

## ZERO POPULATION GROWTH, THE ENVIRONMENTAL MOVEMENT and the ANTI-IMMIGRATION LOBBY

### Part 1: The Center for Immigration Studies (CIS)

Note: This fact sheet does not question the personal views of any individual not specifically identified herein. Rather, this fact sheet merely cites excerpts from publications produced and/or promoted by the Center for Immigration Studies (CIS). Each publication listed in this fact sheet is available on CIS' website. Readers are encouraged to review the materials listed below and determine for themselves whether the views expressed therein are consistent with conservative values such as the right to life and the dignity of the human person and other principles and traditions upon which conservatives have questioned the claims of global warming alarmists and other environmental activists.

Immigration and Rising U.S. Fertility: Immigration and Rising U.S. Fertility [sic]

By [Leon F. Bouvier](#)

January 1991

“As immigrants become an ever expanding proportion of the nation's population, fertility levels could rise to least 2.2. Any hope of attaining zero population growth at any time in the 21st century depends almost entirely on rapid fertility declines among these new minorities.”

Four Hundred Million Americans!: The Latest Census Bureau Projections

By [Leon F. Bouvier](#), [John L. Martin](#)

January 1993

“Vice-President Gore's 1991 tour de force, *Earth in the Balance*, addresses many of the environmental problems that all humans face.

...

With all these problems that are at least partially attributable to population growth, it is perplexing that the media have failed to make the connection. Could they have been lulled into inertia by the propaganda of the Reagan-Bush era when it was argued that population growth is not a problem?

...

How could such goals be attained? Strong efforts to reduce the level of adolescent pregnancy are called for. If all births were planned and wanted, the fertility rate would fall to at least 1.8. There is hope that the new [Clinton] administration will eliminate restrictions on family planning counseling; an injectable drug that offers three-months of protection with 99 percent effectiveness (Depo-Provera) has just been cleared for sale in the United States; it is also possible that the French abortifacient RU-486 may be accepted for sales in the United States.”

So Many People... How Will We Feed Them?

by Philip Shabecoff

A review of Leon F. Bouvier and Lindsey Grant's [How Many Americans? Population, Immigration, and the Environment](#)

Los Angeles Times Book Review

November 27, 1994

"Harshness against aliens, however, is not really what this book is about. The authors are not xenophobic. They have nothing in particular against Mexicans or Chinese or East Europeans. What they are against is people or, more precisely, too many people. Their central thesis and I believe they are correct is that excessive numbers of human beings are the single greatest threat to the environment, to a healthy economy and to the quality of life of American citizens"

Immigration to the United States and World-Wide Greenhouse Gas Emissions

By [Steven A. Camarota](#), [Leon Kolankiewicz](#)

August 2008

The findings of this study indicate that future levels of immigration will have a significant impact on efforts to reduce global CO<sub>2</sub> emissions. Immigration to the United States significantly increases world-wide CO<sub>2</sub> emissions because it transfers population from lower-polluting parts of the world to the United States, which is a higher-polluting country. On average immigrants increase their emissions four-fold by coming to America.

...

Greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions, the most important of which is CO<sub>2</sub>, raise the concentration of these gases in the earth's atmosphere. Most scientists think this increase is causing average global temperatures to rise. There is concern that warming in turn may trigger far-reaching, long-term effects on the Earth's climate and biosphere, and consequently, on human civilization. Thus, the impact of U.S. immigration on annual CO<sub>2</sub> emissions is an important research question.

Immigration, Population, and the New Census Bureau Projections

By [Leon Kolankiewicz](#)

June 2000

"Much of our economic growth and concurrent environmental progress rest precariously on what environmental visionary David Brower once called "Strength Through Exhaustion."

"Our growing energy consumption, carbon dioxide emissions, farmland and topsoil loss, and endangered species are all symptomatic of a nation headed the wrong way on the path to sustainability. "

...

