The Malthusian Moment*, 5.

⁴⁵ Adolf Hitler and J.V. Murphy, *Mein Kampf* (London: Hurst and Blackett, 1981): Chapter 4.

by the aggressors. This view was supported by two popular academics and environmentalists at the time, Fairfield Osborn and William Vogt.⁴⁶ In 1948, Osborn, a zoo-keeper, published *Our Plundered Planet*, a landmark environmental work that posited human populations could grow so large that there would not be enough available resources to clothe, feed, and house them. William Vogt, an ornithologist, published *Road to Survival* that same year, which viewed technological progress as a destructive force responsible for depleting the earth's resources and enabling population growth. Together, these phenomena would result in an earth without enough resources to feed growing global populations. Both books popularized ideas of conservation and are landmarks of the early environmental movement, and highlighted the destructive force of man in ecological equations.⁴⁷ Osborn and Vogt's views that some of the world's worst problems could be attributed to increasing numbers allowed them to blame WWII on overpopulation and the exploitation of resources.⁴⁸ They, too, endorsed a logic of population that victimized the underprivileged.

Biological thinking was thus mobilized for use in population debates. Indeed, it was often prominent biologists and ecologists who advanced some of the most popular arguments warning of increased population, from William Vogt and Fairfield Osborn to Paul Ehrlich. Ideas about carrying capacity, popularized in the 1930s, held that an environment could only support a specific quantity of any given species before scarcity required that some of that species would have to die in order to ensure long-term survival. Ecologists, working off the thesis that animals depended upon a largely immutable natural environment, were naturally concerned about population pressures and the fear that overpopulation would, as in the natural world, lead to mass

⁴⁶ Thomas Robertson, *The Malthusian Moment*, 37.

⁴⁷ Ibid.

⁴⁸ Ibid.

death.⁴⁹ As we have seen, such ideas were bolstered by and themselves supported eugenics and social Darwinism. Only the best should be encouraged to reproduce in such a system, and the rest, in keeping with natural laws, should be allowed to die off (or, more humanely, be prevented from being born in the first place). Indeed, Vogt himself was a proponent of the use of population policy to reduce the number of the world's poor in order to maintain long-term survival: as he stated, international organizations should not give food to millions of Indians and Chinese, who were ““ignorant, backward peoples,”” to keep them alive only to have them die soon after as their increasing numbers depleted limited resources.⁵⁰ In response, Vogt held that food aid must be tied to contraception. Ecological concerns, like the theories of Darwin years prior, were thus mobilized to support increased control over people's bodies, especially those in developing nations.

The context of decolonization would allow for the amplification of such concerns in the 1950s and 60s.⁵¹ In the late 1940s, India, Pakistan, Burma (Myanmar), Korea, and Indonesia won their independence; in 1954, Vietnam, Laos, and Cambodia gained independence; and in the late 1950s and early 1960s, forty countries, mainly in Africa, established themselves as independent states. This wave of decolonization drew more attention to decolonized nations, and, consequently, to worldwide poverty. American foreign policy soon concerned itself with this phenomenon. As people in these newly sovereign nations began to demand development and better standards of living, their appeals reached the United States, where new philanthropic organizations began to work on their behalf and academics established fields like development economics.⁵² Furthermore, as part of this decolonization, a new spotlight was put on natural

⁴⁹ Ibid., 40.

⁵⁰ William Vogt, quoted in Thomas Robertson, *The Malthusian Moment*, 53.

⁵¹ Thomas Robertson, *The Malthusian Moment*, 62.

⁵² Ibid.

resources. They were no longer concentrated in the hands of industrialized nations who held onto colonies as fonts of raw materials. Now, natural resources were being divided into what seemed to be more and more disparate hands. These concerns were compounded as growth in Third World countries exceeded expectations.⁵³ It seemed as if there were more and more threats to scarcer and scarcer resources, and many hands abroad reaching for goods those in First World nations did not believe they could spare.

Advances in health and prosperity after the end of WWII, in conjunction with decolonization, further amplified concerns about population increases, both at home and abroad, encouraging a marked increase in renewed Malthusian thinking.⁵⁴ In the United States, 1 billion people were added to the world's population between 1930 and 1960, and another billion-person increase came between 1960 and 1976.⁵⁵ At home, the Baby Boom meant that American population was growing at startling rates. For decades, the American population growth rate had been declining, reaching a low of 10 percent in the 1930s. Strikingly, it climbed to 18 percent in the 1950s during the baby boom. American population doubled in just 50 years, from 100 million in 1917 to 200 million in 1967.⁵⁶ The 1960s also saw unprecedented growth in population abroad; in this time period, world population grew as much as it had from 1800 to 1900.⁵⁷ As previously stated, population growth worldwide occurred at an unprecedented pace, in large part because of new technologies like antibiotics and DDT, public health programs, and improved sanitation.⁵⁸ The world was growing larger and larger, and it seemed as if no one could control exploding populations.

⁵³ Ibid., 64.

⁵⁴ Matthew Connelly, *Fatal Misconception*, 99.

⁵⁵ Ibid.

⁵⁶ Thomas Robertson, *The Malthusian Moment*, 7.

⁵⁷ Ibid., 65.

⁵⁸ Ibid., 64.

Consequently, as people debated how population growth could be limited, a central issue came to be who should be prevented from reproducing, and who should be allowed to go forth and multiply. The population control movement of this time period was thus very much in touch with its eugenicist roots, as can be demonstrated by the two major population-focused organizations of the time, the Population Council and the International Planned Parenthood Federation (IPPF). Though John D. Rockefeller III founded and presided over the Population Council as its president, its day-to-day operations were managed by Frederick Osborn, who also served as the director of the American Eugenics Society.⁵⁹ Indeed, the first draft of the Population Council's mission statement held that it would aim to promote an environment in which "parents who are above the average in intelligence, quality of personality, and affection will tend to have larger than average families."⁶⁰ The Population Council was extremely influential in population debates; it provided especially crucial guidance to the United Nations and helped develop and fund the UN's first World Population Conference in 1954. Similarly, Planned Parenthood also featured a focus on eugenics; C.P. Blacker, a member of the Eugenics Society, helped draft IPPF's constitution.⁶¹ After all, the organization had grown out of a clinic opened by Margaret Sanger, herself a eugenicist concerned about population explosions.⁶² The origins of the population control movement in eugenics is important, especially in the context of growing concerns over the multiplication of marginalized peoples in countries dominated by what Blacker would deem "dysgenics."⁶³ The answer to the debate, then, seemed to be that the underprivileged, both at home and abroad, must be the primary focus of population control.

⁵⁹ Matthew Connelly, *Fatal Misconception*, 159; Wolfgang Saxon, "Frederick Osborn, A General, 91, Dies," *New York Times*, January 7, 1981.

⁶⁰ Matthew Connelly, *Fatal Misconception*, 160.

⁶¹ *Ibid.*, 106.

⁶² Thomas Robertson, *The Malthusian Moment*, 71.

⁶³ Matthew Connelly, *Fatal Misconception*, 106.

Development assistance, naturally, became one realm in which ideas about population control could be expressed. President Lyndon B. Johnson was one of the greatest proponents of population control, especially as it applied to those in other, nonwhite countries. Convinced by a RAND Corporation study that held that children in Third World nations had negative economic value, Johnson once declared to the United Nations that ““five dollars invested in population control is worth a hundred dollars invested in economic growth.””⁶⁴ In 1966, Congress passed the Foreign Assistance Act, which earmarked funds from the U.S. Agency for International Development (USAID) for population control programs. USAID consequently set up an Office of Population to handle the immense funds now at its disposal to limit population growth.⁶⁵ Development aid thus became a primary outlet for population concerns.

This assistance was especially important in a Cold War context that placed the United States in opposition to Communism. Hugh Moore, the millionaire founder of the Dixie Cup Company turned population activist (and the first person to use the phrase “The Population Bomb”), wrote to Rockefeller that “Communists [use] hungry people in their drive to conquer the earth.”⁶⁶ Moore endorsed the increasingly popular idea that Communists spread their ideology by appealing to hungry masses restless for revolution. Insofar as economic development was a tool of anti-Communism, population reduction would be an important part of such development by limiting the number of dissatisfied hungry people.⁶⁷ Moore viewed overpopulation, like the atomic bomb, as a military threat. This notion, in the context of Cold War policy that viewed Third World nations as dominoes in a struggle for worldwide dominance, made population control policy a powerful tool of the capitalist West. Population policy was thus

⁶⁴ Lyndon B. Johnson, quoted in Robert Zubrin, “The Population Control Holocaust,” *The New Atlantis* 35 (Spring 2012): 34.

⁶⁵ *Ibid.*, 36.

⁶⁶ Hugh Moore, quoted in Thomas Robertson, *The Malthusian Moment*, 88–89.

⁶⁷ Thomas Robertson, *The Malthusian Moment*, 90.

taken up by the U.S. government and foreign aid organizations that saw it as a necessary component of foreign policy.

That is not to say that all eugenic concerns or population worries were directed outwards. These ideas were also used to target undesirable population growth within U.S. borders, as we have seen with sterilization laws in the United States in the 1930s. Similar policies were implemented to prevent the multiplication of marginalized peoples as concern grew in the 1960s. In 1966, Secretary of the Interior Stuart Udall used Medicaid funds to set up sterilization programs at Indian Health Services hospitals.⁶⁸ Sterilizations were often performed without consent, and were performed in startling quantities. One Native American physician estimated that up to 25 percent of native women of childbearing age had been sterilized by 1977.⁶⁹ The U.S. Office of Economic Opportunity executed comparable programs in poor, primarily black regions of the United States. Additional U.S. government efforts also targeted Puerto Rico, where a mass sterilization program was supported by federal funds from the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. This effort sterilized close to one-third of child-bearing-aged Puerto Ricans.⁷⁰ Population concerns were thus used to target poor black and brown bodies both within and outside the United States

So, it is in this context that population concerns became an overriding focus of intellectuals and elites within the United States, and how Paul Ehrlich, a Stanford biologist, could pen a book about population explosions that could climb to the top of the bestseller list. Among concerns about population growth, environmental depletion, and the growing numbers in the Third World, a movement based on the limitation of reproduction would arise. This movement, from its inception, featured a focus on controlling the bodies of the marginalized.

⁶⁸ Robert Zubrin, "The Population Control Holocaust," 34.

⁶⁹ Ibid.

⁷⁰ Ibid, 35.

Increasingly, in the context of Cold War politics, it accompanied the spread of a liberal ideology that necessitated increased control over the seemingly restless and dangerous poor, who themselves represented a bomb set to explode at any moment.

Bretton Woods and the Postwar Financial Order

Indeed, this Cold War context also featured an important development in the financial world. As the postwar period unfolded and the United States grappled with perceived population problems, a new economic order was being constructed. This development—the establishment and evolution of an international economic order based on the Bretton Woods Agreements—would likewise significantly impact how the United States interacted with other nations. The institutions established at Bretton Woods, most notably the World Bank, would come to serve as agents of capitalist expansion across the globe.⁷¹ Largely spearheaded by the United States, and with continued influence from U.S. actors, the Bank would work to lead other nations toward a liberal, capitalist modernity in a way that fit with the ideologies and priorities of the Western world. Population policies would come to be a significant piece of this project. The World Bank's perspective on the population debate is ultimately rooted in its history as an embedded liberal institution for which capitalist economic development was the only path to prosperity.

In July 1944, forty-four nations met at Bretton Woods, New Hampshire, to discuss a framework for the postwar international economic system and the establishment of two institutions that would be charged with shaping it.⁷² These were the International Monetary Fund (IMF) and the World Bank (initially established as the International Bank for Reconstruction and

⁷¹ Samir Amin, *The Liberal Virus: Permanent War and the Americanization of the World*, trans. James H. Membrez (New York: Monthly Review Press, 2004), 82.

⁷² Edward S. Mason and Robert E. Asher, *The World Bank Since Bretton Woods* (Washington, DC: Brookings Institution Press, 1973): 1.

Development).⁷³ The United States was largely responsible for much of the system established at Bretton Woods, as the United States was in a powerful position as the only feasible source of funding for its establishment after World War II.⁷⁴ Politicians and economists from the United States were heavily influenced by the lessons of the Great Depression, and hoped to establish a postwar order in which such a downturn could be prevented or, at the very least, mitigated. In order to avoid the situation experienced by the country during the Great Depression, in which no unilateral actions were sufficient in restoring international demand and trade, the United States joined other nations in establishing a system of balanced foreign exchange rates that could withstand similar economic upheavals.⁷⁵ Initial conceptions of the Bank viewed it as an institution that would work in conjunction with private enterprise to stimulate capital investment. It would work to supplement the movement of private capital, providing a safety net for private funds to move into distant and seemingly perilous investment opportunities.⁷⁶

The World Bank's Articles of Agreement, its founding document, laid out a structure that would position the Bank as the sponsor of a capitalism that guaranteed the economic dominance of Western nations. The Bank was charged with "promot[ing] private foreign investment" through guaranteed loans.⁷⁷ In cases in which private capital was difficult to obtain, the Bank would supplement private investment by offering loans to help in countries' reconstruction and overall development. Its efforts to promote "international investment [in] the development of the

⁷³ Cheryl Payer, *The World Bank: A Critical Analysis* (New York: Monthly Review Press, 1982), 21; the World Bank Group, as it is currently known, would come to be after two new organizations were created: the International Finance Corporation, created in 1956, and the International Development Association. These organizations would come under the umbrella of the World Bank Group along with the IBRD. See: Cheryl Payer, *World Bank: A Critical Analysis*, 24.

⁷⁴ Cheryl Payer, *The World Bank: A Critical Analysis*, 22.

⁷⁵ Robert W. Oliver, *Early Plans for a World Bank* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton Studies in International Finance No. 29, September 1971), 4.

⁷⁶ *Ibid.*, 5; Cheryl Payer, *The World Bank: A Critical Analysis*, 22.

⁷⁷ "International Bank for Reconstruction and Development Articles of Agreement," *World Bank Group*, as amended effective February 16, 1989, Article I.

productive resources of members” would allow the Bank to “assist ... in raising productivity” in nations abroad.⁷⁸ This growth was a necessary precondition for capitalist expansion, and a way in which the Bank could in good faith collect on the loans it offered.⁷⁹ Indeed, at this time the State Department, whose ideas were reflected in the ultimate structuring of the Bank, hoped to establish an international system of free trade and capital movement.⁸⁰ That this capitalist development would be carried out unevenly was nearly guaranteed by the structure of the Bank provided for in the Articles of Agreement. The Conference established a voting structure for the Bank based on a weighting system that gave a greater voice to the already powerful—nations with large economies.⁸¹ From the beginning, then, the World Bank was set up to serve as an agent of development in the service of capitalist expansion from a vantage point favorable to Western nations, specifically the United States.

Though it is often treated as such, the World Bank’s capitalist bent should not be taken as a given expected of any institution interested in economic development, but as reflective of its Western, largely U.S.-led roots. The Bank, from its founding and throughout its history, has largely served as an instrument of U.S. control over international finance. The World Bank’s headquarters are located in the United States, just blocks away from the White House, the Department of the Treasury, and myriad think tanks and institutions firmly rooted in the American perspective. Furthermore, the Bank’s president has always been a U.S. citizen, and its only language of business is English.⁸² The United States has continuously held the largest share of votes in the organization, as voting rights are based on the size of donations from member

⁷⁸ Ibid.

⁷⁹ Muhammad Yunus, “Preface: Redefining Development,” *50 Years is Enough: The Case Against the World Bank and the International Monetary Fund*, ed. Kevin Danaher (Boston: South End Press, 1999), ix.

⁸⁰ Ngaire Woods, *The Globalizers: The IMF, the World Bank, and Their Borrowers* (Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 2006), 21.

⁸¹ Ibid., 22.

⁸² Robert Hunter Wade, “US Hegemony and the World Bank,” 203.

states. The World Bank's staff is firmly situated within United States-based ideologies regarding capitalist development, with most Bank economists—U.S. citizens and non-citizens alike—holding post-graduate qualifications from American universities. Though the United States often tries to avoid revealing any sort of explicit governmental influence in Bank policy, it does at times intervene in situations that could work to subvert U.S. foreign policy.⁸³ Even beyond such explicit connections, however, the Bank's positioning within U.S.-based free trade, capitalist ideology continues to guide its trajectory and lending philosophy.

The World Bank's initial charge was postwar reconstruction in nations especially hard hit by WWII's destruction. However, its Articles of Agreement stipulated that after this goal was completed, it would pivot to developing the resource base and productivity of nations, with a special emphasis on less developed nations.⁸⁴ In this way, the Bank could responsibly serve as a bridge for foreign investment's movement into less developed nations across the globe, establishing their economies as safe harbors for Western finance. This would become an increasingly important imperative as the Bank's operation in a Cold War context made loans to developing nations that were purportedly susceptible to Communist influence more urgent and a greater focus of Bank policy.⁸⁵ This dynamic became especially apparent as more and more nations joined the Bank; its membership increased from 45 founding countries to 139 nations by mid-1981.⁸⁶ Many of the countries that would come to join the Bank were those in the process of decolonization, and the Bank sought to play a significant role in their transition, with a special eye towards ensuring that they did not turn towards Communism. The Bank did this by facilitating sustained resource extraction through capital controls and the coordination of private

⁸³ Ibid., 204.

⁸⁴ Edward S. Mason and Robert E. Asher, *The World Bank Since Bretton Woods*, 2.

⁸⁵ Devesh Kapur, John P. Lewis, and Richard C. Webb, *The World Bank: Its First Half Century, Volume 1* (Washington, DC: Brookings Institution Press, 1997), 10.

⁸⁶ Cheryl Payer, *The World Bank: A Critical Analysis*, 24.

investment in nations that were decolonizing. This allowed the Bank to foster neocolonialism by establishing a system in which powerful nations from the Global North were able to dictate the trajectories and economic structures of former colonies.⁸⁷ Notably, an economic trajectory dictated by the United States' perspective, including an insistence on free trade, would continue to benefit the nations that were former colonizers. This was evident not only in the Bank's mission and activities, but also its administrative structure. Many ex-colonial officers took posts within the Bank as their old jobs became obsolete or untenable in postcolonial regimes.⁸⁸ Its roots and beginnings in a Cold War context have shaped the Bank's development as an emissary of Western capitalism.

