



Genocide — Civil and Humane

by Shekhar Deshpande

The so-called end of the cold war, they say, has brought more peace and at least greater possibility of harmony in the world. All of this hope exists despite the late-breaking story about one of the most expensive and extensive spy scandal cases with Russia (or commonwealth or a republic of some kind, commonly known as Russia proper.

Let us think about the cold war. Nobody seem to say then that it would be foolish to assume that all countries may stop spying on each other. Now, everyone is rushing to admit that it is an inevitable fact of life. The same fact, different and convenient wisdom!

If you had to wake up during the cold war (oh, god! we survived), the threat of nuclear weapons was hanging over us all day. Well, just last month, we heard the news that Yeltsin and Clinton (both presidents of their countries) signed a pact of "not directing their weapons against each other." That was the major news item for the week.

Thanks a lot, Boris and Bill!

What a news to celebrate! It was the most chilling news since they carved up the world during the cold war. So if the weapons are not directed at each other, who are they directed at? Toward themselves?

Toward the heavens? Or, selectively toward the dictatorships that Russia and the U.S. have been supporting for years? Or, as the paranoid minds from the "other" world suspect, these weapons are now directed at the poorer countries, who are fast becoming a burden to the "post-cold-war" way of thinking? William Burroughs once remarked that a paranoid is one who knows too much. And we in the third world know way too much about these giants celebrating their mutual survival.

Slash And Burn 'Em

In the same vein, there came another shocking explanation of the new "post cold-war" way of thinking. It's the Associated Press news item caught in the back pages of *The Philadelphia Inquirer* of February 23, 1994. "World population must be slashed, study finds: Natural resources will fail. By 2100, the U.S. standard of living would resemble that of China," says the headline. Some well funded group in California (its origins uncertain, David Pimentel, a Cornell University ecologist is the "author" of the study) has concluded that the world's population will reach 12 billion by 2100. Now according to this Sherlock, that is ten billion too

many for the world to sustain itself healthily.

Some more pearls of wisdom from the gentleman-thinker. Pimentel says that the world population should reach and sustain a state of "comfortable support," which he defines as something close to the current American standard of living, but "with wiser use of energy and natural resources." Moreover, he says, "If people do not control their own numbers, nature will. That we can count on."

How do we achieve this global slash and burn? Look at the ratio of women to children in different countries. In Rwanda, the birthrate is 8.5; Saudi Arabia, 6.4; Bolivia and Mongolia, 4.6; U. S., 2.1; and Italy, 1.3. Thank his common sense, he does not give breakdown on racial or class lines, or we would have a picture from the United States that would uncover his real, submerged motives.

This idea of "slashing" the population of the world has caught the fancy of quite a few people. But this is one of those rare cases, where someone speaks the wisdom that otherwise works, walks but never talks. OK, suppose we were to slash the population. Where do we start? In Rwanda and Saudi Arabia, I suppose. If we get more details on

his findings, we could pick a few more countries. But one has to start somewhere, you see!

And, how do we achieve this? There is an idea for the bureaucrats and political visionaries to put their dreams into practice. Just direct the nuclear missiles toward these countries and blame some idiot for technical malfunctioning. The old methods of sucking the lifeblood and natural resources from these countries will not help. That just took too much time. Hundreds of years in some cases.

Heavens will be happy with this for two reasons. First, the nuclear weapons are not directed at them and second, we will thank them with the saying that "everything works out for the best in the end." Your heavens, your rationale, but lives belong to other people.

If global population control has to become reality, here's an idea for post-cold-war handlers. They can get Boris and Bill to sign a pact that "right-sizes" the world's population. Think ratings!

"Slashing" the population would be a great "equalizer." It will leave the rest of the surviving world in peace. The cold war would have truly ended. Besides, the "living standards of the U. S." (don't ask which U.S. — urban or suburban, black or white) will have become universalized. We will know how to use natural resources. There will be fewer people to educate on their use of chlorofluorocarbons (aerosol sprays). We will destroy the world, but at least we'll do it in a "civilized" way. We won't have the

"savages" with their high birth-rates to deal with.

But, then there is another way of slashing the world's population. Target those who abuse the resources of the world. Treat each individual, each corporation, each nation, each consumer as a contributor to the ruin of this planet. Extend the strictest possible international criminal sanctions against everyone and meet out the punishment. Their conviction will "slash" the world's population and things will be equalized. And finally, hold each genius who comes with propositions to "slash" the population of the world responsible for any loss of life that occurs as a result of his nut-brain ideas. Convict him first!

Behind the Times

All the news that fits to print!
Does that apply to the editorials?
And, does it apply to the State

Department's report on human rights? The editorial of the *New York Times* of February 19, 1994 and the report from the State Department during the same month are in question here. In its zeal to improvise foreign policy, the diplomatic landlords have focused for the first time, we are told, on the issues of women in its report on human rights.

Guess what? The same old issues pop up. Dowry deaths in India, female circumcision in Africa, and teenage prostitution in Thailand figure prominently in the report. In its liberal posturing that at once appears humane and blissfully ignorant of complexity, the *New York Times* applauds the report and calls for "stepping up of pressure" on these countries to improve women's rights.

Again, no one is saying or should be saying that these abuses are normal or that they should not be exposed and stopped. Although we shouldn't need the State Department to make us aware of that, thanks anyway. But we have heard so much about female circumcision in Somalia that one wonders if anything else happens there at all! And everything appears so hunky dory here in the U.S., thank you.

Two oft-repeated reminders. Those who are looking for a stick with which to beat the world should check to see if they are beating the right thing. And secondly, those who want to beat others should stop the beating at home before they seek to reform the world!