Climatologists generally agree that global warming is underway and that human emissions of the so-called greenhouse gases, principally carbon dioxide (CO<sub>2</sub>) and methane (CH<sub>4</sub>), are responsible. Without controls, the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change predicts that average global surface temperatures will rise by 2°C (4°F) and sea levels by 0.5 meters (1.7 feet) by 2100. Concern over possible economic and ecological ramifications led to the 1997

signing of the Kyoto Treaty in Japan. As the country with by far the largest industrial CO<sub>2</sub> emissions, the United States must play a major role in any international effort. In Kyoto, the Clinton-Gore administration committed the United States to reducing its CO<sub>2</sub> emissions to 7 percent below 1990 emissions by 2010, an ambitious but attainable goal. Yet a booming economy and population — and no firm resolve — have only served to boost our carbon emissions. We are moving away from the target rather than toward it; population growth in the United States almost doubles the required per capita reduction of carbon emissions needed.

## The Environmental Argument for Reducing Immigration to the United States

By [Winthrop Staples III](#), [Philip Cafaro](#)

June 2009

The need to limit immigration necessarily follows when we combine a clear statement of our main environmental goals — living sustainably and sharing the landscape generously with other species — with uncontroversial accounts of our current demographic trajectory and of the negative environmental effects of U.S. population growth, nationally and globally.

Given the many issues that environmentalists must deal with and the contentious nature of immigration debates, it is understandable that many of us would prefer to avoid them. But the reality is that across the country, environmentalists are losing the battle to create a sustainable society and protect wild nature.

...

The environmental argument for reducing immigration to the United States is relatively straightforward and is based on the following five premises:

Immigration levels are at a historic high and immigration is now the main driver of U.S. population growth.

Population growth contributes significantly to a host of environmental problems within our borders.

A growing population increases America's large environmental footprint beyond our borders and our disproportionate role in stressing global environmental systems.

In order to seriously address environmental problems at home and become good global environmental citizens, we must stop U.S. population growth.

We are morally obligated to address our environmental problems and become good global environmental citizens.

Therefore, we should limit immigration to the United States to the extent needed to stop U.S. population growth.

This conclusion rests on a straightforward commitment to mainstream environmentalism, easily confirmed empirical premises, and logic. Despite this, it is not the consensus position among American environmentalists.

Some environmentalists support continued high levels of immigration, while most are uncomfortable with the topic and avoid discussing it. So strong is this aversion that groups such

as the Sierra Club, which during the 1970s prominently featured strong commitments to U.S. population stabilization, have dropped domestic population growth as an issue. Several years ago, the group Zero Population Growth went so far as to change its name to Population Connection (“PC” for short).

...

For these reasons, the United States population has continued to grow, resulting in a missed opportunity to get one key aspect of sustainability — human numbers — under control.

...

A growing population increases America’s large environmental footprint beyond our borders and our disproportionate role in stressing global environmental systems. Consider global warming. Nothing mortifies American environmentalists more than our country’s failure to show leadership in dealing with this, the most important environmental challenge facing the world in the 21st century. As the world’s largest economy and historically largest greenhouse gas emitter, the United States has a moral obligation to lead the world in meeting this challenge. A good start would be striving to stabilize greenhouse gas emissions at 1990 levels (the Kyoto protocol, rejected by the United States, calls for an initial reduction of 5 percent below 1990 levels). Meeting even this modest objective will prove difficult, however, if our population continues to grow.

...

Al Gore has stated that global warming is “the moral challenge of our time;” many of us agree with him. But if Americans are serious about doing our part to limit global warming, the “multiplier effect” of population growth is too important to ignore.

Before we go on, please note: we do not claim that by itself, halting U.S. population growth will solve sprawl, or meet our global warming responsibilities. On the contrary, Americans must reduce our per capita consumption of land and energy in order to meet these challenges. . . . Americans must address both overconsumption and overpopulation if we hope to create a sustainable society and contribute to a sustainable world.