Indeed, Bank employees have sought to promote private capitalist enterprise since the Bank's founding. In the 1950s, employees focused on expanding the Bank's ability to provide loans to private enterprise within member nations.⁸⁹ George Woods, who took over as president of the Bank in 1963, used the Bank's International Finance Corporation to further promote private investment. Though in the past the Bank had sometimes given unenthusiastic support to the development of some nations' public sectors, in a marker of the Bank's preference for private sector development, Woods used the Corporation to promote non-state-owned, capital-intensive projects in industry.⁹⁰ Robert McNamara, who became World Bank president on April 1, 1968, similarly emphasized the importance of Bank lending in promoting private development. Though advised that land reform would be an important facet of development in rural areas, McNamara resisted such a move as too radical and antithetical to Bank goals of promoting private

⁸⁷ Sardar M. Anwaruddin, "Educational Neocolonialism and the World Bank: A Ranciéan Reading," *Journal for Critical Education Policy Studies* (July 2014): 144

⁸⁸ Cheryl Payer, *World Bank: A Critical Analysis*, 24.

⁸⁹ Devesh Kapur, John P. Lewis, and Richard C. Webb, *The World Bank: Its First Half Century*, 12.

⁹⁰ *Ibid.*, 15.

enterprise.⁹¹ In the Bank's most marked shift toward a full embrace of a strict interpretation of capitalism, McNamara would propose the idea of structural adjustment loans and a renewed emphasis on private sector dominance.⁹² Structural adjustment loans stipulated that countries receiving funds break down trade barriers, reduce public sector involvement in the economy, and emphasize private investment and increased capital flows.⁹³ As these structural adjustment loans proliferated in the 1980s, the World Bank was able to pivot towards a wholly neoliberal ethos. As Paul Cammack has concluded, the World Bank's history has been that of establishing an orthodoxy "faithful to the disciplines required for capitalist accumulation on a global scale."⁹⁴ A U.S.-led World Bank has served largely as an instrument of capitalist expansion.

The Bank's role as an overall capitalism-promoting organization that at times allowed for public sector development can be explained by the embedded liberal framework established by political scientist John Ruggie. Ruggie argues that the specific form of liberalism that dominated after World War II can be referred to as "embedded liberalism." This system was overwhelmingly liberal in its endorsement of free trade, but was also embedded in social institutions and norms. Embedded liberalism was the result of a compromise between free trade proponents in the United States and critics of unfettered capitalism who believed in Keynesian interventions both within the United States internationally.⁹⁵ The World Bank is a prime example of an embedded liberal institution, with perhaps a greater emphasis on the *liberal* given the domination of the United States government at Bretton Woods.⁹⁶ Indeed, the Bank's initial

⁹¹ Ibid., 18.

⁹² Ibid., 22.

⁹³ Nirupam Bajpai, "World Bank's Structural Adjustment Lending: Conflicting Objectives," *Economic and Political Weekly* 25, no. 14 (April 1990): 791.

⁹⁴ Paul Cammack, "Neoliberalism, the World Bank and the new Politics of Development," in *Development Theory and Practice: Critical Perspectives*, eds. Uma Kothari and Martin Minogue (New York: Palgrave, 2002), 157.

⁹⁵ John Gerard Ruggie, "International Regimes, Transactions, and Change: Embedded Liberalism in the Postwar Economic Order," *International Organization* 36, no. 2 (Spring 1982): 393.

⁹⁶ Ibid., 398.

founding was guided in part by free traders as well as those interested in increased state intervention in the economy (including John Maynard Keynes himself), who saw the World Bank as providing important scaffolding for the development of global economic governance.⁹⁷ Many people involved in the negotiations tried to elevate the voices of Southern states, and assert their right to intervene and shape their own economies. Ultimately, the Bretton Woods negotiations were a striking example of how demands from more interventionist Keynesian schools of thought could be incorporated into an overall liberal framework. This allowed for the preservation of liberalism's goals while simultaneously mollifying dissenters by embedding said liberalism within Keynes's social context.⁹⁸ Throughout, however, it is important to note that the ideology of capitalism was upheld, even as it absorbed the demands of its opponents into the establishment of a more stable liberal order.

The Bank's position as an embedded liberal institution helps to explain its complex relationship with member nations. In light of its mission as an organization dedicated to poverty alleviation and its country-funded financial structure, the Bank, in order to function, must take input from members in order to maintain credibility and make the minimum concessions necessary to preserve their acquiescence.⁹⁹ Indeed, the World Bank continuously engages in self-criticism in response to external pressures from developing nations.¹⁰⁰ In this sense, the World Bank has not solely served as an instrument of pure U.S. direction; at least, it has made an effort to appear accountable to all member nations. However, as we will see, this accountability had serious limits within the context of an overwhelmingly liberal governing ethos.

⁹⁷ Ngaire Woods, *The Globalizers*, 21.

⁹⁸ Eric Helleiner, *Forgotten Foundations of Bretton Woods: International Development and the Making of the Postwar Order* (Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, April 2014), 2.

⁹⁹ Marcia Annisette, "The True Nature of the World Bank," *Critical Perspectives on Accounting* 15, no. 3 (April 2004): 304.

¹⁰⁰ Devesh Kapur, John Lewis, and Richard Webb, eds., *The World Bank: Its First Half Century*, 10.

Indeed, this self-criticism and embedded liberalism allow the Bank to address the “hegemon’s dilemma.” As established by Paul Cammack, the Bank’s intertwinement with the United States means that the World Bank must find some way of justifying its hegemony that does not make its domination seem unfair. The Bank is forced to balance the appearance of democratization among member countries and *de facto* domination by the United States.¹⁰¹ In order to harmonize these two objectives, the hegemon convinces participants that some system of rule, devised and implemented by the hegemon, offers benefits to all or most participants (and that any alternatives present worse possibilities). This can be seen in the case of the World Bank in its promotion of private investment and capital control. The hegemon also must convince participants that the rules of the system will be applied equally to all participants, including the hegemon itself.¹⁰² This is also evident in the international financial order promoted by the World Bank, which advocates for the lowering of tariffs in developing nations. Though these same rules purportedly also apply to the United States, they did not when the United States was industrializing—and indeed, such protectionism was likely a significant source of prosperity.¹⁰³ However, these tools are important in justifying Bank governance, especially given its overall liberal embeddedness.

Even as the Bank has grown, adapted, and justified itself, it has continued to serve as an agent of liberal hegemony. The Bank’s mission, size, and activities have changed immensely

¹⁰¹ Robert Hunter Wade, “US Hegemony and the World Bank: The Fight over People and Ideas,” *Review of International Political Economy* 9, no. 2 (May 2002): 203.

¹⁰² Paul Cammack, “Neoliberalism, the World Bank and the new Politics of Development,” in *Development Theory and Practice: Critical Perspectives*, eds. Uma Kothari and Martin Minogue (New York: Palgrave, 2002), 157.

¹⁰³ See, for example, Michael Lind’s discussion of the protectionism provided for by economic nationalism. As Lind discusses, from 1866 to 1883, an important time of industrial buildup, the United States implemented policies of extreme protectionism by implementing tariffs of 45 percent on manufactured goods on average. This accompanied some of the highest levels of U.S. economic growth in the nation’s history: GNP increased by 2.1 percent between 1870 and 1890, and the United States grew to be one of the world’s premier industrial powerhouses. Michael Lind, “The Op-Ed History of America,” *The National Interest* no. 37 (Fall 1994): 20.

from its Bretton Woods origins.¹⁰⁴ By 1981, the Bank had an administrative budget of \$410 million alone coordinating commitments of over \$13 billion in 76 countries.¹⁰⁵ That said, the Bank's structural role as a guarantor of capital and staunch believer in capitalist development has not changed. It is this broad definition of the Bank—that of an agent of capitalist growth, rooted in Western power and perceptions—that will be used in my analysis of the Bank's population policies and role in the population control debate in the 1970s and 1980s.

Population and Its Relationship to World Bank Capitalism

These two historical evolutions—the population control movement and the establishment of the World Bank and its development ideology—worked in tandem. Population control, along with the rise of embedded liberal institutions like the World Bank that consistently promoted capitalist expansion, became intertwined as population increasingly became a focus of development. It is the complementary nature of these two ideologies that is of especial interest. As we have seen, dating back to the days of Malthus, population control proponents have believed that the poor eat up the world's resources (sometimes literally), thereby jeopardizing humanity by elevating the prospect of famines and political chaos. The World Bank and similar Western institutions extended this logic to ideas about development. The World Bank was concerned because the poor were not just unfairly devouring food supplies but, in their view, also wasting the resources needed for capitalist prosperity. In order to achieve development, in the Bank's neo-Malthusian view, the only solution was limiting the numbers of the world's poor.

Ultimately, the Bank's involvement in population control debates can be traced back to its foundational liberal ideology and situation in a U.S.-based ideology that promoted a Western-

¹⁰⁴ Johnathan Pincus and Jeffrey Alan Winters, *Reinventing the World Bank* (Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 2002), 2.

¹⁰⁵ Cheryl Payer, *The World Bank: A Critical Analysis*, 15.

dominated mode of capitalism as the only path to prosperity. Indeed, given that capitalism relies on the exploitation of cheap labor from the marginalized, often black and brown people in far-flung colonies, excess people were valuable as long as they were producing for the metropole.¹⁰⁶ However, as soon as independence movements began and developing nations looked to foreign aid for support (or, worse, advocated for an international redistribution of wealth), these people were looked on as excess and unnecessary by those from already-industrialized nations. Another argument could be made that mortality-reducing advances in public health made it so there were “too many people” even for capitalist exploitation. Surplus laborers were no longer positioned as an important reserve to keep wages low, but a potentially dangerous revolutionary force if large enough numbers of people were kept idle.¹⁰⁷ Consequently, the productive value of these workers declined, and liberal logic held that this unemployment was an incontrovertible fact of an independent market. As such, the humane option to liberal institutions like the World Bank would be preventing these people from being born in the first place.

The embedded part of the Bank’s position as an embedded liberal institution did allow for some dissent from the nations themselves, however. This phenomenon ultimately only strengthened the Bank’s position, facilitating some disagreement while absorbing such concerns into a larger liberal framework. This allowed for the continued legitimacy of the Bank’s interventions while offering a release valve for dissatisfied member countries. This would be most prominently shown at the 1974 Bucharest Conference on World Population, which failed to achieve any real change in approaches to population due to the Bank’s overwhelmingly liberal embedding. Furthermore, this ideological liberalism, tied into larger beliefs about what modernity should look like, was so pervasive that it was even internalized by nations themselves.

¹⁰⁶ Edward Green, “U.S. Population Policies, Development, and the Rural Poor of Africa,” *The Journal of Modern African Studies* 20, no. 1 (March 1982): 47.

¹⁰⁷ *Ibid.*

Consequently, the Bank was able to take concerns into account without allowing them to change its conceptions of liberalism or modernity, which were at the heart of its population projects. In this way, the population control debate was doomed to only ever go in the direction the Bank, with its capitalist foundations, allowed.

It is not clear, however, that population was the overwhelming problem developed nations thought it was. For one, insofar as population related to resource depletion, people in developing nations consumed less of the world's resources per capita than the developed world. It is perhaps not surprising that people in developing nations would desire more children, given that children mean a different thing for the poor than the wealthy. For the poor, especially subsistence farmers, who make up much of the world's poor, children help provide food and income, especially in old age. For them, it is rational to desire more children—this actually increases their wealth and household productivity.¹⁰⁸ Indeed, even at the time of the population debates, such a view was endorsed by popular academics like Julian Simon, who argued that population had the potential to improve rather than weaken the economy.¹⁰⁹ Population concerns were thus not rooted in simple fact or obvious phenomena, but in liberal ideology.

Even when faced with these conflicting viewpoints, and evidence that the population policies espoused by institutions like the World Bank were not supported among the populace in the nations they targeted, concern over population in development persisted.¹¹⁰ These policies continued to be justified through a capitalist logic reliant upon free trade rhetoric and the support of a dominant liberal hegemon. As we will see, the World Bank went to great lengths to justify its intervention into population and pursued many population policies that ultimately violated the

¹⁰⁸ Ibid.

¹⁰⁹ Paul Sabin, *The Bet: Paul Ehrlich, Julian Simon, and Our Gamble over Earth's Future* (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 2013), 79.

¹¹⁰ Rickie Solinger and Mie Nakachi, eds., *Reproductive States: Global Perspectives on the Invention and Implementation of Population Policy*. (Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press, 2016), 23.

bodily autonomy of its subjects. Undergirding its sometimes back bending logic and cruel implementations of population control policies was the desire for capitalist expansion that would prove dominant over the desires of the people in developing nations and the reticence of targeted women.

Chapter 2: The World Bank and Population Control

Short of thermonuclear war itself, population growth is the gravest issue the world faces. If we do not act, the problem will be solved by famine, riots, insurrection, and war.

Robert McNamara, President of the World Bank, 1984¹¹¹

Introduction

In the late 1970s through the 1980s, the notion of a population “bomb” came to fruition not in the form of mass famines or resource wars but as population control policies. Indeed, if the notion of a population bomb was initially meant to connote the strategic danger of uncontrolled population increases in developing countries, the population policies of this period were similarly used as weapons in the struggle for capitalist expansion. As has been demonstrated in the previous chapter, population policies naturally became of concern to advocates of development, who worried dissatisfied idle hands could jeopardize the stability and growth of a prosperous capitalist economy. The World Bank took this concern quite seriously, and population control became an important part of its campaign for capital formation and development across the world.

In this time period, perhaps the most significant agent of such policies was the World Bank. Growing from a concern for a supposedly imminently overcrowded planet that was often directed at poor, decolonizing nations, population policy naturally became of interest to the world of development, and population control consequently became a major concern for the World Bank. George Woods, Bank president from 1963 until 1968, was the first to make it a part of Bank policy in several cases.¹¹² In 1969, Robert McNamara, who took over as President of the

¹¹¹ Robert McNamara, quoted in Ronald Lee, “Becker and the Demographic Transition,” *Journal of Demographic Economics* 81, no. 1 (March 2015): 67.

¹¹² Matthew Connelly, *Fatal Misconception* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2008), 263.

Bank, continued to incorporate population concerns into development policy. His views were more extreme than Wood's: McNamara stated that he would prefer not to fund health care projects "unless it was very strictly related to population control."¹¹³ In McNamara's view, there was no reason to save lives in a world whose greatest threat was too many people. Consequently, McNamara concluded, "health facilities contributed to the decline of the death rate, and thereby to the population explosion."¹¹⁴ Additional lives would do more harm than good in terms of overall welfare and economic development; consequently, saving them had no place in Bank policy. And, indeed, the Bank's population policies were notable: in May 1976, the U.S. National Security Council acknowledged that the World Bank was "the principal international organization providing population programs."¹¹⁵ The World Bank accelerated its efforts, with a fair amount of success. By the last half of the 1980s, the Bank had lent over \$500 million to population projects.¹¹⁵

It was not always clear that the Bank had a rightful place in population planning, however. In 1968, McNamara announced that the World Bank would mobilize increased resources and attention to address the population growth problems of developing countries.¹¹⁶ Before this move, Bank lending took into account countries' population in development planning, but evaluated such factors as givens alongside climate and natural resources. By 1968, however, the Bank had concluded it could "no longer remain a neutral spectator in the population field."¹¹⁷ This move was at first controversial, in part because, according to the Bank, developing nations erroneously believed that the Bank would make general development loans conditional upon the requirement

¹¹³ Ibid.

¹¹⁴ Ibid.

¹¹⁵ Ibid.

¹¹⁶ George P. Cernada, "Draft of Population Handbook," December 9, 1977, Records of the Population, Health and Nutrition Sector, Folder ID 1047028, Reference Code WB IBRD/IDA 89, Miscellaneous – Population Handbook, World Bank Group Archives, Washington, DC.

¹¹⁷ Ibid.

that states implement population reduction programs.¹¹⁸ The World Bank held that this was not true, though among the criteria it used to evaluate the eligibility of countries for new loans were their population trends and family planning programs. The Bank moved forward even among the mixed reaction caused by the “political sensitivities ... aroused by any suggestion from the outside that a country’s population was growing too fast.”¹¹⁹ In 1969, it established the Population Projects Department, which would help countries prepare population projects for financing. In 1970, the Bank made its first population loan to Jamaica.¹²⁰

The Bank’s entrance into population planning begs a crucial question. How could the World Bank, an institution that was founded on ideals of capital formation and frequently utilized the rhetoric of free markets and liberal democracy, simultaneously endorse policies that sought to control some of the most intimate decisions of people’s lives?¹²¹ Part of the problem lies in a fundamental contradiction of the way in which people speak about capitalism. A language of liberal and, eventually, neoliberal ideology proliferated in the 1960s, reaching its zenith in the 1980s, at the same time population questions grew and flourished.¹²² The World Bank was an arbiter of capitalism, and as such used this language, with its emphasis on free markets and individual liberties, as part of its belief in its founding liberal ideology. Nevertheless, this language seemed to contradict the World Bank’s behavior in the realm of population.

However, capitalism and the free market are in fact distinct entities, connected by the popular imagination rather than economic truths. Capitalism lends itself to immense concentrations of wealth and monopolies. On its own, it does not encourage truly “free” markets

¹¹⁸ Ibid.

¹¹⁹ Ibid.

¹²⁰ Ibid.

¹²¹ “International Bank for Reconstruction and Development Articles of Agreement,” *World Bank Group*, as amended effective February 16, 1989, Article I; See, for example, Samir Amin, *The Liberal Virus: Permanent War and the Americanization of the World*, trans. James H. Membrez (New York: Monthly Review Press, 2004).

¹²² Noam Chomsky, “Free Market Fantasies: Capitalism in the Real World” (lecture given at Harvard University, Cambridge, MA), April 13, 1996.

in which competition and choice reign supreme.¹²³ As political economists have shown, there is no such thing as a free market. Noam Chomsky has pointed out that governments always pick winners and losers, and deregulation is not an endorsement of the invisible hand but a policy meant to preference corporations. Indeed, the free market generally exists only for the poor, and is often merely a concept invoked by elites to justify their subjugation to the specter of capital.¹²⁴ In reality, protectionism and intervention have oftentimes been the root to prosperity, as Ha-Joon Chang argues. Starting in the 1960s, many Western officials, especially in the United States, started recommending “free-trade, free-market policies in the honest but mistaken belief” that those were the means by which they reached prosperity, working backwards from ideology to evidence.¹²⁵ Their imposition of free trade rhetoric thus works as a way in which they “[kick] away the ladder” to development.¹²⁶ This is all supported by the language of capital, which emphasizes the importance of free choice while not, in fact, allowing for it.

