

Henry Kissinger retools Global 2000 as U.S. national security doctrine

by Lonnie Wolfe

Henry Kissinger will supervise a rewriting of the Carter administration's *Global 2000 Report* in order to sell it to the Reagan White House and the American public as "national security doctrine," according to a source close to the former secretary of state at Georgetown University's Center for Strategic and International Studies (CSIS). The Global 2000 doctrine would commit the United States to a policy of reducing the world's population, as *EIR* has reported, by some 2 billion people in the next two decades: extermination on a scale a hundred times that of the Nazis.

According to the CSIS source, the decision to rewrite the report only months after it was released and endorsed by the Carter State Department came about because "the [Reagan] White House is beginning to get the idea that Global 2000 is some kind of one-world environmentalist conspiracy manufactured by Carter administration hold-overs." Reagan's electoral base "do[es] not support population control" either. But it could be put over as necessary and inevitable, the source indicated, provided that a flag-waving campaign is mounted under Henry Kissinger to convince the President that Global 2000 is the way to safeguard U.S. national security. The environmentalist echelons represented by Mike Kitch of Zero Population Growth, Inc. and Cynthia Green of the Population Crisis Committee are themselves already privately circulating the formula that Global 2000 can most readily be presented as a national security proposition.

George Fauriol, these sources report, is the man Kissinger will assign to conduct the recasting of the Global 2000 documents. While Kissinger and his controllers want to distance themselves from the environmentalists, they will work closely, as is their custom, with the top-level leadership of such groups, including the Committee for the Year 2000, formed last summer to try to ensure that Carter administration doctrine would be carried out no matter who won the 1980 election. Members of the committee include:

- **Russell Train**, former head of the federal Environmental Protection Agency and current head of the U.S. chapter of the World Wildlife Fund.
- **Cyrus Vance**, who helped initiate the Global 2000 project in 1977.
- **Elliot Richardson**, former ambassador to the Court

of St. James, who most recently negotiated the Law of the Sea treaty under United Nations auspices, along Global 2000 resource-control lines.

- **Robert O. Anderson**, chairman of the Atlantic Richfield oil major, whose Aspen Institute has funded and deployed much of international environmentalism and terrorism.

- **Walter Cronkite**, the avuncular newscaster who put environmentalism into media respectability on network television a dozen years ago.

Weinberger and Taylor

The Kissinger-Fauriol rewrite, which will reportedly take up to six months, is supposed to proceed along the following lines, sources at Georgetown report: "There cannot be a geopolitical doctrine that is not a demographic doctrine. . . . *We can count the number of people who will die, but it is not in our power or in our interests to stop it.*" Meanwhile, Defense Secretary Caspar Weinberger, the U.S. delegation chief to the Club of Rome's 1974 World Population Conference and an advocate of zero population growth, is "redefining U.S. strategic doctrine to deal with the population crisis," a source reported. Already, the shift in deployment into limited wars wiping out huge masses of civilians is incorporated in the Weinberger defense budget proposals, masked as a new anti-Soviet capability.

The Population Crisis Committee is circulating a paper drafted by one of its board members, General (Ret.) Maxwell Taylor, the Kennedy-Johnson architect, along with the World Bank's Robert McNamara, of the Vietnam War. The paper contains a hit list of countries where "unchecked population" will supposedly produce internal crises leading to drastic population reductions. The countries include Mexico, India, Pakistan, Nigeria, Iran, Egypt, Bolivia, Indonesia, Morocco, and most of Central America. Each of them contains either a vital strategic resource, says the paper, or has a location vital to U.S. security interests. The implication is that "checking" the population is essential to guaranteeing resources and political stability.

Global 2000 spokesmen's comments to independent investigative journalists are presented below, followed by a report on Global 2000's efforts in Congress.

What Georgetown says

The following interview with a Georgetown University source close to Henry Kissinger took place on March 9.

Q: How is the new administration responding to the increasing prominence of the Global 2000 report?

A: There is a general consensus that the issues raised by Global 2000 represent the policy direction the U.S. has to take. The problem is that the way things have been presented so far makes these issues—population control, strategic resources, food control, water control—seem like the property of the environmentalists and the population control people.

We are in danger of braking the momentum created by the report, and getting sidetracked into quibbling. The whole process can break up. We could have a piecemeal policy approach. This is not what anybody wants, but it could happen.

I don't think the White House will push the report hard enough to get the kind of action we need. They are beginning to think it's some kind of one-world environmentalist conspiracy manufactured by Carter holdover types.

Q: That seems like a serious obstacle.

A: We have to repackage the same ideas. The only way this will fly is as national security doctrine. Population control is a national security issue, not a humanitarian one, not an environmental issue. What we are going to do is what Kissinger and others have suggested. We'll take the Global 2000 report and go through it point by point, and deal with each question as national security. Once we have a product, we can move it through a network in the administration, and set up a *new* outside task force. This will put things into another orbit; we can mobilize the whole national security community.

Q: Can you be more specific?

A: Many people, including Henry Kissinger and myself, think not much can be done in the short run. Some people will die, hundreds of millions maybe, because people didn't do their demographic homework.

There cannot be a geopolitical doctrine that is not a demographic doctrine. Right now we are forced into becoming damage officers of sorts.

Q: You mean triage?

A: No, I mean that we can determine how many people will die, but it is not in our power, or in our interest, necessarily, to stop it. We can make difficult but critical

decisions now about preventing things from being worse later down the line.

Q: But how does this relate to national security in terms most Americans could understand?

