

Inter-American Dialogue demands cut in population to slow 'global warming'

by Gretchen Small

Drug trafficking, terrorist insurgencies, even the officially recognized 10-25% collapse in per capita income over the past decade, are no longer the major crises which face the governments of the Americas, according to the 1990 annual report issued by Sol Linowitz's Inter-American Dialogue in December 1990. The real threat to Ibero-America, the group announced, is "global warming." This threat, it proposes, can only be resolved by reducing all levels of human activity in Ibero-America, including reducing the number of people who inhabit the region—i.e., by killing them.

These policy goals make up the bulk of the content of the Dialogue's report, "The Americas in a New World."

The Inter-American Dialogue is no minor player in Western Hemisphere affairs. The group was founded in the fall of 1982 with the stated purpose of ensuring that "pragmatists," and not men of vision, keep their grip on Ibero-American policy, as the global economic and political crises deepen. The cream of the Liberal Establishment in the United States, including McGeorge Bundy, Sol Linowitz, Robert McNamara, and Elliott Richardson, joined the group. A like number of Ibero-American bankers and politicians loyal to this Establishment, joined their U.S. counterparts in the Dialogue. Among its newer recruits are former Presidents Jimmy Carter and Raúl Alfonsín of Argentina.

The Inter-American Dialogue became notorious in 1986, when it launched a hemisphere-wide "debate" on the "benefits" of legalizing narcotics. In 1988, as narco-terrorist armies rampaged, it declared that the military in Ibero-America threatened democracy, and therefore military forces, and their power and influence, had to be radically reduced.

Economies to be collapsed further

Now, in the name of the "global warming" hoax, the Dialogue demands that the region be depopulated and its economy torn down further. A chapter dedicated to "The Challenge of Global Warming" opens with the assertion:

"The greatest potential threat to the Western Hemisphere's future comes not from the prospects of a clash of arms or the ravages of economic depression. It arises instead from the slow and insidious deterioration of the environment."

Therefore, they argue, "world patterns of production and consumption" must be reduced. "Fossil-fuel consumption worldwide must be cut sharply. Transportation systems and industrial processes must be revamped." Ibero-American nations will have to forego basic centralized, capital-intensive infrastructure projects such as sewage disposal, "central power stations," and "electrical grids," because they are allegedly too "inefficient" and energy-costly.

The Dialogue proposes a "worldwide tax on fossil fuel consumption," which could force a reduction in fuel consumption (by raising its price) and raise funds to finance the environmental policing mechanisms they deem necessary.

Such measures will require "painful social and economic adjustments," including from the "distressed economies of Latin America," they state bluntly. "Some of the policy measures needed to confront global warming will almost certainly dampen economic growth prospects in Latin America . . . [and] will cause some near-term economic and social disruptions." But there must be no hesitation, for "Latin America's [gaseous] emissions, like those of other developing areas, are expected to rise sharply in the coming years as the region's population continues to expand and as industrial and urban development proceeds."

The Dialogue argument boils down to a simple one: Ibero-America's population must not be permitted to continue to rise, nor its industrial and urban development proceed. No quicker route to achieving these reductions could be found than to impose, upon economies already gutted by the debt payment looting of the 1980s, the energy and production cuts demanded by the Dialogue.

Human beings too 'gaseous'

Further economic collapse will condemn millions of people in the region to die of starvation and poverty. But cutting back the number of human beings inhabiting Ibero-America, according to their logic, will help lower "gaseous emissions." Thus they insist:

"No serious effort to deal with global warming or other ecological problems can avoid the issue of population growth. Policy decisions made now could determine whether the world's population, currently at five billion, will eventu-

ally stabilize at eight billion or nearly triple to 14 billion by the middle of the next century. Achieving the smaller number would reduce world carbon dioxide emissions by as much as a complete halt to deforestation.

“Although it would have little short-term impact, a determined effort by all Latin American countries to curtail future population growth is essential to curb greenhouse gas emissions. . . . The United States, for its part, must reverse more than a decade-long decline in support for international population and family-planning programs.”