Capital, as opposed to ideologies of freedom, easily allows for state or para-governmental forms of control over populations. In fact, it often requires it. People should be put to work, and when there are not enough surplus-producing jobs for the number of people who exist, the humanitarian solution is to simply prevent them from being born in the first place. Population control programs followed this logic of capital. Instead of redistributing the wealth to provide for those alive, which would require land reform and income redistribution, institutions like the World Bank instead blamed excess populations for a lack of prosperity.¹²⁷ That is not to say that the World Bank as a whole and every individual within it was motivated by some nefarious

¹²³ For an in-depth discussion of capitalism’s tendency towards accumulation in the hands of the few, see: Thomas Piketty, *Capital in the 21st Century* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2013).

¹²⁴ Noam Chomsky, “Free Market Fantasies: Capitalism in the Real World.”

¹²⁵ Ha-Joon Chang, *Bad Samaritans: The Myth of Free Trade and the Secret History of Capitalism* (New York: Bloomsbury Press, 2009): 12, 16–17.

¹²⁶ *Ibid.*, 16.

¹²⁷ Betsy Hartmann, *Reproductive Rights and Wrongs: The Global Politics of Population Control* (Boston, MA: South End Press, 1995), xv.

desire to harm people in developing countries. For individuals who buy into the logic of capitalism, as many who worked at and continue to be employed by the World Bank do, the idea of population control is benevolent. It supposedly has the potential to reduce the number of sick and suffering people in the world, and frees up resources to lift up those remaining. However, blaming poverty on human numbers effectively “hold[s] the poor responsible for their own misery.”¹²⁸ This strategy denies the role of global elites in creating and perpetuating poverty. Malthusians hold that “[t]he poor are born to their lot, and the only way out for them is to stop being born,” neglecting the very real role Western-dominated capitalism plays in perpetuating their poverty.¹²⁹

Thus, the simultaneous involvement of the World Bank and other Western institutions that preached free choice and liberty but also sought to control the intimate lives of huge numbers of people no longer seems paradoxical. It is in fact entirely compatible with the systematic dominance of capital, which employed free market rhetoric to justify itself. Through “demand creation;” incentive schemes; and information, education, and communication (IEC) programs, the World Bank pursued population control, grooming communities to make themselves available for efficient and swift capitalist exploitation.

The World Bank’s Entrance into Population Planning

As previously stated, the Bank was an important population actor, starting with its initial programs in the 1960s that grew during the latter half of the twentieth century. Throughout its history, the Bank offered many potential reasons for its rightful place in population conversations. These reasons are varied and sometimes contradictory. The vast majority follow

¹²⁸ Ibid., 31.

¹²⁹ Ibid., 34.

tenets of free market logic, and are sometimes contradictory in their desire to justify intrusive programs with rhetoric that emphasized freedom above all. As the World Bank made its focus structural adjustment programs that mandated the spread of capitalism to developing countries, it was this context of capitalism that facilitated the Bank's participation in decidedly undemocratic and top-down maneuvering.¹³⁰ These ideas seem to contradict capitalism's rhetoric of free market economics, but are in line with its objectives of expansion and domination. Specifically, though the Bank claimed that its primary reason for examining population issues was the interrelation between population and development, its rhetoric, rationale, and proposed solutions indicate that it was a concern for capitalist order and not developing countries in particular that motivated it. Ultimately, the World Bank was acting as one part in a larger, increasingly mechanized capitalistic system that demanded it respond to what were perceived as population pressures that limited the resources capital could use to reproduce itself.

One way to examine the Bank's decision to involve itself in population control is to look at the Bank's own account of its entry into population discussions. The Bank highlighted the history of population in order to justify its place in population planning. In a population handbook published in 1977, the World Bank stated that the world had seen a population explosion similar to the one it was experiencing in the second half of the eighteenth century. It primarily attributed the population explosion during that period to a fall in the death rate, especially infant mortality, as a result of advances in the prevention and cure of diseases. The birth rate nevertheless remained at a high level, but eventually began to fall as people came to realize that fewer births were needed to produce a "normal" size family following a decline in infant mortality. The birth rate also fell because the Industrial Revolution brought about higher

¹³⁰ For a discussion of structural adjustment lending, see: William Easterly, "What did structural adjustment adjust?: The association of policies and growth with repeated IMF and World Bank adjustment loans," *Journal of Development Economics* 76, no. 1 (February 2005): 1–22.

incomes, increased educational levels, urbanization, and revised notions of traditional family sizes, all of which contributed to population decline.¹³¹

This interpretation leaves out important lessons learned from the fall of the Malthusian ideas that proliferated at the time of these population increases. It is well known that Malthus did not adequately account for the agricultural revolution and increases in food production.¹³² The World Bank's ignoring of this increase obviates the important consideration that in order to feed everyone in the world, one might instead turn to food production as the problem rather than the number of people themselves. If looking at this problem revealed that food production was sufficient, as many have argued was the case, the Bank could have instead looked to a more equitable distribution of resources.¹³³ Additionally, this interpretation ignores arguments that it is this population pressure that may have "spurred the institutional innovations which account for the rise of the Western world."¹³⁴ That is, population increases are not inescapable drains on productivity, as they allow new people to create and promote new ideas and innovations. However, a refusal to consider these interpretations allows for the continued supposition that population pressures cause unsolvable problems, which can only be prevented or solved by a reduction in populations themselves. In the World Bank's interpretation, it was only the eventual decision of families to have fewer children that saved the world from chaos and overpopulation. This paved the way for Bank intervention in order to bring the same developments to the low-income countries it targeted.

¹³¹ George P. Cernada, "Draft of Population Handbook."

¹³² Betsy Hartmann, *Reproductive Rights and Wrongs*, 15.

¹³³ *Ibid.*, 17.

¹³⁴ Douglas North and Robert Thomas, *The Rise of the Western World: A New Economic History*, quoted in Betsy Hartmann, *Reproductive Rights and Wrongs: The Global Politics of Population Control* (Boston, MA: South End Press, 1995), 15.

In the memo, the Bank went on to assert that a similar population explosion occurred over the 30–40 years preceding the Bank’s population report. Developing countries in Asia, Africa, and Latin America had experienced a comparable population increase due to the fall in the death rate. According to the Bank, this population increase, however, was “far more dramatic than its predecessor,” in part because of improved scientific advances that contributed to greater life expectancies, including the use of DDT, sulfa drugs, and penicillin to control malaria, pneumonia, and dysentery.¹³⁵ Though the Bank stated that the developing countries experiencing the population boom also could be on track to transition to more stable birth and death rates, the Bank rejected the notion that such a transition need occur without external interventions. On the contrary, it was necessary for exogenous actors like the Bank to involve themselves in the population questions of developing nations primarily because the rate of increase was still so high that it was a matter “of the highest urgency” to compress such a transition into the shortest period of time possible.¹³⁶ Only with such interventions would population problems possibly be made manageable in the future. This could reduce poverty without necessitating resource reallocation, all the while allowing for the exploitation of the people and land that remain.

The sense of doom expressed in the idea of an increasingly crowded society introduced in the Bank’s justifications is also indicative of the larger fears under which the Bank operated. This premonition contributed to a sense of urgency that focused on population rather than more general development concerns. The Bank devoted significant attention to the idea that population was increasing overly rapidly in the vast majority of its discussions of population issues. In a 1984 speech, Bank President Clausen stated that the international community could not wait for the natural decline in population that comes with industrialization in developing countries. For

¹³⁵ George P. Cernada, “Draft of Population Handbook.”

¹³⁶ Ibid.

one, the rates of population growth were “so much greater in the developing world than they were at comparable income levels in today’s developed countries.”¹³⁷ Furthermore, even small improvements could vastly decrease the number of people in the world even a few decades in the future. It was thus not enough to wait for a natural decline in population — the Bank must act immediately. The Bank concluded that “[w]orld population has grown faster and to higher numbers, than Malthus would ever have imagined” in a speech imploring the donor community, which was primarily made up of wealthy First World governments, to commit to sponsoring population reduction measures. These measures were the only way to potentially “evade the doom which Malthus saw as inevitable.”¹³⁸ It was important for the Bank to act, it seems, not primarily because of the development rationale it sometimes invoked but because of the urgent prospect of an overcrowded earth, and a concern for the chaos that such an influx would wreak on the wealthy as well as the poor.

It is no surprise, then, that forgoing an explicit focus on population reduction was an impossibility for the Bank. A 1977 memo addresses suggestions that the Bank and similar institutions and governments look toward socioeconomic development rather than strictly population policies as a more effective means of controlling birth rates.¹³⁹ A report put together after Bank representatives attended the International Population Conference in Mexico City in 1984 asserted that development strategies like “easing the most severe poverty, extending women’s education and employment opportunities, and improving maternal and child health”

¹³⁷ J. Grenfell, “Address As Prepared for Delivery By A.W. Clausen before the Population and Family Planning Seminar,” July 11, 1984, Folder ID: 30159500, ISAD(G) Reference Code IBRD/IDA 89, Policy and Research Unit – 14.2 – Population, Health and Nutrition [PHN] Input to Mr. Clausen Speeches – Volume 2, World Bank Group Archives, Washington, DC, 3.

¹³⁸ Ibid.

¹³⁹ George P. Cernada, “Draft of Population Handbook.”

were key to lowering birth rates.¹⁴⁰ According to the Bank, this could not be the only route, however—the Bank’s 1977 report called such a suggestion “a dangerous simplification,” as it would take too long for countries with booming populations to reach the socioeconomic level deemed by the World Bank to correspond to an adequately depressed birth rate.¹⁴¹ If left unchecked for too long, population would rise too quickly, only to stabilize at a projected 11 billion people. An expert panel appointed to evaluate the Bank’s programs stated that its efforts had as much effect as its general development lending. However, these were long-term strategies, and the Bank repeatedly expressed its desire that population be reduced immediately, for otherwise the results of compounding would lead to greater and greater increases. It stated that though its population efforts had not always brought about the results the Bank desired, even modest successes could have substantial impacts in the long run. The World Bank reached the conclusion that population was too important an issue, and too urgent a threat, not to act on immediately. Waiting for development on its own would not do.

Part of this fear of overcrowding stems from the identity of the people themselves who were having children. It has been established that much of the population control movement, and the history of family planning in general, finds its roots in a racist desire to control the reproduction of people of color. As demonstrated in Chapter 1, family planning shares a history with eugenics and coercive means of limiting reproduction, and the Bank did not diverge from this history—as is shown by the places in which it focused its efforts to limit population growth.¹⁴² In a discussion of population projections, a Bank report holds that the stabilization of fertility could result in a final population of 8 rather than 11 billion people. 90 percent of this

¹⁴⁰ J. Grenfell, “Address As Prepared for Delivery By A.W. Clausen before the Population and Family Planning Seminar.”

¹⁴¹ Ibid.

¹⁴² Matthew Connelly, *Fatal Misconception*, 8.

difference would come from developing countries, which the Bank presents as a frightening prospect.¹⁴³ In a discussion of the fearsome effects of population growth, President Clausen laments that rapid population increases could make Sao Paulo the second-largest city in the world by the year 2000, just after Mexico City. Furthermore, London, the world's second largest city in 1950, might not even be among the 25 most populous cities in the world by the end of the 20th century if action was not taken. Population growth was clearly an issue of the global South, despite the fact that population was rising worldwide at the time, and resource use primarily came from the Global North. Indeed, the World Bank defended against implications that population increases were problems in the North, as it was "better equipped to cope with the problem" of rapid increases. On the other hand, developing nations in the South would find themselves quickly descending into chaos and infighting.¹⁴⁴ According to the Bank, black and brown people were not in the position to be able to handle conflicts arising from population increases appropriately. The potentiality of growing masses of people from the Global South was used to incite fear, while population growth and resource depletion in the North was accepted. It thus became excusable to target the bodies of people of color for control.

Indeed, this idea of overcrowding was especially frightening given that it could lead to "rising unemployment and increasing landlessness" capable of "overwhelm[ing] social and political institutions" and plunging nations into "irreversible chaos."¹⁴⁵ In a 1978 speech, President McNamara laments that the global population, at the time about 4 billion, was unlikely to stabilize at less than 8 billion, even with the concerted efforts of the World Bank. The implications, he argued, were severe, and could threaten "global food supplies, energy

¹⁴³ George P. Cernada, "Draft of Population Handbook."

¹⁴⁴ J. Grenfell, "Address As Prepared for Delivery By A.W. Clausen before the Population and Family Planning Seminar."

¹⁴⁵ Ibid.

requirements, ecological pressures, and an already massive problem of absolute poverty.”¹⁴⁶

Rather than question the unequal distribution of resources that caused poverty, the Bank blamed problems that could potentially arise from increasing numbers of people on the people themselves. This mirrors what Betsy Hartmann describes as the Malthusian tendency to legitimize the status quo: “If poor people are rising up, it is only because their numbers are rising too fast.”¹⁴⁷ When the poor start to demand their rights be given priority over the right of capitalist expansion, global elites fear such “political instability,” blaming it on overpopulation.¹⁴⁸

This desire to blame poverty on overpopulation reflects suggestions that McNamara looked to population reduction as a development strategy partially because it was simply easier than easing poverty.¹⁴⁹ Like the Green Revolution, which was initiated in the 1960s in order to assuage food shortages in the developing world through the use of chemical fertilizers, bioengineering, and heavy irrigation, population control served as a technical solution to poverty.¹⁵⁰ Organizations like the World Bank looked at cultural considerations and religious beliefs as malleable, especially when met with the supposedly modern and morally correct advocacy work of international institutions.¹⁵¹ They believed they could easily change opinions in developing nations and convince people to have smaller families through a variety of means. Above all, this was yet another approach to development that was able to preach prosperity

¹⁴⁶ “Remarks of Robert S. McNamara On the Occasion of Receiving the Tun Abdul Razak Foundation’s International Award,” Kuala Lumpur, Malaysia, June 10, 1978, Folder ID 1772447, ISAD(G) Reference Code WB IBRD/IDA 03, Robert S. McNamara Statements / Speeches – Statement 11, World Bank Group Archives, Washington, DC.

¹⁴⁷ Betsy Hartmann, *Reproductive Rights and Wrongs*, 34.

¹⁴⁸ *Ibid.*

¹⁴⁹ Devesh Kapur, John Lewis, and Richard Webb, eds., *The World Bank: Its First Half Century, Volume 1* (Washington, DC: Brookings Institution, 1997), 235.

¹⁵⁰ Kathryn Seby, *The Green Revolution of the 1960’s and Its Impact on Small Farmers in India* (Undergraduate Thesis, Environmental Studies, University of Nebraska – Lincoln: January 2010): 1.

¹⁵¹ Devesh Kapur, John Lewis, and Richard Webb, *The World Bank: Its First Half Century*, 235.

without actually extending it to all. The solution would be found in reducing the number of people who share in wealth, not redistributing it or creating it. Furthermore, the solution would make increased resources available for capitalist expansion rather than the maintenance of a larger population.

The necessity of Bank intervention in population control, then, was based on a fear of dramatic population increases, resource shortages, political instability, and a general antipathy toward wealth redistribution or structural global economic change. The Bank's justifications fit well with the desire to expand capitalism abroad, limiting the number of people who are born poor rather than investing in social or state institutions that could redistribute resources both within and between countries. In this way, restrictive ideas about the ways in which population should be limited could be deemed compatible with its free market rhetoric, as both served capitalism and its ideology of liberty and choice.

Justifications of Population Control's Role in Development

The Bank still found that its focus on population did not fit well with its image as an organization primarily focused on the development and welfare of states around the globe. Accordingly, the World Bank spent significant time and resources justifying its involvement in population planning by linking population to development. According to the Bank, during the decades prior to its official consideration of population concerns in development evaluations, it became clear to development planners that large populations were hindering economic progress (though how this was made clear was not specified).¹⁵² A 1984 memo holds that development is affected by population growth, so "population policies covering fertility, mortality and morbidity,

¹⁵² George P. Cernada "Draft of the Population Handbook."

and migration must be part of development strategies.”¹⁵³ In a 1969 speech at the University of Notre Dame, McNamara declared in dramatic terms: “the greatest single obstacle to the economic and social advancement of the majority of the peoples in the underdeveloped world is rampant population growth.”¹⁵⁴ He went on to say that this must not preclude “more traditional forms of development assistance,” which would continue to be vital, but that such projects would inevitably fail without the alleviation of population pressure.¹⁵⁵ McNamara invoked images of hungry people, brain damage from malnutrition, housing shortages, and, ultimately, political chaos. These phenomena would eat up capital, which could not then be invested in the services the Bank deemed necessary for developing countries. In order to make new capital available to other segments of the economy, the World Bank had to reduce the number of people in the developing world. Only then could capitalist expansion be maintained. In a 1984 speech, Bank President A. W. Clausen reiterates the sentiment expressed by McNamara—that population growth “exacerbates the difficult choice between higher consumption now and the investment needed to bring higher consumption in the future.”¹⁵⁶ Both McNamara and Clausen see capital’s existence threatened by population, “dissipated by the ever rising tide of additional children.”¹⁵⁷ Justifications thus not only invoked the importance of lowering overall population for development purposes, but also the centrality and preeminence of capital in stimulating growth

¹⁵³ Barbara K. Herz, “Mexico International Population Conference – August 5-14, 1984,” Office Memorandum from Barbara K. Herz to PHN Staff, September 7, 1984, Folder ID 1103419, ISAD(G) Reference Code: WB IRBD/IDA 89, Mexico City – International Population Conference – Correspondence, World Bank Group Archives, Washington, DC.

¹⁵⁴ Robert S. McNamara, “Address to the University of Notre Dame by Robert McNamara, President, World Bank Group,” May 1, 1969, Washington DC: World Bank, available at <http://documents.worldbank.org/curated/en/296761468331758372/Address-to-the-University-of-Notre-Dame-by-Robert-McNamara-President-World-Bank-Group>.

¹⁵⁵ Ibid.

¹⁵⁶ J. Grenfell, “Address As Prepared for Delivery By A.W. Clausen before the Population and Family Planning Seminar,” July 11, 1984, World Bank Group Archives Identifier 30159500, “Policy and Research Unit – 14.2 – Population, Health and Nutrition [PHN] Input to Mr. Clausen Speeches – Volume 2.”