Clearly premises two and three are true: U.S. population growth contributes seriously to both domestic and global environmental problems. Can we go further, and state that reining in population growth is essential to environmental success? Yes, we can.

# ZERO POPULATION GROWTH, THE ENVIRONMENTAL MOVEMENT and the ANTI-IMMIGRATION LOBBY

## Part 2: Federation for American Immigration Reform (FAIR)

Note: This fact sheet does not question the personal views of any individual not specifically identified herein. Rather, this fact sheet merely cites excerpts from publications produced and/or promoted by the Federation for American Immigration Reform (FAIR). Each publication listed in this fact sheet is available on FAIR's website. Readers are encouraged to review the materials listed below and determine for themselves whether the views expressed therein are consistent with conservative values such as the right to life and the dignity of the human person and other principles and traditions upon which conservatives have questioned the claims of global warming alarmists and other environmental activists.

### **Why Environmentalists Support Immigration Reform**

Population stabilization is the key to controlling environmental degradation in the U.S. And the key to population stabilization is immigration reduction.

...

Population stabilization means the adoption of a demographic "steady-state" where, over time, the population of the country neither rises nor falls. In such a situation, the average annual population growth rate would be zero. Births and deaths, immigration and emigration would continue to refresh the population and allow it to evolve, but during that process the overall number of people in the country would remain roughly constant.

### **The United States Is Already Over-Populated**

The United States is already overpopulated in the sense that we are consuming our national ecological resources at an unsustainable rate. Our growing dependence on foreign energy supplies is a prime example. We now depend on foreign imports for 28.8 percent of our energy consumption: two-thirds of our petroleum products and about one-sixth of our natural gas consumption. Because of the abundance of our nation's resources, we have long been careless about our level of consumption, but it is the precipitous rise in the U.S. population over the last four decades that has resulted in our outstripping of our national resources. We are living beyond our means and are doing so increasingly as our population expands. This is a serious problem with major implications for future generations.

This imbalance can not be remedied without curbing both population growth and consumption as well as increasing productivity. We must [sic] become more sensitive to the issue of consumption of finite, non-renewable resources and to the limits of renewable resources. Reining in population growth requires immigration reduction, and that objective should be at the top of the agenda for policy makers because it is the most immediate and the most amenable to change through public policy.

In 1972, the Presidential Commission on Population Growth and the American Future recommended population stabilization, concluding: "The health of our country does not depend on [population growth], nor does the vitality of business nor the welfare of the average person." . . . As the root cause of land and resource shortages, ecological degradation and urban congestion, sustained and growing overpopulation is jeopardizing the natural inheritance we leave for future generations.

The United States has a national environmental policy but no national population policy. As a result, environmental policy decisions are made in a vacuum.

Because the birthrate has recently moved above replacement level, it is important not to ignore the large share of births to unmarried, teenaged immigrants. Government should be focused on ensuring that all prospective parents have the necessary information to make good choices.

...

Fortunately, population growth can be moderated by legislating and executing appropriate immigration policies. It can also be influenced by programs that address natural change (births less deaths) through promoting family planning efforts to decrease unwanted births. But that is unlikely to have nearly as great an impact as reducing the imbalance between immigration (arrivals) and emigration (departures). Population stability requires neither discriminatory immigration policies nor intrusive natality policies. It requires three policy reforms: zero-net immigration, enforcement of current laws combatting illegal immigration, and family planning education.

...

The time has come for Congress to adopt a population policy that respects the realities governing our environment and quality of life.

### **Under “Our Principles,” FAIR states the following:**

FAIR advocates:

...

- that the United States should make greater efforts to encourage population stabilization, economic development, and alleviation of poverty worldwide and especially in countries of great migration;
- that the era of mass international migration to the United States as a solution to international problems must come to an end; problems of poverty and overpopulation must be vigorously confronted where people live, rather than postponing their solution by either the export or the importation of masses of people;

Included under “Suggested Reading:”

Grant, Lindsey. *The Case For Fewer People: The Negative Population Growth (NPG) Forum Papers*. Seven Locks Press, 2006. "In this scholarly compendium, author Lindsey Grant presents a collection of writings on the subject of population change, its consequences and the impact of human crowding on the future of mankind."