Dialogue members propose to make these policy proposals the central agenda item at the 1992 U.N. conference on the environment in Brazil. By then, a “Code of Environmental Conduct” should be drawn up for presentation. But since, over the longer term, means must be found to force these “painful” policies upon reluctant nations, they propose “an inter-American environmental protection agency that would have standard-setting, regulatory, and enforcement powers. . . .”

“For now, however, few, if any, countries of the hemisphere would agree to cede control over their national resources to such an international body.”

Delusions of a ‘New Age’

The Inter-American Dialogue report is based on the assumption that because the Soviet Union is allegedly no longer a factor in world politics, the Establishment’s destructive economic policies can be implemented without concern for what the report terms “classic issues of military security and strategy.” The primary strategic reality, they write, is that the Cold War has ended as a result of the “second revolution” in the Soviet Union. They continue:

“Moscow has shown a desire to both limit its overseas political and military involvements and to resolve regional conflicts. . . . In almost any imaginable scenario, the Soviet Union will be a different and indeed a considerably smaller factor in Western Hemisphere affairs during this decade than in the previous two.”

New premises must dominate global affairs since economic competition is replacing military rivalry, the Dialogue claims. “The growing interdependence of the world economy” is replacing “competing national policies, often still tinged with mercantilism.” The role of “institutions of international governance” must rise in importance, such as is occurring with the U.N.

For Ibero-America, such premises dictate “an urgent need to reduce inordinate military expenditures” and a “turning away from inward-oriented development schemes.”

Today, Ibero-America serves mainly “as an exporter of raw materials and as a source of unskilled labor” in the world market, the Dialogue report states, but if these governments expect to continue to attract the attentions of profit-seeking “transnational corporations,” they must realize that they are competing with other “low-wage areas” in attracting overseas investors seeking “manufacturing sites for export-

oriented industries.”

Nothing makes the Dialogue members happier than the degree to which Ibero-American governments have already abandoned past goals of internal development. “Nearly every Latin American country is now striving hard to bolster exports and draw investment from overseas. This is a remarkable turnabout for a region that once emphasized industrial development to serve domestic needs,” they write. Chile is held up as a model, for it now exports over a third of its national production. Domestic markets must be opened wide to imports; tariffs are to be eliminated because, among other things, they “increase profits in domestic markets, thus dampening incentives for export sales.”

History will sweep them away

“The Americas in a New World” provides useful insight into the underlying weakness of the Liberal Establishment’s current grip over the Americas, however. The fundamental premises upon which the Establishment has based its planning are being swept away, even before the ink has fully dried on the report.

The most stunning demonstration of this flaw is their dismissal of the Soviet factor. Even as a new dictatorship in Moscow begins to deploy its military against the subject peoples of the Soviet Empire, the Dialogue assured its followers that “only the coming to power in Moscow of a group committed to worldwide revolutionary struggle could seriously threaten Latin America, and that contingency now seems most unlikely.”

The bankruptcy of that strategic assumption has been demonstrated in Ibero-America itself. In January, two of the terrorist groups in the Americas closest to hardliners in the Kremlin, launched assaults which gave the lie to the Establishment’s insistence that the terrorist threat has ended.

In Colombia, the Communist Party’s armed force, the Revolutionary Armed Forces of Colombia (FARC), killed 36 policemen and blew up infrastructure throughout that nation in the first three days of 1991. FARC spokesmen announced that they are no longer willing to “negotiate” with the government. In El Salvador, the target chosen by the Farabundo Marti Liberation Front (FMLN)—one of the terrorist armies favored by Bush’s State Department for its alleged willingness to “talk”—was U.S. forces. On Jan. 3, FMLN forces shot down a U.S. helicopter, and then shot to death two of the three U.S. servicemen on board.

The second fundamental flaw in the Dialogue’s assumptions is that the Establishment can consolidate a secure “global economy” based on their free market policies. Here, they show an inkling that all may not transpire as they wish in the 1990s. The “appeal of neo-liberal economics in Latin America should not be exaggerated,” they note; liberal policies are still “vulnerable to nationalist backlash.” There is a tone of fear in their warning: “History has by no means ended in Latin America.”