¹⁵⁷ Robert McNamara, “Address to the University of Notre Dame.”

and prosperity. They were thus engaging in a project of ideology, using and promoting capitalist “commonsense” in the shaping of their population policies.

According to the Bank, governments that must devote higher proportions of their resources to maintaining the needs of growing populations will have less to invest in improvements. This assertion is yet another example of the insidiousness of capitalist ideology on the Bank’s view of development. Rapid population growth in places in which jobs are not readily available and people are consequently not read as productive or valuable represented a drain rather than an asset to governments. These issues were especially pronounced in conditions in which much of the population was dependent on agriculture for subsistence. Increasing populations, according to the Bank, lead to the “overuse of limited natural resources, such as land.”¹⁵⁸ This left less land available for capital investment and profit. It further produced little surplus to use for reinvestment or expansion. Furthermore, rapid population growth impeded the industrialization process and trapped more people in the agricultural sector, compounding the problem of the limited availability of land needed for subsistence. According to the Bank, it was already evident that these issues were affecting the developing world. In Addis Ababa, Ethiopia, the price of increasingly scarce wood for fuel rose by a factor of 10 during the 1970s. In southern Asia, population growth and competition for land forced many people to settle near the Ganges River, even in locations especially susceptible to annual flooding. Of course, no mention was made of other factors in such situations, such as an incursion of privatization and neocolonialist policies. Rapid population growth consequently created both rural and urban economic and social problems “that risk[ed] becoming wholly unmanageable.”¹⁵⁹ Restoring population to a

¹⁵⁸ Barbara K. Herz, “Mexico International Population Conference – August 5-14, 1984.”

¹⁵⁹ Ibid.

smaller number that would not overburden land and natural resources, which then could be put to better use for capitalist expansion, was thus imperative.

Such motives also explain why the Bank was so concerned with migration. Migration is not clearly an important aspect for the population movement, as the basic movement of people across space does not affect the overall use of resources. However, migration is an outgrowth of the displacement involved in many capitalist processes, and the World Bank made it a priority to examine and control migration alongside other population considerations in an effort to control the bodies of those from the Global South. The Bank sought, in 1984, to examine the importance of illegal or undocumented migration in addition to labor migration. A big component of this concern stemmed from the “outflow of skills” from developing countries.¹⁶⁰ The Bank wanted to ensure that productive bodies stayed where they could produce profit, and out of other nations where such opportunities could be filled by Westerners. Though it “is indispensable to safeguard the individual and social rights of the persons involved” in such migratory movements, the Bank held that “it is also necessary to guide these different migration streams” in a way that would be economically beneficial.¹⁶¹ The Bank’s focus on migration further demonstrates its commitment to a worldview that prioritized capitalist production over human needs or desires. It was important that people be where development could exploit their skills and resources, and where capital could obtain such skills at a low price.

Overall, the Bank utilized justifications of development to allow for its participation in population control policies. Underlying its policies was the idea that Southern nations must develop in a decidedly capitalist manner that would leave the bodies of productive workers, and acres of productive land, available to return surplus to capital. With the Bank’s standing thus

¹⁶⁰ United Nations International Conference on Population, 1984, *Mexico City Declaration of Population and Development*, E/CONF.76/L.4 (August 13, 1984).

¹⁶¹ *Ibid.*

established, the question then turned to how it would be able to actually accomplish its goals of population reduction.

Demand Creation and Methods of Population Control

The next step in combatting the purported problem of population increases was finding a way to actually institute this change. As previously stated, the Bank made its first population policy loan to Jamaica in 1970. Population-related loans across all international institutions for population grew quickly—from \$250 million in 1960–1969 to \$1.5 billion from 1970–1976.¹⁶² Loans were mainly made for two purposes: the bolstering of health systems to get them to provide and distribute family planning devices and services, and the provision of information, education, and communication (IEC) activities.¹⁶³ The Bank quickly realized that providing for the supply of contraceptives and advice about family planning only reached those who wanted it. Rather than accepting that as a natural limit for the scope of its family planning efforts, the Bank decided that “it was necessary to create demand for family planning services.”¹⁶⁴ The Bank here was operating within a more liberal plane of neo-Malthusianism, but was working within Malthusian ideals nonetheless. Though the Bank’s stance “in favor of friendly persuasion” may seem harmless, it was seeking to control the reproduction of the present generation in order to provide for the expansion of capital.¹⁶⁵ In this way, the World Bank was embodying the compromise that led to its establishment as an embedded liberal institution, allowing for the promotion of capitalism without a full descent into its strict and draconian logic.

¹⁶² George P. Cernada, “Draft of Population Handbook.”

¹⁶³ Ibid.

¹⁶⁴ Ibid.

¹⁶⁵ Betsy Hartmann, *Reproductive Rights and Wrongs*, 39.

This rhetoric of demand creation through IEC campaigns warrants further investigation. First and foremost, it plays into ideas of market supremacy, positing population control policies as merely instruments that played within or amplified market forces. Individual choice would still determine the correct solution—namely, population reduction. IEC campaigns were based on “elitist assumptions” that posit that peoples’ behavior is not rational, and therefore with the proper education populations would choose the right solution: to have fewer children. Market supremacy as an idea, however, is in reality used here to institute the requirements of capital expansion. In reality, large families often were a rational choice in many developing countries.¹⁶⁶ Children’s labor is important in certain situations to offer additional income, emotional and economic support, and insurance for old age.¹⁶⁷ In Indonesia, for example, IEC campaigns advertised a 2-child family as happy and prosperous, a refrain repeated in many educational campaigns worldwide. There, as in many developing countries, the idea of a 2-child family was an out-of-touch Western approach to solving issues of poverty, and was wholly irrational for the reality on the ground.¹⁶⁸ Educational campaigns that sought to manipulate people to play into the desires of foreign institutions did indeed represent market interference, however. It was just that this interference was mandated by the logic of capital, which required that large populations of supposedly unproductive people who occupied productive land be discarded.

The Bank’s 1977 memo also advocated for the adjustment of public opinion in order to reinforce their family planning programs “so as to bring strong social pressure to bear on nonconforming individuals in closely knit communities.”¹⁶⁹ Such language advocating for quick, top-down changes in public opinion and “pressure” to coerce others into opinions held by

¹⁶⁶ Ibid., 6.

¹⁶⁷ Ibid., 7.

¹⁶⁸ Ibid., 64.

¹⁶⁹ George P. Cernada, “Draft of Population Handbook.”

international institutions like the World Bank seems to contradict the laissez-faire policy and individual freedoms it simultaneously espoused, all in the service of capital. Campaigns to increase social pressure are still manipulative as they introduce peer pressure into some of the most intimate aspects of peoples' lives.¹⁷⁰ Such campaigns also utilized a national elite in order to manipulate the opinions and beliefs of the poor. This does not necessarily even change the opinions of so-called "acceptors," but just forces them to succumb to the pressure of others, supposedly by their own free will. The Bank here once again utilized dubious educational campaigns in order to interfere in foreign nations in a way seemingly at odds with free choice and bodily autonomy. Ultimately, the Bank did so as an agent of liberalism ultimately pursuing capital's expansion.

Beyond this sort of educational propaganda, the Bank often engaged in incentive schemes to stimulate family planning "demand." These schemes were supported by Bank urging and funding, but were ultimately carried out by host governments or nongovernmental organizations (many of which were actually Western-based). The Bank stated that in 1985 that its policies "incentivize[d] birth spacing and termination."¹⁷¹ According to a 1984 memo, the Bank looked to incentives, which were used in multiple Asian countries at the time, including nations like Sri Lanka where payments for sterilization were official policy. The Bank did not see this as reducing personal freedom because it couched such policies in terms that portrayed incentive schemes as cultivating demand rather than stifling it. Furthermore, participants would be compensated "in a welfare sense" by the incentive payments "for the insurance and other

¹⁷⁰ Betsy Hartmann, *Reproductive Rights and Wrongs*, 69.

¹⁷¹ Nancy Birdsall, "PRD's Objectives," Memo to Mr. North, May 20, 1985, Records of the Population, Health, and Nutrition Sector, Folder ID: 1104167, ISAD(G) Reference Code WB IBRD/IDA 89, Policy, Health and Nutrition [PHN] Objectives – Correspondence, World Bank Group Archives, Washington, DC.

benefits of an additional child.”¹⁷² Incentive payments were thus economically efficient. Such incentives could “be used to encourage spacing and delay of marriage and of first birth, as well as to encourage stopping childbearing altogether.”¹⁷³ It is in this way—by phrasing their ideas in terms of laissez faire supply and demand—that the Bank could continue to operate within a logic of market supremacy without sacrificing its top-down, capital-oriented motivations.

Providing payment for changes in behavior is not, as scholar Betsy Hartmann points out, a “neutral tool of social engineering,” as its advocates would argue.¹⁷⁴ Though the people hired to advance incentive schemes and reach out to community members were called “motivators” and those who were convinced to change their family planning behavior were called “acceptors,” the situation was much less impartial than such terms suggest.¹⁷⁵ In practice, incentive tools are closer to means of coercion. For people who are extremely poor, the idea that sterilization or other birth control methods could be freely chosen in exchange for compensation is dubious.¹⁷⁶ Regardless, incentive schemes are not neutral market tools—for them to even be conceived as such requires hubris on the part of planners who believe that deep down, poor people who have too many children are behaving irrationally and universally want fewer children. Incentive schemes are clear examples of cultural and market interference, manipulating people in developing countries into behaving in a way acceptable to international institutions.

Furthermore, incentive schemes are by their very nature discriminatory. The Bank did offer a perfunctory disclaimer that “[l]egislation and policies concerning the family and programs of incentives and disincentives should be neither coercive nor discriminatory,” and,

¹⁷² Ibid.

¹⁷³ Nancy Birdsall, “PHNPR Work Program in Population,” Memo to John D. North, S. Denning, I. Husain, and E. Schebeck, November 30, 1984, Records of the Population, Health, and Nutrition Sector, Folder ID: 1104166, ISAD(G) Reference Code WB IBRD/IDA 89, Policy, Health and Nutrition [PHN] Work Program – Correspondence, World Bank Group Archives, Washington, DC.

¹⁷⁴ Betsy Hartmann, *Reproductive Rights and Wrongs*, 67.

¹⁷⁵ Nancy Birdsall, “PHNPR Work Program in Population.”

¹⁷⁶ Betsy Hartmann, *Reproductive Rights and Wrongs*, 67.

furthermore, “should be consistent with internationally recognized human rights as well as with changing individual and cultural values.”¹⁷⁷ In practice, its programs did not reflect such respect (this would require a much less involved approach overall). In some countries, such as in South Korea, incentive payments were only available to low income people in the first place.¹⁷⁸ Regardless of whether or not incentive policy explicitly targeted low-income individuals, such policies are by their very nature discriminatory, as offering cash or other payments for having fewer children or using birth control obviously targets those with less money who would be swayed by such offers. For example, in South Korea low-income “acceptors” were offered substantial cash payments for sterilization. They were given \$45 if they had more than two children, \$110 if they had two, and \$330 if they had one. Incentive schemes amplified the disparity between the rich and poor, as it was often the rich or people who are in a relatively more stable economic position who could afford to forgo benefits from incentive scheme payments.¹⁷⁹ In this way, incentive schemes serve to continue the subjugation of the poor for capitalist exploitation.

Incentives schemes easily lend themselves to coercion, as well. Motivators were often encouraged in their work to reach more people by a rewards system that provided monetary compensation for greater numbers of people reached.¹⁸⁰ World Bank supervision of incentive schemes in South Asia took the form of enforcing accountability and reaching targets rather than offering supportive training or advice.¹⁸¹ The use of quotas often led to health workers and family planners to choose not to disclose potential adverse health effects to “acceptors.”¹⁸²

¹⁷⁷ Barbara K. Herz, “Mexico International Population Conference – August 5–14, 1984.”

¹⁷⁸ Betsy Hartmann, *Reproductive Rights and Wrongs*, 69.

¹⁷⁹ *Ibid.*, 70.

¹⁸⁰ *Ibid.*, 67.

¹⁸¹ *Ibid.*, 64.

¹⁸² *Ibid.*, 65.

Follow-up care was seriously lacking, as targets often prioritized getting birth control users rather than ensuring their health or well-being.¹⁸³ The important thing was to reduce the number of children low-income people had; a concern for the autonomy or safety of users was a secondary concern, if it was present at all. Without an explicit concern for the health of women, encouragement for motivators in the form of fees and a disregard for the comprehensive health of acceptors led to pressure that more closely resembled coercion than an honest attempt to reward people who behaved in ways deemed acceptable to the World Bank.

Coercion itself is briefly discussed in a 1977 memo, which stated that some governments “have gone beyond the use of IEC [information, education, and communication].”¹⁸⁴ Many did so, as discussed above, simply by offering material incentives to keep families small, including ending tax breaks for children above a certain number and limiting maternity leave for more children. Others turned to more oppressive measures. The report discussed India as having utilized coercion by means of forced sterilization. It did not comment on the moral or economic effects of this behavior but instead pointed to the “hostile public reaction” as a barrier to such efforts.¹⁸⁵ Coercion is condemned as contradictory to public opinion and the Bank’s espoused values, rather than antithetical to its project of economic development. Furthermore, McNamara warned that without the family planning initiatives of institutions like the World Bank, tools of coercion would be the *only* viable means of controlling the people and resources left. If people wanted to enjoy their rights, ironically, they must engage in population control methods voluntarily, before they became mandatory. Either way, capital would require productive citizens only; those who took away from its gains were characterized as potential instigators of chaos.

¹⁸³ Ibid.

¹⁸⁴ George P. Cernada, “Cernada Draft of Population Handbook,” December 9, 1977.

¹⁸⁵ Ibid.

Ultimately, the Bank utilized the concept of free choice as a powerful rhetorical tool without actually engaging with its tenets. Despite its deployment of tools like incentives and coercion, the World Bank framed its family planning work in terms of rights in order to justify it. The Bank's report from the International Population Conference in Mexico City in 1984 stated that it was important that "[a]ll people have a right to information, education, and means to plan their families."¹⁸⁶ In a 1977 internal memorandum, one of the ways family planning policy was justified was by touting planning policy a way to enhance rather than constrain free choice.¹⁸⁷ The document advocated family planning centers' presentation of information about birth spacing (a commonly used term for birth control) "in the positive light of a means of improving the health of mothers and children, instead of in purely negative terms likely to offend religious and cultural susceptibilities."¹⁸⁸ The Bank tried to promote the positive effects of birth control without recognizing that to some, such efforts may run contradictory to home cultures or ideas. This emphasis focused solely on the right not to have children rather than a broader recognition of the right to bodily autonomy. The Bank used the free-choice language of liberalism to justify what were in fact extremely controlling policies. As shown above, it did not truly respect the innate rights of the people whose bodies it sought to regulate. Instead, it was after its own agenda that promoted the limiting the reproduction of people whose proliferation the Bank regarded as threatening. In this way, the Bank's activities were in line with capitalist rhetoric that promoted ideas of free market supremacy without actually producing a free market. The Bank ultimately pursued policies that furthered its agenda of capitalist expansion, and subjugated the bodies of people in developing countries to such an end.

¹⁸⁶Barbara K. Herz, "Mexico International Population Conference – August 5-14, 1984."

¹⁸⁷ George P. Cernada, "Draft of Population Handbook."

¹⁸⁸ Ibid.

Conclusion

Overall, the World Bank engaged in a variety of strategies to justify its activities in the realm of population control. The Bank's interpretation of population problems in the past and at the time of its population control programs' inception indicate a fundamental misunderstanding about the ways in which population operates and interacts with structural forces. This is amplified by the sense of doom the Bank feared further population increases could bring. Additionally, the Bank's interpretation of population's relationship to development furthered its misunderstanding of population's place as it related to economic growth. The Bank fundamentally believed that a pursuit of capitalist expansion was the best way to achieve development, and this belief led to its interpretation of population size in which excess (poor) people were a burden and threatening to global order. Finally, the Bank's pursuit of policies to solve the problems of population growth further indicates its deep espousal of capitalist ideals over those of bodily autonomy and respect. Though it used the rhetoric of the free market, the Bank ultimately sought to control the intimate lives of those in developing countries in order to cultivate an environment ripe for capitalist development.

Throughout, the conflict between a rhetoric and ideology of freedom of choice and the reality of capitalist control is apparent. This seeming cognitive dissonance can be explained by the logic of capital. It is ironic that capitalist expansion, often touted as part and parcel of an individualistic ideology, often resorts to coercive means in order to accomplish its goals. This is emblematic of a larger point: capitalism and the free market are not the same.¹⁸⁹ Capitalism is touted as promoting free market ideals, but in reality capitalist expansion requires liberty only for capitalists. The people on whom they rely for their surpluses are not necessarily subject to the same laws, though they are fed the same rhetoric—embodying the strategies used as part of the

¹⁸⁹ See: David Harvey, *17 Contradictions and the End of Capitalism* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2014).

hegemon's dilemma. The World Bank must make it seem as though all nations are subject to the same liberal, free-market ideas while promoting a capitalism that systematically devalues the freedom of choice of the marginalized. Population control is one example of this process. Justifications of population control were necessary in order to convince the public that the Bank was acting in an ideologically consistent manner—it was, in fact, though the ideology was not one of individual choice but of capitalist control.

The Bank's thought process and actions were based on elitist ideas of what an ideal (in their views, Western) capitalist society should look like. In reality, the people it targeted were behaving in an eminently rational manner, and regardless should have been allowed to choose their own paths without the manipulation of international institutions with priorities that were worlds away from the realities on the ground. The Bank's actions are worrying for many reasons, perhaps the most prominent of which is the use of the bodies of marginalized people as sites of control. As has been discussed above, the Bank only targeted low-income countries to reduce populations in the first place. Even within these countries, it could further discriminate using population policies that further targeted the poor. The Bank also put responsibility for population reduction on the shoulders of women, whose bodies were useful only insofar as they could produce limited and productive laborers. Discussions that highlighted the importance of elevating the status of women were presented as important only insofar as they were means to reducing population, and did not first and foremost recognize the necessity of promoting equality in and of itself. Throughout, it was the Bank's vision of modernity that reigned supreme.