# ZERO POPULATION GROWTH, THE ENVIRONMENTAL MOVEMENT and the ANTI-IMMIGRATION LOBBY

## Part 3: NumbersUSA

Note: This fact sheet does not question the personal views of any individual not specifically identified herein. Rather, this fact sheet merely cites excerpts from publications produced and/or promoted by NumbersUSA. Each publication listed in this fact sheet is available on NumbersUSA's website. Readers are encouraged to review the materials listed below and determine for themselves whether the views expressed therein are consistent with conservative values such as the right to life and the dignity of the human person and other principles and traditions upon which conservatives have questioned the claims of global warming alarmists and other environmental activists.

### **The Bottleneck**

Two-time Pulitzer Prize winner E.O. Wilson responds to economists who disbelieve ecologists' warnings about population threats:

#### **Scientific American February, 2002**

We have driven atmospheric carbon dioxide to the highest levels in at least 200,000 years, unbalanced the nitrogen cycle, and contributed to a global warming that will ultimately be bad news everywhere.

Most economists today, and all but the most politically conservative of their public interpreters, recognize very well that the world has limits and that the human population cannot afford to grow much larger. They know that humanity is destroying biodiversity. They just don't like to spend a lot of time thinking about it.

...

But worldwide, over an extended period of time, local differences and statistical fluctuations wash one another out and the iron demographic laws grind on. They transmit to us always the same essential message, that to breed in excess is to overload the planet.

By 2000 the replacement rate in all of the countries of western Europe had dropped below 2.1. The lead was taken by Italy, at 1.2 children per woman (so much for the power of natalist religious doctrine).

...

Enough slack still exists in the system to justify guarded optimism. Women given a choice and affordable contraceptive methods generally practice birth control. By 1996 about 130 countries subsidized family-planning services. More than half of all developing countries in particular also had official population policies to accompany their economic and military policies, and more than 90 percent of the rest stated their intention to follow suit. The U.S., where the idea is still virtually taboo, remained a stunning exception.

NumbersUSA's website also features the following endorsements of U.S. population stabilization from notable environmentalists:

**President Carter's Global 2000 Report**

'The United States should: Develop a U.S. national population policy that includes attention to issues such as population stabilization ... just, consistent and workable immigration laws.'

**David Brower, 1966, then Executive Director of the Sierra Club,**

"We feel you don't have a conservation policy unless you have a population policy."

**Blueprint for Survival, 1972, supported by 34 distinguished biologists, ecologists, doctors, and economists, including Sir Julian Huxley, Peter Scott, and Sir Frank Fraser-Darling**

"First, governments must acknowledge the problem and declare their commitment to ending population growth; this commitment should also include an end to immigration."

**Former Senator Gaylor [sic] Nelson, father of Earth Day,**

"We are preparing to celebrate the 32nd Earth Day just after the Census Bureau has announced that far from winding down in the 1990s, U.S. population growth boomed at its highest level in the nation's history! . . . This new population boom represents a profound failure in our nation's pursuit of environmental quality. Since 1970, another 80 million people have been added to the country. Every environmental goal has been delayed because of this failure."

**Wisconsin Secretary of State [sic], Douglas LaFollette,**

"To continue ignoring the large population component of our increasing environmental problems will certainly doom our grandchildren to a very bleak future."

**Jacques Cousteau,**

'Population growth is the primary source of environmental damage.'

**John Flicker, President, National Audubon Society,**

"Human population growth is the most pressing environmental problem facing the U.S. and the world."

**Garret Hardin, professor emeritus of human ecology at University of California, Santa Barbara (Living Within Limits, 1993)**

"...population policy must be policy for a nation, not for the whole world, because there is no world sovereignty to back up a global policy. We can, and should, seek to persuade other nations to take steps to control their population growth; but our primary focus should be on the population growth within our own borders. . ."

