

Malthusians reshape NATO for 'out-of-area' wars

by Mark Burdman

The July 5-6 summit of NATO heads of state was filled with rhetoric about "the end of the Cold War," the "reduced threat from the Warsaw Pact," and the ensuing need for fundamental changes in NATO strategic thinking and force-disposition. But the real agenda, according to most authoritative sources, was to reorganize the alliance for a new era of "out-of-area" deployments, into regions that are outside the purview of the formal NATO responsibility, such as Africa, the Middle East, and key areas of Asia. The ultimate aim of such deployments would be to bring about a reduction of population in the non-white areas of the world.

One senior NATO consultant told EIRNS July 6: "I'm absolutely sure out-of-area deployments are the real agenda. Clearly, risk and threat from the East has diminished, while there is increasing tension and rearmament in a number of countries, in North Africa, the Middle East including Palestine, and Asia through, increasingly, to Southeast Asia. . . . There are new dangers from new directions. We are shifting from an exclusive focus on the East-West conflict, to a situation of risk coming eventually or potentially from all directions."

The real agenda was not discussed openly, and is barely implied in the final communiqué's discussion of "force changes" toward "smaller and restructured active forces" that "will be highly mobile and versatile." But the nature of the discussions in London can be gleaned from the evaluation emerging from oligarchical policy institutions like the Ditchley Park group in England, the Inter-Action Council, and others. All of them agree: The pivot of global conflict is shifting from an "East-West" pole to a "North-South" pole. As one retired British general put it: "The East-West polarization is really declining, relative to the North-South polarization. This has been going on for some time, but has only

become more obvious since the Berlin Wall came down. It is becoming more and more apparent, that the center of gravity is shifting to south of the Mediterranean. We can probably expect the center of gravity of crisis to extend all the way through the Middle East, beginning with Morocco, and then down to South Africa and Sub-Saharan Africa. There are plenty of conflict-prone situations down there; this is the new center of conflict."

What is involved in such thinking, is nothing less than a shift in the axiomatic premises on which military policy is based. It is not only a matter of eliminating the concept of the Soviet Union as a threat. What is happening on a more fundamental level among particularly British and American planners, is that military policy is being subordinated to a "malthusian-ecologist" world view, which holds that population is growing too rapidly in the developing world, and that military deployments must be reshaped to deal with that "threat." The obsession that now reigns in such circles, is that the next decades will see tens of millions of refugees streaming across international borders and seeking asylum in Europe, for economic and/or "environmental" reasons, and that the containment of population growth and control of population flows must, above all else, shape the strategic agenda. Of course, since the South has been victimized by colonialist and neo-colonialist exploitation and denial of technological growth, such obsessions have the quality of a self-fulfilling prophecy.

What is really meant by the "help Gorbachov" propaganda, is that the Anglo-American elites want to enlist the Muscovite Great Russian imperialists in a joint condominium strategy against the peoples of the South. Since the Muscovites have already been imposing a policy of triage and "divide-and-conquer" inter-ethnic wars in the U.S.S.R.'s

Transcaucasian and Central Asian republics, they would only have to be induced to extend that strategy into the Middle East, the Indian Subcontinent, and further south. In essence, what is unfolding now, is the formal initiation of the strategy mooted by the influential American writer Gore Vidal, who is reported to have won Gorbachov's agreement, in a meeting some years back, to a proposal for a "Caucasian race alliance" against the non-Caucasian peoples. But such arrangements can only be temporary at best, since the Soviets have not relinquished their aim of eventual world domination. For them, the current period is one in which to buy time.

Certain among the Anglo-American planners believe that a Middle East war would be an effective means for triggering the new era of "North versus South" confrontations. As one senior British military expert affirmed July 6: "A Middle East war would tend to escalate horizontally and vertically. A real conflict in the Levant would extend from the Turkish border to the Suez Canal. It would involve the neighbors of the main combatants. The whole thing would be in a state of flux, and the greater powers couldn't afford just to sit there."