However, in reality, the people in developing countries were not simple drains on resources. The World Bank based its interpretations on the simplistic belief that rapid population

growth slowed down increases in per capita incomes.¹⁹⁰ People actually both consume and create wealth and resources, especially when given the opportunity (in terms of education and jobs) to do so. However, to actually treat a new person as a positive force would require the redistribution of resources and state support in order to harness the potential of low-income people. This was an impossibility in a system that advocated for capital's supremacy, especially as the paradigm of structural adjustment began to flourish. Structural adjustment would end up taking the opposite route—causing hardships for the poor in its necessitation of public employment reductions, the elimination of price subsidies for essential commodities and services, and cuts in state expenditures for health, education, and welfare.¹⁹¹ The Bank viewed poor people as capital sinks, and sought to reduce the resources given to them accordingly.

A focus on population ultimately provided a way for the Bank to target and exploit development in a way that served the goals of capitalism. The concept of population “provide[d] a smoke screen behind which Third World governments and Western aid agencies [could] hide their failure to challenge the unequal distribution of wealth and power, which prevents broad-based economic development.”¹⁹² Whether or not individuals within the organization were motivated by legitimate humanitarian concerns and believed that this was truly the best way to promote well being and development, they were operating within a system of capital that saw bodies as valuable as long as they were productive in economically specific ways. As modern nations began to conceptualize bodies as social, available for use in political projects—the most important of which was to “boost economic development”—the bodies of the marginalized

¹⁹⁰ Betsy Hartmann, *Reproductive Rights and Wrongs*, 32.

¹⁹¹ M. Rodwan Abouharb and David L. Cingranelli, “The Human Rights Effects of World Bank Structural Adjustment, 1981–2000,” *International Studies Quarterly* (June 9, 2016): 233.

¹⁹² Betsy Hartmann, *Reproductive Rights and Wrongs*, 37.

became tools to be used for Western actors' ends.¹⁹³ Ultimately, population control substituted for true social justice, all the while upholding the status quo and promoting the interests of global capitalist elites who were searching for new markets and opportunities.

¹⁹³ Rickie Solinger and Mie Nakachi, eds., *Reproductive States: Global Perspectives on the Invention and Implementation of Population Policy* (Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press, 2016).

Chapter 3: 1974 Bucharest Conference: Development versus Population Control in the Context of Embedded Liberalism

“Development is the best contraceptive.”
Dr. Karan Singh, Indian Health Minister, 1974¹⁹⁴

“[F]or us, people, population are a development asset, the present history of continuing decolonisation is a great testimony of this ... the creative and over abundant power of the people to surmount all obstacles.”

-Tanzanian delegation, Bucharest Conference on World Population, 1974¹⁹⁵

Introduction

At the time, the 1974 World Population Conference held in Bucharest, Romania, seemed to represent a fundamental upheaval in the ways in which countries approached population. Despite insistence from powerful organizations like the World Bank that population control was a necessary good that would benefit not only developing countries but also those in industrialized nations, some from the Global South nevertheless resisted international population policy. This view largely stemmed not from a rejection of population policy itself or even the idea that population increases were not a bad phenomenon, but from a recognition that international population control efforts were part and parcel of a larger Western-dominated economic order that systematically disadvantaged the developing countries it purported to help. Though Western-led organizations like the World Bank continued to support population control programs from the 1960s to the 1980s, it is important to note that not all developing nations were wordlessly compliant with their prerogatives. In fact, the capitalist objectives behind the initiatives promulgated by the World Bank, as discussed in the previous chapter, were clearer to the nations who were being forced to undergo top-level change from the Global North. Their resistance is

¹⁹⁴ Karan Singh, quoted in Steven W. Sinding, “Overview and Perspective,” *The Global Family Planning Revolution*, ed. Warren C. Robinson, John A. Ross, 6.

¹⁹⁵ F.A.H. Mkini, quoted in Lisa Richey, “Family Planning and the Politics of Population in Tanzania: International to Local Discourse,” *The Journal of Modern African Studies* 37, no. 3 (September 1999): 460.

perhaps best highlighted by the 1974 Bucharest Conference on population policy, which saw the contention that population control measures, if they existed at all, should be a part of larger social and economic programs.¹⁹⁶

Ultimately, the Conference was but a blip in the history of population debates. Though it did lead to a greater emphasis on the social and economic aspects of economic development, it did not radically alter the population policies of institutions like the World Bank or USAID. Part of this comes from the resistance of these institutions, which wrote off the concerns of developing nations as misguided and misinformed. The World Bank's place as an embedded liberal institution and USAID's role as a more thoroughly liberal one allowed them to listen to the dissent at Bucharest without absorbing its lessons. Their adherence to liberal ideology meant that they believed population growth would only subvert the very aims of the NIEO nations, given that, according to them, population reduction was an integral part of the path to prosperity. In this way, embedded liberalism was working perfectly: as a safety valve that preserved the implementation and spread of liberal ideology. It assuaged conflict in a way that prevented any real revolt, and allowed for the continuing functioning of a liberalism that systematically devalued the bodies of the poor in developing nations.

This story, despite its anticlimactic end, is important because its trajectory is part of a larger narrative about liberal domination and its manipulation of bodies for political ends. First of all, the experience at Bucharest highlights the linkages between the population control policies proffered by the World Bank and its specific brand of Western capitalism. This is fundamentally evidenced by the fact that a rejection of the capitalist-promoting population policies that would

¹⁹⁶ H.J. Hunter, "The United Nations World Population Conference, 1974, with text of World Population Plan of Action; discussion outline, annotated references and commentary on social welfare services," 1978, *USAID*, available at http://pdf.usaid.gov/pdf_docs/PNAAH494.pdf.

disproportionately benefit the West were accompanied by the movement for a New International Economic Order. This movement argued for the transfer goods and services back to the developing countries that believed they had been cheated out of years of growth and opportunity by colonialism and neocolonialism, racism, and trade distortions. They were not rebelling against centralized planning nor free markets but Western imperialism, and a particular form of capitalism that extracted wealth from the Global South for profit in the Global North. It is thus logical that one of the most prominent instances of resistance to the new population regime of the West, which often manifested itself as a way of controlling people insofar as they were productive and valuable to Western-dominated capitalist growth, arose from a desire to counter the World Bank and the Bretton Woods regime.¹⁹⁷ These institutions' devotion to the liberal logic of economic advancement allowed for no real deviation from population control policies.

This episode also highlighted the hegemony of liberalism as emboldened by embedded liberal institutions. The conversations at Bucharest provided a temporary catharsis for Third World nations without fundamentally shifting power relations or economic ideologies. The embedded liberalism that established the World Bank (and the United Nations) as organizations with nominal room for poorer countries' input allowed for the recognition of developing nations' concerns without deviation from the liberal path. Indeed, the aftermath of the Conference demonstrated the pervasiveness of the liberal project supported by the World Bank. After the Conference ended, USAID and the World Bank rejected claims made by developing nations resistant to population control as misguided and uninformed. They continued to uphold the capitalist logic of population control, and lay the blame for the problems exposed at Bucharest with developing nations who misunderstood the true path to prosperity. However, they did this

¹⁹⁷ See: Adeoye Akinsanya and Arthur Davis, "Third World Quest for a New International Economic Order: An Overview," *The International and Comparative Law Quarterly* 33, no. 1 (January 1984): 208–217.

after taking into account the input of developing nations, allowing for their embeddedness to shield their liberal project.

Furthermore, the larger context of the Bucharest Conference demonstrated the pervasiveness of liberalism in various nations. Even though many countries supported a rejection of World Bank intervention into their population policies, they did not all themselves wholly reject the potential of intervening in population matters, as is evidenced by the Indian case after the Emergency Period. India, the nation whose delegation led the crusade against population planning with the slogan, “Development is the best contraceptive,” in fact implemented its own violent population control policies just after the end of the Conference. This example demonstrates the ways in which liberalism proved to be a pervasive and nearly inescapable influence. Even the nations that rebelled against a Western-dominated version of liberalism internalized ideals of liberal modernity in their own politics. Overall, these lessons from the Bucharest experience support the idea that population policy was part of a larger story about liberalism’s promises regarding the fruits of modernity, which elites utilized in order to bolster their own power over economies and bodies in order to achieve capitalist prosperity.

The New International Economic Order

As previously stated, an important component of the dissent at the Bucharest Conference stemmed from the endorsement of a New International Economic Order. In order to understand the New International Economic Order, it is also important to understand the old economic order—the one promoted by the World Bank and similar institutions in the wake of the Second World War. As discussed in Chapter 1, the World Bank’s establishment was part of a greater movement to reshape international finance after WWII, and the postwar order was dominated by

Western nations: primarily the United States, with some help from Western Europe. This system was dominated by three institutions: the International Monetary Fund, the World Bank, and the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade. Together, these institutions leveraged their power to confer great privilege on already-developed nations. Economic underdogs from Asia, the Middle East, Africa, and Latin America were relatively devalued and dismissed in the decision-making processes of such institutions, even though these decisions largely dictated the distribution of resources that would profoundly affect them.¹⁹⁸ Combined with an emphasis on a reduction in tariffs and private over public investment, Western development strategies often conferred great profit to the Global North while providing only marginal (or negative) advantages to the Global South. This led, according to developing nations, to a further imbalance in development and a difficult road to industrialization and self-sufficiency.

Throughout the 1960s, leaders from developing countries, in recognition of this economic inequality, decried the existing international financial system. In recognizing the imbalances it created, developing nations not only demanded an end to their structural disadvantage but also compensation for the favoritism shown to developed nations.¹⁹⁹ These desires were embodied in particular by the non-aligned movement (NAM), which stressed the preservation of national independence, sovereignty, territorial integrity, and the security of non-aligned countries. NAM was established at a conference in Belgrade, Yugoslavia, in 1961, with 25 founding countries.²⁰⁰ The idea of non-alignment came largely from then-Yugoslav President Josip Broz Tito who sought to establish an organization of states not allied to either the United States or the Soviet Union.²⁰¹ Not only seeking neutrality in the Cold War, these nations also came to advocate for

¹⁹⁸ Ibid., 208

¹⁹⁹ Ibid., 209.

²⁰⁰ *The Black Scholar*, "The Non-Aligned Movement," *The Black Scholar* 8, no. 3 (December 1976): 1.

²⁰¹ NTI, "Non-Aligned Movement," *NTI*, February 5, 2016.

self-determination regarding “political status” and “economic, social and cultural development.”²⁰² As part of this, NAM specifically argued that “efforts should be made to remove economic imbalance inherited from colonialism and imperialism” and that it is “necessary to close, through accelerated economic, industrial and agricultural development, the ever-widening gap in the standards of living between the few economically advanced countries and the many economically less-developed countries.”²⁰³

Non-aligned states met at Algiers in 1973, just one year before Bucharest, where they started to put together their demands for a New International Economic Order (NIEO).²⁰⁴ This meeting, and the seemingly revolutionary demands of the nations involved, was partially prompted by the 1973 success of oil-producing nations in achieving an increase in the price of oil through actions by the organization for Petroleum-Exporting Countries (OPEC). Beyond a political achievement, this action “represented a psychological breakthrough for the developing nations,” who realized the dependence of industrialized nations on the natural resources provided by them.²⁰⁵ The articulation of the NIEO was also prompted by “the economic upheavals” of the three years prior to the meeting, which featured the worst international recession since the end of World War II.²⁰⁶ Partially exacerbated by rising oil prices prompted by OPEC strategy, economic decline made it difficult for Southern nations to keep up with debt payments to the industrialized world, highlighting the inequalities of the global economic system.²⁰⁷ UN

²⁰² Non-Aligned Countries, “Belgrade Declaration of Non-Aligned Countries,” September 6, 1961, available at [http://pustakahpi.kemlu.go.id/dir_dok/01st%20Summit%20of%20the%20Non-Aligned%20Movement%20-%20Final%20Document%20\(Belgrade_Declaration\).pdf](http://pustakahpi.kemlu.go.id/dir_dok/01st%20Summit%20of%20the%20Non-Aligned%20Movement%20-%20Final%20Document%20(Belgrade_Declaration).pdf).

²⁰³ Ibid.

²⁰⁴ Robert W. Cox, “Ideologies and the New International Economic Order: Reflections on some recent literature,” *International Organization* 33, no. 2 (April 1979): 257.

²⁰⁵ Jason L. Finkle and Barbara B. Crane, “The Politics of Bucharest: Population, Development, and the New International Economic Order,” *Population and Development Review* 1, no. 1 (September 1975), 92.

²⁰⁶ Andre Gunder Frank, “Unemployment and World Crisis of Economic Policy,” *Economic & Political Weekly* 18, no. 22 (May 28, 1983): 969.

²⁰⁷ Ibid., 973.

Secretary-General Kurt Waldheim, in his annual report, stated that these events were interpreted as ““a profound malfunctioning of the global economy ... the basic efficiency of which has hitherto been more or less taken for granted even while its inequity was recognized and deplored.””²⁰⁸ The stage was set for a revolt against this economic structure.

Consequently, the Sixth Special Session of the United Nations resulted in the adoption of a Declaration on the Establishment of a New International Economic Order and an associated Programme of Action over the objections of a few developed nations, including the United States.²⁰⁹ The Declaration on the Establishment of a New International Economic Order proclaimed a “united determination to work urgently for the Establishment of a New International Economic Order based on equity, sovereign equality, interdependence, common interest and cooperation among all States ... which shall correct inequalities and redress existing injustices.”²¹⁰ Among other things, the Declaration built on the concept of postcolonial independence and the vulnerability of the developing world to argue for a respect for national sovereignty and full participation by developing nations in economic decision-making. The NIEO also advocated for “[f]ull permanent sovereignty of every State over its natural resources and all economic activities,” in a blow to international financial institutions like the IMF and the World Bank that sought to direct the economies and industries of debtor countries.²¹¹ The NIEO further demanded that future assistance, which would be necessary to reduce international inequalities, be “free of any political or military conditions.”²¹² It advocated for cooperation and technology transfers from industrialized countries to facilitate the development of the South in

²⁰⁸ Kurt Waldheim, quoted in Robin C. A. White, “A New International Economic Order,” *International & Comparative Law Quarterly* 24, no. 3 (July 1975): 542.

²⁰⁹ Jason L. Finkle and Barbara B. Crane, “The Politics of Bucharest,” 93.

²¹⁰ United Nations General Assembly resolution S-6/3201. *Declaration on the Establishment of a New International Economic Order*. A/RES/S-6/3201 (1 May 1974), available at <http://www.un-documents.net/s6r3201.htm>.

²¹¹ *Ibid.*

²¹² *Ibid.*

order to achieve these aims. The Declaration was adopted on May 1, 1974, and had a marked influence on the attitude and perceived political power of developing countries. However, it is notable that these nations were not rejecting capitalism but rather the Western imposition of a form of capitalism favorable to the Global North. Throughout, they reserved the right to pursue a capitalist version of liberal modernity on their own shores—what they were really requesting was an end to neocolonial domination and wealth extraction by institutions like the World Bank.

The NIEO would ultimately change the how developing countries reacted to the population interventions promoted by international financial institutions like the World Bank. Although population was not specifically mentioned in the NIEO Declaration, it was recommended that UN programs, including the 1974 World Population Conference, help contribute to the codification of the NIEO.²¹³ Furthermore, in keeping with their philosophy of deliberately placing themselves outside of the Cold War political struggle fought between hegemony, NIEO-promoting NAM nations would also break out of “Marxist vs. Malthus” dichotomy that Western nations thought characterized the population debate.²¹⁴ They did not see population as a neutral facet of the economy that could be adequately provided for by a Communist state, in keeping with Marx’s view, nor did they see population as potentially destructive force that would disrupt capitalist development, as per Malthus. Instead, non-aligned countries, in keeping with their stance as being explicitly outside the Cold War and debates of capitalist versus communist preference, saw the population debate as not really being about population at all. They instead viewed population in the context of a New International Economic Order that would not require policies that favored the capitalist West or the Communist East but the developing nations that had for so long been left out of the economic

²¹³ Carmen A. Miró, “The World Population Plan of Action: A Political Instrument Whose Potential Has Not Been Realized,” *Population and Development Review* 3, no. 4 (December 1977): 423.

²¹⁴ Jason L. Finkle and Barbara B. Crane, “The Politics of Bucharest,” 89.

decision-making arena. This would become especially apparent at the Conference on World Population held in Bucharest just a few months after the UN's adoption of the NIEO.

The 1974 Bucharest Conference

In 1970, the United Nations General Assembly requested that the Secretary-General proclaim 1974 the World Population Year, reflecting increased interest in population following the publication of Ehrlich's *Population Bomb*, as explored in Chapter 1.²¹⁵ Accordingly, 1974 would also feature a political conference on population, hosted in Bucharest, Romania. Bucharest was a 2-week long international conference with 1,200 participants from 137 countries.²¹⁶ No previous UN Conference had ever engaged so many diverse and numerous nations spanning various ideological divides.²¹⁷ It was almost inevitable that this would presage conflict. The setting of the Conference itself also served to highlight the divisions and debates to come. The Conference was held in Romania, a nation with a low fertility rate and pronatalist reactionary policy, highlighting the sheer variations of population policy around the globe.²¹⁸ Furthermore, Romanian President Nicolae Ceausecu used his opening address to highlight the importance of incorporating the NIEO into any consideration of population policy.²¹⁹ The stage was set for a contentious gathering.

Indeed, the World Population Conference presented a unique opportunity for nations

²¹⁵ Population and Nutrition Projects Department, IBRD, "The 1974 World Population Conference," May 6, 1974, World Bank Group Archives, available at <http://documents.worldbank.org/curated/en/867521468331034586/pdf/777170BR0SecM10B00PUBLIC00502401974.pdf>.

²¹⁶ Jason L. Finkle and Barbara B. Crane, "The Politics of Bucharest," 97.

²¹⁷ *Ibid.*, 98.

²¹⁸ It is ironic that Bucharest would be the site of a Conference that largely sought to limit population growth, given that at the time Romania was the only country in the world with explicit policies to encourage births. Ceausecu had implemented policies to discourage the use of birth control and had outlawed abortion. At the time the Conference was held, maternal mortality had reached new heights because of unsafe abortions. See: Matthew Connelly, *Fatal Misconception*, 310.