# ZERO POPULATION GROWTH, THE ENVIRONMENTAL MOVEMENT and the ANTI-IMMIGRATION LOBBY

## Part 4: Excerpts from “Forsaking Fundamentals

### The Environmental Establishment Abandons U.S. Population Stabilization” By Leon Kolankiewicz and Roy Beck, March 2001

Note: This fact sheet cites excerpts from a study published by Leon Kolankiewicz, who is an environmental scientist and national natural resource planner, and Roy Beck, who presently serves as the Executive Director of NumbersUSA. This publication and the comments about it included at the end of this fact sheet are available in their entirety on the website of the Center for Immigration Reform. Readers are encouraged to review the entire publication and determine for themselves whether the views expressed therein are consistent with conservative values such as the right to life and the dignity of the human person and other principles and traditions upon which conservatives have questioned the claims of global warming alarmists and other environmental activists.

### **Forsaking Fundamentals The Environmental Establishment Abandons U.S. Population Stabilization By Leon Kolankiewicz and Roy Beck, March 2001**

“To the Catholic hierarchy and the pro-life movement, the legalized abortion and population stabilization causes have been inextricably linked. In the 1990s, it was still difficult for a pro-stabilization person or group to get a hearing among many Catholic or pro-life groups without automatically being considered an abortion apologist.”

...

Active efforts within Catholic circles arose to disprove that rising population size had anything to do with deterioration of natural or human environments or the ability of poor countries with rapidly-growing populations to develop economically. The worldwide as opposed to the U.S. population stabilization movement now had major organized opposition that was gladly encouraged and touted by economic and class interests which saw their wealth and power threatened by a slowing of population growth. This counter-movement had its intellectual underpinnings as well. Certain influential writers, scholars, and well-endowed think-tanks actually went as far as arguing not just that population growth was benign, but that it was good, even essential to continued economic and technological progress. The best-known advocate of the growth is good school was the late Julian L. Simon, who argued that the human mind was the ultimate resource, and that the more of those minds there were, the more collective human ingenuity there would be to solve problems, create new resources, and forge a better future.

...

Liberty or Limits? Lindsey Grant has observed the transformation of population groups for decades. He says the [1994 U.N. International Conference on Population and Development in Cairo] exposed an old fault line between those primarily interested in making contraceptives available to help people limit their contribution to population growth and those wanting to make them available to give women more liberty and power.

...

The liberty side of the movement triumphed over the limits advocates, Grant concluded. In the final international agreement for action, nowhere was it said that population growth should stop. Nowhere were growing countries urged to give a higher priority to slowing or stopping population growth. Governmental incentives for reducing fertility were rejected as too coercive toward women. While the Vatican received the most media publicity for its efforts to keep the Cairo conference from establishing population goals, the feminist groups ended up working hand-in-glove with the Vatican to ensure that result. The feminist groups defeated the Vatican, however, on the issue of making contraceptives more widely available. Even then, they changed funding recommendations to put less emphasis on contraceptives than had been requested by international experts. Those experts had told the conference that \$17 billion a year was needed just to provide contraceptives to more than 100 million women who wanted them but could not afford them. The final Cairo decision was to put only \$6 billion of that into contraceptives and the rest into other health projects.

...

What is the problem with this, one might ask, if empowerment of women does in fact lead to reduced fertility? There are three problems with substituting the means for the end on this issue. One is that, given the reality of scarce financial resources, diverting already inadequate funds from contraceptives and into other women's issues means fewer dollars for birth control in a world where more than 100 million women (according to the U.N.'s World Fertility Survey) say they would like to stop having more children but lack the means. Worldwide, 30 years after international family planning programs were launched, 40 percent of married women still do not use contraceptives. The Washington-based Population Institute stresses that: Fertility declines in all regions of the world once again prove that economic prosperity is not an essential precursor to population stabilization. Most of the countries that have achieved replacement-level or near-replacement-level fertility in the recent past have been less developed ones. The common denominator among them is increased awareness and use of contraception.