A: There is a connection between current plans for a strategic redefinition and the population crisis. De facto, by emphasizing the RDF [Rapid Deployment Force] and so forth, we are acknowledging that population problems in the developing sector will become political and military questions in short order. The problem is that in all but a few cases, the individuals involved with shaping policy do not see this as the cause.

Weinberger is different, I think; he has been directly aware of population problems. The simple fact is that the policy is a direct response to population problems. That is why we're talking about brushfire wars. Some people confuse the ideas by believing we're dealing with East-West problems. You can say that to sell the idea, but it isn't really the case. This is a North-South issue. We have to clearly explain the relationship between security, population, and resource control; that is the new geopolitics.

Q: After you've redrafted the point-by-point national security version of 2000, then what?

A: It won't be easy, but we will start a new selling job to the administration and the Hill. Vance and [Russell] Train moved too fast and didn't distance themselves from the environmentalists. The idea is not to make these ideas the possession of any one group, especially one that is not well received in the White House.

Q: What does Haig think?

A: He has been briefed, and is certainly not negative. Caspar Weinberger is on board. So is Jim Buckley. Haig may downgrade the Oceans Bureau [under which the Office of Population Affairs is grouped], but they didn't have much clout anyhow. They did a great deal for Global 2000, but now it has to be kicked upstairs to a more national security-oriented arena like I&R [the intelligence and research division of the State Department] or Political and Military Affairs [under former *New York Times* correspondent Richard Burt, a Kissinger liaison].

What Maxwell Taylor says

Retired General Maxwell Taylor's military methods were displayed during his tenure as overseer of the U.S. military involvement in Vietnam, where he carried out the "body count" concept.

General Taylor has been deeply involved in population control and in the 1960s helped organize the Population Crisis Committee. Before being named Special Military Representative by President John F. Kennedy, he was the

president of Lincoln Center for the Performing Arts in New York.

In a recent interview made available to EIR, General Taylor elaborated on his views:

Q: In your recent *Washington Post* article, you talk of the need to orient toward security threats outside traditional areas of concern.

A: There is a much lower chance of war breaking out in Central Europe at this time. The main threats will come in the Third World, with western Africa and Southeast Asia being particularly likely to explode. One of our problems is that the army and the other services still tend to think about refighting World War II, whereas the real situation is quite different. That's why I'm advocating a thorough merger of military and foreign policy.

Q: Why do you think the Third World will be the major focus of instability?

A: One of the key reasons is excessive population growth in these areas. The world has gotten itself in the position where it's in for terrible problems. There are disastrous conditions in some of the smaller Third World countries, where the governments are weak and resources are vanishing.

Q: Why can't the U.S. and other industrialized nations help ameliorate these conditions?

A: Self-interest! We can't help everyone! There's no guarantee we'll be able to feed ourselves 10 or 20 years from now, much less other countries. What we must do is identify those countries that contain special resources vital to us and extend them some kind of protection. We should sign special economic treaties that would stipulate that we would provide certain kinds of aid in exchange for a guaranteed share of the resources we need. We have to have binding, long-term agreements of this kind. As for the other countries, well, what can I say? They'll have to fend for themselves.

Q: Since you see overpopulation leading to war, do you see war as a form of population control?

A: That's not a very delicate way of putting it . . . but in effect it's true. As these devastated countries begin to overrun their borders desperately trying to seek food, war will clearly ensue, and people will be killing each other en masse for access to food supplies. We certainly can't permit people to overrun our border. . . . Just look at Mexico. Millions of immigrants have entered our country illegally, although, of course, we haven't had a war with Mexico. Bangladesh is another example. Masses of people fled into India during the war there.

Q: Are you familiar with the *Global 2000 Report*, and if so, what do you think of it?

A: Certainly I'm aware of it. It's a very thoughtful book and well worth study.

Q: Could you elaborate on your contention that military and foreign policy should be merged?

A: We still think of military policy as war, and somehow different from foreign policy. This is entirely wrong. Clausewitz was right on target when he said that war is simply a continuation of foreign policy by other means. We must close the gap between military and foreign policy, and I have hopes that this administration will accomplish that.

Q: Do you think Secretary of State Haig shares your views on this?

A: I've been personally close to Haig for a long time. In fact, I gave him his diploma at West Point, I certainly hope he shares my views.

What the PCC's Green says

The following interview with Cynthia Green, provided by an independent journalist, took place March 9. Green is a spokesman for the Population Crisis Committee, and a former planner for Zero Population Growth, Inc.

Q: In your view, how does the population question relate to foreign policy?

A: We have been saying for some time that the population crisis would create serious national security problems for the U.S. and the West. The instability we see in places like El Salvador can in a large way be traced to failures of population policy. . . . Look at the teeming cities of the Third World and the slums in Italy. The demographic profiles of these countries are horrendous. More than half their populations, in some cases, are below the age of 20. This means you have idle youth all over the Third World waiting to be turned into terrorists and revolutionaries. The U.S. defense budget has to be geared to deal with these problems, and that is what Weinberger seems to be doing.

We are facing some very difficult foreign policy choices. We face the necessity for reducing population one way or another. There are humane ways to do it, through birth control or sterilization. When those things fail, there are inhumane ways. The humane ways very likely will not be enough. . . .

These next 10 years are crucial. We can keep population down if we take advantage of natural calamities and wars. Even if they wipe out millions it will not be enough if we don't prevent them from rising again. It will be hard to make people tolerate this, but they really won't have a choice.