²¹⁹ Jason L. Finkle and Barbara B. Crane, "The Politics of Bucharest," 100.

from across the world to offer their own opinions on population policy. Bucharest was the first UN-sponsored conference not focused on the science and demography of population questions but rather policy. Though the United Nations had held conferences on population twice before, once in Rome in 1954 and once in Belgrade in 1965, both of those conferences were characterized by an “aseptic scientific manner.”²²⁰ That this “scientific” perspective did not result in controversy is not a testament to scientific objectivity but rather the one-sidedness of the scientific perspective, with many Western scientists holding the view that it was a given that it was desirable to reduce population targets.²²¹ The uniquely political positioning of Bucharest finally gave developing nations themselves a forum to challenge the so-called objectivity of these scientists and present their own views on population. For the first time, population conference attendees were not individual scientists and academics but government representatives and political leaders ready to engage in challenging debates about population policy.²²²

At the Conference, world leaders, primarily those from the developing nations that population policies sought to target, rallied under the slogans “Development is the best contraceptive” and “Take care of the people and the population will take care of itself.”²²³ To the planners of the Bucharest Conference, mainly professional staff at the United Nations who specialized in demographic issues, the eruption of concern over the NIEO came as a surprise.²²⁴ Though they were aware of the recent developments with the NIEO and the NAM countries that

²²⁰ Carmen A. Miró, “The World Population Plan of Action,” 422.

²²¹ Ibid.

²²² Population Division, Department of Economic and Social Affairs, United Nations Secretariat, *Fertility, Contraception and Population Policies*, April 25, 2003, ESA/P/WP.182, available at <http://www.un.org/esa/population/publications/contraception2003/Web-final-text.PDF>.

²²³ Adil Najam, “A Developing Country Perspective on Population, Environment, and Development,” *Population Research and Policy Review* 15, no. 1 (February 1996): 7.

²²⁴ Jyoti Shankar Singh, *Creating a New Consensus on Population: The International Conference on Population and Development* (New York: Earthscan, 1998): 6.

promoted it, they did not see a connection between NIEO demands and population issues. The “furious debate” that would erupt at the Conference came as a surprise to many of the technical advisers assisting governmental attendees and professional UN staff organizers.²²⁵

Major international institutions that had worked to prepare background materials for the Conference thought that their draft of population policy, which reiterated traditional concerns about reducing population in order to spur development, would be easily adopted by consensus at the Conference.²²⁶ Though most UN conferences proceeded in this way, with the UN spearheading a draft plan that would be adopted at the end of a conference with little or no major revisions in order to make the conference seem productive and efficient, Bucharest did not unfold in this manner.²²⁷ Even though some pre-conference deliberations did reveal the extent to which divisions could appear at the Conference, its planners did not think this would result in any major disruption of proceedings at the Conference itself. However, the participants in these meetings were not as high-ranking or even as political as the Conference’s actual attendees, and could not give an accurate preview of the desires of the political leaders of their countries at Bucharest.²²⁸

As might be expected, it was not easy for a group of nations so diverse in their opinions to reach consensus. As it became clear that developing nations would demand an NIEO, the Conference became polarized between Western nations involved in the formulation of the Draft Plan—namely the United States, the United Kingdom, Canada, and Germany—who felt that rapid population growth was an impediment to development, and Third World and socialist nations who sought an NIEO in order to address the fundamental problems they believed caused

²²⁵ Ibid.

²²⁶ Population and Nutrition Projects Department, IBRD, “The 1974 World Population Conference.”

²²⁷ Jason L. Finkle and Barbara B. Crane, “The Politics of Bucharest,” 94.

²²⁸ Ibid., 96.

undesirable population growth.²²⁹ It is telling that merely hearing the voices of the Global South, who were cut out of initial deliberations, was viewed as an unexpected upheaval. Developing nations advocated for a redistribution of wealth as they were convinced that population growth was an outcome of rather than a cause of insufficient development. They argued that if the West was truly concerned about overall resource usage, it would reduce its own excessive consumption and work to enrich the nations whose suffering could be attributed not to population problems but insufficient wealth.²³⁰ This opinion, as expressed by the allied Chinese delegation, reproduced NIEO language, making specific reference to the ““aggression and plunder”” of ““imperialists, colonialists and neocolonialists.””²³¹ According to China, solving population problems would involve addressing these NIEO issues by ““breaking down the unequal international economic relations, winning and safeguarding national independence, and developing the national economy and culture independently and self-reliantly.””²³² This opinion directly opposed the long-held stances of institutions like the World Bank, which thought population was a problem in and of itself. Reconciling these stances would prove difficult.

In total, the Conference’s main working group held 15 long meetings in the 8 days of the conference, and featured more than 50 votes.²³³ More than 200 amendments were proposed to the original draft text, some of which sought to completely gut initial wording.²³⁴ Ultimately, the World Population Plan of Action developed at Bucharest was marked in its emphasis on social

²²⁹ Ibid., 100.

²³⁰ Jason L. Finkle and Barbara B. Crane, “The Politics of Bucharest,” 105; indeed, this view of the West as a resource hog reflects the rooting of the population control movement in environmentalism discussed in Chapter 1, and was even partially supported by Paul Ehrlich, whose work in the Population Bomb mentioned the importance of a reduction in U.S. consumerism.

²³¹ Chinese delegation, quoted in Jason L. Finkle and Barbara B. Crane, “The Politics of Bucharest,” 106.

²³² Ibid.

²³³ Jyoti Shankar Singh, *Creating a New Consensus on Population: The International Conference on Population and Development*, 9.

²³⁴ Carl J. Hemmer, “Trip Report on World Population Conference: Bucharest, August 19–30, 1974,” September 4, 1974, Box 5, Central Decimal File 1974, Record Group 286: Records of the Agency for International Development, 1948–2003; National Archives and Records Administration, College Park, MD, 4.

and economic policy rather than the specifics of population control. Population was examined as a consequence of, rather than a reason for, stunted economic growth.²³⁵ Bucharest scrutinized the rationale behind family planning, launching a debate on whether population growth was a reason for depressed economic growth or if the reverse was true. The outcome was ultimately that development, and not measures of population control, was the World Population Plan of Action's (WPPA) main prescription for economic growth.²³⁶

World Population Plan of Action

The final World Population Plan of Action (WPPA), while impressive in its rhetoric regarding the necessity of the international redistribution of wealth, also contained remnants of the contentious debates that raged at Bucharest. Though it was peppered with references to the NIEO, it also featured sections that uphold the population policy status quo. Above all, the WPPA can be viewed as ineffective in that it does not clearly repudiate population policy as a means of control. A true recognition of the principles of the NIEO as they reverberate downward—that is, the redistribution of wealth and power—would require the recognition of bodily autonomy as well as national self-determination. However, it is important to remember that it was not individuals who were fully represented at the Conference but governments, often composed of national elites that wanted power redistributed from the West to them, but not necessarily to the residents of the nations they represented. None of this is to say that the Conference was a nefarious ploy used by corrupt politicians to line their pockets at the expense of their constituents. There were, of course, many there interested in improving the wellbeing of their citizenry. However, without an understanding of population policy that enshrined the

²³⁵ Population Division, Department of Economic and Social Affairs, United Nations Secretariat, *Fertility, Contraception and Population Policies*.

²³⁶ *Ibid.*

importance of bodily autonomy free from coercive pressures that emphasized economic development above all, even with assertions of the need for a NIEO, population policy failed to truly diverge from its liberal, control-oriented roots.

The WPPA dedicates much space to discussing the need for an NIEO, though this discussion takes place on a global rather than intra-national scale. In its opening refrain, the World Population Plan of Action (WPPA) states, “The Declaration on the Establishment of a New International Economic Order and the Programme of Action to achieve it ... provide the most recent over-all framework for international co-operation.”²³⁷ The WPPA attributes disparity in population increases to “the unequal processes of socio-economic development which have divided peoples since the beginning of the modern era.”²³⁸ Even when population is acknowledged as a potential drag on economic growth and overall wellbeing, the WPPA states that “[e]fforts made by developing countries to speed up economic growth must be viewed by the entire international community as a global endeavor to improve the quality of life for all people of the world, supported by a just utilization of the world’s wealth, resources, and technology in the spirit of the new international economic order.”²³⁹ It also holds that “[t]rue development” must only take place in a context of national independence and liberation, free from the effects of “[a]lien and colonial domination, foreign occupation, wars of aggression, racial discrimination, apartheid and neo-colonialism in all its forms.”²⁴⁰ Throughout, national independence and control over resources is paramount.

The WPPA tries to address the notion of bodily autonomy, but falls short in its considerations. The WPPA notably, and to the consternation of organizations like USAID and

²³⁷ United Nations World Population Conference at Bucharest, 1974, *The World Population Plan of Action*, available at <http://www.population-security.org/27-APP1.html>.

²³⁸ Ibid.

²³⁹ Ibid.

²⁴⁰ Ibid.

the World Bank, addresses the importance of countering infertility and “subfecundity” in order to allow anyone to have the number of children they desire, regardless of whether or not this is greater or less than the number advocated by international organizations. The WPPA highlights the “recognition of the dignity of the individual, appreciation for the human person and his self-determination, as well as the elimination of discrimination in all its forms.”²⁴¹ The document pays lip service to the right of “all couples and individuals ... to decide freely and responsibly the number and spacing of their children and to have the information, education, and means to do so.”²⁴² However, as mentioned in earlier chapters, this emphasis on IEC and a perfunctory acknowledgment of the rights of individuals was more a way to assuage the seemingly top-down nature of population planning than a means of letting individuals lead the way on their own reproductive choices. Ultimately, the WPPA used liberal language without fully condemning the repressive methods of population control that maintained capitalist expropriation.

This is evidenced by the WPPA’s continued focus on the necessity of controlling populations. As has been previously mentioned, the final text represented a compromise between proponents of population control as the most important aspect of social change and those who wished for an emphasis on development. Accordingly, the WPPA still states that population policies are necessary insofar as they are “integrated with [socioeconomic development] policies.”²⁴³ It emphasizes the use of IEC methodology in order to expand the availability of contraceptives. The document discusses the horrors of “demographic inertia,” which it warns could lead to a world population of 5.8 billion people.²⁴⁴ This continued acknowledgement that numbers must still be managed belies the reformist aspects of the NIEO. More than anything, a

²⁴¹ Ibid.

²⁴² Ibid.

²⁴³ Ibid.

²⁴⁴ Ibid.

focus on specific population policies as the “sovereign right of each nation . . . to be exercised in accordance with national objectives and needs and without external interferences,” while highlighting the ability of individual nations to buck the influence of organizations like the World Bank or USAID, was part of an effort for the relocation rather than equitable distribution of power.²⁴⁵ They were looking for a real decolonization—one they were denied as long as they lacked power over their own economic decisions. However, this did not prevent individual nations from interfering in people’s intimate lives; it simply advocated for this power to be transferred to them. Indeed, population policies were still acknowledged “as constituent elements of socio-economic development policies,” and population and development were said to be “interrelated.”²⁴⁶ A continued acknowledgement of population pressures, and policies to counter them, could still be (and was) embraced.

Through this compromise, one can see the continued influence of liberalism in debates over population policy. Even as the embedded nature of the UN allowed for the endorsement of the NIEO, the language that was ultimately adopted did not truly challenge the liberalism that required the continued exploitation of women’s bodies. Even as nations argued for a redistribution of wealth and challenged the Western-dominated capitalism that they saw as exploitative, they did not contest the idea that population control policies were inherently oppressive. They argued for a right to decision-making power, but preserved the caveat that they could implement their own population policies. Above all, the NIEO aimed to allow nations to achieve their own versions of modernity, and for many this could still take a form that followed liberal tenets. Consequently, the WPPA, like the UN and the World Bank itself, was embedded in a larger liberal context that that would continue to dominate ideological battles.

²⁴⁵ Ibid.

²⁴⁶ Ibid.

International Organizations' Response: USAID Reaction to Bucharest

A USAID document reporting on the Conference highlights the disdain many Western institutions and nations held for the Conference. It was dismissed for its “political” bent, and the report stated outright that at Bucharest “political concerns were dominant and many delegations were very thin on demographic understanding.”²⁴⁷ For USAID, the view that development considerations must be the primary focus of evaluations of development was seen as “extreme.”²⁴⁸ In a report on the Conference, USAID staffer Carl J. Hemmer writes with derision that over 200 amendments were introduced to the original draft, subverting the Western-dominated draft plan with “political” and irrational requests.²⁴⁹ Hemmer is further upset that allies like China and the Holy See were silent in the face of opposition to the draft plan. He sees the WPPA as striking a blow to those who see continued population growth as a major threat to development.²⁵⁰ He can only hope that “a basis has been laid that undaunted optimists feel will surely mature into a much more informed and productive Second World Population Conference in the mid-1980s.”²⁵¹ Productive, in this case, would entail subverting the redistribution and focus on socioeconomic proposed by less-developed countries in favor of a shift back to population focuses.

The lessons drawn from the plan by USAID are illuminating. Rather than shift USAID goals based on the desires of the nations they endeavor to help, Hemmer’s USAID memo instead advocates “tightly tailor[ing]” USAID messaging to convince them that population control

²⁴⁷ Carl J. Hemmer, “Trip Report on World Population Conference: Bucharest, August 19–30, 1974,” 1.

²⁴⁸ *Ibid.*, 2.

²⁴⁹ *Ibid.*, 4.

²⁵⁰ *Ibid.*, 5.

²⁵¹ *Ibid.*, 4.

efforts are valid and necessary precursors to development.²⁵² The main USAID takeaway from the Conference was of the “sobering reality that, in much of the world, there is no agreement that there are serious global or national problems stemming from population growth.” Rather than take this at face value—that perhaps population growth is not as large a problem as believed by USAID—the organization instead turned to campaigns to better convince nations of their perspective. In order to argue the reality of the problem, USAID described the need for new analyses of “returns from fertility decline” so that the relationship between family planning and a “more equitable distributions of earning power” could be made clear. In this way, USAID could pursue family planning rather than a more equitable distribution of resources or wealth.²⁵³ These arguments needed to be changed to suit countries that are not “demographically sophisticated.”²⁵⁴ Only then could the purported demographic innocence of many delegations at the Conference be countered.

Furthermore, USAID labeled the developing nations’ dissent “tiring,” rejecting their desire to integrate family planning with development.²⁵⁵ Though USAID claimed it has “never done anything” besides promote development in conjunction with family planning, this contention stemmed from their perspective that population reduction was the route to development, rather than the other way around.²⁵⁶ For example, rather than listen to arguments about the differing perspective of rural versus urban environments, with rural populations arguing that more people, not less, were an important component of development, USAID argued that it would instead need to develop “a variety of family planning services” specifically for rural development in order to lower the fertility of a people with “the strongest bonds to

²⁵² Ibid, 5.

²⁵³ Ibid., 5.

²⁵⁴ Ibid.

²⁵⁵ Ibid.

²⁵⁶ Ibid.

cultural practices that support high fertility.”²⁵⁷ Here, we once again see the disregard for local voices and a refusal to change approach based on cultural specificity. Liberal conceptions of growth would win out in the end.

USAID was not entirely pessimistic about Bucharest, however. It remained confident that its perspective would eventually gain traction, and saw the Conference as a stepping stone. It ultimately called for “a more critical and realistic assessment” of population, as opposed to that offered at Bucharest, which it saw as naive and delusional.²⁵⁸ Development was “indirect and unproven” as a contraceptive, while population policies, according to USAID, had a “record of real achievement.”²⁵⁹ Overall, while Hemmer was disappointed that a stronger statement was not made on population, he was pleased that liberal ideology did not completely fail him: the WPPA continued to enshrine the importance of population policy in general. As he stated, “A serious beginning on joint action has been made, a previously unspeakable topic has filled two weeks of international discussion ... a basis has been laid that undaunted optimists feel will surely mature into a much more informed and productive Second World Population Conference in the mid-80s.”²⁶⁰ As long as USAID continued to operate within a context of the liberal logic of capital growth, people like Hemmer would stand by its intervention in population.

Part of this optimism surely came from the conviction that the economic redistribution advocated for by the Global South would not actually happen. Though the United States endorsed the Bucharest position that economic policy was the best means to achieving stable population levels, the United States took the opportunity to focus on the economy as one for a

²⁵⁷ Ibid., 6.

²⁵⁸ Ibid., 7.

²⁵⁹ Ibid.

²⁶⁰ Ibid.

continued push for “free market” economies; that is, a continuing push for capitalism.²⁶¹ Even after its adoption, however, the United States, Japan, and France voiced their objections to the concept of a NIEO. The United States still clung to the concept that any economic issues should be settled in the GATT or IMF, institutions in which it continued to exercise outsized power.²⁶² Decision-making power was consequently not shifted to the debtor nations, and Western countries could continue to exert their overwhelming influence in population policy. Through them, liberalism continued to dominate.

World Bank Response

The World Bank, like other pro-population control organizations, was not prepared for the confrontation that was set to happen at Bucharest. The Bank was part of a cohort that regarded Bucharest as an important international gathering on population that could “culminate a long series of debates, conferences, and resolutions designed to increase the role of the UN and its member governments to limit population growth.”²⁶³ Furthermore, the Bank’s population staff was composed of many professionals who were overly focused on population issues, investing in technical expertise rather than an overall consideration of the needs and desires of debtor nations.²⁶⁴ It was not aware of, or did not take seriously, the Third World contingent that would transform the Conference into a referendum on the international political economy.²⁶⁵

Insofar as any indication of rebellion from developing nations against the draft WPPA occurred before the Conference, the Bank did its best to put it down. Before the meeting, the Bank criticized the upcoming Conference for focusing too much on problems extraneous to “the

²⁶¹ Adil Najam, “A Developing Country Perspective,” 1.

²⁶² Jason L. Finkle and Barbara B. Crane, “The Politics of Bucharest,” 104.

²⁶³ Population and Nutrition Projects Department, IBRD. “The 1974 World Population Conference.”

²⁶⁴ Jason L. Finkle and Barbara B. Crane, “The Politics of Bucharest,” 94.

²⁶⁵ *Ibid.*, 89.

central problem of excessive population growth.”²⁶⁶ Part of this criticism was directed to the overly “broad ... definition of ‘population activities’” and a disregard for the “central problem of excessive population growth.”²⁶⁷ Leading up to the Conference, the Bank was clearly focused on population as a problem in and of itself, and did not want to promote the perspective that population should be considered in an NIEO framework. It was forced to consider the opinions expressed at Bucharest because of its embedding in social frameworks, but these considerations were ultimately subsumed in its liberal logic.