...

In the 1970s, ZPG's population policy recommendations covered every contribution to U.S. population growth. It included stands on contraceptives, sex education for teenagers, equality for women, abortion, opposition to illegal immigration, and proposals to reduce legal immigration from about 400,000 a year to 150,000 a year by 1985 in order to reach zero population growth by 2008.

ZPG started the modern immigration-reduction movement in the 1970s. After American fertility fell below replacement level, the ZPG board recognized that immigration was rising rapidly and would soon negate all the benefits of lower fertility. Even though immigration seemed separate from the family planning issues that had dominated precursor population organizations, ZPG tackled it squarely because it related to the issue of U.S. population stabilization, which was deemed essential to the health of the American environment. ***By the late 1970s, the ZPG leaders who were the most interested in immigration issues spun off a new organization called the Federation for American Immigration Reform (FAIR). Among them was John Tanton, who had also been a member of the Sierra Club's National Population Committee. Their idea was that FAIR would take no stand on abortion and other controversial family planning issues in order to attract a wider constituency which would work for immigration reform not only for environmental reasons, but for economic relief for the working poor and taxpayers, for social cohesion, and for national security.*** [emphasis added]

The ZPG leaders who left the ZPG board for FAIR also happened to be most of the people with the greatest interest in population as an environmental issue. That meant that those remaining on the board were more inclined toward the type of population movement that was rooted in family planning and womens issues. While ZPG continued to have policies on U.S. stabilization and the environment and produce some useful educational materials these policies and programs got less and less staff and board attention as the 1980s progressed. New staff were hired less on the basis of their environmental expertise and commitment and more because of their commitment to womens issues. One former board member and local mission was explicitly to stabilize the U.S. population, according to members of the Center for Immigration Studies ZPG activist recalled that board members and key staff have been close to womens groups for some time, and want to please them.

...

Historians need to explain how an environmental issue as fundamental as U.S. population growth could have moved from center-stage within the American environmental movement to virtual obscurity in just 20 years. For the American environment itself, the ever-growing demographic pressures ignored by the environmental establishment showed no signs of abating on their own as the nation prepared to enter the 21st century.

...

Those truly concerned about the future environment and quality of life in these United States can only hope that endeavors such as these may yet portend a return to a realistic, comprehensive population policy within the mainstream environmental movement.

**Population, Immigration,  
and the Environment  
Why Green Groups Abandoned  
the Goal of Population Stabilization**

**Praise for Forsaking Fundamentals:**

"I am pleased to participate in the release of this monograph from the Center of Immigration Studies. Leon Kolankiewicz and Roy Beck provide fascinating and rather painful explanations for why our governmental institutions, the news media and especially our environmental groups have acquiesced and even encouraged this new population explosion.

"My hope is that -- as happened at the first Earth Day -- this year's Earth Day will see a renewed pledge to move toward full environmental protection that can be achieved only by U.S. population stabilization. This monograph shows what went wrong the previous 30 years and points the way to what must be done if we are to avoid the present trajectory that will double our population again this century.

**Gaylord Nelson**  
**State Senator, Governor, U.S. Senator (D-Wis.), 1948-81**  
**Founder of Earth Day**  
**Counselor, The Wilderness Society**

"While most Americans realize that our rapid, immigration-driven population growth is affecting their quality of life, most leaders of environmental organizations and elected officials in Washington seem afraid to deal with the issue. To continue ignoring the large population component of our increasing environmental problems will certainly doom our grandchildren to a very bleak future. I'm confident that Forsaking Fundamentals will provoke healthy discussion on this issue so vital to our nation's future."

**Douglas La Follette**  
**Wisconsin Secretary of State**  
**organizer of first Earth Day in Wisconsin**  
**former National Board Member of Friends of the Earth**  
**former professor of chemistry and ecology**