A Middle East war could easily be the trigger for the eruption of various other crises, perhaps in the Balkans, or in the Indian Subcontinent. There is talk in Inter-Action Council circles of a "limited war short of the use of nuclear weapons" between India and Pakistan, that would accomplish the death of several million people. As for Africa, the Bush administration's aggressive response to the developments in Kenya might be seen in this light. Top malthusian spokesmen, such as former World Bank head Robert McNamara and U.S. World Wildlife Fund influential Russell Train, have pointed to Kenya as the biggest population-growth-rate problem in black Africa.

Discussion of "out-of-area" deployments has evidently become so advanced, that some in continental Europe are protesting. On July 11, the French daily *Le Monde* reported statements from Robert Pontillon, an intimate of French President François Mitterrand, who is also the newly elected president of the Assembly of the West European Union. He declared that it was "inadmissible that at the time when President Bush has already twice, without consulting the European allies, announced a cutback in U.S. commitments to NATO, he is demanding an extension of activities of NATO to out-of-area domains." Pontillon asserted that the "external interests" of Europe are "not identical with those of the United States."

North vs. South

The notion of shaping NATO military deployments for the end of population reduction has been kicking around for years in Anglo-American policy circles, but it was first put forward in a semi-formal doctrinal way on Nov. 28, 1989, by British Admiral of the Fleet Sir Julian Oswald, who had just been appointed Her Majesty's First Sea Lord (head of the Navy). He told a *Daily Telegraph* interviewer that Britain

had to maintain its naval strength, despite an ostensible lowering of the Soviet military threat, because of a whole series of new threats, including rapid population growth and the movement from the countryside to the cities in much of the Third World.

A British co-thinker of Oswald, himself a retired general, stated in a discussion July 6 that the "population explosion" was a determining feature in the new crisis dynamics. "The population problem varies from place to place," he said. "The whole Palestine affair is a population problem, that will lead to more conflict, but it is a *qualitative* problem, two different peoples wanting the same land. In Africa it is *quantitative*, due to overpopulation. There is too little food being produced relative to steadily rising population. There are too many mouths, and too little food. Look at Ethiopia, Congo, the West African coast. . . . The problem is, we do not have the machinery to do anything about this. What needs doing, is setting up the machinery for intervention in 'out-of-area' situations, which demands more emphasis on naval capabilities and less on air force. This is certainly being discussed among the ministries of defense in Europe."

An Inter-Action Council source, recently returned from Africa, affirmed that "the new conflicts will be North-South, because of the dynamics of demography and population. Those who tell you we are moving into a multipolar world are speaking nonsense. We are moving into a new bipolar world: on the one side the North, in which the Russians are trying to integrate themselves, and on the other side the South."

The out-of-area propaganda offensive

In the weeks leading up to the NATO summit, a number of public statements were made calling for "out-of-area" deployments, although the link between strategy and demography was not made in an explicit way. These included:

- On June 7, British Prime Minister Margaret Thatcher told NATO foreign ministers in Turnberry, Scotland, that NATO should recast itself, from its current primary focus toward the East, to a new concentration on potential threats from flashpoints such as the Middle East. She voiced concern over the spread of sophisticated military technology to Middle Eastern countries.

- On June 21, Great Britain's permanent representative to NATO, Sir Michael Alexander, spoke before the government-patronized Royal United Services Institute in London, declaring that NATO was "still very much in business," because of threats from the South. He said NATO could be faced in the coming years with "precise" threats, including a possible attack from a specific country. Under such conditions, said Sir Michael, NATO would be able to "retaliate."

- On July 5, Italian strategist Enrich Jacchia, a NATO consultant, wrote a commentary in the *International Herald Tribune* affirming that NATO must be restructured to deal with "new dangers" in North Africa, the Middle East, and Central and South Asia.