After the Conference, the World Bank did begin to turn towards more conciliatory language that prioritized the needs of local communities and sought to give the impression of considered, sustainable change rather than top-down imperatives. In another expression of embedded liberalism, this did not, however, accompany a drastic rethinking of their economic decision-making, nor did it lead to a greater input from debtor nations on the projects in which they were directly implicated.²⁶⁸ Indeed, ten years after the Conference, in evaluating what had come since, the Bank stated that the idea that family planning and development initiatives “reinforced each other ... had been reflected in the design of more recent population programs.”²⁶⁹ However, the debate between family planning and development as disparate factors had disappeared, and, according to the Bank, more nations held the “informed” opinion that population policies were necessary.²⁷⁰ At this time, reflecting on Bucharest, Bank President Clausen’s speech at Mexico City in 1984 emphasized the World Bank’s focus on development-population linkages and its desire to fortify development programs “that build interest in smaller

²⁶⁶ Population and Nutrition Projects Department, IBRD. “The 1974 World Population Conference.”

²⁶⁷ Ibid.

²⁶⁸ Carmen A. Miró, “The World Population Plan of Action,” 434.

²⁶⁹ Barbara K. Herz, “Mexico International Population Conference – August 5-14, 1984.”

²⁷⁰ Ibid.

families.”²⁷¹ Clausen held that the choice between development and family planning was a “false dichotomy,” as improvements in living standards required not just development but also family planning efforts together.²⁷² He reiterated that it was important to limit population growth in order that the fruits of development could be realized.²⁷³ Importantly, it was still a focus on reducing the number of people to help that would justify the provision of aid in the first place for people in need.²⁷⁴

Indeed, ten years later, in a context of explicit neoliberalism, the Mexico City Conference saw a tempering of the Bucharest recommendations. The World Bank embraced Mexico City’s conclusions more strongly, as they featured a more marked emphasis on population growth as a barrier to development rather than a symptom of it. Though the Plan adopted at Mexico City continued to affirm “national sovereignty, [combatting] all forms of racial discrimination, including apartheid, and [the] promot[ion of] social and economic development, human rights, and individual freedom,” it mentioned little about international redistribution of wealth or the potential of an NIEO to facilitate such an economic undertaking. It seems that the Bank’s reaction to the first conference proved dominant—the seriousness of demographic problems had been hammered into developing countries, and the NIEO had collapsed without any real support from powerful Western organizations it had targeted like USAID or the World Bank.²⁷⁵ The liberal ideology that required population reductions continued unabated.

²⁷¹ J. Grenfell, “Address As Prepared for Delivery By A.W. Clausen before the Population and Family Planning Seminar,” July 11, 1984, Folder ID: 30159500, ISAD(G) Reference Code IBRD/IDA 89, Policy and Research Unit – 14.2 – Population, Health and Nutrition [PHN] Input to Mr. Clausen Speeches – Volume 2, World Bank Group Archives, Washington, DC, 3.

²⁷² Ibid.

²⁷³ Ibid., 4.

²⁷⁴ Barbara K. Herz, “Mexico International Population Conference – August 5-14, 1984.”

²⁷⁵ United Nations International Conference on Population, 1984, *Mexico City Declaration of Population and Development*.

The Indian Case: The Emergency Period's Reproductive Violence

None of this is to say that countries in the Global South were against family planning programs or population control in general. What they resisted was international intervention in their domestic policies. Reiterating the theme of sovereignty promoted by NAM and the NIEO, the South easily justified supporting population control programs at home while resisting international implementations promoted by USAID and the World Bank. Less developed countries did not want their priorities to be determined by the international whims of anti-natalists less invested in their wellbeing than in the reduction of population growth worldwide (especially given their fear of the impact of population growth on developed nations' own lifestyles).²⁷⁶ However, this did not subvert the paradigm of population control being used largely to serve the interests of the powerful, especially insofar as economic systems were concerned. India is a case in point, and a particularly fascinating one given the Indian delegation's position at the Bucharest conference just a year before its most draconian population program was implemented. Dr. Karan Singh, India's Union Minister for Health and Family Planning, was the one who led India's 1974 delegation at Bucharest and coined the phrase, "Contraception is the best development." He would be part of a government that not soon after enacted one of the most oppressive population policies of any nation in history.²⁷⁷

In 1952, India was the first nation to adopt family planning as official policy.²⁷⁸ Despite its early interest, efforts to actually implement its population targets were not notable or large scale as national funding priorities did not emphasize population policy. It was not until international interests made funds available in the mid-1960s that India began to expand its

²⁷⁶ Adil Najam, "A Developing Country Perspective," 1.

²⁷⁷ Ramesh Chandra, *Social Development in India* (Delhi, India: Isha Books, 2004), 169.

²⁷⁸ Davidson R. Gwatkin, "Political Will and Family Planning: The Implications of India's Emergency Experience," *Population and Development Review* 5, no. 1 (March 1979), 34.

population program in earnest. In 1965, a consortium of donors, including the United States Government, the World Bank, and the Ford Foundation, pushed India to develop an economic program focused on “self-help:” one that explicitly stressed the importance of population control. The World Bank, discouraged by early failures in Indian population policy due to the country’s size and varied cultures, pushed for more government officials who regarded population control as an “unconditional first priority.”²⁷⁹ The World Bank advocated for incentive payments for IUDs in addition to paying matching funds to midwives who convinced women to get IUDs inserted.²⁸⁰ Despite hesitation from Indian government officials who wanted more research on IUDs before beginning a large-scale program, the UN, World Bank, Population Council, and Ford Foundation forged ahead, convincing the Indian government to launch an initiative promoting IUDs.²⁸¹ They were successful largely because of the leverage their funding sources provided. USAID, the World Bank, the UN, and the Ford Foundation together provided most of India’s annual \$1.5 billion aid package.²⁸² In the 1960s, when India went to war with Pakistan over Kashmir and famine threatened, the importance of international aid was greater than ever, and India gave in to international demands.²⁸³

The World Bank, as an especially avid proponent of population policy, emphasized the IUD push. At an Indian Cabinet mission, a “real stiffening of the administrative machinery” was espoused in order to fulfill the wishes of international donor organizations.²⁸⁴ The initiative was waged using war terminology; as such, deaths were permitted. In India’s relentless pursuit of economic modernity, as spread by the international institutions that bankrolled the programs,

²⁷⁹ Matthew Connelly, “Population Control in India: Prologue to the Emergency Period,” *Population and Development Review* 32, no. 4 (December 2006): 649.

²⁸⁰ *Ibid.*, 651.

²⁸¹ *Ibid.*, 650.

²⁸² *Ibid.*, 651.

²⁸³ *Ibid.*, 652.

²⁸⁴ *Ibid.*, 652.

some fatalities from technologies like untested and dangerous IUDs were acceptable in order to achieve victory. IUD procedures surged, with over 60,000 insertions completed by December 1965 in the state of Punjab alone. Efforts intensified after Indira Gandhi became prime minister in 1966. As famine loomed during the continued war with Pakistan and drought conditions, Gandhi stepped up family planning efforts with support from U.S. President Lyndon B. Johnson and World Bank President George Woods, both of whom tied aid to population control measures.²⁸⁵ Already a longtime proponent of family planning, Gandhi quickly embarked on a population control crusade.²⁸⁶

Throughout this episode, Indian elites were seduced by liberalist modernity and positioned themselves as eager to help with the population control movement in order to build a stronger nation, even if that happened at the expense of the marginalized. They were concerned, above all, with population “quality,” and pursued population goals to spur social and economic development.²⁸⁷ Indian population studies, sponsored by Western institutions like the Population Council, often focused on differential fertility levels between caste, class, and religious groups.²⁸⁸ When these populations were controlled, India could leave behind its “backwardness” and embrace economic modernity. As population control measure acceptance lagged, Indian elites, in the pursuit of economic gains, argued India’s situation was an emergency that required extreme measures to alleviate.

Their wishes would soon be granted: India’s Emergency Period began on June 25, 1975, one year after Bucharest, and was justified as a response to national security during a time of

²⁸⁵ Indeed, before a meeting with Gandhi, when one advisor asked if the United States would commit to a larger food aid package, Johnson raged that he was “not going to piss away foreign aid in nations where they refuse to deal with their own population problems.” Matthew Connelly, “Population Control in India,” 654.

²⁸⁶ Matthew Connelly, “Population Control in India,” 653.

²⁸⁷ *Ibid.*, 662.

²⁸⁸ *Ibid.*, 637

upheaval domestically and internationally. It also provided a cover for harsh policies used to promote economic development. In this period “[e]conomic development had to be treated as an emergency situation, since the rest of the world was quickly progressing while India was lagging behind.”²⁸⁹ It is notable that the Emergency occurred during times of diminished food production due to drought, inflation due to increased oil prices, and dwindling export markets.²⁹⁰ In short, a stable, capitalist system was not functioning.

The Emergency was characterized by a suspension of civil liberties and censorship of dissent. A host of activities deemed unproductive to the state, including “adulteration, hoarding, tax evasion, ... smuggling, ... inefficiency, rumour-mongering, lack of productivity at work and over-productivity with respect to procreation” were all initiatives of the newly emboldened state.²⁹¹ Beggars disappeared from cities, strikes were declared illegal, and the black market was reined in. And, in 1976, more than 8 million sterilizations took place: more than 3 times the number the year prior.²⁹² What all of these efforts had in common was the desire to put the population to work and encourage capitalist expansion. Indian elites wanted their share of the fruits of modernity, and were prepared to take drastic measures to do so when their opportunities seemed threatened.

Gandhi got what she wanted. Luckily, in 1975 and 1976 the rains were good, and agricultural production rose. Prices declined, the inflationary spiral was averted, and industrial output doubled.²⁹³ However, throughout, political freedom was reduced and the centralization of power was codified as temporary restrictions became permanent.²⁹⁴ Gandhi abruptly ended the

²⁸⁹ Arvind Rajagopal, “The Emergency as Prehistory of the New Indian Middle Class,” *Modern Asian Studies* 45, no. 5 (September 2011): 1004.

²⁹⁰ Davidson R. Gwatkin, “Political Will and Family Planning,” 31.

²⁹¹ Arvind Rajagopal, “The Emergency as Prehistory of the New Indian Middle Class,” 1004.

²⁹² Davidson R. Gwatkin, “Political Will and Family Planning,” 29–31.

²⁹³ *Ibid.*, 31–32.

²⁹⁴ *Ibid.*, 32.

Emergency Period on January 18, 1977, believing that the economic gains made under her tenure would allow for an easy reelection. She was wrong. Her top-down governance, and the subjection of millions of people to medical treatments they did not want, toppled her from power.²⁹⁵ Thus ended one of the most aggressive family planning campaigns of any government in history.

Though this episode had roots in the international population control community, its wholehearted embrace by Indian elites is also telling.²⁹⁶ In this vignette, we have seen the same themes play out in the domestic sphere as have played out at the international level. This is not meant to suggest that any family planning measure naturally tends toward injustice, nor is it meant to demonstrate that all states are evil and out to control their populations by any means necessary. Instead, it is included as a demonstration of the fact that it was not just international organizations who were responsible for harsh population policies. Organizations like USAID, the Ford Foundation, and the World Bank planted the seeds of liberalism in the minds of Indian elites, but these elites participated wholeheartedly in population control measures in the pursuit of the liberal path to prosperity.²⁹⁷ This is not an account about the evilness of the West but about the ways in which those in power, seeking to gain or further their own wealth, necessarily turned to population as a means to do so. Economic policy was thus played out on the bodies of the powerless, as theirs and their potential children's resources were expropriated to serve the enrichment of capitalists with the full support of the state.

Aftermath and Conclusion

Ultimately, the two decades after the Bucharest Conference were considered a Golden

²⁹⁵ Ibid.

²⁹⁶ Matthew Connelly, "Population Control in India," 663.

²⁹⁷ See: Matthew Connelly, "Population Control in India."

Age for population control. Many countries, especially in Asia, but also in Latin America and the Caribbean, designed and implemented family planning programs.²⁹⁸ Despite the intentions of the NIEO to reverse the international power imbalance, wealth and decision-making capabilities at organizations like USAID and the World Bank continued to be concentrated in the hands of a few Western hegemony, most notably the United States. Some NIEO-like measures were taken: a few commodity agreements were signed for trade, especially rubber and sugar, granting preferential terms to developing nation providers of natural resources. The IMF created a trust fund to help developing countries, financed by selling one-third of its gold holdings (particularly those of European nations). However, little else developed; for the most part, rich countries rejected the NIEO on its face. This was easy enough to do given the marginal leadership roles of developing nations in international organizations. Developed nations rejected their culpability in promoting the continued underdevelopment of poor countries, and refused to give them greater stakes or funding.²⁹⁹ Their priorities, which did not change as a result of the Conference, as evidenced by USAID and World Bank reactions, continued to dominate international discussion.

This anticlimactic end to the advances sought at Bucharest should not be seen as an indication that the Conference was inconsequential. Indeed, this episode is highly informative in that it demonstrates several ways in which liberal ideology continued to dominate even in the face of seemingly radical challenges. Though the NIEO initially challenged a Western-oriented capitalist system, and the population control policies it promoted, liberal ideas about modernity ultimately won out. Challenges to the NIEO by institutions like USAID and the World Bank highlight their continued liberal domination. These organizations continued to uphold the liberal logic that required population control for economic advancement, and were little deterred by

²⁹⁸ John F. May, *World Population Policies: Their Origin, Evolution, and Impact* (New York: Springer, 2012), 130.

²⁹⁹ Vinod K. Aggarwal and Steve Weber, "The New New International Economic Order," *Harvard Business Review*, 2012.

developing nations' requests for an NIEO. This liberal logic was even internalized by some developing nations themselves, including India, which carried out its own draconian population policies in order to grasp at the fruits of modernity dangled in front of them by institutions like the World Bank. The key difference, in the wake of the NIEO, was that they were looking to obtain these fruits for themselves. Throughout, the importance of bodily autonomy was neglected in favor of liberal promises about economic advancement. This allowed for a continuation of population policies and a further disregard for the desires of ordinary people within developing nations. Ultimately, this episode highlights the hegemonic view of liberal, capitalist progress that undergirded population debates.

Conclusion

In 2011, the United Nations announced that world population had reached seven billion.³⁰⁰ This number far surpasses even the most ambitious estimates of the 1970s and 1980s. Unlike the stories told by alarmists like Paul Ehrlich, however, reality has unfolded in a decidedly different manner. Population increases have not caused mass famines or revolutions that have thrown the world into chaos. Food has not been rationed, nor has population-related resource depletion resulted in any significant lifestyle changes. If anything, the consumption of valuable resources has continued at a breakneck pace worldwide, even as population increases have continued. Nevertheless, Ehrlich's postulations had an incredible impact at the time of their writing. They were ultimately accepted and proliferated due to their cohesion with capitalism and liberalism. Overall, the story of the population control movement and its use in economic development must be understood in a greater context of capitalist modernity and liberalism's hegemony.

As we have seen, the population control debate and the establishment of institutions like the World Bank are rooted in the same liberal ideology that prioritized economic growth over the bodies of the marginalized. Starting with Malthus's observations about population increases to Ehrlich's frightening chronicle of the dangers of the population "bomb," the population debate has through history centered on controlling people's bodies for larger political aims. It is also notable that both of these spikes in concern occurred at times of economic upheaval when fewer hands were needed to tend farms and unemployment was made more marked by industrial growth. As Americans grew increasingly concerned about the proliferation of peoples worldwide,

³⁰⁰ United Nations, "As world passes 7 billion milestone, UN urges action to meet key challenges," *UN News Centre*, October 31, 2011.

the realm of development became a natural outlet for population concerns. The World Bank, with its liberal roots, fit perfectly into these debates. Established to control the postwar economic order that would allow for Western economic domination through global capitalism, the World Bank used population policies as part of its promotion of development. As an institution that hid its liberalism in an embedding in social concerns and contexts, the World Bank was perfectly suited to bring sometimes unpopular population policies to bear in developing nations.

Indeed, the World Bank's involvement in these debates was rooted in its liberal ideology and capitalist goals. The World Bank justified its place in population planning as necessary for the economic growth that would lift the ever-multiplying poor out of poverty. Though the World Bank couched its justifications in terms of free markets and choice in order to present a set of seemingly uniformly endorsed rules of economic order, it was ultimately undertaking a project of capitalism. Because capital could only reproduce in conditions in which the unemployed did not threaten economic stability through their sheer numbers, the World Bank turned to population control policy as the humane solution. The honorable thing, according to the Bank, would be to prevent the existence of these people in the first place, as it could not imagine trying to distribute employment or wealth to all of the world's poor. Capitalism did not, however, promote these same ideas about free markets and choice—capital concerned itself primarily with the reproduction of capital. The domination of the logic of capitalism was made apparent through the Bank's implementation of its ideas about population, including information, education, and communication campaigns as well as “demand-creation” schemes that encouraged and at times coerced people into undertaking fertility reduction strategies. Throughout, the Bank sought economic modernity as dictated by a Western-oriented mode of capitalism.

That the World Bank's population control policies were part of a larger liberal project is further supported by the case of the 1974 Bucharest Conference on World Population. A desire for an international redistribution of wealth led the Third World participants in the Conference to reject international institutions' population policies, arguing that they were yet another tool of global inequality. According to these nations, socioeconomic development presented the optimal path to economic modernity. The fact that the only serious challenge to population policies came from the desire to counter Western capitalist hegemony serves to reaffirm the ties between these two systems. However, this episode's ultimate aftermath also highlights the inescapable liberal ideologies encapsulated in the population control movement. The embedded liberalism of the World Bank upheld the liberal status quo while allowing for the dispensation of developing nations' discontent. Ultimately, this ideology went unchallenged as USAID and the World Bank refused to deviate from their Western capitalist logic that a population reduction was the only humane way to achieve modernity. This view was further internalized by developing nations themselves, as is evidenced by the Indian example before and during the Emergency Period. Though India had been one of the nations that argued for a separation from the domination of the World Bank and USAID in its internal politics, their influence had already taken root. In order to achieve the prospects of the economic modernity it had been promised, India pursued its own draconian population policies in order to facilitate capitalist expansion for its own enrichment. Throughout, liberal logic proved paramount, upholding population control measures as a necessary part of capitalist development.

These themes continue to be relevant today—indeed, the historical context in which they took place is not so far in the past. Their relevancy is especially notable given the current U.S. political climate. Immediately following the 2016 election, I had trouble working on this thesis

because some of the ideas seemed a little too relevant. With deadlines looming, I continued writing, however, and was energized (though deeply upset) by the possibility that this thesis could shed some light on the important themes that continue to hover over discussions rooted in liberalism and the control of populations today. Today, concerns over the increasing non-whiteness of the nation have echoes of the very same debates that catalyzed brutal population control regimes of the past. The lessons of this period must not be relegated to the dustbin of history, as these same issues abound in present political discourse in the United States.

Take, for instance, NumbersUSA, a political organization dedicated to reducing the number of immigrants entering the United States. The organization's founder, Roy Beck, has stated that immigration must be limited in order to avoid "packed" living in "a highly regimented country approaching a billion people."³⁰¹ Voices like Beck's see their political agenda represented in the highest levels of American government with the Trump presidency. Here, population is once again invoked as a method of othering in order to provide for the growth and capitalist lifestyle of a select few. Indeed, NumbersUSA states that its efforts are part of a larger quest for "individual liberty," "worker fairness," and "fiscal responsibility."³⁰² This can be read in a similar manner to the population concerns of the 1970s and 1980s. Extra hands are once again discarded as soon as their productivity in a capitalist system is deemed unnecessary. As employment in blue-collar jobs wanes, the preservation of economic opportunity for the privileged within a capitalist economy becomes a project of paramount importance. Indeed, NumbersUSA asserts that "economic fairness to vulnerable Americans" (which can be read as working class white Americans), is one of its founding credos.³⁰³

³⁰¹ "About Us," *NumbersUSA*, <https://www.numbersusa.com/about>.

³⁰² Ibid.

³⁰³ Ibid.

I hope my thesis can be used to help critically evaluate such phenomena. In order to counter the ideas of people like Beck, it is important to recognize his situation in a broader context of population control movements that are themselves a product of liberal capitalist modernity. Beck's nervousness about the possibility that immigrants will take jobs away from hardworking Americans in a nation whose middle class is already facing tough economic prospects mirrors earlier concerns over the increased unemployment that is thought to come with population increases within capitalist systems. His decidedly liberal economic excuses are marked in their assertion that capitalism cannot be extended to many but can only produce wealth for the few. It is important that we look critically at these claims both in an international context, which would examine the causes of international economic inequality that encourages such displacements, and in a domestic one, in which the economic situation of the United States as a free-market nation beholden to capitalist logic prevents the absorption of new hands for which to provide. Without an apparatus in place to distribute wealth to new immigrants (or with those systems already under threat, as is the case with many social safety net programs), as long economic opportunity is stunted, excess hands present a danger rather than an opportunity. Indeed, just as earlier population control advocates worried that too many undesirable people could incite revolutions and violence, similar concerns are present today in assertions that immigrants commit crimes and threaten U.S. economic stability. Time and time again, the outcome of liberal ideology when applied to the marginalized is the same.

Just as the population control policies of the past resulted in the horrendous and inhumane treatment of marginalized people, we must use these lessons to prevent similar occurrences from happening today. Already, hate crimes against perceived immigrants (specifically, immigrants of color) have skyrocketed, and tales of shouts of "go back to your

country” abound. In order to stop the escalation of these sentiments into even more violence, we must utilize the lessons of the population control movement. Perhaps the answer lies in advocating for an economic system that is truly equitable, and provides for the wealth of all rather than just the very wealthy. It also may lie in the creation fairer international political conditions and a true end to neocolonialism in order to prevent the causes of mass migrations. In short, we must search for solutions that avoid an acquiescence to liberal logics that devalue peoples’ bodies in order to provide economic gain for a select few. It is only in this way that we can learn from the past and, hopefully, avoid repeating it.

Bibliography

- Abouharb, M. Rodwan, and David L. Cingraneli. "The Human Rights Effects of World Bank Structural Adjustment, 1981–2000." *International Studies Quarterly* (June 9, 2016): 233–262.
- "About Us," *NumbersUSA*, <https://www.numbersusa.com/about>.
- Aggarwal, Vinod K., and Steve Weber. "The New New International Economic Order." *Harvard Business Review*, 2012.
- Akinsanya, Adeoye, and Arthur Davis. "Third World Quest for a New International Economic Order: An Overview." *The International and Comparative Law Quarterly* 33, no. 1 (January 1984): 208–217.
- The American Biology Teacher. "Review: The Population Bomb by Paul R. Ehrlich." *The American Biology Teacher* 31, no. 4 (April 1969): 267.
- Amin, Samir. *The Liberal Virus: Permanent War and the Americanization of the World*. Trans. James H. Membrez. New York: Monthly Review Press, 2004.
- Annisette, Marcia. "The True Nature of the World Bank." *Critical Perspectives on Accounting* 15, no. 3 (April 2004): 303–323.
- Anwaruddin, Sardar M. "Educational Neocolonialism and the World Bank: A Ranciéan Reading." *Journal for Critical Education Policy Studies* (July 2014): 143–174.
- Bajpai, Nirupam. "World Bank's Structural Adjustment Lending: Conflicting Objectives." *Economic and Political Weekly* 25, no. 14 (April 1990): 791–794.
- Birdsall, Nancy. "PRD's Objectives." Memo to Mr. North. May 20, 1985. Records of the Population, Health, and Nutrition Sector. Folder ID: 1104167. ISAD(G) Reference Code WB IBRD/IDA 89. Policy, Health and Nutrition [PHN] Objectives – Correspondence. World Bank Group Archives, Washington, DC.
- Birdsall, Nancy. "PHNPR Work Program in Population." Memo to John D. North, S. Denning, and I. Husain, E. Schebeck. November 30, 1984. Records of the Population, Health, and Nutrition Sector. Folder ID: 1104166. ISAD(G) Reference Code WB IBRD/IDA 89. Policy, Health and Nutrition [PHN] Work Program – Correspondence. World Bank Group Archives, Washington, DC.
- The Black Scholar*. "The Non-Aligned Movement." *The Black Scholar* 8, no. 3 (December 1976): 1.
- Burnhill, Michael S. and Thomas S. Moulding. "Evaluation of the Program for International

- Education in Gynecology and Obstetrics.” *USAID*. September 17, 1976.
http://pdf.usaid.gov/pdf_docs/Pdaaa502a1.pdf.
- Cammack, Paul. “Neoliberalism, the World Bank and the new Politics of Development.” Kothari, Uma, and Martin Minogue, eds., *Development Theory and Practice: Critical Perspectives*. New York: Palgrave, 2002.
- George P. Cernada. “Draft of Population Handbook,” December 9, 1977, Records of the Population, Health and Nutrition Sector, Folder ID 1047028, Reference Code WB IBRD/IDA 89, Miscellaneous – Population Handbook, World Bank Group Archives, Washington, DC.
- Chandra, Ramesh. *Social Development in India*. Delhi, India: Isha Books, 2004.
- Chang, Ha-Joon. *Bad Samaritans: The Myth of Free Trade and the Secret History of Capitalism*. New York: Bloomsbury Press, 2009.
- Chomsky, Noam. “Free Market Fantasies: Capitalism in the Real World.” Lecture given at Harvard University, Cambridge, MA, April 13, 1996.
- Connelly, Matthew. *Fatal Misconception: The Struggle to Control World Population*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2008.
- Connelly, Matthew. “Population Control in India: Prologue to the Emergency Period.” *Population and Development Review* 32, no. 4 (December 2006): 629–667.
- Cox, Robert W. “Ideologies and the New International Economic Order: Reflections on some recent literature.” *International Organization* 33, no. 2 (April 1979): 257-302.
- Cullen, David. “Back to the Future: Eugenics—A Bibliographic Essay.” *The Public Historian* 29, no. 3 (Summer 2007): 163–175.
- Digby, Anne. “Malthus and reform of the Poor Law.” Dupâquier, Jacques, E. Grebenik, and Antoinette Fauve-Chamous, eds. *Malthus past and present*. London and New York: Academic Press, 1983.
- Digby, Anne. “Malthus and Reform of the English Poor Law.” Turner, Michael, ed., *Malthus and His Time*. London: Palgrave MacMillan, 1986.
- Easterly, William. “What did structural adjustment adjust?: The association of policies and growth with repeated IMF and World Bank adjustment loans.” *Journal of Development Economics* 76, no. 1 (February 2005): 1–22.
- Ehrlich, Paul R. *The Population Bomb*. New York: Ballantine Books, 1968.
- Finkle, Jason L., and Barbara B. Crane. “The Politics of Bucharest: Population, Development,

- and the New International Economic Order.” *Population and Development Review* 1, no. 1 (September 1975), 87–114.
- Fishlow, Albert. “T.R. Malthus and the English Poor Laws.” *Social Science* 33, no. 1 (January 1958): 35–51.
- Frank, Andre Gunder. “Unemployment and World Crisis of Economic Policy.” *Economic & Political Weekly* 18, no. 22 (May 28, 1983): 969–976.
- Green, Edward. “U.S. Population Policies, Development, and the Rural Poor of Africa,” *The Journal of Modern African Studies* 20, no. 1 (March 1982): 45–67.
- Grenfell, J. “Address As Prepared for Delivery By A.W. Clausen before the Population and Family Planning Seminar.” July 11, 1984. Folder ID: 30159500. ISAD(G) Reference Code IBRD/IDA 89. Policy and Research Unit – 14.2 – Population, Health and Nutrition [PHN] Input to Mr. Clausen Speeches – Volume 2. World Bank Group Archives, Washington, DC.
- Gwatkin, Davidson R. “Political Will and Family Planning: The Implications of India’s Emergency Experience.” *Population and Development Review* 5, no. 1 (March 1979), 29–59.
- Hartmann, Betsy. *Reproductive Rights and Wrongs: The Global Politics of Population Control*. New York: Harper & Row, 1987.
- Harvey, David. *17 Contradictions and the End of Capitalism*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2014.
- Helleiner, Eric. *Forgotten Foundations of Bretton Woods: International Development and the Making of the Postwar Order*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, April 2014.
- Hemmer, Carl J. “Trip Report on World Population Conference: Bucharest, August 19–30, 1974.” September 4, 1974. Box 5. Central Decimal File 1974. Record Group 286: Records of the Agency for International Development, 1948–2003. National Archives and Records Administration, College Park, MD.
- Herz, Barbara K. “Mexico International Population Conference – August 5-14, 1984.” Office Memorandum from Barbara K. Herz to PHN Staff. September 7, 1984. Folder ID 1103419. ISAD(G) Reference Code: WB IRBD/IDA 89. Mexico City – International Population Conference – Correspondence. World Bank Group Archives, Washington, DC.
- Hitler, Adolf, and J.V. Murphy. *Mein Kampf*. London: Hurst and Blackett, 1981.
- Huber, Douglas H. Memo to Sander Levin, Assistant Administrator, PHA USAID, Department

- of State from Cholera Research Laboratory DACCA, Department of State. April 26, 1977. Box 3. Record Group 286: Records of the United States Agency for International Development. National Archives and Records Administration, College Park, MD.
- Hunter, H.J. "The United Nations World Population Conference, 1974, with text of World Population Plan of Action; discussion outline, annotated references and commentary on social welfare services." 1978. *USAID*, available at http://pdf.usaid.gov/pdf_docs/PNAAH494.pdf.
- "International Bank for Reconstruction and Development Articles of Agreement." *World Bank Group*. As amended effective February 16, 1989.
- Kapur, Devesh, John P. Lewis, and Richard C. Webb. *The World Bank: Its First Half Century, Volume 1*. Washington, DC: Brookings Institution Press, 1997.
- Lee, Ronald. "Becker and the Demographic Transition." *Journal of Demographic Economics* 81, no. 1 (March 2015): 67–74.
- LeMahieu, D. L. LeMahieu. "Malthus and the Theology of Scarcity." *Journal of the History of Ideas* 40, no. 3 (July–September 1979): 467–474.
- Lind, Michael. "The Op-Ed History of America," *The National Interest* no. 37 (Fall 1994): 16–28.
- Mason, Edward S., and Robert E. Asher. *The World Bank Since Bretton Woods*. Washington, DC: Brookings Institution Press, 1973.
- Malthus, Thomas. *An Essay on the Principle of Population*. London: Joseph Johnson, 1798.
- May, John F. *World Population Policies: Their Origin, Evolution, and Impact*. New York: Springer, 2012.
- McConnaughey, Gloria. "Darwin and Social Darwinism." *Osiris* 9 (1950): 397–412.
- McNamara, Robert S. "Address to the University of Notre Dame by Robert McNamara, President, World Bank Group." May 1, 1969. Washington DC: World Bank, available at <http://documents.worldbank.org/curated/en/296761468331758372/Address-to-the-University-of-Notre-Dame-by-Robert-McNamara-President-World-Bank-Group>.
- Miró, Carmen A. "The World Population Plan of Action: A Political Instrument Whose Potential Has Not Been Realized." *Population and Development Review* 3, no. 4 (December 1977): 421–442.
- Najam, Adil. "A Developing Country Perspective on Population, Environment, and Development." *Population Research and Policy Review* 15, no. 1 (February 1996): 1-17.

Non-Aligned Countries. "Belgrade Declaration of Non-Aligned Countries." September 6, 1961. Available at [http://pustakahpi.kemlu.go.id/dir_dok/01st%20Summit%20of%20the%20Non-Aligned%20Movement%20-%20Final%20Document%20\(Belgrade_Declaration\).pdf](http://pustakahpi.kemlu.go.id/dir_dok/01st%20Summit%20of%20the%20Non-Aligned%20Movement%20-%20Final%20Document%20(Belgrade_Declaration).pdf).

NTI. "Non-Aligned Movement." *NTI*, February 5, 2016.

Oliver, Robert W. *Early Plans for a World Bank*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton Studies in International Finance No. 29, September 1971.

Payer, Cheryl. *World Bank: A Critical Analysis*. New York: Monthly Review Press, 1982.

Piketty, Thomas. *Capital in the 21st Century*. Cambridge, MA: Belknap Press, 2015.

Pincus, Johnathan, and Jeffrey Alan Winters. *Reinventing the World Bank*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 2002.

Population and Nutrition Projects Department, IBRD. "The 1974 World Population Conference." May 6, 1974. World Bank Group Archives, available at <http://documents.worldbank.org/curated/en/867521468331034586/pdf/777170BR0SecM10B00PUBLIC00502401974.pdf>.

Population Division, Department of Economic and Social Affairs, United Nations Secretariat. *Fertility, Contraception and Population Policies*. April 25, 2003. ESA/P/WP.182, available at <http://www.un.org/esa/population/publications/contraception2003/Web-final-text.PDF>.

"Remarks of Robert S. McNamara On the Occasion of Receiving the Tun Abdul Razak Foundation's International Award." Kuala Lumpur, Malaysia. June 10, 1978. Folder ID 1772447. ISAD(G) Reference Code WB IBRD/IDA 03. Robert S. McNamara Statements / Speeches – Statement 11. World Bank Group Archives, Washington, DC.

Saxon, Wolfgang. "Frederick Osborn, A General, 91, Dies." *New York Times*. January 7, 1981.

Solinger, Richie and Mie Nakachi, eds., *Reproductive States: Global Perspectives on the Invention and Implementation of Population Policy* (Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press, 2016).

Rajagopal, Arvind. "The Emergency as Prehistory of the New Indian Middle Class." *Modern Asian Studies* 45, no. 5 (September 2011): 1003-1049.

Ravenholt, R. T. Letters: As To Sterilization. *St. Louis Post Dispatch*. May 3, 1977. Box 3. Record Group 286: Records of the United States Agency for International Development. National Archives and Records Administration, College Park, MD.

Richey, Lisa. "Family Planning and the Politics of Population in Tanzania: International to Local

- Discourse.” *The Journal of Modern African Studies* 37, no. 3 (September 1999): 457–487.
- Robertson, Thomas. *The Malthusian Moment: Global Population Growth and the Birth of American Environmentalism*. Rutgers, NJ: Rutgers University Press, 2012.
- Ruggie, John Gerard. “International Regimes, Transactions, and Change: Embedded Liberalism in the Postwar Economic Order.” *International Organization* 36, no. 2 (Spring 1982): 379–415.
- Sabin, Paul. *The Bet: Paul Ehrlich, Julian Simon, and Our Gamble over Earth’s Future*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 2013.
- Seby, Kathryn. *The Green Revolution of the 1960’s and Its Impact on Small Farmers in India*. Undergraduate Thesis, Environmental Studies, University of Nebraska – Lincoln: January 2010.
- Sinding, Steven W. “Overview and Perspective.” Robinson, Warren C., and John A. Ross, eds., *The Global Family Planning Revolution*.
- Singh, Jyoti Shankar. *Creating a New Consensus on Population: The International Conference on Population and Development*. New York: Earthscan, 1998.
- Smith, Kenneth. *The Malthusian Controversy*. New York: Routledge, 1951.
- United Nations. “As world passes 7 billion milestone, UN urges action to meet key challenges.” *UN News Centre*. October 31, 2011.
- United Nations General Assembly resolution S-6/3201. *Declaration on the Establishment of a New International Economic Order*. A/RES/S-6/3201 (1 May 1974), available at <http://www.un-documents.net/s6r3201.htm>.
- United Nations International Conference on Population, 1984. *Mexico City Declaration of Population and Development*. E/CONF.76/L.4. August 13, 1984.
- United Nations World Population Conference at Bucharest, 1974. *The World Population Plan of Action*, available at <http://www.population-security.org/27-APP1.html>.
- Vorzimmer, Peter. “Darwin, Malthus, and the Theory of Natural Selection.” *Journal of the History of Ideas* 30, no. 4 (October-December 1969): 527–542.
- Wade, Robert Hunter. “US Hegemony and the World Bank: The Fight over People and Ideas.” *Review of International Political Economy* 9, no. 2 (May 2002): 201–229.
- Wagman, Paul. “U.S. Goal: Sterilize Millions of World’s Women.” *St. Louis Post-Dispatch*,

April 22, 1977. Box 3. Record Group 286: Records of the United States Agency for International Development. National Archives and Records Administration, College Park, MD.

White, Robin C. A. "A New International Economic Order." *International & Comparative Law Quarterly* 24, no. 3 (July 1975): 542–552.

Woods, Ngaire. *The Globalizers: The IMF, the World Bank, and Their Borrowers* (Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 2006).

Yunus, Muhammad. "Preface: Redefining Development." Danaher, Kevin, ed., *50 Years is Enough: The Case Against the World Bank and the International Monetary Fund*. Boston: South End Press, 1999.

Zubrin, Robert. "The Population Control Holocaust." *The New Atlantis* 35 (Spring 2012): 33–54.